

THE UNIVERSITY OF HULL

HENRY EDWARD MANNING
AND
THE TEACHING OFFICE OF THE CHURCH

being a Thesis submitted for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in the University of Hull

by

Rev. José Santiago Pereiro, M.A. (U. of Navarre, Spain)

July, 1995

Summary of Thesis submitted for PhD degree
by
Rev. José Santiago Pereiro
on
Henry Edward Manning and the Teaching Office of the Church

Manning considered that the end of education was the formation of man, helping him achieve his full stature. From a Christian perspective, this implied a remoulding of man's mind, heart and will after the perfect model of humanity as found in Jesus Christ. He is not only the example but also the author of that transformation: Christ's revelation is the only key for the human intellectual to have access to divine truth, and his grace is the only hand which can truly transform the human heart; they changed man into the likeness of God. It was, therefore, of paramount importance, for the process of education, to be able to establish the test to identify with certainty divine truth and to distinguish it from error.

In the mid 1840s he found that the Anglican Rule of Faith - Scripture interpreted by Tradition - provided him with an incomplete answer. Who was the judge to apply that rule without error? In 1847 he discovered that the Holy Spirit, who had led the Apostles into the full truth, was still the teacher of the Church: a divine, and therefore infallible teacher, teaching through a human voice. Next it was necessary to determine which one was the Church where the Holy Spirit dwelt. Manning concluded that it was the Catholic Church; there it was that the Holy Spirit spoke by the voice of its legitimate Pastors, specially through the Pope.

Manning knew that, within the Catholic Church, some of these truths had not been as solemnly defined or were as universally accepted as he would have desired. He constantly preached those vital principles, and had to defend them not only against Anglicans but also against a few Catholics who did not have a clear perception of them. Once the Vatican Council was convoked, he made it his aim to have those principles clearly and solemnly defined. Only then would they shine in all their splendour and produce their full fruits.

1. ABBREVIATIONS

- Appendix* H.E. Manning, *The Rule of Faith. Appendix to a Sermon* (London, 1838).
- APUC* H.E. Manning, *The Reunion of Christendom. A Pastoral Letter* [dated Epiphany 1866] (London, 1866).
- ASer* H.E. Manning, *Sermons*,
Vol. I (3rd ed., London, 1844) (First 1842)
Vol. II (5th ed., London, 1849) (First 1844?)
Vol. III (4th ed., London, 1850) (First 1847?)
Vol. IV (2nd ed., London, 1850) (First 1850).
- CSer* H.E. Manning, *Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects*,
Vol. I (Dublin, 1869)
Vol. II (London, 1872)
Vol. III (London, 1873).
- E&C* H.E. Manning, *England and Christendom* (London, 1867).
I. Preface
II. The Crown in Council, on the Essays and Reviews. A letter to an Anglican Friend (dated 8 March, 1864)
III. The Convocation and the Crown in Council (dated 25 July, 1864).
- English Church* H.E. Manning, *The English Church: its succession and witness for Christ* (London, 1835).
- Four Evils* H.E. Manning, *The Four Great Evils of the Day* (8th Edition, London, n.d.) (First 1871).
- Grounds* H.E. Manning, *The Grounds of Faith* (new ed., London, 1856) (First 1852).
- LD* *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*
Vols. I-VI, eds. I. Ker, T. Gornall, G. Tracey (Oxford, 1978-84)
Vols. XI-XXXI, eds. C.S. Dessain, E.E. Kelly, T. Gornall (London, 1961-72; Oxford, 1973).
- Manning Mss.* *Bod.* Manning Papers at the Bodleian Library, Oxford.
Pitts. Manning Papers at Pitts Theological Library, Emory Univ., Atlanta (U.S.A.).
West. Manning Papers at Westminster Diocesan Archive, London.
- M* J.D. Mansi (ed.), *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vols. XLIX-LIII (Arnhem & Leipzig, 1923-1927).

- Miscellanies* H.E. Manning, *Miscellanies*,
Vols. I-II (London, 1877)
Vol. III (London, 1888).
- P* E.S. Purcell, *Life of Cardinal Manning*, 2 vols. (4th ed., London,
1896).
- Privilegium* H.E. Manning, *Petri Privilegium. Three Pastoral Letters to the Clergy
of the Diocese* (London, 1871).
I. The Centenary of Saint Peter and the General Council (September
8, 1867)
II. The Oecumenical Council and the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff
(Rosary Sunday, 1869)
III. The Vatican Council and its definitions (Feast of St. Edward the
Confessor, 1870)
- Rule* H.E. Manning, *The Rule of Faith* (London, 1838).
- TM* H.E. Manning, *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost, or Reason
and Revelation* (6th ed., London, 1909) (First 1865).
- True* H.E. Manning, *The True Story of the Vatican Council* (2nd ed.,
London, n.d.) (First 1877).
- Unity* H.E. Manning, *The Unity of the Church* (London, 1842).
- VM* J.H. Newman, *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*, 2 vols. (new
ed., London, 1897).
- Workings* H.E. Manning, *The Workings of the Holy Spirit in the Church of
England. A letter to the Rev. E.B. Pusey, D.D.* (London, 1864).

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	5
<i>Introduction</i>	6
<i>I. A TIME FOR BUILDING; MANNING'S VIA MEDIA</i>	12
<i>1. Reading himself into High Church views</i>	
<i>2. The Rule of Faith</i>	
<i>3. The Roman Rule of Faith: the Infallibility of the Church</i>	
<i>4. An Infallible Rule or an Infallible Church?</i>	
<i>5. The Unity of the Church</i>	
<i>6. First Clouds</i>	
<i>II. CALLING FIRST PRINCIPLES INTO QUESTION</i>	43
<i>A. A time of crisis</i>	
<i>1. The events of 1843 to 1845</i>	
<i>2. The Development of Doctrine</i>	
<i>B. A book on infallibility</i>	
<i>1. The Church as the Mystical Body of Christ</i>	
<i>2. The Unity of Life of the Mystical Body of Christ</i>	
<i>3. The Infallibility of the Mystical Body of Christ</i>	
<i>4. The nature of the act of Faith</i>	
<i>5 Butler and the Analogy of nature</i>	
<i>III. CONVERSION: 'TO ADD, TO DEVELOP, TO PERFECT'</i>	82
<i>1. Deep convictions militant against the heart</i>	
<i>2. The Appellate Jurisdiction of the Crown; conversion to Rome</i>	
<i>3. Faith and Reason</i>	

IV. *THE CHURCH AND THE POPE; MANNING'S CATHOLIC ECCLESIOLOGY*
 (1851-1865)

102

1. *The Holy Spirit in the Church: The Mystical Body of Christ*
2. *The endowments of the Church: Infallibility*
3. *The Church as the Interpreter of Holy Scripture*
4. *Faith's Formal Object*
5. *Infallibility in the Church and in its various members*
6. *The Infallibility of the Pope*
7. *Faith or Rationalism*
8. *The Development and Forms of Rationalism*

V. *'ENGLAND AND CHRISTENDOM'*

137

1. *The Anglican Reformation*
2. *Schism and Heresy*
3. *The Establishment: Nessus' Shirt?*
4. *A Bulwark against Infidelity?*
5. *An 'Eirenicon' and the A.P.U.C.*

VI. *CONFLICTS AT HOME*

169

1. *The spirit of 'The Rambler' and 'The Home and Foreign'*
2. *History and Faith*
3. *Ward on Infallibility*
4. *'Idealism in Theology'*
5. *Manning and Ward*
6. *'The Catholic Spirit'*
7. *'The Catholic Spirit' and University Education*

VII. THE PREPARATION OF THE COUNCIL	209
1. <i>The Agenda for the Council</i>	
2. <i>The Jubilee of 1867 and Fr. Liberatore's vow</i>	
3. <i>A Pastoral on the Pope's Infallibility</i>	
4. <i>The opportuneness of the definition of Papal Infallibility</i>	
5. <i>Gallicanism</i>	
6. <i>A controversy on the way to the Council</i>	
VIII. THE FIRST VATICAN COUNCIL	236
A. <i>The Constitution on Catholic Faith</i>	
B. <i>The Path to the Definition of Papal Infallibility</i>	
I. <i>The introduction of the subject in the Council</i>	
1. <i>Petitions for its inclusion in the schema 'De Ecclesia'</i>	
2. <i>The new chapter on the Pope's Infallibility</i>	
3. <i>Moves to change the order of the debates</i>	
II. <i>The Definition</i>	
1. <i>The Minority's fears</i>	
2. <i>A personal Infallibility</i>	
3. <i>The Object of Faith and the Object of Infallibility</i>	
4. <i>An 'absolute' and 'separate' infallibility?</i>	
CONCLUSIONS	285
ABBREVIATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY	291

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to all who, with their ideas and encouragement, have made this study possible. The years spent researching Manning's intellectual development are full of warm memories of those who had given me a generous share of their time and knowledge, and, in particular, of their friendship. Special mention should be made of the Rt. Rev. Dr. Geoffrey Rowell, Dr. Sheridan Gilley and Dr. Peter Nockles. The Newman-Manning Symposiums, organised by Prof. Biemar and Prof. McClelland in Freiburg in 1993, 1994 and 1995, offered me the opportunity to learn much from them, besides enjoying their company. I have a very special debt of gratitude to Dr. Peter Erb, of Wilfrid Laurier University (Ontario), who made available to me the Gladstone-Manning correspondence which he is editing; he was also patient enough to go over the draft text of the first chapters of the thesis, making some very useful suggestions. I must also thank Mr. Andrew Hegarty for having helped me revise chapters four to eight. Dr. Jean Garnett gave me useful leads when studying Butler's influence on Manning and on some of his contemporaries. Last, but obviously not least, I wish to thank Prof. Vincent Alan McClelland. He introduced me to the subject, and, with his stupendous familiarity with Manning and his time, has been a sure guide and helped me avoid many a pitfall, beside being a continuous source of encouragement and assistance in the past few years. It is thanks to him that the thesis has been such an enjoyable experience for me. No amount of help can completely eliminate personal errors and mistakes: of them all I take full and sole responsibility.

INTRODUCTION

Manning was introduced into the subject of education by Bishop Otter in the late 1830s. He claimed that, at first, the matter did not hold a great attraction for him. He was, at the time, full of ideas about the mission and powers of the Church, about truth and tradition. Education might have appeared to him as an unwelcome distraction from the fundamentals. He soon discovered, though, that it was not so alien to his central concerns, coming to see it as closely related to the teaching office of the Church and the rule of faith. Manning's notebooks would soon start recording his thoughts on the nature of education and the role the Church and the State played in it, side by side with his reflections on the rule of faith, tradition and infallibility. His early conclusions on the subject were to prove long lasting, running through his Anglican and Catholic years almost unaffected by the passage of time and his intellectual vicissitudes. In 1878, he felt that he could write to Gladstone: 'I don't think that I have departed from the convictions we then (1838) had in common, except in a very large recognition of the rights of conscience'¹.

His first public utterance on education was the sermon he preached on 31 May 1838, in behalf of the Chichester Central Schools. In it, he surveyed the present situation and tried to give his answer to the question being debated at the time: Is education the responsibility of the Church or of the State? Manning thought that the sphere of the State's activity was being constantly enlarged, and that greater and greater powers were being claimed for it by politicians and social philosophers. More and more questions were then considered 'to be so interwoven with the duties of Civil government, as to fall under the supreme, if not sole, cognizance of Statesmen. Such for instance is the question of ^{National} Education'². Many took for granted, Manning added, 'that the Supreme authority in determining the kind and mode of Education resides in the Civil Government; that the Church is employed in educating the people, incidentally, and as

¹ *Gladstone Papers*, British Library, Add.Mss. 44250, Fol. 261; letter dated 10-XI-87.

² H.E. Manning, *National Education. A Sermon preached in the Cathedral Church of Chichester in behalf of the Chichester Central Schools* (London, 1838), p. 10.

an instrument: the scheme of education ought to be comprehensive; our mixed state requiring an adjust system, which shall extend the benefits to all, and clash with the peculiar persuasion of none³.

What kind of education? Under what control? Manning considered that the answers to these questions hinged on a proper understanding of man, his nature and his end. His sermon of 1838 stated in clear terms what the general principles which should govern education were. The end of man is eternal life, and man attains it by growing into the image and likeness of God, which he received from his Creator. Education could not be the mere intellectual process of instruction or even the means to form good citizens. Christianity had added a deeper dimension to the concept of education: ‘The one predominant idea of Christian education is a remoulding of the whole nature, a rooting out of evil, a ripening of good, and a shaping of the inward character after the heavenly example. Christ is both the author, and the exemplar of the whole process’⁴. The proper character of education is, thus, ‘moral and spiritual: and its importance not temporal alone, but eternal; involving the everlasting welfare of souls for whom Christ died’⁵. Years later, already a Catholic, he would describe the aim of education in similar terms: the ‘formation of the will and heart and character, the formation of man, is education, and not the reading and the writing and the spelling and the summing’⁶. Therefore, a proper understanding of man’s nature and present condition, of his destiny and of the means to achieve it, were essential to carry out that task. All this, he would say, can only be found in the Church: the Church knows that the perfect model of humanity is Jesus Christ, perfect God and perfect Man; she is aware of man’s fallen nature; she also has the divine remedies for his present condition.

Probably the most developed exposition of Manning’s ideas on the subject is to be found in his book *The Unity of the Church* (1842). There, he described man’s fall from the original state in which he had been created, the consequences of original sin, and how the Church helps him to recover his lost dignity. In man, created in the image and

³ *Ibidem*, p. 11.

⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 17.

⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 10.

⁶ *Four Evils*, p. 140.

likeness of God, there had originally been a moral unity, within the multiplicity of elements of which he is composed. The bond which made man one was the union of his will with God's will, the image within himself of the unity of will of the Three Persons. Afterwards, original sin, man's disobedience, had broken the union between the creature and the Creator, the unity of man's mind with the mind of God and of man's will with God's will; it had weakened the inclination of his heart towards good and clouded his intellect. Sin had disfigured the image of God in man because it destroyed man's unity - the external unity of man with God and of man with other men; it had also destroyed man's internal oneness. When man sins he becomes 'manyfold', Manning said, quoting Origen. 'His one will becomes a multiplicity of wills (...). This inward anarchy is the moral opposite and conscious antagonist of the Divine image'⁷. The Church helps man recover his lost dignity by enabling him to restore internal and external unity. This is the mission that Christ entrusted her, after having accomplished the work of Redemption. With the mission, He entrusted her with the means to carry it out: the true knowledge of God and His grace.

According to Manning, the Church's rôle in education is determined, primarily, by the relationship that exists between the Church and truth. Truth, and in a very special way revealed truth, is not a convenient educational commodity one may dispense with, but an essential element for the life of the individual and society. True knowledge of God, he wrote in 1842, is 'a necessary condition to man's restoration to the Divine image'⁸. Ten years later he was to express the same idea in more explicit terms: 'Truth [particularly revealed truth] bears the stamp of God, and truth changes man to the likeness of God'⁹. Not any knowledge, but only the knowledge of truth, effects that change. 'Opinion', he would write to Miss Stanley in 1851, 'cannot unite the soul with the eternal word; but Faith does'¹⁰.

This knowledge is to be found in Jesus Christ: nobody knows the Father except the Son. He reveals God to man. Christ is also the type of man's perfect nature, and exhibits the

⁷ *Unity*, p. 250.

⁸ *Ibidem*, pp. 236-237; see also p. 177.

⁹ *Grounds*, p. 19.

¹⁰ *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 660, Fol. 70; letter dated 27-VII-51.

complete ideal of moral unity in his obedience to the will of his Father, and in his unity of charity with all mankind. Consequently, the knowledge of Christ is a revelation for man, dispelling the blindness of his mind and attracting his will towards God. Manning would say that the 'knowledge of God in Christ has developed the reason and the will of man'¹¹.

Only God has the powers to educate in the true sense of the word, and these powers 'can be found nowhere but in His truth, which is the key of the human intellect, and in His grace, which is the only hand that can touch the heart in man'¹². God had handed down to the Church both truth and grace. Therefore, it could be said that 'the Christian Church alone has received the commission to educate, and the means and powers whereby to educate'¹³. Christianity, understood as *truth* and *grace*, was the sole real educator of mankind. The Church could not be excluded from education or be considered merely as a provider of truth for the educational process. The restoration of man, as an end to education, meant that the Church had to be involved at every stage of it.

Manning considered that man had fallen by the will in rebelling against God, and that by the will he would be restored to his original condition. The Church was the means God had devised to tame the pride of man's rebellious will. She did so, on the one hand, by re-establishing two fundamental relationships: one, of *subordination* to God, expressed in obedience to an authority standing in God's place; the other, of *equality*, by uniting man with his fellow men in charity. The intellectual nature would also be tamed and restrained from its wild excesses by the Church. Man has a tendency 'to put subjective opinion in the place of objective truth'¹⁴. This had become a widely accepted prejudice: it was 'commonly thought, and roundly asserted now-a-days', Manning had said in 1838, 'that a man's opinions in religion are worth little, if he do not form them for himself, first doubting, then gathering arguments, weighing, comparing, deducing, concluding'¹⁵. This intellectual pride found its corrective in men's submission to the

¹¹ H.E. Manning, *Denominational Education. A Pastoral* (London, 1869), p. 4.

¹² *Four Evils*, p. 138.

¹³ H.E. Manning, *Denominational Education*, p. 6.

¹⁴ *Unity*, p. 268.

¹⁵ H.E. Manning, *National Education*, p. 24.

Church, 'as learners to an order of men who are divinely commissioned to teach'¹⁶. Ignorance and pride, the eldest daughters of sin, would be healed by 'the illumination of the intellectual nature through the one objective doctrine, and by the purifying of the moral nature through the one objective discipline, the will is once more enthroned supreme, and its energies united with the will of God'¹⁷.

From that standing point, Manning could write to Hare: 'I am too much of a Platonist to hold truth moderately - I should as soon [think] of holding the multiplication table in moderation'¹⁸. And, a couple of years later, he wrote again to the same correspondent: 'From my heart I can say that I desire peace before all things but truth'¹⁹. 'Truth before peace' would be the title of one of his later sermons; by then, Manning had gone through a long pilgrimage and a considerable amount of heartache in his search for truth.

The teaching office of the Church, and the means by which she gains access to divine truth and proposes it to men, were constant concerns in Manning's mind. The present study tries to trace the development of Manning's ideas in search for the true rule of faith. The thesis attempts to set Manning's thought in its historical context, against the background of the personalities and the questions he addressed and tried to answer. This interplay between Manning's principles and his historical milieu helps to illustrate further his thought, and, at the same time, shows the external pressures which forced the different issues on him and, in good measure, channelled his attention towards some particular questions.

Manning considered that the books he had published had a unity and were enough, 'even without the private records', to follow 'the progressive, but slow, and never receding advance of my convictions, from the first conception of a visible Church, its succession and witness for Christ, to the full perception and manifestation of its divine organization of Head and members, of its supernatural prerogatives of indefectible life, indissoluble

¹⁶ *Unity*, p. 268.

¹⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 251.

¹⁸ *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 653, Fol. 18; letter dated 24-VIII-40.

¹⁹ *Ibidem*, Fol. 214; letter dated 2-I-42.

unity, infallible discernment, and enunciation of the Faith'²⁰. The present study concentrates its attention on the analysis of Manning's published writings. Full use has also been made of the relevant manuscript sources preserved in British Archives, the Congregation of Propaganda Fidei and the Venerable English College in Rome. Thanks to Dr. Peter Erb, I have been able to gain access to Manning's letters to Gladstone, now at Emory University (Atlanta, USA).

I have tried to preserve Manning's system of punctuation and his use of capital letters in the quotations from his writings. Manning did change frequently, even in the same paragraph, his use of capital letters, conveying a certain impression of the hurried nature of some of his writing. References to and discussion of secondary sources have been reduced to a minimum, in order to present as clear a vision as possible of Manning's thought.

²⁰ *CSer*, I, p. 2.

CHAPTER I

A TIME FOR BUILDING: MANNING'S VIA MEDIA

1. Reading himself into High Church views

On his arrival at Lavington in January 1833 H.E. Manning's theological baggage fitted neatly into a few short sentences. He summed it up years later in a letter written to Samuel Wilberforce: 'When I came to Lavington in 1833 I believed, as I always did, in Baptismal Regeneration; I had no view of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ; and no idea of the Church'¹. In the recollections of his later *Journal* (1878-82) he described his position at this time in greater detail: 'The state of my religious belief in 1833 was profound faith in the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation, in the Redemption by the Passion of our Lord, and in the work of the Holy Spirit, and the conversion of the soul. I believed in baptismal regeneration, and in a spiritual, but real, receiving of our Lord in Holy Communion. As to the Church, I had no definite conception'².

Manning's Evangelical background is a matter under discussion³; however, his own

¹ *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 656, Fol. 55 (copy); letter dated 20-X-1850.

² *P*, I, p.112. This repeated plea of ignorance about the nature of the Church in the early 1830s should not be taken too literally. Manning judged his early views on the Church from the Catholic understanding of it which he had reached after many years of study and development (see also H. Wilberforce's letter to Newman in *LD*, IV, p. 317).

³ The traditional view of the Evangelical origin of Manning's religious ideas has been recently challenged by C. O'Gorman. He concludes that the development of Manning's religious opinions begins to make sense if 'it is portrayed (...) as the waking up from a merely nominal old high churchmanship, into what became the fullness of the historical Catholic faith' [C. O'Gorman, 'A History of Henry Manning's Religious Opinions, 1808-1832', in V.A. McClelland (ed), *Henry Edward Manning 1808-1892*, in *Recusant History*, Vol. 21, n.2 (October, 1992), p. 156]. O'Gorman seems to be unaware of a letter of Manning to Miss Maurice (30-VIII-50) in which Manning's own words offer support to O'Gorman's conclusion: 'I was brought [up] in the old Establishment High Church way. (...) At 21-22 I fell in with good Low Church friends, read Leighton which I have kept by me to this hour, and many puritan books. I never received their doctrinal opinions but embraced their devotional and practical views with all my heart' (*Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 659, Fol 160). This letter also offers a brief summary Manning's readings during and after his university studies; additional information on his reading in the years before ordination can be found in his *Notes and Reminiscences*, in *P*, I, p. 68.

words seem to suggest that his theological horizon at the time - because of his previous formation or because of his lack of it - bore a certain resemblance to the Evangelical position. He started soon, though, to read his way into the Anglican High Church Tradition, and Samuel Wilberforce seems to have guided his first steps in this direction: 'you sent me to Hooker', Manning would write in the above letter to Samuel, 'to learn the real presence'.

His pastoral work urged him along that course of reading. It presented Manning with challenges for which he was not fully equipped, and questions which he could not answer with the scanty theological resources at his disposal. 'The first question that rose in my mind was, What right have you to be teaching, admonishing, reforming, rebuking others? By what authority do you lift the latch of a poor man's door and enter and sit down and begin to instruct or to correct him? This train of thought forced me to see that no culture or knowledge of Greek or Latin would suffice for this. That if I was not a messenger sent from God, I was an intruder and impertinent'⁴.

Manning's train of thought also led him to confront another riddle: 'the necessity of a divine certainty for the message I had to deliver became, if possible, more evident. A divine, that is, an infallible message, by a human messenger is still the truth of God; but a human, or fallible message, by a messenger having a divine commission, would be the source of error, illusion, and all evil'⁵.

The pastoral implications of the answer to those two questions were momentous, and Manning felt them very keenly from the very beginning of his ministry. 'Perhaps there is none' - he wrote in 1838 - 'whose anxious sense of responsibility has [not] been sharpened by the charge of souls, and has not sometimes felt the harassing of a doubtful mind on great and weighty points of doctrine and interpretation'⁶. He was not alone in asking those questions; the excited theological atmosphere generated by the Oxford Movement, and the events which had stirred it up, were bringing these and other connected issues into public debate. However, it can be claimed that in Manning's early

⁴ *P*, I, p. 112; see also *CSer*, I, p. 3.

⁵ *CSer*, I, p. 3.

⁶ *Rule*, p. 12.

years at Lavington, these inquiries were urged by the demands of his pastoral work rather than by general matters of ecclesiastical policy. The ecclesiastical statesman in him, though, was soon to be awakened to the transcendence of those issues in the wider context of the relationship between Church and State.

From Manning's own description of the events it seems that it was Samuel Wilberforce who had introduced him to the tradition of the great Anglican divines. After that first step Manning did not seem to need much encouragement, neither did he seem to have asked others for advice in his course of reading. He was always jealous of his independence and reacted firmly against any attempt to identify him with a party. In a letter to Hamilton he would claim that he had reached on his own the positions he then held: 'You mistake me by associating me with anybody, except so far as accidental agreement warrant the putting me into the same category. Before my ordination I may say I had no intercourse with any clergy of any kind[!], or class. Since that time I have lived wholly at this place, and my views, as far as any man can say so, have been formed alone, by the word of God; and an examination of the Christian faith before Popery corrupted it, and Protestantism wrested it aside'⁷. In the course of that reading Manning had found his own *Via Media* between the two extremes of Ultra-Protestantism and Rome, two bodies which over the centuries had acted 'as the upper, and nether millstones grinding truth to death'⁸. The coincidence of views with the Oxford Movement should not be a matter for surprise. At Lavington Manning had read by himself in the same direction. In 1840 he would describe to Hare the influences which had shaped his theological opinions: Coleridge - with whom he differed in many points - had done for his mind in theology 'some of the work which Bacon did to Philosophy of nature (...). Next I have always said that, after the Prayer Book, Hooker best represents my mind; and Leighton except when the seams of Calvinism are yet visible'⁹; Hooker had led him to Thorndike, who was to play an important part in the forming of his ideas. This letter, together with other evidence, shows that Manning was also well read in the other classic Anglican theologians: Bramhall, Hammond, Taylor, Bull, Beveridge; that he was familiar with Calvin's commentaries of the Scriptures,

⁷ *Manning.Mss.Bod.*, c. 662, Fol. 2; letter dated 10-VIII-36.

⁸ *Ibidem*, Fol. 1.

⁹ *Ibidem*, c. 653, Fol. 21.

which he liked, but unacquainted with Luther's works. His sermons and writings clearly show, on the other hand, that he was well versed in the knowledge of the Fathers of the Church, particularly St. Augustine and St. Cyprian. Fortunately for him, Manning's copious reading had found in the atmosphere of Lavington the complement of peace required for ideas and concepts to find their proper connexions and settle into a system with clear and well defined principles.

The Tractarians did not lay a claim to originality or to having founded a new system. On the contrary, they strove to make it clear that they were not propounding a new theory; their confessed aim was rather to restore the original purity of their Anglican Reformation, represented by the sixteenth and seventeenth century Anglican divines, a purity which had been deformed and smothered by the Protestantism imposed on it by the last one hundred and fifty years. Newman himself seemed to confirm Manning's contention of independence from the Oxford Movement when writing to Edward Churton: 'He [Manning] is, in no conceivable sense, of the Oxford school (to use a wrong word) - Pusey knows him now, being drawn to him by congeniality of opinions - but he is Pusey's, only so far as Pusey is Truth's, and Manning also - and as you are Manning's or Pusey's, which is not at all'¹⁰. In one of his remonstrances to Hare, Manning would write in the same sense: 'In some things I thoroughly agree with Newman; in some things partially, in some things not at all'¹¹.

Manning's progress in the acquisition of High Church views was a swift one. By November 1833, Henry Wilberforce was reporting to Newman that Manning had reviewed his opinions and adopted Apostolic Succession; and, in subsequent letters, he would continue to chart - not always accurately - the development of Manning's views along Catholic lines. Apostolic Succession provided an answer to the first of Manning's questions. He saw it as the origin of the divine commission that the priest received at ordination and the source of his authority. The invitation to preach in 1835 the sermon on the occasion of the Archdeacon of Chichester's Visitation offered Manning the opportunity to bring into public view his ideas on the subject. In the sermon, he affirmed that the Apostles were not just Christ's companions; they were also the

¹⁰ *LD*, VI, p. 175; letter dated 4-XII-1837.

¹¹ *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 653, Fol. 223 (letter dated 7-I-42); see also 'Biographical Note', *P*, I, p.259.

witnesses of Christ's Resurrection and representatives of their Master, of his personal presence. They 'were commissioned and sent by the Son, as the Son by the Father. This constituted the validity of their mission, and the value of their testimony'¹². The priestly ministry nowadays, he continued, rests on the same foundations: forgiveness, Baptism, or the Sacrament of the Lord's body and blood can only be offered on the condition 'that the testimony we bear is a direct personal testimony, and the authority we exercise a valid commission derived to us from Himself'¹³. Christ's salvific design was clearly stated: the divine commission - the powers of teaching and sanctifying - was to be handed on, following our Lord's example, along a continuous chain which would run down the centuries. The Bishops, successors of the Apostles, were the links in that chain, and the validity and power of their ministry would depend on the soundness of their union with that first link, our Lord. A break in that succession would imply the end of that particular line of witness, authority and power: 'what man [would] dare, on his own authority, renew what the authority of Christ began?'¹⁴ The inferior degrees of ministry, in their turn, derived their 'representative character from him that laid hands on us', Manning added. Thus, our 'commission to witness for Christ, then, hangs upon this question: *Are the Bishops of our Church the successors in lineal descent, of the Lord's Apostles?*'¹⁵ The historical argument proved it to Manning's satisfaction.

The matter was of great momentum in the times he happened to live. The circumstances, he would say, made it necessary to 'remind ourselves that we are not ministers of men, nor by men, but witnesses called and commissioned by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead'¹⁶. Manning's exalted vision of the Episcopate would be even more forcefully expressed in his letter of 1838 to the Bishop of Chichester on the principle of the Ecclesiastical Commission: 'our Bishop is to us the source of authority and the centre of unity in order, deliberation and discipline. (...) We believe that no power, spiritual or ecclesiastical, excepting only the collective authority of the whole Episcopal order to which supreme jurisdiction all Bishops are

¹² *English Church*, p. 7.

¹³ *Ibidem*, p. 9.

¹⁴ *Ibidem*.

¹⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 10.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 22.

severally subject, can reach us, unless it pass through his express permission'¹⁷.

His second great concern also made a brief appearance in the Visitation Sermon. The spiritual origin and mission of the priestly ministry might be clear beyond any doubt, but he felt that this was not 'sufficient security, taken alone, that our message be according to the truth. An accredited ambassador may pervert his message and betray his master's charge'¹⁸. The greater the authority of the witness the more he should be concerned not to pervert the message entrusted to him. The temptations from false philosophy, worldly spirit, or the desire to please, could lead him to adulterate the truth revealed by God; he should be watchful over his trust, fully aware of the enemies threatening it.

2. *The Rule of Faith*

Manning thought that the Episcopal principle was advanced enough by the abundant literature on the subject, and he went on to concentrate his attention on how to find the certainty for the message he was supposed to deliver. His correspondence with Newman and S.F. Wood shows that by the autumn of 1835 he was already studying the relationship between Holy Scripture and Tradition. 'I have been reading' - he wrote to Newman - 'Vincentius Lerinensis; and have thought of trying to put something together about Tradition, its use, authority, and limits in the Church of Christ, with an application to the Church of England, shewing how much we necessarily and unconsciously depend on it, while we anathematise it in Popery'¹⁹. In November of the same year he wrote to Samuel F. Wood to announce that he was sending a paper on Apostolic Tradition. That prompted Wood to send Manning his own thoughts on the

¹⁷ H.E.Manning, *The Principle of The Ecclesiastical Commission Examined, in a Letter to the Right Rev. Lord Bishop of Chichester* (London, 1838), pp. 5-6.

¹⁸ *English Church*, pp. 22-23.

¹⁹ *LD*, V, p. 137; letter dated 15-IX-35. The first fruit of his reading on the subjects of Tradition and the Rule of Faith was Tract 78, a Catenae of authorities in support of the principle of Vincent of Lerins: *Quod semper, quod ubique,* The tract appeared in 1837 and served as groundwork and ready available quarry of material for his *Sermon* and *Appendix* on the Rule of Faith.

subject, including a schematic but clear expression of a theory of doctrinal development²⁰. In his answer, which is not extant, Manning seems to have agreed in many respects with Wood's ideas but he could not go along with him as far as development was concerned. Samuel wrote back, minimizing their differences: 'Your paper on Tradition and your general concurrence with my view gave me very sincere delight (...). Our sole difference appears to me to consist in our notions of the development of truth in the Church as stated in my 3d. proposition'. Manning had countered it, Wood recorded in his letter, with his own 4th proposition: 'Therefore the Church has no warrant to promulgate new truths'²¹. Newman who, after his debate with the Abbé Jagger, was working on the same topic in his *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church*, also rejected Wood's theory of doctrinal development, and agreed in substance with Manning's answer to Wood.

Newman's *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church* appeared in 1837; Manning followed with his Sermon *The Rule of Faith*, preached in June 1838. In it he made his own the High Anglican doctrine of the rule of faith. Soon after its publication, the Sermon was under fierce attack from the Evangelical party, and the Rector of Lavington defended his positions with a barrage of Anglican authorities, published as a long *Appendix to The Rule of Faith*. It was a fortunate circumstance. The need for a defence forced Manning to give a more complete view of his ideas on the subject, and the combined Sermon and Appendix amount to a rather complete treatise on the rule of faith.

Manning preached the Sermon on a text of the Epistle to the Galatians: 'But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we have said before, so say I now again. If any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed' (Gal. 1, 8-9). He considered that St. Paul's words had not lost any of their

²⁰ See J. Pereiro, 'S.F. Wood and an early theory of development in the Oxford Movement', *Recusant History*, Vol. 20, n. 4 (October, 1991), pp. 524-553.

²¹ Wood to Manning (18-XII-35), *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 654, Fol. 442. Wood's 3rd proposition in his letter to Manning dated 19-XI-35 read: 'In common with other societies the Church has the inherent power of expanding or modifying her organisation, of bringing her ideas of the truth into more distinct consciousness, or of developing the truth itself more fully', *Ibidem*, Fol. 440.

original force; they were an everlasting injunction: 'We may no more swerve from the pure faith of Christ's Gospel, and be held guiltless, than the fickle Galatian, or the inflated gnostic'²². The dangers threatening the faith had grown more numerous from the time of the Apostles: errors had multiplied since then, and, to counter them, we no longer have 'the inspired servants of our Lord to bear a living and personal witness to the mind of the Holy Ghost'²³. There was no refuge to be found behind the plea of non-wilful error. Manning rejected it as a subterfuge to pacify one's conscience: 'though *wilful* heresy be the blacker sin, yet the doctrinal errors of the cold earthly mind, of the indolent and unconcerned heart, (...) have their graduate measures, and those not small, of positive moral guilt'²⁴. Doctrinal error had its moral root in 'a sinful temper of mind', and, in its turn, produces pernicious effects in the flock of Christ. The ordained minister bore a double responsibility for this. The charge of souls had, therefore, made Manning anxious 'to find some *rule* by which to measure the proportions of the faith'. His aim was not 'to inquire what are the specific *doctrines* of the Gospel, but what is the *rule* by which we may ascertain them'²⁵. He conceived the rule of faith as a test of doctrine: 'the test by which we ascertain the *character* of revelation, the proof of that *fact* being presupposed'²⁶. It was obvious to him that such a rule must exist, 'unless the knowledge of the Gospel be revealed over and over again, from age to age, to churches and to individuals, immediately, as in the beginning: that is, unless the faith once delivered to the saints is, by the same supernatural communication, still being perpetually delivered to the saints'²⁷. This would amount to perpetual inspiration, which possibility Manning rejected.

Manning's line of argument started from an assumption which he considered generally accepted: Scripture contains all things necessary for salvation. This, though, was not the same as saying that Scripture needed no interpreter. That would have been the case 'if either the Scriptures were so clear that private Christians could not err in

²² *Rule*, p. 8.

²³ *Ibidem*, p. 9.

²⁴ *Ibidem*, pp. 8-9.

²⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 13.

²⁶ *Appendix*, p. 1.

²⁷ *Rule*, p. 13.

understanding [them], or Churches so infallible as never to go astray in expounding the interpretation'²⁸. Experience showed, according to Manning, that Churches had erred, and that individual Christians had produced innumerable and contradictory interpretations of the same scriptural text. He went on then to state the obvious: the faith of the first Christian communities did not depend on written books; the preaching of the Gospel, and the foundation of churches built upon that faith, had preceded the writing of the scriptural books. The original Apostolic Teaching had consequently been summarised in brief formulas - Symbols or Creeds - for the confession of faith of the candidate to the sacrament of Baptism, 'as the condition of his entering into the Church of Christ, and the rule of his faith afterwards'²⁹. The Creeds of the different Churches, although diverse in their actual wording, were all the same in substance. They anteceded the writing of the New Testament books, and when these were received by the different Christian communities they were interpreted from the faith that they already professed: 'each particular Church read and understood its own particular Scripture in the sense of the faith before delivered to it, and the whole Church read and understood the whole Scripture in the sense of the Apostolic teaching, which all in common had received. In each particular Church, therefore, as well as in the Church at large, there was both the Scripture and the sense...'³⁰. Tradition, therefore, attested both Scripture - handing to us the canon of the inspired books - and the sense. Thus, 'the Rule of Faith, as recognised and contended by the Reformed Church of England, is Scripture and antiquity, or Universal Tradition attesting both Scripture and the sense'³¹. He described the workings of the two elements of the Rule by saying that Scripture's rôle is to be 'the proof of the creed [which stands here for Tradition], and the creed the interpreter of Scripture'³². The Foreword to Tract 78 had been more explicit in its description of the relationship between Scripture and Tradition: 'Catholic tradition teaches revealed truth, Scripture proves it; Scripture is the document of Faith, tradition the witness of it; the true Creed is the Catholic interpretation of Scripture, or

²⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 26.

²⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 28; Keble had expressed similar ideas in his sermon at Winchester on 27 September 1836: 'Primitive Tradition recognised in Holy Scripture'.

³⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 28.

³¹ *Appendix*, p. 33.

³² *Rule*, p. 35.

Scripturally proved tradition; Scripture by itself teaches mediately and proves decisively; tradition by itself proves negatively and teaches positively; Scripture and tradition taken together are the joint Rule of Faith³³. This, Manning claimed, did not produce a circular argument; they were two witnesses attesting to the one truth, the harmony of the two being the first rule of interpretation. This, however, did not solve all the problems, as there still remained a large body of doctrine not included in the Creed but fundamental to the faith, i.e.: original sin, the doctrine of justification, the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, etc. The unnumbered repugnant interpretations of these doctrines witnessed to Scripture's need for an expositor. The practice of the Anglican Reformers, and the canons of 1571, offered welcome support here: where the Creeds were silent, the Anglican Church listened to those who are presumably by their antiquity, to know the truth, and by their uniform consent, neither to mistake themselves, nor to deceive us. Manning thought that few texts of Scripture would be left without a clear interpretation after having used the above principles. That was what Bramhall called 'the infallible rule of faith', i.e.: Holy Scripture interpreted by the Catholic Church, the tradition of the Christian world united. Nothing should be put forward, as a necessary article of faith, except those doctrines which, in accordance with Vincent of Lerins' rule, had been believed always, everywhere, and by all.

The 'consent of the Christian world they knew to be the voice of God, promulgated from the Apostles to themselves'³⁴. It could not be otherwise, Manning said, quoting Palmer: 'nothing short of an universal cause, in all places acting alike with *one unerring uniform* operation, could bring about an *universal* effect, which like the laws of the material world, and the instincts of animate creatures, point by their universal harmony to the sole universal Agent'³⁵. The consent of the Christian world was, for Manning, 'a visible and perpetual MIRACLE', and Christians knew it to be 'the voice of God, prolonged from the Apostles to themselves'³⁶. Thus, nowadays, universal agreement with the Church of the apostolic age was 'the *surest test of agreement with*

³³ H.E. Manning, *Testimony of writers in the later English Church to the duty of maintaining quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus traditum est*, Tracts for the Times, n. 78, Catena Patrum n. III (new ed., London, 1839), p. 2.

³⁴ *Appendix*, p. 62.

³⁵ *Ibidem*.

³⁶ *Ibidem*.

*the doctrine of the Apostles of Christ*³⁷. Manning, following Palmer, went even further: 'I maintain that Christians cannot possibly admit that any doctrine, established by universal tradition can be otherwise than *divinely, infallibly, true*³⁸.

The existence - and character - of a truth belonging to that Universal Tradition was determined by historico-critical methods: 'the existence of such a tradition from the beginning is a matter of fact, which is to be established on the same sort of evidence as proves any other historical fact'³⁹. There was a danger in this of which Manning was still unaware. The difficult task of sifting through the vast body of writings of the Fathers, and of weighing the not always concordant material, threatened to remove 'the real authority in the Church from the faithful and the pastors into the hands of the Church historian, who would declare with expert information the teaching of the early Church'⁴⁰.

Scripture and Tradition made up the rule of faith of the Anglican Church. This was also the Rule of Primitive Christianity. The perfect Rule which God had devised as the external channel of conveyance for his revealed truth. In conformity with His general providence, as shown in the establishing of the Church and the Sacraments, God had also provided for a medium, external to the individual, to perpetuate and dispense truth.

It was a position much in need of defence. The Ultra-Protestant party did not waste time to attack the Tractarians and their friends on that count, accusing them of upholding Romanist doctrines, while rejecting those of the Anglican Church. On the other hand, Catholic controversialists - like Wiseman - argued that such an idea of the rule of faith bore little difference, if any at all, from the principle of Private Judgment. The Tractarians' strategy in defence would be twofold. They first endeavoured to prove that the theory of the sola Scriptura was opposed to the principles of the Anglican Reformation, while showing that the principle of private judgment was theoretically absurd and had already proved to be unworkable in practice. Secondly, they attacked

³⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 3.

³⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 112.

³⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 112; again quoting Palmer.

⁴⁰ O. Chadwick, *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement* (Cambridge, 1990), p. 30.

the Roman doctrine of the infallibility of the Church, in order to defend themselves against the charge of Romanism, while fighting off Catholic objections to the Anglican rule of faith.

3. *The Roman Rule of Faith: the Infallibility of the Church*

Both, Manning and Newman, would deal in their books with the so-called Roman Doctrine of the Infallibility of the Church, of which they had a rather distorted and superficial notion. They approached it from different angles and treated it in different ways, which went some way to show their diverse intellectual frame of mind; it is easy to detect, though, their common basis in Butler's doctrine in the *Analogy*.

Newman considered that the infallibility claimed by Rome was the first principle, 'the sovereign and engrossing tenet', 'the foundation-stone, or (as it may be called) the fulcrum of its theology'⁴¹. In this system the living Church becomes the author and teacher of Faith, which supersedes and makes unnecessary the appeal to Scripture and Antiquity. In his opinion, the origin of the doctrine of infallibility could be traced back to an original misconception: the notion 'that any degree of doubt about religious truth is incompatible with faith, and that an external infallible assurance is necessary to exclude doubt'⁴². Otherwise, according to those who uphold the doctrine of infallibility, what is called faith would be no more than, a mere opinion; certainty, to be such, would require the conjunction of God's revelation and the Church's infallibility to convey it.

Newman equated infallibility with omniscience: 'to know some things in any subject infallibly, implies that we know all things'⁴³. Only an absolute knowledge would exclude uncertainty. This presumption forced the Church of Rome, according to Newman, to build up a complete theology, and, in developing his argument, he seemed to identify the theology of the schools with the doctrine of the Church. In this system

⁴¹ *VM*, I, p. 69.

⁴² *Ibidem*, pp. 85-86.

⁴³ *Ibidem*, p. 89.

there would be no room for doubt or obscurity; all questions would be settled. This process, according to Newman, being contrary to the divine dispensation, could only be the work of human intellect, to which divine truth would be subject. To Newman's mind, the rationalistic bent of the doctrine of infallibility was obvious. He concluded his analysis of the doctrine of infallibility by declaring it defective 'in respect of *proof*, it is defective even viewed in its *theory* in two main points; (...) Roman theologians, though claiming for the Church the gift of Infallibility, cannot even in theory give an answer to the question *how* individuals are to know for certain that she is infallible; nor in the next place *where* the gift resides'⁴⁴. They cannot 'complete their system [the Roman Theology] in its most important and essential point'⁴⁵. The Roman rule of faith - its dogmatic system - was based on Infallibility, a doctrine that had not been even defined as a dogma!

Manning, when studying the Roman rule of faith, concentrated his attention on whether there existed a living judge in the controversies about the faith. To establish the principle which he was going to criticise he quoted from a Catholic source, Berington and Kirk, affirming: '*the same spirit which dictated the writing of the Scriptures, [is] directing the Church to understand them*'⁴⁶. The Church, thus, would be a living and infallible judge of interpretation. Manning considered that great evils followed from this principle, the chief one being that if the meaning of Scripture was 'tied to follow the utterance of a *living* voice which shall claim the supreme right of interpretation, [the interpretation] must vary with the living expositor'⁴⁷. The Church may use Tradition, and the Roman Catholic Church called on Antiquity to witness for its dogmas, but both Tradition and Scripture were made 'to follow the interpretation of the present Church. Of antiquity it [the Roman Church] accepts as much as is in accordance with its existing system; of the rest, some it explains away, some it rejects, some utterly condemns'⁴⁸. To make matters worse, Catholics also affirmed that 'some points of *belief* (...) *were*

⁴⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 122.

⁴⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 125.

⁴⁶ *Appendix*, p. 82.

⁴⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 85.

⁴⁸ *Ibidem*, pp. 100-101.

*not committed to writing in Holy Scripture, but rest on oral tradition alone*⁴⁹.

The Roman Church, Manning pointed out, maintained ‘that there is a living infallible judge, who may, from time to time, declare, upon the sole proof of unwritten tradition, points of necessary doctrine, and add them to the Creed’⁵⁰. This contradicted Vincentius’ Rule: ‘*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*’. Manning did not develop this point further, as Newman had done. He went beyond Vincentius, to look for support in Gal. 1, 8: ‘*Sed licet nos, aut angelus de caelo evangelizet vos vobis praeterquam quod evangelizavimus vobis, anathema sit*’. Taylor and Thorndike had rebutted Bellarmine’s translation of *praeterquam* in this text as *against*, claiming that it stood for *besides*, in addition to. In their interpretation, the Apostle was not only condemning any teaching contrary to the truths he had taught the Galatians, he was also anathematizing those who attempted to add to the Creed, as points of necessary belief, truths unknown to the primitive Church.

The doctrine of infallibility, Manning thought, presupposed the existence in the Church of an inspiration of the same kind with that which dictated the Holy Scripture. This guidance of the Holy Spirit would be *perpetual* and *immediate*. The Holy Spirit would inspire the Church with the meaning of Scripture; the Church, when reading Holy Scripture, would infallibly perceive its true interpretation, or, rather, receive it from the Holy Spirit. This would make redundant the recourse to Tradition as the interpreter of Scripture: ‘The infallibility of the *living* Church absorbs all proof into itself’⁵¹.

Manning considered that the origin of this erroneous notion of infallibility was to be found in an *a priori* argument, which presumed that God could not leave the Scriptures without an infallible interpreter and judge in the controversies about the faith. The Roman doctrine then concluded, ‘from our anticipations of what God would be likely to do, that therefore He has done so’⁵². He would dwell again on this point in one of

⁴⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 82.

⁵⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 26.

⁵¹ *Ibidem*, p. 100.

⁵² *Ibidem*, p. 94. Manning was always alive to the danger ‘of sliding from the ideas of the Reason into a priori theories of what revelation is or ought to be’ [Letter to Hare (25-IX-40); *Manning Mss. Bod.*, c. 653, Fol. 23]. Coleridge, Butler and even Bacon were quoted by him as witnesses for this principle.

his letters to Pusey of 7 December 1839, in which he gave advice on how to deal with someone on the verge of Popery. The *a priori* argument, he said, was inadmissible; if used at all it would tell 'against infallibility on the idea of probation which includes Churches as well as men'⁵³. If the infallibility of the Church were true it should be part of 'the original Christian Revelation', and, thus, 'capable of the same sort of proof, i.e.: 1. Scripture or 2. Catholic Tradition. But there is no proof in either. The onus is on the Romanists'⁵⁴. Manning also dismissed the claim that infallibility - a gift granted to the Apostles - was intended to be perpetual; the promises of divine guidance 'in the search after divine truth in the Church, relate rather to the *moral* than to the *intellectual nature*'⁵⁵. God had already provided for the preservation of truth in the Church by fixing the rule of faith: Scripture and Tradition. 'The office and work of the Holy Spirit is plainly to *sanctify* us, through the truth *already understood*, by means of the outward teaching which God has appointed for that end'⁵⁶.

Manning, like Newman, also remarked upon the lack of agreement among Catholics concerning the seat of infallibility: 'investing the pope with infallibility is the *Italian* doctrine, the *Gallican* and *British* Romanist placing it in the Church assembled in Council'⁵⁷. It made little difference, as far as Manning was concerned, whether the Pope or the Council were considered infallible: a living and, therefore, changing judge - whether an individual or a collectivity - could not avoid introducing doctrinal changes. He considered that the Roman and the Protestant Rules of Faith, though very different in their formulation, had something in common and tended to produce similar fruits. Both exalted the living judge guided by the Holy Spirit: the Church collective, for Catholics; the individual person, in Protestantism. The consequences of both Rules could already be seen in practice: the Roman Church - against St. Paul's injunction - had introduced new doctrines, ignored by the Primitive Church; Protestants, on the other hand, had excluded some of those taught by the Apostles.

⁵³ *Pusey Mss.*, Pusey House, Pusey-Manning Correspondence, Let. 2.

⁵⁴ *Ibidem*.

⁵⁵ *Appendix*, p. 91.

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*, pp. 91-92.

⁵⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 87.



Both, Catholics and Protestants, undermined the foundations on which Christianity was built: the '*attack on universal tradition*' - Manning would say - '*undermines the foundation of Christianity*. It is not an *interpretation*, but *the Gospel* that is at stake'⁵⁸. In the Protestant and Catholic systems human reason was set above Scripture, thus opening the door to rationalism and subjectivism, and, finally, to scepticism. The return to the true rule of faith would, on the other hand, correct those inclinations. Nor would this be the only benefit consequent to its adoption: sharing in common the true rule of faith would considerably reduce the number of doctrinal differences among Christians, the source of their disputes, and strengthen the bond of brotherly love among them.

4. An Infallible Rule or an Infallible Church?

Bramhall's words about the infallible rule of faith were a *locus communis* among the Highchurchmen, and those who shared their ideas. The Church as Teacher of the Faith - a rallying cry for the Tractarians - had been entrusted by God with its keeping, and commissioned to transmit it. Still, Catholic Controversialists were to impugn the soundness of the Anglican rule of faith, likening it to Private Judgment. At the beginning of the century Charles Butler and Bishop Milner had entered the controversialists' arena on those grounds; Wiseman would renew and reinforce the argument in the mid eighties in his *Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church* (1836). In them, he argued from the Thirty Nine Articles of the Church of England. The Sixth said that 'Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary for salvation'. It falls to the Church, according to the Twentieth article, the power to decide in controversies of faith what is or what is not to be believed on the above basis, 'and yet' - it continues - 'it is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing contrary to God's word written; neither may it so expound any passage of Scripture, as to be repugnant to another'. Nothing

⁵⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 111.

contrary to Holy Scripture can be imposed as an article of faith, either by an individual on another or by the Church on its members.

The Anglican articles, to Wiseman's mind, left an open question: where was to be found the authority capable of judging whether the doctrinal decisions of the Church were or were not in accordance with Holy Scripture? If there is a rule - as there must be - to determine whether the Church's decisions are in accordance with Scripture, who shall apply it?; 'if the Church, not being infallible, may teach things contrary to Scripture, who shall judge it, and decide between it and those whose obedience it exacts?'⁵⁹ He could see only two possible answers to this question: 'if the Church is not to be obeyed when it teaches anything contrary to Scripture, there are only two alternatives - either that limitation supposes an impossibility of its so doing, or it implies the possible case of the Church being lawfully disobeyed'⁶⁰. The first possibility - to consider that the Church will never contradict Scripture in her decisions on matters of belief - would be equivalent to upholding the Catholic doctrine of the infallibility of the Church. The other possible answer would admit that the Church might err. In this last case, he concluded, it was up to the individual to determine the above: 'each one has to judge for himself whether the Church be contradicting the express doctrines of Scripture; and that consequently, each person is thus constituted judge over the decisions of his Church'⁶¹. This implied that the Church is not able to require belief in any particular doctrine, given that any individual may question any doctrine by pronouncing it to be contrary to Scripture, as the Presbyterians had done under Elizabeth, and others did thereafter.

Manning, in his letters to the *British Magazine*, reacted angrily to what he considered as Wiseman's wilful deformation of the Anglican rule of faith. S.F. Wood, on the other hand, while admitting that the Anglican rule of faith was as Manning had described it, accepted that the recent condition of the Church of England lent substance to Wiseman's claims, and he upbraided Manning for his intemperate language: 'it would be more

⁵⁹ N. Wiseman, *Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church* (London, 1836), vol. I, p. 30.

⁶⁰ *Ibidem*.

⁶¹ *Ibidem*.

wise, more humble, more truthful, and more Christianlike to confess our practical defection from our principles, and to warn and to recall men to them, than hastily to tax him with unfairness'⁶². Newman had reacted in a similar way, almost welcoming Wiseman's article as a revulsive to help the Church of England rise from her state of prostration. Manning was unrepentant, and in a long note in the Sermon on the Rule of Faith, he dealt again with Wiseman's objections, taxing him with unfairness. In the Appendix, though, he made his own Wood's point about the condition of Anglican theology in the previous century: 'Our adversaries know full well that we have departed from the principles of that age [the seventeenth century Anglican divines]; and they take due advantage of it'⁶³.

Against Wiseman, Manning affirmed that the Sixth Article did not claim that Scripture is so clear as to need no interpreter, or that every man is able to interpret it for himself; Wiseman had falsely attributed to the Church of England the Ultra-Protestant rule of faith⁶⁴. The Church - Manning continued - is the supreme authority in matters of faith, but this did not mean 'authority which admits no limits or restriction'⁶⁵, she is bound by the Catholic traditions tested on the principle of *universitas, antiquitas, consensio*. It was not up to the individual to judge of the proper application of this rule by the Church. The Anglican Church 'far from submitting either the rule, or her decisions according to the rule, to the judgment of the individual member, will not submit them to the judgment even of particular churches, or to any tribunal less to that to which all particular churches are subject, that is, a general council, of which, either the members shall truly *represent* the Catholic Church, or the decrees be universally *received*'⁶⁶.

⁶² P, I, p. 119. Manning decided to inform himself about the Catholic controversy. In February 1837 he told Newman that he was reading Milner's *End of Controversy* (cfr. LD, VI, p. 33); in the *Sermon* and in the *Appendix* he would also quote the *Letter to a Prebendary* by the same author and would make a reference to Charles Butler.

⁶³ *Appendix*, p. 130.

⁶⁴ Wiseman also thought himself justified in pairing under the yoke of the same Rule of Faith the Anglican Church and Protestants on the count that the High Anglican doctrine was not received by the Anglican Church. 'Let the Church, *as a Church*, detach itself from all other sectaries in its reasoning against us, let it avow disapprobation of their principles, (...) and then we will acknowledge its right to record a separate plea from the great body of Protestants' [N. Wiseman, 'The High Church Theory of Doctrinal Authority' (*Dublin Review*, July 1837), in *Essays on Various Subjects* (London, 1853), vol. II, p. 133].

⁶⁵ *Rule*, pp. 24-25.

⁶⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 25.

Manning did not realize at the time that he had just moved Wiseman's objection one step further away. Was the universal church infallible? If not, who was to judge the correctness of the doctrinal decisions of a non-infallible Universal Church? The Thirty Nine Articles left Manning little room to manoeuvre. Article Twenty One clearly affirmed that General Councils 'may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God; wherefore things ordained by them as necessary unto salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scriptures'. Manning had made this doctrine his own. The Church in Council is not infallible, he would write to Pusey; as a matter of fact, 'there is no more guarantee that a Council shall necessarily coincide with Catholic Tradition than an individual man'[!]⁶⁷. Wiseman's objection remained unanswered.

Palmer, in his *Treatise on the Church*, offered a possible escape route out of this theological cul-de-sac. He affirmed that a 'General Synod, confirmed by the Roman Pontiff, has not, without the consent of the Universal Church, any irrefragable authority'⁶⁸. This consent or judgment of the Universal Church would be shown by the acceptance and execution of the Synod's decrees by the Universal Church. It could only be a moral unanimity. 'Scripture, in teaching us that heresies were to exist, shows that a judgment *absolutely unanimous* could not be expected at any time; but if the judgment be that of so great a majority of the Church that there are only a very small number of opponents, then its unanimity cannot fairly be contested'⁶⁹. Was the moral unanimity of the Universal Church infallible?

The infallibility of the Church was a concept that haunted men like Newman and Manning, and many others in a similar theological position. Newman, in his Second Lecture on the Prophetical Office of the Church, had condemned the Roman doctrine of infallibility as a 'theory in itself extravagant', and one which - as he would try to

⁶⁷ *Pusey Mss.*, Pusey House, Pusey-Manning Correspondence, Let. 2; dated 7-XII-39. Newman's *Tract 90* (1841) would claim that Article XXI was compatible with a belief in the infallibility of Ecumenical Councils; the conditions which fulfilled the notion of such a gathering were rather vague, though, and left ample room for the exercise of private judgement along Wiseman's objection to the Anglican rule of faith (cfr. *VM*, II, pp. 291-293).

⁶⁸ W. Palmer, *A Treatise on the Church of Christ* (3rd ed., London, 1842), vol. II, p. 117.

⁶⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 81

show in Lectures III and IV - had generated innumerable evils. Still, in the Eighth Lecture, he went on to claim for the Church almost as much. The Church Catholic, he would say, is not only 'bound to teach the Truth, but she is ever divinely guided to teach it; her witness of the Christian Faith is a matter of promise as well as of duty; her discernment of it is secured by a heavenly as well as by a human rule. She is indefectible in it, and therefore not only has authority to enforce, but is of authority in declaring it. (...) The Church not only transmits the faith by human means, but has a supernatural gift for that purpose; that doctrine, which is true, considered as a historical fact, is true also because she teaches it'⁷⁰. She would have no authority if she would be declaring a lie; only truth can demand the assent of conscience. The reception of the Athanasian Creed was for Newman 'another proof of our holding the infallibility [!] of the Church, as some of our Divines express it, in matters of saving faith (...). [The] Church Catholic is pronounced to have been all along, and by implication as destined ever to be, the guardian of the pure and undefiled faith, or to be indefectible in that faith'⁷¹. And, in another place, he would claim that the Church Catholic 'may be truly said almost infallibly to interpret Scripture aright'⁷². Having reached this point, the constraints of the Thirty Nine Articles, and the polemic with Rome, made it rather difficult for Tractarian theology to determine how indefectible the indefectibility of the Church was or how infallible its *almost* infallibility was.

Newman would admit that the texts used by Roman Catholics to support the Church's infallibility could bear that interpretation; even more, 'there surely is no antecedent reason why Almighty God should not have designed to bestow on the Church the perfect purity which the Roman School claims for her'⁷³. He went as far as to accept as a probability, and as a premise for the sake of the argument, that God might have promised infallibility to His Church, but - he would add - this promise depended on man's cooperation for its fulfilment. History showed, on the other hand, how many times the divine intentions had been mysteriously frustrated by man. The Scriptural

⁷⁰ *VM*, I, p. 190.

⁷¹ *Ibidem*, p. 192.

⁷² *Ibidem*, p. 158; Keble, on his part, would speak of 'a constant and practical infallible Tradition', while rejecting infallibility in the Roman sense ['Proscript to the Sermon on Tradition', in *Sermons Academical and Occasional* (Oxford, 1847), p. 407].

⁷³ *Ibidem*, p. 196.

texts on which the Roman claims were based - Newman would say - attested to unity as the divinely appointed condition for the Church to be clad in all its glory. If Infallibility had been intended as a gift for the Church, it would have required the presence in it of a superhuman charity. This was true of the early days of the Church, but that extraordinary unity was soon broken. Nowadays, he said, the Church is not one, it has become many, and with unity it has 'lost the full endowment and the attribute of Infallibility in particular, *supposing that were ever included in it*'⁷⁴. The gift, though, was not altogether lost: unity is capable of degrees, and higher or lower measures of truth would be attached to different degrees of unity. Again, providentially, those divisions had not occurred until after the fundamentals of the faith had been fully enunciated and fixed. The Church, in its three branches, had always preserved this fundamental outline of the faith. This partly offset Wiseman's claim, as far as the fundamental beliefs were concerned, that is, the truths necessary for salvation.

Palmer, in the same line, would assert that it was not to be believed 'that the whole existing church would unanimously teach what was contrary to the articles of faith certainly revealed by Christ'⁷⁵. These 'fundamentals' were made up of the Nicene Creed, the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation, and the doctrine of grace. Catholic orthodoxy rested on them and on episcopal government, the guardian of sound doctrine. The divisions between the churches were 'only concerning matters of opinion and practice'⁷⁶. If that were the case, and if the non-fundamental doctrines were of an optional nature, what would justify the separation from Rome? The answer was a well rehearsed one: Rome had added to those fundamentals of faith, claiming that doctrines which were only matters of opinion - sometimes true doctrines deformed by abuses, at other times errors - were of necessary belief for salvation.

The Tractarians, though, soon felt themselves smothered by the narrow limits of the doctrine of fundamentals. Antiquity, without the medium of the Anglican Reformers, was to be seen then as normative in all matters of doctrine and practice. The Preface to the second part of Froude's *Remains* would speak of the 'great principle of

⁷⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 201; my italics.

⁷⁵ W. Palmer, *Treatise on the Church*, vol. II, p. 62.

⁷⁶ *Ibidem*.

Catholicism, *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*', as the only safe way for the Church. In the application of this principle, the Tractarians went far beyond the so-called doctrine of fundamentals. A mind 'thoroughly uncompromising in its Catholicity, would feel deeply, that an Ancient Consent binds the person admitting it alike to all doctrines, interpretations and usages, for which it can be truly alleged'⁷⁷. National Churches, Formularies and liturgical practices were to stand or fall by that test. Were a National Church to insist 'as the condition of her communion on something contradictory to the known consent of Antiquity, such communion can no longer be embraced with a safe conscience'⁷⁸. The same grounds used to legitimize the separation from Rome could be used now to refuse allegiance to the National Church! Here the Tractarians and the High Anglican Tradition parted company. High Churchmen warned of the danger of subjectivism and private interpretation in that access to the Fathers without the safeguards provided by the Anglican formularies, the living Church and the traditional theological method. It has been claimed that the casualties of the new method soon piled high, one on top of another: 'The old controversial method against Rome in Tract 71 (...), the existing liturgy in Tracts 75 and 86, the Reformers in Froude's *Remains*, the Thirty-Nine Articles in Tract 90, and then the Caroline Divines, were all victims of this looking at Antiquity using "his own eyes". At length, even the Vincentian Rule itself fell victim'⁷⁹. It would, perhaps, be more appropriate to say that the Vincentian Rule was given a new meaning and rôle, one which Wood had already claimed for it in his paper on tradition.

Manning would be more resolute than Newman in his denial of the infallibility of the Church, whether as a present endowment or even as originally intended by Christ. His conviction that the faith would change with the changing of the living judge made it impossible for him to countenance - even as a possibility - the infallibility of the Church, present or past. The only safe path to the purity of Apostolic Truth left to us was to follow the universal agreement of the Church of the Apostolic and early Post-Apostolic ages. Nevertheless, he did not consider that primitive Church to be infallible.

⁷⁷ R.H. Froude, *Remains* (London, 1839), Part II, vol. I, Preface, p. XIII.

⁷⁸ *Ibidem*, p. XVII.

⁷⁹ P.B. Nockles, *Continuity and Change in Anglican High Churchmanship, 1792-1850* D.Phil. Thesis (Oxford 1982), p. 162. For the reactions of High Churchmen to the new method of approaching Antiquity see P.B. Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in context* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 113-118.

In the first pages of the *Appendix to the Rule of Faith* Manning listed twenty objections to the Rule he described in the Sermon. Objections 3 and 4 argued that it was ‘identical with the principle of the Church of Rome’, and that it invested ‘the Church, or the early Christian writers, with the Romish attribute of infallibility’⁸⁰. The main purpose of the *Appendix* was to show how the rule of faith he contended for was the recognised principle of the Church of England, and that it was also the universal rule of the Primitive Church. By page 36 he felt justified in claiming that his explanations had made clear that this rule of faith did not ‘invest the Church or early Christian writers with the Romish attribute of infallibility’⁸¹. The practical and theoretical difficulties of his position, though, were obvious to Manning. In the course of his lucubrations in search of the certainty of faith, while considering the doctrine of infallibility, he had noted down in one of his notebooks that he was ready to accept and believe that the Church, as far as the main points of the faith were concerned, ‘has not erred: and will not err: but I dare not say *can* not’⁸².

There was always an ambivalent tone in the references of the Tractarians to the Church as teacher of doctrine and its relation to the faith of the individual Christian. This was one of her main rôles, but one in which she could only be trusted up to a certain point. Palmer had claimed that the instruction of the existing church is, ‘in its own age, an ordinary and divinely-appointed external means for the production of faith’⁸³. The doctrinal decree of the universal Church - past or present - was ‘*absolutely binding on all individual Christians from the moment of its full manifestation*’; such a judgment was ‘irrevocable, irreformable, never to be altered’⁸⁴. For Palmer, to suppose that the universal church ‘could determine what is contrary to the Gospel revealed by Jesus Christ, would be inconsistent with the promises of Christ’⁸⁵. The Church, though, is not infallible; she is only credible. The testimony of the Church is a human testimony, given by fallible men, but it is ‘a sufficient means to produce the firmest conviction that

⁸⁰ *Ibidem*, pp. 3-4.

⁸¹ *Ibidem*, p. 36.

⁸² *Manning Mss.Bod.*, Ms. Eng. misc. e. 1397, 15-17.

⁸³ W. Palmer, *Treatise on the Church*, vol. II, p. 57.

⁸⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 86; also p. 84.

⁸⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 83.

certain doctrines were revealed by God'⁸⁶. Then, rather surprisingly, Palmer added: 'human testimony is a means sufficient of conducting us to divine faith, by assuring us infallibly [!] of the fact that God has revealed certain truths'⁸⁷.

Manning, on his part, thought that it was always 'both the *right*, as men speak, and the privilege of Christians to labour out their belief by analysis and induction, by evidence and history', but this could never become their necessary duty, 'until the Church had failed of hers'⁸⁸. Were the Church to cease its guidance, then individual Christians would have no choice 'but to set their hand to the hard inverted labour of first seeking for evidence, and afterwards deducing as conclusions, what they ought to have received by intuition as axioms of revelation'⁸⁹. That had happened at the Reformation; it had happened again in Manning's time, when the faith and principles of the Anglican faith, after being purified in the Reformation, found themselves corrupted and obscured by the prevalent Protestantism of the previous one hundred and fifty years. Men had now to work out for themselves 'the teaching of the Church as well by the rule of her genuine protest [of the Anglican Reformation], as by the witness of antiquity'⁹⁰. Newman, in this context, drew from his rich reservoir of imagery: 'The Church Catholic is our mother; (...) A child comes to its mother for instruction; she gives it. She does not assume infallibility, nor is she infallible; yet it would argue a very unpleasant temper in the child to doubt her word'⁹¹. Samuel F. Wood saw clearer than his two friends the predicament in which they found themselves; he told Manning how they should feel pained 'at being obliged, - a caution imposed by the sad experience of past errors - to *test* what the Church may propound to us by Scripture, instead of yielding an implicit confidence to our holy Mother'⁹².

⁸⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 60.

⁸⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 61.

⁸⁸ *Rule*, p. 44.

⁸⁹ *Ibidem*, pp. 45-46.

⁹⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 47.

⁹¹ *VM*, I, p. 257.

⁹² *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 654, Fol. 441.

5. *The Unity of the Church*

The year of 1838 had also seen the publication of Gladstone's book *The State in its Relations with the Church*. One of its main theses was that the State had a corporate identity and personality, a conscience, and was, therefore, able to recognise religious truth, and thus enshrine it - as it was its duty - in the constitution. No liberal thinker or politician would subscribe to or let pass without remark such a statement. The April issue of *The Edinburgh Review* carried a savage attack by Macaulay on Gladstone's thesis. Macaulay's final salvo went directly to the point: the Church of England had not unity with respect to the doctrines of faith, admitting a variety of opinions, diverse and even contradictory, on almost any doctrinal point. As unity 'is the essential condition of truth the Church has not the truth'⁹³.

Macaulay's darts, by proxy, also reached the Tractarians. Unity had for them an almost sacramental character: the 'purity of faith', Newman had written, 'depends on the *Sacramentum Unitatis*'⁹⁴. Manning would echo similar ideas: 'unity is the sacrament of truth. It is by unity that it is conserved and transmitted; by abruption and isolation that it is exhausted and extinguished'⁹⁵. Macaulay's contention had to be answered. The Tractarians admitted that the unity of the Church had been broken, but - they would add - unity has different aspects and breaches of unity were susceptible of different degrees, and to each of them corresponded a higher or lower share in truth. As far as they were concerned, the unity of Apostolical Succession was the tenure 'on which the sacred mysteries of faith are continued to us'⁹⁶.

Manning was to dedicate the following years to a detailed study of the unity of the Church, a theme to which he had referred in passing in his Sermon of 1835. On Christmas Day 1840 he told Gladstone about it: 'I have all but done a book on the Unity of the Church, a poor matter, but it may be a sort of flying buttress to some of

⁹³ T.B. Macaulay, 'Gladstone on Church and State', reprinted in his *Critical and Historical Essays* (1909), p. 278. See also V.A. McClelland, 'Gladstone and Manning: A Question of Authority', in P.J. Jagger (ed.), *Gladstone, Politics and Religion* (London, 1985), pp. 148-170.

⁹⁴ J.H. Newman, 'Tract 71', in *VM*, II, p. 134.

⁹⁵ *Unity*, p. 347.

⁹⁶ *VM*, I, p. 202.

your positions'⁹⁷. He also referred to it in his correspondence with Archdeacon Hare: 'I have many thoughts about the Church', he wrote on 17 April 1841⁹⁸; and, on 17 July: 'Lately all manner of things have been coming into my head; but I have been too much taken up to write. I have noted them down'⁹⁹. His notebooks attest to the fact: they record his thoughts, and collect ideas from different authors on the infallibility of the Church, Peter's ministry, the unity of the Church as contained in the Episcopate, etc.

The first fruit of his labours was the sermon *The mind of Christ the perfection and bond of the Church*, preached at Brighton on 9 December 1841. In it Manning claimed that the basis of Christian unity was the result of Christ's grace impressing his mind upon the minds of his own, conforming them to his divine mind: 'so long as the mind of Christ prevailed over the diversities of individual will and character, the church was united'¹⁰⁰. Unity was assailed during the first six hundred years of the Church but that uniform character promptly extinguished the sparks of division and strife. Later on, the individual mind and subjective character prevailed in the Church, and the miracle of unity was destroyed. It could not be otherwise, 'for what is the source of all strife but self-exaltation; and what is the withering blight of all holier aspirations but self-sparing?'¹⁰¹ Manning concluded that if sanctity and unity were to be restored to the Church on earth it must be by restoring the mind which was in Christ Jesus: unity was a consequence of sanctity; all other things needful would follow in its train. Hare would agree with the Sermon as a whole but he could not see, as Manning did, 'the working of the mind of Christ in the unity of the Church during the first six centuries. It was a period of all manner of fierce and wild divisions; and the chief power that held the Church together was the unity of the Roman Empire' [!]¹⁰².

⁹⁷ *Manning Mss.Pitts*, 401225mg, Chapeau, Let. 33, p. 88; see also Journal entry 15-XI-88 in *P*, I, p. 272.

⁹⁸ *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 653, Fol. 105.

⁹⁹ *Ibidem*, Fol. 162.

¹⁰⁰ H.E. Manning, *The mind of Christ the perfection and bond of the Church* (Chichester, 1841), p. 8.

¹⁰¹ *Ibidem*, p. 20.

¹⁰² *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 653, Fol. 212.

Manning's *Unity of the Church* appeared in 1842. The first pages of the book introduced the unity of the Church as an article of the Creed, confessed in all the early and later Symbols. As such it should be believed by all Christians. That the Church is one was not under discussion. What needed to be established was *how* it is one, i.e.: the meaning and the reality of the article; what is the doctrine of unity as revealed by Jesus Christ. The Anglican theory of the Three Branches posed some problems which the Roman Catholic Church or the Orthodox did not have to contemplate: they both claimed to be the One and True Church, from which the rest of Christians had cut themselves off. The Branch theory, on the other hand, had to reconcile the essential unity of the Church with the 'apparent' divisions between its Three Branches.

From his research into the Old and the New Testament Manning concluded that the unity of the Church is twofold: 'one kind of Unity being objective, consisting in its faith, sacraments, and organised polity; the other subjective, in the peace and brotherly love of the several members'¹⁰³. The organic or objective unity is 'the identity of the Church of any age with the Church of the Apostles in the faith and sacraments, and in the commission received from Christ, and transmitted by lawful succession'¹⁰⁴. The subjective or moral unity of the Church, on the other hand, consists in unity of communion at two levels: first, submission to the lawful pastor of the local church; secondly, charity in the relationships with the several churches dispersed around the world.

The Apostolic Succession is the guarantee that the Church is one and the same as in apostolic times. Manning liked to speak of a personal identity with the Church of the Apostles: the 'properties of this personal identity', he had written to Hare, 'are the knowledge of the pure truth; and a power to do in Christ's name the same acts for the reconciliation of man to God'¹⁰⁵. The founding of the Church, he would say in *The Unity of the Church*, contained in it 'the principle of succession, as the birth of a living soul contains a continuous personal identity'¹⁰⁶.

¹⁰³ *Unity*, p. 86; see also pp. 56-57.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 162.

¹⁰⁵ *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 653, Fol. 136; letter dated 21-VII-41.

¹⁰⁶ *Unity*, p. 90.

Although both, the subjective and the objective unity, play their part in the preservation of revealed truth, it is the objective one that is essential in this task. Manning considered that 'objective unity cannot be wholly forfeited without the forfeiture of the subjective unity', while 'subjective unity may be forfeited without a forfeiture of the objective unity'¹⁰⁷. This meant that although 'the channels of communion on earth are cut asunder, yet the lines of ascent and descent from earth to heaven, by which the communion of sacrifice and grace is interchanged between the faithful and their unseen Head, are open and sure'¹⁰⁸. Some churches - according to Manning - had retained objective unity while losing the subjective one. That was the case of the Three Branches of the Church according to Tractarian doctrine: the Anglican, the Greek and the Roman Church. Protestantism, on the other hand, had lost both, and was, as a consequence, marked by schism and heresy.

Manning insisted that the unity of the Church is an article of faith; it has its origin and foundation on an explicit will of God, which cannot fail. It is not based on sharing in common with other Christians some vague, pious and charitable feelings and endeavours, as Arnold propounded; it is founded on an objective system of doctrine and discipline. Manning wanted to prove that the unity of the Church existed, against all appearances to the contrary. It was recognisable and visible, and men had an obligation to submit to it if they were to achieve salvation. They could not use the existing divisions - subjective and moral - as an excuse to follow their own opinions without regard for objective truth.

The divisions and differences among the branches of the Church were to be deplored. Objective unity was preserved in spite of them, but subjective unity, the final end of the objective one, was missing. The blame for the divisions between the Eastern and Western Churches was to be laid at the doors of both of them, although the fault of the Greek was never so great as the usurpation of the supreme Pontificate by the Bishop of Rome. This claim of universal jurisdiction was also the cause of the separation between Rome and the English Church. Manning, following Thorndike, accepted the preeminent place of Peter in the Apostolic College and the precedence of the Bishop of

¹⁰⁷ *Ibidem*, pp. 272-273.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 274.

Rome in the College of Bishops, but only as a precedence of honour among equals. In all questions relating to the whole Church, the whole Church should be consulted, Rome first because of precedence. On the other hand, he added, a particular Church might reform itself in those questions affecting only a part of the Church. He defended the separation of the Anglican Church from Rome on the principles of Bramhall's *Just Vindication of the Church of England*, and cleared it from the charges both of schism and heresy. There was no schism in rejecting the pretence of universal jurisdiction of divine right, neither was there heresy: the Anglican Church accepted the canonical Scriptures, the Catholic Creeds, the Ecumenical Councils (there had been only six truly ecumenical ones, according to Manning), the Apostolic Traditions, and it was ready to submit to the decisions of any future free and lawful Ecumenical Council - to be truly ecumenical it should bring together the Three Branches of the Church.

Objective doctrine and discipline were the terms of unity among the three branches of the Church, and among the several churches within each branch. None of the branches had fallen into formal heresy or schism such as to cut themselves off 'from the one visible Church, and from communion with the one Head of the Church in heaven'¹⁰⁹. Gladstone, naturally, was delighted with Manning's book, particularly with the section where Manning dealt with the Gordian knot of whether there is unity in the Church at present or not.

6. *The First Clouds*

The book on the unity of the Church closed a circle of study for Manning. He could feel that he had established on solid foundations the principles of his belief and action. Unfortunately for him, he was not going to rest for long in the peaceful possession of the intellectual ground he had so laboriously conquered. While he was putting the finishing touches to his book on unity, the Oxford Movement was being buffeted by the storm which followed the publication of Tract 90, and which threatened to shipwreck

¹⁰⁹ *Unity*, p. 359.

not only its author, but also the principles which had been the banner under which so many had rallied.

That was not Manning's only source of concern. Though firmly anchored intellectually in the Anglican Church, he had felt for some time the need to develop the devotional life within it. His exalted idea of the Christian vocation - a call to sanctity, to identification with Christ - found expression in his early Sermons, where he encouraged his hearers to commit themselves 'to the great movement of His mysterious providence, by which He is working out the change and transfiguration of his saints'¹¹⁰. Truth played an important part in that process by which God changes us 'into the likeness of His Son'¹¹¹, but it was not the only means He used: 'It is by His holy word and sacraments, by acts of homage and adoration, by a life of obedience, and by a wisely tempered discipline of chastisement and peace, that He wins and conforms us to Himself'¹¹².

Sanctity, beside its individual dimension, had an ecclesiological one. Manning considered it the chief and most distinctive of the properties of the Church, being as well its end. The effect implies and witnesses to the presence of the cause: sanctity witnesses to the presence of that truth and grace which are the inheritance of the true Church¹¹³. It was a common theme in Tractarian circles. Manning soon found himself perplexed by the limitations which the Anglican system presented to the longings awakened in the faithful by the ideals of Christian life presented to them. He expressed his perplexities to Newman as early as 1839. The response made clear their predicament: 'our blanket is too small for our bed. (...) I am conscious that we are raising longings and tastes which we are not allowed to supply - and till our Bishops and others give scope to the development of Catholicism externally and wisely, we *do* tend to make impatient minds seek it where it has ever been, in Rome'¹¹⁴.

¹¹⁰ *ASer*, I, p. 60.

¹¹¹ *Ibidem*, 61.

¹¹² *Ibidem*, p. 60.

¹¹³ Cfr. *Manning Mss.Bod.*, Eng. misc. e 1396, p. 58-60.

¹¹⁴ *Ibidem*, c. 654, Fol. 36.

Manning felt the importance of confession and other ascetical practices. He also lamented the lack of a proper ascetical theology in the Church of England. In his mind, he blamed its present deficiencies in this area on the reaction against the abuses which she had rejected at the Reformation. Some customs and devotions, though legitimate in themselves, had led to abuses, and the Reformers had been forced to discard them altogether. In 1840 he complained to Archdeacon Hare: 'The Romanist errors have bereft us of our inheritance of blessed contemplation'¹¹⁵. The English Church, he wrote to Gladstone, was 'Catholic in dogma, and in polity, that is in all the objective being of a Church. But the subjective, the internal, ascetic, contemplative, devotional, moral, penitential elements are wasted down to a meagreness which is nigh unto death'¹¹⁶. These deficiencies, though, did not worry him unduly. The English Church had to develop those Catholic elements she had rejected at the Reformation, after having purified them from the deforming corruptions. That she would do. She was 'a real substantial Catholic body capable of development and all perfection - able to lick up and absorb all that is true and beautiful in all Christendom into itself - and this is our problem'¹¹⁷.

¹¹⁵ *Ibidem*, c. 653, Fol. 50; letter dated 20-XI-40.

¹¹⁶ *Manning. Mss.Pitts*, 411111 mg, Chapeau, Let. 40, p. 93; letter dated 11-XI-41.

¹¹⁷ *Ibidem*, 410417mg, Chapeau, Let. 35, p. 89; letter dated 17-IV-41.

CHAPTER II

CALLING FIRST PRINCIPLES INTO QUESTION

A. A TIME OF CRISIS

1. The events of 1843 to 1845

Manning was able to appreciate the Catholic elements present in the Church of Rome and sadly missing in the English Church, the virtues of the one and the deficiencies of the other; a contrast which was to be raised to fever pitch by the younger Tractarians. Many thought that the furore created by the publication of *Tract 90* called for a period of prudence and consolidation; Catholic principles and practices needed a trouble-free time to settle in the minds and in the hearts of people. The *British Critic* of Ward and Oakley would not hear that advice of prudence, and their tone of almost unqualified praise for the Roman elements and system often went hand in hand with repeated criticisms of the Church of England.

High Churchmen could not but look with apprehension on these developments. Palmer, who had taken Newman's part on the *Tract 90* crisis, would now publish his *Narrative of Events* (1843) designed 'to clear those who uphold Church principles from the imputation of approving certain recent tendencies to Romanism'¹. It was a clear manifesto for High Churchmen, fixing the principles to be defended and the pitfalls to avoid, and intending to prove how High Church principles did not lead to Romanism. To illustrate this last point, Palmer listed the names of well known public figures who upheld High Church principles, while showing support for the English Reformation and denouncing in clear terms the errors of Rome. Manning's name was included in this list. Palmer also gave clear norms of conduct for those who were unsettled in their opinions and in doubt about the Church of England's grounds. Someone in that situation

¹ W. Palmer, *A Narrative of Events* (2nd ed., Oxford, 1843), p. V.

was bound in conscience 'to seek silently for the solution of those doubts; to cease from writing or speaking on subjects in which his own opinions are *unsettled*'². Those who, on the other hand, were convinced of the duty of uniting to Rome should not labour, while still in the Anglican communion, 'to insinuate their own persuasion amongst the duped and blinded members of the English Church'³.

Manning could not have failed to be impressed by the tone and the content of Palmer's *Narrative*; an impression which was to be reinforced and confirmed by certain events in the autumn of 1843. The change of tone which marked Manning's correspondence around this time, and his altered state of mind, can be clearly traced to the quick exchange of letters with Newman at the end of October, after the latter's resignation from St. Mary's. What had originally started as an expression of sympathy from Manning led to the subsequent disclosure of Newman's true condition. In a letter dated 25th October Newman wrote: 'Your letter is a most kind one but you have engaged in a dangerous correspondence'. And, indeed, it was! 'I must tell you frankly, lest I combat arguments which to me, alas, are shadows, that is from no disappointment, irritation, or impatience, that I have, whether rightly or wrongly, resigned St. Mary's - but because I think the Church of Rome the Catholic Church, and ours not a part of the Catholic Church, because not in communion with Rome, and feel that I could not honestly be a teacher in it any longer'⁴. The letter went on to map in detail the steps which had led to that conviction: the passing flashes of light, the hesitations, the counterarguments. It was still an ongoing process; he felt that the events of those years 'were confirmations of a conviction forced upon me, while engaged *in the course of duty*, viz. the theological reading to which I have given myself. And this last mentioned circumstance is a fact which has never, I think, come before me till now that I write to you'⁵.

It was an unexpected bolt from the blue for Manning. He was horrified; he had now become party to a secret which only a few friends, Henry and Robert Wilberforce

² *Ibidem*, p. 67.

³ *Ibidem*, p. 68.

⁴ *Manning Mss.Bod*, c. 654, Fol. 52

⁵ *Ibidem*, Fol. 53.

among them, knew. On the 27th Manning wrote to Gladstone with a heavy heart: "The clouds return after the rain" and they are heavy indeed. The enclosed letter fulfils all. ... What a history is Newman's - And now what must we do each in our place for the Church? The trust seems now to fall into the hands of us - men younger, weaker, less learned, *every way*⁶. Many had denounced the dangers inherent in the Tractarian Movement, and he perceived now the full force of their arguments. It was a revelation which filled him with revulsion. The intensity of his feelings found outward vent in his letter to Pusey later that year. 'I can no longer deny' - he wrote - 'that a tendency against which my whole soul turns has shown itself. It has precipitated those that are impelled by it into a position remote from that in which they stood, and from that in which I am'. Newman's letter had been a sudden revelation of the wrong turn the Movement had taken. 'I feel to have been for four years on the brink of I know not what; all the while persuading myself and others that all was well; and more - that none were so true and steadfast to the English Church; none so safe as guides. (...) Day after day I have been pledging myself to clergymen and laymen all about me that all was safe and sure. I have been using his books, defending and endeavouring to spread the system which carried this dreadful secret at its heart. There remains for me nothing but to be plain henceforward on points which hitherto I have almost resented, or ridiculed the suspicion. I did so because I knew myself to be heartily true to the English Church, both affirmatively in her positive teaching, and negatively in her rejection of the Roman system and its differential points. I can do this no more. I am reduced to the painful, saddening, sickening necessity of saying what I feel about Rome'⁷.

Indeed, he spoke of Rome, in vehement terms, in his University Sermon of 5th November. Newman's words had thrown a cloud over Manning's recently expressed theory on the unity of the Church: the Church of England was not a part of the Catholic Church because it was not in communion with Rome! These were as yet words which were confined to the narrow circle of a few close friends but Manning could foresee their effect in time: a mine was being driven under the main battlements of the Anglican Church, and he felt called to strengthen its positions. The University Sermon shows

⁶ *Manning Mss.Pitts*, 431027mg; Chapeau, Let. 74, p. 129.

⁷ Manning to Pusey, 22nd Sunday after Trinity, 1843; *Pusey Mss.*, Pusey House, Pusey-Manning Correspondence, Let. 14.

plainly its hurried composition and the turbulence in Manning's mind. There is in it much of accusation against the Church of Rome, her inordinate claims to supremacy and her efforts to justify the horrors with which some had tried to impose it. More important, although obscured by the anti-Roman rhetoric, was the positive affirmation of principle: 'The act of the sixteenth century was the last and the successful effort in a long series of ineffectual struggles against the secular encroachment of the Roman court. (...) And the principle on which they rested their act, and on which our relation to the Roman Church is still amply to be defended, is this - that there is no one supreme prince or power in things temporal from whom the civil rulers of this realm derive their sovereign authority: neither by Divine right any one supreme spiritual head on earth from whom the pastors of this Church derive their apostolical commission: that both the Spirituality and Temporality of this Church and Realm severally possess full authority and jurisdiction derived to them by succession and devolution; and that both under Christ alone, are within their respective spheres perfect and complete'⁸. The independence of the separate churches no more contravened the obligations to Catholic Unity than the independence of the separate states clashed with the principles of international law and relations. The aim of the separation from Rome was to restore and preserve true primitive doctrine; this had been impaired not only by the Roman but also by the Greek Churches. These 'true' and 'living' principles of God's kingdom - which Manning borrowed from Bramhall and the High Church tradition - had to be preserved and defended, then more than ever. Within the spirit of that tradition, he added a note of optimism, which, with hindsight, looks more like defiance: the Church of England, purified by her trials, might still be 'a principle of reconciliation between east and west, and a law of unity and peace to mankind'⁹.

But reconciliation there could not be with the men at Oxford. Manning answered Dodsworth's remonstrances with a series of long letters in which he fully disclosed his thoughts; he also sent Dodsworth Newman's letter. The men at Oxford, he wrote on

⁸ H.E. Manning, 'Christ's Kingdom not of this world', in *Sermons preached before the University of Oxford* (Oxford, 1844), pp. 91-92.

⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 95. The Church of England, as the true representative of Primitive Christianity, was the model on which the other Catholic Churches had to reform themselves, before reunion could be achieved (see P. Nockles, *The Oxford Movement*, pp. 162ff). Ward and Oakley turned High Church principles upside down by maintaining that the Roman Church was the standard of Catholic doctrine and spirit.

6 December 1843, were making 'our position untenable; and leave us at the mercy of Roman controversialists'¹⁰. They did not know the principles of the Church of England. It was true, he wrote two days later, that her faith and practice had to be raised to a more Catholic standard, but this 'could not be done if we make our affirmative principles dubious, tame, or halfhearted (...). I cannot consent nor endure to be going back in the midst of work to root up first principles to see if they [are] alive, like children gardening (...). I distinctly and strongly feel that the prevalent tone of many of our friends does call our first principles in question'¹¹. Their position was untenable: the Catholicism 'we hear of distinct from both [Anglicanism and Romanism] is an antiquarian conceit, a sham, and a delusion'¹². It was a vision born of selectiveness and private judgment. Manning confessed that he believed 'that Anglicanism and Romanism are the only tenable and logical systems; each on their own principles'¹³. He felt 'fully persuaded that if the position of Thorndike and Bramhall is not tenable the Roman Church is right; I believe their position to be tenable, and I know that it is the only alternative to entering the Roman Communion. (...) Be sure of this that the day I cease to be Anglican I shall be Roman. Nothing in the world could induce me to take up the fanciful, half and half, intermediate system which embodies the reality of neither, and forfeits the strength of both'¹⁴.

A chapter of his life was now closing, and he noted in his journal: 'I have taken my last act with those who are moving at Oxford. Henceforth I shall endeavour by God's help to act by myself without any alliance. My duty is to live and die striving to edify the Church in my own sphere'¹⁵. Happily, as he wrote to Pusey, he was not troubled about 'the reality of the English Church'¹⁶, and he could still defend it on the basis of the principles he had described in *The Unity of the Church*. He would admit to Gladstone that a tendency to Romanism was a risk to which the restoration of Catholic

¹⁰ *Manning Mss.Bod*, c.658, Fol. 6.

¹¹ *Ibidem*, Fols. 12-13; letter dated 8-XII-1843.

¹² *Ibidem*, Fol. 24; letter dated 13-I-44.

¹³ *Ibidem*.

¹⁴ *Ibidem*, Fols. 26-27.

¹⁵ Quoted by A. Chapeau, 'Manning the Anglican', in J. Fitzsimons (ed.) *Manning Anglican and Catholic* (London, 1951), p. 17. Chapeau dates it in 1845.

¹⁶ *Pusey Mss.*, Pusey House, Pusey-Manning Correspondence, Let. 14.

principles was liable, but it was 'something parasitical', 'a specific error by excess and defect', alien to Catholic truth¹⁷.

The year 1844 brought little relief to the general condition of the Tractarian Party or to Manning's mind. Ward - partly in answer to Palmer's *Narrative* - delivered to the world in this year his *Ideal of the Christian Church*. In it he described in detail how much the Anglican Church fell short of that ideal as teacher of moral discipline and orthodox doctrine. On this last count he would say: 'We cannot learn doctrine from the English Church, if we would, for she *teaches* no uniform doctrine to be learned' ¹⁸. She tolerated heterodoxy within herself, and the contradictory opinions of the several parties which composed, while omitting to make a clear affirmation of orthodox truth.

Manning expressed his frustrations and fear in his correspondence with Gladstone, together with his disgust at Ward's behaviour during the ensuing controversy and degradation. He decided to wait until the full consequences of the moment could be clearly discerned. It was an anxious time, one in which his convictions about the rule of faith were being tested, as he confessed a year later to Robert Wilberforce. One thing was clear: following Palmer's advice, he would never act or speak doubtfully; 'if I doubted I would cease to speak and act till I was decided for England or Rome'¹⁹.

He was concerned by the unsettlement of many minds, and looked to Robert Wilberforce for support, 'because some of the ablest and dearest of those around us fail to satisfy in some of the conditions necessary for dealing fairly and solidly with the realities of our relation to the Roman Church'²⁰. The events of the last years had raised many hard questions, and they demanded plain answers. In October he would write deploring the condition of theological studies in the Anglican Church: 'our theology is a chaos, we have no principles, no form, no order, or structure, or science'²¹. His anxiety, though, did not extend to doubts, 'for nothing can shake my

¹⁷ Cfr. *Manning Mss.Pitts*, 431119mg; Chapeau, Let. 81, p.136.

¹⁸ W.G. Ward, *The Ideal of the Christian Church* (Oxford, 1844), p. 409.

¹⁹ Letter to Dodsworth (13-I-44); *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 658, Fol. 28.

²⁰ *P*, I, p.504; letter dated 30-VI-45.

²¹ *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 655, Fol. 28; letter dated 6-X-45.

belief of the presence of Christ in our Church, and Sacraments. I feel incapable of doubting it'²². Years later, he would confess to Robert to have been more unsettled than he had admitted at the time: he adhered to his previous intellectual convictions until 1845, although with increasing difficulty²³.

2. *The Development of Doctrine*

In November 1845, Newman published his *Development of Christian Doctrine*, and announced his conversion to Catholicism. Manning, at first, treated Newman's book almost dismissively, as a wonderful intellectual work, subtle even to excess. The arguments, though, did not impress him: 'After reading the book', he wrote to Robert Wilberforce, 'I am left where I was found by it'²⁴. Development was the refuge of the destitute - Romanist and Protestant alike - who could find no shelter in antiquity. He judged the odds against Newman's principle being true at a thousand to one!

Gladstone encouraged Manning to answer Newman's argument. He did not need encouragement: the book had to be answered. As he told Gladstone, he needed to find the 'ultimate positions in which I can stand and work for life'²⁵. Later, in September 1846, he would write to Hare in a similar vein: 'I feel the only rest and solid bases of the soul is Truth, and my prayer is that I may count all loss for Truth's sake'²⁶. In the crisis they were going through what was at stake were the foundations of the Faith, and the Anglican and the Roman Church were affected by it. He rejected the idea of development, and felt that 'the Tridentine doctors would have severely censured the modern theories of development, or gradual rise as false, and dangerous'²⁷. He held their principle, for who was to judge which developments were right and which wrong? '*Quo jndice?*', he asked in his letter to Robert Wilberforce of

²² *Ibidem*, Fols. 28-29.

²³ Cfr. *Manning Mss.Bod*, c.656, Fol. 107; letter dated 22-I-51.

²⁴ *Ibidem*, c. 655, Fol. 34; letter dated 30-XII-45.

²⁵ *Manning Mss.Pitts*, 451226mg; Chapeau, Let. 124; letter dated on Feast of St. Stephan 1845.

²⁶ *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 653, Fols. 328-329.

²⁷ *Ibidem*, c. 662, Fol. 68; letter to unknown corr., dated 10-III-46.

30 December 1845. Manning did not read infallibility in Newman's book, but he did read in it the end of the Anglican rule of faith: 'it opened my eyes to one fact,' he would write years later, 'namely that I had laid down only half of the subject. I had found the *Rule*, but not the *Judge*. It was evident that to put Scripture and Antiquity into the hands of the individual is as much Private judgment as to put Scripture alone'²⁸. This conviction was still some way off in 1845. For the time being the book forced him again into the same subjects of his previous studies: it compelled him 'to examine into the nature of faith and the principles of divine certainty'²⁹, to review his notions of unity and infallibility³⁰.

The whole question arose progressively and in order before him. The matter to be ascertained was the revelation of the day of Pentecost. This was to be done by means of a recourse to the Tradition of the Church, in which he included Sacred Scripture. This process of discernment was to be carried out by the Church, not by the individual. Here Manning arrived at an obstacle that would halt his progress: if the process of discernment by which the Church is to identify truth were to be 'only the intellectual powers of its members taken collectively, [it] would be no more than natural and fallible, and therefore could afford no basis of divine certainty for faith'³¹.

Newman, indirectly, had sown the seeds of doubt in Manning's mind. Using the Anglican rule of faith, he had reached conclusions Manning could not accept; it seemed clear, though, that the rule was not self-sufficient. The following years would mark a time of perplexity. The clear signposts were no longer there; questions and answers were both too vague even to be formulated. It was also a time of silence, in which he started to feel the drawing of Rome. The office of Sub-almoner to the Archbishop of York, vacated by Samuel Wilberforce, was offered to him. He declined it. To the anxious enquiry of Robert Wilberforce he answered that the refusal meant 'no *unsettlement*, I thank God, which make me wish to avoid new bonds'³². He felt that

²⁸ *Ibidem*, c. 656, Fol. 107; letter to R. Wiberforce, dated 22-I-51.

²⁹ *CSer*, I, p. 5.

³⁰ Cfr. Letter to Laprimaudaye (June 1847), in *P*, I, p. 470; see also *CSer*, I, p.5.

³¹ *CSer*, I, pp. 5-6.

³² *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 655, Fol. 32; letter dated 30-XII-45.

course of action to be the safest one for his soul, helping him to have a clearer perception of truth. He feared, as he confessed later to Robert, 'lest the sphere of attraction should bias me in weighing the great doubts which had then fully opened themselves to me'³³.

Manning, in spite of his protestations, was certainly unsettled, and this spiritual and intellectual unsettlement grew more intense throughout 1846. 'I am conscious to myself', he recorded in his diary in May, 'of an extensively changed feeling towards the Church of Rome'. It seemed to him nearer to the truth than the Church of England. 'There seems about the Church of England a want of antiquity, system, fullness, intelligibility, order, strength, unity; we have dogmas on paper; a ritual almost universally abandoned; no discipline, a divided episcopate, priesthood and laity'. And, in August, he added: 'wherever it [the Church of England] seems healthy it approximates the system of Rome, e.g. Roman Catholic Catechism, Confession, Guidance, Discipline'³⁴. His ties with the Church of England were being loosened: 'Tho' not therefore Roman, I cease to be Anglican', he wrote on May 15. He went further as the months wore on: 'I believe the Bishop of Rome to be Primate and by devolution Chief', he recorded in his diary on 5th July. And, about a month later: 'Now I see that St. Peter has a Primacy among the Apostles. That the Church of Rome inherits what St. Peter had among the Apostles. That the Church of Rome is therefore heir of Infallibility'³⁵. These, at the time, were not firm convictions. He hesitated, and he still felt that the Church of England was part of the Universal Church, distinct from all Protestant bodies.

The year 1847 marked a turning point for Manning. In February he discovered the first symptoms of the illness, suspected consumption, which would keep him for three months at death's door. Overwork, and his prolonged spiritual and intellectual crisis, were no doubt at the root of this breakdown of health. The enforced inactivity offered him the possibility of quiet study and reflection. During those months of illness and convalescence he found the key to unlock the answers to his many questions. He

³³ Letter dated 2nd Sunday after Christmas, *Ibidem*, Fol. 62.

³⁴ *P*, I, p. 484.

³⁵ Quoted in S. Leslie, *Henry Edward Manning. His Life and Labours* (London, 1921), pp. 77-78.

described it years afterwards, a Catholic by then:

‘During the long illness I read S. Leo through - and much of S. Gregory, S. Aug. and S. Optatus. All brought me in great doubt as to the tenableness of ‘moral unity’. It showed me the nature of the Primacy of S. Peter. And at the same time I wrote the IVth Vol. of Sermons which was published the year after... In that volume for the first time I began to find and to express the truth which afterwards brought me to the Church: and has filled my mind with increasing light to this day: I mean the Personal coming, abiding and office of the Holy Ghost...

I had seen human certainty rising up to the summit of intellectual discernment and the *communis sensus* of mankind, but here it could rise no higher. The coming of the Holy Ghost from above to rest upon the intellect of the Church and to elevate it to a supernatural consciousness of faith was the first sight I got of the Infallibility of the Church. It was suggested to me by Melchior Canus’ “Loci Theol.”³⁶.

Manning was reading Cano’s treatise as early as the end of 1845, but it was not till 1847 that it suggested to him the answer to his uncertainties: ‘I remember how the words of Melchior Canus used to return upon me “consensus sanctorum omnium sensus Spiritus Sancti est” (De Locis Theol., lib viii, c.3). And I saw that the “consent of the Fathers” was an inadequate and human conception of a higher and divine fact, namely, of the unity of illumination that flows from the Presence of the Holy Ghost in the Universal Church and inundates it with the perpetual light of the day of Pentecost’. That truth came upon him ‘gradually, slowly, and at first dubiously’. Soon it was to become a firm conviction: ‘that the Holy Ghost perpetually and infallibly guides the Church, and speaks by its voice’³⁷. The last words of his Sermon *The Rule of Faith* acquired then a new significance for him: ‘the universal tradition of all ages is no less than the voice of God’³⁸.

³⁶ Quoted by Chapeau, *op.cit.*, p. 23.

³⁷ *CSer* I, pp. 6-7.

³⁸ *Rule*, p. 133; in 1850 he would tell Miss Stanley that sermons V and IX of his Fourth Volume of Sermons were ‘an expansion and continuation of the last paragraph of the book’ (*Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 660, Fol. 11).

The discovery may have taken place towards the end of his illness. The entry in his diary for the 20th April 1847 described the questions then in his mind as follows:

- '1. Is it the will of our Lord Jesus Christ that His flock should be subject to Saint Peter and his successors?
2. Is it part of the mystery of Pentecost that the Church should be infallible?'³⁹

The answers were not yet fully formed in his mind; there were some intellectual difficulties to be ironed out, but he was on the road to solving them.

He was not slow in later years to acknowledge his debt to Cano. Just before his conversion, in a letter to James Hope-Scott, he made a reference to it: 'The subject which has brought me to my present convictions is the perpetual office of the Church, under Divine guidance, in expounding the truth and deciding controversies. And the book which forced this on me was Melchior Canus' "Loci Theologici"⁴⁰. Manning had previously rejected the idea of a living judge, as he felt that doctrine would change as the judge was substituted by a new one. Now, he had seen that the living voice speaking in the Church, the judge in matters of doctrine, was not a perishable man but someone unchangeable, permanent and divine: the Holy Spirit, perpetually present in the Church.

On 11 May he was able to go out of doors for the first time for months, into the fresh air and the sun. His intellectual vision was already acquiring consistency, and soon his discovery found its way into his correspondence: 'What you say', he wrote to Robert Wilberforce on 9 June 1847, 'is my feeling, that the Presence, and Office of the Holy Spirit in the Church is the true foundation of certainty and perpetuity in doctrine. And that this is an object of *Faith*. Everything below this seems to me to be in principle purely rationalistic, whether the judge of Doctrine and Tradition be an individual or a Synod'⁴¹.

³⁹ P, I, p. 487.

⁴⁰ Letter dated 11-XII-1850, in R. Ornsby, *Memoirs of James Hope-Scott* (London, 1884), vol. II, p. 83; also letter to Robert Wilberforce (22-I-1851), *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 656, Fol. 108.

⁴¹ *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 655, Fol. 55.

He also wrote to Laprimaudaye in similar, though more explicit, terms. He had found the answers to the questions he had asked himself, but they were not yet firm enough to rest on them:

'First.- Is not the infallibility of the Church a necessary consequence of the Presence of the third Person of the Blessed Trinity, and of His perpetual office, beginning from the day of Pentecost? This seems to me revealed in Scripture.

A perpetual presence, perpetual office, and perpetual *infallibility* - that is, a living voice witnessing for truth and against error under the guidance of the Spirit of Christ - seem inseparable.

Secondly.- Is it not part of the revealed will and ordinance of our Lord Jesus Christ, that the Church should be under an episcopate united with a visible head, as the apostles were united with St. Peter?'⁴²

Manning was not thinking of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff, as understood by Roman theologians: 'It is not the question of primacy with me so much as *unity of the episcopate*. "*Episcopatus unus est*" ', he would say quoting St. Cyprian's *De Unitate*. 'I take St. Peter to have been the first of apostles, as the Primate of Christendom is the first of bishops; in spiritual order or power all being equal'⁴³. It was as yet a theory of his own, and he mistrusted his conclusions. 'In this state of self-mistrust and fear of going wrong, I went abroad'⁴⁴. He didn't want to proceed alone and intended to consult and test his thoughts with Robert Wilberforce and Dr. W.H. Mill, Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge.

The ensuing months marked a rapid progress in the development and consolidation of Manning's ideas. 'Things seems to me clearer', he wrote to Robert Wilberforce in January 1848, 'plainer, shapelier and more harmonious; things which were only in the head have got down into the heart; hiatuses and gaps have bridged themselves over by obvious second thoughts, and I feel a sort of *processus* and expansion going on which

⁴² Letter dated 16-VI-47; *P*, I, p. 471.

⁴³ *Ibidem*.

⁴⁴ Quoted by Chapeau, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

consolidates all the old convictions and keeps throwing out the premises of new ones'⁴⁵. Internal development and external events contributed to hammer Manning's ideas into more definitive form: 'there are truths so primary and despotic that I cannot elude them', he wrote on 5 February 1848. 'Such is the infallibility of the mystical body of Christ on earth through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. I could as soon disbelieve the Canon of Scripture, or the perpetuity of the Church. Infallibility is not an accident, it is a property, as inseparable by the Divine Will as perpetuity. This is evident to me from holy Scripture, from Catholic Tradition, from the internal and necessary relations of Divine Truth and Divine acts, as well as from reasons which alone would prove nothing'⁴⁶.

It was a process that did not only affect Manning's idea of the rule of faith. It also implied a new vision of the Church. The difference between his fourth volume of Sermons and the previous ones is rather revealing in this respect: it shows a new reading of Holy Scripture and the Fathers, mainly St. Augustine, in the light revealed to him by Cano's work.

B. A BOOK ON INFALLIBILITY

In his recollections - quoted above - Manning said that he had written the fourth volume of Sermons in 1847. His memory failed him when he added that it had been published the following year: it actually appeared in 1850. It seems likely, though, that he was right about the composition of the Sermons. In his letters to Robert Wilberforce and Allies he would repeat that the Sermon 'The Analogy of Nature' had been written in 1847; the latter would show his surprise when reading it: 'Surely no.9 was not written three years ago'⁴⁷.

The volume of Sermons was intended, Manning confessed to Mary Wilberforce, as a manifesto of his beliefs on the Church and infallibility: 'I read you that Sermon because

⁴⁵ *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 655, Fol. 62.

⁴⁶ *Ibidem*, Fol. 63.

⁴⁷ *Ibidem*, c. 657, Fol. 199.

I intend to put it out as a statement of my belief. And my purpose is, by the will of God, to publish as full a book on the subject of infallibility as I have a light to make. And by that book to take my path⁴⁸.

At first sight, though, the fourth volume of Sermons reads more like a study on the nature of the Church, and about the rôle of the Sacraments in its life and in the life of the individual Christian, than a treatise on infallibility. This is understandable, because Manning was aiming at presenting the topic of infallibility within its proper setting; that is, the work of Redemption, and the nature and mission of the Church. He also dealt at length with the nature of the virtue of Faith, a topic intimately connected with infallibility.

It has been said that no Tractarian - with the exception of Robert Wilberforce - had 'ever worked out a systematic and thorough ecclesiology, not to speak of an entire theological system'⁴⁹. It could be argued, however, that Manning's fourth volume of Sermons is the expression, in a form that tends to disguise the systematic approach of his thought, of a rather complete conception of the Church as Mystical Body of Christ. Manning's attachment to the literary form of the Sermon as a means to convey ideas continued well into his Catholic period. In 1865, in his Introduction to *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost*, he mentioned how he had tried to publish a volume of Sermons on Reason and Revelation, but, he added, 'when I began to write I found it impossible to throw the matter into the form of sermons. (...) I was therefore compelled to write this volume in the form of a short treatise'⁵⁰.

1. The Church as the Mystical Body of Christ

Manning unfolds his conception of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ within the general context of God's plan for man. The whole economy of creation and of grace, he says, are the manifestation of God's love for man, and the greatest sign of

⁴⁸ *Ibidem*, c. 655, Fol. 136; letter dated 2-XII-49.

⁴⁹ A. Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist* (Uppsala, 1965), p. 84.

⁵⁰ *TM*, pp. 1-2.

that love is His desire that men may be called, and actually be, Sons of God. Original sin frustrated God's creative plan, and man's subsequent fallen condition made necessary a work of restoration, amounting to a true new creation. In God's providence, Christ - the Creator of all things - is to be also the principle of their restoration, and the Incarnation the 'first act of the new creation'⁵¹.

'The mystery of the incarnation is not a mere isolated fact, terminating in the personality of the Word made Flesh, but the beginning and productive cause of a new creation of mankind'⁵². The restoration of man's lost divine sonship, and, consequently, the restoration of the image of God in man follow on from it. Christ is the Son, the perfect image of God the Father; and the Incarnation 'is the restoration of our manhood to God in the Person of Jesus Christ (...). In the mystery of the Incarnation is contained (...) the mystery of our renewal, in body, soul, and spirit, to the image of God'⁵³. Christ shares in our humanity in order to be the salvation of our nature, and of each one of us, through His sacrifice on the cross. This is the foundation on which the new humanity is built: the 'mystery of the Incarnation is, indeed, a humanising of God, as it is also a deifying of man; for in Him the Godhead and the manhood are alike perfect and indivisible'⁵⁴. He shares in our humanity, that we may share in His divinity.

Manning would describe the nature of this deifying procedure even further when he says: 'It does not mean that we are made partakers of the incommunicable Godhead, but that we are made partakers of the manhood of the incarnate Word. It is our nature made divine. We partake of Him: of His very flesh, of His mind, of His will, and of His spirit'⁵⁵. Christ's human nature was divinised - without losing its human character - by His contact with the divine nature in the one Person; similarly we are divinised by entering into contact with the divinity through our union with His human nature. The 'Word, who is by eternal generation of one substance with the Father, by the mystery

⁵¹ *ASer*, IV, p. 180.

⁵² *Ibidem*, p. 92.

⁵³ *Ibidem*, p. 181.

⁵⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 52.

⁵⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 203.

of the Incarnation became of one substance with us'⁵⁶. Then, as the Son lives by the Father 'so we, distinct in person, but partaking of His substance, live by the Son'⁵⁷.

Manning affirmed that the union in Christ of the divine and human natures is not something accidental, it is, rather, a 'substantial' union. He conceived our union with Christ to be of a similar character. His terminology at this point becomes somewhat obscure, particularly in the use he makes of the terms substance and substantial: 'our union with the Word made flesh' - he would say - 'is not figurative or metaphorical, by affinity and relation of will, or love only, but in substance, spirit, and reality.(...) How can there be any living union which is not real? or a real union which is not substantial? (...) Branches do not derive their life by a figurative engrafting, neither is the union of the trunk and the root a metaphor. The Incarnation is a real and substantial partaking of our manhood; and our union with Christ is a real, substantial partaking of His'⁵⁸.

That sharing in Christ's manhood was not possible for man while He was still on earth. His presence was then local, and men's relation to it external. Manning would quote here Eph. 4,10: 'He who descended is He who also ascended far above all heavens, that He might fill all things'. The departure of Jesus was the necessary prelude to His return in a new mode of presence; 'by His departure His local presence was changed into an universal presence'⁵⁹. Now the presence of His Mystical Body reaches the whole world and is able to embrace all men. The words of Heb. 10, 5 (quoting Ps. 40, 6): 'You wanted no sacrifice or cereal offering, but you gave me a body', are taken by Manning as referring not only to the physical body of Christ but also to the mystical one; a body, physical or mystical, in which and through which He carries out the work of Redemption.

The living principle of the Mystical Body is the Holy Spirit, His coming was dependent

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 184. Manning used the terms *substance* and *nature* indistinctly. This may be a source of confusion at times, although the actual meaning of the terms is clarified by the context in which they are found, i.e.: whether it means *natura* or *suppositum*.

⁵⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 186.

⁵⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 187; see also *TM*, p. 63.

⁵⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 89.

on Jesus' departure to the Father, from where He would send His Spirit. 'If He had tarried with us, He had abode alone; the Comforter had not come; His mystical body had not been knit together; His truth and spirit had not dwelt in us. While he was upon earth all was local, exterior and imperfect: now all is universal, inward, and divine'⁶⁰. The coming of the Holy Spirit was conditional on Jesus' departure to the Father, from where He would send His Spirit. Then, the Holy Spirit, who had been the agent of the union of the divine and the human nature in Christ, would be the agent of our union with Christ: He partook of our nature 'by the operation of the Holy Ghost, and we of His by the power of the same Spirit. The miraculous Agent in the Incarnation and in the holy Sacraments is the same third Person'⁶¹.

Man joins Christ, is incorporated into His Mystical Body, by Baptism, the Sacrament of man's regeneration in water and the Holy Spirit. This new birth is a free gift from God; man can only be the recipient of it and in no way the agent: 'the dust of the ground [was not] more passive when the first man was made in God's likeness, than we, when, through baptism, we were born again as sons of God'⁶². Thus, Christ 'through His Holy Sacraments began a new line of spiritual generation'. We are newly-born, or regenerated, in Baptism, but this - like our natural birth - is only the beginning of life. 'The work of our renewal, indeed, is not perfected in regeneration [Baptism], but only begun'⁶³.

Christ's Mystical Body is, thus, 'the whole fellowship of all who are united to Him by the Spirit'⁶⁴. The Mystical and the Physical Body of Christ are not independent, unconnected realities in Manning's thought. 'The glorious body of the Word made flesh is the centre of His mystical body, and to it He joins us one by one'⁶⁵. Manning sees in the parable of the Vine an almost perfect image of the Mystical Body. 'In that parable we see the perfect outline of the Incarnation, or Christ mystical in all fullness:

⁶⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 103.

⁶¹ *Ibidem*, p. 187.

⁶² *Ibidem*, p. 27.

⁶³ *Ibidem*, p. 182.

⁶⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 201.

⁶⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 275.

the root, the stem, the branches (...). It describes by anticipation the life, growth, and fruitage of the Church, and reveals also the source and channels through which the quickening life passes into all its structure and farthest sprays'⁶⁶. The Sacraments being the 'channels through which the grace of it [Christ's sacrifice] flows to us (...), one by one'⁶⁷.

'The natural body of our Lord Jesus Christ is, as it were, the root out of which, by the power of the Holy Ghost, His mystical body is produced'. Men 'were engrafted into the stock of the Word made flesh (...) Then began the growth and expansion of the mystical vine' ⁶⁸.

2. The Unity of Life of the Mystical Body of Christ

Christ and Christians become a unity of life; the many members become one body and share in one life. The Church is 'the production and overflow of His life and substance - the fruit and fulfilment of His incarnation, - the complement and perfection of His mystical body. What is the Church but Christ's invisible presence openly manifested by a visible organisation? The Church is Christ mystical, - the presence of Christ, by the creative power of His incarnation, produced and prolonged on earth'⁶⁹.

Manning here quoted Eph. 4, 22-23: Christ is the 'head over all things to the Church, which is His body; the fullness of Him that filleth all in all'. From this it followed that the prerogatives of the head became the prerogatives of the body: 'When He ascended up on high, the virtues of His glorified manhood were shed abroad upon His Church'⁷⁰. 'Therefore the Church is one, because He is one; holy, because He is holy; catholic, because His presence is local no more; apostolic, because He still sends His

⁶⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 190.

⁶⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 220.

⁶⁸ *Ibidem*, pp. 198-199.

⁶⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 93.

⁷⁰ *Ibidem*, pp. 181-182.

own servants; indefectible, because He is the life; unerring, because He is the truth'⁷¹.

A community of life is, thus, established between Christ and Christians, whereby the whole Mystical Body and the individual Christian share Christ's life, eternal life. 'As His Godhead and manhood are united in one natural person, so we and the Lord of the resurrection are united in one mystical body. A living head must needs have living members; and a Head that is risen must raise His members in due season (...) He *is* our resurrection'⁷². Our Lord's words 'I am the Resurrection and the life', did not only mean, "I will quicken and raise mankind from the dead", but "I *am* the Resurrection, and all rise in Me: I *am* 'the Life', and all live in Me"⁷³.

If the natural body of Jesus is the stock on which the Christian is engrafted, His sacramental body is the means by which Christ's life is communicated to all the members of the Mystical Body and sustains them, His presence in them being their life: 'as the life and substance of the first creation are sustained and perpetuated until now, so in the second, which is the mystical Vine, He is root and trunk, branch and fruit; wholly in us, and we in Him'⁷⁴. He will expand on the character of that presence by saying: 'the humanity of the second Adam is the immediate and substantial instrument of our regeneration and renewal. It has, therefore, a supernatural presence throughout the whole mystical body of Christ. As the substance of the first man is the productive cause of the whole human race, so the Manhood of the second, in its reality and presence, is extended throughout the Church. It is the presence of God which upholds all the creation of nature: it is the presence of the incarnate Word which upholds all the creation of grace'⁷⁵.

Manning apparently did not wish to develop further this theme which was dear to Tractarian thought. Moreover, Robert Wilberforce had described in great detail this concept in his earlier book on the Incarnation (1848). Thus, Manning probably did not

⁷¹ *Ibidem*, p. 103.

⁷² *Ibidem*, p. 345.

⁷³ *Ibidem*, p. 287.

⁷⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 198.

⁷⁵ *Ibidem*, pp. 92-93.

feel the need to expand upon it. It may be useful, though, to describe here, briefly, Robert Wilberforce's line of argument, so as to make clearer the background to Manning's thought. The first Adam, Wilberforce had said, is not only the originating generative principle of human life but also the original on which all his descendants are generated. The unity of form is a consequence of the law of descent from a single parent. That guarantees a perpetual succession of beings, in each one of whom the original type reappears. Analogically, Christ is the originating principle and the original of the new creation of the sons of God. 'The necessity then of Christ's Presence according to His humanity,' Wilberforce wrote, 'rests upon His being that Pattern Man, in whom renewed manhood shone forth in its brightest colours, by reason of those supernatural endowments with which it was invested. So that it is essential that we should be as truly united to Him by grace, as we were to the first Adam by nature'⁷⁶.

Manning pulls together the threads of his thought by saying: 'In one sense the Church is called the body of Christ, by metaphor and analogy to the members and unity of a natural body: in another sense mystically, because of its true and vital union with Him'⁷⁷. The image of the vine has a similar representative value, for it expresses 'the intense inwardness and spirituality of the body of Christ, [it] expresses equally its visible unity and organisation. It is as visible, sensible, and local as was the natural body of Christ Himself. In all the world it is visibly manifest as the presence of its unseen Head. It speaks, witnesses, acts, binds and looses in His name, and as Himself'⁷⁸. Thus, the unity of life of the Mystical Body implies also a unity of action. The highest manifestation of this unity of action is to be found in the sacrifice of Christ in the Eucharist: 'This is the first foundation of the Church - its perfect unity of life and act with Christ its Head'. The priesthood of Christ, like His other prerogatives, descends 'from the Head to the body, whereby He offers the body in Himself, and the body, in and for itself, offers Him unto the Father'⁷⁹.

The bond which holds together the Mystical Body of Christ is the law of love. 'The

⁷⁶ R. Wilberforce, *The Doctrine of the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ* (London, 1848), p. 308.

⁷⁷ *ASer*, IV, p. 201.

⁷⁸ *Ibidem*.

⁷⁹ *Ibidem*, pp. 223-224.

unity of love is a type of the unity of nature'⁸⁰, Manning would say somewhat cryptically, implying that, although the members of the Mystical Body cannot achieve the unity of the Three Divine Persons in the oneness of God's nature, they reflect it in the unity of love and its corollaries. The unity of love of God the Son and God the Father flows down from heaven unto the Church to make all one. Love 'is one of the names of Christ and of His Church. Its visible body is the earthly clothing, the mystical impersonation of the love of God, in which all, whether visible or invisible, are united to Him as the Father is in the Son'⁸¹. The unity and expansion of God's love is 'the cause and the law of unity and communion to the visible Church'. It 'had its beginning upon earth in Him who is Love incarnate; from Him it spread and embraced His disciples, binding them into one visible fellowship'⁸².

Manning, from the publication of his fourth volume of Sermons, affirmed unequivocally that the communion of charity is an essential element of the unity of the Church. This is a departure from his previous position. He had until then maintained that 'the unity of the Church is organic and moral - that the organic unity consists in succession, hierarchy, and valid sacraments, and the moral in the communion of charity among all the members of particular Churches, and all the Churches of the Catholic unity'. He had also affirmed 'that moral unity might be permanently suspended, and even lost, while the organic unity remained intact, and that unity of communion belongs only to the perfection, not to the intrinsic essence of the Church'⁸³. In his Third Volume of Anglican Sermons he had still spoken of the theory of the Three Branches making up, though separate, the one Church. By the time he wrote the Fourth Volume, he had come to realise that the unity of charity and communion is an integral element of the unity of the Church; that visible unity, following from the law of charity, is an essential characteristic of the visible Church.

The Mystical Body is the revelation of the love which unites the divine persons; it is also the revelation of the love of God for man, just as Jesus Christ's physical presence

⁸⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 290.

⁸¹ *Ibidem*.

⁸² *Ibidem*, p. 296.

⁸³ *TM*, p. 28.

among men had been. 'The Love of the Father and of the Son was thenceforward manifest, not in a natural, but in a mystical body, which, from age to age, perfects itself by the inward working of its own principle of life. Its unity and growth are properties of its very being, descending from "the Head, even Christ: from whom the whole body, fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love" (Eph. IV. 15,16)'⁸⁴.

The Church 'is, therefore, by its very nature and law, one and indivisible, ever enlarging, all-embracing; gathering in all nations, fusing all races, harmonising all tongues, blending all thoughts, uniting all spirits: making the earth once more of "one life", of one speech, of one heart, and of one will. (...) "There is one body and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling: one Lord, one faith, one baptism" (Eph IV, 4,5), one altar, one holy sacrifice, one divine tradition of corporate identity and living consciousness, sustaining the illumination of truth, seen by love alone, and itself sustained by the Holy Ghost'⁸⁵.

Schism is a most grievous sin, but it does not rend the unity of the Church: 'it is a sin against the indivisible love of God. To separate from the Church is to forfeit love; for love cannot be divided. Schisms do not rend it, but are rent from it. As the life retires into the living trunk when the branches are cut away, so love still dwells undivided in the life of the Church when members fall from its communion'⁸⁶.

Manning was conscious of this change in his way of thinking, and he would later offer an explicit retraction of the ideas he had previously expounded in his book *The Unity of the Church*. In *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost* (1865) he pointed out the three errors into which he 'unconsciously fell' in his Anglican books and Sermons. Among them, he confessed that he had 'not understood from whence the principle of unity is derived. It had seemed to be a constitutional law, springing from external organisation, highly beneficial, but not a vital necessity to the Church. (...) I had not

⁸⁴ *ASer*, IV, pp. 296-297.

⁸⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 297.

⁸⁶ *Ibidem*, pp. 297-298.

as yet perceived that the unity of the Church is the external expression of the intrinsic and necessary law of its existence; that it flows from the **unity** of its Head, of its Life, of its mind, and of its will; in other words, from the unity of the Person of the Incarnate Son, who reigns in it, and of the Holy Ghost, who organises it by His inhabitation, sustains it by His presence, and speaks through it by His voice'⁸⁷.

There are not three bodies of Christ - physical, mystical and sacramental - but only one; 'one in nature, truth, and glory. But there are three manners, three miracles of divine omnipotence, by which that one body has been and is present; the first, as mortal and natural; the second, supernatural, real, and substantial; the third, mystical, by our incorporation. The presence is one, the manner threefold; the substance one in all three: all three one in Him'⁸⁸.

3. The Infallibility of the Mystical Body of Christ

Manning would then describe how Christ, beside his life-giving and sanctifying work, also continues now His teaching action in and through the Church. After His Ascension the imperfect knowledge of the Apostles was to become full illumination in the Church by the working of the Holy Spirit. 'When He departed, the Spirit of Truth took up all that He had revealed, and unfolded it with great accessions of divine illumination. He then opened a ministry of interior and perfect faith, which has guided His Church in all ages and in all lands unto this day. His own teaching was partial and local: the guidance of the Holy Spirit is plenary and universal. And our Teacher departs not, but abides with us for ever: a guide ever present, though invisible; ever presiding, though in silence; unerring, though teaching through human reason and by human speech. The Spirit of Truth is Christ Himself by His Spirit guiding and teaching still (...) the whole Church of God throughout the world; sustaining in its spiritual consciousness, and in the successive and continuous line of its spiritual and intellectual life, the whole mystery of God, the unfading image of the heavenly Truth'⁸⁹. Thus, there still is nowadays a

⁸⁷ *TM*, p. 30; see also *CSer*, I, pp. 17-18.

⁸⁸ *ASer*, IV, p. 202.

⁸⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 97.

living and divine voice speaking the truth of salvation in the world.

Manning had been looking, from his early days as a pastor in Lavington, for the faith of the day of Pentecost. Now he had come to see that Pentecost did not end at sunset, leaving the historical sciences to find out what the Holy Spirit had taught the Apostles on that day; it was not an event of the past but a permanent reality in the Church. This is the central theme running through the Fourth Volume of Sermons: 'The day of Pentecost is a perpetual miracle. It stands in its fullness even until now, and we are partakers of its presence and its power'⁹⁰. That 'original inspiration has descended in a perpetual illumination'⁹¹. The 'inspiration of the Apostles became illumination in the Church. The illumination of the Holy Ghost is as perpetual as His presence. His office is, as His presence, "for ever"; that is, unto the end of the world'⁹².

Thus, the infallibility of the Church is made up of two elements: 'perfect certainty in the object revealed, and spiritual illumination in the subject which perceives it, that is, the Church itself'. The infallibility of God who reveals is mirrored by the infallibility of the Church in receiving without distortion the content of the revelation. 'Shake this foundation', Manning would add, 'and faith becomes uncertainty'⁹³.

Manning affirmed that the 'perpetual preservation of truth is a part of the divine office of the Holy Ghost, ever present in the mystical body of Christ; and that the presence of the infallible Teacher is as necessary to the infirmities of human reason, as the presence of an omnipotent Comforter is necessary to the infirmities of the human will; that both, the will and the reason, without such presence, omnipotent and infallible, would be in bondage to evil and to falsehood'⁹⁴. The Truth revealed by God would soon have been deformed and corrupted had it been left to unaided human reason to understand, preserve and transmit it. 'Is it possible to believe', Manning asked, 'that the supernatural illumination of the Spirit was so given as to rest upon no higher base

⁹⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 103.

⁹¹ *Ibidem*, p. 172.

⁹² *Ibidem*, p. 169.

⁹³ *Ibidem*, p. 171.

⁹⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 172.

than reason, discovery, criticism, and analogies of nature?’⁹⁵. He summarised his thought on the matter as follows: ‘What has been said amounts to this: that the doctrines of the faith, fully and clearly revealed by inspiration in the beginning, were fully and clearly apprehended by the Church’⁹⁶.

Some, arguing from the analogy of nature, could perhaps say that ‘as certainty is found nowhere in nature, it is not to be demanded in revelation; that a measure of uncertainty, that is, of probability, is involved in the idea of moral trial, and that the facts of nature shew us on what laws revealed truth is to be sought and held; and that therefore the whole analogy of our condition is opposed to the supposition of an unerring witness preserving and propounding truth by Divine appointment in the Church’⁹⁷. Manning, in his response to that objection, acknowledged the Analogy of Nature as an instrument at the service of God’s revelation. ‘It clears away supposed objections [preliminary objections to revelation and faith in general, or to particular doctrines of faith] by fact; it raises a probability that revelation is, like nature, the work of God; and that the analogy we trace in part, may extend beyond our range of observation. Thus far it invests nature with a divine character, and makes it the basis of faith’⁹⁸. A short time later, in a letter to Lowe, he tried to explain what he had said in the sermon on the subject: the Analogy of nature is good ‘(1) to clear away objections against Revelation which would equally smite nature. (2) To raise a presumption - as the spring of the Resurrection. (3) To raise a *probability* that what we cannot see will be like what we can see, because as far as we know there is a proportion’⁹⁹. It would be a serious mistake, though, to use the analogy antecedently, to determine either the limit of the faith as to its content, or to prescribe the manner and kind of the divine procedure to be followed by God in revealing Himself: it ‘would be mere infidelity to take the analogy of nature as the measure or limit of revelation’¹⁰⁰. Doing so would devalue God’s supernatural revelation to the level of natural religion.

⁹⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 170.

⁹⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 172

⁹⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 162.

⁹⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 157.

⁹⁹ *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 662, Fol. 178; letter dated 3-IV-50.

¹⁰⁰ *ASer*, IV, p. 158.

Revelation stands on its own proper evidence. 'We must receive it [revelation] in its own light and upon its own proper proofs. (...) What, then, is this proper evidence on which revelation, or, as we shall better say henceforth, the Church and the Faith, repose? Plainly, upon no presumption or probabilities deduced before the fact, that is, upon no *a priori* reasoning. We are not able to say before the fact whether any revelation shall be given or not; or, if given, to what extent, to what end, on what evidence, or how secured, and the like. In this, nature is silent as death. Analogies have no existence. All our proofs are after the event. The fact attests itself, and reveals its own outline, character, and conditions'¹⁰¹.

The proofs of revelation are not found in the analogy of nature, but 'in a series of supernatural facts, in original revelations, in spiritual consciousness, in the words of inspired Scripture, in apostolical traditions, in the testimony of the Church, in the definitions of Councils, in the collective discernment of men sanctified by the Spirit of God'¹⁰². These supernatural facts - which have no counterpart or analogy in nature - are the only ones which reveal the manner of God's dealings with man and the truths of faith. 'The supernatural inspiration of the Church is a perpetual illumination above the laws of nature. Its conditions, limits, and modes of operation are all its own'¹⁰³. Otherwise, man's belief would be limited by his natural experience, which can never rise to the experience of the supernatural. Manning considered as enemies of the faith those who applied wrongly the analogy of nature. 'They not only use the analogy of nature antecedently to the proper proof, so as to prescribe *a priori* the manner in which the Divine revelation has been put and left, but ultimately even against it. In fact, they are but the fine end of naturalism'¹⁰⁴. When the analogy of nature is pressed beyond its proper range then the analogies existing between the counterparts 'soon run into a supposed identity, and the faith sinks into a mere natural religion'¹⁰⁵.

Manning insisted repeatedly on the idea that what is natural cannot determine what and

¹⁰¹ *Ibidem*, p. 164.

¹⁰² *Ibidem*, p. 168.

¹⁰³ *Ibidem*, p. 165.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 162.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibidem*, p.159.

how the supernatural should be. If that were to be the case, it could, for example, be concluded that there are three Gods, because in nature each person is one man and several persons several human natures. The revelation is supernatural, and the supernatural has its own laws - different from and above those of nature - and it can be reached only by faith. Having settled that point, he added rhetorically: 'because among men the father is before the son, cannot the ever-lasting Son be co-eternal with the Father? (...) Because human traditions grow corrupt, may not divine traditions be kept pure? (...) Because natural truth is an uncertain light, may not the light of Christ be sustained by Himself infallible and clear?'¹⁰⁶

4. The nature of the act of Faith

Manning had established two elements in the formula of the certainty of faith: the certainty of the original revelation, based on God's infallibility, and the certainty of the faith in its preservation and transmission, guaranteed by the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church. There was however another element in need of satisfactory explanation: how does the individual believer reach the certainty of faith? Any knowledge worthy of the name, as far as Manning was concerned, should be certain in the two senses of the word: the truth itself should be objectively certain, and, on the other hand, the one who knows should be certain about it being true.

By what faculty is it that 'the truth [of revelation] is to be apprehended?', Manning asked. 'The whole world of God answers at once, By faith'¹⁰⁷. Unfortunately, men seemed to have lost sight of faith's true nature. He considered that the controversies of last centuries had committed two evils: 'they have dethroned the object of faith [he seems to refer to the Church, as formal object of faith], and they have degraded faith itself [as a virtue]'¹⁰⁸. Manning was not satisfied by the different definitions of the nature of faith being proposed: 'Some will have it to be a speculative assent to truths revealed; and some, to correct them, will have it to be a principle of moral action; and

¹⁰⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 166.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 168.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 376.

others, to set both sides right, join together these two definitions in one, and tell us that faith is a principle of moral action springing from speculative assent to truths revealed'¹⁰⁹.

According to Manning, these were only partial answers, separating what is and acts in unison. Moreover, they turned faith into 'an effect without a cause, or with a simply human cause, and within the natural endowments of the human intelligence'¹¹⁰. The latter was their more serious error: human reason can never be the foundation of the knowledge of faith nor the basis of certain knowledge about the supernatural, nor the origin of the act of believing. This is why he rejected the attempts of those who looked to the analogy of nature or to probabilities for the foundation and source of the act of faith. For them, as Manning saw it, the act of faith consisted in man's decision to believe what God has revealed; man would draw that conclusion after weighing the probabilities about a particular truth or system being of divine origin, ascertaining in what direction the scales moved. They would accept that human reason cannot reach the supernatural truths which are the object of faith, but, once they were revealed, the act of faith was a human act. Theirs was a 'certainty' based on probabilities¹¹¹. Manning could not be content with that type of certainty, neither could he accept that the act of faith was in substance a human act: it was not given to man by flesh and blood, but by the Father who is in Heaven. Then, what is faith and what are its sources?

Manning had spoken of action and consent springing from faith; 'but what is that cause or power' - asked Manning - 'which is before both the assent and action of faith?' And he answered: 'What but faith itself?'¹¹² A faith which has no human cause, but is

¹⁰⁹ *Ibidem*, pp. 376-377.

¹¹⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 377.

¹¹¹ A certain amount of confusion may be generated by the different concepts about what constitutes 'certainty', whether it was seen merely as a subjective quality of the assent or a quality both of the assent and of the truth to which the assent is given. It seems that in Butler the term 'probability' is opposed to 'demonstration', rather than to 'certainty', and that he left the door open for a certainty based on probabilities (moral certainty). Manning's 'certainty', on the other hand, is a knowledge which excludes doubt, and which can never be reached as a conclusion based on probabilities; the probable character of the premises would not allow the conclusion to rise above the level of a probable truth. Keble, in his Preface of 1847, seems to be closer to Manning than to Butler in his use of the term.

¹¹² *ASer*, IV, p. 377.

only in God's power to grant. In the sermons Manning stressed this character of faith as an infused grace of God: 'Faith is a spiritual consciousness of the world unseen, infused into us, in our regeneration, by the supernatural gift of God'¹¹³. 'Faith means trust in divine authority. (...) [F]aith is an infused grace of God, by which the soul casts its whole confidence upon the authority of God. The infallibility of God is the foundation of that trust'¹¹⁴. It generates a certainty founded on revelation: what is 'the very first idea of revelation but a clear and infallible knowledge of the truth given direct from God?'¹¹⁵

The Holy Spirit is the foundation of the certainty of revelation in itself, and also of the certainty with which man accepts God's revelation. He inspires this certainty in man with the gift of faith. Probability, Manning would say, is the best 'that nature can give in most things, but the least truth in the kingdom of God is greater than it'¹¹⁶. Manning saw divine faith as consisting in an infusion of supernatural grace illuminating the intelligence to know and inclining the heart to believe. There was no other path to certainty, as he explained, a few years later, to Robert Wilberforce, then on the brink of conversion: 'I fancy that you are looking for what God does not give. I mean a conviction which precludes the exercise of faith. Except in figures and numbers there is no [human] conviction which excludes the possibility of the contrary being true. (...) A deist in becoming a Christian has no more than a conviction which excludes *reasonable* fear that Christianity may turn out not to be true. Reason can go no further, and until upon the motives of credibility supplied by reason he makes an act of faith, he can raise no higher. (...) As a student of Aristotle and Butler you know all this better than I'¹¹⁷.

Faith, he would insist henceforth, was a gift, with the same structure in the Christians on the day of Pentecost as in the rest of believers down the centuries: 'this divine gift, as it was, at the first, not discovered but received, so it has been, not critically proved,

¹¹³ *Ibidem*.

¹¹⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 171.

¹¹⁵ *Ibidem*.

¹¹⁶ *Ibidem*.

¹¹⁷ *P*, II, pp. 36-37; letter dated 20-I-54.

from age to age, by intellect, not gathered by inductions or by the instruments of moral reasoning, but preserved and handed on by faith; that the office of reason [then and now] is, not to discover and attain, but to illustrate, demonstrate [!], and expound'¹¹⁸.

The knowledge of faith is a means, the most perfect one granted by God, for man to gain access to reality; it 'is that power of spiritual perception analogous to sense, that is, to sight, hearing, and feeling; and also to affection, that is, to love, fear, and desire. It is as wide as the whole soul of man, uniting it in one continuous act'¹¹⁹. Its object is a world of spiritual realities which cannot be apprehended except through it. Faith does not contradict or oppose the natural powers, its rôle is rather to complement and to perfect them. We experience how the senses give us a perception of the visible world and the intellect adds its interpretation; they don't oppose but complement each other. Such is the case with Faith: the intellect 'corrects and exalts sense; faith corrects and exalts both'¹²⁰.

The gift of faith perfects the whole rational man: it 'has been defined as the perfection of the will and of the intellect - of the will as it sanctifies, of the intellect as it illuminates, of both at once as it issues in its congenial fruits'¹²¹. Faith helps the proper acts of both potencies; it is an active principle: 'Acting towards God, it issues in trust, love, prayer, contemplation, worship; towards man, in charity, gentleness, self-denial; upon ourselves, in abasement, discipline, and penance'¹²².

Manning hastened to add that this 'supernatural gift [faith] was infused into us as a habit [virtue] by the Spirit of God; but in its acting depends upon our will'¹²³. Like all other gifts from God, it 'is subject to the will of man. It is the matter of our higher probation. It may be used or abused, matured or neglected, made perfect or

¹¹⁸ *ASer*, IV, p. 172.

¹¹⁹ *Ibidem*, pp. 377-378.

¹²⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 379.

¹²¹ *Ibidem*, p. 380.

¹²² *Ibidem*.

¹²³ *Ibidem*, p. 378.

perverted'¹²⁴. Faith 'is a moral habit, having its root in the will'¹²⁵. Man's moral nature has, thus, a determining influence in the act of faith. The effort to purify one's conscience, the habitual exercise of prayer, frequent communion, etc., help faith to mature; sin and worldliness, on the other hand, deaden and blur that spiritual perception, in the same way as human defects and vices affect the exercise of the intellect and the will.

The home and resting place of the truth of faith revealed by God is the Church of Christ. In the Church truth is 'one, perfect, absolute, and binding; admitting no diminution or addition, election or choice. It is all contained in the baptismal creed, as is all the law of sanctity in the ten commandments, not expressly, but by deep implication; and the authority on which we receive both is one, - the Church teaching in the name of Christ'¹²⁶. The entirety of revealed truth, as proposed by the Church, is binding on those who belong to it; the very nature of faith excludes a partial reception of the truths proposed by the Church.

In one of the sermons, Manning considered the case of those who because of not having the truth proposed to them do not come to know it, and that of those who, because of some deeply ingrained prejudice, cannot recognise the truth of revelation when confronted with it. He affirms that 'no ignorance of truth is a personal sin before God, except that ignorance which springs from personal sin'¹²⁷. If that is the case, why should men need the teaching of a visible Church? Would it not be enough to leave man to discover and follow truth with his own, unaided, reason? To Manning's mind, the question ignores how great a treasure the possession of the truth of revelation is: it brings life to those who possess it, in the measure of their knowledge and acceptance of it. Moreover, Manning would say, those who asked that question did not understand the moral rôle of the Church as a means for the probation of man.

¹²⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 381.

¹²⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 386.

¹²⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 84.

¹²⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 75.

5. Butler and the Analogy of Nature

Manning's Fourth Volume of Sermons, and particularly the sermon entitled 'The Analogy of Nature', marked an important departure from Butler's *Analogy*, and from the standpoint of men like Keble, Pusey and Gladstone. They felt that the shipwreck of the Oxford Movement was, in good measure, because of a neglect of Butler's ideas. Keble, writing to Ryder in 1846, had pointed this out: 'I am sure it is long since I dreamed of "maintaining the cause" of all truths I firmly believe, or of "finding sufficient answer" to all objections. In such matters I should have made shipwreck long ago, had I not accepted, and tried to act upon the theory of Bishop Butler - that theory which seems now to be so sadly despised and forsaken by so many of our friends'¹²⁸.

In 1847, Keble did try to remedy that deficiency with the publication of his *Sermons Academical and Occasional*. Its long Preface was meant as a diagnosis of the illness affecting so many of the old Tractarians and as a prescription to arrest the stream of conversions to Rome. Pusey had urged him repeatedly to reassure those who were anxious and discouraged by recent events, and Keble tried to give direction to what was left of the Movement by steering it clear of the rock on which the allegiance to the Anglican Church of so many of the Tractarians had been broken up. He charted that treacherous rock and identified it as the desire for certainty - absolute certainty - in matters of faith which was felt by some of the Tractarians, and that had led a certain number of them to Rome. The long Preface to the volume of sermons was Keble's effort at unmasking that unhealthy urge, for the benefit of those still in the Anglican Church. The desire for certainty, he wrote, was 'a generous and devotional feeling; still it is a feeling, not reason, and proceeds on an inadequate view of the necessary imperfection of this our mortal state'¹²⁹. Keble thought that this 'longing after assurance', for 'perfect rest of mind and heart', 'might perhaps not unaptly be called

¹²⁸ Letter dated 22-V-46, quoted by D. Newsome, *The Parting of Friends* (London, 1966), p. 311. Newman was one of those friends, and Keble had offered him before his secession to Rome the same advice [see J. Baccus (ed.), *Correspondence of John Henry Newman with John Keble and others 1839-1845* (London, 1917), p. 320]. Gladstone also saw in Butler the antidote for the new ideas of Development: 'I am persuaded', he wrote to Manning (28-XII-45), 'that Bishop Butler if he were alive would in his quiet way tear the whole argument [Newman's] into shreds' (*Gladstone Papers*, British Library, Add.Ms. 44247, Fol. 279).

¹²⁹ J. Keble, *Sermons Academical and Occasional*, Preface, p. X.

the "last infirmity" of saintly spirits. As the tender and anxious conscience is won by the expectation of some peculiar, untried repose, to be found in Roman Catholic confessionals only; forgetting that the same treasure of pardon is by God's mercy already within its reach; so the restless argumentative intellect thinks to take refuge in the doctrine of infallibility¹³⁰. The Preface argued that the change to Rome was not the safer way on moral grounds, and that, on the other hand, the analogy of nature militated against the existence of certainty in the knowledge of the matters of faith.

Keble followed Butler's argument in *The Analogy of Nature*, where Butler had dealt with the objection arguing that Revelation lacked clarity, and that this denied its divine origin. The deist claimed that, if God had really given a revelation, He would have accompanied it with an unmistakable proof of its truthfulness, and its content would be plain to all. This argument, Butler said, was an *a priori*, deducing from what we think reasonable how God should have acted. We are not justified in assuming that this is the case in revelation. As a matter of fact, Butler added, the analogy of nature would have us think otherwise. The truths of Christian revelation, like those of nature, are, and can be, only imperfectly apprehended by us. Probable evidence is, in most cases, the highest achievable evidence; but moral certainty could be built on the foundation of cumulative probabilities. Probability is the guide of life, and man should not pretend to enjoy absolute certainty where God only intended probable knowledge for him. Gladstone would say that this was the reason why Butler, the milder of men, would pronounce such a severe sentence on the claims of the Popes; it was born of his horror at the daring and presumption of their claim to infallible knowledge¹³¹.

Butler saw in this a disposition of Providence, a moral design: it was part of man's moral test. Faith would have no merit if the knowledge of divine truth would impose itself to our mind with an absolute certainty; that would just be a worthless and compulsory assent. Evidence in matters of religion needs to be weighed carefully, and where the evidence falls short of being conclusive the effort to determine its proper value is more of a probation for man than would be the case if the evidence were to be overwhelming. The examination of the evidence requires the exercise of a series of

¹³⁰ *Ibidem*, pp. LXVI-LXVII.

¹³¹ Cfr. W.E. Gladstone, *Studies Subsidiary to the Works of Bishop Butler* (Oxford, 1896), pp. 105-106

virtues: the fickle and worldly man would be inclined to excuse himself from accepting the revealed truth, and its demands, on the plea of its uncertainty, while the virtuous man would be more inclined to make it his own. God may deliberately hide himself from men and his hiddenness is not just 'the divine response to the corruption of their minds. It is rather the theory that those disposed to seek the truth with full seriousness might have to be presented with obstacles to test their moral determination'¹³².

Manning had dismissed the analogy of nature, probabilities and the natural light of the individual mind - aided in some general way by grace - as the sources of the knowledge of faith. If this were the case, then the highest evidence achievable would be only a moral evidence or 'moral certainty', as Butler and Keble would call it. It would be just a probable evidence and, Manning thought, it would imply 'uncertainty both in the subject and in the object. Is it possible to believe', he asked, 'that this scheme of probabilities (that is, of uncertainty) in doctrine, and of imperfection (that is, of doubt) in evidence, is part of the probation of the regenerate within the revelation of the faith?'¹³³ He had a different idea about the nature of man's probation, one which he had already described in *The Unity of the Church*. Submission to the teaching Church was, in Manning's mind, the essential element of man's probation and regeneration. As he saw it, there is on man's part - as a consequence of sin - an unwillingness to submit to the Church. This ordinance of God seems to him unreasonable and arbitrary; his intellect and his will rebel against it. He finds it difficult to believe that Pastors - whom he sees as human and defective - are commissioned to teach infallible truth; he also finds it difficult to submit to the discipline dictated by an order of men, and to preserve the unity of brotherhood. Man tends 'to put subjective opinion in the place of objective truth', and this pride of the human intellect is encountered and corrected by the submission 'of men as learners to an order of men who are divinely commissioned to teach'¹³⁴. Man's rebellion, which destroyed the image of God in him, is corrected by his submission to the discipline of the Church. In so doing, he conforms to the image of Christ, the obedient Son of the Father. Consequently, the unity of man is restored:

¹³² T. Penelhum, 'Butler and Human Ignorance', in C.J. Cunliffe (ed), *Joseph Butler's Moral and Religious Thought* (Oxford, 1992), p. 137.

¹³³ *ASer*, IV, p. 170.

¹³⁴ *Unity*, p. 268.

'By the illumination of the intellectual nature through the one objective doctrine, and by the purifying of the moral nature through the one objective discipline, the will is once more enthroned supreme, and its energies united with the will of God'¹³⁵.

Thus, the probation of man does not consist in his discovering or not discovering the truth of faith by himself, aided by grace and his moral rectitude. Manning considers that this avenue led to spiritual pride and rationalism. The Church's mission is not to call man 'to weigh the value of truth in the balance of the individual reason, but to call upon the individual will to surrender itself to the sweet yoke of Christ'¹³⁶. 'Latitudinarian errors and proud indifference' were the very moral opposites of the humility required for the act of faith, and they were not without moral responsibility.

Manning's central idea in his Fourth Volume of Sermons was the permanent presence and permanent teaching office of the Holy Spirit in the Church. He thought that those who spoke of criticism, probabilities or the analogy of nature as the sources of the knowledge of faith could be addressed with the words of the Apostle: "Are ye so foolish? Having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?" (Gal. 3,3)¹³⁷.

Keble, on the other hand, seems to have stressed Butler's rôle of the moral element in the actual acceptance of revealed truth. More than as helping in the acceptance of the truth which appeared to the intellect as probable, he seems to conceive of it as a light guiding man to find the truth. Probability left ample room for the moral sense to correct the errors of the intellect: 'He that is willing to do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God'¹³⁸. Keble also contended that probable knowledge was more consistent with the proper understanding of the nature of Faith and Hope as described in Holy Scripture, 'since "hope which is seen is not hope": and "faith is the substance", the realizing, "of things hoped for", the "evidence, or making venture", of things not seen. When objects therefore, either earthly or heavenly, present themselves

¹³⁵ *Ibidem*, p.251.

¹³⁶ *ASer*, IV, p. 84.

¹³⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 170.

¹³⁸ Keble, *Sermons Academical and Occasional*, p. XVI.

to the mind as distinctly as though they were seen, there is no room any longer for either hope or faith, properly so called'¹³⁹.

Manning would reject this contention on the basis that Keble had disregarded the nature of the act of faith; he had also failed to consider that, although a truth may lack intrinsic evidence, its truthfulness may be supported by extrinsic evidence, i.e.: the truthfulness and omniscience of the one propounding it. Manning's departure from Butler's ideas had a Butlerian foundation. As far as he was concerned, to use the analogy of nature to determine the degree of certainty or uncertainty of God's revelation was as much an *a priori* as the Rationalistic ideas that Butler was trying to refute. He felt that Butler's conception of the act of faith had degraded it to a natural act: the act of weighing and deciding on a series of probabilities presented to the intellect; a purely human act, in which both the intellect and the general rectitude of the will played the decisive part. Manning rejected this position: faith is not based on 'probability' but on a double certainty. First, the truth revealed presents itself to us as infallibly true; secondly, the subjective act of faith is not originated by a judgment of the believer upon probabilities; it has its origin in God who grants it to man.

Manning had circulated the proofs of his Sermon among a few of his friends. Gladstone answered in detail Manning's contention as to the analogy of nature; he rejected infallibility outright. For him, as he wrote at this time, 'faith essentially involves the idea of what we have called probable evidence; for it is "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen"; and "what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for"?'¹⁴⁰ Robert Wilberforce, on the other hand, could not fault Manning's logic but found it difficult to accept his conclusions, and he would have preferred if Manning had used the word indefectibility rather than infallibility; he also asked whether the Sermon had been written against Keble's Preface. No, it had not, Manning answered; he had written it in 1847 when he was ill, before the Preface appeared¹⁴¹. Allies was

¹³⁹ *Ibidem*, p. XI.

¹⁴⁰ Gladstone, 'Probability as the guide of Life', in *Subsidiary*, p. 362. He started writing these studies in 1845.

¹⁴¹ Cfr. *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c.655, Fols. 131-132; letter dated 16-XI-49. In a letter to Gladstone (21-XI-69) he seemed to suggest that he had written the Sermon with Keble's Preface in mind (*Gladstone Papers*, British Library, BL 44249, Fols. 120-130).

enthusiastic about the Sermons, particularly number nine on the analogy of nature. Had he read it before, the Sermon could have saved him from years of uncertainty. His judgment upon it, half in jest, was that Manning should be brought to the Court of Arches: 'You have been not so much attacking a single point here and there in the Articles of our faith, as overthrowing the whole ground on which the Anglican Church originally went and now stands. When you speak of inhering in the infallibility of the Church Catholic, it is a language and a thought unknown to all her writers, and utterly alien to her action and life for three hundred years. How has she lived save on criticism of the text of Scripture, criticism of antiquity[?]'¹⁴²

Manning's correspondence with Robert Wilberforce in the years following the publication of his last volume of Anglican Sermons dwells repeatedly on the themes sketched in it. On 22 January 1851 he wrote speaking about his concern: the 'strange and sad words I have heard from good men about "craving for certainty", and "uncertainty being the utmost sphere of moral probation", are alarming for the faith of their followers. Is it the probation of Faith to be uncertain whether there be a True and proper Trinity of Persons - whether there be a Real Presence - or any Holy Ghost? And if not in these, why in any truth whereby we must be saved?'¹⁴³ Pusey and Keble had a false view of moral probation, and this was perhaps more dangerous than their doctrinal errors. In 1854 he would still be playing the same themes in Robert's mind: 'Do you mean that the ground of your faith is probability? What, then, is the office of the Holy Spirit? You know that it is a condemned proposition to say that "the supernatural assent of faith can consist with only a probable knowledge of revealed truth". See Viva, *Prop.* XXI Innocent XI. Look at my old nonsense on the Analogy of Nature, and your own better sense in the Sermon before the University of Oxford at the end of your Erastianism. This is not consistent with the presence and office of the Holy Spirit, the Guide and Light of the Church'¹⁴⁴.

¹⁴² *Ibidem*, c. 657, Fol. 196; letter dated 29-I-51.

¹⁴³ *Ibidem*, c.656, Fol. 111.

¹⁴⁴ *P*, II, p. 40; letter dated 28-II-54.

Manning's Fourth Volume of Sermons builds upon contemporary Tractarian ideas on the Church, an ecclesiology to which he himself had made important contributions. The Tractarians' understanding of the nature of the Church developed gradually. The 'idea of the Church as an organism, as the mystical body of Christ, which forms so prominent a feature of the thought of the Fathers, was not developed by the Tractarians until a later stage'¹⁴⁵. The principle of Apostolic Succession, the prerogatives of the Episcopate, the idea of the Church as a means of grace, the concept of the regeneration of Christians through their union with Christ and their life in him, were the steps that led the Tractarians to the vision of the Church as a living body: Christ's Mystical Body. It was a gradual, but it might be added, almost inexorable progress. Asking the question about the nature of the Church opened the door to a hundred others; thereafter, the logical development of their tenets and the reading of the Fathers could hardly fail to bring the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ to the forefront of Tractarian thinking about the Church.

It would be no mean task to chart in detail the springs which fed Manning's thought. It has been pointed out that his 'sermons bear in many, though not all respects, a notable likeness to Pusey's'¹⁴⁶. Manning, and also R. Wilberforce, seem indebted to Pusey's Tract on Baptism when they speak about the incorporation of the Christian to Christ and the Christian's life in him. It might be more difficult, and it would require detailed study, to ascertain the extent of Newman's influence - if any - on Manning's ecclesiology; echoes may have grown too faint here, and ideas too widely spread and generally accepted, to identify direct influences. It is, however, easier to detect the many obvious similarities between Manning's Fourth Volume of Sermons and Robert Wilberforce's book on the Incarnation; though, their regular intercourse and copious correspondence during the late 1840s and early 1850s would make it hard to determine the extent of their mutual influence, and what precisely they owed to each other. This

¹⁴⁵ A. Härdelin, *op.cit.*, p. 72.

¹⁴⁶ G. Rowell, "'Remember Lot's Wife" Manning's Anglican Sermons', in V.A. McClelland (ed.), *Henry Edward Manning (1808-1892)*, in *Recusant History*, Vol. 21, n. 2 (October, 1992), p. 170. D. Forrester, for example, has pointed out 'how closely baptismal regeneration was bound with a notion of Christian life as a mysterious incorporation of the individual into the Humanity of God Incarnate' [*Young Dr. Pusey* (London, 1989), p. 192]. O. Chadwick has, in his turn, remarked on Pusey's contribution to the Tractarian concept of the Church as the Body of Christ, he 'almost feels the individual's incorporation into the Body. His language is more mystical (...) than the language of any other Tractarian' (*The Spirit of the Oxford Movement*, p. 39).

is particularly the case where the theology of the Church and that of the Eucharist are concerned.

What is beyond doubt is that, from the basis of opinions commonly held among the Tractarians, Manning developed the concept of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ - its unity and infallibility - well beyond the ideas of men like Pusey or R. Wilberforce. The latter, in his book on the Incarnation, still spoke of the theory of the Three Branches and of the Church's loss of the gift of infallibility with their separation. Manning's doctrine about the nature of the virtue of Faith, and its genesis, can also be said to be a new development in Tractarian thinking.

CHAPTER III

CONVERSION: 'TO ADD, TO DEVELOP, TO PERFECT'

1. Deep convictions militant against the heart

Newman's book on development had made Manning rethink his position with respect to the Anglican rule of faith. He thought that it was no longer tenable as an instrument to attain certainty in the knowledge of the truth of Faith: it was incomplete and, in its present formulation, equivalent to private judgment. He had to find an answer to the fundamental question: *Quo iudice?* He discovered it in 1847: the Church was the final judge in controversies about the Faith, and she was infallible in her judgments because of the perpetual presence of the Holy Spirit.

Manning, having reached the conviction that infallibility was an essential property of the Church, and in spite of all his doubts, remained in the Church of England for almost another four years. The Anglican Church did not lay claim to infallibility; was this another of those Catholic truths which, like the Sacramental System, the Tractarians had been called to restore to their proper place in the Church of England? A true and forgotten doctrine might be restored in a true Church; was the Anglican Church a part of the true Church? It was a painful question, and the final answer was to be even more so.

His letters to Robert Wilberforce chart the meandering course of that lengthy process, and are the best means at our disposal to follow it. On 5 February 1848 - while the Hampden case was raging in England - Manning wrote from Rome: 'I cling to the Church of England, because, trusting that it is a portion of the visible Church, it partakes of this undoubted divine property'¹, infallibility. But this was not an absolute belief, and, in the following line, he added: 'If it does not partake of this property it

¹ *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 655, Fol. 63.

affords no foundation for my Faith. It is useless to offer me antiquity for my foundation. What do I know of antiquity?'² The appeal to antiquity was a barely masked exercise of private judgment. In May 1850 Manning wrote to Pusey: 'we appeal to Antiquity - to seven Councils - and the undivided Church of the past, not claiming this guidance [of the Holy Spirit]. And this seems to me to be *a corporate exercise of private judgment*: judging by *reason*. (...) Upon what do we form our exposition of the Faith of the undivided Church, but upon an intellectual criticism of the Fathers? This seems to me to be only a learned form of private judgment'³. And, around the same time, he would tell Robert that Pusey and Keble seemed to 'have given up the Divine Tradition as the Supreme authority, and to apply private judgment to antiquity, as Protestants do to Holy Scripture'⁴. In January 1851 he would round up these thoughts by saying that the Anglican rule of faith was 'manifestly private reason, judging by way of historical criticism'⁵.

External events contributed to Manning's unsettlement and growing doubts about the Church of England. The appointment of Hampden to the see of Hereford had shown, he wrote on 12 February 1848, the 'separation of the English Episcopate from the whole episcopate under heaven, the denial of Catholic doctrine in *substance* by a large body of the English Priesthood (...) and the rejection of Catholic doctrine in *form* by the rejection of Catholic tradition as the rule of Faith, the historical fact that the Church of England has made common cause with Protestantism (...), all these have for a long time[!] deprived me of the power of claiming for it the undoubted guidance of the Holy Spirit along the path of Catholic Tradition'⁶. That was not all. This 'event has brought out a miserable truth, namely that the Civil Power is the ultimate judge of doctrine in England, a principle which is not more heretical than atheistical'⁷.

² *Ibidem*.

³ *Ibidem*, c. 654, Fols. 382-383; letter dated 4-V-50.

⁴ *Ibidem*, c. 655, Fol. 217; letter dated 15-VI-50.

⁵ *Ibidem*, c. 656, Fol. 99; letter dated 7-I-51.

⁶ *Ibidem*, c. 655, Fol. 65.

⁷ *Ibidem*, c. 655, Fol. 66; for Manning correspondence with S. Wilberforce see Newsome, *Parting*, pp. 337ff.

The Hampden case, and, later on, that of Gorham, seemed to Manning to give the same answer to the '*Quo judice?*' question, one which denied Manning's fundamental belief about the Holy Spirit's perpetual presence and teaching in the Church. Those instances appeared to confirm the conviction which had been growing in his mind: that the Church of England did not share in the endowment of infallibility, which she did not claim; nor in that of unity, which she did claim. Hampden's consecration, he believed at the time, was the final nail in his coffin: 'the Court of Queen's Bench *plus* Hampden's consecration declares the Civil power to be *ultimate* and supreme even in spiritual obligations. This overthrows the only defence I have ever been able to make of our position. If it be true I am myself one of the foremost in believing it to be fatal to our claims as a member of the visible Church. I cannot evade this; and I cannot obey it. If it be finally confirmed, I am at an end'⁸.

His correspondence with Gladstone did not mention the theme of infallibility, but there were in it some references to the unity of the Church. During his illness of 1847 Manning had reviewed his ideas on unity, and he had come to see - still somewhat vaguely - the rôle of the Pope in preserving it. That is why he did not follow Gladstone in his confessed 'insularity'. 'I never had much of it', he wrote to him from Rome on 3 April 1848, 'and feel that every year has convinced me more deeply that Protestantism is heretical, and Nationalism is Judaic. I remember you saying that the English Monarchy is an idea which commands the veneration and affections of your mind in a way beyond what I am likely to feel. On the other hand "*Tu es Petrus*, and "*Credo in Unam Catholicam Ecclesiam*" reveal to me a divine Monarchy claiming a sentiment of loyalty to a Person in Heaven before which all other kingdoms melt away. I trust that your insularity does not limit the full living practical realization of this transcendent law of Faith and action'⁹.

The final act was, though, not so close as Manning had led Robert Wilberforce to understand. His return to England stayed the ultimate decision. The whole doctrinal system, however, remained as clear and obvious to him as before. On 28 December 1849 he wrote to Robert: 'My whole reason seems filled with one outline. The Faith

⁸ *Ibidem*, Fols. 67-68; letter dated 11-III-48,

⁹ *Manning Mss.Pitts*, 480403mg; Chapeau, Let. 81, p. 218.

of the Holy Trinity and of the Incarnation subdue me into a belief of the indivisible unity and perpetual infallibility of the Body of Christ. (...) I am forced to believe that the unity of His Person prescribes the unity of His visible kingdom as one undivided whole, and that numbers are an accident. It was once contained in an upper chamber; it may be again; but it must always be one, and indivisible'¹⁰. What was stopping him from leaving the Church of England? He felt himself divided, as he saw it, between truth and love. The emotional side of Manning clung to the Anglican Church, and he still hoped against hope that his conclusions with respect to it would be proved wrong, and that the exercise of the civil power as ultimate judge on doctrinal matters would be denounced by the Anglican Church as an usurpation and against the nature of the Church. While preparing the fourth volume of *Sermons* for publication, at the end of 1849, he wrote to Mary Wilberforce: 'intellectual convictions are I think not enough taken alone; that they are *logical*, and eminently liable to mislead from their very clearness; the error being in the subject matter; in the premises, not in the reasoning'¹¹. Manning did not yet feel that the safety of his soul required him to act on those convictions.

The Gorham appeal dispelled his last doubts. He had been able to defend the acquiescence of the Church to Hampden's nomination on the basis that he had not been formally condemned as unorthodox by an ecclesiastical court. That was not Gorham's case: his bishop and the Archbishop's court had judged his doctrine on Baptismal Regeneration erroneous. The problem now was not whether the Crown would judge in favour or against the Ecclesiastical Court in a doctrinal matter, but whether the Church acknowledged the Crown's power so to do. The question was once again reformulated: 'Does the Royal Supremacy carry a claim to review by appeal the declarations and interpretations of the Courts of the Church in matter of doctrine?'¹² As a matter of fact, Manning feared more a decision in favour of the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration than one against it. The wrong decision would probably galvanise the opposition to the present interference of the State in matters doctrinal, the right one would mislead many into thinking that all was proper. As he told Gladstone: 'A

¹⁰ *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 655, Fols. 142 and 144; see also letter dated 27-V-50, *Ibidem*, Fol. 213.

¹¹ *Ibidem*, Fol. 137; letter dated 2-XII-1849.

¹² Letter to R. Wilberforce (12-I-50), *Ibidem*, Fols. 150-151.

judgment right in matter, cannot heal a wrong in the principle of the Appeal'¹³. 'Even if they decide rightly, it is not using, or going by the decision of the Church. It is an independent and absolute judgment of the Crown in matter of Faith'¹⁴. This would make the civil power the ultimate interpreter of the Church's formularies and the ultimate judge in controversies about the faith, the final expositor of doctrine. 'No higher power is claimed by Pope or General Council'¹⁵, Manning exclaimed.

His correspondence during the months preceding the appeal evinced a clear sign of how far removed he found himself now from the position held by his friends. Pusey, writing in December 1849, had spoken of the Council of Trent and its definitions saying that he could not receive '*on authority* what does not come to me on the authority of the whole Church (...) I could not subscribe the Council of Trent (as now interpreted), for for [sic] this it matters not whether the articles are more or fewer which I could not sign - except of the belief that the Roman Church alone were the Church of Christ. And I can see no ground to anathematize the Russian Greek Church as well as our own. The claim several times made parenthetically in the Council of Trent, to be "*mater omnium et magistra*", is surely unhistoric...'16. Manning could not accept the principle on which Pusey had worked out his response to Trent, i.e.: the Branch Theory. It was against his deep conviction about the presence and work of the Holy Spirit in the Church. In June he would write to Pusey:

'I seem to see no choice but this - the voice of God speaking always by His Church, or the reason of man judging of Revelation. That the Divine Spirit guides the Church in Faith is to me a manifest doctrine of revelation. That this guidance has ceased to rule the Church seems to me repugnant to Faith. That it therefore guides it now is inevitably a matter of Faith. But how can it be said that the Greek, Latin, and English Church are under this guidance? The supremacy as between the East and the West, the Sacrifice as between us and both (to say nothing of Regeneration in Baptism as of a matter as yet only in peril) seems to overthrow the idea of one universal guidance. Also I observe

¹³ *Manning Mss.Pitts*, 491231mg; Chapeau, Let. 156a.

¹⁴ *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 655, Fol. 157; letter dated 18-I-50.

¹⁵ Letter to Pusey (4-I-50), *Ibidem*, c. 654, Fol 379.

¹⁶ Letter quoted in H.P. Liddon, *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey* (London, 1894), vol. III, p. 207.

that the Greek Church claims to be the True Church and to possess alone this guidance. So does the Roman.

But we appeal to antiquity - to seven Councils - and the undivided Church of the past, not claiming this guidance. (...) The Greek Church will not accept our exposition of the Seven Councils. Much less the Roman.

(...) Has not our Lord invested the Church with the office of declaring by a lineal and perpetual tradition what was and is the Faith in all ages?¹⁷

2. *The Appellate Jurisdiction of the Crown; conversion to Rome*

The divine authority of the Church of England was at stake. Manning considered that the nature of the appeal implied putting forward the claim that the jurisdiction of the Crown was assumed to be in *eadem materia* with that of the Spiritual Courts, *co-extensive* with all their jurisdiction, *superior* to them¹⁸. This would destroy the supernatural foundation of the Church. Manning maintained that the Church was infallible, and no other external body was such; thus, in matters of Faith the Tribunal and the Judge should be purely spiritual, and within the Church. The appeal took the final decision in matters of faith out of the Church's hands, and gave it to a Civil court; he wrote: 'the final interpretation of doctrinal formularies - which is equivalent to *definition* - (...) is thus removed out of the Church to the Civil powers'¹⁹. As he told Robert Wilberforce: 'I seem to see that all Divine authority in England is at stake, all Divine law for the intellect and for the will'²⁰. The Civil Court was just a human body, and its judgments could be based only in human reason. This procedure would inevitably lead to Rationalism.

Everything conspired to urge Manning in the same direction. In June he could write to Robert: '*Logically* I am convinced that the One, Holy, Visible, Infallible Church is that

¹⁷ *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 654, Fols. 381-383; letter dated 4-VI-50.

¹⁸ Cfr. Letter to R. Wilberforce, *Ibidem*, c. 655, Fol. 168.

¹⁹ Letter to Pusey (4-I-50), *Ibidem*, c. 654, Fols. 378-379.

²⁰ *Ibidem*, c. 655, Fol. 202; letter dated 10-V-50.

which has its circuit in all the world, and its centre *accidentally* in Rome'²¹. Recent events, including the Hampden case, had not changed the position of the Church of England, only revealed it. It was a revelation of a position untenable *ab initio*. Hope-Scott had played an important rôle in revealing to Manning that the present exercise of the Royal Supremacy was not a recent abuse, something accidental to it, but an essential element of the Anglican Church. As early as 29 January 1850, Hope-Scott had written to his friend : 'You have a theory of allegiance based upon ecclesiastical principles, while I have not. But when you adopted that theory, had you fully considered the facts? If you had, it ought still to hold good, for I maintain that nothing, in principle new, has befallen us in the case of Hampden, or, as yet, of Gorham. But if you have not hitherto read Erastianism in the History of the Church of England since the Reformation, then I fear you and I have much to discuss before we can meet upon common ground'²². Discuss they did, and, after the failed protest against the Gorham judgment, Manning published, as a letter addressed to the Bishop of Chichester, *The Appellate Jurisdiction of the Crown in Matters Spiritual*; it was dated 2 July 1850. The Gorham judgment, and its acceptance by the Church of England, implied for Manning a dramatic departure from what until then he had considered the basic principles of the Church of England, as a branch of the Universal Church. In the Letter he would point out what he believed those principles to be, and how the judgment had violated them.

The Church had been entrusted by Christ with the custody of the Faith and Holy Sacraments. For 'the perpetuity of the Church, and for the preservation of the Truth, He has pledged His own perpetual presence and the guidance of the Holy Spirit'²³. She 'possesses a sole, supreme, and final power, under the guidance of its Divine Head, and responsible to Him only'²⁴. The Church of England, in its measure and sphere, would possess 'the same guidance as the whole Church at large'²⁵. She would have in her the fountain of doctrine and discipline, and it 'has no need to go beyond itself for

²¹ *Ibidem*, c. 655, Fols. 224-225.

²² *P*, I, p. 527.

²³ H.E. Manning, *The Appellate Jurisdiction of the Crown in Matters Spiritual, A Letter to the Right Reverend Ashurst-Turner, Bishop of Chichester* (London, 1850), p.4.

²⁴ *Ibidem*.

²⁵ *Ibidem*.

succession, orders, mission, jurisdiction, and the office to declare to its own members, in matters of Faith, the intention of the Catholic Church²⁶. Manning could not think of the faith of the Anglican Church in isolation from the Universal Church: Faith is the belief of the Church dispersed throughout the world. He had a clear conception of the relationship between the Particular or local Church, and the Church Universal. 'The Church in every land' - he would say - 'is the Church throughout the world sojourning as in a place, and there teaching and ruling by the whole weight of the Divine Office committed to the Church Universal (...). The only superior known to the local Church is the authority of the Church universal'. The Church of England was for Manning the presence and action of the Universal Church in a particular place, active with the virtuality of the Church Catholic and with her authority. In the Reformation the Church of England 'did not accept the supremacy of the Crown instead and in place of the supremacy of the Universal Church; but resumed the full, free, and final exercise of its own Spiritual office, legislative and judicial, within its own proper sphere'²⁷. The unhappy suspension of communion between East and West, between the Roman and the Anglican Church was a fact to be deplored, not a normal state.

A particular Church cannot hand over to the Crown powers which are inconsistent with the Divine Sovereignty of the Church Universal. Thus, the Royal Supremacy was 'strictly and simply a civil or temporal power over all persons and causes on temporal things, and over Ecclesiastical persons and causes in the temporal and civil accidents attaching to them'²⁸. These legitimate, and custom-sanctioned, principles of the ancient jurisdiction of the Royal Supremacy over the Church had been stretched beyond their proper limits by the statutes of Henry VIII; Charles I, though, would have corrected the abuse and restored the limits of the ancient jurisdiction. Manning refused to acknowledge the following claims of the Royal Supremacy:

1. That Princes have, or can have, any inherent spiritual authority, or become fountains of spiritual jurisdiction, so far as it is spiritual.
2. That they may exercise a directive or legislative power in matters purely spiritual.

²⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 5.

²⁷ *Ibidem*, pp. 22-23.

²⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 6.

3. That they may re-hear and review with a power of discretion and determination the judicial sentences of the Church in matters purely spiritual²⁹.

The Crown did not possess the prerogative of receiving appeals in matters of doctrine. 'The Church is final and sole in its Divine office (...). The Apostolic commission [to teach and rule] did not depend for its exercise upon the licence of Princes - it descends directly from Him who is over all supreme³⁰, and, for centuries, it was exercised in spite of the opposition of the civil power.

The above principles had been ignored by the Appeal. The Civil authority had claimed for itself a power 'to judge and to declare that the Faith and Formularies of the Church admit of this or that interpretation, of this or of that latitude'; that was 'nothing less than a power which subjects the whole faith of the Church to the judgment of the Prince'³¹. This was a late case of the old *Ejus religio cujus est regio*, and a most serious violation of the divine commission of the Church. She 'alone possesses the deposit of the Word of God, or Christian faith, contained in the Holy Scripture, with its true interpretation, as a trust committed to it by its Divine Head'³².

The power to judge in matters of faith had been committed to the Church by Christ. In a certain sense, 'the whole office of the Church, in respect to doctrine, may be called judicial'³³. Manning used the term judicial in this context analogically, as opposed to a legislative power to create and promulgate law, i.e.: the Church cannot create or change an article of faith. The Church's only rôle is to interpret and to declare the truth revealed by God. Thus, he inveighed against those who said that doctrine was untouched by the Gorham decision because the formularies remained the same. 'Doctrine', he stated, 'is not a written, but a living truth (...). If books were doctrine, no sect could be in heresy so long as they retained the Bible. If creeds were doctrine, the Socinians, who recite the Apostle's Creed, must be acquitted. But books and forms

²⁹ *Ibidem*, pp. 18-19.

³⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 21.

³¹ *Ibidem*, p. 31.

³² *Ibidem*, p. 34.

³³ *Ibidem*, p. 34.

without their true interpretation are nothing'³⁴. And that interpretation, the doctrine of faith, is always to be found in the oral exposition of the Church as universal teacher.

The act of the Appellate Jurisdiction transferring the decision in matters of faith from the tribunal of the Church to an external and secular judge had momentous consequences. It had, on the one hand, isolated the faith of the Church of England from the faith of the Universal Church; even more, it had lowered faith to the level of human opinion by destroying authority. Faith believes because of the authority of God, who reveals, and because of the proposition of the Church, teaching with His authority. To question or to reject this authority in teaching a particular doctrine of faith amounted to rejecting it altogether. 'If I have authority to affirm, another has equal authority to deny the same doctrine. Henceforth, we speak in our own name; not by authority at all, but by opinion; and if one article of faith is thus without authority, what article is more than an opinion? for opinion, and not faith, will be the principle and basis of all our teaching'³⁵. The final conclusion was clear: the Church of England was in danger of 'abdicating the Divine authority to teach as sent by God, and a body which teaches under the authority of human interpretation descends to the level of a human society'³⁶.

He felt justified in saying to Robert Wilberforce, that the pastors of the Church of England, in their passive acceptance of the Gorham judgment, had 'betrayed the divine authority of faith - not an article alone, but the whole principle of Divine Authority in Faith'³⁷. It was a confession - he wrote years later, already a Catholic - of their being unconscious of a divine commission and assistance to teach the truth of faith. The Church of England 'could not speak for God, because it was not the organ of His voice'³⁸. Men, 'slowly and painfully', 'yielded to the truth, that what they had believed to be divine was not a Church just then fallen from unity and faith, but a

³⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 35.

³⁵ *Ibidem*, pp. 44-45.

³⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 44.

³⁷ *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 656, Fol. 99; letter dated 7-I-51.

³⁸ *CSer*, I, p. 105.

human society, sprung from private judgment, established by civil power³⁹.

Manning seemed to have ignored Allies's conclusions in his pamphlet *The Royal Supremacy viewed in reference to the two Spiritual Powers of Order and Jurisdiction*, published at the beginning of 1850, where Allies had claimed that the Royal Supremacy was not a late usurpation, but the foundation-stone on which the Church of England had been built at the beginning of its separate existence. But when, in September 1850, Allies's *The See of Peter* appeared, Manning confessed that - although the author had deformed his book by a few things - it provided him with a mass of evidence 'which would be immoral to put aside'⁴⁰.

Event followed closely upon event. Just before the summer of 1850, Gladstone was urging his friends to commit themselves not to take any steps towards Rome for a certain period of time. Manning would not do so: time, he wrote to Gladstone, 'is not measured by the dial but by events, that is not chronological but moral'⁴¹. The final event - the third sign from God - was for him the Restoration of the Catholic Hierarchy in England by Pius IX, at the end of September 1850. That act was full of significance for Manning. As he himself would say in 1863, the 'supremacy of the Vicar of our Lord had reasserted itself in England, and claimed of all men submission to its direction. The royal supremacy paled before the splendour of the head of the Church of all nations upon the earth'⁴². What the Church of England did not claim for itself - or had abdicated - was being claimed by the Pope: a jurisdiction sovereign and independent from any civil power; an authority which did not submit its claims to any human authority, but which based them on a divine commission.

In his capacity as Archdeacon of Chichester, he was asked to convoke the clergy to a meeting against Papal aggression. He did so. The meeting took place on the 22nd November. Manning had formally resigned his Archdeaconry the previous day, and

³⁹ *Ibidem*.

⁴⁰ Letter to Robert Wilberforce (19-IX-50); *P*, I, p. 560.

⁴¹ *Manning Mss.Pitts*, 500522mg; Chapeau, Let. 160.

⁴² H.E. Manning, 'The Work and the Wants of the Catholic Church in England' (*Dublin Review*, July 1863), in *Miscellanies*, I, p. 40.

made public in the meeting his disagreement with the proceedings. On the 28th he wrote to an unknown correspondent, explaining the reasons for his action: 'I can take no part with any movement which is inconsistent as I believe this to be with the principles which tend to restore the Church of England to the unity and communion of the Universal Church'⁴³. As he wrote to Lord Campden, he could 'lift no hand in so bad a quarrel either to defend a Royal Supremacy which has proved itself indefensible, or against a Supremacy which the Church for 600 years obeyed'⁴⁴.

The end was nigh. Manning, on 6 December 1850, wrote to Gladstone in the following terms: 'I do not believe that the Church of England is more than a provisional institution'⁴⁵. This, he continued, was not a rash judgment provoked by recent events, 'it is the deep conviction of long years of patient silent thought. You thought me hasty. I may have seemed so, for events have precipitated conclusions which for long years have hung suspended, waiting only for some change in the law of proportion to give them form'⁴⁶. Gladstone, who had not been party to Manning's confidential expansions with Robert Wilberforce, tried everything in his power to retain his friend within the Anglican Church; all to no avail: Hope-Scott and Manning, two of Gladstone's closest friends, were received together into the Catholic Church on 6 April 1851.

Wiseman communicated to Talbot the good news of Manning's conversion and the part that the Hierarchy commotion had played in it: 'I am sure that [to know this] will console the Holy Father', he wrote. He added how Manning, after his reception, 'had said to Allies that "it was wonderful how many doubts and difficulties had completely vanished, and [that] he was perfectly happy"⁴⁷. Had he come to see clearly the Primacy of the Pope? Had he discovered the place of the infallibility of the Pope in the schema of the infallibility of the Church?

Soon after his conversion Manning moved to Rome, to the Accademia Ecclesiastica.

⁴³ *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 662, Fol. 265.

⁴⁴ *Ibidem*, Fols. 270-271; letter dated 14-I-51.

⁴⁵ *Gladstone Papers*, British Library, Add. Mss. 44248, Fol. 113.

⁴⁶ *Ibidem*, Fol. 114.

⁴⁷ *Talbot Papers*, Venerable English College, Rome, Letter 1007, dated 14-IV-51.

There he was to spend the years 1851-1854, alternating his stay in Rome with extended periods in England, escaping from the hot Roman summers. He soon found that the public schools did not suit his needs, and he read at home, directed by some of the Roman professors. During this period he came to know well the main Roman theologians of his time: Perrone, Pasaglia, Ballerini, Schrader. In his letters he speaks of how he was reading Moral Theology, an area in which he felt particularly deficient, Perrone's *Compendium*, and others. It seems that Pasaglia acted as his main director of studies, guiding him, among other things, in his study of the *Summa Theologica*. Manning maintained long conversations with him, and he told Robert Wilberforce that they had discussed many of the points and elaborations which had filled his mind during his years as an Anglican. He felt that the answers he had found to the different questions he himself had raised were, on the whole, correct: 'It is to me a delight to have a living voice to answer the questions which past years have helped me to make. And I am truly thankful to find how, in the main, I have rightly kept to the end of the thread'⁴⁸.

It would be difficult to define the precise influence that his acquaintance with the Roman School of Theology had on his thinking about the question of infallibility. It is obvious, though, that he did not owe to it his doctrine on the Mystical Body of Christ. Pasaglia was perhaps the first Catholic theologian to have developed a detailed conception of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ; still, his book *De Ecclesia Christi*, published together with Schrader, did not appear until the years 1853-54, three or four years after Manning's fourth volume of Anglican Sermons. Möhler's *Symbolik*, which Manning was reading in the middle forties, could have been another Catholic influence on the evolution of his vision of the Church. There are reasons, though, to affirm that his main sources of inspiration - shaped by the original illumination received by his reading of Cano - were Scripture and the Fathers of the Church, in particular St. Augustine; the sources which had fed Möhler's own theology.

The same could be said with respect to infallibility. The original discovery and its subsequent elaboration preceded his conversion by more than four years; here he had been helped by his knowledge of the Catholic theologians of the past, Cano in

⁴⁸ Letter dated 25-I-1852; *P*, II, p. 27.

particular. As a result, the main lines of his ideas on the matter of infallibility can be found in his Anglican writings and letters. As a Catholic, he may have completed them in some respects - particularly in what refers to the infallibility of the Pope - but the main arguments remained the same: the living presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church, the reality of the Mystical Body of Christ, and the infallibility of the Church consequent to that presence. These themes were part of his original vision and were to remain with him for the rest of his life.

3. *Faith and Reason*

In 1852, during one of his sojourns in England, Manning gave four lectures at Southwark Cathedral which were later published under the title *The Grounds of Faith*. The lectures read like a Catholic re-writing of his Anglican Sermon *The Rule of Faith* (1838), after a quarter of a century of intellectual development that had led him, through conversion, into the Catholic Church. In the lectures he carried on his dialogue with the questions which had occupied his mind in his last years as an Anglican, and he also addressed the queries and objections which had been raised in his correspondence with Robert Wilberforce, Pusey and Gladstone. In the Fourth Lecture, in particular, he answered Keble's arguments in the Preface to his *Sermons Academical and Occasional* (1847) against joining the Catholic Church, outlining the basic points of his Catholic approach to the Anglican Church. An approach which would find a more detailed expression in subsequent Sermons, Lectures, and Pastorals.

The First lecture opened with words reminiscent of those he had used in 1838: 'My purpose is to speak of the grounds of Faith; I do not mean of the special doctrines of the Catholic theology, but of the grounds or foundation upon which all Faith rests'⁴⁹. This was a vital task at all times, 'because the end of man is life eternal, and as the means to that end is the knowledge of God, and of Jesus Christ whom He hath sent, our whole being, moral, intellectual, and spiritual, demands that we should rightly know, and by knowledge be united with, the mind and will of God'⁵⁰.

⁴⁹ *Grounds*, p. 1.

⁵⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 2.

Manning affirmed that the knowledge of the rule of faith is the only means to avoid religious confusion and scepticism. If scepticism had made such inroads in many minds it 'is because the Rule of Faith is lost, and the principle of certainty destroyed. (...) The effect of this is that men come to state, as scientifically certain, that there is no definite doctrine in revelation. (...) The objective certainty of truth is gone'⁵¹. Consequently, as he had said as an Anglican, and would repeat in his Sermon before the First Council of Westminster (1852), opinion becomes the ultimate rule of faith⁵².

For Manning, proper and true knowledge should be clear and definite, it should also be certain. 'If we have not a definite knowledge of what we believe, we may be sure we have no true knowledge of it'⁵³. A blurred and contourless perception cannot be properly called knowledge, whether in the field of natural sciences or in that of faith. We may have guess, or conjecture, or probability, but not proper knowledge. Any kind of knowledge worthy of its name should be certain in the two senses of the word: the certainty of the truth in itself and the subjective certainty. In other words, 'that the proofs of that truth are either self evident, or so clear as to exclude all doubt'; and 'that we are inwardly convinced, by the application of our reason to the matter before us, of the sufficiency of the evidence to prove the truth of it'⁵⁴. The knowledge of faith should also enjoy that double certainty: 'He that has not certain faith has no faith'⁵⁵. He rejected the contention of those who said 'that to crave for certainty implies a morbid disposition'. The Prophets craved for certainty, so did the Apostles and Evangelists. Conversely, 'the contrary disposition is worthy of rebuke. How can we venture to content ourselves with uncertainty in matters where the truth and honour of God and the salvation of our own souls are at stake?'⁵⁶ Some would perhaps contend that uncertainty is the proper climate of faith, that 'probability is the atmosphere in which faith lives, and that if you extinguish probabilities, faith dies'. These people, Manning thought, were promulgating a new virtue, the essence of which would be 'to

⁵¹ *Ibidem*, pp. 4-5.

⁵² Cfr. *CSer*, I, p. 104.

⁵³ *Grounds*, p. 8.

⁵⁴ *Ibidem*.

⁵⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 10.

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*, pp. 10-11.

be uncertain of the truth and of the will of God; to hold our faith on probabilities'⁵⁷.

Later, in his sermon 'Truth Before Peace' (1864) he tackled a different, though connected argument, which he summarized by saying that "England prides itself on its piety and its freedom"; that "earnest men will always be inquiring"; that "the Apostles urged inquiry into natural religion, into the visible creation, into Scripture"; that they "appealed to the burning curiosity and yearning after something better, which was the chief feature of their age"; that "this is the age of inquiry; that inquiry is the rule"; and that "the source of inquiry is doubt"⁵⁸. Manning accepted the principle as valid for as long as it applied to the natural world and to the world without faith. On the other hand, if that were to be said of 'the world illuminated by the faith and the Church of Jesus Christ, it is', he held, 'self-evidently false. They who have not the truth whole and perfect, must be always inquiring, always doubting. Not so they who are "taught by God" '⁵⁹. They had already found truth; nothing remained but to hold fast to it. As he had said in the Fourth Lecture of *The Grounds of Faith*: 'the very idea of revelation involves the properties of definiteness and certainty, because the knowledge divinely revealed is presented to us as it exists in the mind of God'⁶⁰. Therefore, 'where faith begins uncertainty ends'. Faith 'terminates upon the veracity of God; and what God has spoken and authenticated to us by Divine authority cannot be uncertain'⁶¹.

Manning was clear about what he had to say to his interlocutors: 'we are saved by truth; and truth which is not definite is no truth to us; and indefinite statements have no certainty; and without certainty there is no faith'⁶². Truth is not to be trifled with; borrowing a leaf from his Anglican writings, he would say: 'Truth bears the stamp of God, and truth changes man to the likeness of God'⁶³.

⁵⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 11.

⁵⁸ *CSer*, II, p. 239.

⁵⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 240.

⁶⁰ *Grounds*, p. 60.

⁶¹ *Ibidem*, p. 11.

⁶² *Ibidem*, p. 24.

⁶³ *Ibidem*, p. 19.

Men have God's revelation to accede to salvific truth, but the revealed word of God - Manning said - poses a problem of interpretation. 'Scripture is not Scripture except in the right sense of Scripture'⁶⁴, and that sense is what needs to be determined. Let us say - Manning added - that we reject private judgment and introduce, as Anglicans do, the test of the historical tradition of the Church. This does not solve the problem. Individual reason has shown itself unable to deal with a small book and to determine its true interpretation; how can it deal with the literature of six centuries of Christianity? Here, said Manning, 'we touch upon another difficulty even more pressing and more vital. We have now the test by which to discover the truth; but where is the mind by which the test shall be applied?'⁶⁵ This was where Manning had found himself after reading Newman's *Development of Christian Doctrine*. The subject matter demanded a test, the test demanded a judge. He concluded: 'a perpetual doctrine tested by a perpetual rule needs a perpetual judge'⁶⁶.

There were only two possible ways of access to the revelation of God: an infallible teacher or a mere human one. 'If there exists in the world no teacher invested with divine commission to guide all others, either every several local church is invested with a final and supreme authority to determine what is true and what is false; that is, possesses the infallibility denied by objectors to the Universal Church itself; or else, no authority under heaven respecting divine truth is more than human'⁶⁷. To claim that the definition of what is divinely revealed is the privilege of a human authority would not lead, even remotely, to any sort of certainty, but rather to rationalism, subjectivism and scepticism; not to Faith, but to the destruction of it. And his own times, Manning thought, afforded ample evidence of this fact.

One could appeal to the promise made to the Apostles of a permanent teacher, the Holy Spirit. But, he asked, if 'you believe that the Holy Spirit does still teach in the world, how does He teach?'⁶⁸ It is obvious that He does not teach each man by immediate

⁶⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 24.

⁶⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 43.

⁶⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 44.

⁶⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 71.

⁶⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 14.

inspiration. The one answer left was that the Holy Spirit teaches through the Church. 'But if through the Church, through what Church? How are we the better or the wiser by knowing that the Spirit of God teaches the world at this hour, and that He has an organ through which to speak, if we know not which, nor where that organ is?'⁶⁹ It was a fundamental question, the answer to which defined the one true way of salvation.

The Branch Theory was found wanting by Manning. 'If these three bodies, then, be indeed the one Church, the Church is divided. (...) These three bodies, brought by theory into unwilling combination, refuse, in fact, to be combined. They can be united only upon paper'⁷⁰. They disagree over the essentials of the faith, and even over which doctrines are essential to it. This could not be called unity, Manning said. There is one only Church; to say otherwise is to deny the visible unity of the Church in its government and its doctrine. The differences between Anglicans and Catholics were obvious and deep. So were those between Catholics and Greek Orthodox: 'In the baptismal faith we profess to believe in one Holy Catholic Church. Surely the question whether or no there be on earth a supreme head of the Church divinely instituted, is as much part of the substance and the exposition of that article as any other point'⁷¹. The Church is one, and visibly so. 'How shall an invisible church carry on the revelation of God manifest in the flesh, or be the representative of the unseen God: the successor of visible apostles, the minister of visible sacraments,...?'⁷² It would contradict the whole mode of God's dispensations to man.

The office of the Holy Spirit as infallible guide of the Church was not ended with the appearance of divisions among Christians. If that were to be the case, if 'the office of the Church to teach the truth and to detect falsehood, to define the faith and condemn heresy, be suspended, we know not now with certainty what is the true sense even of the Articles of the Creed'⁷³. There would be no judge on earth to decide the disputes about matters of faith. If the universal Church is the judge of doctrine, then it 'must be

⁶⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 15.

⁷⁰ *Ibidem*, pp. 63-64.

⁷¹ *Ibidem*, p. 69.

⁷² *Ibidem*, p. 64.

⁷³ *Ibidem*, p. 68.

infallible; for if it may err, who shall determine whether it errs or no? (...) It comes, then, by the force of rigorous argument to this, that either the universal Church cannot err, or that there is on earth no certainty for faith'⁷⁴.

This infallible Church can only be, Manning concluded, the Roman Catholic Church. 'No other Church but this one interpenetrates in all nations, extends its jurisdiction wheresoever the name of Christ is known, has possessed, or, I will say, has claimed from the beginning, a divine primacy over all other Churches; has taught from the first with the claim to be heard as the Divine Teacher (...). Whatever may be said in theory, no other, as a matter of fact, from the east to the west, from the north to the south, claims to be heard as the voice of God'⁷⁵. Moreover, Manning added, the Church of Rome had been acknowledged as the uncontaminated fountain of truth by the undivided Primitive Church of the first centuries, and that this Primitive Church was recognised as infallible [!] by the Anglicans. True, the Roman Church's claim had been controverted almost from the beginning, but this did not tell against it: all articles of the faith have been controverted. The fact that its authority had been disputed was just a corroboration that it had been claimed from the very beginning.

Man, unaided, could not have attained the knowledge of revealed truth and, once this has been handed on to him by God, he would not have been able to preserve it unadulterated if the bases on which it rested were purely human. Truth would turn into opinion, and this would also have serious consequences for moral life. When 'the objectivity of truth is lost, the obligation of law is gone'⁷⁶. It is not possible for a human authority to bind fellow creatures under pain of sin unless it possesses a divine authority so to do.

The message of the Lectures can be summarised briefly: 'We believe (...) that we have no knowledge of the way of salvation through grace, except from the revelation of God', and that 'neither have we any certainty what that revelation was, except through

⁷⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 46.

⁷⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 61.

⁷⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 82.

the Church of God'⁷⁷. 'The teaching of the One, Holy, Universal, Roman Church (...) is to us the living voice of God now, and the foundation of our faith'⁷⁸. These were words that Manning would repeat that same year in his Sermon before the First Provincial Council of Westminster. He saw the whole doctrinal edifice and the moral life of the Church resting on the keystone of its infallibility: 'The unity and the infallibility of the Church of Jesus Christ, these are our principles, and this shall be our safety'⁷⁹.

The following year, in a sermon entitled 'The Certainty of Faith', he returned to the same theme. The fullness of the kingdom of faith consists of three divine gifts: an infallible testimony, an inward witness in man's reason, and charity to kindle the heart and to inspire the will. The infallible testimony of the Church 'is the true and formal object of our faith, which is surer than all sense, higher than all reason, perfecting both. Faith has a certainty of its own above all other kinds; above the certainty of science, different in its nature, loftier in its reach, deeper in its convictions; for it unites the reason of man with God, the eternal changeless truth'⁸⁰. Those who rejected the witness of the Church, her infallibility, were the heirs of a long tradition of incredulity: 'there are those who profess to believe the divine power and commission of the Apostles, but refuse to believe the divine mission and power of the Church; and yet, in the days of the Apostles, they would have equally appealed from them to the authority of Moses'⁸¹. It was a human temper of rebelliousness before God's claims that had never ceased to produce new shoots. It was the human temper that assumed 'that the dispensation under which they were who saw Him [Jesus] in the flesh was a dispensation heavenly and divine, and that the state in which we are now is human and earthly; that in those days God manifested Himself by explicit works and signs of power which are now passed away (...). This is but another form of the general unbelief of these latter times'⁸².

⁷⁷ *Ibidem*, pp. 25 and 28.

⁷⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 60.

⁷⁹ *CSer*, I, p. 194.

⁸⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 207.

⁸¹ *Ibidem*, p. 201.

⁸² *Ibidem*, p. 202.

CHAPTER IV

THE CHURCH AND THE POPE: MANNING'S CATHOLIC
ECCLESIOLOGY (1851-1865)

Manning's residence in Rome ended in 1854, after repeated requests from Wiseman for his return. On 7 May he wrote to Robert Wilberforce with the news: 'So far as I know I am come home for good. And my purpose is to continue in London the life I was living in Rome, that is, to live in community with three or four, having a library, chapel and refectory in common. I find this both intellectually and spiritually a great help. And I shall set apart a room for you'¹. This was not a new idea with him, for about a year earlier he had already mentioned it to Robert, not yet a Catholic: 'My hope is to find some one or two priests who will give themselves to study, writing, and preaching - to live in community, as Merton and All Souls should have been. Why should not you be the Warden?'² Manning's hopes were, for a moment, very close to becoming a reality. Unfortunately, Robert's conversion and subsequent decision to become a priest were closely followed by his premature death in 1857. Neither was Manning to enjoy the peace and quiet for 'study, writing, and preaching' he was looking forward to. As he wrote in 1863, surveying the years since his conversion: 'the constant and increasing press of active work (...) for the last ten years, has rendered it difficult, if not impossible, for me to find the quiet or time necessary for writing'³.

The period from his return to England until 1865, when he was made Archbishop of Westminster, was one of intense activity, including, among other things, representing Wiseman in his numerous suits in Rome and the founding of the Oblates of St. Charles. His name was mentioned several times when a vacancy in the episcopal bench occurred, or even as a possible Coadjutor to Wiseman. There were few substantial publications

¹ *P*, II, p. 41.

² Letter dated 13-VI-53; *Ibidem*, p. 33.

³ *CSer*, I, p. 1.

during those years: a collection of Sermons .- the first volume of his *Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects* - and his lectures on the temporal power of the Pope. In 1865, shortly after his appointment as Archbishop, he published a treatise which had been in the making for some time: *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost*. It was a sort of systematic exposition of themes and ideas that had been the constant subject of his Sermons in previous years: the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ, inhabited by the Holy Spirit; one, imperishable and infallible.

He felt very deeply the need to insist on those points in order to ensure the proper understanding of the nature of the Church, and to rest faith on solid foundations. This was particularly necessary in those countries where, as in England, the dominant culture was predominantly Protestant, with the consequent blurring of the formal object of faith. In his concern to foster the proper concept of the rule of faith, he even lectured the English bishops, assembled for the Second Synod of Westminster (1855), about the infallibility of the Church!

1. The Holy Spirit in the Church: The Mystical Body of Christ

Manning's last volume of Anglican Sermons already contained most of the elements that intervened in the structuring of his thought on this matter as a Catholic. The vision of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ, and the perpetual presence of the Holy Spirit in it, became the constant point of reference for the whole of his Ecclesiology, and he would fall back on it when confronting the different problems that presented themselves to him or to the Church.

The permanent and active presence of the Holy Spirit is central to Manning's vision of the Church. 'It is not by accident, or by mere order of enumeration,' he said, 'that in the Baptismal Creed we say, " I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church". These two articles are united because the Holy Spirit is united with the Mystical Body'⁴. He repeated time and again that the Church 'is not the name of a multitude,

⁴ *TM*, p. 36.

but of a supernatural unity, the Head and the Body, Christ mystical⁵; it is not a collection of individuals brought together by a common ideal or way of life, it is rather a living and organically unified reality.

The Wisdom of God had inhabited the tabernacle of Christ's humanity. There was 'another house still to arise, built upon His own Incarnation - that is, His mystical body'⁶. It was the work of the Holy Spirit to 'create' the Mystical Body of Christ on the day of Pentecost, and since then He had preserved its life and helped its operations. 'Until the day of Pentecost the mystical body was not complete. There could be no body till there was a Head. There was no Head until the Son was incarnate; and, even when incarnate, the completion of the body was deferred until the Head was glorified; that is, until the Incarnate Son had fulfilled His whole redeeming office in life, death, resurrection, and ascension, returning to enthrone the Humanity with which His eternal Person was invested, at the right hand of the Father, Then, when the Head was exalted in His supreme majesty over angels and men, the creation and organisation of the body was completed'⁷. The Ascension was the 'condition ordained by God for the advent and perpetual presence of the Third [Person]. And the coming of the Holy Ghost is likewise declared to be the condition of the creation, quickening, and organisation of the Mystical Body'⁸. The whole body was knit together by the Holy Spirit. 'As then till the Incarnation there was no Incarnate Head, so till the day of Pentecost there was no complete organisation. The members were not united to the Head, nor to each other, nor as a body to the Holy Spirit. (...) And these three unions were constituted by the mission of the Holy Ghost from the Incarnate Son'⁹.

The Holy Spirit is to the Mystical Body what the soul is to the body of man. The Spirit of God - in an analogy taken from the creation of man in Genesis - is the breath of supernatural life breathed by God into the Church: He 'entered into the mystical body,

⁵ *CSer*, I, p. 118.

⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 150.

⁷ *TM*, pp. 58-59.

⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 41.

⁹ *Ibidem*, pp. 68-69.

and breathed into it the breath of life'¹⁰. The Holy Spirit, 'inhabiting that body, and diffusing His created grace throughout it, animates it as the soul quickens the body of man'¹¹. He is the Mystical Body's 'life, soul, and mind'¹².

The Church is 'a new creation of omnipotence'¹³. Something which the world had not seen before. It is 'the fullness of the mystery of the Incarnation - the prolongation of its presence upon earth, the extension of its powers, the creation of the mystical body'¹⁴. The Head and the members constitute one mystical person: the 'Church is, as St. Augustine says, *una quaedam persona, unus perfectus vir*; or, as the Apostle says, "the Spiritual man, who judgeth all things, and himself is judged of no man"¹⁵. 'The Church itself is Jesus teaching and reigning upon earth: by His Spirit and His Word, He is present still, and will be, to the consummation of the world'¹⁶. 'The work which He had begun in His own Person Jesus continued by His Mystical Body, through which he went and preached to all the nations of the world'¹⁷.

The union of the Holy Spirit with the Church is an indissoluble one: the Church would not be able to live without the Spirit, and it is part of Christ's promise that the Church will remain for ever. Besides, the union of the Holy Spirit with the Church on Pentecost day is 'after the analogy of the Incarnation. As Godhead and manhood are united in one person, never to be divided, by the indissoluble link of the hypostatic union, so the Holy Spirit united Himself to the mystical body on that day, never to depart from it; to be its life, guide, and voice to the end of time'¹⁸. This, Manning said, is a union which can never be dissolved, as it results from 'a Divine act, analogous to the hypostatic union, whereby the two natures of God and man are

¹⁰ *CSer*, I, p. 418.

¹¹ *TM*, p. 66.

¹² *CSer*, I, p. 118

¹³ *Ibidem*, p. 15.

¹⁴ *CSer*, II, p. 8.

¹⁵ *Ibidem*.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 13.

¹⁷ *CSer*, I, p. 419.

¹⁸ *CSer*, II, p. 10; see also *CSer*, I, p. 19..

eternally united in one Person. So the mystical body, the head and the members, constitute one mystical person'¹⁹. Manning dedicated many a page to insisting on the indissoluble character of this union between the Holy Spirit and the Church. He had an eye on the need to refute the Anglican theory which, while maintaining the infallibility of the Church in the first six hundred years of her existence, affirmed that the infallible guidance of the Holy Spirit had ceased when the process of separation of what it called the 'Three Branches of the Church' started. For Manning, this theory implied a clear denial of the true office of the Holy Spirit in the Church; it affirmed that the Church 'is on probation, and that the power and prerogatives of the Holy Spirit depend upon condition of the will of man'²⁰.

The presence and action of the Holy Spirit in the world after the Incarnation, Manning said, is wholly different from what it was before the day of Pentecost. Before the Incarnation, the Holy Spirit was active in men's souls, one by one; the illumination and sanctifying action of the Holy Spirit being dependant upon their individual will, and therefore conditional. That is still the case as far as individuals are concerned. Since Pentecost, though, there is a new presence and a new office of the Holy Spirit: He is present in the Church. This is a kind of union wholly different from that between the Holy Spirit and the individual soul: the 'union of the Holy Ghost with the Church is not conditional, but absolute, depending upon no finite will but upon the Divine will alone, and therefore indissoluble to all eternity'²¹; 'though individuals may fall from the Body, the Body can never be parted from the Spirit of God, who dwells in it'²².

If the union of the Holy Spirit to the Church does not depend on any finite will, neither do His operations. 'The Spirit of Jesus is here to accomplish a perpetual work; to carry on a dispensation of grace which must last until the end of the world, until the whole number of God's elect gathered out from the successive generations of mankind be full. (...) A perpetual work demands a perpetual office and a perpetual operation. And a perpetual work demands also a perpetuity in the means of its accomplishment. (...) What

¹⁹ *TM*, p. 66.

²⁰ *CSer*, I, p. 245.

²¹ *TM*, p. 65; see also *CSer*, I, pp. 239-240.

²² *CSer*, I, p. 19.

are the means whereby the Elect of God are made perfect but grace and truth? and the work of sanctifying and illuminating is as perpetual as the chain of the Elect (...). The whole office, therefore, of the Holy Spirit is as perpetual and indispensable as His presence'²³. 'The Doctrines and Sacraments therefore, are, and ever shall be, perpetually and divinely preserved, until the works of which they are the means and instruments shall be fully accomplished'²⁴. The sin of man cannot suspend any of the operations of the Holy Spirit in the Church, although each individual can deprive himself of His illumination and sanctifying grace. The Church 'is not like an individual upon probation, as if the endowments and prerogatives of the Holy Spirit depend upon the will of man. It is itself the instrument of probation to individuals. It is through the Church that God confers His grace and truth upon mankind; and by the bestowal of grace and truth that He tries us one by one'²⁵.

Manning had brought side by side the sanctifying and the teaching operations of the Holy Spirit, as complementary and inseparable. The two offices of the Holy Spirit, as Teacher and Sanctifier, were intimately related and depended on each other. He had pointed this out in the fourth volume of his Anglican Sermons, and, before that, in *The Unity of the Church*. 'How is it that any one can fail to perceive that the condition of our sanctification is Truth, and that the perpetuity of the office of the Sanctifier presupposes the perpetuity of the office of the Illuminator?'²⁶ He also hinted at another connexion. Human misery cannot prevent the sacraments granting grace, even when administered by an unworthy minister; neither can it corrupt the voice of the Holy Spirit in the Church²⁷. The presence and the operations of the Holy Spirit are always necessary if the life of grace and the knowledge of truth are to be preserved in the Church. Only He can grant the gift of grace, a share in God's life in Jesus Christ; only He can preserve from corruption the truth that God has revealed, a share in the mind of God. The Holy Spirit 'both teaches and sanctifies, without intermission, with a perpetual divine voice and a perpetual sanctifying power; or, in other words, the divine

²³ *Ibidem*, pp. 235-236.

²⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 13

²⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 242.

²⁶ *TM*, p. 82.

²⁷ *Cfr. Ibidem*, p. 67.

action of the day of Pentecost is permanent, and pervades the world as far as the Church is diffused, and pervades all ages, the present as fully as the past, to-day as fully as in the beginning'²⁸.

2. *The endowments of the Church: Infallibility*

The union of the Holy Spirit with the Church is the source of her supernatural endowments, 'which can never be absent from it, or suspended in their operation'²⁹. The Church's supernatural properties, notes, and other endowments, are 'derived from the Divine Person of its Head, and the Divine Person who is its life. As in the Incarnation there is a communication of the Divine perfections to the humanity, so in the Church the perfections of the Holy Spirit become the endowments of the body'³⁰. Thus, the Church 'became one with a twofold unity, essential and intrinsic, visible and external, because Jesus, its Head, is one and indivisible. It became indefectible, because Jesus is life eternal. It became infallible, because Jesus is eternal truth, and its intelligence is perpetually illuminated by His intelligence, and its voice governed by His voice'³¹.

The Church, therefore, enjoys an immutable '*knowledge, discernment, and enunciation* of truth; and that in virtue of its indissoluble union with the Holy Ghost, and of His perpetual teaching by its living voice'³². It could not be otherwise. The perpetuity and indefectibility of the Church were clearly revealed in Christ's promise that the gates of hell should not prevail against it: 'this includes the perpetuity and indefectibility of the Faith on which the Church is built. If the superstructure be indefectible, much more the foundation: and the union of the Faith with the Church is therefore perpetual and indefectible. They are divinely united, never to be divided'³³.

²⁸ *Ibidem*, pp. 75-76.

²⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 36.

³⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 67.

³¹ *CSer*, I, p. 419.

³² *TM*, p. 36.

³³ *CSer*, I, p. 20.

The Holy Spirit speaks in the Church, and through the Church, in a continuous office of teaching; 'the body of Christ is the organ of His voice'³⁴. Manning dwelt repeatedly on the words of the Apostles in the first of the Church's Councils: "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay no further burden upon you than these necessary things" (Acts 15, 28). What words are these for men to speak! "Who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been His counsellor?" (Rom. 1,34) Who can declare the mind of the Holy Ghost? This was their prerogative, this was the endowment bestowed on the Church of God. It could speak in the name of the Holy Ghost, because it could discern by His light, and decree by His assistance'³⁵. This was the fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaias (Is. 49, 21), announcing his new covenant with His people: "My spirit that is in thee, and My word that I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart, out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever". That is, there shall come a day when thou shalt have a teacher in the midst of thee who shall not err, who cannot mislead, whom thou shalt follow in safety'³⁶.

The Holy Spirit is always present in the Church and exercises His teaching office not just on isolated and distant occasions but uninterruptedly. He is actively present in its teaching, 'not only from council to council, (...) with an intermittent and broken utterance, but always, and at all times, by its continuous enunciation of the faith, as well as by its authoritative dogmatic decrees'³⁷. The active infallibility of the Church is not confined in its exercise to the dogmatic definitions of Popes and Councils, with long intermediate periods in which it remains dormant. In 1869 he would return to this theme: 'through all those eighteen centuries its [the Church's] active infallibility has been, not intermittent but continuous, both in its Episcopate with its Head, and in its Head as Universal Pastor and Teacher, both of pastors and flock'³⁸. The Holy Spirit's task is to preserve truth in its integrity: 'as the preservation of the world is the work of creation by the same omnipotence perpetually produced, so the illumination of the

³⁴ *TM*, p. 73; see also *CSer*, I, p. 18.

³⁵ *CSer*, II, p. 12.

³⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 4.

³⁷ *TM*, pp. 36-37.

³⁸ *Privilegium*, II, p. 149.

Church is the perpetual fullness of His inspiration, which descended on it the day of Pentecost³⁹. Pentecost is not an event of the past, it is the permanent state of the Church. The Holy Spirit assists the Church 'in the perpetual enunciation and proposition of the same immutable truth in every age. The Holy Spirit, through the Church, enunciates to this day the original revelation with an articulate voice, which never varies or falters'⁴⁰.

The office of the Holy Spirit as illuminator includes, according to Manning, several operations, the first of them being 'the original illumination of the Apostles, and through them of the whole Church throughout the ages'. Since then, the Holy Spirit has preserved that which was revealed, assisting the Church at the same time 'to conceive with greater fullness, explicitness, and clearness, the original truth in all its relations'⁴¹. He would also describe this process as the 'progressive unfolding of the inward sense and consciousness of the Church'⁴², which is for the Church what the awakening consciousness of self and the world is for the individual human being.

The Holy Spirit permanently inhabits the Church 'eliciting, shaping, and perfecting the ideal conception and the verbal expression of the original intuition of Faith. It is the Spirit of God unfolding the mind of God; freely and gently acting upon the intelligence of the mystical Body: not overbearing its operations, but perfecting its perceptions and its powers, as grace elevates and perfects the will, until it adequately apprehended and, with unerring precision, expressed [a particular truth] (...); assisting the mind of the Church, which, as one continuous and universal intelligence unites the whole Body of Christ in every age and in every land, to penetrate, to analyze, to apprehend, to harmonize, and to define the doctrines of the original revelation'⁴³. Thus, the Holy Spirit helps the Church in her effort to give verbal expression to the truths revealed by God, 'in the choice, selection and consideration of the very words in which to express

³⁹ *CSer*, I, p. 237.

⁴⁰ *TM*, p. 84.

⁴¹ *Ibidem*, p. 83.

⁴² *CSer*, I, p. 131.

⁴³ *Ibidem*, pp. 131-132.

the doctrines of Faith'⁴⁴. The help of the Holy Spirit to give adequate verbal expression to the truths received by revelation is an essential corollary of the general work of the Holy Spirit as Teacher of Truth in the Church. The Church would find virtually impossible to teach the faith or to judge on doctrinal matters if she were not able to express adequately in words her apprehension of revealed truth.

A defined dogma is, thus, 'the true intellectual apprehension, and the true verbal expression of the truths and facts of the Divine Revelation '⁴⁵. It is something precious to the Church: 'a new and profound insight into the intelligence of God, an enlarged knowledge of "the things of God". To the Church every dogma is a heavenly treasure, dear and priceless, living and giving life. (...) Even the syllables of its sacred language shed abroad the illumination of truth, the motives of obedience, the fervour of devotion. Dogma has a sacramental power of its own'⁴⁶. Manning, with this unusual expression, wanted to convey idea of the permanent power to confer truth and life that dogma has in itself, being the voice of the Holy Spirit.

Manning did not understand those who saw dogma as an enemy of freedom, a constraint to the expansion of intellectual life. They thought that 'the human reason, by submitting itself to faith becomes dwarfed; that faith interferes with the rights of reason; that it is a violation of its prerogatives, and a diminution of its perfection'⁴⁷. He called that pure superstition. The opposite happens to be the case. 'The truth will make you free', he liked to repeat. 'God sent His Son into the world, divided and distracted as it was by contentious teachers, that He might abolish all human usurpation over the reason of mankind, and redeemed it into a divine liberty of truth'⁴⁸. Dogma does not set a limit to the expansion of the intellect, it is rather a border separating truth from the regions of error. Those who reject faith, the voice of the Holy Spirit, 'inevitably forfeit the divine freedom which our Lord has purchased for the human intellect through His most precious Blood: and forfeiting this divine freedom, they fall under the

⁴⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 132; see also *TM*, p. 230.

⁴⁵ *APUC*, p. 20.

⁴⁶ *CSer*, I, pp. 135-136.

⁴⁷ *Four Evils*, p. 3.

⁴⁸ *CSer*, II, p. 246.

authority and into a bondage of human teachers'⁴⁹.

It is also the Holy Spirit - he had written in 1855 - 'who chooses the times and seasons when such definitions [of faith] shall be made'⁵⁰. With His assistance the Church is able 'to discern not only of the truth, but [also] of the opportunity of declaring it (...) We are sure that the "homoousion" is true, and that the fourth century was the opportunity divinely chosen for its declaration. We know with the certainty of faith that the Immaculate Conception is true, and we are certain that this time was the opportunity divinely chosen for its definition. The event is proof'⁵¹. This principle would be at the forefront of Manning's mind during the Vatican Council, when the opportuneness of the definition of Papal infallibility was being discussed. At that time, even inopportunist like Moriarty could write: 'If it is the secret counsel of God that the infallibility should be defined, there must be not only truth in the definition, but also great need of it which we do not foresee'⁵²; were Papal infallibility to be defined, he wrote on another occasion, 'the opportuneness will then have ceased to be a question'⁵³.

3. The Church as the Interpreter of Holy Scripture

Manning also dealt with a theme dear to him from the time of *The Rule of Faith* (1838) and *The Unity of the Church* (1842). Christianity was not dependent upon the Scriptures of the New Testament to be born; the Faith was before the Scriptures were written. It was derived from and it still depends upon 'the order of divine facts introduced into the world by the Incarnation; among which facts, one is the perpetual presence of a Divine Teacher among men'⁵⁴. The Holy Spirit had taught the Primitive Church the Divine

⁴⁹ *CSer*, I, p. 232.

⁵⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 132.

⁵¹ *APUC*, pp. 51-52.

⁵² Letter to Newman (28-IV-70), quoted by C. Butler, *The Vatican Council, 1869-1870* (London, 1962), pp. 299-300.

⁵³ Letter to Newman (14-V-70); *ibidem*, p. 320.

⁵⁴ *TM*, p. 183.

Truth, and, when the writings of the New Testament were spread throughout the Church, Christians interpreted them in the light of the faith they had previously received. To affirm that Christianity is to be derived from the Bible, and that the dogma of faith is to be limited to what is written in it, was the same as saying 'that the Spirit is bound by the letter; and that in place of a living and Divine Teacher, the Church has for its guide a written Book'⁵⁵. Those who upheld this opinion impoverished the Church and reduced it to the condition of the Jewish people in the old dispensation: the Jews had the Book, but they were unable to discover in Christ the Messiah announced by the Prophets; their present counterparts were unable to discover in the Church the active presence of the Holy Spirit. While Christ was among the Jews, He 'interpreted to them the sense, and confirmed the authenticity of the Books of Moses and of the Prophets with a Divine witness'⁵⁶. But the Jews appealed from the living voice of a divine teacher to the letter. The same error was still repeated in Manning's days. The Holy Spirit is to the Scriptures of the New Testament what Jesus was to those of the Old. Manning was fond of repeating: 'the letter kills, the spirit vivifies'. The letter, without the Spirit to give it its true interpretation, may be a hindrance rather than a help to gaining access to truth.

Those who were left only with the 'letter' ignored a fundamental fact: revelation was originally recorded 'upon the mind of the Pastors, or the *Ecclesia docens*, the Church teaching the world; and upon the mind of the flock or the *Ecclesia discens*, the Church learning throughout the world'⁵⁷. It was written by the Holy Spirit, first and foremost, 'upon the intelligence and heart of the living Church, and sustained in it by His presence. The New Testament is a living Scripture, namely, the Church itself, inhabited by the Spirit of God, the author and writer of all revealed Truth'⁵⁸. This is 'the New Testament "in spirit and in truth", the revelation of the day of Pentecost, given and sustained by the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church, the divine and perpetual Teacher of the world. This is the original, of which the written Scripture is but a partial and subsequent transcript (...) pointing to the living and Divine Teacher as the only

⁵⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 188.

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 185.

⁵⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 191.

⁵⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 190.

guide into all truth'⁵⁹.

The Scriptures, chronologically, were written after the Christians had believed and lived the faith for at least a generation: 'It was not till the faith had been everywhere preached, believed, defined in creeds, recorded in the mind of the universal Church, embodied in sacraments, and manifested in its perpetual worship, that the New Testament was formed'⁶⁰. He insisted: 'We neither derive our religion from the Scriptures, nor does it depend upon them. Our faith was in the world before the New Testament was written'. Even more, 'Scripture itself depends for its attestation upon the Witness who teaches us our faith, and that Witness is Divine'⁶¹. Without the testimony of the Church 'we should not have known that a revelation had ever been given'. Thus, it does not make sense to believe in the Scriptures while, at the same time, disbelieving the Church which delivers the Scripture to us: 'it is the Church alone that testified to us the existence of Holy Scripture. We should not have known with divine certainty that sacred books had ever been written, much less their inspiration; or what inspiration is; or the number and names of the books (...); or the reading and sense of the text - but for the supernatural witness and discernment of the Church'⁶².

It follows that, in the same way as the Church is the only one that can determine what books are Sacred Scripture and contain God's revelation, she is also the only one that can judge of the right interpretation of the sacred books. The Church judges of the books, being divinely assisted to distinguish God's Word from human words and to understand its message. It is 'the sole fountain of all judgments as to the faith (...). It alone in the world knows the revelation of God, its contents and its limits; and therefore it alone can judge what truths are contained in it, what is accordant, what is discordant with it'⁶³. The Church is the only one empowered to decide in the

⁵⁹ *Ibidem*, pp. 195-196.

⁶⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 193.

⁶¹ *Ibidem*, p. 181.

⁶² *CSer*, II, p. 250.

⁶³ *Ibidem*, p. 249.

controversies about the faith, and its judgments 'are infallible and therefore final'⁶⁴. Time did not erase from Manning's memory the lessons of the Gorham case.

In short, 'this science of God, incorporated in the Church, is the true key to the interpretation of Scripture'. The Church possessed it before the New Testament was written. And that science of God 'bore witness to the whole revelation of the day of Pentecost; it fixed the meaning of the Scriptures by the evidence of divine facts'⁶⁵.

This idea introduces another important theme in Manning's thought: the Church 'is not only the interpreter, but [also] the interpretation'⁶⁶ of the Scriptures. The meaning of Holy Scripture is made manifest by 'the evidence of divine facts'; the Church's life declares and fixes the true interpretation of the Sacred Books. In 'its unity, universality, and authority, in its faith, sacraments, and action upon the world'⁶⁷ the Church proclaims the true meaning of Holy Scripture. The New Testament recognised and presupposed this order of divine truths and facts; they are 'the actual and scientific key to their true [Sacred Books] interpretation'⁶⁸. Therefore, it makes no sense to proclaim, for example, that there are only two sacraments, no sacrifice, no real presence in the Eucharist, because there are not 'explicit' references to them in Holy Scripture. This last point might be argued from a purely scriptural point of view; but, leaving aside the argument, the life of the Church has expressed in words and in life its faith in the seven sacraments, the sacrificial character of the Mass, etc. 'The faith and the Church then were the key of interpretation'⁶⁹, and this key is still the only one to unlock the meaning of the Sacred Scripture.

The Holy Spirit, Manning said, is 'the author and teacher of the whole revelation of Christianity, the guardian of the Sacred Books, and the interpreter of their sense: and

⁶⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 252.

⁶⁵ *TM*, p. 196.

⁶⁶ *CSer*, II, p. 250; see also *TM*, p. 200.

⁶⁷ *Ibidem*.

⁶⁸ *TM*, p. 198.

⁶⁹ *Ibidem*.

the Church in all ages, one and undivided, is the perpetual organ of His voice'⁷⁰. 'The Church diffused throughout the world, both pastors and people are filled by a consciousness of this faith. And in the light of this consciousness the whole sense of Scripture, I do not say in all its contents, but in all that bears upon the faith and law of God, is instinctively clear to it'⁷¹. The facts of antiquity are also 'transparent in the light of its perpetual consciousness of the original revelation'⁷². Manning's conclusion was a straightforward one: 'The enunciation of the faith by the living Church of this hour, is the maximum of evidence, both natural and supernatural, as to the *fact* and the *contents* of the original revelation'⁷³. Thus, the Church's doctrine is incorrupt, as pure as on the day of Pentecost; incorruptible, because of the perpetual presence of the Holy Spirit; immutable, because it is incorruptible; and, therefore, primitive. The Church, Manning affirmed, 'has no antiquity. (...) The Church is always primitive and always modern at one and the same time; and alone can expound its own mind, as an individual can declare his own thoughts'⁷⁴.

In *The Grounds of Faith*, Manning summarised his whole argument in two conclusions, which he was to repeat in his sermons and in *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost*: first, man has no knowledge of the way of salvation except through the revelation of God; secondly, man can have no certainty about the content of the revelation except through the Church. She is 'the organ by which the Holy Spirit speaks on Earth, and the vessel in which the Heavenly light always burns in undiminished splendour'⁷⁵.

4. Faith's Formal Object

Manning affirmed that faith's first step is to believe God, who reveals to us; a belief based on God's omniscience and truthfulness. The 'formal object of faith [is] the

⁷⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 205.

⁷¹ *Ibidem*, pp. 201-202.

⁷² *Ibidem*, p. 218.

⁷³ *Ibidem*, p. 214.

⁷⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 239.

⁷⁵ *CSer*, I, p. 241.

veracity of God revealing His Truth to us, and not only by an act of revelation eighteen hundred years ago, but also by sustaining His revelation, whole and inviolate, in all its fullness and integrity, through all times, and by proposing it to us by His Divine voice in every age⁷⁶. God speaks now in the voice of the Church. ‘The ultimate authority, then, on which we believe, is the voice of God speaking to us through the Church. We believe, not in the Church, but through it: and through the Church, in God’⁷⁷. He could, therefore, say: the ‘voice of the living Church of this hour, when it declares what God has revealed is no other than the voice of the Holy Ghost, and therefore generates divine faith in those who believe’⁷⁸; this is ‘the basis of divine certainty and the rule of divine faith’⁷⁹. Faith is not just belief in God and in a certain number of connected truths, but rather believing God and believing the Church, through which He speaks. Believing in the the Church is the first act of the virtue of faith; remove that foundation, and there is faith no longer: ‘When the Divine authority of the Church manifests itself to our intellect, it lays its jurisdiction upon our conscience to submit to it. To refuse is an act of infidelity, and the least act of infidelity in its measure expels faith; one mortal act of it will expel the habit of faith altogether’⁸⁰.

He would insist time and time again on this idea, which he considered of fundamental importance, i.e.: our only access to God’s revelation is in the Church and through the Church. The ‘proposition of the Church is the test of the Revelation of God. (...) We have no contact with the Revelation of God, except through the proposition of the Church. We are in contact with the Scriptures, because the Church proposes them to us as the written word of God; we are in contact with tradition, because the Church proposes tradition to us as the unwritten word of God. We are in contact with antiquity, because the Church proposes antiquity as its own past experience. Antiquity is no more than a period in the mind of the Church: for the mind of the Church is continuous’⁸¹. Without ‘the perpetual and supernatural witness of the Church, how should we know,

⁷⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 24.

⁷⁷ *Grounds*, p. 50.

⁷⁸ *TM*, pp. 86-87.

⁷⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 86.

⁸⁰ *Workings*, pp. 16-17.

⁸¹ *APUC*, pp. 46-47.

with divine certainty, the revelation given to man eighteen hundred years ago?'⁸²

To deny the infallibility of the Church implies denying the presence and action of the Holy Spirit in it: 'they who deny the infallibility of the Church, deny also the guidance of the Holy Spirit; and therefore either in part or in whole deny the office of the Third Person of the ever blessed Trinity'⁸³. Faith in the Blessed Trinity, according to Manning, demands the right faith in the office of the Holy Spirit; and 'one direct and inseparable consequence [of that faith] is faith in the infallibility of the Church'⁸⁴.

He reached the same conclusion from another starting point: the analogy of faith. 'The perpetuity of the dispensation of the Holy Spirit is shadowed forth in the mystery of the Holy Trinity. There are reasons in the analogy of faith, which, if express proof in words were wanting, would suffice'⁸⁵. St. Gregory of Nazianzen had referred to the Holy Spirit as 'the Perfecter', and Manning, quoting him, would write: the 'mystery of the Divine Trinity had its perfection in itself in the third and last Person of the ever blessed Three. So also in the outward operations of God'⁸⁶. He saw the perfecting rôle of the Holy Spirit in the work of Creation; it was apparent in the Incarnation; and the same could be said of the work of Redemption. 'What the Second Person began, the Third Person continued. (...) He is come to take up and carry on to the end of the world the dispensation of grace. The Perfecter is now in the world to finish the work of the kingdom of God'⁸⁷.

The Church claims authority to judge and to define matters of doctrine, and to impose those definitions on the faithful. She demands their assent to them as one having power to bind men to believe, and her authority has its foundation in truth. It is truth 'that generates authority', Manning would say, 'not authority that generates truth'⁸⁸; he

⁸² *CSer*, II, pp. 244-245.

⁸³ *CSer*, I, p. 243.

⁸⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 231.

⁸⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 233.

⁸⁶ *Ibidem*.

⁸⁷ *Ibidem*, pp. 234-235.

⁸⁸ *CSer*, II, p. 249.

‘that has truth has power, and none other but he’⁸⁹. Truth comes first, and authority follows; ‘for authority is truth convincing the intelligence with its light, and binding the will by those convictions, and by the authority of God which pervades them’⁹⁰. Truth’s power to command acceptance springs from man’s calling to pursue it and make it his own. This is particularly so in the case of the highest truth about God and man, as contained in God’s revelation. The Church is in possession of the truth because it has the mind, the truth, of God; having ‘the truth of God [it] has also the power and authority of God’. Manning concluded saying that the ‘Church binds men to believe, because it is divinely guided to teach them what they are bound to believe’⁹¹. It is an imperative command, and, of its nature, lays a serious obligation on man. ‘If indeed, God the Holy Ghost be in the midst of us, and if it be God the Holy Ghost Who speaks to us through the one Holy Catholic and Roman Church, then it imposes its doctrines on the consciences of men under pain of eternal damnation’⁹².

Already in 1854, in a letter written to Robert Wilberforce, Manning had made a confession of his faith in ‘One God, one Spirit of Truth, one Church, one Theology, one Living Judge. *Authoritative* only because *divinely guided*’⁹³. The infallibility of the Church was, for Manning, a matter of faith, but it was a truth for which he found abundant support in reason; it also had the hall-mark of experience.

5. Infallibility in the Church and in its various members.

The Mystical Body of Christ, Manning had said, was anointed with the unction of the Holy Spirit, and the endowments of the Head became the endowments of the body. He added, however, that this outpouring of the Holy Spirit had descended upon the members of the Church ‘in his own order and measure - upon the Pontiffs with a perpetual divine assistance; upon the Episcopate diffused throughout the world

⁸⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 248.

⁹⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 249.

⁹¹ *Ibidem*, p. 248.

⁹² *Ibidem*, p. 23.

⁹³ Letter dated Holy Thursday, 1854; *P*, II, p. 41.

sustaining it in the light of truth; upon the Church in its Councils, preserving it from error; upon the faithful of every tongue, who cannot err in believing, because the Church cannot err in teaching'⁹⁴. The Church had received the 'Divine gift of twofold infallibility - the passive, whereby the whole body was pervaded by a luminous consciousness of the Revelation of God (...): the active, whereby the Church, with unfaltering voice and the precision of a supernatural intelligence, propounds the dogma of faith and the law of morals in every land and in every age'⁹⁵.

Manning described in a terse sentence the source of the passive infallibility: the Church 'cannot err in believing; for God is its teacher'. The first act of faith is to believe God, an infallible teacher; the believer, searching for divine truth, cannot lose his way with that guide. The illumination of the day of Pentecost had pervaded the whole Church: the 'Bishop in his throne, the Doctor in the schools, the peasant in the fields, the little child at his mother's knee, all alike are illuminated and sustained by the passive infallibility which replenishes the whole mystical Body'⁹⁶. This universal consciousness - passive infallibility - manifests itself in different ways: it is 'expressed in every form of word and witness, by liturgies and offices, by homilies and by feasts'⁹⁷. The whole life of the Church - how the faithful express their faith in life and prayer, in celebration and worship - is a witness to her faith.

The Church also has a divine assistance in its teaching: 'the gift of active infallibility which sustains the whole body of its pastors, whether spread throughout the world, or congregated in council; and also in an eminent way the person of the Vicar of Jesus Christ'⁹⁸. The collective body of the Pastors 'is the organ of the Holy Spirit of truth, and their voice is the active infallibility of the Church'⁹⁹. Individuals - lay people and pastors - may err, but their error would leave no stain upon the mind of the Church, upon its belief or its teaching; the seeds of corruption cannot lodge and germinate in

⁹⁴ *CSer*, II, p. 310.

⁹⁵ *CSer*, I, p. 292.

⁹⁶ *CSer*, II, p. 246.

⁹⁷ *CSer*, I, p. 130.

⁹⁸ *CSer*, II, p. 247.

⁹⁹ *TM*, p. 234.

its faith. It could be said, paraphrasing Manning, that the Church cannot err in teaching; for God is the teacher.

Manning made clear that the distinction between an active and a passive infallibility did not distribute the members of the Church into two groups: teachers and taught. All the members of the Church are believers and are taught by the Church. The authoritative teachers of the faith are, in their turn, disciples: 'Jesus made His Apostles to be disciples before He sent them forth as Doctors. (...) What He did for them, the Church does for us. *Doctores fidelium, Ecclesiae discipuli*. The doctors of the faithful are the disciples of the Church, because the unction which is upon it teaches them all things. (...) They learn to believe as the Church believes, and to teach as the Church teaches'¹⁰⁰. 'The Church is the teacher of the pastors, as the pastors are the teachers of the flock'¹⁰¹. 'They are first taught by a divine teacher before they teach others, so all alike are "taught of the Lord". The dogma of faith is infused into them by the light of the Church before they speak in its name; and the faithful, by their mouths hear not the voice of an individual, but of the universal Church of all ages and of all lands'¹⁰². Manning seems to have had in mind Newman's *On consulting the faithful on matters of doctrine* when he added that individual pastors are not infallible, one by one, but that 'the Church which guides them is. They must be unfaithful to it before they can err; and even then "the ears of the faithful" would be, as of old, purer than the "lips of the priest". The instincts of a Catholic child would detect the novelties of human error'¹⁰³.

In *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost*, Manning would describe the organs through which the Holy Spirit speaks in the Church. There, he wrote, 'I have indicated, at least in outline, the organs through which the infallibility is exercised, and have noted the degrees of authority possessed by them, and the kind and degrees of assent

¹⁰⁰ *CSer*, II, pp. 327-328. Manning would frequently use the words of St. Gregory quoted here, among other occasions in his speech to the Council on 25-V-70 (cfr. *M*, 52, col. 250A).

¹⁰¹ *TM*, pp. 233-234.

¹⁰² *CSer*, II, p. 247.

¹⁰³ *Ibidem*.

required by the acts and words of the Church or of its members'¹⁰⁴. The voice of the Holy Spirit can be heard in the Baptismal Creeds, 'which represent at this day, in all the world, the preaching of the Apostles and the faith of Pentecost'; Holy Scripture - known to be such, and rightly understood - is also the voice of the Holy Spirit. We hear Him speak in the Tradition found all over the world 'running up beyond Scripture and the General Councils'; in the Decrees of the General Councils; in the Definitions and Decrees of the Roman Pontiffs speaking *ex cathedra*; in the unanimous voice of the saints who 'in any matter of the Divine truth or law can hardly be believed to be other than the voice of the Spirit of God'¹⁰⁵.

'*Consensus Sanctorum sensus Spiritus Sancti est*'. These words of Cano had set Manning in 1847 on the path to becoming a Catholic. He now added a qualification to this rule: 'though there is no revealed pledge of infallibility to the Saints as such, yet the consent of the Saints is a high test of what is the mind and illumination of the Spirit of Truth'¹⁰⁶. The voice of the Theologians or Doctors also has a certain amount of weight and should be taken into consideration, although it does not generate or demand an act of divine faith. Something similar can be said of the Fathers of the Church, whom Manning mentioned surprisingly after the Saints and Doctors of the Church: 'The voice of the Fathers has weight as that of the Saints and Doctors, and also as witnesses to the faith in the ages in which they lived, and yet they cannot generate divine faith nor afford a divine certainty'¹⁰⁷.

He rounded off the argument saying that, if the relation between the Church and the Holy Spirit 'be absolute and indissoluble, then all its enunciations by Pontiffs, Councils, Traditions, Scriptures, and universal consent of the Church, are divine, and its voice also is divine, and identified with the voice of its Divine Head in Heaven'¹⁰⁸.

¹⁰⁴ *TM*, p. 93. Manning's enumeration of the organs of infallibility is little more than a summary of Cano's scheme of the theological sources, and their authority, as described in *De Locis Theologicis*.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibidem*, pp. 86-90.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibidem*, pp. 90-91.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 91.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 92.

6. *The Infallibility of the Pope*

In 1847 Manning had confided to Laprimaudaye his belief in the Pope's rôle as focal point for the unity of the Church; he was the centre around which the episcopate found its unity: *Episcopatus unus est*. The concept had started to take shape in his mind, although there were still many grey areas in and around it. The following years brought with them a strengthening of this conviction, leading him eventually to accept the supremacy of the Pope. We do not know when this actually happened. Although Manning maintained that infallibility was one of the endowments of the Church, he did not yet have in early 1851 a definite concept of the primacy and infallibility of the Pope. His opinions at the time seem to have had a certain 'Anglo-Gallican' flavour. On 17 March 1851 he sent to Gladstone a statement of his own thoughts on the subject, in which he said that 'the highest *active* form [of evidence and decision] is the Church in council, countersigned by the reception of the Church diffused'¹⁰⁹.

It may have been that his doubts on this matter were among those which Baptismal grace clarified for him. In any case, either then or during his sojourn in Rome, for reasons of study, he soon came to espouse the doctrine of Papal infallibility. It found its way into his Southwark Cathedral lectures in 1852, barely a year after his conversion. If Manning's fourth volume of Anglican Sermons had been a manifesto of his belief in the infallibility of the Church, *The Grounds of Faith* (1852) were a confession of his belief in the infallibility of the Roman Church: 'The teaching of the One, Holy, Universal Roman Church (...) is to us the voice of God now, and the foundation of our faith'¹¹⁰. Manning acknowledged that the primacy of Rome had been denied from the beginning, but he felt that this fact, rather than telling against it, reinforced the argument in favour of its claim. 'Tell me', he said, 'that the waves have beaten upon the shore, and I tell you that the shore was there for the waves to beat upon'¹¹¹. St. Leo's words to the Council of Chalcedon - which he had already read in 1847 - were a clear expression of awareness in Peter's successors of their rôle in the Church, one expressly acknowledged by the Fathers of the Council. No other Church.

¹⁰⁹ *Manning Mss.Pitts*, 510317; Chapeau, Let. 187.

¹¹⁰ *Grounds*, p. 60.

¹¹¹ *Ibidem*, p. 53.

he would say, 'has claimed from the beginning, a divine primacy over all other Churches; has taught from the first with the claim to be heard as the Divine Teacher'¹¹².

Manning was even clearer in his sermon to the First Synod of Westminster (1852). There he spoke to the assembled Bishops of the heresies which had afflicted the Church in all times, and of how sometimes they had penetrated 'into every place except that one to which denial of faith has never come'; and then, when the time was ripe, 'by Peter spoke the Divine Head, who gave to His Vicar upon earth the authority and power to speak'¹¹³. Christ had announced the storms which would be unleashed against the Church; he had promised that they would break upon the rock of Peter, which would withstand them all.

The sermons preached in the years following his return from Rome developed further the theme of the infallibility of the Pope and its relationship to the infallibility of the Church. The Supreme Pontiff, he told the Second Synod of Westminster (1855), is 'the pillar of supernatural illumination; the immovable centre of universal tradition, the Heir of the promise, "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not"¹¹⁴. The recent definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception was a clear manifestation of this: 'The Church, through its Visible Head has spoken, but the utterance' - he said - 'is the voice of the Spirit of God'¹¹⁵; the Holy Spirit had promulgated the definition.

Peter had been the organ of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost day, and he had never ceased to be such. The voice of the Church was the voice of the Holy Spirit; Peter's voice was the voice of the Church. The whole Church, Manning wrote on another occasion, 'spoke through the lips of the Vicar of Jesus Christ when the other day he defined to the world by his infallible voice the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God'¹¹⁶. Years later, he would be even more specific: the whole Church acts when the Pope

¹¹² *Ibidem*, p. 61.

¹¹³ *CSer*, I, p. 99.

¹¹⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 131.

¹¹⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 133.

¹¹⁶ *CSer*, II, pp. 18-19.

acts, 'for it is all contained in him, and where the Head acts, all act with him'¹¹⁷.

Manning would define more clearly the relationship between the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff and the infallibility of the rest of the Church in his sermons around 1860. He saw the endowments of the Church as having been granted by Christ to His Vicar on earth, and, through him, to the rest of the Church. The 'endowments of the body are the prerogatives of the head', he would say, and they are in the head in a preeminent way, i.e.: 'the illumination which is diffused throughout the whole body of the Church resides eminently in the Episcopate, but resides preeminently and above all in the chief of Bishops, the Pastor of pastors, the Vicar of the Incarnate Word Himself'¹¹⁸. These prerogatives are not only preeminently in the head, they flow from it to the whole Church. Peter is the Rock, 'from whose foot these living sources of the manifold perfections of the Church pour forth their streams'¹¹⁹. That is why, after his book on the Temporal Power had been criticised by Rome, he could write in a letter to Talbot: 'The one truth which has saved me is the infallibility of the Vicar of Jesus Christ, as the only true and perfect form of the infallibility of the Church, and therefore of all divine faith, unity, and obedience'¹²⁰.

Only in 1867, in his Pastoral about the forthcoming Council, would Manning explain at greater length these expressions. 'The formation of the Church', he wrote then, 'is traced in the order of the Baptismal Creed. God sent His Son into the world to be made man. The Incarnate Word, in Whom were hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, became the fountain of grace and truth, of doctrine, and of jurisdiction, to the world. To the chief of His Apostles He conveyed by the Holy Ghost all His communicable prerogatives, and thereby constituted him His vicar upon earth. Peter became the head and guide, the fountain of doctrine and jurisdiction, to the Apostles. The Church sprang from him, and was formed, as St. Cyprian says, like the seamless robe of our Lord, from the top throughout (...). The organisation of the Church was unfolded from the plenitude of its head. The prerogatives of stability, perpetuity, and

¹¹⁷ *CSer*, III, pp. 85-86.

¹¹⁸ *CSer*, II, p. 19.

¹¹⁹ *CSer*, I, pp. 305-306.

¹²⁰ Letter dated 5-VIII-61; *P*, II, p. 160.

indefectibility in the head became endowments of the body united to him. But they existed in Peter before they were communicated to the Church, and before the Church was organised to which they were to be communicated'¹²¹. Thus, the supernatural gift of infallibility 'resides first in its [the Church's] head, next in the whole episcopate united with him;(...) [The] fountain of infallible teaching is the Divine Head in heaven, through the organ of the visible head of the Church on earth (...); the prayer of the Divine Head of the Church sustains the faith of Peter. (...) The Faith of Peter is, by a Divine assistance, perpetual in the Church; and is therefore, by its intrinsic stability, indefectible and infallible'¹²².

From this special prerogative of the Roman Pontiff descend the unique prerogatives of the Church of Rome. She is the only particular Church which cannot err, and her faith has always been considered as the standard to which all other particular Churches should conform, the test of orthodoxy. 'What is the sense of all this', Manning asked, 'but that the indefectibility and infallibility of the Pontiff, by a singular privilege, pervades the Church of which he is pastor?'¹²³ But it is important not to forget that 'the prerogative of Peter is the cause, the fidelity of the Roman Church the effect'¹²⁴. The infallibility of the Pope was the only perfect infallibility on earth, depending only on that of the Divine Head of the Church in Heaven. The infallibility of the Bishops, on the other hand, teaching or not in Council, and that of the rest of the believers, depended on the infallibility of the Pope.

The Roman Pontiffs, as Vicars of Christ, have a 'twofold relation, the one to the Divine Head of the Church of whom they are representatives on earth, the other to the whole body. And these two relations impart a special prerogative of grace to him that bears them'¹²⁵. Manning considered the infallibility of the Pope from that double standpoint: 'The Vicar of Jesus Christ', he wrote, 'would bear no proportion to the body if, while it is infallible, he were not. He would also bear no representative

¹²¹ *Privilegium*, I, pp. 22-23.

¹²² *Ibidem*, pp. 23-25.

¹²³ *Ibidem*, p. 26; see also *Privilegium*, II, p. 148.

¹²⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 28.

¹²⁵ *TM*, pp. 88-89.

character if he were the fallible witness of an infallible Head'¹²⁶.

The Pope's *ex cathedra* definitions were infallible. As for the object of his infallibility, Manning thought that it extended 'to the whole matter of revelation, that is to the Divine truth and the Divine law, and to all those facts or truths which are in contact with faith and morals'¹²⁷; and that would include truths of the natural order in spheres like ethics, philosophy and politics.

7. Faith or Rationalism

Manning, in the introduction to *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost*, had clearly described how he viewed the alternative before man when confronted with God's revelation. As he put it: 'my object in the following pages is to show that the reason of man has no choice but to be either the disciple or the critic of the revelation of God'¹²⁸. He also wanted to demonstrate that faith does not detract from the perfection of human reason; on the contrary, faith perfects and elevates reason. He numbered the theses he wanted to prove:

1. That to believe in revelation is the highest act of the human reason.
2. That to believe in revelation, whole and perfect, is the perfection of reason.
3. That to submit to the voice of the Holy Spirit in the Church is the absolute condition to attain a perfect knowledge of revelation.
4. That the Divine witness of the Holy Spirit in the Church anticipates the criticism of the human reason, and refuses to be subject to it'¹²⁹.

He considered that to denounce the doctrinal authority of the Church as tyranny would be 'as unreasonable as to talk of the tyranny of science and the bondage of

¹²⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 89.

¹²⁷ *Ibidem*.

¹²⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 3.

¹²⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 9.

numbers'¹³⁰. It is 'no bondage to know the truth, and no freedom to be in doubt'¹³¹. Man's only access to supernatural truth is through God's revelation. After the event, man still needs a divine teacher to understand the revelation properly and not to corrupt it. 'The revelation of faith is no discovery which the reason of man has made for himself by induction, or by deduction, or by analysis, or by synthesis, or by logical process, or by experimental chemistry. The revelation of faith is a discovery of itself by the Divine Reason, the unveiling of the Divine Intelligence, and the illumination flowing from it cast upon the intelligence of man'. If that is the case, how 'can the illumination of the faith diminish the stature of the human reason? How can its rights be interfered with? How can its prerogatives be violated? Is it not the truth the very reverse of all this? Is not the fact that the human reason is perfected and elevated above itself by the illumination of faith?'¹³²

Consequently, man cannot be the judge but only the disciple of revelation. Reason's rôle, as a judge, is confined to 'estimating the motives of credibility'. It acts as a judge of the evidence that Christianity is a divine revelation. 'This process of reason is the preamble of faith. Once illuminated, the reason of man becomes the disciple of a Divine Teacher'¹³³. When taught by the Holy Spirit, the 'highest discursive powers of the reason are developed by revelation, which elevates it from the contemplation of the first principles and axioms of truth in the natural order to a higher and wider sphere, unattainable by reason without faith'¹³⁴.

There were only two possible answers to the '*Quo judice?*' question: 'the individual proceeding by critical reason, or the Church proceeding by perpetual Divine assistance'¹³⁵. Man may receive the knowledge of God either from an infallible divine teacher or from a fallible human one. The first leads to the true knowledge of God, the

¹³⁰ *CSer*, II, p. 249.

¹³¹ *APUC*, p. 22.

¹³² *Four Evils*, p. 4.

¹³³ *TM*, p. 94.

¹³⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 122.

¹³⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 30.

second - as he had pointed out many a time in the past - to rationalism, subjectivism and indifferentism.

Manning's discovery of the indissoluble union of the Holy Spirit with the Church had made him see 'at once that the interpretations or doctrines of the living Church are true because Divine, and that the voice of the living Church in all ages is the sole rule of faith, and infallible, because it is the voice of a Divine Person. I then saw that all appeals to Scripture alone, or to Scripture and antiquity, whether by individuals or by local Churches, are no more than appeals from the Divine voice of the living Church, and therefore essentially rationalistic'¹³⁶. Human reason becomes then the one and supreme Judge; the 'Private Judgment of individuals exercised critically upon history, philosophy, theology, Scripture, and revelation (...) is ultimately all that remains to those who reject the infallibility of the living Church'¹³⁷.

The history of the Christian faith was punctuated by a long series of heresies. There is no doctrine or article of the Creed which had not been controverted in the twenty centuries of Christianity. The denial of the divinity of our Lord was followed by the denial of the divinity of the Holy Spirit; then came errors about faith and the Sacraments, and many others. Manning saw the progress of heresy moving gradually through the doctrines confessed in the Creed. In Manning's time, heresy came in turn to assail one the Creed's last articles: the visible Church's existence, and its divine authority. The substance of the Reformation was to be found not in the denial of particular doctrines - like Transubstantiation, Purgatory, Indulgences and the like - but in a much more fundamental principle: the denial of the true rule of faith, the formal rejection of the divine voice speaking perpetually in the Church. What 'is the chief and master heresy of the last three hundred years, but a denial of the perpetual office of the Holy Ghost[?]'¹³⁸ The perpetual teaching office of the Holy Spirit in and through the Church is the foundation of truth and certainty, the guarantee of the preservation of the original revelation and of its transmission in all its integrity. Manning expressed it in a clear formula: 'The one fountain of truth is God; the only sure channel of truth is His

¹³⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 29.

¹³⁷ *Ibidem*, pp. 91-92.

¹³⁸ *CSer*, I, p. 137.

Church, through which God speaks still'¹³⁹.

The rejection of the Church as the channel of the Holy Spirit's teaching action in the world was for him the fountain and source of all heresy and, ultimately, of indifferentism: 'men have come first to deny, and then to disbelieve the existence in the world of a foundation, divinely laid, upon which revealed truth can certainly rest'¹⁴⁰. The denial of the office of the Holy Spirit in the church led to the loss of the Rule of Faith, and this, in its turn, opened the door to 'the denial of the foundation of the certainty in faith'. Once the principle of certainty had been removed, 'certainty was broken up, and the principle of uncertainty introduced'¹⁴¹. Protestantism had torn itself from the source of certainty, and this was followed in due course, as the logical conclusion of its generative principle, by the loss of believe in the objectivity of truth: 'To deny that there exists for the faith any higher than human authority, is to destroy the objectivity of truth'¹⁴². 'The rejection of the Divine Voice has let in the flood of opinion, and opinion has generated scepticism, and scepticism has brought in contentions without an end'¹⁴³. It could not be otherwise: if the 'office of the Church to decide questions of faith has been suspended, then the world in this hour has no teacher. (...) There is no longer (...) a divine teacher upon earth. (...) [T]here exists no judge on earth to say who has the truth in this [or any other] dispute'¹⁴⁴. Or, rather, each individual is constituted supreme judge, from whom there can be no appeal. Man was left at the mercy of rival human teachers, and with them came contradiction, with contradiction uncertainty, and with uncertainty doubt.

Private judgment gave birth to the Reformation; since then, it had gone on to generate schism after schism. Manning described the causes of that process succinctly: 'Each Protestant church, as it was established, contained within itself the principle both of its

¹³⁹ *Grounds*, p. 79.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 22.

¹⁴¹ *Ibidem*.

¹⁴² *Ibidem*, p. 79.

¹⁴³ *TM*, p. 225.

¹⁴⁴ *Grounds*, p. 68.

creation and dissolution, namely, private judgment'¹⁴⁵.

8. The Development and Forms of Rationalism

Private judgment had set in motion the ongoing process of division and subdivision among the Reformers, adding continually to the ever increasing number of Protestant sects. Manning thought that the rejection of the rule of faith was also the root from which rationalism grew: the 'first cause of Rationalism (...) was the rejection of the Divine authority of the Church of Jesus Christ three hundred years ago'¹⁴⁶. The rejection of the infallibility of the Church resolved itself in time into rationalism 'by a law of production so legitimate, by an intellectual law so certain, that, I think, any one who could give himself sufficient time and apply sufficient industry to follow the history of unbelief in the last three hundred years would see it to demonstration'¹⁴⁷.

Manning would describe, in its general lines, the steps of the progress from private judgment to rationalism, as he saw it. The Protestant Reformation had set its followers on an inclined plane towards rationalism; a plane 'on which, if individuals may stand, generations cannot'¹⁴⁸. The conclusion followed necessarily from the premises set by the Reformation. Once the presence of a Divine Teacher upon earth was denied, this led at once to a rejection of the supernatural character and office of the Church, and subjected all doctrines to the examination and criticism of man. There were few alternatives opened to the Reformers: either to admit that the Holy Spirit taught individuals one by one or to accept that human reason is left to its own devices in pursuing the truth of revelation. The first proposition was soon found theoretically untenable, and practice made its unsoundness even more apparent. It was obvious that revelation had not been made to men individually, and that it did not spring up by inspiration in the inward consciousness.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibidem*, pp. 2-3.

¹⁴⁶ *Four Evils*, p. 14.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibidem*.

¹⁴⁸ *Workings*, p. 27.

The Reformation, according to Manning, had broken the union between the Spirit and God's word; that which God had joined by an inseparable bond. Once the Reformers had rejected the guidance of the Spirit, it followed next that 'the word departed from their lips. They clutched at it with jealousy, and they found in their hands the written word alone: *Litera occidit, spiritus autem vivificat* (2 Cor. 3, 6). The letter that killeth was left behind, the spirit that giveth life departed. The word was interpreted no more by the light of the Holy Ghost, no more by an infallible Guide, but by the interpretations of man and the light of the human intellect'¹⁴⁹.

Then, men 'began to examine the human evidences upon which the doctrines of Christianity reposed'. They could 'rest either upon a Divine authority - that is, a divine basis of certainty - or upon human and historical basis. Having rejected the Divine authority, or the Divine basis, they had nothing left to them but the human and historical basis'¹⁵⁰. It could not be otherwise, for they 'who do not rest upon the divine office of the Church rest on history alone'¹⁵¹. And the historical sources of Christianity were to be found in Holy Scripture, inspired by God, and in the works of the early Christian writers, witnesses of the primitive faith. Thus, Manning wrote, 'they began to apply human reason to criticise, to test, to measure the credibility, both extrinsic and intrinsic, of every article of the Faith. I say, first, the extrinsic credibility; that is, whether it could be historically proved that this or that doctrine was believed in the beginning and has been believed ever since: secondly, the intrinsic credibility; that is to say, whether this or that doctrine was in itself reconcilable with the human reason'¹⁵².

This use of history, Manning would say, is flawed. Because of its nature, history 'must be a record of the past gathered from documents by criticism, fallible as the judge who applies it'¹⁵³. Historical investigation cannot provide certainty or a permanent interpretation, since it is necessarily subjective and in need of constant revision. Human

¹⁴⁹ *CSer*, II, p. 27.

¹⁵⁰ *Four Evils*, p. 15.

¹⁵¹ *Grounds*, p. 23.

¹⁵² *Four Evils*, p. 15.

¹⁵³ *Grounds*, p. 37.

reason, on the other hand, working out by itself what was credible and probable, could not but fail to downgrade revelation and produce a variety of interpretations, constantly eroding the common ground held by 'believers', and, therefore, ever enlarging the constituency of doubt and uncertainty in matters of faith. To reject the living voice of the Spirit in the Church meant that 'all things would be in a perpetual flux of mutation and uncertainty; so that for three hundred years the amount of Christianity that has been believed on this human and critical basis has been perpetually diminishing, and the residuum which is left upon that foundation now is incalculably less than that with which men started three hundred years ago'¹⁵⁴.

On other occasions, he enunciated the principle in more general terms: 'The rejection of the Divine authority necessarily throws men upon the only alternative - human criticism applied to Scripture, to antiquity, to Fathers, to history, to Councils and to the acts of the Holy See'¹⁵⁵. That false premise led necessarily to the destruction of Christianity altogether. Manning contended that the 'transmission of truth in the world is not by books, but by men; not by parchments and rolls, but by living intelligences and wills formed by the Spirit of God. Written records and formularies of faith are of little avail when the living teachers are in error, or contradict each other'¹⁵⁶.

The divine authority of the Church, according to Manning, keeps the human mind from converting faith into the subjective imaginations of the individual reason. Remove the check of the Church, and religious belief becomes 'a kind of waking dream. For what is dreaming but the perpetuity of human thought running unchecked by waking consciousness, which pins us down to order and rule by fact and by reality? (...) In like manner, the visible Church, with its rule of faith, its authoritative teaching, its order, its discipline, its worship, is that outer world in which we move. It keeps the spiritual mind in limit and in measure. Dissolve it, and the mind weaves on in its own fancies, throwing off heresies, eccentricities, and falsehood'¹⁵⁷. This is what the *Syllabus of errors* had tried to correct by condemning, in propositions 3 and 4, the opinions of

¹⁵⁴ *Four Evils*, p. 16.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 18; see also *TM*, pp. 91-92.

¹⁵⁶ *CSer*, II, p. 131.

¹⁵⁷ *Grounds*, pp. 80-81.

those who saw human reason as the sole and sufficient judge of truth and falsehood, and as the source of all the truths of religion.

Manning acknowledged that rationalism was not a single uniform phenomenon. Under its name were gathered a variety of intellectual approaches to reality, closely related and yet distinct. For the sake of clarity he would distribute them into two main groups: ‘those who reject all revelation and those who profess to receive it’¹⁵⁸. He called the first ‘fully-developed’ or ‘absolute’ rationalism; he referred to the second as ‘imperfect’, ‘moderate’ or ‘incipient’ rationalism. The perfect or fully-developed rationalist accepts the existence of God, being forced upon him by nature. ‘But, while these men believe in a God of nature, nevertheless they reject the revelation which He has given them of Himself’¹⁵⁹. Their thought ‘is founded upon the assumption that the reason is the sole *fountain* of all knowledge relating to God and to the soul, and to the relations of God and of the soul’¹⁶⁰. The system was provided with a safety valve: the collective reason of the human race would serve as a corrective to the excesses of the individual reason. In summary: ‘reason is therefore the *source* and the *measure* or the *limit* of what is credible [!] in the theology of rational religion. This, necessarily excludes all supernatural revelation’¹⁶¹.

Moderate rationalism, on the other hand, while retaining a believe in God’s revelation to man, rests ‘upon the assumption that reason is the supreme *test* or *judge* of the intrinsic credibility of revelation admitted in the main to be supernatural’¹⁶². It admits its existence, ‘but it constitutes the reason as the judge by critical inquiry of the contents of that revelation, of the interpretation of Scripture, and of the witness of antiquity’¹⁶³. Moderate rationalism professes belief in revelation but ‘only so much as, upon private criticism and its own judgment, the individual mind is disposed to

¹⁵⁸ *TM*, p. 6.

¹⁵⁹ *Four Evils*, pp. 13-14.

¹⁶⁰ *TM*, p. 7.

¹⁶¹ *Ibidem*.

¹⁶² *Ibidem*, p. 8.

¹⁶³ *Ibidem*, p. 9.

retain'¹⁶⁴. Moderate and absolute rationalism shared a common origin, the rejection of the divine voice of the Church; they also tended to a common end, a purely natural religion or vague deism. Manning maintained, as we have seen before, that 'the human reason can only stand related to the revelation of God, either as a critic, or as a disciple in the presence of a Divine Teacher'¹⁶⁵. There is no middle ground between those two points where man's reason can take its stand. 'In both [absolute and moderate rationalism] the reason is the critic of revelation. In the latter, it rejects portions of revealed truth as intrinsically incredible; in the former, it rejects revelation as a whole for the same reason'¹⁶⁶. Reason, here, is no longer a disciple, it has become a judge.

Manning considered that only 'the inconsequence of those who hold this system [moderate rationalism] arrests it from resolving itself into its ultimate form of perfect Rationalism'¹⁶⁷. These people do no longer have faith, because they reject the divine authority teaching in the Church, the source and foundation of faith. And Manning added, he who 'shall believe all the articles of faith, and yet reject one of them, in that rejection rejects the whole Divine authority upon which all the articles of the faith alike depend'¹⁶⁸. He might accept a divine text, but the interpretation was human: reason being the test and measure of what was to be believed.

For how long could moderate rationalism hold its ground before reaching the stage of fully-developed rationalism? Manning thought that it was just a matter of time. 'Protestantism is running its natural career. (...) Its incoherences, contradictions, internal repulsions, endless contentions, are doing their work with an unrelenting certainty. The Reformation is devouring itself, and all its many forms of contradiction are resolving themselves into Rationalism and simple unbelief'¹⁶⁹.

The 'real ultimate question between the Catholic Church and all the Christian bodies

¹⁶⁴ *Four Evils*, pp. 20-21.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 21.

¹⁶⁶ *TM*, p. 8.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibidem*.

¹⁶⁸ *Four Evils*, p. 22.

¹⁶⁹ *CSer*, I, p. 380.

separated from it,' Manning would say, 'is not one of detail but of principle. It is not a controversy about indulgences, or purgatory, or invocations and the like, but of the divine tradition of dogma, its certainty and its purity'¹⁷⁰. The Catholic Church confesses the perpetual presence of the Holy Spirit teaching the Faith in and through the Church, and preserving Revelation from corruption. The Reformation pretends to reform the Church from the corruptions which have infected the dogma of faith. The first is a work of God, the second of man.

¹⁷⁰ *TM*, p. 226.

CHAPTER V

'ENGLAND AND CHRISTENDOM'

Manning was rather reluctant, after his conversion, to launch into an open attack against the Anglican Church; he did not want to be involved in controversy. He conceived the rôle of the Catholic Church in England as one of building up the whole edifice of revealed truth, completing the structure of partial truth preserved in the Anglican Church. It should not be a work of demolition. He was loath to contribute to internal divisions already existing and multiplying. For him, it was a matter of personal feeling and also of charity: 'The Anglicanism of the Reformation is upon the rocks, like some tall ship stranded upon the shore, and going to pieces by its own weight and the steady action of the sea. We have no need of playing the wreckers. It would be inhumanity to do so. God knows that the desires and prayers of Catholics are ever ascending that all which remains of Christianity in England may be preserved, unfolded, and perfected into the whole circle of revealed truths and the unmutated revelation of the faith'¹. Still, the circumstances of the times, and the whole bent of his thought, forced him to speak frequently, sometimes even harshly, about the Anglican Church.

1. The Anglican Reformation

The Anglican Reformation, Manning thought, had as its confessed aim to impugn certain doctrines, or corruptions, introduced into the purity of the primitive faith by the Church of Rome. In fact, he wrote, it 'consists formally in the rejection of the Divine voice of the Church - in effacing from the minds of English people the whole idea of a visible and divinely endowed Church, with supernatural offices'². The vast majority of Anglicans, while disagreeing in almost every other aspect, found common ground

¹ *TM*, pp. 225-226; see also *Grounds*, p. 13.

² *CSer*, I, p. 34.

in opposing the idea of an infallible teaching Church as ‘a human superstition or a spiritual tyranny’³. His conclusion was that the ‘master heresy of the English race is to deny the presence of any infallible authority upon earth’⁴.

‘The reformers of the Church of England took for the basis of their religion, not the perpetual and infallible teaching of the Spirit of Jesus in His Church, but the Bible. A written book was erected in the place of the living Teacher, so as to exclude His supreme living voice. Anglican Christianity was to be based upon the Bible’⁵. That foundation, Manning contended, ‘Anglicans have ruined under their foot’⁶. The Scriptures, separated from the Church, which is their custodian and interpreter, became lost in a maze of contradictory interpretations. And he would quote St. Jerome’s words in support of the principle that the Gospel consists not in the words of Scripture but in the sense; when the sense is misinterpreted then the words of the Sacred Books become mere human words. ‘When right sense is lost, the Scripture is lost’⁷. As history had shown, ‘when the interpretation goes, faith in the inspiration of Scripture speedily follows. The course of Biblical criticism, both in Germany and in England, shows that men do not longer believe in the divine inspiration of books which are rendered incredible by misinterpretation’⁸. The paradox of Anglicanism, and of Protestantism of every shade, was that those who had claimed to be most scriptural ended by being the most unscriptural; ‘the system which founded itself upon the claim to be essentially and above all Scriptural, is ending in denying the inspiration and authenticity of Holy Scripture’⁹. Manning would quote the authors of *Essays and Reviews*, and Dr. Colenso’s works, as samples of those who, encouraged by German criticism, were already moving in that direction. This was still far from being the general spirit of the Anglican Church, but the seeds had been planted in the Reformation and they could not but grow in time to full stature.

³ *Ibidem*, p. 41.

⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 56.

⁵ *CSer*, II, pp. 191-192.

⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 192.

⁷ *TM*, p. 205.

⁸ *Ibidem*, pp. 206-207.

⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 207.

It had taken many generations to unfold the consequences of the original error. The process had gone further and faster in Germany. Manning thought that only a divine intervention had prevented the Anglican Church from going that far: ‘That which in Germany produced pure Rationalism, in England, but for the interposition of God, would have produced the same general disbelief of Christianity’¹⁰. The course of the Anglican Church, though, was a downward one; error grew larger all the time while truth disappeared. ‘Every error which has sprung up in it adheres to it still. Its doctrines vanish, its heresies abide. All its morbid humours are absorbed into its blood. The Lutheranism of Edward the Sixth; the Hierarchical Calvinism of Elizabeth; the Ceremonial Arminianism of James; the Episcopalian Antiquarianism of the two Charleses; the Latitudinarianism of William the Third;(…) all coexist (…) together, in open contradiction, and almost perpetual controversy’¹¹. This was the inevitable consequence of the Anglican schism: ‘because separation from the Holy See is separation from the Universal Church, and to be separated from the Church is to be deprived of its divine guidance and support’¹², i.e.: the presence and assistance of the Holy Spirit. Truth, like a body deserted by the soul or like a branch separated from the vine, began its long process of decomposition within the Anglican Church. There was no provision in it to arrest that process. The Church of England did not pronounce judgment among its factions, and there was not within it any infallible authority or test of certainty to be applied in order to discern truth from error. All the different and contradictory schools which made up the Church of England were in it by right. ‘It would be untrue to represent any one of these schools of error as the legitimate voice or exponent of the Anglican Church. They are equally so, and equally not so. They each claim so to be, and deny the legitimacy of all the rest’¹³.

There had been, though, a reaction against that downward trend of faith within the Anglican Church, and that effort to recover the foundations of faith had begun with the rejection of the principle of private judgment. Manning would trace the origins of that theological school to the Elizabethan period. It had ‘sprung up within the Established

¹⁰ *Grounds*, p. 88.

¹¹ *CSer*, I, p. 57.

¹² *Ibidem*, pp. 25-26.

¹³ *Ibidem*, p. 57.

Church, basing itself upon Catholic tradition, and claiming to found its faith not upon private judgment, but upon the rule of Vincent of Lerins, namely, on that which was believed "at all times, every where, and by all men"¹⁴. They had conducted a courageous campaign to recover the lost inheritance of Catholic truth, and to defend that under attack. A measure of their success was that they had created the illusion that the Anglican Church was still part of the great Catholic family. Unfortunately, they were only a school, and a small one at that, within the Anglican Church. However, Manning acknowledged that they had performed a providential service in slowing down the decline towards rationalism within the Church of England. They were trying to cure the wounds that the Anglican Church itself was opening in its own body, but they were unable to identify and tackle the cause of the illness. They laboured under the same fundamental error as their opponents: they could not see that to enthrone man as judge of Scripture and Tradition was as much private judgment as making private judgment the interpreter of Holy Scripture. Manning saw them as 'entangled in a circle which is never discovered until the divine fact of the presence and office of the Holy Ghost in the mystical body becomes intelligible to them'¹⁵. That was the truth which those who belonged to this school had still to recover. As he had written to Miss Stanley in 1851: 'The difference between the Church of England and the Church of Rome is not so much in *what* they respectively believe (though it is there also) but in *why* they believe it'¹⁶. That difference 'is not one of doctrine and details. It is a question of the Presence and Office of the Holy Ghost'¹⁷.

The process of dissolution was relentless, and the Anglo-Catholic party within the Church of England was powerless to arrest it; the general body was moving in a different direction and leaving those who held Catholic views more and more isolated. 'Whatsoever be the partial reaction of opinion in individuals or fragments of the Anglican body towards a more positive faith, I cannot note in the body as such, any tendency but one of further departure from unity, and of a lower descent in

¹⁴ *Grounds*, pp. 41-42.

¹⁵ *TM*, p. 78.

¹⁶ *Manning Mss.Bod.*, c. 660, Fol. 59; letter dated 4-VII-51.

¹⁷ *Ibidem*, Fol. 184; letter dated 29-XII-53.

unbelief¹⁸. Each period of its history brought with it a further erosion in the belief of Anglicans as a whole, and Manning saw each of these descending steps as the nemesis after a collision with the Church of God.

In the final analysis, the controversies of the last three hundred years had resolved themselves into a simple alternative: a choice between 'Rome and rationalism, between the divine certainty of faith, and the instability of human opinion: between the presence of a Divine Teacher and the solitude and darkness of the human soul'¹⁹; the human reason testing the doctrines of revelation or the human reason submitting as a disciple to the teaching of a Divine Person. It was no longer a matter of choice between 'Anglo-Catholicism and Roman Catholicism, but between Rationalism and Christianity; that is, Rationalism or Rome'²⁰.

Pusey, in his *Eirenicon*, was later to misquote those words, as he had misquoted Newman's reference to the Church of England. Newman had described it as a 'barrier against errors more fundamental than its own'; at the touch of Pusey's pen those words metamorphosed into 'a bulwark in God's hands against infidelity'. When it came to Manning, his alternative between Catholicism and rationalism became in Pusey's hands an alternative between Catholicism or atheism. Manning refuted that false accusation in his pamphlet *The Workings of the Holy Spirit in the Church of England*. 'I do not believe', he said, 'that the alternative before us is Catholicism or Atheism. (...) If a man, through an intellectual or moral aberration, should reject Christianity, that is Catholicism, the belief of God and of His perfections stands immutably upon the foundations of nature. Catholicism, or Deism, is the only ultimately logical and consistent alternative, though, happily, few men in rejecting Catholicism are logically consistent enough to reject Christianity. Atheism is an aberration which implies not only intellectual blindness, but a moral insensitivity'²¹.

The alternative between Catholicism and Rationalism, Manning felt, had become a

¹⁸ *CSer*, I, p. 67.

¹⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 60.

²⁰ *E&C*, III, p. 79.

²¹ *Workings*, pp. 24-25.

public and practical question in England. Some, in their effort to recover Catholic truth, had moved forward to embrace the fullness of the faith; others, because of intellectual and social reasons, had retreated from that step in the only direction possible, i.e.: towards rationalism. They had thrown themselves back 'in the direction of German criticism, as the only assignable reason for not submitting to the Catholic Church'. The inevitable declension which followed had led them to go a long way in a very short time: 'Many who are now prominent in the anti-catholic movement in England, specially in public life, were once on its frontiers, and, parted from their former colleagues and convictions actually on the threshold of its unity, I may say *ad limini* [sic] *apostolorum*'²².

Prejudice was a powerful force. The hatred of the Catholic Church - 'into which we English are born, as into the fall of Adam'²³ - was the fruit of centuries of anti-catholic propaganda. And this deep-seated prejudice was married to the conviction that there is no divine voice now teaching on earth: 'the Anglican Reformation has entirely cancelled from the intelligence of the English people the whole idea of a Church divinely founded, endowed with supernatural attributes, and teaching with divine, and, therefore, infallible certainty'. This meant, that, as shown by the universal experience of those who had exercised the evangelical ministry in England, 'the last article of the Creed, which enters, and that slowly, and for a long time painfully, into the English intelligence, is the nature and office of the Church: or to speak theologically, the formal object of Faith, and the divinely ordained conditions of its manifestations to the world'²⁴.

2. *Schism and Heresy*

Manning claimed that 'the relation of any body or people to the Church or to the Faith may be measured by their relations to its head. Their attitude towards Rome will give

²² *CSer*, I, p. 61.

²³ *Privilegium*, I, p. 102.

²⁴ *CSer*, I, p. 58.

the exact appreciation of their attitude towards the Revelation of Jesus Christ'²⁵. Henry VIII had removed England from their allegiance to Rome; a human authority had dismissed a divine one and enthroned itself in its chair. That set in motion a process which, once initiated, could not be arrested. Because of its break with Rome, 'the mind and spirit of the Universal Church has no influx into the Anglican communion'²⁶. England had rent itself from the source of certainty of faith. 'You know', Manning would say, 'how the rejection of this Divine authority [of the Church] has shattered the unity of faith in England'²⁷. 'With schism came contradiction; with contradiction uncertainty, debate, and doubt. (...) And private judgment, working out its result in individual minds, caused schism after schism'²⁸.

He did not, however, utterly condemn his fellow Englishmen. 'The English people are indeed in heresy, but I do not call them heretics. God forbid!'²⁹. The Anglican Reformation had been 'the sin of the Rulers, not of the people; of the Pastors, not of the flock. It was not until after long years of force, and fraud, and unrelenting cruelty, of persecution unto death, with frequent but fruitless armed risings in defence of their faith, that the poor of England fell under the power of their masters. They were robbed of their faith, and separated from the Church of God by conquest; and their children have been born into the ruin of their inheritance, and are in schism by no conscious, much less by any perverse election of their will'³⁰. 'They have never known their rightful inheritance. They have grown up, believing what has been set before them by parents and teachers (...). They have never made a perverse election against the truth'³¹. Englishmen were in a state of invincible ignorance, and their prejudices were so strongly rooted in their minds and hearts that, in good measure, prevented them from being able to detect the light of the true faith. 'They were born into an atmosphere in which all lights are distorted and all colours change their hue. Truth and falsehood have

²⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 34.

²⁶ *Grounds*, p. 77.

²⁷ *Four Evils*, p. 22.

²⁸ *Grounds*, pp. 2-3.

²⁹ *Four Evils*, p. 23.

³⁰ *CSer*, I, p. 72.

³¹ *Four Evils*, p. 23.

shifted places, and the history of the English reformation is a traditionary fable'³². Manning was confident that the conjunction of the virtues of the English race and the grace of God might open their eyes to see the illusion and enable them to break the spell under which they had lived for so long.

There were, in Manning's analysis, two great tendencies at work within the Anglican Church: 'the one a tendency to exaggerate the importance of external forms of worship and discipline; the other, to concentrate itself in an internal Pietism'³³. One 'bearing the appearance of Catholic doctrine and of Catholic tradition'; the other, 'earlier in the day, springing from the very substance of the Reformation itself, pre-occupying the Anglican communion, a school of pure Protestant theology'³⁴. In the conflict between these two schools, the 'Pietistic or Puritan school, under the name of Evangelical, gradually prevailed more and more in imparting its character to the popular religion of the Anglican Church'³⁵. They still lived together, side by side - Anglicanism and Puritanism, he calls them this time - 'the ruins of the outer and the inner life of the Catholic Church, from which they separated at the Reformation and then split asunder. This accounts', he added, 'for the dryness of Anglicanism, and the disembodied vagueness of evangelical pietism'³⁶.

Manning would say there had been a time when it was thought that the Catholic school was 'the substance of the Anglican Church, and the Protestant a parasite: a malady which, though clinging closely to it, might yet be expelled and cast off'³⁷. A crisis came, the Gorham case. The civil appeal did show that the secular power had a jurisdiction on spiritual questions coextensive and superior to that of the bishops. Before it, there had been men who 'once trusted that those who claim to be the pastors of this people could teach them truly; but in the midst of contradiction they have asked for guidance, and waited in vain for a response. When the faith, by confession of their very

³² *CSer*, I, pp. 192-193; see also *Workings*, p. 15.

³³ *Ibidem*, p. 45.

³⁴ *Grounds*, p. 74.

³⁵ *CSer*, I, p. 46.

³⁶ 'Notes and Reminiscences', in *P*, I, p. 68.

³⁷ *Grounds*, p. 74.

teachers, was openly denied, they looked up with inquiring gaze to the authority which they had believed to be divine. They asked in vain. (...)The authority in which they trusted failed, because it had no consciousness of divine commission. It could not speak for God, because it was not the organ of His voice'³⁸.

The Gorham case had shown that the Anglican Church was a human society, as human as the will which had set it up at the Reformation. Manning was reliving his own personal experience when he wrote: 'Slowly and painfully they yielded to the truth, that what they had believed to be divine was not a Church just then fallen from unity and truth, but a human society, sprung from private judgment, established by civil power; human in its origin, human in its authority, and because human without divine office or power from the first. The land once fair in their eyes became a wilderness'³⁹.

He saw signs of future declension in the Anglican Church: the growth of the ignorance of the supernatural among the multitudes living in towns and cities; the contradictions, confusion and uncertainty among its teachers and guides. In 1855 he had written about the Church of England's proved and manifest 'impotence to rule, its incapacity to teach'. 'It cannot judge, it cannot decide: it may not legislate: it dares not to solve its own perplexities: it has no mind or courage to define its own doctrine. There is no voice to be heard: no divine certainty, no divine guide in the seat of its councils. And lastly, never was there a time when the public opinion, the supreme infallibility which guides and teaches in England, was so absolute in its will. It is bearing all before it down the stream to a deeper indifference to all positive revelation'⁴⁰. In the introduction to the volume *England and Christendom* he would add that this was the natural consequence of the national character of the Church of England. In a national church comprehensiveness takes the place of truth, and it necessarily has to do so if it is to preserve its character as a national church. Thus, 'the tendency of the Church of England to conform itself to the state of opinion among the English people, so as to reflect their subjective contradictions instead of witnessing to objective truths, has been

³⁸ *CSer*, I, p. 105.

³⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 105; see also *Grounds*, p. 78.

⁴⁰ *Ibidem*, pp. 141-142.

elevated to a test of its perfection'⁴¹: creeds were removed to make room for people. It had even been said that Christianity was not essential to a national church but only a blessed accident, a providential bonus⁴². As an Anglican, Manning had already noted with disquiet the theories being put forward in Germany claiming that the Christian Church in each country should be the spirit of the nation expressing itself through an organisation of its own. He felt that what in Germany was a philosophical doctrine had been long ago introduced in England on grounds of political expediency. Manning, though, did not despair of the eventual conversion of England to the Catholic faith. Ezekiel's vision of the Valley of the Dry Bones was before his eyes, and he felt that Providence might again draw good from evil, and make the global empire of the British People a vehicle for the expansion of the Catholic Faith⁴³.

3. *The Establishment: Nessus' Shirt?*

After the court decision on some of the authors of *Essays and Reviews* the old cry for disestablishment of the Anglican Church was raised anew: the ills of the Church of England, it was said, were consequent upon its condition as a Church by law established; remove the cause, and the patient would soon recover her former strength. Not many voices echoed this call. Still, Manning would have to answer the charge of not having distinguished, in his commentary on the court's decisions, between the Church and the Establishment.

That was a congenial theme for Manning, and one on which he had tried his hand before, while still an Anglican. As far as he was concerned, the court decisions on the authors of *Essays and Reviews* had once more revealed the internal contradiction that lay at the very heart of Anglicanism. In the Reformation the Anglican Church had declared herself independent of external jurisdiction, and self-sufficient for the preservation and declaration of doctrine, and for the determination of all controversies over matters of faith. While claiming this power, the Church of England had almost in

⁴¹ *E&C*, I, p. LXXXVII.

⁴² *Cfr. Ibidem*, p. XCI.

⁴³ *Cfr. CSer*, I, pp. 112-114 and 378ff; see also *CSer*, II, pp. 351ff.

the same breath denied being endowed with infallibility, confessing that particular churches were liable to error, and that they had in fact erred. It followed that, even if the Bishops or Convocation were to give a unanimous decision on a controverted point of doctrine, this could not be the basis for a human certainty and even less for a divine one. Convocation can only 'give a human judgment, even on a matter of revealed faith; and therefore it can generate in the minds of men only a fallible opinion'⁴⁴. Lord Brougham's speech against Bishop Blomfield's proposed law to amend the Appellate Jurisdiction of the Crown in matters of doctrine had made it abundantly clear that, in the eyes of the country as a whole, the decisions of the Bishops would have no weight and would carry no power of convincing. The position, Manning thought, was an untenable one, 'for the common sense of Englishmen would refuse to submit in appeal, on matters of faith, to the judgment of a bench of bishops, who disclaim infallibility, and are openly divided against themselves'⁴⁵.

The Parliamentary Statutes of the Tudors made it clear that the power to judge on appeal all causes of controverted doctrine belonged to the Crown: a judge which, like the Bishops, disclaimed infallibility. Even more, the Crown did not even claim to 'judge of the truth of the matter brought before it'⁴⁶. The Crown was 'invested with a power to admit or to exclude doctrines upon the exercise of its own *discernment*, all the while disclaiming the power to pronounce them to be *true*, and claiming only to pronounce them to be legal'⁴⁷. The judgment of the Crown confined itself to declaring whether a particular doctrine was in open contradiction to the Anglican formularies. But, Manning would say, the cause of the evils which afflicted Anglicanism was the Anglican Church itself, not the Crown or its Privy Council: 'If the Church of England were the Church of God, the tribunals could do it no harm. It is Anglicanism which *generates* the errors. The tribunals only *legalise* them. The Anglican system is the source of all its own confusions, which the law contemptuously tolerates'⁴⁸.

⁴⁴ *E&C*, III, p. 49.

⁴⁵ *E&C*, II, p. 12.

⁴⁶ *E&C*, III, p. 56.

⁴⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 44.

⁴⁸ *E&C*, II, pp. 28-29.

Those who looked at the Establishment as the cause of the Anglican Church's evils, and thought of disestablishment as the solution for its ills, were prey to a misconception. The Establishment was not Nessus' shirt for the Anglican Church; 'my belief', Manning wrote in 1864, 'is that when the Church of England lost its inheritance in the universal Church, the principle of all spiritual and intellectual disease was developed in its blood, and ate into its bone. I do not believe that it is a poisoned vestment which is put upon it from without, but a morbid and manifold disease which is ever reproducing itself from within'⁴⁹.

Anglicans readily acknowledged that 'Protestantism is essentially rationalistic, but deny that Anglicanism is Protestant'⁵⁰. Manning, on the other hand, maintained that they were intimately related, if not identical to each other: both appealed from the voice of the living Church; both alike rejected its divine infallible authority. It did not matter what they appealed to, the basis for that appeal was the same one: 'the refusal of the living voice of the Church as the rule of faith'⁵¹. If there was no infallible authority, the only criterion by which to interpret Holy Scripture - or Scripture and Tradition - was human reason, and the position was, therefore, essentially rationalistic: there is 'nothing intermediate between divine faith and human opinion'⁵². Human reason was to determine which books have been inspired and their interpretation: the 'ultimate certainty upon which it rests, even Scripture, its authenticity, interpretation, inspiration is a human, and therefore a fallible, tradition'⁵³. This was rationalism; this procedure could generate neither a human nor a divine certainty; it could not generate faith. A human authority 'can bind no man to believe in its decisions; for no man can be under obligation to make an act of faith in a teacher who may err'⁵⁴. The individual was left to the devices of his private judgment; he was 'free to revise all judgments of a teacher who disclaims infallibility'⁵⁵.

⁴⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 24.

⁵⁰ *E&C*, III, p. 50.

⁵¹ *Ibidem*, p. 51.

⁵² *Ibidem*, p. 53.

⁵³ *Ibidem*, p. 57.

⁵⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 59.

⁵⁵ *Ibidem*.

This, naturally, had momentous consequences as far as the act of faith was concerned. Following the above principles, the ‘distinction between reason and faith is thus obscured; and the generic difference between the last act of reason and the first act of faith, so far as my experience reaches, which is not now little or superficial, is effaced from the minds of most Anglicans’⁵⁶. What they called faith was a personal opinion based on reason or sentiment, or both. This erroneous concept of the act of faith made it very difficult for Anglicans to find the true faith, and it was a serious obstacle in their dialogue or controversy with Catholics. The terms they used were equivocal. The Catholic position, Manning summed up, was that reason ‘leads us to the feet of a Divine Teacher; but thenceforward His voice, and not our balancing of probabilities, will be the formal motive of our faith. (...) My faith terminates no longer in a cumulus of probabilities gathered from the past, but upon the veracity of a Divine Person guiding me with His presence’⁵⁷.

Rationalism was not an external agent working on the Church of England from the outside. The door to it had not been opened by the Civil Courts. It was a habit of thought which had conceived Anglicanism and all the dissenting bodies which had separated from it. ‘The Churchman differed from the Socinian, and the Socinian from the Deist as to the number of articles in his creed; but all alike consented to test their belief by the rational evidence for it’⁵⁸.

4. A Bulwark against Infidelity?

The publication of *Essays and Reviews* (1860) had signalled the beginning of a new crisis in Anglicanism, and the subsequent court decisions on the contributions of Williams and Wilson increased the atmosphere of gloom among those of the Catholic party in the Church of England. The highest ecclesiastical tribunal, excepting only the Queen in council, had pronounced in the cases of Williams and Wilson. Manning saw in the decision of the Court of Arches an official recognition of the legitimacy of

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 75.

⁵⁷ *Ibidem*, pp. 75-76.

⁵⁸ *E&C*, I, p. XXIII.

rationalism within the Anglican Church. His analysis concluded that the decision, 'though in some degree adverse to the liberty claimed by the Rationalists, nevertheless gives to that school a substantive existence, and incorporates its principles by public law in the system and rights of the Church of England'⁵⁹. In Manning's summary, the Court of Arches upheld the following principles: that the Church of England held as inspired and canonical the books of the Old and New Testaments, but it did not define what inspiration was; that the inspiration of parts of a particular book could be denied; that those parts which were considered inspired could be interpreted freely, provided the interpretation did not contradict the articles and formularies of the Church of England, which were vague and ambiguous enough 'to permit liberty and largeness of interpretation, of which everyone may avail himself as his conscience and critical faculty may require'⁶⁰. This, for Manning was pure rationalism: whatever was retained or rejected, was retained or rejected 'upon the principle of Rationalism, that is, of human testimony tried by the same criterion'⁶¹.

The judgment of the Court of Arches was raised in appeal to the Privy Council. The judgment was delivered on 8 February 1864. It went beyond the decision of the Court of Arches, 'it did open a large[r] area of biblical criticism and theological enquiry to free discussion among the clergy, and it rendered a large part of the conventional teaching of the Church unenforceable at law'⁶². The Anglo-Catholic party was not idle in the face of those events. Pusey's pamphlet on the legal force of the judgment of the Privy Council in Wilson's case (1864) was part of the reaction against the threat posed by the *Essays and Reviews*. In his pamphlet Pusey made some remarks which were to stir Manning into action. He described the reaction of the English Catholics before the recent events as follows: 'A class of believers joined in the triumph. And while I know that a very earnest body of Roman Catholics rejoice in all the workings of God the Holy Spirit in the Church of England, (whatever they think of her,) and are saddened in what weakens *her* who is, in God's Hands the great bulwark against infidelity in this

⁵⁹ *CSer*, I, p. 52.

⁶⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 53.

⁶¹ *Ibidem*, p. 54.

⁶² J.L. Altholz, *Anatomy of a Controversy: the Debate over Essays and Reviews, 1860-1864* (Aldershot, 1994), p. 109.

land, others seemed to be in ecstasy of triumph at this victory of Satan⁶³. It was generally believed that Manning was included among those who rejoice at Satan's victory. He had recently been accused of having changed from being slow, cautious and moderate before his conversion to being violent and unreasonable; from being over-English before to being now Ultramontane. Pusey was to disclaim later on, in his *Eirenicon*, that he had included Manning and Wiseman in that group; by then, after Manning's broadside in his *The Workings of the Holy Spirit in the Church of England*, they were already engaged in open polemic and more of the capital ships of both sides were about to join the action.

Manning felt that he could not leave unanswered Pusey's claim that the Church of England was a bulwark against infidelity. On the contrary, Manning thought that the Anglican Reformation and the Anglican Church were the 'true and original source of the present spiritual anarchy of England. (...) [The Church of England] so far from being a barrier against infidelity, must be recognised as the mother of all intellectual and spiritual aberrations which now cover the face of England'⁶⁴. He tried to substantiate this charge by applying those principles that were so dear to him. The Church of England, he would admit, could be called a 'barrier against infidelity' by grace of the truth that she retained; but she was, at the same time, a source of unbelief in the measure in which she denied other truths, and here he included not just particular doctrines but the very foundations of the faith. The Church of England propagated unbelief 'by principle, and in the essence of its whole system. What is the ultimate guarantee of the Divine revelation but the Divine authority of the Church? Deny this, and we descend at once to human teachers. But this is that the Church of England formally and expressly denies. The perpetual and ever-present assistance of the Holy Spirit, whereby the Church in every age is not only preserved from error, but enabled at all times to declare the truth, that is the infallibility of the living Church at this hour -this is that the Anglican Church in terms denies'⁶⁵.

⁶³ E.B. Pusey, *Case as to the legal force of the Judgment of the Privy Council in re Fendall v Wilson* (London, 1864), pp. 3-4.

⁶⁴ *Workings*, pp. 29-30.

⁶⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 34.

The true barrier against infidelity is the faith in the divine voice perpetually speaking in the Church, keeping the deposit of faith incorruptible, interpreting and propounding the revelation infallibly, resolving the controversies about the faith. Thus, it was becoming more and more evident ‘that in the flood of unbelief pouring at this time upon England, the sole barrier to the inundation, the sole guardian and keeper of Holy Writ in all the integrity of its text and meaning, (...) the sole, immutable, and unerring interpreter of its meaning is the Catholic and Roman Church’⁶⁶.

Manning did not regard the Church of England as a *teacher of truth*, ‘for that would imply that it teaches the truth in all its circumference, and in all its divine certainty. Now this is precisely what the Church of England does not, and (...) [it] has destroyed in itself the power of doing’⁶⁷, by rejecting the infallible authority of the Church. Manning was willing to call it ‘a teacher of Christian truths’, but not a teacher of Christian truth, ‘because it rejects much of that truth, and also the divine principle of its perpetuity in the world’⁶⁸. It had to be admitted that the Anglican Church had preserved and taught more truths than the German Protestants, but it undermined the evidence of the truths it still retained in a double way, because:

[a] ‘It has detached them from other truths which by contact gave solidity to all by rendering them coherent and intelligible’.

[b] ‘It has detached them from the Divine voice of the Church, which guarantees to us the truth incorruptible and changeless’⁶⁹. He concluded: ‘How can this be regarded as “the great bulwark in God’s hands against infidelity”?’⁷⁰

These were hard words, and harder things were still to follow. Manning had borne witness ‘to the presence and voice of a divine, and therefore infallible, teacher, guiding the Church with His perpetual assistance, and speaking through it as His organ’. He had also ‘borne witness that the Church through which He teaches is that which S.

⁶⁶ *TM*, p. 221.

⁶⁷ *Workings*, p. 21.

⁶⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 22.

⁶⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 30.

⁷⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 35.

Augustine describes by the two incommunicable notes - that is "spread throughout the world" and "united to the Chair of Peter"⁷¹. Manning was fully aware of the corollaries which follow from these premises: 'If the Catholic faith be the perfect revelation of Christianity, the Anglican Reformation is a cloud of heresies; if the Catholic Church be the organ of the Holy Ghost, the Anglican Church is not only no part of the Church, but no church of divine foundation. It is a human institution sustained as it was founded by a human authority, without priesthood, without sacraments, without absolution, without the real presence of Jesus upon its altars'⁷².

The fact that Manning recognised the workings of the Holy Spirit in the Church of England could not be of great consolation for men like Pusey. The Holy Spirit, Manning had added, was active in the whole world and among every nation even before the Church came into existence. He continued now His operations in individuals outside the Church, and His presence and action would necessarily be more abundant among those who have been regenerated by Baptism. Manning qualified this statement: 'What I have said does not recognise the grace *of* the Church of England as such'. Grace 'works not *by* it, nor *through* it, but *in* it and among those who, without faults of their own, are detained by it from the true Church of their baptism'⁷³.

He added that he did not rejoice, but lament, any further loss of truth in the Anglican Church. In his introduction to *England and Christendom* he would quote an old sermon of his published in the fourth volume of Anglican Sermons: 'Christ preached every way a cause for joy'. There he had affirmed that any light is better than darkness, and that in the least measure of truth there is cause for rejoicing. His belief was that anything which undermined the truths still taught by the Church of England drove the people further and further away from the Catholic Church. He did not look forward to the Anglican Church being swept away by a flood of infidelity. He desired to see the Church of England passing away 'under the action of a higher and more perfect truth', that would make the lingering embers in it rise into a burning flame. Then, all the Christianity 'which survives in Anglicanism would be perfected by the restoration of

⁷¹ *Ibidem*, pp. 41-42.

⁷² *Ibidem*.

⁷³ *Ibidem*, p. 20.

the truths which have been lost, and the whole would be fixed and perpetuated by the evidence of a Divine certainty and the voice of a Divine Teacher'⁷⁴. The mission of the Church in the world is not to destroy but 'to fill up the truth'⁷⁵.

Manning foresaw that his words would seem 'heartless, cruel, unfilial, unbrotherly, ungrateful' to Pusey. He had never spoken so strongly of the Church of England. It seems that when doing so he had in mind more than just Pusey's phrase, and that he was also addressing certain developments then taking place within the Catholic Church. Was he also making use of the opportunity to correct, without making explicit reference to them, some of Newman's expressions? Many people thought so, and Newman himself seems to have been of that opinion, although he expressed it rather cautiously, at least, publicly. Manning would later disclaim all intention of attacking Newman⁷⁶; Newman, on his part, declared that he had never made his own what the rumour said. None of them seem to have truly believed the other's disclaimer. What is a fact, however, is that Manning used several times in his text the word 'barrier', Newman's word, instead of 'bulkward', the word used by Pusey⁷⁷.

5. An 'Eirenicon' and the A.P.U.C.

Manning's judgment of the Church of England could not but draw a response from Pusey; he had denied to the Anglican Church everything the latter felt it stood for. Pusey wrote to Newman expressing how hurt he was by Manning's letter: he has 'denied us every thing, except what in a greater degree Dissenters had too...'⁷⁸. He seemed to have forgotten, though, that Newman had said as much in his *Difficulties of Anglicans* (1850): 'If I let you plead the sensible effects of supernatural grace, as exemplified in yourselves, in proof that your religion is true, I must allow the plea to others [i.e.: Wesleyans] to whom by your theory you are bound to deny it. (...) Have

⁷⁴ *Ibidem*, pp. 28-29.

⁷⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 24.

⁷⁶ Cfr. Letter to Ullathorne (5-VIII-67), *Manning Mss. West.*, Manning-Ullathorne Correspondence, U 78.

⁷⁷ Cfr. *Workings*, pp. 30, 33, 34-35.

⁷⁸ *LD*, XXII, p. 99.

they not more remarkable phenomena in their history, symptomatic of the presence of grace among them, than you can show in yours?'⁷⁹ The comparison with the Dissenters was not a new one, and the High Church party in the Church of England had contrived to answer it many a time. In his *Eirenicon*, Pusey would move along well-trodden paths.

Manning's charges against the Anglican Church, Pusey thought, could be grouped together under two headings: a) the errors of the Anglican Church; b) the rejection of the infallibility of the Church. He counterattacked by saying that the Catholic Church itself was not free from error - devotion to our Lady being a conspicuous example; indeed, the Anglican Reformation had been a protest against such abuses. Manning's fundamental charge, though, was that the Church of England had rejected the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Church. Pusey did address it in detail, and made use of Ward's articles in the *Dublin Review* to rebut the charge and turn it against the Catholic Church. 'The last charge which Dr. Manning brings against the Church of England', Pusey wrote, 'is that "it formally denies" the "perpetual Divine voice" of the Church'⁸⁰. He rightly pointed out that the main stress in Manning's words was laid on the term 'perpetual'. Pusey claimed that the Anglican Church did not deny the infallibility of the Church, in the past or at the present time. Manning's mistake, according to him, originated in a false assumption: 'that, in denying the infallibility of the Roman Church by itself, we are "denying the infallibility of the living Church at this hour"; because, on his hypothesis, the Roman Church is, alone, the living Church, to the exclusion of the Eastern Church and of ourselves'⁸¹.

The Church of England, Pusey claimed, was in possession of infallible truth and accepted the infallibility of the Church of all times. She had infallible truth resting on an infallible authority, that of the Primitive Church, and, he added, 'we do not need the present agency of an infallible Church to assure us of the truth of what has been ruled

⁷⁹ J.H. Newman, *Certain Difficulties felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching*, new ed. (London, 1897), vol. I, p. 88.

⁸⁰ E.B. Pusey, *An Eirenicon, In a Letter to the Author of 'The Christian Year'* (London, 1865), p. 82.

⁸¹ *Ibidem*, pp. 83-84.

infallibly'⁸². Besides, the Church of England not only accepted that the Church had been infallible in the past, but also that it would be infallible now if it were to be united and act in unison. The Holy Spirit still speaks in the Church when its three branches 'teach the same faith which was from the beginning (...); and if need required, they could at this day declare concurrently any truth, if it should appear that it had not, as yet, been sufficiently defined, against some fresh heresy which should emerge'⁸³. The 'whole' Catholic Church had not collectively sanctioned error, and what it had or might collectively sanction in the future would be certain truth: a truly General Council would now be as infallible as those of the Primitive Church. This, Pusey felt, was the theory of the Gallican divines, which sets the test of infallibility in the reception of a particular doctrine by the whole Church. To Pusey's mind, the main difference between him and Manning was that the latter identified the Church with the 'Roman Church', while Pusey saw it in the union or concurrent action of its three constitutive branches: the Anglican, the Roman and the Orthodox.

On the other hand, Pusey added, the infallibility of the Pope - the cornerstone of Manning's argument - was not accepted by the whole Church, not even by all 'Roman Catholics': the Orthodox and the Anglicans rejected it, and so did the Gallicans within the Roman Church. What was more, it had never been declared a dogma of faith. Were the Roman Church to do so in future, it would find itself enmeshed in a web of inextricable difficulties. The *Dublin Review* was claiming for the Pope an infallibility which covered the *Syllabus* and *Quanta Cura*, and 'consequently, for every like expression of the Pope's mind, to be *the very word of God*'⁸⁴. Thus, it would have 'to be shown how any statement of any Pope which has since been abandoned, is consistent with such infallibility'⁸⁵.

There were fundamental issues involved in the controversy. The main argument was concerned with the concept of the unity of the Church and what constituted it. Ironically, Pusey, in his *Eirenicon*, had repeated, almost verbatim, the ideas about unity

⁸² *Ibidem*, p. 96.

⁸³ *Ibidem*, p. 84.

⁸⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 304.

⁸⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 305.

and infallibility which Manning had published in *The Unity of the Church* (1842), and which he would formally retract in *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost* (1865).

Manning - who, in the meantime, had been made Archbishop of Westminster - did not answer Pusey's *Eirenicon* directly. He thought that it had been written at Keble's instance, and in order to prevent people from entering the Catholic Church. To Manning's mind, Pusey had confirmed the contention put forward in *The Workings of the Holy Spirit in the Church of England*. There Manning had claimed 'that the Anglican Church appeals from the living voice of the Church at this hour, thereby denying its Divine authority'; he felt that Dr. Pusey in the *Eirenicon* had done precisely that, 'thereby confirming the argument of my Letter'⁸⁶. Still, the points raised by Pusey would be taken into consideration in his subsequent works. *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost*, published that same year, addressed some of the issues; others were to be tackled in his Pastoral on the A.P.U.C.

In *The Temporal Mission* he dismissed Pusey's appeal to antiquity, to the infallible Primitive Church. Anglicans maintained, Manning said, 'that the only certain rule of faith is to believe that which the Church held and taught while yet it was united and therefore infallible. Such reasoners fail to observe, that since the supposed division, and cessation of the infallible voice, there remains no divine certainty as to what was then infallibly taught. To affirm that this or that doctrine was taught then where it is now disputed, is to beg the question. The infallible Church of the first six centuries - that is before the division - was infallible to those who lived in those ages, but is not infallible to us. (...) Its infallibility does not reach to us, for the Church of the last twelve hundred years is by the hypothesis fallible, and may therefore err in delivering to us what was taught before the division'⁸⁷. For Manning, once the existence of a permanent divine doctrinal authority had been denied, then the points of faith decided by the General Councils while the Church was still united were no longer safe. 'There needs only an individual of sufficient intelligence and sufficient influence' - he had written in *The Grounds of Faith* - 'to rise up and call them in question. If the interpretation of the decrees of the Councils of Nice or Ephesus be disputed, an

⁸⁶ *E&C*, I, p. XIV.

⁸⁷ *TM*, pp. 78-79.

authoritative exposition of these ancient definitions is required. But this cannot be obtained unless there still sit on earth a judge to decide the law⁸⁸.

That, however, was accidental. The main point of contention was the concept of the Church's unity. Pusey acknowledged the infallibility of the present-day Church almost as much as Manning did. The all-important difference consisted in their divergent concepts of what the Church is and, therefore, of what constitutes its unity. Manning's concept of the Church, as we have seen, rested on the perpetual and inseparable union of the Holy Spirit to it, and the consequent perpetual endowments of unity (intrinsic and visible at the same time), of holiness and of infallibility. Pusey's idea of the *Ecclesia Anglicana* rested on the acceptance of an externally divided Church which, at the same time, had preserved its essential unity. The Universal Church was still infallible, although its infallibility was suspended in so far as the Church was prevented from acting in unison by the divisions which had broken its visible unity.

Manning was to dwell on the concept of unity in his Pastoral *The Reunion of Christendom* (6 January 1856), and in doing so was to address together the issues raised by Pusey and the A.P.U.C. He saw them sharing the same basic error on a fundamental point of faith, and he felt the need to act on the matter promptly and clearly. Manning considered that vital principles for the Church were at stake. As he had written in 1852: 'The unity and infallibility of the Church of Jesus Christ, these are our principles and these shall be our safety'⁸⁹. These principles were now openly attacked by Pusey, and, at the same time, they seemed to be obscured in the minds of many of those Catholics who had given their names to the A.P.U.C.

The *Association for Promotion of the Unity of Christendom*, heir to previous initiatives for corporate reunion, had grown out of the enthusiasm and sanguine hopes of Ambrose Lisle Phillipps. In his letters to Propaganda he gave the impression that the number of those Anglicans committed to the scheme of reunion was much larger - and their determination to seek reunion with Rome stronger - than they actually were. Those who had set up the Association declared that they looked forward to a corporate reunion of

⁸⁸ *Grounds*, p. 70.

⁸⁹ *CSer*, I, p. 194.

those three great bodies which claim for themselves the inheritance of the priesthood and the name of Catholic. They claimed that they did not want, at that stage, to compromise any principles that those separate bodies might uphold; their only aim was to pray for unity.

The Catholic Hierarchy, from very early on, looked with suspicion on the initiative. In 1857, within a year of the setting up of the Association, Cardinal Wiseman wrote a strong Memorandum to Propaganda about the A.P.U.C. In it he referred at length to the unfounded hopes or 'dreams' of Mr. Ambrose Lisle Phillipps. The Cardinal also mentioned that the tone of Lisle Phillipps's expressions 'tend to strengthen the Anglicans in their intrenchments, and to make them more confident of the validity of their orders, and to encourage them to look for the conversion of the whole body, rather than for that of individuals'⁹⁰. Wiseman had carefully read Phillipps's *On the future Unity of Christendom*, and he objected to the way in which he spoke of "the three great denominations" (the term itself is Protestant) "of Christians", i.e. "Catholics, Greek, and Anglicans," as though they were all equal, and could treat of religious union upon a footing of equality'⁹¹. The unionists, he added, had tried to obtain his support and pretended that Wiseman held similar views to those of the Association; he, for his part, had made every effort to dissociate himself from their principles in the strongest possible terms, telling Lisle Phillipps - as he reported to Propaganda - that he 'had always been far from allowing the slightest prerogative to the "Church" (as it professes to be) of England, whether in the matter of orders, of missions, of sacraments, or of instruction in doctrine; that, on the contrary, he had impugned all right, on the part of Anglicanism, to the name of church; and that he had warmly, and not ineffectually, invited each one singly to save his own soul by leaving a system of falsehood and error'⁹².

⁹⁰ Quoted in W. Ward, *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman* (new ed., London, 1912), vol II, p. 483.

⁹¹ *Ibidem*, p. 485. Lisle Phillipps was aware of Wiseman's opposition to the A.P.U.C. and to his pamphlet; see letter to Lee (4-IX-57), quoted in M. Pawley, *Faith and Family. The Life and Circle of Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle* (Norwich, 1993), p. 299. *The Rambler* and the *Dublin Review* were also highly critical of Phillipps's pamphlet.

⁹² *Ibidem*, pp. 483-484.

No action was taken about discouraging Catholics from joining the Association, and, one year after its formation, it counted a thousand Catholics among its membership of seven thousand. The majority of members of the Association, though, belonged to the Anglo-Catholic party, and they became the dominant influence within it. Wiseman had promised Propaganda to keep an attentive eye over its doings, and to act if that were to be required. The need for action presented itself to the bishops after the foundation of the *Union Review* by Lee to succeed the *Union Newspaper*. The latter, until then the organ of the Association, had, by its advocacy of 'Romish' practices, alienated many moderate High Churchmen. The newly born *Union Review*, as a reaction, 'was anxious to adopt a measured and cautious tone, but in developing this approach to assuage Anglican susceptibilities it succeeded in offending Roman Catholics by a sustained antagonism to individual conversions and bitter attacks upon well-known converts'⁹³. The Review, willingly or unwillingly, was 'encouraging disharmony among the body of Roman Catholics, setting "old Catholic" against convert'. What galvanized the bishops into action, though, was its decided advocacy of the Branch Theory: 'ample evidence could be culled from it [the Review] of the views of leading members of the Association to give weight to the papal rescript when it declared that the Association "has resulted from a view put forward by it in express terms, that the three Christian Communion, the Roman Catholic, the schismatic Greek and the Anglican, though separated and divided one from another, yet with an equal right claim the title Catholic"⁹⁴. Not all the members of the Association held those views, but most of them did, and there was a danger of scandal, as it could be presumed that the Catholic members partook of those ideas.

The Catholic Bishops commissioned Bishop Ullathorne to write to Propaganda to denounce the Association and its principles, which he duly did on 26 April 1864; he also sent some issues of the *Union Review*, to illustrate the case. The Holy Office's answer - dated 16 September 1864 - came as a cold shower to the members of the Association: it condemned the Branch Theory, implicit in the declaration of the A.P.U.C., as 'a heresy overthrowing the nature of unity, and the Divine Constitution

⁹³ V.A. McClelland, 'Corporate Reunion: A Nineteenth-Century Dilemma', in *Theological Studies*, March 1982, p. 25.

⁹⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 27.

of the Church'⁹⁵; consequently, it added, it would be unlawful for a Catholic to join the Association, 'in as much as it is an implicit adhesion to heresy, and to an intention stained with heresy'⁹⁶.

The blame for the A.P.U.C.'s condemnation was laid by general opinion at Manning's door. This was to be a lasting tradition. Wiseman tried to set the record straight, and he wrote to a correspondent: 'it is not true that the recent letter of the Holy Office has been obtained by representations made by Mgr. Manning'⁹⁷. Ullathorne himself tried to dispel this false opinion in his Pastoral on the A.P.U.C. question, but the charge against Manning lingered on. Dr. Littledale would affirm that the Rescript against the A.P.U.C. had been issued in consequence of a petition in which Dr. Manning was the main mover; that, to his mind, disqualified it, 'since the name of so accomplished a master of the art of suppression and misstatement is almost enough of itself to demolish any rescript based upon his presentation'. He acknowledged that Ullathorne had denied this to be the case. That went to show, Littledale would say, Manning's astuteness: he had misled Cardinal Patrizi, and had also been 'effectual in concealing his own workings from Bishop Ullathorne'⁹⁸. That Manning was not sympathetic to the Association is beyond doubt, but, although there are some references in his letters to Propaganda about the A.P.U.C., they are for the most of a passing nature and could have had little influence in Propaganda's response.

The disappointment of members of the Association was great, and they felt themselves gravely misunderstood. An 'Address', signed by 198 Anglican clergymen, was sent in the summer of 1865 to Cardinal Patrizi trying to clarify those points which they considered the Holy Office had misinterpreted. The essential point they made concerned the question of the three branches, or communions. They clarified that when they had previously said that Anglicans, Orthodox and Roman Catholics had an equal claim to

⁹⁵ *APUC*, p. 6.

⁹⁶ *Ibidem*.

⁹⁷ Letter dated 26-XI-64, quoted in W. Ward, *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman*, II, p. 491.

⁹⁸ Quoted in W.B. Ullathorne, *The Anglican Theory of Union as maintained in the Appeal to Rome and Dr. Pusey's "Eirenicon", A second letter* (London, n.d.), p. 5. Recent studies have shown the unfounded nature of Littledale's allegations, see for example E.B. Stuart, *Roman Catholic Reactions to the Oxford Movement and Anglican schemes for Reunion, from 1833 to the condemnation of Anglican Orders in 1896*, DPhil Thesis (Oxford, 1987); see also M. Pawley, *op. cit.*, p. 298 and specially p. 311.

call themselves Catholic they were treating of the question of *fact*, not of *right*.

The new Archbishop-elect was asked by Rome for his comments on the address, and he was not slow in sending them. The Association had been '*in no sense misunderstood*'. Their answer clearly manifested their mind: 'They say that they do not believe that there are three Churches *de jure*, but only *de facto*. But this denies (1) the exclusive unity of the Catholic and Roman Church, and (2) its exclusive infallibility, and (3) the universal duty and necessity of submission to it. These three points they do not hold. They hold that the three are all alike *de facto* Churches. (...) Under the disguise of this theory lies hid the old assumption of the *divisibility* [breach of the visible unity] of the Church, and its consequent loss of *perfection* only. And this assumes also the suspension of infallibility, and, therefore, of the perpetual Divine assistance of the Holy Spirit'⁹⁹.

Manning's letter, and consequent visit to Rome, had considerable influence in shaping the answer of the Congregation of the Holy Office to the letter of the 198 Anglican clergyman. He felt the urgent need for an authoritative declaration. The 'unionists', he wrote to Ullathorne, claimed the support of the Bishops, and many Catholics were being deceived. He considered that the way to clarify those misunderstandings would be for each bishop to publish individually the forthcoming document from Rome, and to show their personal sentiments. 'For my part', he added, 'I am ready to come out more strongly than ever'¹⁰⁰.

The letter of the Congregation, dated 8 November 1865, was handed first to the representatives of the Anglican clergymen who had written to Cardinal Patrizi. Talbot sent a copy to Manning as soon as he possibly could. In the accompanying letter he told Manning: 'I think that you will admire it. It contains all your ideas on the subject, as they made your instructions their rule'¹⁰¹. Manning, however, was not entirely satisfied with the Congregation's reply. He felt that the letter was 'very solid and

⁹⁹ Letter to Talbot (18-VII-65); *P*, II, p. 281.

¹⁰⁰ *Manning Mss. West.*, Manning-Ullathorne Cor., U 34; letter dated 25-VIII-65.

¹⁰¹ Talbot to Manning (1-XII-65); *P*, II, p. 284.

dignified, as far as it goes'. Still, he had hoped for more, 'but it will do'¹⁰². To make it really do Manning published the letters from Rome with a long commentary, where he developed at great length the points made in them. He prefaced his remarks with a summary of the events which had led to the exchange of letters, and then summarized the answer of the Holy Office for the benefit of his flock:

'1. That the unity of the Church is absolute and indivisible, and that the Church had never lost its unity, not for so much as a moment of time ever can. (...) There is, therefore, both *de jure* and *de facto*, only one Church, one by a numerical and exclusive unity.

2. That the Church of Christ is indefectible, not only in duration, but in doctrine, or in other words, that it is infallible, which is a Divine endowment bestowed upon it by its Head; and that the infallibility of the Church is a dogma of faith. (...)

3. That the Primacy of the Visible Head is of Divine institution, and was ordained to generate and to preserve the unity both of faith and of communion, that is, both internal and external, of which the See of Peter is the centre and the bond.

4. That therefore the Catholic and Roman Church alone has received the name of Catholic. (...)

5. That no one can give to any other body the name of Catholic without incurring manifest heresy (...).

6. That whosoever is separated from the one and only Catholic Church, however well he may believe himself to live, by the one sin of separation from the unity of Christ, is in the state of wrath.

7. That every several soul under pain of losing eternal life, is bound to enter the only Church of Christ, out of which is neither absolution nor entrance into the kingdom of heaven'¹⁰³.

It is difficult to see what else Manning could have expected from the Congregation: the letter dwelt clearly with those topics - unity and infallibility - which he felt were threatened. He prepared his Pastoral, and sent the draft to some people asking for their opinion. Ullathorne thought that some things in it were sharp, but Grant did not think

¹⁰² Manning to Talbot (11-XII-65); *P*, II, p. 284.

¹⁰³ *APUC*, pp. 8-10.

them so. Manning did not want to sound sharp and, following Ullathorne's advice, corrected some points in it. His efforts were not totally successful; many thought that it did mark a change of tone, harsher now, from previous utterances on the subject.

The fundamental difference involved in the exchange of letters between the Association and Propaganda or the Holy Office, as with the controversy between Pusey and Manning, was about the concept of unity of the Church. Manning's Pastoral on the A.P.U.C. was considered generally as aimed against Pusey's *Eirenicon*; bringing the two together, under one theological umbrella, has been controversial ever since. The Association felt itself misrepresented by Rome, claiming that it did not have a proper doctrine on unity, and that it did not identify itself with the articles published in its organ; they represented the opinions of the individual writers. It has been said recently that Pusey 'had no links with the A.P.U.C. and the A.P.U.C. had no theology of the Church'¹⁰⁴. How did they become associated? For some, the cause would be purely accidental: the publication of the *Eirenicon* so soon after the condemnation of the A.P.U.C. would explain why the two were seen as closely related. 'They both suffered from being linked with one another. The A.P.U.C. was seen as essentially Anglican and only conceiving of a reunion based on the Branch Theory; the *Eirenicon* was mentally fixed under "unionist" and therefore trying to prevent individual conversions'¹⁰⁵. That Pusey and the almost totality of the Anglican members of A.P.U.C. supported the Branch Theory is beyond dispute. On the other hand, the profession by the A.P.U.C. that they had no theology of the Church did clash with the public perception of the Association; based on the uniform character of the utterances of the *Union Review*. Besides, its official language in dealing with Rome has been charged with 'incompetence (or deliberate ambiguity)' even by those who accuse Rome of harshness in its dealings with the A.P.U.C.¹⁰⁶. This ambiguity, which people like Lisle Phillipps did little to clarify, more than justified the way in which Rome and the English Catholic Bishops had acted. Pusey and the Association were dealt with together by Manning, not because Manning considered Pusey an 'unionist' in the strict sense of the word, although he wrote with ideas of reunion in mind, but because he saw both

¹⁰⁴ A.B. Stuart, *op. cit.*, p. 186.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibidem*.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 170.

as sharing the same fundamental error about the nature of the Church. It is safe to say that Manning's main concern, and also Propaganda's, was not what Pusey and the Anglican members of A.P.U.C. might think about the unity of the Church, but how far the existing ambiguity could go to confuse the issue in Catholic minds.

For Manning, unity could only take place in truth. 'We are ready', he wrote in his Pastoral, 'to purchase the reunion of our separated brethren at any cost less than the sacrifice of a jot or a tittle of the supernatural order of unity and faith'¹⁰⁷. Agreement in truth should always precede unity, and the signatories of the letter to Cardinal Patrizi could probably have underwritten that statement. 'Truth alone generates unity. It was the dogma of faith which united the intellects of men as one intelligence. (...) From this unity of intellects has sprung the unity of wills'¹⁰⁸. But truth could not be found 'till we have submitted ourselves to a teacher who cannot err'. The only infallible teacher is God Himself, and unity was to be achieved 'by surrendering reason and will to His divine voice, teaching through His only Church. We must be taught by God before we can be at peace with one another'¹⁰⁹. The unity of the Church is created 'by the submission of all wills to one Divine Teacher through the pastors of the Church, specially the one who is supreme on earth'¹¹⁰. Thus, there could be no unity which did not accept this fundamental truth of faith: 'We can offer unity only on the condition on which we hold it - unconditional submission to the living and perpetual voice of the Church of God. If this be refused, it is not we who hinder unity. For it is not we who impose this condition, but the Spirit of Truth who abides in the Church for ever'¹¹¹. The visible unity of the Church was the 'landmark which God has set up to bound the Fold of Salvation (...). They who teach that the Anglican separation and the Greek schism are parts of the Catholic Church violate a dogma of faith'¹¹². This was a truth that Christians are as bound to believe as that of Baptismal Regeneration.

¹⁰⁷ *APUC*, pp. 16-17.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibidem*, pp. 23-24.

¹⁰⁹ *CSer*, II, pp. 238-239.

¹¹⁰ *APUC*, p. 24.

¹¹¹ *Ibidem*, p. 17.

¹¹² *Ibidem*, p. 26.

Pusey had looked to Gallicanism for support in the question of infallibility. On Gallican principles, the reception by the whole Church was the guarantee of the infallibility of a doctrine. Gallicanism in fact, Manning would argue, offered little support for Pusey's contention. Bossuet, and Gallicans as a whole, maintained the idea of the visible unity of the Church. Manning would quote Bossuet's words about the Catholicity of the Council of Trent: it was a true Council, 'as it is certain that it is received and approved in that respect by the whole body of the Churches which are united in communion with that of Rome'¹¹³. Bossuet might have thought that the infallibility of the Pope could be denied, but he accepted the unity and infallibility of the Catholic Church united to the Roman Pontiff. Thus, Manning concluded, Anglicanism stood condemned not only by Ultramontane principles, but also by Gallican ones.

Manning admitted that some Anglicans were ready to accept the decrees of the Council of Trent, but that was not enough for reunion, as they would accept the decrees according to their own interpretation. 'To profess a readiness to accept the Council of Trent, if it be interpreted according to our opinion, is not to subject ourselves to the authority of the Council, but to subject it to our own judgment'¹¹⁴. That was equivalent to receive the Council upon the principle of private judgment. This procedure 'would make no man a Catholic. To receive the Council of Trent only because we critically believe its decrees to be true, and not only because its decrees are infallible, is private judgment'. And, Manning added, in that case we 'should not be submitting to them, but approving them. The formal motive of our approval would be not the divine authority of the Council, but the judgment of our private spirit'¹¹⁵. The A.P.U.C. and Pusey occupied the same ground. 'If a man were to hold the whole Catholic Theology and the decrees of the eighteen General Councils on the principle of the *Eirenicon*, he would not be a Catholic. He would be as true a Protestant as Luther or Calvin. It is not the believing of isolated doctrines, but the act of Divine Faith, terminating in its formal motive, the veracity of God through the living voice of the

¹¹³ *Ibidem*, p. 32.

¹¹⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 39.

¹¹⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 41.

Church, that makes us Catholic Christians'¹¹⁶. 'The Anglican system, - including its most advanced developments of Anglo-Catholicism, Unionism, Ritualism, - rests upon one and the same basis; and the period which commenced with 1830 and the *Tracts for the Times*, diverse as its phenomena may be, is nevertheless in principle, in procedure, and in result, as purely and simply rationalistic as the period from 1688 down to that date'¹¹⁷. Ritualism, to single one out, was just 'private judgment in gorgeous raiment'¹¹⁸. Pusey, Manning claimed, had not answered his argument, he had merely confirmed it, and he added: 'every *Eirenicon* against the Catholic Church is a fresh reinforcement to the Rationalism in England'¹¹⁹.

Pusey had also charged Manning with wanting to impose on Anglicans, as a truth of necessary belief, the infallibility of the Pope, when it had never been defined as a dogma of faith, and when even Catholics, like the Gallican Church, denied it. This was a point which Manning felt very deeply, and it was a charge constantly repeated by Anglicans. He acknowledged the fact, but he countered the argument by telling the faithful of his diocese: 'it must be always borne in mind, and explicitly declared to our flocks, that the infallibility of the Pope, speaking *ex cathedra*, is an opinion protected by the highest authority'¹²⁰, and it would be temerity - as Alexander VIII had declared - to oppose it. It was an opinion which had been considered *proxima fide* by the most renowned theologians.

Reunion was not just a question of believing a bit more or a bit less of dogma. It implied a fundamental choice between a divine faith and rationalism. 'Unionism is outwardly a reaction against latitudinarianism; inwardly it promotes it. There can be but two principles and two tendencies: the one, divine faith (...); the other, of human criticism, disguise it as you may in texts of Scripture, or in patristic learning, or in sceptical history, or rationalistic interpretation, the tendency of which is always to

¹¹⁶ *E&C*, I, pp. LXXXII-LXXXIII. In his speech to the Vatican Council (25-V-70), Manning will affirm that belief in the infallibility of the Church is the only adequate motive for conversion to the Catholic faith (cfr. *M*, 52, col. 258A).

¹¹⁷ *Ibidem*, pp. LI-LII.

¹¹⁸ *Ibidem*, p. LXXXIII.

¹¹⁹ *Ibidem*, p. LIII.

¹²⁰ *APUC*, p. 44.

wider formulas and diminished truth, to comprehension of communion, and loss of faith'¹²¹.

There was no point in talking about the 'essentials' of the faith. What are essentials? Who has the power to determine what is essential and what is not? By whose judgment are we to ascertain it? 'I had thought', Manning would say in answer, 'that the word "essentials" had long ago departed with "fundamentals", into the limbus of infantine theology'¹²². For those who accepted the principle of infallibility there was no question of a little more or a little less of dogma; implicit in their faith on the infallibility of the Church was the belief in everything that the Church had defined as revealed or might define in the future as belonging to the deposit of revelation: 'The Church knows only one essential truth, and that is, the whole revelation of God'¹²³. For those who did not accept the principle of infallibility, there was no question of more or less. They did not have faith, only an opinion based on private judgment. In any case, Manning would add, the 'circle of essentials [in the Anglican Church] has so short a radius, that it is difficult to enclose in it any perfect Christian truth'¹²⁴. Manning put it very simply in a letter to Ullathorne: 'I am very glad you have written about Dr. Pusey's Book. What you say is most true. It shows a simple unbelief in the two articles of the Creed, - the Holy Ghost and the Church. I am surprised and sorry that men should fail to appreciate this. (...) I see Dr. Pusey is again writing in answer to me about "*explanations*" [i.e.: of terms and concepts used]. What can explanations do for a man who does not believe the Voice of the Explainer to be divine? He may agree with the explanations, but that is not faith. Can Dr. Pusey be really so blind?'¹²⁵

Pusey and the 'unionists' were men of great zeal. They had struggled hard to preserve and recover Catholic principles; it was a gallant effort, but they were building on sand.

¹²¹ *Ibidem*, pp. 66-67.

¹²² *E&C*, I, p. LXIV.

¹²³ *Grounds*, p. 25.

¹²⁴ *E&C*, I, p. LXV.

¹²⁵ *Manning Mss. West.*, Manning-Ullathorne Cor., U 40; letter dated 15-III-66.

CHAPTER VI

CONFLICTS AT HOME

1. The spirit of 'The Rambler' and 'The Home and Foreign'

Manning, while dealing with Pusey's remarks and the A.P.U.C. question, had an eye on developments within the Catholic Church which deeply worried him. He had, for some time, been concerned about the growth among Catholics of a school of thought which, if successful, would introduce in the Church the evils afflicting Anglicanism. Manning had openly expressed his fears in a letter to Ullathorne dated New Year's Day, 1863: 'I am very glad you are following up the *Rambler*. The whole system of opinion both Philosophical and Theological seem to me false and highly dangerous. You are of course aware that the independence of revelation claimed for society and science is a new reproduction of a Tübingen theory. In these last months I have had constant evidence of the progress of rationalism and absolute unbelief not only out of the Church but among Catholics: and I believe we have a storm coming which will try the faith of many. What has ravaged Germany will pass over England, with modified results perhaps, but with extensive loss of faith'¹. The clouds of that storm, which had been gathering in Germany for some time, had already started to appear over the intellectual horizon of English Catholicism.

The new problems arising from scientific discoveries, and the progress and rigour of historical studies, had prompted some German Catholic scholars to search for a theological method able to meet the new challenges; the old speculative theology was deemed wholly inadequate for that purpose. The new method, they argued, should be

¹ *Manning Mss. West.*, Manning-Ullathorne Cor., U 8. Manning had previously encouraged Wiseman to act against *The Rambler* (cfr. J. Altholz, *The Liberal Catholic Movement in England* (London, 1962), p. 39.

modelled on that of the positive sciences, while not losing sight of the supernatural character of revelation, i.e.: that access to revealed truth can only be gained through revelation. In the final analysis, it was history's role to determine the content of the revelation, which it was to glean from the historical records which contained it. That was the main thesis of the German Catholic theological school which had its recognised centre around Döllinger, in Munich. It was being translated into English in the pages of *The Rambler* and, subsequently, in those of *The Home and Foreign Review*; Acton acted as moderator and main mouthpiece of this school of thought and he explicitly described its principles on more than one occasion.

Its sympathizers were men inspired with a reverential respect for the new scientific methods, which, in their view, preserved science from any contamination by prejudice or party spirit. Thus, 'learning ceased to be hostile to Christianity when it ceased to be pursued as an instrument of controversy - when facts came to be acknowledged, no longer because they were useful, but simply because they were true'². Religion had nothing to fear from science: the scientific method guaranteed the certainty of the truths reached by it, and truth could not be an enemy of faith. Acton had very much at heart the desire to disarm two widespread prejudices, which he described in a letter to Newman in July 1861: 'I cannot bear that Protestants should say the Church cannot be reconciled with the truths or precepts of science, or that Catholics should fear the legitimate and natural progress of the scientific spirit. These two errors seem to be almost identical, and if one is more dangerous than the other, I think it is the last. So it comes more naturally to me to be zealous against the Catholic mistake than against the Protestant. But the weapon against both is the same, the encouragement of the true scientific spirit, and disinterested love of truth'³. According to Acton, an incompatibility between science and faith could only arise in the minds of those 'who had not learned to distinguish what is divine from what is human - defined dogma from the atmosphere of opinion which surrounds it, - and who honour both with the same awful reverence'⁴. The men of *The Rambler* or *The Home and Foreign* were not

² J.E. Acton, 'Cardinal Wiseman and the Home and Foreign Review' (*Home and Foreign Review*, 1862), in *The History of Freedom and other Essays*, J.Figgis and R. Laurence (eds.) (London, 1909), p. 453.

³ *LD*, XX, p. 6.

⁴ J.E. Acton, 'Cardinal Wiseman and the Home and Foreign Review', p. 458.

afflicted by that particular complaint. One of the essential principles of both reviews was the clear recognition 'first, of the infinite gulf which in theology separates what is of faith from what is not of faith, - revealed dogmas from opinions unconnected with them by logical necessity, and therefore incapable of anything higher than a natural certainty - and next of the practical difference which exists in ecclesiastical discipline between the acts of infallible authority and those which possess no higher sanction than that of canonical legality. That which is not decided with dogmatic infallibility is for the time susceptible only of scientific determination, which advances with the progress of science, and becomes absolute only where science has attained its final results'⁵.

Acton clearly affirmed that God's revelation is made up of truths and facts which although 'absolute and objective in themselves, are not and cannot be known to us except through revelation, of which the Church is the organ'⁶. The philosopher could not contradict them without going outside the sphere of his competence. History, though, had a different relationship to revelation. The latter is an historical fact which can be gathered from historical sources. 'God's handwriting', Acton would say, 'exists in history independently of the Church, and no ecclesiastical exigence can alter a fact. The divine lesson has been read, and it is the historian's duty to copy it faithfully without bias and without ulterior views'⁷. Only the historian, who had deeply studied and practised the historical method, would be in a position to sift truth from error, gathering it by historical research.

Some felt, not without foundation, that the new school aimed at substituting history for theology, and that in it there was little room for the magisterium of the Church. Nothing below an infallible pronouncement had more weight or authority than the acquirements of the individual or individuals putting it forward, were they the Congregation of the Index or the Pope himself. It went without saying how little regard the school of Döllinger and Acton had for scholastic theology, on which most of the utterances of the Roman Pontiffs and the Roman Congregations were founded. The

⁵ J.E. Acton, 'Conflicts with Rome' (*Home and Foreign Review*, April 1864), in *The History of Freedom*, p. 484.

⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 473.

⁷ *Ibidem*.

Germans, in Acton's own words, had 'ceased to regard them as equals, or as scientific divines at all. Without impeaching their orthodoxy, they learned to look on them as men incapable of understanding and mastering the ideas of a literature so very remote from their own, and to attach no more value to the unreasoned decrees of their organ [the Holy Office] than to the undefended *ipse dixit* of a theologian of secondary rank'⁸.

While particular questions - such as education and the temporal power of the Pope - may have been the occasion of the frequent clashes of *The Rambler* and *The Home and Foreign* with ecclesiastical authority, Manning's opposition was directed rather against the principles that inspired them. He saw in them a semi-rationalistic approach to faith, which, in due course, could only run into absolute rationalism. It was on this basis that he denounced *The Rambler* to Propaganda in 1862, asking for the review to be included on the Index⁹.

2. History and Faith

Acton's words about history ascertaining the content of revelation had a particularly familiar ring for Manning. They resembled voices returning from his Anglican past. In 1838, as we have seen, he had made his own Palmer's words about how to determine the truths belonging to universal tradition: their existence is an historical fact, to be established 'on the same sort of evidence as proves any other historical fact'. It had taken him many years to discover the presence of a Divine Teacher in the Church, and to break away from what he now saw as the ever deepening spiral of rationalism. The ghost that he had thought buried in the past was raising its head again and it had to be laid to rest anew.

Manning referred on several occasions to the relationship between history and faith; some times while addressing Protestant critics, on others when referring to the Catholics of the School of Historical Criticism. Naturally, his most explicit denunciations coincided with the controversies over the infallibility of the Pope. To

⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 476.

⁹ Cfr. SCPF, *Scritture Riferite nei Congressi, Anglia 1861-1863*, Fols.. 341-2 and 515-6.

Manning's mind, the school of scientific historians laid down 'as a principle that history is tradition, and tradition history: that they are one and the same thing under two names'; this implied 'a tacit elimination of the supernatural, and of the Divine authority of the Church'¹⁰. His fundamental question was: 'Are we to understand (...) that the words and acts of the Fathers, and the documents of human history, constitute the Rule of Faith, or that the Rule of Faith depends upon them, and is either more or less certain as it agrees or disagrees with them? or in other words, that the rule of faith is to be tested by history, not history by the rule of faith?'¹¹. According to Manning, the supporters of these ideas seemed to accept two principles. One, explicitly: a doctrine cannot be defined until the historical difficulties are solved. The second principle, implicit in the first, was more insidious, and undermined the very foundations of the faith of the Church. It considered that the doctrinal authority of the Church and the certainty of dogma depended, 'if not altogether, at least in part, on human history. From this it would follow that when the critical or scientific historians find, or suppose themselves to find, a difficulty in the writings of the Fathers or other human histories, the doctrines proposed by the Church as of Divine revelation are to be called into doubt, unless such difficulties can be solved'¹².

Manning's answer to the question was clear and uncompromising: 'Human history is neither the source nor the channel of revelation'¹³. A Catholic does not deduce his faith from history, fact or antiquity; the reason being that 'faith was revealed and taught before history, fact, or antiquity existed. (...) The Church, which teaches him now by its perpetual living voice, taught the same faith before as yet the Church had a history or an antiquity. The rule and basis of faith to those who lived before either the history

¹⁰ *Privilegium*, III, pp. 123-124. It is of interest to compare Manning's and Newman's ideas on the subject. Newman dealt with the relationship of History to Dogma in his 'Letter to the Duke of Norfolk' [in *Certain Difficulties felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching* (London, 1898), vol. II, pp. 309-313]. His notes to the third edition of *The Prophetical Office of the Church* (i.e.: Lecture I, note 2; Lecture II, notes 1 & 3; Lecture XI, note 3) are also illustrative of their concurrence in the main arguments on the subject.

¹¹ *Privilegium*, III, p. 121.

¹² *Ibidem*. Manning seems to have taken these ideas from the Vatican Council's Constitution *Dei Filius*, Chapter III, c. 6. He himself had suggested their insertion there, probably borrowing them from Chapter IX of the First Schema *De Ecclesia*.

¹³ *Ibidem*, p. 125.

or antiquity (...) existed, is the rule and basis of our faith now'¹⁴. 'The Church itself is the Divine witness, teacher, and judge, of the revelation entrusted to it'¹⁵. The pastors of the Church, or *ecclesia docens*, 'divinely sustained and guided to guard and declare the faith', were 'antecedent to history, and are independent of it'¹⁶.

He acknowledged that it would be legitimate to ask the question 'If you reject history and antiquity, how can you know what was revealed before (...) history and antiquity existed?' His answer would be: 'The enunciation of the faith by the living Church of this hour, is the maximum of evidence, both natural and supernatural, as to the *fact* and the *contents* of the original revelation'¹⁷. The Third Person of the Blessed Trinity is now teaching in the Church, as He was then, with a divine and infallible voice; 'history, and antiquity, and the facts (...) of the past vanish before the presence of an order of facts which are divine - namely, the unity, perpetuity, infallibility of the Church of God'¹⁸. The followers of the school of Historical Criticism were more or less explicitly rejecting the perpetual office of the Holy Spirit in the Church. They appealed 'from the traditional doctrine of the Catholic Church, delivered by its common and constant teaching, to history interpreted by themselves'¹⁹. 'This would be an inverted and rationalistic method of extracting dogmas from the facts of history'²⁰. History is not the source of faith, neither is it the method of theological proof. Manning quoted Cano's rules about the authority of history and its role in theology; Cano's main principle was that history 'can afford no adequate motive of divine certainty'²¹. History could provide some probable arguments, sometimes even a certain one, but

¹⁴ *TM*, p. 214.

¹⁵ *Privilegium*, III, p. 123.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*. During the Vatican Council - while Hefele was claiming in his speech (17-V-70) that historical difficulties militated against the definition of Papal infallibility, Manning wrote in his notes: 'Non sumus in scholis sed in oecumenico Concilio congregati. Interrogandi sunt non historici et critici, sed vivum Eccl[esi]ae oraculum', quoted in F.J. Cwiekowski, *The English Bishops and the First Vatican Council* (Louvain, 1971), p. 324.

¹⁷ *TM*, p. 214.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 216.

¹⁹ *Privilegium*, III, p. 128.

²⁰ *TM*, p. 216. Newman, in his 'Letter to the Duke of Norfolk', would write: 'He who believes the dogmas of the Church only because he has reasoned them out of History, is scarcely a Catholic' (*Difficulties of Anglicans*, II, p. 312)

²¹ *TM*, p. 91.

based only on a human and, therefore, fallible authority.

History was not an exact science. Not even the new rigorous historical method could turn it into a proper science, made up of certain principles and conclusions. Manning examined what the sources were from which history was built up. It was fashioned from documents 'written by uninspired human authors, transmitted by documents open to corruption, change, and mutilation, without custody or security, except the casual tradition of human testimony and human criticism, open to perversion by infirmity and passion of every kind'²². If such was the raw material for the work of history, 'who and what are the workmen? Has any of them, or have they altogether, the promise of Divine assistance to interpret history against the living witness of the Church of God? They appeal to the past, which is dead and speechless, save as it echoes their own voice'²³. The school of historical criticism, though, had obviated these objections and rendered them ineffective 'by the simple introduction of one additional compound, their own personal infallibility. The universal Church assembled in Council under the guidance of its Head' - the Vatican Council had just taken place - 'does not, cannot, and what is worse, will not, know its own history, or the true interpretation of its own records and acts. But, by a benign though tardy provision, the science of history has arisen, like the art of extracting sunbeams from cucumbers, to recall the Church from its deviations to the recognition of its true misdeeds. Such higher intelligences may be called and revered as the Pontiffs of the Realm of Criticism. We are warned, however, not to profane this awful Hierarchy of superior persons by further analysis'²⁴.

Manning's sense of humour did not make him underestimate the dangers inherent in the principles of that school, for he considered that 'under the pretext of scientific history

²² *Privilegium*, III, p. 133; see also *Grounds*, p. 37. Fessler, the Secretary of the Vatican Council and himself an historian, also pointed out the difference between a divine source and a human one. He considered history of value for theology as a corroboration of doctrinal statements or as offering an opportunity for clarifying them further because of the historical objections put forward in apparent contradiction to particular truths [cfr. J. Fessler, *The True and False Infallibility of the Popes* (London, 1875), pp. 22-23].

²³ H.E. Manning, *Religio Viatoris* (5th ed., London, n.d.), p. 84. Döllinger's blunder in denying the ecumenical character of the Council of Florence (*Allgemeine Zeitung*, 21 January 1870) would offer a glaring example of an historian victim of both scientific fraud and of his own anti-infallibilist passion [Cfr. Conzemius, 'Lord Acton and the First Vatican Council' in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* (October 1969), p. 279].

²⁴ H.E. Manning, *Pastime Papers*, W. Meynell (ed.) (London, n.d.), p.72.

lurks an assumption which is purely heretical'²⁵: the appeal from the divine authority of the Church to another authority. Lutheran and Calvinistic Protestantism had appealed to Holy Scripture, interpreted by private judgment; Anglicanism to the faith of the undivided Church, with some adding the consent of the Fathers. The new German and English school, according to Manning, 'places itself in constant antagonism to the authority of the Church, and, to justify its attitude of antagonism, appeals to "scientific history"'²⁶. The 'appeal from the light of faith to the light of history' implied an appeal 'from the supernatural to the natural order; a process, as I have said again and again, consistent in Protestants and Rationalists: in Catholics, simply heretical'²⁷. These ideas would weaken the hold of many Catholics on the rule of faith by exalting history and deprecating the teaching authority of the Church. God's will is different, Manning would say, He wants man to learn the doctrines of revelation not 'by criticism on past history, but by acts of faith in the living voice of the Church at this hour'²⁸. Those theories posed a serious danger; they had already perverted the faith of some, and, according to Manning, others would follow: many people had been partly deceived, and partly intimidated, by the tone and by the apparent or real scholarship of the leaders of the party.

Manning did not reject history. The Church has indeed a history recorded in documents, and the 'tradition of the Church may be historically treated; but between history and the tradition of the Church there is a clear distinction'²⁹. Tradition, for Manning, is made up of two divine elements: the word of God, written and unwritten, and the teaching authority of the Church. In the same way as the Church is the only one which 'can judge of the true sense and interpretation of Holy Scripture, it alone can judge of the true sense and interpretation of the acts of its own Pontiffs and Councils'³⁰. To appeal from the judgment of the Church to history would be equivalent to 'Lutheranism in history'.

²⁵ *Privilegium*, III, p. 126.

²⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 127.

²⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 135.

²⁸ *Privilegium*, II, p. 126

²⁹ *Privilegium*, III, p. 123.

³⁰ *Ibidem*, pp. 129-130.

Manning, following Schlegel, considered the witness of the Church to be the greatest historical authority for the events of her own history. 'The Church is a living history of the past. It is the page of history still existing, open before our eyes. Antiquity to the Catholic is not a thing gone by; it is here, still present'³¹. Manning saw the Church as a living witness, whose consciousness stretched from Pentecost morning to the present day. Consequently, she is 'a sufficient motive to convince a prudent man that Christianity is a divine revelation'. A motive of credibility 'sufficient for the act of faith in the Church as a divine witness'³².

The conclusive crisis for the School of Historical Criticism was unleashed by Döllinger's manifesto in the Munich Catholic Congress of September 1863. This time, the voice which would rise against the principles he espoused was not going to be the voice of an English bishop, but that of the supreme authority in the Church. On 21 December 1863, Pius IX addressed a letter to the Archbishop of Munich in which he clearly stated, among other things, that the assent of faith should not only be given to the dogmatic definitions of Ecumenical Councils or of the Roman Pontiffs, 'it must also be extended to those things, which through the ordinary teaching of the whole Church throughout the world, are proposed as divinely revealed and, as a result, by the universal and constant consent of Catholic theologians are held to be matters of faith'³³.

Acton, in the April 1864 issue of *The Home and Foreign*, summarized in clear sentences the substance of the Papal Brief: 'In the present condition of society the supreme authority of the Church is more than ever necessary, and must not surrender in the smallest degree the exclusive direction of ecclesiastical knowledge. An entire obedience to the decrees of the Holy See and the Roman congregations cannot be inconsistent with the freedom and progress of science. The disposition to find fault with the scholastic theology, and to dispute the conclusions and the methods of its teachers threatens the authority of the Church, because the Church has not only allowed theology

³¹ *Grounds*, p. 37.

³² *Privilegium*, II, p. 125.

³³ Dz 1683; Translation from *The Church Teaches*, G. Van Ackeren (ed.) (Rockford, 1973), p. 84.

to remain for centuries faithful to their system, but has urgently recommended it as the safest bulwark of the faith, and as an efficient weapon against her enemies. Catholic writers are not bound only by those decisions of the infallible Church which regard articles of faith. They must also submit to the theological decisions of the Roman congregations, and to the opinions which are commonly received in the schools. And it is wrong, though not heretical, to reject those decisions or opinions'³⁴.

Acton acknowledged to Simpson that there was nothing new in the principles put forward by the Rescript; he felt, though, that 'the open aggressive declaration, and the will to enforce obedience', were 'in reality new'. This placed the Review, he would add, 'in flagrant contradiction with the government of the Church'³⁵. He did not want to hide or disguise in public how far the principles contained in the Munich Brief were in opposition to those upheld by *The Home and Foreign*. The Review had not only expressed opinions contrary to those of the Brief, it existed for the purpose of doing so. Acton publicly acknowledged the position in which the editors found themselves. 'It is the design of the Holy See not, of course, to deny the distinction between dogma and opinion (...) but to reduce the practical recognition of it among Catholics to the smallest possible limits. A grave question therefore arises as to the position of a *Review* founded in great part for the purpose of exemplifying this distinction'³⁶. Part of that distinction was to declare that the Pope was not infallible, and that 'there is no institution from which this [infallible] knowledge can be obtained with immediate certainty. A council is not *a priori* ecumenical; the Holy See is not separately infallible. The one has to await a sanction, the other has repeatedly erred'³⁷.

The awkward position in which *The Home and Foreign* had been placed by the Brief was to be resolved by its closure. The Review, according to Acton, was to be sacrificed on the double altar of truth and of obedience to authority: it would be as wrong to abandon principles which had not ceased to be true as to defy the legitimate authority

³⁴ J.E. Acton, 'Conflicts with Rome', in *History of Freedom*, p. 482.

³⁵ Acton to Simpson (8-III-64), in *The correspondence of Lord Acton and Richard Simpson*, Edited by J.L. Altholz, D. McElrath and J. Holland, Vol. III (Cambridge, 1975), p. 185.

³⁶ J.E. Acton, 'Conflicts with Rome', in *History of Freedom*, p. 484.

³⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 477.

of the Church, which had condemned them³⁸. The withdrawal of *The Home and Foreign* from the arena did not imply that the principles it had maintained were by any means dead; Acton had spoken of the need to wait for better times.

3. Ward on Infallibility

Acton's parting shot could not fail to draw in the fire of *The Dublin Review*. In July of the same year Ward published his essay on 'Rome and the Munich Congress', where he clearly defined the error which was to be his target: that the assent of faith is due to no other doctrines except those which the Church had expressly defined. His contention was that to maintain 'that the Church taught no doctrines as of faith before she defined them, is to say that before heresies arose she had no faith at all'³⁹. Manning could have made that sentence his own, and it is quite likely that he was the source of it. It was reminiscent of what he had said in answer to those who affirmed that faith was based on Holy Scripture alone: had there been no faith in the Church till the Canon of Holy Scripture was formed? The volume in which Ward collected his essays in the *Dublin* would be dedicated to the Archbishop, in recognition of Ward's debt to Manning's constant teaching that 'there is no security for religious truth, except in the most humble and unreserved submission to the Church, in all matters which are related ever so remotely to faith and morals'⁴⁰. Thus, he felt as imperative the need to clarify the degree of assent due to the different declarations of authority, and, in particular, to those of the Roman Pontiffs and of the Roman Congregations. Ward considered that this all-important methodical ground had not been cultivated with the attention that it deserved, and he decided to study it thoroughly. As far as he could see, men of the *Home and Foreign's* stamp regarded the Church rulers much as they 'might

³⁸ The Munich Brief was published on 5 March 1864. Three days later, in a letter to Simpson, Acton clearly defined their position and the way forward. Simpson would agree with the course proposed by Acton: 'It is clearly impossible', he wrote, 'to carry on a professedly Catholic Review on our principles, as it is for us to change our principles at every wind of pastoral that may blow across the Alps (...) Of course you will let it be clearly understood that we in no sense accept the views of Pius IX' (in *The Correspondence of Lord Acton and Richard Simpson*, vol. III, p 186).

³⁹ W.G. Ward, 'Rome and the Munich Congress' (*Dublin Review*, July 1864), in *The Authority of Doctrinal Decisions which are not Definitions of Faith, Considered in a short series of Essays reprinted from the 'Dublin Review'* (London, 1866), p. 2.

⁴⁰ *Ibidem*, Preface, p. V.

regard Balaam's ass: they are made the organs of divine utterance (...) at certain very wide intervals, but are otherwise below the ordinary level of humanity, in their apprehension of God's works and ways'⁴¹.

Fr. Ignatius Ryder was to claim, in 1867, that Ward's ideas on the subject had their origin in his 'craving for ideal completeness'. This led him to an *a priori* argument which took the leap 'from our notion of what should be, to what it *is*'⁴². Ward, he continued, in search for the most effective system to 'beat this wretched wild world into subjection' would have defined a system which 'recommended itself to him as the best moral discipline, and the most satisfactorily supplying a moral want'⁴³. Ward's ways, then, could not be but God's ways! Newman had suggested to Ryder this strategy against Ward, before dealing with his opinions: 'to show from Ward's character of mind how untrustworthy he was'⁴⁴. It is doubtful whether the strategy suggested by Newman was the correct one in the circumstances. What seems to be beyond doubt is that Ryder misunderstood Ward's fundamental reason for the theory that he had put forward on the subject. Among other things, as it would be pointed out to Ryder, it was not a new theory. In its general lines, the Pope's infallibility was a common opinion among theologians, and Viva's famous work on the *Theses Damnata* considered it as *proxima fide*.

The fundamental principles Ward was fighting for were: the Church is infallible; the 'infallibility which the Catholic Episcopate possesses collectively, the Holy Father possesses individually, as the Church's teacher'⁴⁵; the 'Pope's infallibility is precisely co-extensive with that of the *Ecclesia Docens*'⁴⁶.

Ward had developed his ideas starting from a proposition which he considered

⁴¹ W.G. Ward, 'Rome and The Munich Congress', in *The Authority of Doctrinal Decisions*, p. 25.

⁴² H.I. Ryder, *Idealism in Theology. A review of Dr. Ward's schema of Dogmatic Authority* (London, 1867), p. 9-10.

⁴³ *Ibidem*, p.8.

⁴⁴ Newman to Canon Walker (11-V-67); *LD*, XXIII, p. 227.

⁴⁵ W.G. Ward, 'Rome and the Munich Congress', in *The Authority of Doctrinal Decisions*, p. 9.

⁴⁶ W.G. Ward, 'Rome, Unionism, and Indifferentism' (*Dublin Review*, July 1865), in *The Authority of Doctrinal Decisions*, p. 84.

‘indubitable on Catholic principles, (...) that the Church *possesses* whatever infallibility she *claims*’⁴⁷. Thus, he felt that all the arguments could be resolved into one of fact: ‘Does the Pope claim to teach doctrine *ex cathedra* in Allocutions, Encyclicals, and the like?’⁴⁸ The *Ecclesia Docens* cannot claim an infallibility that it does not possess, and it followed that the Pope had to be infallible in all those pronouncements where he claimed to speak infallibly. It could not be otherwise. If he were to be mistaken once in considering himself infallible when he were not, there would be no guarantee that he would be infallible on any other occasion. Ward considered that Gregory XVI had claimed to speak infallibly in his Encyclical *Mirari Vos*. That was for him more than enough to prove the infallibility of all Encyclicals: ‘no human being who will admit the doctrinal infallibility of this Encyclical, while he hesitates in attributing the same quality to that whole class of Papal decrees which it represents’⁴⁹. The acceptance by the Episcopate of the Pope’s doctrinal pronouncements would also identify them as infallible, on Gallican principles.

Ward applied his principle to *Quanta Cura* and the *Syllabus*, and he declared them infallible. He acknowledged that neither of them were definitions of faith, as the Bull *Unigenitus* had been; they covered many areas not directly connected with faith and morals. This went to prove, he argued, that: a) the Church is infallible when she pronounces any censure less severe than that of heresy; b) that there is an ‘enormous number of *philosophical* truths, on which she may infallibly pronounce; and this because of their intimate connection with the Apostolic Deposit’⁵⁰. Infallibility, though, did not cover all the doctrinal statements introduced in a particular Papal document, but only that doctrine which the Pope intended to teach; thus, ‘if the doctrinal reasons even for a doctrinal declaration are not infallible, much less can infallibility be claimed for the doctrinal reasons of a disciplinary enactment’⁵¹.

⁴⁷ W.G. Ward, *The Authority of Doctrinal Decisions*, Preface, p. XI.

⁴⁸ *Ibidem*, p. XII.

⁴⁹ W.G. Ward, ‘Extent of the Church’s Infallibility - The Encyclical “Mirari Vos”’ (*Dublin Review*, January 1865), in *The Authority of Doctrinal Decisions*, p. 45.

⁵⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 38.

⁵¹ *Ibidem*, p. 50.

The Pope taught *ex cathedra*, according to Ward, when he spoke as universal teacher and demanded the assent of the faithful to a particular doctrine. Ward seemed to imply that the mere fact of demanding assent was a sufficient sign of an *ex cathedra* infallible pronouncement, and he would express his surprise in a letter to Manning when the Archbishop expressed a different opinion: 'Are there 10 people in the world who think themselves bound to accept his [the Pope's declarations] with *interior assent* while not thinking them *infallible*? I did not know there was any such person, till you expressed your opinion. A man like Monsell would be fully as disgusted with your opinion as with mine'⁵².

Again, the fact of the Pope designing a doctrinal document for the general guidance of the faithful identified it, to Ward's mind, as an *ex cathedra* pronouncement. It was clear that this had been the Pope's intention in some Letters or Briefs addressed to individuals, as in the case of Günther's condemnation or in that of the Munich Brief. From this he concluded that 'all the doctrinal instructions contained in these addresses [Allocutions, Encyclicals, Letters to a Bishop, etc.] are *ex cathedra*'⁵³. It was rather more difficult to qualify the character of those doctrinal decrees of Roman Congregations which the Pope had made his own by confirming them and ordering their publication. Ward, on this particular, declared: 'Such decrees, if promulgated by the Pope's express command, are probably *ex cathedra*'⁵⁴.

Ward acknowledged that his ideas were not accepted by all Catholics, and that there were 'two propositions' - contrary to the ideas he was propounding - 'which may be held by a Catholic, at all events, without forfeiting his title to Catholicism. He may hold (1), that the Holy See is not infallible, even in those definitions of *faith* which it may put forth, unless the Catholic Episcopate expressly or tacitly adhere to them; and he may hold (2), that the Pope and bishops united are fallible, when they condemn a

⁵² Ward to Manning, quoted in D. McElrath, *The Syllabus of Pius IX. Some reactions in England* (Louvain 1964), p. 150. Did Manning come to agree with Ward in later years? In 1875 he would write: 'It is an axiom in morals *Lex dubia non obligat*. But if it be doubtful whether the Syllabus is *ex cathedra*, I am not bound to receive it with interior assent' [*The Vatican Decrees in their bearing on civil allegiance* (London, 1875), p. 60].

⁵³ W.G. Ward, *The Authority of Doctrinal Decisions*, Preface, p. X.

⁵⁴ *Ibidem*, p. XVI.

thesis not precisely as heretical, but as deserving some lesser censure'⁵⁵. They were not excluded from the body of the Church but they were 'unsound catholics'; their error was a fundamental one and violently anti-catholic; 'they commit, moreover as we must maintain, (materially at least) mortal sin'⁵⁶.

According to Ward, the steps that led a Catholic towards apostasy were as follows: 'First, he refuses to believe any Catholic doctrine which is not strictly defined. Next, as to the defined doctrines themselves, he more and more chooses to confine his acceptance of them to the lowest sense which their words will grammatically bear, instead of studying the Church's full intention. Then a current of thought finds outward vent, which has long been silently proceeding; and he both thinks and speaks of the Church's rulers with compassionate contempt. (...) [The] time could not be far distant, when he would find himself in direct opposition to the Church's teaching'⁵⁷. There was little doubt that he was referring to men like Döllinger and Acton, and those associated with them.

Still, a certain amount of what Ward had said was generally accepted doctrine. During the Ward-Ryder controversy, a good number of the theologians consulted, or who volunteered their opinions, agreed with Ward on the infallibility of the minor censures. They also affirmed that interior assent was due to Encyclicals, Allocutions, and similar pronouncements⁵⁸. A representative sample of current theological opinion can also be found in the study by the Preparatory Theological Commission of the Vatican Council, in February 1869, of Cardoni's Vote on the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff. The Commission counted among its twenty-four members such eminent theologians as Perrone, Franzelin, Schrader and Hettinger. In their answers to eight questions on the subject, taken from Cardoni's Vote, they unanimously affirmed that the Pope was infallible as a public person, with an infallibility co-extensive in its object with that of the Church, i.e. even in his minor censures and in non-revealed matters connected with

⁵⁵ W.G. Ward, 'Extent of the Church's Infallibility', in *The Authority of Doctrinal Decisions*, p. 36.

⁵⁶ W.G. Ward, 'Rome, Unionism, and Indifferentism', in *The Authority of Doctrinal Decisions*, p. 107.

⁵⁷ W.G. Ward, 'Rome and the Munich Congress', in *The Authority of Doctrinal Decisions*, p. 25.

⁵⁸ At first, because of his ideas on the relationship between demanding interior assent and infallibility, Ward presumed that these theologians maintained the infallibility of all those documents. He soon discovered that this was not always the case.

the deposit. Opinions were divided, however, on whether the Decrees of the Roman Congregations were infallible once they had obtained the approval of the Roman Pontiff. The majority seem to have thought that they were or could be infallible; others were of the opinion that to be so they required an special act of the Pope, equivalent to an act *ex cathedra*, not just a simple approval⁵⁹. It is also worth mentioning that, during the Council, the Theological-Dogmatic Commission would point out that the fact that a doctrinal decree was directed to a particular person did not necessarily exclude it being addressed to the Universal Church⁶⁰. On the other hand, Ward's identification of the demand of internal assent as the hallmark of an infallible decree had led him to conclusions far beyond the limits of common theological opinion. Here he found himself open to criticism on purely theological grounds, and that from a quarter he did not expect: that of the Roman theologians.

Wilfrid Ward was to point out later that although his father's 'logic was more moderate than his rhetoric, it was his rhetoric which gave the tone to his works and decided their effect'⁶¹. That is true up to a certain point. Men like Newman and Ryder resented his branding of those who did not go along with him to his final conclusions as unsound and disloyal Catholics. They thought this a source of scandal for both Protestants and Catholics. The former might come to consider Ward's view as the only legitimate one for Catholics to maintain, and would then feel further alienated from the Church; Catholics, for their part, could be unnecessarily upset in their faith by the implications of Ward's theories. He was free to maintain them, Newman thought, but he should not impose them on others. 'Let me observe then,' Newman wrote to him, 'that, in former years *and now*, I have considered the theological differences between us as unimportant in themselves; that is, such as to be simply compatible with a reception, both by you and by me, of the whole theological teaching of the Church in the widest sense of the word "teaching"; but now, he added, 'by exalting your opinions into dogmas', Ward was dividing the Church. 'I protest then again, not against your tenets, but against what I must call your schismatic spirit. (...) I pray God that I may never denounce, as you

⁵⁹ Cfr. *M*, 49, cols. 668-673.

⁶⁰ Cfr. *M*, 52, col. 940A; also col. 1225BC.

⁶¹ W. Ward, *William George Ward and the Catholic Revival* (London, 1893), p. 183.

do, what the Church has not denounced'⁶². He confessed that he preferred to act in the spirit of the old maxim: *In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus charitas*.

4. 'Idealism in Theology'

Ryder was the man to attempt to rid Newman, and those who thought like him, of that quarrelsome layman. His *Idealism in Theology* (1867) showed, on the one hand, how far Ryder and Newman, from whom Ryder had imbibed most of his ideas, would go along with Ward. 'I have ever conceived myself to be an Ultramontane'⁶³, Ryder would say. He confessed that he accepted the infallibility of the Pope in his definitions of faith or in dealing with dogmatic facts. That covered those truths which are contained in the *depositum* or which can certainly be deduced from truths contained in it, as well as those facts - canonizations, etc - in which, if the Church were liable to error in judging them, it would be equivalent to the gates of hell prevailing against it. Furthermore, he admitted that Encyclicals were written under the special guidance of the Holy Spirit, and should be received with respect and obeyed by all Catholics. These Papal documents go so far to engage the Church to the particular line they take that, were they to foster error, the life of the Church would be severely affected. Such would not be in accordance with Christ's promises. All the doctrinal instructions contained in the Encyclicals, Ryder said, 'at least after they have been received without protest by the Church, must be presumed to have a sort of infallibility, to use the term improperly, viz: an *ex post facto* immunity from all substantial error of faith or morals'⁶⁴. This was far from a statement of Gallican faith, but rather an echo of Newman's '*securus iudicat orbis terrarum*'.

Ward, Ryder maintained, had lost sight of the difference between certain and probable religious truths. There is 'a wide sphere of probable religious truth, approximating more or less closely to certainty, but never reaching it, within which we are bound to

⁶² Letter dated 9-V-67; *LD*, XXIII, pp. 216-217.

⁶³ H.I. Ryder, *op.cit.*, p. 13.

⁶⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 17.

yield not merely the practical assent of obedience, but also a certain degree of intellectual adherence, varying according to the nature of the case'⁶⁵. He argued 'that any one, who should mentally reject as untrue, even whilst punctiliously obeying, any official utterance of the Holy Father, on the ground that it was not infallible, would not only be acting unreasonably, but even sinfully against the *pietas fidei*'⁶⁶. Ryder, though, did not accept the infallibility of Encyclicals per se, nor did he acknowledge the infallibility of all the minor censures, if this were to imply that they were all certainly false. As far as the *Syllabus* was concerned, he subscribed to Dupanloup's interpretation of it. He complained that Ward, in trying to buttress the infallibility of the Pope, was damaging the cause he wanted to defend. To make the Pope unable to speak except infallibly - which was more than Ward had ever claimed - would amount to a 'most inconvenient gift, which, like the golden touch of King Midas, is calculated to check the free action of its possessor'⁶⁷. Ward, like Saul in David's case, was forcing upon Catholics 'an equipment, in which however it may become himself, the majority of them cannot even walk, still less fight'⁶⁸.

Ryder's argument was partly deformed by its tone and the attempt to ridicule Ward, and by suggesting that adulation and flattery of authority were among the principal reasons of those who, like Canute's courtiers, exaggerated the power of the Pope. His sense of humour, sometimes sharp and pointed, was on other occasions a poor imitation of Newman's irony and, in general, rather unsuited to the theme in hand and to the circumstances of the moment. Ullathorne judged Ryder's pamphlet inopportune, and Manning concurred with this opinion. 'I fear', Manning wrote to Ullathorne on 11 May 1867, 'that it will gravely complicate matters which were tangled enough already'⁶⁹. To Talbot he wrote: 'Fr. Ryder of the Edgbaston Oratory has published an attack on Ward's book on Encyclicals. Dr. Newman sent it to Ward with a letter *adopting* it, and

⁶⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 24.

⁶⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 25. This was a concept which Newman used repeatedly. In his letter to Flanagan (15-II-68) he wrote: 'There are two motives, short of *fides divina*, which occasion silence and acquiescence on such points, or at least very cautious and restrained avowals in opposition to them: the *pietas fidei* (which I think I did not refer to) and the duty of obedience' [*The Theological Papers of John Henry Newman on Biblical Inspiration and on Infallibility*, J.D. Holmes (ed.) (Oxford, 1979), p. 155].

⁶⁷ H.I. Ryder, *op. cit.*, pp. 17-18.

⁶⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 62.

⁶⁹ *Manning Mss. West.*, Manning-Ullathorne Cor., U 75.

saying that he was glad to leave behind him young men to maintain those principles'⁷⁰.

Flanagan, writing to Ryder at the time of the publication of the *Idealism*, described the possible sources of opposition to his ideas in England: 'My opinion is that by 3 schools (if they are distinct) you are looked upon as a semi-heretic, if not worse. *First* that Manning and his school entirely agree with Ward is not to be doubted. The quotation at p.14 of W[ard]'s letter from Manning's work (neither of which I have seen [!]) are, I think conclusive, both as to condemned propositions, and encyclicals, etc. *Next* we have the Ushaw school as represented by Dr. Gillow. He is furious, and if he had his will would commit you and your essay to the flames. *Lastly*, I fancy, the London Or[atory] are against you. This is only my own inference. They will stick up for anything Faber has written. Now he has committed himself distinctly to the "Ecclesiastical Faith" view'⁷¹. It was an accurate prediction. On the other hand, the Jesuits Garside and Coleridge were in favour of Ryder, and so were Edmund Knight of Oscott and Russell of Maynooth, the latter with some qualifications; Moriarty, Bishop of Kerry, found himself somewhere between Ward and Ryder.

The ensuing war of pamphlets between Ward and Ryder did little to clarify issues. Perhaps the only real point of interest in them was that Ryder made an explicit declaration of the infallibility of minor censures, and that, on the other hand, Ward came to make a rather surprising acknowledgment of the theoretical possibility that some *obiter dicta* in the Pontifical Acts might be infallible! On the question of the infallibility of Encyclicals *per se*, Ryder and Ward maintained their initial positions.

There was in contention another important point, which became more prominent as the controversy went on: to whom does the definition of what is an *ex cathedra* pronouncement and what is not belong?; which authority is entrusted with the authentic interpretation of infallible pronouncements? Ryder had raised these points, in passing, in his *Idealism*. He, with Newman, considered that the Pope's words were always in need of interpretation, and that this was the task of theologians. 'None but the *Schola Theologorum*', Newman would write years later, 'is competent to determine the force

⁷⁰ P, II, p. 320.

⁷¹ Quoted in D. McElrath, *op.cit.*, p. 162.

of Papal and Synodal utterances, and the exact interpretation of them is a work of time'⁷². It required a slow and careful process of theological discernment; which, Ryder thought, would hardly suit the hot haste of the *Dublin Review*. Ward, on the other hand, maintained that it is 'for the *Ecclesia Docens* (...), and not for private theologians, to decide the extent of her own infallibility'⁷³. Manning agreed with him on this point: the interpretation of an infallible pronouncement could not be the province of a fallible authority. The Council of Trent was for him a clear example of this principle, its interpretation had been reserved to the Holy See.

5. Manning and Ward

Newman considered that Manning shared the ideas expressed in Ward's articles: Ward was according to Manning, who was according to the Pope. When considering whether to answer Pusey's *Eirenicon*, he felt that he could do it well, 'but not, except at the expense of theories and doctrines, which the Archbishop thinks of vital importance, and which I cannot receive'⁷⁴.

Manning and Ward had collaborated closely since the beginning of Ward's editorship of *The Dublin Review*. They both viewed with growing alarm the spirit of *The Home and Foreign Review* spreading in England, and were united in their effort to eradicate that mentality from English Catholicism, substituting for it a more loyal adherence to the *magisterium*. Manning, when writing to Ward, could speak of 'our position' and agree with Ward's strategy: 'It seems to me that we can do nothing surer nor more practical than to pursue the line you have begun and to keep to it almost exclusively; I mean, the exposition of the Pontifical Acts'. He also indicated how this exposition was to be carried out: 'we must disclaim [though] to be the interpreters and derive our interpretation, as far as we can from Rome, or interpret them avowedly as private

⁷² J.H. Newman, 'Letter to the Duke of Norfolk', in *Difficulties of Anglicans*, vol. II, p. 176. He would ask, on another occasion: 'Who could ever guess *what* is condemned, what not, in a *Theses Damnata*, without such a work as *Viva*?' [Letter to Canon Walker (17-VI-67); *LD*, XXIII, p. 254].

⁷³ W.G. Ward, *A Letter [to] the Fr. Ryder on his recent pamphlet* (London, 1867), p. 20.

⁷⁴ Letter to Allies (11-X-65); *LD*, XXII, p. 72.

writers, and with submission⁷⁵. This call for restraint went mostly unheeded. The end result was that Ward's excesses were also generally attributed to the archbishop, as Ullathorne was to deprecate in his letter to Manning of 9 May 1866: 'I am deeply convinced that the *Dublin's* extreme line tends to conjure up reaction. I know that it does, and I should care less for that if people did not persist in making you the sponsor of Mr.W.'⁷⁶.

Ward had acknowledged his debt to the Archbishop on the subject of infallibility. They were to reach somewhat similar conclusions, but this did not always mean that they had followed the same path or that they shared all their ideas. Ward had more of a mind of his own with respect to Manning than Ryder with respect to Newman. Manning's acceptance of the infallibility of Encyclicals was not based on the logical reason that internal assent can only be demanded to a proposition infallibly true, but on theological grounds: the Holy Spirit speaks through Peter whenever he speaks as teacher of the Universal Church, and his voice is infallible. Manning, while agreeing on the whole with Ward's conclusions, did not hide his doubts about many points in his writings. His letter to Talbot of 25 February 1866 gives clear insight into his mind on the subject: 'Ward and Faber may exaggerate, but they are a thousand times nearer to the mind and spirit of the Holy See than those who oppose them. Between us and them there is a far greater distance than between them and Dr. Pusey's book'⁷⁷. Later on, though, when sending to Talbot Ward's book, he manifested his general agreement with its content: 'I send you a book of Ward's on the authority of Encyclicals. It is ably done and it is the sole and only book we have on the subject. This is that has brought on him the charge of extravagance. But I am confident that in Rome it will not be thought so'⁷⁸. Talbot himself had noticed Ward's exaggerations, but he had looked benignly upon them, writing to the author: 'it is a book most useful and opportune at the present

⁷⁵ Letter dated 12-I-65; quoted in W. Ward, *W.G. Ward and the Catholic Revival*, pp.187-188.

⁷⁶ Quoted in S. Leslie, *op.cit.*, p. 276.

⁷⁷ *P*, II, p. 323. An opinion which *The Union Review*, in its desire to discover divisions among Catholics, would share with Manning: 'by accepting Papal infallibility [Ryder] seems to place himself technically on common ground with his antagonist, there is really a great gulf between them, but little more than an ideal barrier between him and ourselves' ('Father Ryder and Dr. Ward on infallibility', in *The Union Review*, 5th Volume, January to December 1867, p. 349). Manning might exaggerate; in the *Review*, it looked like wishful thinking.

⁷⁸ Letter dated 4-III-66; *P*, II, p. 389.

moment. Perhaps here and there you have erred a little on the right side, but that is of no importance. It is much better and safer to believe too much than too little and no one can make a mistake by being guided in all he does by what comes from the Holy See'⁷⁹.

Manning's doubts about Ward's 'exaggerations' were fully expressed after the publication of Ryder's pamphlet: 'Would you oblige me', he wrote to Talbot, 'by asking F. Brunego to read over Ward's book on Encyclicals, and mark any doubtful passages. I will do so too, and compare in Rome. *I must know with certainty what to state*'⁸⁰. The Roman theologians did indeed express some reservations about Ward's book. They agreed with him on the general principle of the infallibility of the Pope, but there were a number of points in Ward's writings which were arguable. Consequently, Ward was to make later an explicit acknowledgment to the effect that, in his book and in his controversy with Ryder, he had extended infallibility beyond what was generally held by theologians. He left a record, in his *De Infallibilitatis extensione* (1869)⁸¹, of those statements which had been censured in Rome. Against what he had originally said, he accepted that not all Encyclicals, Allocutions or Apostolic Letters contained *ex cathedra* pronouncements, and that not all documents quoted by the *Syllabus* were infallible. He also acknowledged that many theologians were of the opinion that the fact of demanding internal assent to a doctrinal declaration did not identify it *per se* as an infallible pronouncement (although he was still inclined to think that it was so). Again, he added, some theologians of repute maintained that a doctrinal declaration by one of the Roman Congregations did not become infallible by the mere fact of being confirmed by the Pope.

Manning generally agreed with Ward about the infallibility of Encyclicals and other Papal pronouncements. In *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost* (1865) he had maintained that the 'Definitions and Decrees of Pontiffs, speaking *ex cathedra*, or as the Head of the Church and to the whole Church, whether by Bull, or Apostolic letters,

⁷⁹ Quoted in McElrath, *op.cit.*, p. 135.

⁸⁰ Letter dated 3-V-67; *P*, II, p. 320.

⁸¹ W.G. Ward, *De Infallibilitatis extensione, Theses quasdam et questiones theologorum iudicio subjicit Gulielmus Georgius Ward* (Londinii, 1869).

or Encyclical, or Brief, to many or to one person, undoubtedly emanate from a divine assistance, and are infallible'⁸². Ward used similar words in the preface to his book. In regard to the object, or subject matter, covered by infallibility, Manning declared: 'This extends to the whole matter of revelation, that is, to the Divine truth and the Divine law, and to all those facts or truths which are in contact with faith and morals'; and revealed truth 'is in contact with natural ethics, politics, and philosophy'. These truths of philosophy, 'being in contact with the faith, they fall within the infallibility of the Church'⁸³. He was also explicit in considering infallible the censures of propositions below those declared heretical. In them 'the assistance of the Holy Spirit certainly preserves the Pontiffs from error; and such judgments are infallible, and demand interior assent from all'⁸⁴. Manning and Ward were in harmony in the general lines of their ideas, but it may be safely said that the archbishop did not necessarily follow where the layman went, stretching the logic of his principles to breaking point.

In the field of political thought their disagreements were even more fundamental. Manning - against Ward's explicit statements on the subject - maintained that the principles of the Revolution of 1789 were not incompatible with Catholic doctrine: 'In a moment of haste and precipitation, some French writers and politicians have interpreted the condemnations in the Syllabus as a condemnation of the principles of 1789. (...) We would desire to believe, if we can, that those principles (...) are (...) reconcilable with the great laws of political morality which lie at the foundations of human society, and are consecrated by the sanction of the Christian world'⁸⁵. He was fully in agreement with the efforts of Catholics like De Broglie and the Abbé Godard to remove the supposed contradiction between the principles of 1789 and the doctrines of the Church.

It has been suggested, on the other hand, that Newman, 'who (...) condemned emphatically the Liberalism of the Munich school, felt strongly the intellectual enlargement which, with all its shortcomings, it promised for Catholic education and

⁸² *TM*, pp. 87-88.

⁸³ *Ibidem*, pp. 89-90.

⁸⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 90.

⁸⁵ *Privilegium*, II, p. 17.

speculation. He shrank from an abrupt logical challenge, which might simply irritate its members, and might lose their services for the Catholic Revival⁸⁶. As he repeatedly declared in his letters, he did not want to impose as matters of necessary belief those propositions which he did not consider part of the faith to be professed by all Catholics, even though he might have accepted them himself. It was his avowed aim to avoid introducing theological opinions while declaring the doctrine of the Church. The *Apologia*, he wrote to Flanagan on 15 February 1868, 'was addressed to Protestants *in order to show* them what it was that a Catholic fairly undertook in the way of theological profession, when he became a Catholic. I myself, for instance, have ever held as a matter of theological opinion the Infallibility of the Pope'⁸⁷. His letters to Pusey, written around March 1867, are also very important in order to show the full import of his thought. Against Pusey's talk of a 'Minimum' to be demanded of those who seek reunion, Newman clearly defined Faith's formal object. Faith, he affirmed, is not a code made up of certain definite articles or a written creed. The act of faith 'must ever be partly explicit, partly implicit; viz. "I believe *whatever* God has revealed, whether I know it or not;" or "I believe whatever has been and whatever shall be defined as revelation by the Church who is the organ of the revelation"⁸⁸. The Faith rests on the Church, and she 'is the teacher of the whole faith'. Applying this principle to the Pope's infallibility he said: 'I think that the Church *may* define it (...), but that she *will not ever* define it'⁸⁹.

If Newman had hopes of the philosophical and historical movement represented by the Munich school, Manning felt sympathy for the movement of Lacordaire and Montalambert, which he hoped might contribute to the Catholic Revival. And both, Newman and Manning, 'shrank from pressing logical conclusions which might kill this

⁸⁶ W. Ward, *William George Ward and the Catholic Revival*, p. 167. Acton was fully aware of their differences: 'Newman has great sympathy with our cause, in as much as he is enlightened and liberal and highly cultivated, but I do not believe he really understands our theory, and certainly would no more admit it than De Buck' [Letter Acton to Simpson (7-II-64), in *The Correspondence of Lord Acton and Richard Simpson*, vol. III, p. 172]. Contrast the difference between Acton's words (quoted above in note 7) and Newman's ideas on the subject in his Lecture 'Christianity and Physical Science' (1855) [cfr. *The Idea of a University* (new ed., London, 1908), p. 452].

⁸⁷ J.D. Holmes (ed.), *The Theological papers of John Henry Newman*, p. 155.

⁸⁸ Letter dated 22-III-67; *LD*, XXIII, p. 100

⁸⁹ Letter dated 23-III-67; *LD*, XXIII, p. 104.

prospect. Each was a movement full of heterogeneous life; and they hoped that dangerous elements might be discarded, and the life utilised for the Church. In these hopes Ward had no share whatever⁹⁰. Manning did not want to set Church and Society in opposition to each other, or to exclude Catholics from playing an active part in the political life of the systems born from the principles of the French Revolution. Newman was similarly anxious to avoid the divorce between the intellectual life of his time and Catholic thought, and wanted to stop Catholics forming an intellectual ghetto, isolated from contemporary science and culture. Manning, who likewise felt that danger, saw a different remedy for it: only a clear concept of the infallibility of the Church and the Pope offered the key to unlocking the problem of the relationship between faith and reason; without it, the problem would remain for ever an insoluble one.

6. *'The Catholic Spirit'*

According to Manning, Catholics, in order to confront the world successfully and to make a really positive contribution to the solution of its ills, should be fully imbued with what he called 'Catholic Spirit'. He conceived it as a 'habit of mind' with distinctive 'signs or rules'; a habit that should be found in every 'true Catholic student'. The Feast of St. Edmund of Canterbury in 1865 offered him the opportunity to describe it in detail to his students and future priests at St. Edmund's, Ware. The echoes of the last broadside of *The Home and Foreign* had not completely died away, and Manning wanted to show how the true Catholic Spirit was in clear opposition to the temper of mind displayed by the supporters of that school.

Five characteristics, or signs, came together to define the 'Catholic Spirit'. The first sign of Catholic Spirit, he said, is 'a loving submission to the Church, (...) a joyful and thankful obedience to the Church as a divine guide; and a generous and unreserved conformity of our whole nature and mind, intellectual and spiritual, to its guidance and direction'⁹¹. This is the natural disposition of those who know the Church to be the

⁹⁰ W. Ward, *W.G. Ward and the Catholic Revival*, p. 167.

⁹¹ *CSer*, II, p. 328.

Body of Christ. To the voice of the Holy Spirit, speaking in it, they render not only 'a bare submission of outward obedience, or of silence', but 'an inward assent and affiance of heart'. They obey 'not only the dogma of faith delivered by Councils, but the whole spirit and mind which pervades the discipline, worship, and devotions of the Church'⁹². This was a principle worlds apart from those advocated by *The Home and Foreign*.

The second sign is 'devotion to the Saints', under which he included the Fathers and Doctors of the Church. 'Next to the infallible voice of the Church, there is no guidance so certain as the doctrine of the Saints'. And he then went on to quote Cano: 'Theologians boldly say, that what the Saints unite in teaching is undoubtedly true. "The consent of the Saints is the sense of the Holy Spirit"⁹³. This is not their only contribution in building up the Catholic Spirit; in the Saints, Catholics find 'not only the dogma of faith, but instincts, discernments, intuitions in matters both near to the faith and remote from it, which are most salutary for our guidance'⁹⁴.

Scholastic theology, which had been summarily dismissed by Döllinger in his Munich speech, was given a prominent place by Manning in the make-up of the Catholic Spirit. Its third sign is 'deference to theologians'. When 'the theologians of the Church agree, no individual without temerity can oppose them. (...) They have a claim (...) to our deference, not only on the ground of intellectual superiority, confirmed by unanimity in some things and a wide consent in others, but as doctors of the faithful, in whom a higher intellectual cultivation was elevated by a larger illumination [being some of them also great saints]. Their judgments and decisions cannot indeed make matter of faith, but they certainly make matter of moral certainty'⁹⁵.

In 1860, in one of his sermons, Manning had made large claims for the theologians. Peter, he said, had received from our Lord the two keys of jurisdiction and knowledge. But, he added, 'the key of knowledge has been entrusted by St. Peter himself to the

⁹² *Ibidem*, p. 329.

⁹³ *Ibidem*.

⁹⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 330.

⁹⁵ *Ibidem*, pp. 330-331.

Orders of Religion; (...) so now it is to the Orders of Religion that we come for the toils and fruits of theology matured in rest and silence'⁹⁶. He saw, however, the constitution of the Church as finely balanced: 'God has so tempered all things together in His Church, that to the apostolic authority, to the episcopate sitting in its consistories and its councils, all, even the doctors and teachers of the religious life, must come as to the fountain of jurisdiction and of light, of discernment and of judgment. On the heads of the Apostles and their successors rests the *gratia veritatis*, the special gift and unction of the Faith. And they sit as judges on the illuminated labours of all; for they rule the Church, and are the guardians of the Faith, and with them in its fullness is the grace of Pentecost (...). All the theology of the Church, dogmatic and mystical, passes at last under the judgment of the Church in its Hierarchy, and of its Supreme Pontiffs, and is corrected by its discernment, and stamped with its authority'⁹⁷. Manning, in this context, would often quote St. Irenaeus's words about the bishops possessing the 'unction of truth'.

A 'fear and suspicion of novelty' was, for Manning, the fourth sign of Catholic Spirit. Truth, he said, is immutable, although it may always be defined with greater precision. The terminology may be new, but the truth is always as old as the revelation of faith. The true Catholic student is suspicious of new doctrines, new interpretations of Holy Scripture, and new principles in philosophy. 'He will take his stand upon the sacred terminology and scientific tradition of the Church in its schools; and will not be tempted to depart from them by any novelties, howsoever alluring'⁹⁸. Manning, then, fired a direct shot at the Munich school: the above principle was particularly relevant in the present circumstances, when 'we hear, not from Protestants only, but even from some Catholics, that the scholastic philosophy and theology are antiquated, unfit for modern thought, and must be replaced by new methods and a new criticism of history and of antiquity, in order to lay the basis of science and to generate faith'⁹⁹.

The fifth and last sign is 'mistrust of self'. 'A Catholic student', Manning wrote, 'will

⁹⁶ *CSer*, I, p. 301.

⁹⁷ *Ibidem*, pp. 301-302.

⁹⁸ *CSer*, II, pp. 332-333.

⁹⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 333.

be confident wheresoever the Church has spoken, or the consent of Saints or of theologians goes before him; but when he is left to himself he will have a wholesome mistrust of his own opinions (...). Confidence in our own light is a virtue out of the Catholic unity, but a vice within it. It is the maximum of certainty to those who have no divine and infallible teacher; it is the minimum to those who are guided by the Church of God'¹⁰⁰.

It seems clear that, to Manning's mind, Newman was not possessed of this 'Catholic Spirit' which he had just described. He agreed with Talbot on the danger posed by those imbued with the spirit of *The Home and Foreign*, and the school of old Catholics, rallying round Newman. 'Whether he knows it or not,' Manning wrote to Talbot, 'he has become the centre of those who hold low views about the Holy See, are anti-Roman, cold and silent, to say no more, about the Temporal Power, national, English, critical of Catholic devotions, and always on the lower side. I see no danger of a Cisalpine Club rising again, but I see much danger of an English Catholicism, of which Newman is the highest type. It is the old Anglican, patristic, literary, Oxford tone transplanted into the Church. It takes the line of deprecating exaggerations, foreign devotions, Ultramontanism, anti-national sympathies. In one word, it is worldly Catholicism, and it will have the worldly on its side, and will deceive many'¹⁰¹. Talbot was even harsher in his judgment of Newman. In his opinion, Newman lacked true Catholic Spirit because, 'by living almost ever since he has been a Catholic surrounded by a set of inferior men who idolise him, I do not think he has ever acquired the Catholic instincts'¹⁰².

Bodley also witnessed to Manning's mistrust of Newman's thought, saying that he 'sincerely believed that Newman was not an orthodox Catholic'¹⁰³. And he quoted the following incident in support of this assertion. One evening, his conversation with Manning touched upon Newman, and after a time they moved onto theological ground.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibidem*, pp. 333-334.

¹⁰¹ Letter dated 25-II-66; *P*, II, pp. 322-323.

¹⁰² Talbot to Manning (n.d.); *P*, II, p. 323.

¹⁰³ J.E.C. Bodley, *Cardinal Manning. The Decay of Idealism in France. The Institute of France. Three Essays* (London, 1912), p. 15.

The archbishop remarked: ‘ “From an observation you made”,(…),”I gather that you are under the impression that Doctor Newman is a good Catholic”. I replied that such was my vague belief. He retorted: “Either you are ignorant of the Catholic doctrine, or of the works of Doctor Newman” (...). After asking me which of Newman’s books I had read, he proceeded to tick off on his tapering fingers, in his usual way, ten distinct heresies to be found in the most widely read works of Dr. Newman’. Bodley’s reaction was one of surprise: ‘This seemed to me, at the time, on a par with Voltaire’s discovery of a series of heresies in the Lord’s Prayer’¹⁰⁴. Years later, though, the Modernists’ claiming of Newman as a precursor made him think that perhaps Manning was not so far off the mark as he had at first thought.

Admittedly, an after-dinner remark cannot be given too much credit as representing Manning’s true perception of Newman’s orthodoxy; beside, Bodley’s use of words may not be entirely accurate. It is unfortunate that we cannot conjure back the tapering fingers ‘ticking off Newman’s heresies’, and we are left to surmise what they were. A reasonable assumption would point in the direction of the rule of faith and of the permanent action of the Holy Spirit in the Church. Manning seems to have seen in Newman the spirit of the Oxford Movement, covered with a cloak of Tridentine definitions, which he would have reached by way of the Fathers and his doctrine of Development. Could he have read that in Newman’s words in his *Letter to Pusey*? There Newman had written: ‘I am not ashamed still to take my stand upon the Fathers, and do not mean to budge’. That, however, was qualified by the words: ‘Of course I maintain the value and authority of the “Schola”, as one of the *loci theologici*; nevertheless I sympathize with Petavius in preferring to the “contentious and subtle theology” of the middle age, that “more elegant and fruitful teaching which is moulded after the image of erudite Antiquity”. The Fathers made me a Catholic, and I am not going to kick down the ladder by which I ascended into the Church’¹⁰⁵.

What is clear is that Manning thought that Newman’s views about the infallibility of the Pope were minimalist, and that they obscured the permanent action of the Holy Spirit in the Church. It may be assumed that Manning would have pointed out to Bodley some

¹⁰⁴ *Ibidem*, pp. 16-17.

¹⁰⁵ J.H. Newman, ‘Letter to Pusey’, in *Difficulties of Anglicans*, vol II, p. 24.

of Newman's expressions which, because of their imprecision of language, left the door open to an unorthodox interpretation of his thought. The essay *On consulting the faithful* had got into trouble for this reason, and his *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk* ran a similar risk. In this last case, Manning intervened to prevent any official or unofficial sign of disapproval from Rome. On 9 February 1875 he wrote to answer Cardinal Franchi's remarks about passages in the *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk* which, in the opinion of some theologians in Rome, could mislead the faithful: 'I warmly implore your Eminence', he urged, 'to take no public steps as regard Father Newman's pamphlet, for the following reasons: The heart of Father Newman is as straight and Catholic as it ever was. His pamphlet has a most powerful influence over non-Catholics of this country. It makes a wholesome impression, specially on various Catholics of a difficult nature and of unsatisfied ideas. The aforesaid Father has never, up to the present, so openly defended the prerogatives and infallible authority of the Roman Pontiff, though he has always believed and preached this truth. The substance of the recent pamphlet is wholesome, but it is impossible not to notice certain propositions and a certain method of reasoning which is not in accord with the accepted mode of expression'¹⁰⁶. Manning felt that no harm would follow from this; on the other hand, a rebuke would be a source of untold evil for the Church in England. There is little doubt that Manning might have got a better impression of Newman's orthodoxy had he been aware of the content of his correspondence, and particularly that of his letters to Pusey and Flannagan.

Newman, for his part, was rather critical of the writings of the archbishop. He wondered how the 'science necessary for a theologian and the *responsibility* weighing upon an ecclesiastical ruler'¹⁰⁷ had not inhibited Manning from indulging in the extraordinary "rhetoric" which he had used concerning the infallibility issue. That was fair criticism, Manning's rhetoric could disfigure at times the expression of his thought. Still, it has to be said that Newman was rather unfamiliar with Manning's writings and with the general framework of his thought. As he confessed in one of his letters¹⁰⁸,

¹⁰⁶ Quoted by S. Leslie, *op.cit.*, p. 281. Manning, though, did not further define in his letter just how 'straight and Catholic' Newman's heart had ever been.

¹⁰⁷ Letter to C. Jenkins (2-XII-75); *LD*, XXVII, p. 383.

¹⁰⁸ Cfr. Letter to Mrs. Helbert (30-VIII-69); *LD*, XXIV, pp. 323-325.

he had not read Manning's *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost, The Grounds of Faith* or *England and Christendom*. It is highly probable that he had not read either the fourth volume of Anglican Sermons. As for Manning's *Pastorals*, Newman's letters give the impression of talking about them from what others had told him of their content, rather than from direct knowledge. Was this a literary device, to avoid direct criticism of the Archbishop? It seems unlikely.

7. 'The Catholic Spirit' and University Education

During the nineteenth century, Catholics in a position to benefit from university education and wishing to attend the English universities numbered but a few hundred souls. On the other hand, the amount of attention, time and energy which the English hierarchy dedicated in the last third of the century to university education was to be inversely proportional to the portion of their flock concerned with the issue. The interests involved, and the personalities arranged in the opposing camps, made sure that, for the best part of thirty years, the bishops were to have this matter almost constantly before their eyes.

The reforms of the 1850 had opened the doors of the ancient universities to those who, until then, had been prevented from attending them on religious grounds, and the Religious Test Act would in 1871 weaken even further the Established Church's hold on the universities. Catholics, as well as Dissenters, were bound to examine very carefully the implications and the advisability of the new freedom enjoyed by the members of their congregations. In 1864, the Catholic Bishops had been directed by *Propaganda* to address the issue. Two questions were then formulated: whether it was expedient for Catholics to avail themselves of the opportunity offered them of studying at Oxford and Cambridge; and if so, should they join the existing colleges or should a Catholic College be founded to receive them? The fruit of their deliberations, published on 13 December 1864, disappointed many expectations: the bishops forbade Catholics to attend Oxford and Cambridge, either by joining the existing Colleges or by entering a new Catholic College set up to receive them.

The *Pastorals* in which they announced to their respective dioceses the policy with respect to the universities made plain the reason for the resolution they had passed: Catholics could not, without endangering their faith, attend the universities. The general moral doctrine about the avoidance of occasions of sin was used to buttress this decision: to expose youths at a very impressionable age, when the most lasting intellectual influences are received, to the Protestant and rationalistic teaching then dominant in the universities would have given occasion for them to be shaken in the soundness of their religious convictions. No Catholic should expose himself to an occasion of grave sin or loss of faith without a very serious reason, and the bishops could not think of any such reason which could justify English Catholics attending Oxford and Cambridge. Some bishops cited the experience of Catholics who had attended Trinity College, Dublin, to show that the danger was a proximate and real one.

Manning was generally seen as the inspiration and driving force behind the policy. That, however, seems to have more to do with popular demonology than with the facts of the case. He had made abundantly clear his opposition to allowing Catholics to attend Oxford and Cambridge, but to make him responsible for the policy exaggerates his influence with Wiseman and with the rest of the bishops. Wiseman, knowing what was being said about Manning's influence in the affair, wanted to keep his Provost clear of the charge¹⁰⁹; besides, Manning had no part in the bishops' deliberations in 1864. Did Wiseman impose on the bishops a policy which had been previously distilled in his ear by Provost Manning? This is hardly likely. The English bishops, who had more than once shown their independence of spirit in opposing Wiseman's policies at home and in Rome, would probably have done so again if they had really disagreed with him on this issue. Manning was, on the whole, accurate when, years later, he described the reasons behind the Cardinal's actions: 'If ever, therefore, was anyone who, if it had been possible to sanction it, would have rejoiced over an association of prayer for the reunion of Christendom, and the return of Catholic youth to the Universities which Catholic England had created, it would have been our late Cardinal. But two things

¹⁰⁹ Wiseman rejected a suggestion from Manning about the form of his letter on the subject to avoid giving the impression that he was receiving -as was being said - all his inspirations from Manning, that he was under moral pressure, and that the text did not represent his own sentiments: 'Whatever, therefore, I write must be recognizable as mine'[Wiseman to Manning (30-XI-64), 'Unpublished letters of Cardinal Wiseman to Dr. Manning', in *The Dublin Review*, Vol. 169, n. 339, p. 191].

forbade him in any way to accept these invitations: his unerring Catholic instinct, and his keen intuition of the impossibility of combining fidelity to the divine tradition of the faith with the intellectual deviations and contradictions of modern England. His decision, therefore, on both these questions was prompt and final'¹¹⁰.

Manning was fully in agreement with the decisions of the hierarchy, and with the reasons they adduced. More than a year before their meeting, he had balanced the arguments in favour and against the attendance of Catholics to Oxford and Cambridge in an article in the July issue of *The Dublin Review*¹¹¹. The reasons in favour were clearly, though briefly, stated, but they were outweighed by the arguments against. Those who favoured the attendance of Catholics at the Universities supported their contention on the need for a Catholic presence in public life. They saw the two traditional universities as the means by which Catholics would break their social isolation, and be incorporated into the main stream of English society. Attendance at Oxford and Cambridge, they thought, would arm Catholics with the necessary intellectual tools to compete on equal terms with Protestants in the fields of literature and science, social and political life; their present inadequacies in those areas placed them at an obvious disadvantage. Besides, the personal relationships forged during those years would grant them easy access to future men of influence and power.

Manning was not indifferent to these arguments. He felt them as strongly as any, perhaps even more so. He could never reconcile himself to the idea of a fortress Church, hidden behind high walls, securing her intellectual and moral purity from contamination by avoiding all contact with the world. The Church had a mission to the world. It 'has a twofold work to do for mankind. Its first and primary, indeed, is to save souls, to lead them to eternal life. Its second, but not less true, is to ripen and elevate the social and political life of men by its influence of morality and of law'¹¹². He considered that the Church has a divine commission 'to enter into the most intimate relations with the natural society or commonwealth of men, or, in other words, with

¹¹⁰ H.E. Manning, *The Office of the Church in Higher Education, A Pastoral Letter* (London, 1885), p. 5.

¹¹¹ H.E. Manning, 'The Work and Wants of the Catholic Church in England' (*Dublin Review*, July 1863), in *Miscellanies*, I, pp. 25-71.

¹¹² *Ibidem*, p. 29.

peoples, states and civil powers'¹¹³. Thus, he would deeply regret, in later years, the abstention of Catholics from exercising their duties as citizens in countries like France and Italy. He avoided direct reference to Italy, however, so as not to clash with the official policy of the Vatican. He felt that abstention on the part of Catholics from social and, in particular, from political life had left social influence and political power in the hands of the enemies of the Church, and opened the door to a string of anti-Catholic laws. This was an abdication of natural duty and an indirect sanctioning of the separation of Church and State, between Church and Society, which had been condemned by the *Syllabus of Errors*. It was God's will, Manning thought, that the Church should always be in dialogue with society: 'the Church never withdraws from the State as such, which would be to abandon the natural society to its own maladies and mortality'¹¹⁴. And he added that the 'withdrawal of Catholics from the active service of the commonwealth, and the non-fulfilment of the duties of citizens and patriots, is a dereliction of duty, and unlawful in itself'¹¹⁵. In every situation, even revolutionary ones, the 'duty of using all civil powers and privileges still within reach for the welfare of the people, for the restoration of authority, and the maintenance of order, is a Christian and a Catholic duty'¹¹⁶. He thought that the Church had duties towards those political systems born of the French Revolution, even when they were anti-Catholic in many of their principles and pronouncements. In those situations, her aims should be: '(1) first, to guard and to conserve all the Christian faith and morals, that still remain in them; (2) secondly, to minimize all the evil of their legislation or government; and (3) thirdly, to recall them by all influences to a better condition'¹¹⁷.

He particularly regretted the absence of Catholic lay presence in English public life. It was true, he had written in 1863, that the 'social exile in which they had lived, and their exclusion (...) from public and private employments, have seriously diminished

¹¹³ H.E. Manning, 'The Catholic Church and Modern Society' (*North American Review*, n.d.), in *Miscellanies*, III, p. 310.

¹¹⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 312.

¹¹⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 317.

¹¹⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 313.

¹¹⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 315.

our capacity for usefulness'¹¹⁸. But that was an explanation which could be easily turned into an excuse. The situation was very much the same twenty years later; Catholics had still not made any sensible progress in the public life of England. Some blamed this on the lack of access for Catholics to higher education. Could Manning not see that it was precisely the ban on Catholics frequenting Oxford and Cambridge that had prevented any further Catholic advance and influence in the life of the country? That Manning could not draw this conclusion was due less to a lack of logical powers than on the very logic of his ideas on education.

The mission and duty of the Church, he would say, is to provide education: 'by its divine commission it is bound to form its own members. Their education in childhood and in youth is the inalienable duty of the Church'¹¹⁹. That included university education. Some might perhaps argue that, sooner or later in their lives, Catholics in England had to enter into the atmosphere and dangers of public life, that they had to enter into contact with anti-Catholic prejudices, a dominant Protestant culture and rationalism. Was it prudent to cocoon them and to try isolate them from the society of the world? Manning thought that not only was this impossible, but that their involvement in society was absolutely necessary; they should be fully immersed in it. It had to be, Manning would say, 'but not until their Catholic formation is complete. The Church would abdicate its pastoral office if it were to suffer the formation of its youth to pass from its own hands into the hands of teachers external to its own intellectual and Catholic unity. And no Catholic parent, without dereliction of duty, can withdraw a son from the education of a Catholic College, and place him at the most critical period of his life, when youth is passing into manhood, under the influence of non-Catholic Universities, where the last Catholic formation cannot be given, and where the first Catholic formation may be destroyed'¹²⁰.

The dangers attached to attendance at the Protestant universities were not the only reasons, in Manning's mind, for the banning of Catholics from Oxford and Cambridge. He felt even more keenly that, if Catholics were to attend them, Catholic education

¹¹⁸ H.E. Manning, 'The Work and Wants of the Catholic Church in England', in *Miscellanies*, I, p. 60.

¹¹⁹ H.E. Manning, *The Office of the Church in Higher Education*, p. 18.

¹²⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 19.

would remain an unfinished fabric, a machinery unable to turn out a finished product. It would also make impossible the building up of a Catholic culture. Manning felt that the foundation of a Catholic University was an imperative need; without it the Church would not be able to perform fully its commission. Giving permission for Catholics to frequent Oxford and Cambridge would postpone *sine die* provision for that need. He was, therefore, sorely disappointed when, in 1864, the bishops, while banning Catholics from attending the two traditional universities, decided against setting up a Catholic university. As he wrote to Talbot: 'The bishops decided against the Protestant Universities in all ways; but that a Catholic University is not possible. To this I cannot agree. And I trust that they will be encouraged to attempt, or to let others attempt something to meet the needs of our laity. It would not do to prohibit, and to provide nothing. Many will go to Oxford and Cambridge; and the precedent will be set, and all hope of anything higher will be lost'¹²¹.

Thus, it can be said that Manning's concept of higher education was in no sense a negative one. 'The prohibition against the ancient universities has to be seen as but one facet of the much greater constructive project, the preparation of English Catholics for the formation of a Catholic University. Neither was the formation of such an institution an indication of a ghetto mentality'¹²². Catholics had a contribution to make to contemporary English thought, and a Catholic University was the appropriate means to enable them so to do. The prevalent intellectual atmosphere of the time was dominated by rationalism, either in its absolute or moderate varieties. It was the Catholics to whom fell the task of rescuing human culture and society from what Manning did not hesitate to call a superstition; one, which, 'strange to say, pervades those who are willing to believe but little else'. The credal articles of this superstition were that 'faith and reason are at variance; that human reason, by submitting itself to faith, becomes dwarfed; that faith interferes with the rights of reason; that it is a violation of its prerogatives, and a diminution of its perfection'¹²³.

¹²¹ Quoted in V.A. McClelland, *Cardinal Manning. His Public Life and Influence 1865-1892* (London, 1962), pp. 92-93.

¹²² V.A. McClelland, *English Roman Catholics and Higher Education (1830-1903)* (Oxford, 1973), p. 353.

¹²³ *Four Evils*, p. 3.

Manning felt that two ideas should be safely anchored in every Christian heart at the end of the educational process: first, the existence of a divine revelation, elevating and perfecting human knowledge; second, the divine institution of an infallible teaching authority. It was the task of Christian education to leave deeply engraved in the Christian mind that the 'revelation of faith is no discovery which the reason of man has made for himself by induction, or by deduction, or by analysis, or by synthesis, or by logical process, or by experimental chemistry. The revelation of faith is a discovery of itself by the Divine Reason, the unveiling of the Divine Intelligence, and the illumination flowing from it cast upon the intelligence of man; and if so, I would ask, how can there be variance or discord? How can the illumination of faith diminish the stature of the human reason? How can its prerogatives be violated? Is not the truth the very reverse of all this? Is it not the fact that human reason is perfected and elevated above itself by the illumination of faith?'¹²⁴

Once Catholics had these fundamental principles well rooted in their minds and had made them a test in the acquisition of human knowledge, they would be ready to enter into a dialogue with the world and with the dominant ideas and principles of the day. The purpose of a Catholic university education was to help Catholics acquire human knowledge, and to learn how to approach culture and scientific discoveries from a clear intellectual position. This was something which could hardly be given them during the years of their school education.

Manning felt that if Catholics were to serve their generation in a truly Christian way 'it must be by the boldest and clearest enunciation of the great principles of Divine certainty in matters of Faith, and by pointing out the relations of Faith to human knowledge, scientific and moral'¹²⁵. That was an approach, he thought, which recommended itself to English people. 'There is', he wrote, 'something downright, manly, and decided in it [the English character]; and it respects the same - that is, its own - qualities in others as much as it despises and ridicules all servile or petty eagerness to court its favour. Downright, masculine, and decided Catholics - more Roman than Rome, and more ultramontane than the Pope himself [!] - may enter

¹²⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 4.

¹²⁵ *TM*, p. VII.

English society and be treated with good will and respect everywhere, if only they hold their own with self-respect and a delicate consideration of what is due to others (...). No greater blunder could be committed than to try to propitiate Englishmen or English society by a tame, diluted, timid, or worldly Catholicism'¹²⁶. Some might be tempted by the thought that English people could be won by compromise. Manning quickly dismissed that opinion: 'All the experience that I possess tells me that there is no greater illusion than this. The people of England expect us to be inflexible in all that make us Catholic: and they confide readily in those who never compromise'¹²⁷.

What made a man thoroughly Catholic, and thus distinct from his Protestant neighbours, was the firm belief in a divine authority still teaching the faith in the world, i.e.: the permanent presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church, and His constant and infallible *magisterium*. '*Sentire cum Ecclesia* - that is, to think and to feel with the Catholic Church - [would] be the test and note of a faithful Catholic'¹²⁸. That meant to think and to feel with Rome. This was the sure principle and the firm foundation for Catholics moving among the stormy seas of present day conflicting ideologies and rampant rationalism. Manning's article on 'The work and wants of the Catholic Church in England' (1863) finished with the following words: 'There is but one safety for us: "*Sentire cum Ecclesia*", in the whole extent of faith, discipline, worship, custom, and instincts - the most intimate and filial fidelity of intellect, heart, and will to the living voice of the Church of God'¹²⁹. Only then, once the foundation was solidly established, could the Catholic make a positive contribution to the intellectual, social and political life of his country. Manning's own presence in so many and diverse areas of public life - from social concerns to his participation in the Metaphysical Society - rested on those convictions.

Protestant England, on the other hand, was also in need of being confronted with those Catholic principles. The root of her errors and divisions was the denial of the presence

¹²⁶ H.E. Manning, 'The Works and Wants of the Catholic Church in England', in *Miscellanies*, I, pp. 65-66.

¹²⁷ H.E. Manning, *The Office of the Church in Higher Education*, p. 20.

¹²⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 14.

¹²⁹ H.E. Manning, 'The Work and Wants of the Catholic Church in England', in *Miscellanies*, I, p. 71.

of an infallible teaching authority on earth; the remedy, its enthroneing in the mind of the people of the country. Here public opinion was overwhelmingly Protestant, and opposed to a Church divinely constituted and endowed with an infallible teaching authority. 'The first principles and maxims of Catholic education - such as a submission to a teaching authority, fear of error, mistrust of our own judgments - are extinct. This spirit begins in our schools, pervades our Universities, and animates the whole of English society'¹³⁰. Manning was also afraid of the influence that the general atmosphere of the country could have on the habits of mind of English Catholics. In his report to Propaganda in 1867 about the state of his diocese he pointed out how it was not surprising that daily intercourse with non-Catholics, reading their newspapers and books, would imbue Catholics with some of their errors, 'more through ignorance than through malice'¹³¹. Still, that was a worrying fact. The atmosphere was there, he would write on another occasion: 'We cannot draw breath without inhaling it; and the effect of it is visible upon men who do not suspect themselves of any want of Catholic instincts. It has become unconscious; and what strikes and offends foreign Catholics is hardly, or not at all, perceived by those who are born into this atmosphere'¹³². That subtle and imperceptible influence of the intellectual environment on Catholics made it even more necessary to insist on those fundamental Catholic principles, until they were deeply and safely engraved in Catholic minds.

Manning's opposition to allowing Catholics to study at Oxford or Cambridge had the above principles at heart. His opposition to Newman going to Oxford, on the other hand, had a twofold basis. It is true that he was afraid that the presence of Newman at Oxford would encourage Catholics to go there. But there was also another reason: Manning felt that Newman was not in full possession of the elements that made up the 'Catholic Spirit', as he had described them, and he could not accept with equanimity the idea of leaving the formation of Catholic university students in his hands. As has been pointed out, 'there was his own personal unease at the influence that Newman, being Newman, would actually exercise in Oxford. He would tend to create Catholics

¹³⁰ *Ibidem*, pp. 62-63.

¹³¹ SCPF, *Scritture Riferite nei Congressi, Anglia (1867-1870)*, Fol. 345.

¹³² H.E. Manning, 'The Work and Wants of the Catholic Church in England', in *Miscellanies*, I, p. 63.

after his own image; and it was not an image that Manning much liked¹³³.

A Catholic university would obviate these problems. It would also offer an additional advantage. Its contact with similar institutions, then growing in different countries of Europe and America, would help break down the intellectual insularity and national prejudices of English Catholics. Unfortunately, Manning's Catholic University College at Kensington was a sad failure. As usual, he consoled himself with the thought of the mysterious ways of Providence: good always comes out, in the end, from what men consider failure and defeat, if one is working for God's glory. Perhaps the time was not yet ripe for a Catholic university. In 1882, Manning, from the present setback, looked into the future: 'That a college of higher studies for Catholic young men will one day be demanded is certain.' On that day, 'the timid and narrow counsels (...) of those who desire to see our Catholic youth at Oxford and Cambridge, will be heard no more'¹³⁴.

He had dreams of true and deep Catholic influence on every aspect of the life of the country, born from the pure spring of Catholic principles. He died with those dreams intact.

¹³³ D. Newsome, *The Convert Cardinals* (London, 1993), pp. 265-266.

¹³⁴ H.E. Manning, 'The Work and Wants of the Catholic Church in England', in *Miscellanies*, III, p. 351.

CHAPTER VII

THE PREPARATION OF THE COUNCIL

1. The Agenda for the Council

Pius IX's decision to convoke an Ecumenical Council had a long period of gestation. It seems that Cardinal Lambruschini had mentioned this possibility as early as 1849, as a response to the extraordinary needs of the times. Still, it was not until December 1864 that Pius IX introduced to the Curial Cardinals his intention of calling a General Council, an idea, he said, which had been in his mind for a long time. The Cardinals expressed themselves favourable to the idea of the Council, and the wheels of the machinery to prepare it were soon set in motion. In March 1865 the newly set up 'Congregation for the Future Council' started acting on its own suggestion of preparing in draft form the *Schemata* to be discussed in the council. The first step was to consult bishops all over the world about the matters that they considered should be addressed by the forthcoming council. Letters were sent in the following months to the bishops selected for the purpose. The original list did not include any English-speaking bishop among those to be consulted.

Henry Edward Manning was appointed Archbishop of Westminster by Pius IX in May 1865. In October of the same year, after his consecration in England and his journey to Rome for the Pallium, he received a letter from Cardinal Catarini asking him to send his suggestions. His answer was prompt and clear. It followed the lines along which his thought had been running for many a year, expressing the intellectual convictions which had shaped his life.

'To His Eminence Cardinal Catarini, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for the Council, Rome.

Your Eminence,

It would not be difficult to give some vague answer to your letter of 26th of last month; to give an exact answer to a question so serious as the present one is very difficult.

The multiple perversions of error have grown forth so much in our days, particularly in England, that it is easier to compile them than to analyze them.

As in past centuries, so it is in our present time, that among the revealed truths there is always some particular truth which seems to become prominent or conspicuous as a sign of contradiction. In the first centuries, the first articles of the creed were under attack by the heretics; in later centuries those which came next; in these present days, the last articles of the creed are called into question. It may be said that the heresies of our time concern mainly the last paragraph of the creed, that is, the Holy Spirit and His temporal mission. All the heresies of the Pseudo-Reformation can be included under this heading: once the infallibility of the Church - the necessary corollary of the Holy Spirit's presence in the Church - has been rejected, then, all those divine things that hung on it perish; once the tree is cut the fruits and the leaves fall down. This is what has happened in England, that the notion of the Church as a body perpetually endowed and supported with supernatural gifts by the action of the Holy Spirit has almost completely disappeared from the minds of the English people.

Thus, taking into consideration the circumstances of my country, it seems most opportune to me that the supreme authority [of the Council] should make some pronouncement about the temporal mission of the Holy Spirit and about his perpetual and infallible assistance. This would serve to show more clearly the following truths:

1. That the Holy Spirit, after the Incarnation of the Word, had come into the world in a more eminent way, in order to undertake more powerful works.
2. That between the Holy Spirit and the Church there exists an indissoluble union - in the analogy of the Incarnation, but excluding an hypostatic union - from which flow the endowments and properties which inhere intrinsically and perpetually in the Church.

3. That the living and perpetual teaching is consequently infallible.
4. That, therefore, to appeal from the teaching Church is essentially heretical.
5. That the appeals to the testimony of the ancient Fathers, or to the testimony of antiquity as some say, are clear manifestations of rationalism.
6. That the *viva vocis* teaching given by the Supreme Pontiff on matters concerning faith, morals, or dogmatic facts is infallible.

Today, as your Eminence well knows, three centuries after the Reformation, this heresy, like Arianism in the time of St. Gregory, is passing away. In those parts where the pestilence of Protestantism rages, the dispute is about the most fundamental principle of religion; that is, about the nature of divine faith. Today it is not just a particular doctrine of faith which is controverted, Christian revelation and the divine authority of the Church are being questioned. The possibility and the fact of revelation should be maintained against perfect rationalists; the presence and perpetual assistance of the Holy Spirit, and his perpetual and infallible voice in the Church, should be upheld against the imperfect rationalists, among which should be counted the Anglicans. Thus, in the same way as the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary has been defined, it is to be expected that the dogma of the infallibility of the Church will be equally defined. In these present days we have reached the first foundation of the faith; the present time, the exposition of the faith and the ripeness of the matter itself, seem to demand urgently the promulgation by the supreme authority of the infallibility of the Church and of the Supreme Pontiff speaking *ex cathedra Petri*.

Thereupon, I, with my whole heart, humbly embrace the counsel of our Lord to extirpate the errors of this time, the only and always looked for remedy for the evils of the Church.

I remain the obedient and humble servant of your Eminence,

Henry Edward, Archbishop of Westminster.

Westminster, 15th November 1865¹.

His controversy with Pusey, the A.P.U.C., the pamphlet war between Ward and Ryder and the growth of what he called the spirit of *The Home and Foreign* reinforced in his mind the need for the definition. He did trust that the Council would find, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the solution for present day problems; he also held that the Holy Spirit counts on man's effort and industry to obtain the desired result. Manning, therefore, was to act decidedly on his own convictions about what the Church, and the world, needed most at that particular juncture.

The infallibility of the Church and the Pope had been constant theme of his sermons and writings long before he had come to know of the forthcoming council. *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost* had appeared in 1865, and his answer to Pusey and the Pastoral on the A.P.U.C. were to deal with the same subject.

2. *The Jubilee of 1867 and Fr. Liberatore's vow*

His first passage of arms on the world's stage championing the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope was to take place in 1867, during the celebrations in honour of the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul. Some five hundred bishops had gathered in Rome for the occasion. Making use of the opportunity presented by the Jubilee, the Pope announced publicly, in his Allocution of 26 June, his intention of holding a General Council. The bishops present decided to respond with an address to the Pope's announcement; its drafting was entrusted to a commission of seven, Manning and Dupanloup, bishop of Orleans, among them. Ullathorne would later report as a certain fact that, on this occasion, Manning had 'got a hint from the Pope to check Orleans in the commission for drawing up the Address'². Whether this is true to fact, or just a rumour, is difficult to determine. One thing is clear, however: Manning did not require any hint to spur him into action.

¹ *M*, 49, cols. 170D-171D.

² Letter to Brown (26-X-69); quoted in C. Butler, *op.cit.*, p. 123.

Haynald, archbishop of Kalocsa, was asked by the committee to produce a first draft to be submitted to the other members for study and approval. Haynald's text used several times the word *infallible* when speaking about the Pope and his teaching. No objections were raised in the meeting of the committee but Dupanloup suggested that Franchi, archbishop of Thessalonica, should revise the text. After Franchi's revision the word *infallible* was no longer included in the Address, and it was supposed that the omission was due to Dupanloup's influence.

Manning's sanitized version of the proceedings in *The True Story of the Vatican Council* described the sequence of events at length. Haynald's draft, in outline, 'was nearly as it was adopted at last; but in one point, bearing intimately on the history of the Council, it underwent an important revision. As it originally stood, the word *infallible* was, in more places than one, ascribed to the office and authority of the Pontiff. To this word, as expressing a doctrine of Catholic faith, no member of the commission objected. It was however said that the word *infallible* had as yet been used only in provincial councils, or pastoral letters, or theological schools, but that it had not been inserted in the formal acts of any general Council of the Church, and that, inasmuch as the 500 bishops then in Rome were not assembled in council, it might be advisable not to seem to assume the action or office of a Council. These considerations were assented to by all. It was then proposed to insert the words of the Council of Florence, which was the last authoritative decree on the primacy of the Roman Pontiff. To this no objection as to the subject-matter was made; but it was urged that the draft address already contained expressions stronger than the decree of the Council of Florence, which only implicitly contains the infallibility of the head of the Church as the teacher of all Christians, for the address explicitly declares that "Peter has spoken by the mouth of Pius". To this it was answered that though beyond all doubt these words explicitly declare the voice of the Pontiff to be infallible as Peter's was, yet this acclamation of the fathers of Chalcedon and that of the third Council of Constantinople were always, and not unreasonably, set aside as of little weight in controversy, as little more than rhetorical amplifications of the authority of Leo and of Agatho. They were not doctrinal formulas, much less definitions, but only acclamations; and acclamations define nothing, and can form neither objects of faith nor terminations of controversy. It was therefore by the vote of almost all the seven members of the commission, if not indeed

by the united vote of all, decided that the words of the decree of the Florentine Council should be inserted'³.

The exchange of arguments seems to have been rather more heated than Manning gave to understand at first. In 1879, Manning wrote a note to answer Ollivier's contention⁴ that the recollections in *The True History* were not accurate, and that it had been Manning himself who had insisted on the insertion of the word 'infallible'. 'I did not press', he wrote, 'for the insertion of the doctrine [in the original draft], but I resisted the exclusion of the word unless the Florentine Decree were inserted in the Address'. Dupanloup opposed this, but the insertion of the Decree of the Council of Florence was agreed. The episode did not quite end there. Manning takes up the narrative again: 'At the fourth session the Address was read again, but the Decree had not been inserted. I had foreseen that this might happen, and I had brought with me a transcript of the Decree which I gave to Mgr. Franchi. At our fifth session I found that the Decree had not been inserted. And as I had again a prevision that this might happen, I had brought with me a second copy of the Decree, which was then incorporated into the Address'⁵. The tensions within the committee did reach the bishops: 'you know', Ullathorne wrote to Bishop Brown on 26 October 1869, 'what a fight there was between them [Dupanloup and Manning], and what a different edition Orleans subsequently gave to the story from that we received on the spot'⁶.

In *The true story of the Vatican Council* Manning would say 'that the impression made by the Centenary upon the minds of the bishops determined many to promote, by all means in their power, the closing of a controversy which had for centuries periodically disturbed the Church'⁷. Manning was among them. A small but significant event had taken place during the celebrations of the Centenary, while the preparation of the Address was going on. Manning told the story in a *Memorial* written in 1881: 'On the eve of St. Peter's Day I and the Bishop of Ratisbon were assisting at the throne of the

³ *True*, pp. 53-55.

⁴ É. Ollivier, *L'Église et l'État au Concile du Vatican* (Paris, 1879), vol. I, p. 318.

⁵ Leslie, *op.cit.*, pp. 214-215.

⁶ C. Butler, *op.cit.*, p. 123; see also Cwiekowsky, *op.cit.*, pp. 67-69.

⁷ *True*, p. 55.

Pope at the first Vespers of St. Peter; we then made the vow drawn up by P. Liberatore, an Italian Jesuit, to do all in our power to obtain the Definition of Papal Infallibility. We undertook to recite every day certain prayers in Latin contained in a little book still in my possession⁸. The formula, subsequently published by the *Civiltà Cattolica*, was to be used widely, particularly in France.

The Jubilee of 1867 had a momentous significance for Manning. It had been, as far as he was concerned, a proof of how 'the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, with its full prerogatives and endowments, was vividly before the minds of the bishops'⁹. The words of the Address were a confession - by the largest number of bishops ever before gathered together - of their faith in the infallibility of the Pope. 'Without doubt', Manning said, 'the^{se} words did not explicitly declare the Roman Pontiff to be infallible, but half the episcopate of the Church would be not unreasonably accused of great temerity in their language if they had not believed the head of the Church to be in some special way guarded from error in his teaching'¹⁰.

3. *A Pastoral on the Pope's Infallibility*

The news of the forthcoming Council was now in the public domain, and Manning lost no time in fulfilling his vow: his Pastoral *The Centenary of Saint Peter and the General Council* was dated 8 September 1867. As he had done before with the Pastoral on the A.P.U.C., Manning sent the draft Pastoral to Ullathorne on 5 September. Ullathorne answered at length on the 8th: 'My time has only let me run once over the Pastoral, and I have not been able to verify the quotations, but that you probably did not expect. I certainly should not put it out, were its responsibility on me, without modifications. And, in so formal a document as a Pastoral should carefully mark the distinction between what is defined truth and what is theological exposition. What I would recommend would be to submit it to some very sound theologian'¹¹, and he suggested

⁸ *P*, II, p. 420.

⁹ *True*, p. 55.

¹⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 52.

¹¹ *Manning Mss. West.*, Manning-Ullathorne Cor., U 84.

either Perrone or Murray of Maynooth. Ullathorne felt that if it was published as it stood 'there are things in it which will tend to embarrass rather than to help Rome'¹². Manning incorporated Ullathorne's suggestions, and told him on the 9th that the draft had been sent to Murray. His answer was forwarded to the Bishop of Birmingham, who, on the 15th of the same month, wrote: 'Thank you for the sight of Dr. Murray's letter, I congratulate you in obtaining his suffrage to your theological accuracy'. He was, at the same time, somewhat suspicious: 'You do not however say whether the copy sent to him was the same that was sent to me or the one in which you informed me that you had made certain modifications'¹³. Yes, Manning would confirm, the 'proofs were the same: without the change of a letter'. The Bishop of Birmingham, in spite of Murray's judgment, was still doubtful about the appropriateness of publishing the Pastoral: 'Theological accuracy is one thing', he would say, 'the *tempus omnia loquendi* is another'¹⁴. Manning hoped that he had not misjudged *de tempore loquendi*. In his mind, as he had already said on 9 September, the 'matter is no more than we were taught in Rome; and I feel that one of the causes of misunderstanding is that we have not sufficiently expressed it'¹⁵. Had the doctrine been put forward boldly and clearly many of the difficulties which then afflicted the Church would have been prevented. Newman, after the publication of the Pastoral, would agree with his bishop. He thought the Archbishop 'obviously wrong in introducing into his Pastorals the Pope's infallibility'. For his part, when writing the *Apologia*, he had born in mind Ullathorne's advice that there should be no mixing up 'dogma with theological opinion, and that in a popular work theological opinions ought to be kept under'¹⁶.

The Pastoral pointed out how the gathering of Bishops in Rome in 1862 and 1867 had been a manifestation of the unity and universality of the Church; a reaffirmation of faith in the supremacy and the prerogatives of the Prince of the Apostles, in the person of his successor; a manifestation of the absolute adherence of the bishops to his authority and teaching. That was the great lesson from the Jubilee which Manning wanted to

¹² *Ibidem*.

¹³ *Ibidem*, U 86.

¹⁴ *Ibidem*.

¹⁵ *Ibidem*, U 85.

¹⁶ J.D. Holmes (ed.), *The Theological papers of John Henry Newman*, p. 155.

expand upon for the benefit of his people: ‘the perpetual office and action of Peter as the source of unity and infallibility to the Church’¹⁷.

Manning repeated in the Pastoral what he had already said many a time. ‘The Incarnate Word, in Whom were hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, became the fountain of grace and truth, of doctrine, and of jurisdiction to the world. To the chief of His Apostles He conveyed by the Holy Ghost all His communicable prerogatives, and thereby constituted him His vicar upon earth. (...) The indefectibility of truth, therefore, both in its conception and enunciation, (...) resides first in its head, next in the whole episcopate united with him; so that the declarations and condemnations of the head of the Church apart from the episcopate are infallible; and likewise those of the episcopate, being united with him. (...) [The] fountain of infallible teaching is the Divine Head in heaven, through the organ of the visible head of the Church on earth’¹⁸.

The Centenary had been the celebration of the Chair of Peter, and this ‘is the power of Peter, and the place where it has been divinely fixed’¹⁹. Peter’s faith, sustained by Christ’s prayer, is ‘transmitted and impersonated in his successors’, and it is, therefore, ‘by its intrinsic stability, indefectible and infallible’²⁰. From this special prerogative of the Roman Pontiffs it follows that the particular Church of Rome cannot err. The ‘Chair of Peter has been held to be the test of orthodoxy, the confirmer of Councils, the supreme tribunal of faith, the destroyer of heresies, the end of controversies, an authority which is subject to no appeal, to no reversal, to no revision, to no superior upon earth’²¹. He could call, in confirmation of his words, upon expressions from Pius IX’s Allocution on 26 June, together with the response of the Bishops.

¹⁷ *Privilegium*, I, p.16.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*, pp. 22-24.

¹⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 24.

²⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 25. Manning did not equate stability, indefectibility and infallibility; he saw them as ‘three modes of expressing the same Divine fact’ (*Privilegium*, II, p. 149). That fact being the active presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church, from which the stability, indefectibility and infallibility of the Church follow.

²¹ *Privilegium*, I, p. 26.

Manning felt that this clear doctrine had been obscured by those who alleged that it was a novel opinion which, under the name of Ultramontanism, had made its appearance but recently, its main principle being 'put in act' by the Council of Constance. Those who held this so used to add that its rise was to be ascribed to ambition and to bureaucratic despotism. After the Reformation, the breaking away from Rome of the freedom-loving Teutonic nations left that despotic theory to grow unchecked. Manning saw it differently. He considered the infallibility of the Pope to be the foundation of the life of the Church and of its mission, the keystone holding the whole structure together. It was a doctrine which had always been maintained by the Church: 'The Divine order has united the supremacy of truth and jurisdiction in the same person; and from the Tradition of the Fathers and Councils it is evident that the whole Church has believed the successor and the See of Peter to be not only supreme in power, but infallible in faith'²². As was his custom, he added a long list of quotations and authorities in confirmation of what he had just said. Ultramontanism was under attack not because it was a new doctrine; the real reason was that the 'greatest blunder in the world's eyes is Catholicism: the next greatest is Christianity. Ultramontanism is Catholic Christianity'²³.

Manning made use of a practical example to illustrate the Pope's infallibility from a different angle: the relationship of the Pope to a General Council, which all accept as infallible. The prerogative of Peter, he would say, 'as the confirmer of his brethren is never so explicitly manifest as in the direction and confirmation of Councils. Every Council of the Church, from Nice to Trent, has reflected more visibly and vividly the supremacy and infallibility of the Chair of Peter'²⁴. It belonged to the Pope, and to him alone, to convoke, direct, prorogue, translate or dissolve a Council. The Bishops in Council are judges of the faith, but it is important to understand in which sense they are such. 'If, at any time, in an Oecumenical Council, any dogma be defined which has already been defined by the Pope, or by other General Councils, the bishops act as judges, but are already bound to judge in conformity to what is already defined. But if the defining of anything not yet defined is in question, they are the judges in such a

²² *Ibidem*, pp. 58-59.

²³ *Ibidem*, p. 39.

²⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 70.

sense that their judgments have no force to bind the conscience until the assent and confirmation of the Supreme Pontiff has been given'²⁵. The need for confirmation by the Pope what shows more clearly the Church's awareness 'that from the head the influx [of infallible truth] descends into the members', he said quoting Brancatus de Laurea²⁶.

In *The True Story of the Vatican Council*, Manning, against the Conciliarist ideas, went on to say that the holding of Councils is not essential for the Church to carry out her mission, although they are useful and some times necessary for particular times and errors; but the 'Church does not depend on General Councils for the knowledge of truth'²⁷. He would point out how there is 'no divine commandment, no divine obligation, requiring that the bishops of the universal Church should meet in one place'²⁸.

She 'is not infallible in virtue of General Councils, but General Councils are infallible in virtue of the infallibility of the Church. The whole Church, both the *Ecclesia Docens* and the *Ecclesia Discens*, diffused throughout the world, is infallible at all times. The Church discharges its office as witness, judge, and teacher always, and in all places'. The See of Peter and the episcopate diffused throughout the world - and united to the Roman Pontiff - 'are so assisted by the perpetual presence of the Spirit of truth that they can never err as witness, judge, or teacher'²⁹.

4. *The opportuneness of the definition of Papal Infallibility*

Having presented the case against the need for General Councils, as of absolute necessity for the life of the Church, Manning was then confronted by the task of showing the opportunity of General Councils in general, and of the forthcoming one in

²⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 78.

²⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 72.

²⁷ *True*, p. 14.

²⁸ *Ibidem*.

²⁹ *Privilegium*, I, p. 77; see also *True*, p. 14ff.

particular. His main priority, however, was to defend the opportunity of the definition of Papal Infallibility against the voices which started to be raised against it.

Councils, he would say, are very effective against heresy and schism, and for the discipline of the Church. They 'confirm both truth and unity', as the faith of the Church is witnessed by the confession of the Universal Church gathered in Council; they also 'set a mark against their opposites which wither their growth and ensure their fall'. From a disciplinary point of view, Councils provide a means of gathering information about the needs of the Church which help to readjust its practice and laws; besides, laws 'are far more acceptably carried through when the Supreme Pontiff makes such laws with the assent of General Council'³⁰.

There was an obvious need, to Manning's mind, for the convocation of a Council at that juncture of the history of the Church. Times had changed since the Council of Trent, and the Church's discipline needed to re-adjust to the new circumstances; new doctrinal questions were in need of urgent answer; and the Church also had to redefine its relationship to the new political order born after the French Revolution, so as to achieve peaceful cooperation between Church and State.

One great benefit arising from the Council would be the consciousness of the unity of the Church, and, with it, of its power: the 'conscious unity, universality, and power of the Church must be indefinitely elicited, and strengthen by meeting in Council (...). All who have been assembled at the centre of authority will carry back with them a consciousness of power which will spread through the whole Catholic unity; and this consciousness of unity is strength'³¹. The confidence born of this knowledge could not fail to mark the relationships of the Church with Society, and with the State.

Manning thought that the unity of the Church would be reinforced if the Council were to put forward a clear statement on the nature and prerogatives of its Head. The Church's unity is based on truth, and truth rests on the infallibility of the Pope. He is the keystone on which the whole edifice rests, the source of its unity and infallibility.

³⁰ *Privilegium*, I, p. 80.

³¹ *Ibidem*, pp. 92-94.

The lull which followed the announcement of the Council was suddenly broken by the articles of the *Civiltà Cattolica* in February 1868, published as a correspondence from France. They were based on two reports sent to Rome by the Nuncio in Paris about the climate of opinion in the country with respect to the forthcoming Council. The reports seem to have originated from the circle of Veillot, and they affirmed that the majority of French people were for the definition of Papal Infallibility. They hoped, the report continued, that the Council would be a short one and that the unanimity of the Council would make long deliberations unnecessary; the definition of Papal infallibility could, consequently, be carried by acclamation.

The articles could not but excite powerful feelings in more than one heart. The anti-romanism of Döllinger vented its anger in a series of articles, signed by *Janus*, which started appearing in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* early in March. They were soon collected and published in book form, with translations into English and other several languages appearing during the summer of that year. The confessed aim of the articles was to assail that party which tried to carry out its plans 'either in ignorance of Church history or by deliberately falsifying it'³². The decadence of the Church, *Janus* said, had its ultimate root in the present form of the Primacy. It had been meant, in God's plan, to be a source of strength for the Church; but the Primacy had been transformed into the Papacy in the Middle Ages, and in its present form was 'hindering and decomposing the action of its vital powers, and bringing manifold diseases in its train'³³. *Janus* went on to state in clear terms that to 'prove the dogma of Papal Infallibility from Church history nothing less is required than a complete falsification of it'³⁴. Only public opinion could prevent this happening, and *Janus* felt it was his responsibility to awaken public opinion to the danger. To do so *Janus* was forced to bring forth the dark side in the history of the Papacy. The book did not bear the names and titles of its author or authors; they considered 'that a work so entirely made up of facts, and supporting all its statements by reference to the original authorities, must and can speak for itself,

³² 'Janus', *The Pope and The Council* (2nd ed, London, 1869), p. XVIII. The articles seem to have been a collaborative effort, with Döllinger as the main author and the moving force behind them.

³³ *Ibidem*, p. XIX.

³⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 49.

without needing any names attached to it'³⁵.

Janus' spirit was a curious sort of revived Donatism, bringing up the human errors of Popes and bishops, as clear disclaimers of their assumed prerogatives; the abuses being the clear signs of the erroneous character of the principle. Manning's attention may have been attracted by *Janus'* reference to Melchor Cano: 'The third of the theological fathers of Papal Infallibility was Tapper's contemporary, the Spanish Melchior Canus, who, like him, was at the Council of Trent. His work on theological principles and evidences was, up to Bellarmine's time, the great authority used by all infallibilists. But his experience of the effects of that system on the Popes and the *Curia* themselves is thus summed up in a later judgment, composed by command of the King of Spain, "He who thinks Rome can be healed, knows little of her; the whole administration of the Church is there converted into a great trading business, a traffic forbidden by all laws human, natural, and divine"³⁶. The conclusion the reader was expected to draw was an obvious one, though far removed from the actual mind of Melchor Cano. That was, Manning thought, history at its worst: biased and claiming for itself the certainty of an exact science. *Janus'* book was 'an elaborate attempt of many hands to destroy, by profuse misrepresentations of history, the authority of the Pope, and to create animosity against the future Council'³⁷.

The Council stood condemned in the eyes of *Janus* even before its opening Session. The last paragraph of the book claimed: 'whatever course the Synod may take, one quality can never be predicated of it, namely, that it has been a really free Council. Theologians and canonists declare that without complete freedom the decisions of a Council are not binding, and the assembly is only a pseudo-Synod. Its decrees may have to be corrected'³⁸. As an exercise in poisoning the wells, the book was a success; it had a considerable influence in shaping the vision of future events and it unsettled many a mind.

³⁵ *Ibidem*, p. XXIX.

³⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 379.

³⁷ *True*, p. 67.

³⁸ '*Janus*', *op.cit.*, p. 425.

Manning was directly affected by one of *Janus*' assertions. The book claimed that 'the whole plan of the campaign for fixing the infallibility dogma is already mapped out. An English Prelate - we could name him - has undertaken at the commencement of the proceedings to direct a humble prayer to the Holy Father to raise the opinion of his infallibility to the dignity of a dogma'³⁹. Then, the plan hoped, it would be carried by acclamation. All the eyes turned towards Manning. Ullathorne seemed to have believed the report: 'I have it on second-hand authority', he wrote to Bishop Brown on 26 October 1869, 'that the Archbishop was to have put the proposition about the infallibility to the Council, and that the priest is named to whom he told it. I do not doubt myself but that there was an understanding between him and Rome about it'⁴⁰. The official denials in *The Tablet* do not seem to have affected Ullathorne's belief in the accuracy of the report.

Numerous publications, mostly pamphlets, appeared around this time; the greater part of them trying to stir up opinion against the Council and attacking the infallibility of the Pope from historical precedents, like that of Honorius. Germany, though, was the country where the ferment created by *Janus* was at its highest. The *Coblentz Memorial*, drawn by lay people, expressed their concerns about the Council and suggested some of the areas which they considered should be the object of study and reform by the Council. Montalembert, and the school of *Le Correspondent* welcomed it, afraid of the possibility of the Ultramontanists pushing even further the condemnation of modern civilisation and of the principles of the State forms born of the principles of 1789. Meanwhile, those in favour of the definition of Papal Infallibility were not idle. Dechamps published in June his pamphlet about the infallibility of the Pope; it achieved a great success with his moderate but unequivocal Ultramontanism, and it went through numerous editions in a few months. August saw the publication in several languages of *Observations on the question, whether it be opportune to define the Infallibility of the Sovereign Pontiff?*, the work of Brentano, Döllinger's disciple. The pamphlet was sent to most of the bishops, and it was to provide Dupanloup with much of his material for his *Observations*. The German bishops, assembled at Fulda in September for their annual meeting, issued a joint Pastoral about the Council trying to reassure their flocks

³⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 6.

⁴⁰ C. Butler, *op.cit.*, p. 123.

about the forthcoming Council. In a significant move, sixteen out of the twenty German bishops signed a separate letter to the Holy Father expressing their conviction that the definition would be inopportune. The Hungarian and Bohemian Bishops expressed similar feelings. The French Episcopate was too divided for common action. The other European Episcopates did not express a common opinion, although it was well known that Italian and Spanish Bishops were solidly behind the definition. Newman looked on apprehensively. He welcomed Dechamps's pamphlet on the Pope's infallibility, and, on 3 September, wrote to Monsell: 'There is an Essay of the Archbishop of Malines, a Redemptorist, on the Pope's Infallibility - very moderate, as I thought, and good - and agreeing with Fr. Ryder's pamphlet - and the view I should take myself, though I don't want it *defined*'⁴¹.

Manning's Pastoral - *The Oecumenical Council and the Infallibility of the Pope* (Rosary Sunday, 1869) - was written against that background, and it was mainly concerned with the 'opportunity' of defining the infallibility of the Pope; he also intended to allay the fears of those who were afraid of an all out attack by the Council on the principles of 1789. Manning started by confessing the obvious: he did not know what would be defined at the Council; he added that he had no anxiety as to its result, the Council being in the hands of the Holy Spirit. He was ready to accept its decrees, whatever the outcome, even if they were to go against his previous judgment. It goes without saying that he considered this eventuality highly unlikely. In his estimation, there were many and weighty reasons for the definition, while those which had been put forward against it were easily answerable.

The doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope, Manning said in the Pastoral, is true and belongs to the *Depositum*. It is therefore redundant to ask whether it is or it isn't opportune to define it. 'Is not this question already closed by the fact that God has thought it opportune to reveal it? Can it be permitted to us to think that what He has thought it opportune to reveal, it is not opportune for us to declare?'⁴² The *disciplina arcani* had no room in the present condition of the Church! It could be argued, Manning acknowledged, that not all doctrines need to be defined. But the doctrine of

⁴¹ *LD*, XXIV, p. 326.

⁴² *Privilegium*, II, p. 39.

the Pope's infallibility had been denied, and the denials had given rise to doubts in many minds. It was not simply a latent and unobtrusive error; it was 'patent, notorious, importunate, and organised'⁴³. It had already produced ill effects, and more would follow: 'doubt generates secret antipathies, contentions, and mistrusts', and it keeps alive 'a theological and practical disunion in mind and feeling among the faithful'⁴⁴. Manning painted a dark landscape of doubt, scandal to the weak, hindrances to the expression and expansion of truth, party spirit, mistrust of brethren and of pastors, as following on from the obscuring of this doctrine.

The effects of this state of affairs were no less serious outside the Catholic Church, among other Christians. It had been argued that the definition would be an obstacle in the way of reunion with the Greeks, who recoiled from new words; that it would also retard the return of Protestants to the unity of the Church, by increasing their prejudices against Catholic Teaching. These arguments cut no ice with Manning: reunion had to be achieved by the acceptance of revealed truth, not by blurring its content. Even more, he thought that the conversion of Protestants was being delayed by the apparent contradictions among Catholics on the subject of infallibility. The unchecked disparity of opinions on this matter offered Protestants an opportunity for controversy. The definition of infallibility was, to Manning's mind, essential to the mission of the Church, especially in England. He had already expressed this same conviction in his 1867 Pastoral: 'It is certain that the action of Catholic truth upon England has been weakened by the Gallican opinions'. Gallicans maintained the infallibility of the Church, but the inconsistency of their theories had given some foundation to the Protestant retort "'What is the use of infallibility if you don't know where it resides?" [and this] has sufficed for two centuries to evade the force of the argument in which both Ultramontanes and Gallicans are agreed'⁴⁵. The action and influence of truth was enfeebled, because the controversy obscured the infallible authority of the Church. This had also momentous consequences for the foundation of the faith, given that the 'infallibility of the Church is the ordinary medium through which the material object,

⁴³ *Ibidem*, p. 43.

⁴⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 45.

⁴⁵ *Privilegium*, I, pp. 55-56.

that is, the doctrine, of Divine faith becomes known to us'⁴⁶; or, to put it more precisely, the 'virtue of divine faith has for its formal motive the veracity of God, and for its ordinary means of knowing the revelation of God, the proposition of the Church'⁴⁷. The Ultramontanism *versus* Gallicanism controversy, by obscuring the authority of the Church, turned the principle of divine certainty into a doubtful question. This situation made it imperative to clarify once and for all the question of the infallibility of the Pope. The Church, Manning would say, teaches mainly 'by its Head alone'; he is 'the teacher of the Church'. 'If there be any truth of the faith in which ambiguity is perilous, it is the Divine and infallible authority on which all faith reposes. The infallibility of the Vicar of Jesus Christ is the infallibility of the Church in its Head, and is the chief condition through which its own infallibility is manifested to the world. To convert this, which is the principle of Divine certainty, into a doubtful question, and one of the highest endowments of the Mystical Body, into a subject of domestic strife and fraternal alienation, is a master-stroke of the Enemy of Truth and souls'⁴⁸. A doubtful infallible teaching, like a dubious law, would impose no obligation to believe; 'it cannot exclude doubt, and for that reason cannot generate faith. Where faith is, doubt cannot be; and where doubt is, faith ceases to exist'⁴⁹.

'Let it not, then, be imagined' - he had claimed in 1867 - 'that this subject is remote from our pastoral work; or that we can declare the truth, or guide souls as we ought, unless we clearly and firmly comprehend the Divine procedure in revealing and perpetuating the faith of Jesus Christ'⁵⁰. The dissensions and confusion generated by the controversies about infallibility prejudiced the whole mission of the Church; they 'tend to paralyse the action of truth *ad intra*; and consequently, by giving a false appearance of division and doubt among Catholics, upon the minds of Protestants and others *ad extra*'⁵¹.

⁴⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 57.

⁴⁷ *Privilegium*, II, p. 50.

⁴⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 47.

⁴⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 50.

⁵⁰ *Privilegium*, I, p. 58.

⁵¹ *Privilegium*, II, p. 120.

5. Gallicanism

Manning considered Gallicanism a Royal Theology, imposed by royal pressure and opposed to the great theological tradition of the French Church. The French Monarchy had patronised it in an attempt to revive the Conciliarist ideas of the *Old Sorbonne* and, thus, provide a doctrinal justification for its regalist ambitions. The end result, the *Gallican Articles*, were but a feeble imitation of the Statutes of Henry VIII. Manning claimed that this had always been the way of despots: to seek to divide the unity of the Church. A universal united Church is a power that they are not able to control; a national Church, on the other hand, can be easily oppressed. 'So long as the Church is kept apart by the jealousies of governments and nations, it remains unconscious of the vast strength which arises from the unity of co-operation. Despots hate popes, and love patriarchs; for popes are sovereigns, and inflexible; patriarchs may become courtiers, and dependents'⁵². Theologically, Gallicanism was full of inconsistencies. It admitted the infallibility of the Church while rejecting the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff; it confessed the infallibility of the See of Peter while denying the infallibility of Peter's successors. 'Instinct told them that to deny the infallibility of the Roman See was to deny the infallibility of the Church, and to depart from the whole *praxis* of the Church for the first sixteen centuries'⁵³. It affirmed 'that the judgments of the Roman Pontiff in matters of faith are not irreformable, unless the assent of the Church - that is, either congregated or dispersed, either previously or subsequently - shall adhere to them'⁵⁴. A Council, therefore, is not essential for a declaration of the Pope to be confirmed as irreformable or infallible, the consent of the Church diffused around the world would suffice.

It would be difficult for Gallicans, Manning thought, 'to show that such an opinion is to be found in the tradition of the Church'. Their theory was rather an inversion of the immemorial belief and practice of the Church, and it would be easy to show 'that the tradition of the Church is not to test the teaching of the Pontiffs by the assent of the

⁵² *Privilegium*, I, p. 94.

⁵³ *Privilegium*, II, p. 65.

⁵⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 61.

Church, but to take the doctrine of the Pontiffs as the test of the doctrine of the Church. The Head spoke for the whole Body, and the utterances of the Head were the evidence of what the Body believed and taught'⁵⁵. And Manning supported this assertion with a long list of quotations from Councils and Synods of the past, from Constance to Chalcedon. Even Gerson was called as a witness: he had clearly said that the infallibility of the Pope was the doctrine generally admitted in his time, and that any one who had ventured to deny it would have been condemned for heresy. Manning summed up by saying: 'if for heresy, in what light did the consent of the faithful, and the tradition of the Church, regard the truth denied? The correlative of heresy is faith'⁵⁶.

Manning felt that the spirit of Gallicanism, condemned innumerable times and almost defunct in France, had to be finally eradicated from the Church. The fact that no theological censure had been attached to the condemnation of the Articles of 1682 meant that they were put forward as an opinion which Catholics could hold without blame. In 1867 Manning had claimed - somewhat optimistically, perhaps - that England was free from Gallicanism: Gallicanism, he said, 'has no place among us. It has no existence in any of our colleges; it is not to be found in our clergy, secular or regular. It has no part in our laity'⁵⁷. Even so, in 1869, he claimed that it posed a more serious danger for English Catholics than Anglicanism. The Anglican Reformation, he said, is external to the Catholic Church, 'in open heresy and schism. Gallicanism is within its unity, and is neither schism nor heresy. It is a very seductive form of national Catholicism, which, without breaking unity, or positively violating faith, soothes the pride to which all great nations are tempted, and encourages the civil power to patronise the local Church by a tutelage fatal to its liberty. It is therefore certain that Gallicanism is more dangerous to Catholics than Anglicanism'⁵⁸.

Nationalism was for Manning one of the most serious dangers for the Church and he had been inveighing against it from his Anglican days. It was a cancer which would

⁵⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 62.

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 93.

⁵⁷ *Privilegium*, I, p. 56.

⁵⁸ *Privilegium*, II, p. 53.

weaken and finally destroy its unity. 'Gallicanism is nationalism: that which the Gospel casts out; that which grew up again in mediaeval Christendom'⁵⁹. He called it Christian Judaism, and he conceived it as national in spirit, against the universality of the Church; inward looking and refractory to external influences, rebellious and reticent to any authority which is not its own. In a National Christianity to be national would come before being Christian. This had been the root from which had grown the factional spirit that had divided the sacred college and set up uncanonical Popes; it had provided the excuse for worldly avarice to get hold of the temporalities of the Church and for the civil power to impose its rule on it. Nationalism, he added, tends to exert a subtle and stealthy influence 'by which the national spirit invades and assimilates the Church to itself; and [produces] the bitter fruits of heresy and schism which the assimilation legitimately bears'⁶⁰. Heresy, built on the foundation of a schismatical Church, is its legitimate issue. The history of England bore witness to this fact: English nationalism became the Anglican schism by the steady and constant encroachment of the civil power upon the liberty of the Church. 'The schism once complete, the work of heresy was inevitable, and was pursued at leisure'⁶¹.

Gallicanism, as expressed in the 1682 Articles, was a mild form of the same illness. It caused a great harm to the Church, and, if unchecked, it would lead to a more serious condition. 'Anything that fosters this idea of National Churches, independent except in a few vital relations, of the Holy See, powerfully excites a spirit which is not filial [opposed to the Catholic Spirit]. An Episcopate which depends as little as it can upon the Pope, rears a laity which depends as little as possible upon the Episcopate'⁶². These were the tendencies unleashed by Gallicanism. 'The definition of the infallibility of the Pontiffs, speaking *ex cathedra*, is needed to exclude from the minds of Catholics the exaggerated spirit of national independence and pride which has, in these last centuries, so profoundly afflicted the Church'⁶³. Its definition by the Council would clear up the atmosphere of confusion; the fact of being defined by an Ecumenical

⁵⁹ *Privilegium*, I, p. 40.

⁶⁰ *Privilegium*, II, p. 52.

⁶¹ *Ibidem*.

⁶² *Ibidem*, p. 54.

⁶³ *Ibidem*, p. 52.

Council would help its reception by all, 'both by those who believe the infallibility of the Pontiff and by those who believe the infallibility of the Church'⁶⁴.

England was not the only country endangered by unchecked Gallicanism. France had been the cradle of Gallican ideas, and Manning felt that they could still strike root in it: 'the unity of the French nation renders it yet possible that influences and claims inconsistent with the liberty of the Church may still exist'⁶⁵. Manning was aware of the fact that, although the majority of the French bishops could not be accused of Gallicanism, some of Napoleon's nominees had clear Gallican tendencies, and he expressed the desire that 'the Bishops of France should, in this first Council of the Vatican, stand forth to lead the voices of the Episcopate in asking that the infallibility of the Vicar of Jesus Christ may be declared by a decree of the Universal Church'⁶⁶. The invitation was not altogether flattering, as Manning used the parallel of the Dominicans and the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary to illustrate what he meant: having for a long time opposed the doctrine, they had recently removed this blot from their history by asking for its definition.

6. A controversy on the way to the Council

Ullathorne thought Manning's 1869 Pastoral moderate, 'until it reaches the Appendix on Maret's injudicious book'⁶⁷, but he considered that the Archbishop had 'committed a blunder by inviting the French bishops to bring the infallibility forward, angry as many of them are against him, and divided as they are into three parties'⁶⁸. He was right. France may have not been 'put into a fury', but there was a good dose of hurt Gallican pride in the subsequent controversy between Manning and Dupanloup.

⁶⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 121.

⁶⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 54.

⁶⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 122.

⁶⁷ Henri-Louis-Charles Maret, dean of the Theology Faculty at the Sorbonne, had been appointed titular Bishop in 1861.

⁶⁸ Letter to Brown (26-X-69); quoted in C. Butler, *op.cit.*, p. 123.

Maret's book, *Du Concile général et de la paix religieuse*, had appeared in September 1869, while Manning's Pastoral was being given the final touches before publication. Maret identified the Church in Council as the supreme authority in matters of faith. His disavowal of the Pope's infallibility was couched in mitigated terms; he claimed that his book did not deny it, 'but brought back to its true nature'. As a matter of fact, he added, we 'acknowledge and prove that the Pope, by his right to *consult* or to *convoke* the episcopal body, by the possibility in which he is of acting always in concert with it, possesses in virtue of the Divine order the assured means to *give* infallibility to his dogmatic judgments'⁶⁹. The book had been sent to every bishop, and Manning had received his copy after the Pastoral was ready for publication. He still managed to add an appendix in which he tried to answer Maret's assertion that, 'apart from the episcopal body, the Pontiff is not infallible'⁷⁰. This, to Manning's mind, denied the infallibility of the Pope altogether, and amounted to an inversion of our Lord's words. It was equivalent to say: 'It is the brethren who confirm him, not he who confirms his brethren. The endowment of infallibility residing in the body flows to the Head when in consultation with the Episcopate. It is *influxus corporis in Caput*, not *Capitis in corpus*'⁷¹. Manning added: 'The doctrine maintained by me, under the guidance of every great master of theology of all Schools, (...) excepting only theologians of the Gallican school, is, that judgments *ex cathedra* are, in their essence, judgments of the Pontiff, *apart* from the episcopal body, whether congregated or dispersed'⁷². The concurrence of the Episcopate with the Head of the Church is not necessary for an infallible judgment of the Roman Pontiff. Were it to be so, it would be the occasion of multiple practical difficulties. What would happen if the episcopate had not examined the matter or pronounced about it? 'How long were they [the Pope's acts] in this tentative state of suspended or conditional infallibility? Who has ever discerned and declared the epoch and the crisis after which they became judgments *ex cathedra*?'⁷³ Manning thought that, 'except in a few cases, we cannot be certain, by explicit proof,

⁶⁹ Quoted by Manning in *Privilegium*, II, pp. 139-140.

⁷⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 140.

⁷¹ *Ibidem*. Ullathorne used a similar expression in his pastoral of October 1870 (see C. Butler, *op.cit.*, p. 458).

⁷² *Privilegium*, II, p. 142.

⁷³ *Ibidem*, p. 143.

whether the episcopal body has concurred in these judgments or no⁷⁴.

Maret had claimed that his ideas were reconcilable with the doctrines of moderate Ultramontanism; a claim Manning rejected outright. Maret's opinion, he would say, 'seem to place the infallibility of the Church in the whole body as its proper residence, and by result in its Head'. Ultramontanism, on the other hand, maintained 'that infallibility was communicated by the Divine Head of the Church to Peter as His visible representative and Vicar upon earth, and through him to his Successors and to the Church for ever'⁷⁵.

Maret's book, as it was to be expected, attracted the thunder of *L'Univers*. In the controversy which ensued, Manning's Pastoral was among the ammunition used by Veillot. Dupanloup came to know of Manning's Pastoral through the pages of *L'Univers*, and his attention focused in particular on Manning's reference to the Pope acting *apart* from the bishops in the definitions *ex cathedra*. It was not the first time that Manning had used this expression⁷⁶, but not until now had it attracted criticism.

Dupanloup, in his letter to the clergy of his diocese of 11 November, launched an all-out attack against the opportunity of defining the dogma of the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff in the forthcoming Council. He made clear that he did not want to refute the doctrine, which he himself had propounded, but the opportunity of its definition. In so doing he misrepresented the reasons of those who, like Manning, were promoting the definition for theological reasons; he attributed it to the natural 'piété filiale du vouloir orner un père de tous les dons, de toutes les prérogatives'⁷⁷. In determining such a delicate question, he added, one should not allow himself to be guided purely by sentiments. The Church, he continued, had not felt the need for a definition of the Pope's infallibility in eighteen centuries of existence; the belief in the Church's infallibility had sufficed until now. Why speak then of the need for a new definition,

⁷⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 145.

⁷⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 148.

⁷⁶ It can be found, among other places, in his Pastoral of 1867 (*Privilegium*, I, pp. 18, 23, ...)

⁷⁷ F. Dupanloup, *Lettre de Mgr. L'Évêque D'Orléans au Clergé de son Diocèse relativement à la définition de l'Infaillibilité au prochain Concile* (2nd ed., Paris, 1869), p. 3.

‘et de constituer dogmatiquement une nouvelle règle de foi?’⁷⁸ Dupanloup, with Newman, appealed to St. Irenaeus’: *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus...* He would also use another expression dear to Newman: *In dubiis libertas, ..in omnibus charitas, in necessariis unitas*. His main aim was to show the extravagances of the Ultramontanes, and both, Ward and Manning, came in for a fair deal of criticism. Manning’s expression - ‘apart from the bishops’ - is quoted several times and it is followed by what Dupanloup considered its corollaries. The Vatican Council would be the Council to make redundant all future Councils: ‘Le Pape, "EN DEHORS DES EVEQUES" pourra tout décider infalliblement, même les questions de foi, à quoi bon réunir les évêques?’⁷⁹ The Bishops would no longer be needed as judges of the faith. Dupanloup considered that Manning’s mistake sprung from separating the Pope from the Church: the Pope, he would claim, cannot be separated from the Church; neither can the Church be separated from the Pope!

It is doubtful whether Dupanloup had read Manning’s Pastoral, apart from the paragraphs quoted by *L’Univers*; it is beyond doubt, though, that he was unfamiliar with the context of Manning’s ideas. It would have been difficult, otherwise, to suggest the possibility of Manning entertaining any thought of the Pope being separated from the Church. Manning complained of Dupanloup’s treatment of the question of infallibility. He felt that his thought had been misrepresented and asked Dupanloup in a letter of 25 November to rectify the wrong impression given by the way in which his words had been quoted. The bishop of Orleans had attributed to Manning the following expressions: the Pope is infallible when ‘il prononce seul "en dehors du corps épiscopal réuni ou dispersé"; et qu’il peut définir les dogmes seul, "séparément, indépendamment de l’épiscopat;" sans aucun concours exprès ou tacite, antécédent ou subséquent, des évêques’⁸⁰. Manning would say that the word ‘indépendamment’ was to be found in his writings, but that this was not the case as far as ‘séparément’ was concerned; the two words together did not appear in the Postscriptum: ‘cette proposition

⁷⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 1.

⁷⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 45.

⁸⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 7.

n'est jamais sortie de ma plume'⁸¹. His words referred to Maret's contention that the Pope was not infallible 'sinon avec le concours ou consultation de l'épiscopat'. Manning had tried to formulate the contrary theses: the Pope is infallible '(apart from), c'est-à-dire, sans le concours ou consultation de l'épiscopat'. Dupanloup's conclusion that the sentences quoted implied the possibility of schism or opposition ('emportent l'idée de scission ou d'opposition'⁸²) was false, and misrepresented Manning's words.

Dupanloup, in his response to Manning's, letter would gladly grant that the Archbishop of Westminster did not maintain the possibility of an opposition or breach between Pope and Bishops: 'Non, vous n'enseignez point une telle doctrine; vous l'attribuer serait vous calomnier'⁸³. He then went on to disclaim responsibility for the translation of Manning's words: the translation used in his Letter was that printed by *L'Univers*! This was true up to a certain point: Manning had accepted that 'indépendamment' was a proper translation of his thought; *L'Univers* had rendered 'apart from' as 'séparément' and had also used the words 'en dehors' in the translation; the expression 'séparément, indépendamment de l'épiscopat', though, had been concocted by Dupanloup, and it can be argued that, by the repetition of similar terms, he had come to suggest the idea of scission between the Pope and the Episcopate, if not of opposition. Dupanloup ended his response to Manning with a defence of the Gallican Church, which the Popes had praised innumerable times and which was truly devoted to the Holy See. To claim that Gallicanism was more dangerous than Anglicanism was unjust, an insult made more galling by a comparison which harnessed together Bossuet and Cranmer, Louis XIV and Henry VIII!

Mgr. Dechamps had also written a response to Dupanloup's Letter of 11 November: 'you have undoubtedly touched upon the final issue, and enveloped it in mists. (...) It is a mist, Monseigneur, this term *new dogma* (...). A mist again, Monseigneur, these terms of *personal* and *separate* infallibility of the Sovereign Pontiff'⁸⁴. It could be said

⁸¹ Manning to Dupanloup (25-XI-69), quoted in F. Dupanloup, *Réponse de Mgr. L'Évêque D'Orléans à Mgr. Manning* (Paris, 1869), p. 6.

⁸² *Ibidem*.

⁸³ *Ibidem*, p. 7.

⁸⁴ V. Dechamps, *A Letter to Monseigneur Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans* (London, 1870), pp. 7-9. The letter was dated 30-XI-69.

that Manning also came in for some criticism, although he would probably not have recognised it as such. Dechamps referred to those who spoke of ‘separate infallibility’, saying that if by that ‘they meant that, to establish tradition, the Pope has no need always to convoke a Council, or even to consult the Bishops, they mean what is true, but they express it badly’⁸⁵.

The Council had already started its sessions when Dupanloup published his *Response*. Manning wrote once again to him, but again without success. Ullathorne summed it up well in his letter of 28 December: ‘The Archbishop tells me he has sent another note to Orleans, still holding that Orleans does not fairly translate him. I told Dr. Manning I had read his pastoral nearly in the same sense, and that others had done so. People certainly imagined that by *apart from* the Episcopate, he meant isolated, and *not* merely acting apart although in union with them. However it is a petty quarrel which has damaged both combatants’⁸⁶. Manning could have argued: why did you not say so when correcting the 1867 Pastoral before its publication?

The Council had now started. Manning’s words in his 1869 Pastoral expressed the general feeling of the Fathers: ‘If the Council should decide contrary to their previous judgment [his own], they would rejoice to be corrected by its unerring guidance; if it should refrain from pronouncing on matters on which they previously believed a decision to be opportune or even necessary, they would with their whole heart submit their judgment, and believe that such a decision would be not only not necessary, but not even opportune. In this sense of perfect submission, springing from faith in the perpetual and infallible assistance of the Holy Spirit, all Catholics will await the final result of the first Council of the Vatican’⁸⁷.

⁸⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 10.

⁸⁶ Quoted in C. Butler, *op.cit.*, p. 155.

⁸⁷ *Privilegium*, II, p. 26.

CHAPTER VIII

THE FIRST VATICAN COUNCIL

The Council was solemnly opened by Pius IX on 8 December 1870, the feast of the Immaculate Conception. The first General Congregation took place two days later, and in it were announced the names of those Council Fathers appointed by the Pope to the Deputation *De Postulatis*. Their task, according to the Reglament of the Council, was to consider the bishops' proposals on new topics to be introduced in the Council, and to report them, with their opinion, to the Pope, on whom the final decision rested. The Deputation had an all important rôle to play, given that, as decided during the preparatory work of the Council, the introduction of the subject of the Pope's infallibility had been left to the initiative of the Council Fathers. The actual list of twenty-six members of the Deputation included a wide spectrum of the shades of opinion on the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff, as represented in the Council. Among their number were three of the main promoters of the definition: Archbishop Victor Dechamps, of Malines; Archbishop Manning; and Conrad Martin, Bishop of Paderborn.

The next item on the agenda of the Council was the election of the special Deputations. These were to have great influence in the actual work of the Council; upon the particular Deputations fell the greatest share of the work of shaping the material to be studied and voted on by the Council, and they had to deal also with the amendments presented by the Fathers. Thus, the election of the Deputation *De Fide* would see infallibilists and inopportunistes exerting themselves to the utmost to influence its outcome. 'Everybody feels', wrote Ullathorne on 16 December, 'that on the twenty four [members of the Deputation] much will depend when *the question* comes on'¹. Before the election, the Fathers were presented with lists prepared by the committees on both sides of the argument about 'the question'. The list of the infallibilist group did not include any bishop who was thought to oppose the definition, while the

¹ C. Butler, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

inopportunist' one had some supporters of the definition among its names. Passions were running high, and each party charged the other with intrigue and underhand tactics. The election returned the names of all those included in the infallibilist list. The lack of representation of the minority in the Deputation was to be one of their main grievances. Many considered their exclusion a tactical mistake, to be laid at Manning's door. Still, an inopportunist found its way into the list put forward by the infallibilist grouping: Archbishop Simor, Primate of Hungary. The Pastoral he had issued before the Council gave to understand that he was in favour of the definition, but on his arrival to Rome he joined the ranks of the inopportunist party, and he was to absent himself from the meetings of the Deputation when it discussed the primacy and infallibility of the Pope.

Manning's possibilities of influence in the running of the Council were quite considerable, as a member of the Deputations *De Postulatis* and *De Fide*. His sphere of activity, though, would not be confined to the work of the Deputations. He would be tireless in his efforts to bring about the definition of infallibility by, among other things, canvassing support for the petition to introduce the subject into the Council and bring forward its discussion. Within and without the Deputation *De Fide*, Manning worked very closely with Ignaz von Senestréy, Bishop of Ratisbon. At times, in the meetings of the Deputation, they would find themselves unable to get their points of view accepted by other members. There, the opinions of Dechamps and Martin - more conciliatory in their approach to the objections of the minority - had great weight and tended to prevail with Cardinal Bilio, President of the Deputation. Manning described the situation in his *Reminiscences of the Vatican Council*: 'In the *deputatio de fide* he was overborne by Malines and Paderborn, and had a fear of French Bishops, who beset him in private. Ratisbon has given the history'². Manning, in some of those occasions, would restrain himself from arguing a point further, considering that it would be to little avail and serve only to generate friction within Deputation. However, that did not mean that he had given up promoting it. With the help of Senestréy and others, he looked for ways to advance the principle in question. Manning was aware of the animosity which his incessant activity generated even among supporters of the definition, and, to avoid increasing it, he would at times pass ideas and even written

² *P*, II, p. 454; for Senestréy's Diary see *M*, 53, cols. 276C-286B.

texts to other Fathers, for them to bring to the Council's attention. It would be difficult to trace these contacts in detail, but some speeches in the General Congregations, and some written amendments or suggestions made by the Fathers, could probably be identified as having originated with Manning.

A. THE CONSTITUTION ON CATHOLIC FAITH

On 10 December the Fathers received the draft schema on Catholic Faith and Rationalism. The text was distributed in eighteen chapters, preceded by an introduction. The first two condemned materialism, pantheism and rationalism, pointing out how such errors had their origin in the Reformation. They were followed by three chapters on the nature and sources of divine revelation, and the mysterious character of revealed truth, transcending human reason. Chapters six to eleven - which interested Manning in a particular way - dealt at length with the nature of faith and its relationship with the human sciences. Finally, the schema referred to those errors which affected particular truths of faith.

The General Congregation of 28 December initiated the discussion of the proposed draft schema. The general feeling expressed by the Fathers was that the schema was too long, too polemical - touching on very specialised errors - and far removed from the needs of the faithful; its tone was more that of a dogmatic treatise than of a Conciliar Document. Manning's perception of the schema was somewhat different from that of the majority of the Fathers who spoke in the General Congregations. 'The original *schema*', he wrote, 'was one of the grandest of theological documents, cast in the traditional form of conciliar decrees, taking its shape, as they did, from the errors which required condemnation'. He admitted that it was somewhat archaic in language; still, it was 'worthy to rank with the decrees of the Council of Toledo or of Lateran'³. His praise for the schema is particularly significant when one considers how economical Manning would be in his praise of the first schema *De Ecclesia*, which, being based entirely on the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ, should have been close to his heart. The fact is that the need for a proper understanding of the nature of the act of

³ True, p. 93.

faith was second to none in Manning's mind. Semi-rationalism was for Manning the great enemy of the Church at the time, and he could not but welcome as clear a denunciation as possible of that pernicious error, the fountain from which sprung innumerable others. Besides, he felt that the progress of the natural and historical sciences made it imperative to have a clear concept of the relationship between science and faith.

When Franzelin⁴, the main author of the schema rejected by the Fathers, defended it before the Deputation *De Fide* on 11 January, he must have found a sympathetic hearer in Manning. The schema, Franzelin said, followed an 'essential' order. It dealt first, briefly, with absolute rationalism and its denial of a supernatural revelation. The second section, the main body of the schema, was devoted to refute the errors of semi-rationalism about the nature of Christian knowledge. It considered the formal aspects of faith. First, the object, nature and sources of divine revelation, together with the supernatural character of the act of faith. Then, it went on to deal with the differences and connexions between faith and science. The schema pointed out that they have different formal objects; the unity of truth, though, meant that there were many connexions between these two fields of knowledge, and that they could never contradict each other. The final chapters dealt with errors concerning particular truths of faith which followed from a mistaken conception about the nature of revelation or of faith.

The schema was sent to the Deputation *De Fide* to be redrafted. The decision of the Deputation was to maintain the substance of the original schema while dramatically remodelling it. The work of revision was entrusted to a commission of three bishops members of the Deputation with the assistance of some theologians. By the end of the revision work, the schema had been reduced from eighteen to nine chapters, and these had been divided in two separate schemata. The first was made up of four chapters: chapter one dealt with the natural knowledge of God, as Creator, through his creatures (natural revelation); chapters two to four were concerned with God's supernatural revelation, including the nature of the knowledge of faith and the relationship between faith and science. This schema, once studied and reformed by the Council, was to

⁴ Jesuit theologian. Professor of Dogmatic Theology at the Roman College and one of the theological consultors of the Deputation *De Fide*.

become the First Constitution on Catholic Faith, *Dei Filius*. The second schema *De Fide*, which would not be discussed in the Council, was concerned with the condemnation of particular errors against individual truths of faith.

The beginning of the Proemium of the schema *De Fide* referred to the innumerable benefits and good results derived from the holding of ecumenical councils as far as the preservation and formulation of the faith was concerned. A revealing incident took place during its study by the Deputation. It was suggested to introduce into the Proemium a reference to the rôle of the Holy See in combatting error. The Deputation, on Martin's advice, decided on 2 March not to add another reference to the *magisterium* of the Pope in the opening lines of the Proemium, as he was already mentioned in a similar context at the end of it. Manning would not let the matter rest there. His notes tell of a meeting he held, with four other bishops, some time before the start of the debate on the Proemium in the General Congregation, in which they prepared three amendments asking for the Proemium to mention the *magisterium* of the Pope where it spoke on that of the councils. 'Manning recorded the reasons for the proposed emendation. Silence on the Roman pontiff in this place in the introduction, especially after the many papal condemnations made in the preceding three centuries, would not pass unnoticed; such silence would certainly cause *admiratio* among the faithful. An omission of this sort would be more conspicuous since mention was made of the councils; the text would seem to insinuate that the supreme rule and magisterium of the Church was exercised only in ecumenical councils. Precaution ought to be taken lest this omission, alongside a later mention of the bishops as judges, seem to favour in some way the "theories of pseudo-Catholics" on these matters. Manning also tried to anticipate those who might object to the proposal. A first objection: might this seem to prejudice the discussion of papal infallibility that would come with the second dogmatic schema? The intention here was simply to recognize the Church's supreme magisterium as it was already held by all the faithful'⁵. The amendments were put forward in the General Congregations of the 22 and 23 March by three of the bishops who attended Manning's meeting: Dreux-Brèze, of Moulins; the bishop of Seo de Urgel, Caixal y Estrade; and Magnasco, a titular bishop. The suggestions did not prosper, the amendments being dismissed by the Deputation.

⁵ Cwiekowski, *op.cit.*, pp. 194-195.

During the study by the Deputation of Chapter II, on revelation, Manning proposed a change to its fifth paragraph, which contained a reaffirmation of Trent's teaching on the authority of the Church as interpreter of Holy Scripture⁶. Manning thought that the suggested wording could give the impression that the unanimous consent of the Fathers, when interpreting Holy Scripture, was on a level with the interpretation of the Church, as a sort of parallel norm of faith. Thus, the present text would seem to offer some support to the claims of those who appealed from the teaching of the living Church to the unanimous consent of the Ancient Fathers, as Anglicans did. The Deputation accepted Manning's suggestion, and the reference to the Fathers of the Church was omitted in the text presented to the Council Fathers for study. The omission did not pass unnoticed, and some of the Fathers remarked upon it during the debates of the General Congregation. On 28 March, Manning decided to intervene in the debate, in order to explain to the General Congregation the reasons for the exclusion. He spoke of how the apologists of the Anglican schism, from Jewell to Pusey, had justified the separation from Rome on the grounds that the Roman Church had departed from the original purity of the Faith, and that the Anglican Reformers' only aim had been to restore it by going to the uncontaminated fountain of Primitive Christianity and the Fathers of the Church. Manning quoted from Pusey's third *Eirenicon* to illustrate the point in question⁷. His intervention was not wholly unsuccessful. At the insistence of the Fathers, the full text was later on reintroduced, but it now contained a clause making clear that it was the task of the Church not only to interpret Holy Scripture but also to judge of the consent of the Fathers⁸.

Manning's quotation of Pusey did more than illustrate the Anglican appeal to the Fathers. It also described the theory of the three branches of the Church, as used by Pusey to refuse submission to the definitions of Trent on the basis that only the dogmatic decisions of the universal Church - of which the Roman was but a branch - could demand acceptance as matters of necessary belief. With this quotation, which did

⁶ 'Quia vero, quae sancta Tridentina synodus de interpretatione divinae Scripturae, ad coercenda petulantia ingenia, salubriter decrevit, a quibusdam hominibus prave exponuntur, idem decretum hoc approbante concilio renovantes, hanc eius mentem esse definimus, ut in rebus fidei et morum, is pro vero Scripturae sensu habendus sit, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater ecclesia, aut quem sanctorum patrum consensus unanimis attestatur' (*M*, 53, col. 166B). My italics.

⁷ Cfr. *M*, 51, cols. 165B-166B.

⁸ Cfr. *M*, 51, col. 288D; this clause have been requested by several Council Fathers as early as January.

not quite relate to the point in question, Manning seems to have lent indirect support to Ullathorne's proposal of 24 March to change the opening words of Chapter I from *Sancta Romana catholica ecclesia* to *catholica atque romana ecclesia*, on the basis that the original wording, Ullathorne argued, could offer some ground to the Anglican claims⁹. The Deputation decided to reject Ullathorne's suggestion on 27 March; Manning spoke in the General Congregation the day after. This rejection seems to have been the reason for the *placet juxta modum* votes of a good number of American and English bishops on 12 April. In the end, the Deputation was to reverse its own vote - and that of the General Congregation - in order to include Ullathorne's suggestion.

When it came to the study of Chapter III, on faith, Manning took in the Deputation Senestréy's side. On 5 and 9 March, he had suggested that mention should be made of the fact that the object of faith was not confined to the solemn dogmatic definitions of the Church, but it did also include those truths taught by the ordinary *magisterium*¹⁰. Manning felt deeply the need to defend this fundamental principle. In his pastoral on the centenary of the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul he had written: 'many truths of divine revelation have not been defined. All that is defined is indeed *de fide*, but not all that is *de fide* has been defined'¹¹. The Deputation, while acknowledging the importance of the matter, decided that the topic belonged more fittingly to the study of the infallibility of the Church. Manning made no objection to the Deputation's decision, 'not, indeed, from assent, "*sed pro reverentia erga Em[minentissimum] Praesidem*"'¹². His notes recorded his hope that Senestréy's suggestion would be eventually introduced; it was necessary to correct a German error which had some influence in England, and, in particular, to make clear that the Christian was to believe the whole of revealed truth, not just what had been defined.

Senestréy's insistence would finally achieve the insertion of the clause. The final text reads: 'all those things are to be believed with divine and Catholic faith which are

⁹ Cfr. *M*, 51, cols. 105A-106B.

¹⁰ Senestréy was a determined opponent of the opinions of the Munich school, and, like Manning, an ardent defender of the authority of the ordinary *magisterium*.

¹¹ *Privilegium*, I, p. 66.

¹² Cwiekowski, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

contained in the Word of God, written or handed down, and which the Church, either by solemn judgment, *or by her ordinary and universal magisterium*, proposes for belief as having been divinely revealed'¹³. This positive obligation was to be complemented by a negative one in the final paragraph of the Constitution: 'it is not sufficient to shun heretical pravity, unless those errors also be diligently avoided which more or less nearly approach it'¹⁴, and which had been condemned by the Holy See.

Manning would intervene in the meeting of the Deputation of 6 March, while discussing the canons attached to Chapter III, on Faith. He suggested incorporating here the canon corresponding to Chapter IX of the original schema. The Deputation accepted his proposal, the final text of the Constitution *Dei Filius* has it as canon 6 of Chapter III. The new canon rejected the claim of those who thought that it would be legitimate for a Catholic to doubt, 'with suspended assent, the faith which they had already received under the *magisterium* of the Church, until they shall have obtained a scientific demonstration of the credibility and truth of their faith'¹⁵. Although the canon had the primary objective of condemning the Hermesian doubt, it was also, in Manning's eyes, an explicit rejection of the claims advanced by those who, on the basis of the new scientific theories or the findings of the so-called 'school of historical criticism', felt justified to question the faith of the Church and the recent pronouncements of the magisterium.

In *The True Story of the Vatican Council (1877)*, when explaining the new Constitution, Manning would say that, although very different from the original schema, it was 'full of condensed doctrine' and that the whole of it had 'a singular beauty and splendour of divine truth impressed upon it'¹⁶. He strongly approved where Strossmayer, Bishop of Bosnia, had complained of lack of irenicism in the Proemium, where the Reformation was charged with having as its natural offsprings Rationalism and Naturalism. Manning had said as much in his writings before the Council. The final

¹³ *M*, 51, col. 432C; Manning's translation in *Privilegium*, III, p. 198 (my italics). The word *universal* was introduced at the request of some Fathers who felt that, otherwise, it would be thought that the sentence referred only to the Pope's *magisterium*.

¹⁴ *M*, 51, col. 436A; translation by Manning in *Privilegium*, III, p. 203.

¹⁵ *M*, 51, col. 435D; Manning's translation in *Privilegium*, III, p. 202.

¹⁶ *True*, p. 93.

text toned down those expressions without breaking the connexion between the Reformation and modern error. *Dei Filius* had taught, according to Manning, that the first cause of all the evils which had followed the Reformation was 'the rejection of the divine, and therefore infallible, authority of the Church. The inevitable consequence of this rejection was to leave all matters of religion to be decided by the judgment of individuals; from this, again, had followed the multiplication of sects conflicting with each other'. The faith of many Christians had been shipwrecked in the ensuing confusion. Three hundred years before the Reformers had claimed Holy Scripture to be the sole foundation of Christian faith; but the Holy Scriptures were now rejected as myths by many who had followed on the footsteps of the early Protestants. The rejection of divine authority had generated two main principles of error: 'the one, Rationalism, which makes the human reason to be the test, the measure, or the source of all truth itself; the other, Naturalism, which denies altogether the existence of a supernatural order of grace and truth'¹⁷. Pantheism, Atheism, Materialism, and, in politics, the 'lawless spirit of revolution' followed in their train.

Philosophy had trodden a parallel path and reached similar conclusions. The Reformation, Manning thought, had 'revolted against both the scholastic theology and the scholastic philosophy'¹⁸; the end result had been: rationalism, scepticism, pantheism, atheism, naturalism. Consequently, the Reformation and the ideologies born of it, had closed both the natural and supernatural paths to gain access to God. The Council, on the other hand, would re-affirm the existence of these two orders of knowledge and define that human reason can prove the existence of God. This was of fundamental importance to Manning: 'This certainty of our natural reason', he said, 'may be called the infallibility of the natural order. (...) This infallible certainty is the foundation of the moral life of man. St. Paul says that they who know not God, by the things which are made, are inexcusable. But they would not be inexcusable if God could not be known by the light of reason. And if in this knowledge the reason could be deceived - that is, if it were not certain - then there could be no moral obligation upon the conscience to believe. The atheist, pantheist, and sceptic, would all be excused for their doubt and unbelief. But if the existence and moral character of God be

¹⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 124.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 129.

doubtful, the basis of all morals is doubtful too. *Lex dubia non obligat*¹⁹.

Having affirmed the possibility of gaining knowledge of God through natural reason, the Constitution went on to say that the communication of supernatural truth to man by means of a supernatural revelation is not only possible, it is also necessary, and that for two reasons: 'first, that man may attain to the knowledge of truths above and beyond the order of nature, and, secondly, that by such revelation man may be raised to a higher order of knowledge and perfection'²⁰.

Manning considered Chapter III, on Faith, as particularly relevant for the times; it might 'be truly said', he wrote, 'that in this chapter every word is directed against some intellectual aberration of this century'²¹. It taught 'that inasmuch as God reveals to man truths of the supernatural order, man is bound to believe that revelation by reason of the authority or veracity of God, who can neither deceive nor be deceived. The infallibility of God is the motive of faith', and the act of believing the supreme act of reason, 'for no act of reason can be more in harmony with its nature than to believe the Word of God . (...) It is also an act not of necessity but of perfect freedom'. Although reasonable, he would add, the act of faith is an act not 'of the natural order, but of the supernatural, and springs from the preventing grace of the Holy Spirit, Who illuminates the intelligence and moves the will'. It embraces, as its object, the whole of God's revelation: 'whatsoever God has revealed, man, when he knows it, is bound to believe'. God had 'made provision that man should know His revelation, because He has committed it to His Church as the guardian and teacher of truth'. Thus, we are bound to believe all that the Church proposes to our belief 'whether by its ordinary and universal teaching, or by its solemn judgment and definition'²². Significantly, Manning gives precedence to the ordinary teaching of the Church over the solemn teaching, changing the order in which they appear in the Constitution, for the reason that he considered the ordinary and universal teaching of the Church to be the means she uses to communicate the faith. The ordinary *magisterium* contains all the truths to be

¹⁹ *Ibidem*, pp. 131-132.

²⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 133.

²¹ *Privilegium*, III, p. 46.

²² *Ibidem*, pp. 46-47.

believed, while the solemn dogmatic definitions, because of their origin and nature, cover a much narrower spectrum of revealed truth.

Dei Filius, Manning said, had clearly taught three things: 'first, that there are two orders of knowledge; secondly, that they differ as to their object; thirdly, that they differ as to their methods of procedure'²³. Once the character of the knowledge of faith had been clarified, the Constitution, in its fourth chapter, went on to define the relationship between faith and natural knowledge. Manning, when explaining the Constitution, would carefully develop this point, as he felt that this was the area where the errors of rationalism grew thicker and where the seeds of confusion had been sown in plenty, even among Catholics. The Constitution had clearly affirmed that human reason was not the sole fountain, measure and judge of truth; there was a truth which no man could not reach on his own, but to which he had to submit, once it was made known to him. Absolute Rationalism and Semi-Rationalism obliterated this distinction: the first, by its denial of any supernatural truth; the second, by maintaining that 'although without revelation many truths would not have been known to man, yet when once revealed they may be adequately comprehended and proved by reason, so that they become objects not only of faith but of science'²⁴. The Constitution was primarily concerned with the errors of Hermes and Bautain, among Catholics; still, their condemnation also covered the errors of Anglicanism, given that, as Manning saw it, they all shared a common vision of the act of faith as originating in a human act and a human authority.

Faith and reason 'move on different planes', different levels of truth, between which there is no continuity nor opposition. Their objects and methods of procedure are different: 'in the order of nature the instrument of knowledge is discovery; in the supernatural order, it is faith, and the intellectual processes which spring from faith'²⁵. Thus, science and faith can never be in real contradiction, 'the conflict can only be apparent and transient, and while it seems to exist we are bound even by reason, which assures us of the certainty of faith, to believe the conflict to be not real, but only

²³ *Ibidem*, p. 48.

²⁴ *True*, p. 135.

²⁵ *Privilegium*, III, p. 49.

apparent'²⁶. It could spring either 'from error as to the doctrine of the Church, or error in the assumptions of science. Every assertion, therefore, contrary to the truth of an illuminated faith, is false'²⁷. The Church has always promoted and encouraged the cultivation of the human arts and sciences; on the other hand, as the Council had pointed out, it has the right and the duty - together with the divine assistance to implement them - to correct the false science which 'by going beyond their own limits (...) enter upon and disturb the things which are of faith'²⁸. The Church does not claim jurisdiction over the development of philosophy and science, the 'only judgment it pronounces regards the conformity or variance of such processes of the human intelligence with the deposit of faith, and the principles of revealed morality'²⁹.

In the final paragraphs of the constitution, the Roman Pontiff, by his supreme authority, commanded all faithful - Pastors and people - to drive away errors contrary to faith, whether solemnly condemned as heretical or denounced as more or less close to it by the Holy See. Manning felt that if the 'Vatican Council had met and parted without any act beyond this one decree, it would have applied a direct and searching remedy to the intellectual aberrations of the nineteenth century'³⁰. No Council, in his estimation, had defined so explicitly the divine and infallible authority of the Church in declaring and defending the deposit of truth³¹. He thought that the importance of the Constitution could not be overestimated, and that at the time, because of its great breadth, its full significance might 'not as yet be fully perceived'³².

The constitution, as far as Manning was concerned, was the best introduction to the definition of the infallibility of the Pope: 'It begins with God and His revelation; it closes with the witness and office of the Visible Church, and with the supreme authority of its Head. The next truth demanded by the intrinsic relations of doctrine was the

²⁶ *True*, p. 137.

²⁷ *Privilegium*, III, p. 49.

²⁸ *M*, 51, col. 434B; Manning's translation in *True*, p. 137.

²⁹ *Privilegium*, III, pp. 77-78.

³⁰ *True*, p. 137.

³¹ *Privilegium*, III, p. 50; Chapter IV of the Constitution affirmed: 'fidei doctrina, quam Deus revelavit, (...) tamquam divinum depositum Christi sponsa tradita, fideliter custodiendo et infallibiliter declaranda'.

³² *Ibidem*, p. 49.

divine endowment of infallibility. And when treated, this doctrine was, contrary to all expectation [!], and to all likelihood, presented first to the Council, and by the Council to the world, in the person and office of the Head of the Church³³.

B. THE PATH TO THE DEFINITION OF PAPAL INFALLIBILITY

I. The introduction of the subject in the Council

1. Petitions for its inclusion in the schema 'De Ecclesia'

The infallibility of the Pope had been the subject of public debate from the very moment the Council had been convoked. Once it was under way, the unceasing activity of those advocating its definition and of those who opposed it shaped the whole itinerary of the Council: moves and countermoves followed, petitions to bring in the topic, counterpetitions, reasons which made the definition imperative or arguments that showed the harm that would follow it, efforts to talk out the definition and countermanoeuvres to put an end to the debates, appeals to the powers to put pressure on the Council, exaggerations to raise fears... The partial blindness of mind and the distortions generated by the heat of controversy goes some way to explain certain actions of the main protagonists of the infallibility debate, which, at a distance, look less than flattering for the individuals concerned.

The lines were drawn, and the first skirmishes already fought, by the time the Council Fathers received the text of the schema *De Ecclesia* on 21 January 1870³⁴. The draft submitted for their study contained fifteen chapters covering the nature and mystery of the Church: its divine origin and properties (like unity, immutable constitution and infallibility); the hierarchical character of the Church and the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff; finally, it also dealt with the relations between Church and State. Central to the

³³ *Ibidem*, p. 51.

³⁴ *M*, 51, cols. 539A-553A.

schema was the presentation of the Church as Mystical Body of Christ, a perspective which marked a clear progress from the too juridical ecclesiology predominant at the time. Manning could not but welcome that treatment of the Church, and he expressed his opinion on the schema in the notes he wrote during the Council, and which were probably intended as points to bring up in the public sessions of the Council or in the meetings of the Deputation *De Fide*. His notes praised the schema as a whole because 'it treated the creed's article on the Church at length and in an orderly way. Trent was so preoccupied with explicit heresies (...) that in the last analysis it was scarcely able to see the source and principle of the Protestant error: the rejection of the Church and its prerogatives. In rejecting the infallible authority of the teaching Church, Protestantism rejected the ordinary means instituted by God to lead men to the faith. It was altogether necessary that this council solemnly define the Church's teaching on the institution and prerogatives of the Church'³⁵. He considered that the definition of Papal Infallibility, founded on the perpetual living presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church, was particularly necessary for those countries where Catholics and non-Catholics lived side by side: 'Non-Catholics accepted the authority of a revealing God (...) but they questioned the means by which revealed truth was given to men'³⁶. Protestants and Anglicans had in common the emphasis on private judgment, and they both rejected the infallibility of the living Church.

Manning added another reason for praising the schema: its treatment of the principle '*extra ecclesia nulla salus*'. This was a question which had exercised his mind even before becoming a Catholic, and which he had considered at length in his fourth volume of Anglican Sermons. Manning felt that there was a great ignorance on the subject, both among Catholics and non-Catholics: 'Catholics despaired of the salvation of non-Catholics and non-Catholics rejected the Catholic doctrine as incompatible with divine mercy and justice. This misunderstanding was a great obstacle to conversions, Manning complained, and his efforts to clarify the Church's position were met with the charge that he was mitigating the Church's doctrine without proper authority'³⁷. The text of the schema *De Ecclesia*, though, was never to be discussed in the Council. The main

³⁵ Cwiekowski, *op. cit.*, p. 219.

³⁶ *Ibidem*.

³⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 220.

reason for this was that, although it affirmed in clear terms the infallibility of the Church, there was no reference in it to the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff.

As soon as the Council started, the wheels were set in motion to introduce the study of the infallibility of the Pope, or to prevent its insertion, into the proceedings of the Council. Cardinal Rauscher, Archbishop of Vienna, and Dupanloup opened fire for the opposition, and the infallibilists did not remain silent for very long. Manning, Senestréy, Dechamps, Martin and some others met on 23 December to prepare the text of a petition asking for the subject to be introduced. They would later attach to the petition a statement of the reasons for the opportunity of the definition, needed in order to win the support of many of the Fathers, and an Appendix containing some recent decisions of provincial synods touching upon the matter. The petition was ready by the 28th, and it was circulated with a covering letter to all the bishops, 'omitting', according to Manning, 'only those whose known opposition made it a duty of delicacy and of respect not even to seem to obtrude upon them'³⁸. The signing of the petition went on for most of January. 'I remember our anxiety', Manning wrote, 'while the signatures were coming in, hindered and delayed by intrigue and misrepresentation'³⁹. Some 380 bishops signed the petition. Its text⁴⁰, however, did not satisfy all those in favour of the definition: some thought that it was too extensive; others, while wanting to preserve the substance of the definition, preferred different wordings,... As a result, there were several other petitions in favour of the definition, one of them attracting some 68 signatures. On the inopportunist side, the petitions against the introduction of papal infallibility in the Council were signed by 136 Council Fathers. Ullathorne, who did not sign any of the petitions, pronounced that Manning's [!] formula - which he misquoted - 'did not incorporate the doctrine of infallibility at all. The *suprema ideoque irreversibilis auctoritas* was just our own constitutional doctrine: there being no tribunal above him, the King can do no wrong'⁴¹. The actual wording of the petition was: 'that the authority of the Roman Pontiff is supreme, and therefore, exempt from error [*supremam, ideoque ab errore immunem*], when in matters of faith and morals he

³⁸ *True*, pp. 115-116; for Ullathorne's comments see C. Butler, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

³⁹ *P*, II, p. 453.

⁴⁰ *M*, 51, cols. 646C-650A.

⁴¹ C. Butler, *op. cit.*, pp. 184-185; my italics.

declares and defines what is to be believed and held, and what to be rejected and condemned, by all the faithful'⁴²; in another place it said: 'the judgments of the Roman Pontiff in matters of faith and morals are irreformable'⁴³. It is hard to see how the wording of the Petition - or the English Constitution, for that matter - could support Ullathorne's interpretation.

This Petition was the first Conciliar text attempting to put into words the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope. It insisted on the connexion between primacy and infallibility: Sacred Scripture plainly taught 'the Primacy of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, (...), over the whole Church of Christ, and, therefore, also his Primacy of supreme teaching authority'⁴⁴. That the supreme judge in doctrine must be infallible, and his judgments irreformable, had been obvious to Manning from his late Anglican days; were this not to be so, it would be left to private judgment to decide whether he had judged correctly in matters of doctrine!

The Congregation *De Postulatibus*, in its meeting of 9 February, decided to send the petition to the Pope, accompanied by their favourable opinion.

2. *The new chapter on the Pope's infallibility*

From the very beginning of the Council, those opposed to the definition of the Pope's infallibility were on the alert to prevent any wording of the conciliar documents that could affirm it by implication. This was the reason why some of the Fathers objected to the final paragraphs of the Constitution *Dei Filius*. In them, the Roman Pontiff, by his supreme authority commanded all the faithful, and particularly the Pastors, to ward off and eliminate the errors described and condemned in the Constitution. Then, he added: 'And since it is not sufficient to shun heretical pravity, unless those errors also be diligently avoided which more or less nearly approach it, We admonish all men of

⁴² *M*, 51, col. 646C, also in col. 650A; Manning's translation in *Privilegium*, III, p. 167.

⁴³ *M*, 51, col. 646D: '*Romani Pontificis iudicia de fidei morumque doctrina irreformabilia esse*'; Manning's translation, in *Privilegium*, III, p. 167.

⁴⁴ *M*, 51, col. 646CD; Manning's translation, *Privilegium*, III, p. 167.

the further duty of observing those constitutions and decrees by which such erroneous opinions as are not here specifically enumerated, have been proscribed and condemned by this Holy See⁴⁵. The paragraphs in question could be originally found at the end of the reformed schema *De Fide*, after the canons attached to Chapter IX⁴⁶; once the schema had been divided in two, they were included at the end of what became the First Constitution *De Fide*. These sentences aroused the suspicion of the inopportunist Fathers, who saw in them a veiled reference to the Pope's infallibility. They argued, at first, that the words should be reserved for the end of the Second Constitution on Faith; later on, after the 83 placets *juxta modum* in the vote of 12 April, forty four Fathers signed a memorandum asking for the suppression of the paragraphs in question, adding that this change would help achieve unanimity in the final vote⁴⁷. The request was rejected. Gasser, Bishop of Brixen (Austria), on behalf of the Deputation *De Fide*, would explain that the character of the Pope's previous pronouncements was not modified by the concluding paragraphs; that is, infallibility was not touched upon in them⁴⁸.

The inopportunist's objection could have been considered somewhat far-fetched, but Manning, when presenting the Council to the faithful of his diocese, seemed to substantiate it by giving particular prominence to that precise text. He seemed to have been less than candid in saying that when 'these words were written, it was not foreseen that they were a preparation, unconsciously made[!], for the definition of the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff'⁴⁹.

The infallibility of the Church was dealt with in Chapter IX of the first schema *De Ecclesia*, entitled *De ecclesiae infallibilitate*⁵⁰. It was affirmed in it that infallibility

⁴⁵ *M*, 51, 436AB; Manning's translation in *Privilegium*, III, p. 203.

⁴⁶ Cfr. *M*, 53, col. 177AB.

⁴⁷ Cfr. *M*, 51, cols. 411B-412C.

⁴⁸ Cfr. *M*, 51, 424BD; Odo Russell, writing to Clarendon on 25 April, would bring to his attention the last paragraph of the decree: 'To my mind this paragraph is the first step taken by the Council towards the dogmatization of Papal Infallibility', in N. Blackinstone, *The Roman Question* (London, 1962), p. 426; see also p. 433.

⁴⁹ *Privilegium*, III, p. 51.

⁵⁰ Cfr. *M*, 51, cols. 542D-543B.

had been revealed as a permanent prerogative of the Church, a consequence of the perpetual presence and action of the Holy Spirit in it; that immunity from error was an essential property of the Church, absolutely necessary for the fulfilment of her mission as pillar of truth in the world. The schema went on to say that the Church's infallibility extended to all the things contained in God's revelation; within its realm were also those truths necessary to preserve revelation intact, propose and explain it without error, and defend it against the claims of 'false science'. Consequently, as enunciated in Canon IX of the same schema⁵¹, infallibility's constituency also embraced those truths which, although not contained in divine revelation, were required to preserve the integrity of the deposit.

Having received the text of the schema *De Ecclesia*, the Council awaited several weeks the decision of the Pope on whether to grant permission for the introduction of the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff. In the meantime, the study of the schema and the preparation of suggestions and amendments by the Fathers was going apace. Neither was Manning inactive at this time. On 15 February he presented a Postulatum to the Deputation *De Postulatis* in which he tried to introduce into the schema, as it stood, the infallibility of the Pope, independently of whether permission were to be granted to discuss it on its own⁵². His Postulatum tried to do so in a somewhat indirect way. It asked, among other things, for a new canon to be inserted after canon XVI. In it he did not mention the word infallibility; its main thrust was to define the irreformable character of the decrees on faith and morals promulgated by the Roman Pontiff as supreme pastor and doctor of the universal Church. The connexion between irreformable decrees and infallibility had already been established in the text of the petition: the decrees of the Pope were irreformable not because they emanated from a supreme tribunal, from which there was no appeal, but because they conformed to truth⁵³. In the final instance, by declaring, with the assistance of the Holy Spirit, that a particular doctrine was revealed, those decrees were anchored on God's truthfulness and omniscience.

⁵¹ Cfr. *M*, 51, col. 552A.

⁵² Cfr. *M*, 53, cols. 519D-520B.

⁵³ The same supreme tribunal could have reformed any of its own decrees. Mgr. Gasser elaborated later on the distinction between the decrees emanating from a supreme authority, without appeal, and infallible decrees (cfr. *M*, 52, cols. 1225C and 1316AB).

On 1 March, Pius IX gave his approval, and the decision was communicated to the Council Fathers five days later. They received at the same time a new additional chapter on the Pope's infallibility, to be included after Chapter IX of the schema *De Ecclesia*, on the Pope's primacy of jurisdiction. The granting by Pius IX of the petition for the introduction of the infallibility of the Pope in the Council made Manning's *Postulatum* redundant. The new chapter, entitled *Romanum Pontificem in rebus fidei et morum definiendis errare non posse*, was based on the texts of definition proposed by Manning and Dechamps, and it had been re-elaborated by Cardinal Bilio. The introduction referred to the foundation of the privilege of infallibility on the divine will; adding how the primacy of the Pope made him supreme judge in matters of faith, to defend it and to judge in the controversies about the faith. The definition then followed:

*'hinc, sacro approbante concilio, docemus et tamquam fidei dogma definimus, per divinam assistentiam fieri, ut Romanus pontifex, (...) cum supremi omnium christianorum doctoris muneri fungens pro auctoritate definit, quid in rebus fidei et morum ab universa ecclesia tenendum sit, errare non possit; et hanc Romani Pontificis inerrantiae seu infallibilitatis praerogativam ad idem obiectum porrigi, ad quod infallibilitas ecclesiae extenditur'*⁵⁴ [therefore, the Sacred Council approving, we teach and define that it is a dogma of faith that the Roman Pontiff (...) cannot fall into error when, in the exercise of his office as supreme teacher of all Christians, defines that which is to be held by the universal Church in matters of faith and morals; the object of this prerogative of inerrancy or infallibility of the Roman Pontiff reaches out as far as the object covered by the infallibility of the Church].

The word infallibility was used; its object was very widely defined, while the conditions of its exercise were left rather vague. The classical *ex cathedra* clause, traditionally employed to describe the infallible utterances of the Roman Pontiff, was not part of the text; the suggested formula, in its place, inserted a descriptive sentence: *'cum supremi omnium christianorum doctoris munere fungens pro auctoritate definit, quid in rebus fidei et morum ab universa ecclesia tenendum sit'*. It is quite likely that the exclusion of the *ex cathedra* formula might have been an attempt to bypass the problems arising from the claims, made by opponents to the definition, about the difficulty of agreeing

⁵⁴ *M*, 51, cols. 701D-702A.

in what *ex cathedra* actually meant.

The text of definition presented to the Fathers was substantially that of Dechamps⁵⁵; Manning's formula⁵⁶ contributing a couple of sentences to the proposed definition. The first - '*et tamquam dogma fidei*' - qualified the character of the doctrine being defined; the second made reference to the object of the infallibility of the Pope, and said that it was coextensive with the infallibility of the Church. These last words were taken from the draft on the Pope's infallibility prepared by the theological commission, and never presented to the Fathers. It seems that Manning, during his sojourns in Rome before the Council, had been granted access to the work of the preparatory commissions, and, according to Bilio, had even taken with him to London some of the material prepared by the theological commission⁵⁷. As it happened, the expression had been criticized by some of the members of the preparatory theological commission, and it was to encounter similar criticisms in the Council, both in the Deputation and in the debates of the General Congregations.

The Fathers were given until 25 March to study and to submit their comments and amendments to Chapter IX and the new one on infallibility. Numerous observations were made on both chapters; the one on infallibility receiving the greater number of them. They ranged from those who thought the definition inopportune and even impossible, to those others who, while being in favour of the definition, wanted to improve its wording and the general presentation of the doctrine.

3. Moves to change the order of the debates

During the end of March and the first weeks of April, the energies of the Fathers were not wholly absorbed by the study of the chapters on the Roman Pontiff or the discussion of the text of the Constitution *Dei Filius*. A petition had been presented on 23 March

⁵⁵ Cfr. *M*, 51, cols. 697B-698A.

⁵⁶ Cfr. *M*, 51, cols. 698D-699B.

⁵⁷ Cfr. U. Betti, *La Costituzione dogmatica "Pastor aeternus" del Concilio Vaticano I* (Roma, 1961), p. 62, note 4.

asking for a change in the order of the debates, in order to introduce the study of the infallibility of the Pope immediately after the discussion and final vote on the First Constitution *De Fide*⁵⁸. The bishops of the minority opposed this move, asking for the order of the Chapters to be preserved; some of them went as far as asking that the chapters on the relationships between Church and State were studied before those on the primacy⁵⁹.

Manning described the reasons for petitioning the change in the order of procedure: first, the need for the definition itself, and, secondly, the importance of discussing it while the majority of the Fathers were still resident in Rome. Those in the inner circle of infallibilists saw clearly that the absence of many members of the Council from the debates and the vote on infallibility would have reinforced the claims - already made before the Council - that the infallibility of the Pope would be introduced surreptitiously. The adversaries of the definition would be able to claim that the matter had been kept under wraps until its main opponents had absented themselves from Rome; then, the small number of Fathers left behind could be easily manipulated or overawed into acquiescence. The question was of such transcendence, and the discrepancy so public, that many saw it as essential that the matter should be discussed and decided 'by the largest possible assembly of the Catholic Episcopate. All other questions, on which little divergence of opinion existed, might well be left to a smaller number of Bishops. But a doctrine which had divided both Pastors and people, the defining of which was contested by a numerous and organised opposition, needed to be treated and affirmed by the most extensive deliberation of the Bishops of the Catholic Church'⁶⁰. The uncertainty as to the future of the Council, because of the threat of impending war between Germany and France, added urgency to the demands of the majority.

Adhering to the established order of debates would imply that, before addressing the primacy and infallibility of the Pope, the Fathers had to study the second schema *De Fide*, and the first ten or so chapters of the schema *De Ecclesia*. This would mean that

⁵⁸ Cfr. *M*, 51, cols. 703-711.

⁵⁹ Cfr. *M*, 51, cols. 719D-722A.

⁶⁰ *Privilegium*, III, pp. 53-54.

the subject, in a conservative estimate, would not come up for debate before the General Congregation of the Council until some time well into 1871. The Fathers of the majority felt that there was no point in studying aspects of the doctrine on the Trinity or the Church which had been clearly taught and defined, and were held without dispute by the faithful. What was really urgent was to study and define, in Manning's words, 'such truths as at this time are both especially contradicted and vitally necessary to the very foundations of the faith'⁶¹. The rest might safely be deferred. The schema on the Church in Manning's estimate, 'was prolix and multifarious.(...) Much of its contents had already been implicitly or even explicitly defined. Its chief points, as, for instance, the infallibility of the Church, have never been denied or even doubted by any Catholic'⁶². That was not the case with the infallibility of the Pope. The majority of the Fathers felt, therefore, that it would be wise 'to define first the truths which had been denied, to declare that which had been contradicted, to settle that which had been in controversy, before treating of those things in which all men were agreed'⁶³.

The minority's weightiest argument was the need to treat of the Church before dealing with the Pope; to study the infallibility of the Church before defining the Pope's infallibility. Manning would have partly conceded the point, although he would have argued that the infallibility of the Church was common doctrine, not assailed by any Catholic and, thus, not in need of study or definition. The Constitution *Dei Filius* had made clear that the assent of faith was not only due to dogmatically defined doctrines but also to those handed down by the Church's ordinary and universal *magisterium*. Consequently, the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church - as taught by the ordinary *magisterium* and held by all the faithful - could be used as foundation for the discussion of the Pope's infallibility.

In his speech to the Council on 25 May, Manning went even further, using the words of *Dei Filius* to support his contention that the infallibility of the Pope was '*doctrina catholica fidei divina et catholica credenda*'⁶⁴: it had been taught by the ordinary and

⁶¹ True, p. 194.

⁶² *Ibidem*, p. 195.

⁶³ *Ibidem*, p. 195.

⁶⁴ M, 52, col. 251B.

universal magisterium of the Church; it had been proclaimed - at least implicitly - by several ecumenical councils; it was common doctrine among theologians; and it had been believed and accepted, always and everywhere, by the faithful. As far as Manning was concerned it bore more than enough marks to identify it as a revealed doctrine to be believed with divine faith, even before it had been the object of a dogmatic definition. A definition was now necessary, not to make it into a doctrine of faith but in order to defend a doctrine of faith against those who assailed it. The infallibility of the Pope was not a matter for free opinion among Catholics; those who, speaking about this subject, quoted the dictum '*In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas*' laboured under a misconception⁶⁵.

The reluctance of the Presidents of the Council to change the order of the debates urged some members of the Deputation *De Fide* to meet together at Manning's residence during Holy Week (10-16 April), to decide on a plan of campaign to achieve the above end⁶⁶. The result of their deliberations was to accept the suggestions put forward by the theologians Maier and Schrader, i.e.: to prepare a separate constitution on the Roman Pontiff, made up of the chapters on the primacy and infallibility; they also agreed on not changing the formula of the definition proposed on 6 March. In order to speed up the proceedings within the Deputation *De Fide*, they committed themselves to abstain from proposing modifications to that text in its meetings. Their approach to Bilio - and, later on, to the First President of the Council, Cardinal de Angelis - did not produce the desired effect. The Cardinals adhered to the original order of debates. There was no appeal left, except to go directly to the Pope. Senestréy and Manning had an audience with Pius IX on the morning of the 19th, at the end of which they thought that the Pope would act in the direction of their desires. Business within the Council, though, proceeded as usual in the following days. The members of Manning's group grew impatient, wondering whether the advice of those intent on preserving the previous order of debates had prevailed with the Pope. On the 22nd they decided not to wait any longer, and, in a meeting in the residence of de la Bouillerie, bishop of Carcassone, they drew a formal petition asking the Holy Father to bring forward the

⁶⁵ Cfr. *M*, 52, col. 252A.

⁶⁶ See Senestréy's Diary; *M*, 53, cols. 279C-280A.

schema on the Roman Pontiff⁶⁷. Eighty four bishops had signed it by the 23rd, when the petition was presented to the Pope. On the 27th, the Deputation *De Fide* received the news that the schema *De Romano Pontifice* was to be brought in at once, and they started work on it that same day. The Fathers of the Council were notified on the 29th. Gratitude and disappointment at the Pope's decision found expression in different documents; the most relevant of which was perhaps the one signed by some seventy bishops putting forward the reasons - theological and pastoral - against the change of order⁶⁸.

II. The Definition.

1. The Minority's fears

The new schema was ready for the Council Fathers's study by 8 May. The Deputatio *De Fide* had been working from 2 to 8 May on a text presented by Maier and Schrader. It was entitled *Constitutio Dogmatica Prima de Ecclesia Christi*, suggesting that it did not exhaust the study on the Church that the Council intended to carry out. Maier and Schrader had distributed the subject matter in four chapters: the first three dealt with the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff, the fourth with his infallible Magisterium. The revision of the first three chapters did not occupy the Deputation for long, and it afforded few substantial amendments. The discussion of Chapter IV, as it was to be expected, was more extensive and took them from 5 to 8 of May.

The bishops of the minority, particularly the French bishops, had expressed before the Council their fears of a definition which would declare what they called the 'personal, separate and absolute infallibility of the Pope'; fears which seemed to have found confirmation in the verbal excesses of some French supporters of the definition. Maret, in his book, had given definite and clear conceptual expression to those fears, coining

⁶⁷ *M*, 51, cols. 722B-724A.

⁶⁸ *M*, 51, cols. 727B-730B.

the sentence that the minority would use, time and time again, in the conciliar debates. The ultramontane school, to Maret's mind, did 'not conceive infallibility as attached "to the human person". Rather, infallibility as attached "to the pontifical person, to the pontiff, becomes, in this sense, personal". By *absolute*, this school means "without condition, or rather with conditions which no one can or should verify". (...) By *separate*, this school means "the attribution of this divine privilege to the pope, exclusive of any agreement of the bishops in pontifical decisions, either this agreement be antecedent, concomitant, or subsequent; whether it be expressed or tacit"⁶⁹. Dupanloup, in his correspondence with Dechamps, would express himself in similar terms about personal infallibility: 'You say: "It is not a *private* but to a *public* person that infallibility was promised". The personal infallibility of which I spoke is the infallibility of the public person of the pope'⁷⁰. At first, most minority bishops seem to have concentrated their attention on the "separate infallibility", but it seems that they soon came to view the three aspects as closely connected, each one of them logically demanding the other two⁷¹. Unfortunately, the terms - personal, separate and absolute - were equivocal even to Council Fathers: they suggested more than the precise meaning here expressed by Maret and Dupanloup; for the public outside the Council, they were grotesque and provided plentiful ammunition for those who wished to caricature its proceedings and the bishops supporting the definition.

Manning's Pastoral of 1869 - particularly his Appendix about Maret's book - had been viewed and judged by Dupanloup in the French context. His use of the expression '*apart from the bishops*', when speaking of Papal infallible pronouncements, had, in many minds, set Manning's name firmly at the head of the list of proponents of a personal, separate and absolute infallibility. His disclaimers availed him little. After the Council he would dwell on this formula, consecrated by repeated use. 'The frequency and confidence with which this formula was repeated, as if taken from the writings of the promoters of the Definition, made it not unnatural to examine into the origin, history, and meaning of the formula itself. I therefore set myself to search it out; and

⁶⁹ M. O'Gara, *Triumph in defeat: infallibility, Vatican I, and the French minority bishops* (Washington D.C., 1988), p. 84.

⁷⁰ Letter dated 1-III-70; quoted in O'Gara, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

⁷¹ Cfr. O'Gara, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

I employed others to do the same. As it had been ascribed to myself, our first examination was turned to anything I might have written. After repeated search, not only was the formula as a whole nowhere to be discovered, but the words of which it is composed were, with the exception of the word 'independent', equally nowhere to be found'⁷². For those who used the formula, though, Manning's admission of an 'independent' infallibility would justify attributing to him the expression in its entirety. As a matter of fact, after Manning's correspondence with Dupanloup on the subject, the opponents of the definition would speak at times of a 'personal, separate, independent, and absolute infallibility'!

The Deputation *De Fide* had, therefore, a twofold task. On the one hand, it had to hammer out a precise and accurate formula of definition. At the same time, it had to try to assuage the fears - genuine or tactical - of those who opposed the definition on the above grounds. It was no easy task: Cardinal Guidi of Bologna, as late as 18 June, would still be raising the issue of a personal, separate, independent and absolute infallibility. He was answered the following day by d'Avanzo, Bishop of Calvi, speaking in the name of the Deputation. His explanations, though, did not seem to satisfy some of the Fathers; Moriarty, of Kerry, ploughed the same furrow of a personal, separate, and absolute infallibility on the 28th. Manning did not intervene in the debates on this point, although his notes have many references to it. It was left to Mgr. Gasser, in his long defence of the definition of 11 July, to explain how the proposed formula did not put forward a personal, separate, independent and absolute infallibility.

2. A Personal Infallibility?

The title of Chapter IV of the Constitution *Pastor Aeternus*, about the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff, went through several revisions in the course of its history. It started, in the additional chapter to the general schema *De Ecclesia*, as '*Romanum Pontificem in rebus fidei et morum definiendis errare non posse*'; the subsequent first schema of the Constitution on the Roman Pontiff was rather more vague and general: '*De Romani*

⁷² *Privilegium*, III, p. 93.

Pontificis infallibilitate’; it became, in the definitive version, ‘*De Romani Pontificis infallibili magisterio*’. Manning would later say that ‘the reason of this change was not only for greater accuracy, but because even the title of the decree excludes at once the figment of a *personal* infallibility’⁷³.

The first paragraphs of the chapter reinforced that idea. Manning, when commenting on the Decrees of the Council, later pointed out how the first words of Chapter IV, established the clear connexion between primacy and infallibility: ‘the supreme power of teaching is also included in the Apostolic primacy’⁷⁴; the ‘*magisterium*, or teaching office, or doctrinal authority, is contained in the primacy. The supreme ruler is also supreme teacher. The primacy contains two things, the fullness of jurisdiction, and a special assistance in the exercise of it. Now, under jurisdiction is contained the office of teaching. (...) The assistance [by the Holy Spirit] of infallible guidance is attached to the *magisterium* or teaching office, and the *magisterium* is contained in the primacy’⁷⁵. It is ‘a supernatural grace, or *charisma*, attached to the primacy in order to its proper exercise’⁷⁶. Manning would say that by using the word *charisma*, ‘again the notion of a “personal” infallibility is excluded’. A *charisma* is not a grace granted by God to make the person who receives it acceptable in His sight; it is rather ‘a *gratia gratis data*, or a grace the benefit of which is for *others* (...) By this also is excluded another misconception, (...) that if Popes are infallible they are therefore impeccable; that if they cannot err in faith, they cannot sin in morals; that if their intelligence be guided by divine light, their will must be necessarily conformed to divine grace’⁷⁷. Infallibility, he would say, is not a ‘quality inherent in the person, but an assistance inseparable from the office. It is therefore not personal, but official. It is personal only so far as the primacy is borne by a person’, not by a commission, it ‘is personal, therefore, only in the sense that the successor of S. Peter is a man and not a body of

⁷³ *True*, p. 173.

⁷⁴ *Privilegium*, III, p. 216; cfr. *M*, 52, col. 1333C.

⁷⁵ *True*, pp. 173-174.

⁷⁶ *Privilegium*, III, p. 97.

⁷⁷ *True*, p. 185. Maret, in the book he published before the Council, would establish, from a different point of view, the connexion between holiness and infallibility: infallibility could only be the prerogative of a person endowed with an extraordinary degree of holiness. Manning viewed this opinion as some sort of intellectual quasi-Donatism.

men'⁷⁸. The Roman Pontiff is not infallible as a 'private person, or a private doctor, or as a local Bishop, or as sovereign of a state (...). In all these acts the Pontiff may be subject to error. In one and only capacity he is exempt from error; that is, when, as teacher of the whole Church, he teaches the whole Church in things of faith and morals'⁷⁹. The Council 'does not even say that it is an abiding assistance present always, but only never absent in the discharge of their supreme office'⁸⁰.

Manning, in his personal notes taken during the Council, had located the privilege of infallibility within the distinction between personal, real or mixed types of privileges: 'a privilege was *personal* which looked not to a thing or to an office but to a person; it was *real* when it was ascribed to a thing or to a place, or to an office; and it was *mixed* when it belonged to a college or to a community of persons'. He concluded that the 'privilege of infallibility was real in so far as it belonged to the primacy and personal because it was ascribed to the person enjoying the primacy, but it was not mixed in the sense that it belonged to the pontiff only if he were united with the episcopate'⁸¹. In his pastoral on the Council, Manning would quote authors like Ballerini and Toletus, who had used the adjective 'personal' when referring to the Pope's infallibility: all of them stressed the fact that by personal they understood a privilege which could not be communicated to another, and which did not require the help or association of others for its exercise.

Gasser, in his speech to the General Congregation on 11 July, had pointed out that the infallibility of the Pope could also be called personal in order to exclude the Gallican distinction between the Roman Church and the Roman Pontiff, the Sede and the one who sat in it; this distinction would reserve infallibility for the first element of each of these binomials, the second being fallible. The prerogative, Gasser added, belonged to each and all of the Roman Pontiffs, not, as some had claimed, to the series of the Roman Pontiffs as a whole⁸².

⁷⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 174.

⁷⁹ *Privilegium*, III, p. 58.

⁸⁰ *True*, p. 186.

⁸¹ Cwiekowski, *op. cit.*, p. 263.

⁸² Cfr. *M*, 52, col. 1212CD.

The definition of Papal infallibility would make clear that this special assistance of the Holy Spirit - the origin and foundation of his infallibility - was granted to the Pope only while in the exercise of his office as supreme Pastor and Doctor of the Church; even here, not all his acts were guaranteed by the charisma of infallibility, but just his *ex cathedra* pronouncements. The Council, Manning would later say, had fixed the meaning of the definition by adopting a terminology which had become classical in that context: the Pope is infallible when '*loquens ex cathedra*; that is, [when] speaking from the Seat, or place, or with the authority of the supreme teacher of all Christians, and binding the assent of the Universal Church'⁸³. In the same Pastoral, he would also use more general definitions of the formula: the 'Pontiff speaks *ex cathedra* when, and only when, he speaks as the Pastor and Doctor of all Christians'⁸⁴. Manning's conclusion was that 'the whole *magisterium* or doctrinal authority of the Pontiff as the supreme Doctor of all Christians, is included in the definition of his infallibility. (...) The Definition, then, limits the infallibility of the Pontiff to his supreme acts *ex cathedra* in faith and morals, but extends his infallibility to all acts in the fullest exercise of his supreme *magisterium* or doctrinal authority'⁸⁵.

Some of Manning's expressions seem to obscure one of the constitutive elements of an *ex cathedra* pronouncement: the act of defining a doctrine as divinely revealed, to be believed as such by all. It can be safely said that the mind of the Council Fathers was in harmony with the precision made by Gasser in his speech to the Council of 11 July⁸⁶: an *ex cathedra* act is one in which the Pope not only proposes a doctrine as supreme doctor and pastor of the Church, but one in which he has a clear intention of defining a doctrine of faith and morals by passing a definitive sentence. This precision was of paramount importance, given that the Pope's ordinary teaching is also an exercise of his supreme magisterium and demands interior assent of the faithful, even though he may not be teaching infallibly.

Manning did not ignore the above, and in his pastoral he referred to what definition and

⁸³ *Privilegium*, III, p. 57.

⁸⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 58.

⁸⁵ *Ibidem*, pp. 89-90.

⁸⁶ Cfr. *M*, 52, cols. 1225C & 1316AB.

defining meant in the Constitution. He described it as ‘an authoritative termination of questions which had been in doubt and debate, and therefore of the judgment or sentence there resulting. (...) *Definire* is *finem imponere*, or *finaliter iudicare*. It is therefore equivalent to *determinare*, or *finaliter determinare* (...). It is in this sense that the Vatican Council uses the word *definienda*. It signifies the final decision by which any matter of faith and morals is put into a doctrinal form’⁸⁷.

It has been claimed that Manning seemed to have a juridical understanding of infallibility⁸⁸. This interpretation, beside its terminological ambiguity, fails to take into consideration that Manning, when speaking of the power of teaching as judicial, was setting it in contrast with a legislative power, able to create law: the Church cannot create the law of Faith, she can only proclaim and apply the law of truth promulgated by God. As an Anglican he realised that he had found the true rule of faith - Scripture and Antiquity - but not the judge to apply it in order to find the true faith. He had finally concluded that an infallible judge was needed as foundation of supernatural faith, given that faith demands certainty in the object and certainty in the believer.

Manning saw the primacy, or power of supreme jurisdiction, as containing within it the supreme doctrinal authority or supreme doctrinal jurisdiction: ‘under jurisdiction is contained, he would say, the office of teaching’, and then he went on to add, that to ‘deliver the law is to teach’⁸⁹. He would also say that infallibility ‘is a quality of the doctrinal jurisdiction of the Pontiff in faith and morals’⁹⁰. The above, though, did not confine the exercise of infallibility to passing sentence on controversies or questions about faith and morals. The definition, Manning would say, ‘speaks of the doctrinal

⁸⁷ *Privilegium*, III, pp. 87-88.

⁸⁸ J.T. Ford thinks that Manning ‘seems to understand it [the act of defining] as a juridical process (...) [thus] one should not be surprised that Manning describes infallibility as a charism of juridical discernment’ [‘Different Models of Infallibility’, in *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America*, vol. 35 (1980), p 225]. In a previous article, he had spoken of a certain ambiguity in the Conciliar Fathers’ ideas about the concept of *magisterium*: ‘one suspects that some participants considered *magisterium* as basically a teaching power which invites the response of faith, while others construed *magisterium* as essentially a lawmaking power which requires the response of obedience’ [‘Infallibility: A Review of recent studies’, *Theological Studies*, vol. 40 (1979), pp. 287-288]. He seemed to include Manning in the second group.

⁸⁹ *True*, p. 174.

⁹⁰ *Privilegium*, III, p. 97.

authority of the Pontiff in general; and therefore both of what may be called pacific definitions like the Immaculate Conception, and of controversial definitions like those of St. Innocent against the Pelagians...⁹¹. Thus, 'jurisdiction' means that the Pontiffs are 'witnesses, teachers, and judges of the revelation already given to the Church; and in guarding, expounding, and defending that revelation, their witness, teaching, and judgment, is by Divine assistance preserved from error'⁹².

3. *The Object of Faith and the Object of Infallibility*

Chapter IX of the General schema *De Ecclesia*, and the canon attached to it, made clear that the end of the privilege of infallibility is the safeguarding of the deposit of faith. Thus, its object extends to the whole of divine revelation, and to all those non-revealed truths without which it would not be possible to preserve, propose, explain or defend the deposit. Infallibility, therefore, has a double object: revealed truth and non-revealed truth closely connected with truths revealed. The difficulty to define precisely the limits of the secondary object of infallibility showed in the wording of the Chapter and canon; they attracted a good deal of criticism and numerous amendments from the Council Fathers, although the doctrine itself was generally accepted.

The new chapter of 6 March, defining the Pope's infallibility, was to be dramatically changed by the Deputation *De Fide* while preparing the new schema of the First Constitution *De Ecclesia*. Cardinal Bilio, the Cardinal President, to the surprise of the members of the Deputation, criticized the formula of 6 March, which he himself had prepared. The difficulty arose, in his opinion, from the fact of dealing with the infallibility of the Pope before carrying out a detailed study of the Church. In Senestréy's diary he is reported as saying: 'No more can be defined concerning the infallibility of the Pope than has been defined concerning the infallibility of the Church; but of the Church this only is of faith, that she is infallible in dogmatic definitions strictly taken; [therefore,] the question arises whether in the proposed formula the

⁹¹ *Ibidem*, p. 88; Gasser had explicitly excluded the restrictive interpretation (cfr. *M*, 52, col. 1316AB).

⁹² *Ibidem*, p. 85.

infallibility of the Pope be not too widely extended'⁹³. He thought it inappropriate to define the infallibility of the Pope as reaching beyond the defined infallibility of the Church, and suggested including Martin's qualification - '*ab universa ecclesia fide catholica credendum sit*' [those things to be believed by the whole Church as of Catholic faith]⁹⁴ - in the formula of definition. On the other hand, Cardinal Bilio was of the opinion that the sentence which defined the object of the Pope's infallibility by making it coextensive with the object of the infallibility of the Church should be preserved. Franzelin, then, produced a new formula along the lines suggested by Bilio; it was presented to the Fathers of the Deputation that same evening⁹⁵.

Senestréy's diary records that, in reply to Bilio's arguments, it was contended that it was true that 'the infallibility of the Church had never been defined; even so, it was evident to all that the infallibility of the Church was a dogma and that it was a fundamental dogma, as all Catholics in proffering the act of faith confessed: "*Credo quod Deus revelavit et ecclesia catholica credendum proponit*". As, therefore, it is of faith that the Church is infallible, let the same be defined of the Pope'⁹⁶. Senestréy does not say who it was that uttered these words, but they reflected well Manning's thought⁹⁷. They felt that the new formula represented a serious setback: the ground which had been recently gained, with the Munich Brief and with the final paragraph of *Dei Filius*, was now being surrendered.

Manning's notes registered the objections he found to the new wording of the definition: it restricted the number of truths to be believed to those which had been defined under censure of heresy; infallibility would not guarantee other truths taught

⁹³ *M*, 53, cols. 281D-282A; translation by C. Butler, *op. cit.*, p. 376.

⁹⁴ *M*, 53, col. 249D. The Archbishop of St. Francisco had made also a similar restrictive suggestion: '*de questionibus fidei et morum iudicans, de iis definivit, quid ab universali ecclesia sub haeresis censura credendum vel reiiciendum sit, errare non possit*' (*M*, 53, col. 249D-250A)

⁹⁵ *M*, 53, col. 250D: '*...in rebus fidei et morum ab universa ecclesia fide divina credendum tenendumve vel reiiciendum sit, errare non possit; et hanc Romani pontificis infallibilitatis prearogativam ad idem obiectum porrigi, ad quod infallibilitas ecclesiae extenditur*'.

⁹⁶ *M*, 53, col. 282AB; my translation.

⁹⁷ In *The True History of the Vatican Council* Manning would write: 'no one who denies it [the Church's infallibility] is a Catholic. Whosoever doubts it ceases to be a Catholic. But this doctrine has never been defined. It needs no definition' (*True*, p. 190). The new dogma 'defined that the head of the Church is infallible, and it is assumed as certain that the Church is also infallible' (*Ibidem*, p. 191).

by the Pope or those errors condemned by him with a censure below that of heresy; on top of all that, as the object of the infallibility of the Church had not been defined, it could not be used - on the above basis - to define the object of the infallibility of the Pope. Beside, looking beyond the question in hand, Manning considered that the present restriction in defining the infallibility of the Pope would prejudice the future definition of the infallibility of the Church, which was to be subsequently studied by the Council⁹⁸.

The arguments were brought forth in the meetings of 5 to 7 May. The discussion had become at times rather heated. Two of the Fathers - probably Manning and Senestréy - asked for a monitum to be added after the Canons to avoid restricting the object of faith to dogmatic definitions, in accordance with the Letter of Pius IX to the Archbishop of Munich, as it had been done in the Constitution *Dei Filius*⁹⁹; several Fathers of the Deputation reiterated this petition, unsuccessfully, on 7 May.

The text finally passed by the Deputation had it as: '*quid in rebus fidei et morum ab universa ecclesia tamquam de fide tenendum vel tamquam fidei contrarium reiiciendum sit*'¹⁰⁰. The formula went some way towards answering the requests of those who thought like Manning and Senestréy, although it did not satisfy them. When the schema was distributed to the Council Fathers, many felt - Senestréy reports in his diary - that these changes had deformed rather than reformed the text, and, in the debates of the General Congregations, the object of Papal infallibility would attract the greatest number of criticisms and amendments. Many Council Fathers pointed out that the new formula restricted infallibility to definitions of faith, leaving out the dogmatic facts, the censures below heresy, the canonization of saints, etc., which had traditionally been considered as covered by the infallibility of the Church. Meanwhile, a group of bishops - Manning and Senestréy among them - started to meet together to study ways for bringing back the original formula of definition of 6 March. It is quite likely that Senestréy's *emendatio* was one of the fruits of those meetings; he suggested a new wording for the clause on the object of infallibility: '*quid in rebus fidei et morum ad*

⁹⁸ Cfr. Cwiekowski, *op. cit.*, p. 238.

⁹⁹ Cfr. *M*, 53, col. 252AB.

¹⁰⁰ *M*, 52, col. 7B.

*ecclesiam universalem spectantibus tenendum aut reiciendum sit*¹⁰¹.

It was here, on the extension of the object of Papal Infallibility, that the dividing line was drawn within the infallibilist camp. Some, like Dechamps and Martin, were content with defining the infallibility of the Pope when proposing dogmatic definitions; others, like Manning and Senestréy, were unhappy with this restrictive definition, particularly if it gave to understand that the Pope was infallible only in those cases.

As it happened, the insistence of the Council Fathers would bring about the omission of any reference about the infallibility of the Pope being confined to what was to be believed as '*de fide Catholica*' - dogmatic definitions - or have attached to it the censure of heresy. The final formula of the definition would describe the object of Papal infallibility in words closer to those used in the text of 6 March: '*cum doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universa ecclesia tenendum definit*'. The intended vagueness of the formula used left the path open to different possible interpretations about the extension of the object of Papal infallibility, restricting or enlarging the number of Papal pronouncements to be considered *ex cathedra*. It was certain that the Pope was infallible when proclaiming a dogma or when censuring an error as heretical; beside, many thought that Papal Infallibility also embraced other doctrinal definitions or minor censures. The Fathers objections to the restrictive wording of the definition, and the consequent changes effected in it, seem to suggest that it was the intention of the Council not to exclude - explicitly or implicitly - from the object of papal infallibility a wider range of pontifical acts. The question was left open.

Gasser's speech of 11 July, when explaining the mind of the Deputation *De Fide* with respect to the object of infallibility, followed along those lines. It undoubtedly embraced, he said, all those things contained *per se* in the deposit of revelation: truths capable of dogmatic definition and imposed under censure of heresy; as far as the truths not directly contained in the deposit but necessary for its custody, transmission and defence (dogmatic facts, etc), it was the unanimous consent of theologians that the Church was infallible when defining them, and that it would be a serious error to deny this infallibility. There was diversity of opinions, though, about whether this was a truth

¹⁰¹ *M*, 52, col. 1152B.

de fide or *theologicæ certæ*, and the Deputation had seen it prudent not to decide this particular matter¹⁰². He repeatedly insisted on the need to keep always in mind that, whatever was said of the object of the infallibility of the Church, was to be predicated also of the infallibility of the Pope; infallibility was one and the same in both cases, and for the same end.

In his Pastoral after the Council Manning would describe the object of infallibility by saying that 'the definition limits the range, or, to speak exactly, the object of infallibility, to the doctrine of faith and morals. It excludes therefore all other matter whatsoever'¹⁰³. He would point out that there still was an unanswered question; the Constitution *Pastor Aeternus*, had declared that the Pope's infallibility - and that of the Church - 'extends to all matters of faith and morals, but it is not defined where the limits of faith and morals are to be fixed'¹⁰⁴. 'The infallibility is defined but not its extent', he wrote to Aubrey de Vere; and, to Maskell: 'The extension of the Pope's infallibility is a matter of theology'¹⁰⁵.

Manning, when explaining the Council decrees, tried to map those regions still unexplored by the Council. In doing so, he did not always make clear where the limit between what was generally admitted by theologians and his more personal opinions stood, and he gave no indication of the theological weight of his different assertions relative to one another. This could not but give rise to misunderstandings. He was not alone in doing so; many wrote at this time about the 'true concept of infallibility', claiming for their 'theological' interpretation the exclusive title of 'authentic'. Again, before the Council, some had referred to the infallibility of the Pope as a *theological opinion* or in, in most cases, as an *opinion*. In so doing, they had used a technical term, part of a refined and complex system of qualifying and weighing theological propositions. Unfortunately, in ordinary language it conveyed the impression of an idea held on emotion, prejudice or unstable logical grounds; it suggested, by implication, that the doctrine could be ignored or dismissed as an irrelevance.

¹⁰² Cfr. *M*, 52, col. 1226AC.

¹⁰³ *Privilegium*, III, p. 59.

¹⁰⁴ *True*, p. 191.

¹⁰⁵ S. Leslie, *op. cit.*, p. 231.

Manning drew his arguments about the object of the Pope's infallibility from the chapter on the infallibility of the Church in the original schema *De Ecclesia*. From there, he proceeded by successive steps to clarify what 'doctrine of faith and morals' stood for. As it was his custom, he would do that by marshalling a long series of quotations from Popes, Councils and theologians.

The expression 'faith and morals', Manning said, 'signifies the whole revelation of faith; the whole way of salvation through faith; or the whole supernatural order, with all that is essential to the sanctification and salvation of man through Jesus Christ'¹⁰⁶. The authorities quoted, he went on to say, affirmed more or less explicitly, 'that the Church has an infallible guidance in treating all matters of faith, morals, piety, and the general good of the Church. The object of infallibility, then, is the whole revealed Word of God, and all that is so in contact with revealed truth, that without treating of it, the word of God could not be guarded, expounded, and defended. (...) Further, it is clear that the Church has an infallible guidance, not only in all matters that are revealed, but also in all matters which are opposed to revelation. For the Church could not discharge its office as the Teacher of all nations, unless it were able with infallible certainty to proscribe doctrines at variance with the word of God'¹⁰⁷. This included, as the Constitution *Dei Filius* Chapter IV had declared, the proscribing of the errors of false philosophies and false science. Thus, the promulgation, explanation and defence of revelation requires the Church to be infallible in some matters which belong to the natural sciences, like the existence of substance, or to philosophical knowledge, like the immateriality of the soul. It also embraced truths of history - that Peter was bishop of Rome, that the Council of Trent was ecumenical, etc.; and the interpretation of the literal and doctrinal meaning of scriptural texts, the judgments about the orthodoxy of human writings...

The Church taught the doctrine of faith positively, and also in a negative way; to 'define doctrines of faith, and to condemn the contradictions of heresy, is almost one and the same act'¹⁰⁸. She was infallible in both cases. Manning argued that her

¹⁰⁶ *Privilegium*, III, p. 60.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 66.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 73.

infallibility also covered the proscribing of errors condemned with a note below heresy, the so called minor censures: ‘In like manner, the detection and condemnation of propositions at variance with theological certainty is a function of the same discernment by which theological certainty is known. But the Church has an infallible discernment of truths which are theologically certain; that is, of conclusions resulting from two premises of which one is revealed and the other evident by the light of nature. In these two kinds of censures, at least, it is therefore of faith that the Church is infallible’¹⁰⁹. These other censures - temerarious, scandalous or offensive to pious ears - were more related, according to Manning, to the moral character of propositions. ‘If the Church be infallible in faith and morals, it is not to be believed that it can err in passing this moral judgments on the ethical character of propositions’¹¹⁰. Manning, though, with Gasser, would not qualify as heresy the denial of the infallibility of the Pope when he condemned a proposition with a censure below heresy. Some theologians judged these Papal pronouncements as being infallibly true, others qualified them as theologically certain; both groups agreed on considering their denial as theological error rather than heresy.

Beside the doctrinal definitions and censures, Manning thought that the Pope was also infallible in ‘all legislative or judicial acts, so far as they are inseparably connected with his doctrinal authority; as for instance, all judgments, sentences, and decisions, which contain the motives of such acts as derived from faith and morals’- like laws of discipline, canonization of saints, approval of religious orders; ‘all of which intrinsically contain the truths and principles of faith, morals, and piety’¹¹¹.

Manning would end by saying - somewhat to his reader’s surprise - that he did not want to enumerate the subject matters that fell under the infallibility of the Church; it was for the Church to do so. ‘Hitherto it has not done so except by its acts, and from the practice of the Church we may infer to what matter its infallible discernment extends’. The Vatican Council had some unfinished work to do: ‘By the definition of the Vatican

¹⁰⁹ *Ibidem*, pp. 73-74. Gasser, when clarifying how the Deputation understood the term *definitiv*, did not confined its use to dogmatic definitions or heresy censures (cfr. *M*, 52, col. 1616AB).

¹¹⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 74.

¹¹¹ *Ibidem*, p. 89.

Council, what is traditionally believed by all the faithful in respect to the Church is expressly declared of the Roman Pontiff. But the definition of the extent of that infallibility, and of the certainty on which it rests, in matters not revealed, has not been treated as yet, but is left for the second part of the "Schema De Ecclesia"¹¹².

4. An 'absolute' and 'separate' infallibility?

Gasser, in the name of the Deputation *De Fide*, had clearly rejected the interpretation claiming that the formula of definition affirmed the 'absolute' infallibility of the Pope. Only God, he would say, has absolute infallibility: He is infallible always and in everything. Any participated infallibility would be limited - in its exercise and object - by the end for which it is communicated. The infallibility of the Pope was limited by reason of the subject; the Pope is infallible only in the exercise of his office; it was also restricted by reason of the object, as it was concerned only with matters of faith and morals; and it was further restricted by reason of the act itself, as only those acts which define what is to be believed or to be rejected by all the faithful are guaranteed by the privilege of infallibility¹¹³.

In view of these comments, Manning's reference, after the Council, to the legitimate use of the term 'absolute', when referring to the Pope's infallibility, seem somewhat misjudged and likely to create confusion or resentment, even when the use of the word was carefully qualified, along the lines of Gasser's explanations: 'It is *absolute*, in as much as it can be circumscribed by no human or ecclesiastical law; it is not absolute, in that it is circumscribed by the office of guarding, expounding, and defending the deposit of revelation'¹¹⁴. Unfortunately, the use of the word in other occasions, within the same Pastoral, was not so nuanced: 'that what is circumscribed by no condition is absolute'¹¹⁵. He had not used the word absolute before the Council, to use it after the definition was as unnecessary as it was provoking.

¹¹² *Ibidem*, pp. 78-79.

¹¹³ Cfr. *M*, 52, col. 1214AB.

¹¹⁴ *Privilegium*, III, p. 113.

¹¹⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 97.

It was a different case when it came to the question of a 'separate' infallibility. The Archbishop of Westminster had been on the receiving end of some of the first shots fired against it. Dupanloup had preyed on his 'apart from', taking it as implying a separate infallibility. Although, Manning had tried to dissociate himself from that interpretation, by claiming that 'apart from' meant not 'separate' but 'independent', this, as we have seen, did not help his case in the eyes of the minority. They contended that the Roman Pontiff could not be separated from the Church: it was absurd to think of a headless body or a bodiless head. Manning, on his part, confessed that he found hard to believe that serious men could have drawn that conclusion from his words, even less, from the texts about the Pope's infallibility proposed to the Fathers: 'such a monstrous sense includes at least six heresies; and I could not think that any Catholic would fail to know this, or, knowing it, would impute it to Catholics, still less to Bishops of the Church'¹¹⁶. The infallibility of the Pope is '*separate* in no sense, nor can be so called, without manifold heresy, unless the word be taken to mean *distinct*'¹¹⁷.

The fears of the minority sprung from the absence of any reference to the need for the Pope to consult the bishops, as a normal means to arrive at a right judgment. The Deputation would try to clarify the issue through the explanations given by some of its members. Gasser would say that it was legitimate to speak of a 'separate', or better, a 'distinct' infallibility: the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff was founded on a special assistance of the Holy Spirit, distinct from that which is granted by the same Spirit to the whole teaching Church united to its head. But this is no 'separate' infallibility, separating the Pope from the Church; the Pope is infallible only [*solummodo*] when exercising his office of supreme doctor of all the faithful; that is, when, representing the whole Church, he defines what is to be believed or rejected as contrary to the faith of the Church¹¹⁸. The difference between the position of the Deputation and that of the minority seemed to consist in the fact that the minority felt that the only way to avoid separating the Pope from the Church when speaking *ex cathedra*, was to

¹¹⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 105.

¹¹⁷ *Ibidem*, p.113.

¹¹⁸ Cfr. *M*, 52, col. 1213AC; he pointed out that the Roman Pontiff manifests the mind of the Church and speaks '*universalem ecclesiam representans*'.

introduce into the definition some reference to the need for the Pope to consult the bishops before publishing an *ex cathedra* pronouncement or to obtain their subsequent consent. They viewed this previous consultation or *post factum* assent as an essential element of any infallible pronouncement. The Deputation denied this to be the case, although, in the normal course of events the Pope would probably consult some or all bishops, and also use other means to ascertain revealed truth. This cooperation was not excluded by the definition, given that infallibility was not inspiration or revelation; the Constitution itself described different means available to the Pope for that purpose. The Pope was morally bound to use the appropriate means to ascertain the truth of revelation, but it was part of the charisma of infallibility to know which ones he should use in each particular case¹¹⁹.

Manning's notes registered his thoughts on the matter during the sessions of the Council: the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the Church makes it impossible that the head be separated from the body or that they be in opposition. This 'separation' was a mere ghost, invented to frighten the bishops away from the definition¹²⁰. He would develop these ideas in his Pastoral on the Council, where he described the indissoluble union of the head and the body in the Church in three points:

'1. It is *de fide*, or matter of faith, that the head of the Church, as such, can never be separated, either from the *Ecclesia docens*, or the *Ecclesia discens*; that is, either from the Episcopate or from the faithful.

To suppose this, would be to deny the perpetual indwelling office of the Holy Ghost in the Church, by which the mystical body is knit together (...). On this unity all the properties and endowments of the Church depend; indefectibility, unity, infallibility. As the Church can never be separated from its invisible Head, so never from its visible head.

2. Secondly, it is matter of faith that the *Ecclesia docens* or the Episcopate, to which together with Peter, and as it were, in one person with him, the assistance of the Holy

¹¹⁹ Cfr. *M*, 52, cols. 1213D and 1215CD.

¹²⁰ Cfr. Cwiekowski, *op. cit.*, pp. 261ff.

Ghost was promised, can never be dissolved; but it would be dissolved if it were separated from its head. Such separation would destroy the infallibility of the Church itself. The *Ecclesia docens* would cease to exist; but this is impossible, and without heresy cannot be supposed.

3. Thirdly, it is also matter of faith that not only no separation of communion, but even no disunion of doctrine and faith between the Head and the Body, that is, between the *Ecclesia docens* and *discens* can ever exist. Both are infallible; the one actively, in teaching, the other passively, in believing; and both are therefore inseparably, because necessarily, united in one faith¹²¹.

Manning turned the tables on the opponents of the definition of infallibility: they were the ones who really presumed that a separation could exist. The reason for the 'inseparable union [of the Church] is precisely the infallibility of its head. Because its head can never err, it, as a body, can never err. How many soever, as individuals, should err and fall away from the truth, the Episcopate would remain, and therefore never be disunited from its head in teaching or believing. (...) They, therefore, and they only, teach the possibility of such a separation, who assert that the Pontiff may fall into error. But they who deny his infallibility do expressly assert the possibility of such a separation'¹²². Infallibility was a was a power aimed at uniting the Church, not at dividing it:

'1. It is *de fide* that the plenitude of jurisdiction was given to Peter and his successors; and that its exercise over the whole body, pastors and people, import no separation or disunion from the Body. How then should the exercise of infallibility, which is attached to that jurisdiction, import separation?

2. Again, it is *de fide* that this supreme jurisdiction and infallibility was given to maintain and perpetuate the unity of the Church. How then can its exercise produce

¹²¹ *Privilegium*, III, pp. 105-107; see also Gasser's speech in *M*, 52, cols. 1213D-1214A. In his notes Manning mentioned two ideas which had a long tradition in his thought: 'unity' as '*sacramentum veritatis*', and the reference to the Mystical Body of Christ as '*unus homo*' (cfr. Cwiekowski, *op. cit.*, p. 264).

¹²² *Privilegium*, III, p. 107.

separation, which it is divinely ordained to prevent?

3. Lastly, it is *de fide* that in the assistance promised to Peter and his successors, all the means necessary for its due exercise are contained. An infallible office fallibly exercised is a contradiction in terms. The infallibility of the head consists in this, that he is guided both as to the means and as to the end. (...) It is a part of the promise, that in the selection of the means of its exercise, the successor of Peter will not err'¹²³.

The Pope's infallibility is '*independent*, he would add, in as much as it does not depend upon either the *Ecclesia docens* or the *Ecclesia discens*; but it is not independent, in that it depends in all things upon the Divine Head of the Church, upon the institution of the primacy by Him, and upon the assistance of the Holy Ghost'¹²⁴.

Manning wanted to prevent the introduction of any form of conditional clause in the definition. He thought, for example, that to make the infallibility of the Pope's pronouncements dependent on the assent - concomitant or subsequent - of the bishops would not only be Gallicanism, it would also nullify the effect of the definition, and leave the Church in worse condition than before. Who would be the judge of whether those conditions had been properly fulfilled?¹²⁵ One would find oneself in a similar situation to that of Anglicans with respect to Article XXI: the Church is the judge on the controversies about the faith, but she should not be followed if her judgment is against Holy Scripture. Who would determine whether that is the case? *Quo iudice*? Again, if 'the consent of the Universal Church is to be obtained before a doctrine is certain, how is it to be done? Is it to be the consent of the bishops only, or of the priests also, or of theologians, or of the faithful, or of all together? And from what age? If the *ecclesia discens* is to confirm the *ecclesia docens*,' Manning added, 'no member of it ought to be disfranchised (...). If the consent of the Church is to be

¹²³ *Ibidem*, p. 108. Manning had mentioned the last point in his speech to the Council on 25 March (cfr. *M*, 52, col. 253B). The Constitution also made a passing reference to it.

¹²⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 113

¹²⁵ Pusey, in his third *Eirenicon*, had remarked how an infallible authority would be needed to determine if the conditions had been fulfilled in each particular case [cfr. E.B. Pusey, *Is healthy reunion impossible?* (London, 1870), p. 306].

obtained, it must be waited for. And how long is it to be waited for, and in the meanwhile in what state are the doctrines defined? Are they of faith or not of faith? (...) Open questions are bad enough, but suspended questions are worse'¹²⁶.

Manning's mind revolted against those ideas, both on the basis of Christian revelation and on purely logical grounds. He felt that the rôle of the *ecclesia discens* could not be to confirm the faith of the *ecclesia docens*, that would mean a total subversion of Christ's injunction to Peter to confirm his brothers in the faith. The rôle of Peter would consequently become vague and unreal: 'If the certainty of the teaching depends upon the assent of the taught, what becomes of the teacher?'¹²⁷

A related question was the concept of 'moral unanimity' put forward by the minority. Their ideas on the subject were clearly expressed in the pamphlet published during the Council¹²⁸: a dogmatic definition could not be passed on a simple minority, moral unanimity was necessary for the definitions of faith. Disciplinary laws could be passed by mere majority, but for the valid election of the Pope two thirds of the votes of the Cardinals were required; a much greater unanimity was 'absolutely essential' when dogmatic definitions were in question. This was particularly necessary in a Council where the minority was made up of bishops of such important dioceses, eminent in doctrine and character; while, on the other hand, the ranks of majority were swollen by numerous Italians and titular bishops, and their assent vitiated by pressures. The Protest signed by the minority bishops would include these ideas, plus a thinly-veiled threat that a definition without moral unanimity would be null and void¹²⁹.

What the supporters of 'moral unanimity' did not say, Manning remarked, was that the

¹²⁶ True, pp. 193-194; Gasser had used similar arguments, see *M*, 52, cols. 1215A and 1216A.

¹²⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 193.

¹²⁸ *De l'Unanimité Morale nécessaire dans les conciles pour les Définitions Dogmatiques. Mémoire présenté aux Pères du Concile du Vatican* (Paris, 1870).

¹²⁹ Cfr. *M*, 52, col. 27AD. Lord Acton had been very active in promoting these ideas among the minority bishops. He would write to Gladstone (10-III-70): 'In Chapter VIII and IX the Protest affirms the principle that no dogma can be proclaimed which does not command a moral unanimity among the bishops representing the Churches (...) The last paragraph of IX, where the bishops say that the claim to make dogmas in spite of the minority endangers the authority, liberty and oecumenicity of the Council, was inserted by me' [J.N. Figgiss and R.V. Laurence (eds.), *Selections from the correspondence of the first Lord Acton* (London, 1917), Vol. I, p.107].

majority of the minority Bishops were not opposed to the truth of the doctrine but to the opportuneness of its definition. Was 'moral unanimity' concerned with matters of opportuneness or with matters of belief? Manning did not have much time for the whole argument: 'About a tenth part [as signified by the final vote] of the Council endeavoured by argument, reason, influence, and the powers given to them by the order or procedure of the Council, to prevail upon the vast majority of their brethren, which was, morally, indeed, the episcopate of the Church, to follow their guidance. (...) The minority were not wronged because the majority would not swerve. What injury could be done to them if the Council declined to yield to the judgment or will of those who were only a tenth of its number?'¹³⁰ The same difficulties as to the universal consent presented themselves when trying to determine what constitutes moral unanimity: Where should the line of moral unanimity be drawn? Should the minority have held the Council to ransom against the wishes of the majority of the Fathers? Acton, for one, saw in moral unanimity an instrument to nullify infallibility: 'Everything depends on the question of majority rule. If Rome concedes the point [of moral unanimity], she surrenders herself. An infallibility which is subject to the veto of the minority of bishops ceases to be infallible'¹³¹.

During the discussions of the Deputation Manning had striven to introduce into the definition a clear indication of how *ex cathedra* definitions of the Roman Pontiff did not require the concurrence of the bishops - neither before, during or after their study and publication - to be infallible. On 5 May he asked that the word *irreformabile* be added when speaking of the decrees and judgments of the Roman Pontiff on faith and morals; in this request he was supported by Steins, Vicar Apostolic of Calcutta¹³². The word *irreformabile* was commonly used in that context by theologians, and could be found in the Vota of the Consultors preparing the draft schemata before the Council; it had also been requested by several Fathers¹³³, who wanted clearly stated by the Council that the Pope was infallible *per se*, independently from the consent or concurrence of the bishops. The Deputation incorporated the word into the new paragraph added to the

¹³⁰ *Privilegium*, III, pp. 162-163.

¹³¹ 'Quirinus', *Letters from Rome* (London, 1870), pp. 409-410.

¹³² Cfr. *M*, 53, col. 248AB.

¹³³ see Betti, *op. cit.*, pp. 139-141 and 177.

definition of infallibility: '*et eiusmodi decreta sive iudicia, per se irreformabilia, a quovis christiano, ut primum ei innotuerint, pleno fidei obsequio...*'¹³⁴.

The formula '*per se irreformabilia*' would be slightly modified and reinforced in the new text of the schema presented for the study of the Deputation on 19 June. The new wording was '*ex sese irreformabile esse*'¹³⁵, a precision long used by the theologians. This, in turn, was to become '*esse ex sese irreformabiles*', in the text hammered out after the debates in the General Congregations, and put to the vote of the Council Fathers on 13 July. All seemed to suggest that this would be the final version of that clause.

The above wording, though, did not satisfy all the Fathers of the majority, and many references had been made in the debates to the need of including in the Constitution some explicit mention of the fact that the antecedent, concomitant or consequent consent of the Church was not necessary to consider as infallible an *ex cathedra* definition. Maier had put forward a similar request on 27 April, during the discussions of the Deputation, and Senestréy had done likewise in the Canon he included in his *Postulatum*¹³⁶. Manning, for his part, had used similar words in the proposal of definition, and accompanying canon, presented for the study of the Deputation on 24 June: '*Si quis dixerit... non esse irreformabilia, antequam consensus ecclesiae accesserit; anathema sit*'¹³⁷. The Deputation considered that the formula of definition, as it stood, was clear enough, and that it did not need any further precision.

On 14 July, Mgr. Freppel, Bishop of Angers, and some other French bishops wrote to Pius IX to express their concern over the formula of definition as it stood after the last vote by the Council. They felt that it still left the door open to a Gallican interpretation, and that it was necessary to qualify it even further, adding a reference to the fact that the *consensus episcoporum* (whether antecedent, concomitant or subsequent) was not

¹³⁴ *M*, 53, col. 255CD.

¹³⁵ *M*, 53, col. 266A.

¹³⁶ Cfr. *M*, 53, col. 238CD and *M*, 52, col. 1152C. The theological commission preparing the draft schemata before the Council had also considered that it would be necessary to include this clarification (cfr. *M*, 49, col. 712A).

¹³⁷ *M*, 53, col. 267C; see also his notes in Cwiekowski, *op. cit.*, p. 271.

necessary. Pius IX passed the letter to Bilio, the President of the Deputation *De Fide*, with his favourable opinion¹³⁸. That same night, the Deputation added to the definition the words '*non autem ex consensu ecclesiae*', which until then it had rejected as unnecessary.

The minority was also active in its attempts to introduce some last minute changes softening the effect of the Constitution. Their efforts arrived too late, and they were bound to produce, if any, the opposite effect to the one intended. On 15 July, the representatives of the minority had a meeting with Pius IX, during which they asked the Pope, among other things, that in the definition some mention should be made of the union of the Pope with the Church on those occasions. At the request of Pius IX, Darboy, Archbishop of Paris, put in writing, the following day, some of their suggestions. There were several possible ways, Darboy would say, of expressing the above union, as for example the expressions: '*testimonio Ecclesiarum innixus*', '*et mediis quae semper in Ecclesia Catholica usurpata fuerunt adhibitis*' or '*non exclusis episcopis*'¹³⁹. It was clearly said in the letter that these, and some other minor changes, would secure the unanimous *placets* of those who, until then, had been voting against the definition. They were too late: the Pope had been forewarned about the ambiguity of the formula of definition as it stood, and viewed the suggestions in that light; the new addition had already been made by the Deputation, and it was to be put to the vote of the General Congregation the same day Darboy's letter was dated. The new text approved by the Fathers now read: '*Romani Pontifices definitiones ex sese, non autem ex consensu ecclesiae, irreformabiles esse*'. Dupanloup wrote in support of Darboy, after the vote had taken place, and complained of how new words had been added to the definition - 'probably without informing His Holiness' - reinforcing the absolute and separate character of the Pope's infallibility!¹⁴⁰

Manning could not but welcome this addition, as reinforcing the meaning of the original formula. He would stress the importance of the clause when writing about the Council:

¹³⁸ Cfr. *M*, 52, col. 1262AD.

¹³⁹ Cfr. *M*, 52, col. 1322CD; see also Senestréy's diary (*M*, 53, cols. 285D-286A); C. Butler (*op. cit.*, p.407) quotes Quirinus saying that Manning and Senestréy went to see the Pope after the delegation of the Minority and stiffened him against any concessions. There is little support for this assertion.

¹⁴⁰ Cfr. *M*, 52, col. 1321B-1322B.

'it is affirmed that the doctrinal declarations of the Pontiff are infallible in and of *themselves*, and not from the consent of the Church. That is to say, they are infallible by divine assistance, and not by the assent or acceptance of the Church to which they are addressed. (...) The motive for these words is obvious. They were the critical difference between what must be called once more by names which now have lost both meaning and reality, the Ultramontane and the Gallican doctrines'¹⁴¹. Those words 'precluded all ambiguity by which for two hundred years the promise of our Lord to Peter and his successors has in some minds been obscured'¹⁴².

The path towards finding the formula for the definition of infallibility had been a long and laborious one for the Council and, in particular, for the Deputation *De Fide*. Their efforts had repeatedly run aground in the drifting sands of the innumerable proposals presented by the Council Fathers. A clear way forward did not appear until 18 June, when Cullen, Archbishop of Dublin, presented, at the suggestion of Bilio, a formula which was to serve as the basis of the one approved by the Council. On the 19th, Bilio proposed it to the Deputation, and it was favourably received by its members. Its study was postponed until after the Deputation had finished considering the amendments suggested in the General Congregations to Chapter III of *Pastor Aeternus*. In the meantime, Bilio introduced to the Deputation another proposal of definition with its accompanying canon, the work of Manning and Franchi, titular Bishop of Thesalonica. It seems that this was the first formula, among those put forward for the study of the Deputation, which included the *ex cathedra* clause.

On the 26th, the Deputation started the study of the different formulas of definition which had been suggested to date by the Council Fathers. Most of its members seem to have been in favour of Cullen's formula, but there was no general agreement; some wanted to introduced certain changes in it, while others still preferred the formula

¹⁴¹ *True*, pp. 192-193.

¹⁴² *Privilegium*, III, p. 92.

included in the schema. Given the inconclusive result of their discussions, the Deputation decided not to present a new formula to the Council Fathers, but to wait till the end of the debates on the subject, in order to take into consideration all the comments made. Only then, having in view the opinions of the Council, the Deputation would decide which one of the formulas was the most appropriate. Meanwhile, the Deputation's search for the right wording of the definition was not abandoned. Its members discussed again the subject on 3 July. On this occasion Manning presented yet another formula, it preserved the *ex cathedra* expression while trying to avoid this time the link established between the infallibility of the Church and that of the Pope, given that, as it had been pointed out, its wording could be misinterpreted. The Deputation dealt with the same problem in the Congregations of 7 and 8 July, when a new wording was devised to express that correlation.

On the basis of those discussions, Kleutgen and Franzelin prepared the new formula. It was presented on 8 July to the Deputation, which approved it that same day. With slight modifications of style, and the addition of the clause '*non autem ex consensu ecclesiae*', it was passed by the Council as the definition of Papal infallibility on 16 July, it read:

*'Itaque nos traditioni a fidei christianae exordio perceptae fideliter inhaerendo, ad Dei Salvatoris nostri gloriam, religionis catholicae exaltationem et christianorum populorum salutem, sacro approbante concilio, docemus et divinitus revelatum dogma esse definimus: Romanum pontificem, cum ex cathedra loquitur, id est, cum omnium Christianorum pastoris ac doctoris munere fungens pro suprema sua apostolica auctoritate doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universa Ecclesia tenendam definit, per assistentiam divinam ipsi in beato Petro promissam, ea infallibilitate pollere, quae divinus Redemptor ecclesiam suam in definienda doctrina de fide vel moribus instructam esse voluit; ideoque eiusmodi Romani pontificis definitiones ex sese, non autem ex consensu ecclesiae, irreformabiles esse'*¹⁴³.

¹⁴³ *M*, 52, col. 1334D. 'Therefore faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God Our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic Religion, and the salvation of Christian people, the Sacred Council approving, We teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed: that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when in discharge of the office of Pastor and Doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church, by the divine assistance promised

The solemn proclamation of the Dogma of Papal Infallibility took place in the midst of the storm so dramatically described by Tom Mozley: 'The storm, which had been threatening all the morning, burst now with the utmost violence(...). And so the "placets" of the Fathers struggled through the storm, while the thunder pealed above and the lightning flashed in at every window (...). "Placet", shouted his Eminence or his Grace, and a loud clap of thunder followed in response...'144. Newman saw in the storm a sign of God's displeasure at the proceedings of the Council; Manning would view it in a different light: 'critics saw in this thunderstorm an articulate voice of divine indignation against the definition. They forgot Sinai and the Ten Commandments'145.

to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals: and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church' (Manning's translation in *Privilegium*, III, p. 218).

¹⁴⁴ Quoted by C. Butler, *op. cit.*, p. 413.

¹⁴⁵ *True*, p. 147.

CONCLUSIONS

Gladstone always considered Manning a man of principle in action. Intellectually, he was a man of first principles. Pastoral needs, temperament, and the circumstances of the times all contributed to channel his study and interest in that direction. Later on, throughout his involvement in some of the major social and religious events of his time, first principles were always brought to bear upon the case in question. Sometimes they lay just under the surface of the argument, on most occasions they break into broad daylight. This need for a clear exposition and defence of first principles did not become less with the progress of the century; on the contrary, the advances of the natural and historical sciences, opening a new front against basic principles or traditional assumptions of faith and religion, made it even more urgent. Old certainties and assumptions could no longer be accepted on trust. New questions had arisen and they were in need of urgent answers.

The Church claimed to be a teacher of truth and she required acquiescence to her doctrines; an empty claim and an unjust demand if she were not in possession of the truth she professed to hand over. In the early 1830s, Manning embarked on a journey in search of the rule by which divine truth may be ascertained with certainty. Theologically, the Anglican Manning was very much a self-taught man, something not uncommon at the time. He had no teacher to direct his steps, and he did not look for one. Samuel Wilberforce may have pointed him in the direction of the High Church theological tradition. Manning explored it, however, without a guide. His ideas were not shaped in the hotbed of intellectual intercourse that was Tractarian Oxford; they germinated and grew up in Lavington, the fruit of study and silent contemplation. There, the echoes of the agitation being moved at Oxford and elsewhere reached him hushed by distance and by the peaceful atmosphere of the South Downs countryside. However, the Oxford Movement was trying to breathe new life into fundamental theological principles within the Church of England, as a reaction against latitudinarianism and liberal thought, and Manning could not fail to identify with their

general aims and to cooperate, from a distance, in their efforts.

In his search for solid religious principles, Manning found shelter, for a while, in High Church doctrines about the rule of faith and the unity of the Church. It was a short-lived resting place, though. His confidence in High Church principles was shaken by the crisis of the Oxford Movement and, in particular, by Newman's *Development of Doctrine*. The latter helped him discover that the Anglican rule of faith was incomplete: he had found the rule but not the judge to apply it. The anxious time that followed was a prelude to what he called his 'illumination': the discovery of the permanent presence and teaching action of the Holy Spirit in the Church, and its consequent infallibility. He also came to see that only an infallible Church could preserve and transmit the truth revealed by God in its purity and integrity. Rome was the end of his pilgrimage.

The fundamental principle he had discovered in his pilgrimage from Lavington to Rome was a light which Manning, after his conversion, did not intend to keep under a bushel. It was also in need of re-assertion within the Catholic Church, where recent scientific progress had similarly challenged Catholic doctrine. As he saw it, the problem was compounded by the fact that some Catholic minds lacked a firm grasp of principles and were not fully acquainted with the nature, basis and sources of faith. Thus, they were particularly ill-equipped to weigh and judge the discoveries of the new sciences, and to evaluate how they impinged on basic truths of faith. His Catholic years, up to Vatican Council I, were marked by a growing realisation that the educational and formative force of the truth he had seen so clearly would not achieve its potential fruitfulness and shine in all its splendour - within and without the Catholic Church - until it was enshrined among the defined dogmas. Only then, he thought, would it exert its full educative and forming influence on minds and hearts. He had always claimed that faith did not depend on the definitions of Councils, being independent of them and existing prior to their taking place; still, he believed that the circumstances of the times demanded the conciliar definition of the infallibility of the Church and of papal infallibility, the latter being the key-stone, as Manning saw it, on which the infallibility of the Church rested. It was not just a question of defending a particular truth from those who assailed it, the very existence of Faith was at stake.

At the end of the Council, Manning felt at rest. In a later *Note* he wrote: 'On my return from the Council I wrote a Pastoral which recorded all I thought was necessary. This done, I have never named Council or Definition or Infallibility. The Day was won and the Truth was safe, like it was after the Council of Nicea. We had no need to talk about it'¹. He was aware of the difficulties which followed Nicea, and he knew that the acceptance of the dogmatic definition of papal infallibility would also encounter opposition. However, he felt that the defined dogma would, in time, work its way into the consciousness of the whole Church, and develop its full corollaries.

The questions which had dominated his mind for so long seemed, in good measure, settled. There were, however, some matters very close to Manning's heart which still remained unanswered at the end of Vatican I. The object of Papal infallibility had been defined by the Council as coextensive with that of the infallibility of the Church, but the suspension of the Council, because of the Italian invasion of Rome, did not allow the Fathers to define the object of the Church's infallibility, the next point in the agenda of the Council. Again, the infallibility of the ordinary magisterium had been touched upon, but it had not been fully developed by the Council. Manning had very definite ideas on both subjects, and some of them had found their way into the documents promulgated by the Council, although they were not as clearly and fully developed as he had desired.

History has not judged very favourably Manning's intellectual powers. The historians's views have tended, to a great extent, to conform to Gladstone's opinion on the subject when he wrote: 'I habitually considered Manning's faculties of action, I mean in the management and government of men, to be far in advance of his faculties of thought. In polemical matters he was narrow and positive: he had not the power of looking all around a great subject (...). I think in short that his mind was not philosophical: (...) he arrived with extraordinary facility at broad conclusions: and he held to them with a tenacity no less remarkable. He was not subtle, but he was always intensely clear: if he deceived anybody, the person taken in was alone responsible'².

¹ *P*, II, p. 458.

² Quoted by Cwiekowski, *op.cit.*, p. 57. Gladstone's opinion on Manning's intellectual powers, which had been for a long time very high, never recovered from the shock caused by the latter's conversion to Catholicism, which Gladstone could only account for as springing from some intellectual deficiency on

Cwiekowski, in his study of Vatican Council I, made his own Gladstone's comments and went on to say that, as Manning 'was decidedly not a theologian, it would be an exaggeration to talk of the "sources" of his thought'³. He was 'far more interested, and capable of, dealing with living men than with abstract ideas'⁴; moreover, 'the limitations of his mind rarely permitted him to grasp more than the surface of the issue at hand'⁵. As a consequence, his positions tended to be 'one-sided and simplistic'⁶. Cwiekowski acknowledged that Manning, 'by his emphasis on the Holy Spirit in his explanation of papal infallibility', avoided the 'most serious shortcoming of so much of nineteenth century ecclesiology, that the Church was seen more as the perfect society than as a supernatural mystery (...). But the breadth of Manning's outlook became constricted in the agitation surrounding the council's debates'⁷. This evaluation is, as we hope to have shown, largely untenable in the light of a more detailed study of Manning's thought.

D. Newsome, for his part, had provided a much more balanced and informed estimate of Manning's intellectual powers in *The Parting of Friends*⁸. However, in his more recent book, *The Convert Cardinals* (1993), he seems, up to a certain point, to make his own Gladstone's opinion on the subject⁹.

It is also claimed that Manning was not an original thinker. This may be misleading. It is generally accepted that he was a man who thought and acted by himself, that he had a mind of his own. Those who deny Manning's originality of thought do so mainly on the basis of his not having opened new grounds of theological enquiry. Nevertheless, although Manning certainly spent much time seeking the already well charted doctrine of the infallibility of the Church, the voyage of discovery was all his own. That

the part of his friend (see D. Newsome, *The Parting of Friends*, p. 367).

³ Cwiekowski, *op.cit.*, p. 319.

⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 57.

⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 56.

⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 317, 318

⁷ *Ibidem*, pp. 318-319.

⁸ Cfr. D. Newsome, *The Parting of Friends*, pp. 328-329 and 367.

⁹ Cfr. D. Newsome, *The Convert Cardinals*, p. 371.

explains why he came to have such a grasp of the principles involved and of the corollaries which followed from them. He had found those principles for himself, after long enquiry, and he had tried them long and hard before making them his own.

On the other hand, his doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ, developed in good measure while he was still an Anglican, was far in advance of contemporary thought, even within Catholic theology. His Pneumatological concept of the Church, as acknowledged by Cwiekowski, was in striking contrast with the more institutional and juridical vision of it then prevalent. Manning's ideas were not fully appreciated in his time. Some of the concepts he touched upon did not engage the attention of theologians until well into the twentieth century. He played little part in this development; it did not build on his work. His fourth volume of Anglican Sermons, perhaps the most original of his works, was confined to a theological limbo by his conversion to Catholicism a year after its publication. Anglicans shunned it, while Catholics ignored it as the work of an Anglican. When Manning consulted about the possibility of republishing some of his Anglican works, he was discouraged from doing so. Dr. Bernard Smith advised against publication, saying: 'Recollect these were the works of Dr. Manning, a Protestant. They were the fruits of the Anglican not of the Catholic Church'¹⁰. The books of heretics dealing with religious matters, were, according to the rules of the Index, absolutely forbidden. That decided the issue of republication. Manning, when speaking about reprinting his volumes of Anglican Sermons, would later write: 'I wished my past, while I was in the twilight, to lie dead to me, and I to it'¹¹.

The influence of his ideas was also conditioned by the style of his works. They were not the writings of a professional theologian. Rather, they were conceived and written in the midst of unceasing administrative and pastoral work, and the expression of his thought suffered, in regard to clarity and completeness, from the fragmented way in which he presented it and from the hurried composition of his writings. He could, no doubt, see in his mind all the connexions of the ideas he was putting forward, but in presenting them he some times presumed that his readers were as familiar with them as he was. Thus, it often happens that sentences and concepts contained in a particular

¹⁰ Letter dated 18-III-65; *P*, II, p. 723.

¹¹ Note dated 1882; *P*, II, p. 722.

work can only be properly understood when looking at them in the context of his other writings; when taken in isolation from the whole corpus of his work, they leave the door open to misunderstanding. That is compounded by Manning's occasional rhetorical excesses. These could have gone down well on a public platform, but in his published works they often served to obscure his thought, thus deforming the public appearance of his ideas, and detracted from the force of the argument, while offering an easy handle for the critic or the satirist. Manning did not create a school. On the other hand, the numerous editions of his works are testimony of his deep and lasting influence on English Catholicism.

Manning loved peace; still, he treasured truth above peace, holding firmly to the conviction that peace could only be built upon truth. As a man of action, he valued expediency; on the other hand, as a man of deep faith and deep thought, he held that only those actions rooted in sound principles were truly expedient. He did try to live by these convictions.

1. ABBREVIATIONS

- Appendix* H.E. Manning, *The Rule of Faith. Appendix to a Sermon* (London, 1838).
- APUC* H.E. Manning, *The Reunion of Christendom. A Pastoral Letter* [dated Epiphany 1866] (London, 1866).
- ASer* H.E. Manning, *Sermons*,
Vol. I (3rd ed., London, 1844) (First 1842)
Vol. II (5th ed., London, 1849) (First 1844?)
Vol. III (4th ed., London, 1850) (First 1847?)
Vol. IV (2nd ed., London, 1850) (First 1850).
- CSer* H.E. Manning, *Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects*,
Vol. I (Dublin, 1869)
Vol. II (London, 1872)
Vol. III (London, 1873).
- E&C* H.E. Manning, *England and Christendom* (London, 1867).
I. Preface
II. The Crown in Council, on the Essays and Reviews. A letter to an Anglican Friend (dated 8 March, 1864)
III. The Convocation and the Crown in Council (dated 25 July, 1864).
- English Church* H.E. Manning, *The English Church: its succession and witness for Christ* (London, 1835).
- Four Evils* H.E. Manning, *The Four Great Evils of the Day* (8th Edition, London, n.d.) (First 1871).
- Grounds* H.E. Manning, *The Grounds of Faith* (new ed., London, 1856) (First 1852).
- LD* *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*
Vols. I-VI, eds. I. Ker, T. Gornall, G. Tracey (Oxford, 1978-84)
Vols. XI-XXXI, eds. C.S. Dessain, E.E. Kelly, T. Gornall (London, 1961-72; Oxford, 1973).
- Manning Mss.* *Bod.* Manning Papers at the Bodleian Library, Oxford.
Pitts. Manning Papers at Pitts Theological Library, Emory Univ., Atlanta (U.S.A.).
West. Manning Papers at Westminster Diocesan Archive, London.

- M* J.D. Mansi (ed.), *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vols. XLIX-LIII (Arnhem & Leipzig, 1923-1927).
- Miscellanies* H.E. Manning, *Miscellanies*, Vols. I-II (London, 1877)
Vol. III (London, 1888).
- P* E.S. Purcell, *Life of Cardinal Manning*, 2 vols. (4th ed., London, 1896).
- Privilegium* H.E. Manning, *Petri Privilegium. Three Pastoral Letters to the Clergy of the Diocese* (London, 1871).
I. The Centenary of Saint Peter and the General Council (September 8, 1867)
II. The Oecumenical Council and the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff (Rosary Sunday, 1869)
III. The Vatican Council and its definitions (Feast of St. Edward the Confessor, 1870)
- Rule* H.E. Manning, *The Rule of Faith* (London, 1838).
- TM* H.E. Manning, *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost, or Reason and Revelation* (6th ed., London, 1909) (First 1865).
- True* H.E. Manning, *The True Story of the Vatican Council* (2nd ed., London, n.d.) (First 1877).
- Unity* H.E. Manning, *The Unity of the Church* (London, 1842).
- VM* J.H. Newman, *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*, 2 vols. (new ed., London, 1897).
- Workings* H.E. Manning, *The Workings of the Holy Spirit in the Church of England. A letter to the Rev. E.B. Pusey, D.D.* (London, 1864).

2. MANUSCRIPT SOURCES CONSULTED

Archives of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda Fidei (Rome): Scritture Riferite nei Congressi, Anglia.

Birmingham Oratory: Newman correspondence with H.E. Manning.

Bodleian Library (Oxford): Manning Papers, Wilberforce Papers.

British Museum (London): Gladstone Papers.

Pusey House (Oxford): Pusey Letters.

Ushaw College (Durham): Wiseman Papers, Wilberforce Papers, Gillow Papers.

Venerable English College Archive (Rome): Talbot Papers.

Westminster Diocesan Archive (London): Wiseman and Manning Papers.

3. PUBLISHED WORKS BY H.E. MANNING

- *The English Church: its succession and witness for Christ* (London, 1835).
- *Catena Patrum no. III. Testimony of writers in the later English Church to the duty of maintaining, Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus traditum est*. Tracts for the Times, n. 78 (new ed., London, 1839) (First 1837).
- *A sermon preached in the Cathedral Church of Chichester in behalf of the Chichester Central Schools* (London, 1838).
- *The Principle of the Ecclesiastical Commission Examined, in a Letter to the Right Rev. Lord Bishop of Chichester* (London, 1838).
- *The Rule of Faith* (London, 1838).
- *The Rule of Faith. Appendix to a Sermon* (London, 1838).
- *The mind of Christ the perfection and bond of the Church* (Chichester, 1841).
- *The Unity of the Church* (London, 1842).
- *A charge delivered at the Ordinary Visitation of the Archdeaconry of Chichester* (London, 1842).
- *Sermons preached before the University of Oxford* (2nd ed., Oxford, 1845) (First 1844).
- *A Charge delivered at the ordinary visitation of the Archdeaconry of Chichester* (London, 1845).
- *A Charge delivered at the Ordinary Visitation of the Archdeaconry of Chichester* (London, 1846).
- *A Charge delivered at the Ordinary Visitation of the Archdeaconry of Chichester* (London, 1848).

- *A Charge delivered at the ordinary visitation of the Archdeaconry of Chichester* (London, 1849).
- *Sermons*, 4 vols. (London, 1842-1850).
- *The Appellate Jurisdiction of the Crown in matters spiritual* (London, 1850).
- *The Grounds of Faith* (2nd ed., London, 1856) (1st 1852).
- *The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ* (2nd ed., London, 1862) (First 1860, as *Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes*).
- *The Workings of the Holy Spirit in the Church of England* (London, 1864).
- *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost* (6th ed., London, 1909) (First 1865).
- *The Reunion of Christendom. A Pastoral Letter* (London, 1866).
- *England and Christendom* (London, 1867).
- *Denominational Education. A Pastoral Letter* (London, 1869).
- *Petri Privilegium. Three Pastorals* (London, 1871).
- *Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects*, 3 vols. (Dublin, 1869; London, 1872-1873).
- *The Four Great Evils of the Day* (8th ed, London, n.d.) (First 1871).
- *Sin and its consequences* (London, n.d.) (First 1874).
- *The Vatican Decrees in their bearing on Civil Allegiance* (London, 1875).
- *The Internal mission of the Holy Ghost* (9th ed., London, n.d.) (First 1875).
- *The Glories of the Sacred Heart* (London, 1876).
- *The true story of the Vatican Council* (2nd ed., London, n.d.) (First 1877).
- *The Independence of the Holy See* (London, 1877).
- *Miscellanies*, 3 vols. (London, 1877-1888).
- *The Pastoral Office* (Printed for Private Use Only, 1883).
- *The Office of the Church in Higher Education. A Pastoral Letter* (London, 1885).
- *Religio Viatoris* (London, 1887).
- *A Pastoral Letter on Education* (London, 1889).
- *National Education* (London, 1889).
- *Pastime Papers by Henry Edward Cardinal Manning*, Wilfrid Meynell (ed.) (new ed., London, n.d.) (First 1892?).

4. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acton, J.E., *Selections from the correspondence of the First Lord Acton*, J.N. Figgis and R.V. Laurence (eds.) (London, 1917).
- *The History of Freedom and other Essays*, J.N. Figgis and R.V. Laurence (eds.) (London, 1909).
- *The Correspondence of Lord Acton and Richard Simpson*, J.L. Altholz, D. McElrath and J.C. Holland (eds.), 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1971-1975).
- Allchin, A.M., *Participation in God: a forgotten strand in Anglican tradition* (London, 1988).
- Allies, M., *Thomas William Allies* (London, 1907).
- Allies, T.W., *Per Crucem ad Lucem*, 2 vols (London, 1879).
- Altholz, J., *The Liberal Catholic Movement in England* (London, 1962).
- *Anatomy of a Controversy: the Debate over Essays and Reviews, 1860-1864* (Aldershot, 1994).

- Anon, *De l'unanimité Morale nécessaire dans les Conciles pour les Définitions Dogmatiques* (Paris, 1870).
- Aubert, R., *Vatican I* (Paris, 1964).
— *Le problème de l'acte de Foi* (3rd ed., Louvain, 1958).
- Barnes, A.S., *The Catholic Schools in England* (London, 1926).
- Beck, G.A., *The English Catholics, 1850-1950* (London, 1950).
- Bellamy, *La Théologie Catholique au XIXe siècle* (3rd. ed., Paris, 1904).
- Betti, U., *La Costituzione Dogmatica "Pastor aeternus" del Concilio Vaticano I* (Rome, 1961).
- Biemer, G., *Newman on Tradition* (Freiburg, 1967).
- Blackinton, N. (ed.), *The Roman Question. Extracts from the Despatches of Odo Russell from Rome, 1858-1870* (London, 1962).
- Bodley, J.E.C., *Cardinal Manning. The Decay of Idealism in France. The Institute of France* (London, 1912).
- Bossy, J., *The English Catholic Community, 1570-1850* (London, 1975).
- Bradley, I., *The call to seriousness* (London, 1976).
- Brandreth, H.R.T., *The Ecumenical ideals of the Oxford Movement* (London, 1947).
- Bremond, H., *The mystery of Newman* (London, 1907).
- Brendon, P., *Hurrell Froude and the Oxford Movement* (London, 1974).
- Brilioth, Y., *The Anglican revival. Studies in the Oxford Movement* (London, 1925).
- Burgess, H.J., *Enterprise in Education. The story of the work of the Established Church in the education of the people prior to 1870* (London, 1958).
- Butler, C., *The Vatican Council, 1869-1870* (new ed., London, 1962).
— *The Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne, 1806-1889* (London, 1926).
- Butler, P.A., *Gladstone: Church, State, and Tractarianism. A Study of his religious ideas and attitudes, 1809-1859* (Oxford, 1982).
— (ed.) *Pusey Rediscovered* (London, 1983).
- Caudron, M., 'Magistère ordinaire et infailibilité pontificale d'après la constitution 'Dei Filius', *Ephem. Theol. Lovan.*, XXXVI (1960), pp. 393-431.
- Chadwick, O., *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement. Tractarian Essays* (Cambridge, 1990).
— *The Victorian Church*, 2 vols (3rd ed., London, 1971).
— *Catholicism and History* (Cambridge, 1978).
- Chapeau, A., 'Manning the Anglican', in J.Fitzsimons (ed.), *Manning Anglican and Catholic* (London, 1951).
- Chapman, R., *Father Faber* (London, 1961).
- Chinnici, J.P., *The English Catholic Enlightenment: John Lingard and the Cisalpine Movement, 1780-1850* (Patmos, 1980).
- Church, R.W., *The Oxford Movement* (London, 1891).
- Clark, J.C.D., *English Society, 1688-1832: Ideology, Social Structure and Political Practice during the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge, 1985).
- Congar, Y., 'L'Ecclésiologie de la Révolution Française au Concile du Vatican', *Revue des Sciences Religieuses*, ns. 2-4 (1960).
- Conzemius, V., 'Lord Acton and the First Vatican Council', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, XX, (1969) pp. 267-294.
- Crumb, L.N., *The Oxford Movement and its leaders. A Bibliography of secondary and lesser primary sources* (Metuchen, 1988).

- Cruickshank, M., *Church and State in English Education, 1870 to the present day* (London, 1963).
- Cruz, F.L., *Spiritus in Ecclesia. Las relaciones entre el Espíritu Santo y la Iglesia según el Cardenal Manning* (Pamplona, 1977).
- Cunliffe, C.J. (ed.), *Joseph Butler's Moral and Religious Thought* (Oxford, 1992).
- Cwiekowski, F.J., *The English Bishops and the First Vatican Council* (Louvain, 1971).
- Dawson, C., *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement* (London, 1933).
- Dechamps, Mgr., *L'Infaillibilité et le Concile Général* (2nd ed, Paris, 1869).
- *A letter to Monseigneur Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans* (London, 1870).
- Dessain, C.S., *John Henry Newman* (London, 1966).
- 'What Newman taught in Manning's Church', in *Infallibility in the Church* (London, 1968), pp. 59-80.
- Dewan, W.F., 'Preparation of the Vatican Council's Schema on the Power and Nature of the Primacy', *Ephem. Theol. Lovan.*, 36 (1960), pp. 23-56.
- Dibble, R.A., *John Henry Newman: The Concept of Infallible Doctrinal Authority* (Washington D.C., 1955).
- Dupanloup, Mgr., *The Future Oecumenical Council. A letter by the Bishop of Orleans to the Clergy of his diocese* (London, 1869).
- *Lettre de Mgr. L'Évêque D'Orléans au Clergé de son Diocèse relativement à la définition de l'Infaillibilité au prochain concile* (Paris, 1869).
- *Reponse de Mgr. L'Évêque D'Orléans à Monseigneur Dechamps, Archevêque de Malines* (Paris, 1870).
- Earnest, J.D. and Tracey J., *John Henry Newman. An Annotated Bibliography of his Tract and Pamphlet Collection* (New York, 1984).
- Fessler, J., *The true and false infallibility of the Popes. A controversial reply to Dr. Schulte* (London, 1875).
- Fitzsimons, John (ed.), *Manning: Anglican and Catholic* (London, 1951).
- Ford, J.T., 'Infallibility: a review of recent studies', *Theological Studies*, vol. 40 (1979), pp. 273-305.
- 'Different models of Infallibility', in *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America*, vol. 35 (1980), pp. 217-233.
- Forrester, D., *Young Dr. Pusey* (London, 1989)
- Fothergill, B., *Nicholas Wiseman* (London, 1963).
- Froude, R.H., *The Remains of Richard Hurrell Froude*, Part II, 2 vols. (London, 1839).
- Garnett, J., *Bishop Butler and the 'Zeitgeist'*, in C. Cunliffe (ed.) *Joseph Butler's Moral and Religious Thought* (Oxford, 1992), pp. 63-96.
- Gasquet A. (ed.), *Lord Acton and his circle* (London, n.d.).
- 'Unpublished letters of Cardinal Wiseman and Dr. Manning', *Dublin Review*, vol. 169 (October-December 1921), pp. 161-191; also vol. 172 (January-March 1923), pp. 106-129.
- Gilley, S., *Newman and his age* (London, 1990).
- 'John Keble and the Victorian Churching of Romanticism', in J.R. Watson (ed.), *An infinite complexity: Essays in Romanticism* (Edinburgh, 1983).
- 'New light on an old scandal', in A. Bellenger (ed.) *Opening the Scrolls. Essays in Catholic History in honour of Godfrey Anstruther* (Downside, 1987), pp. 166-195.
- Gillow, J., *A Literary and Biographical Dictionary of the English Catholics from the breach with Rome in 1534 to the Present Times*, 5 vols. (London, 1885-1902).
- Gladstone, W.E., *Studies subsidiary to the works of Bishop Butler* (Oxford, 1896).

- *Correspondence on Church and Religion of W.E. Gladstone*, D. C. Lathbury (ed.), 2 vols. (London, 1910).
- Gomez-Hera, J.M., *Temas dogmaticos del Concilio Vaticano I* (Vitoria, 1971).
- Gray, R., *Cardinal Manning: A Biography* (London, 1985).
- Greenfield, R.H., *The attitude of the Tractarians to the Roman Catholic Church, 1833-1850*, unpublished D.Phil. Thesis (Oxford, 1956).
- Griffin, J., 'L'Eirenicon du Dr Pusey de 1865; une interpretation', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 82, n. 2 (Avril-Juin 1987), pp. 281-290.
- Gwyn, D. *The Second Spring, 1818-1852*. (London, 1942).
- Härdelin, A, *The Tractarian understanding of the Eucharist* (Uppsala, 1965).
- Hasler, A.B., *How the Pope became infallible* (New York, 1981).
- Hilton, B., *The Age of Atonement* (Oxford, 1991).
- Holmes, J.D., *More Roman than Rome: English Catholicism in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1978).
- 'Newman, History and Theology', *Irish Theological Quarterly* 36, n.1 (January 1969), pp. 34-45.
- Hutton, A.W., *Cardinal Manning* (London, 1892).
- Hylson-Smith, K., *High Churchmanship in the Church of England from the sixteenth century to the present century* (Edinburgh, 1993).
- Imberg, R. *In quest of Authority: the 'Tracts for the Times' and the Development of the Tractarian leaders, 1833-1841* (Lund, 1987).
- Ippolito, R., 'Archbishop Manning's Championship of Papal Infallibility, 1867-1872', *Ampleforth Journal* 72, n. 2 (Summer 1972), pp. 31-39.
- 'Janus' (Döllinger), *The Pope and the Council* (London, 1869).
- Keble, J., *Sermons Academical and Occasional* (Oxford, 1847).
- Ker, I., *John Henry Newman. A biography* (Oxford, 1990).
- Kerkvoorde, A., 'La théologie du "Corps Mystique" au Dix-Neuvième Siècle', *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, 67 (1945), Septembre-Octobre, pp. 417-430, 1025-1038.
- Knight, M., *The Sacramental Theology of Robert Isaac Wilberforce*, unpublished M.A. Thesis (Durham, 1979).
- Knox, T.F., *When does the Church speak infallibly; or the nature and scope of the Church's teaching office* (2nd ed., London, 1870).
- Leslie, S., *Henry Edward Manning, His Life and Labours* (2nd ed., London, 1921).
- Liddon, H.P., *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, 4 vols (London, 1893-1897).
- McClelland, V.A., *Cardinal Manning. His public life and influence* (London, 1962).
- *English Roman Catholics and Higher Education* (Oxford, 1973).
- (ed.) *Henry Edward Manning (1808-1892)*, in *Recusant History*, Vol. 21, n. 2 (October 1992).
- 'The "Free Schools" issue and the General Election of 1885: A Denominational Response', *History of Education*, Vol. 5, n. 2 (1976), pp. 141-154.
- 'Corporate Reunion: A nineteenth century dilemma', *Theological Studies*, Vol. 43, n.1 (March 1982).
- McElrath, D., *The Syllabus of Pius IX. Some reactions in England* (Louvain, 1964).
- *Lord Acton: The Decisive Decade, 1864-1874* (Louvain, 1970).
- Madoz, J., 'La Iglesia Cuerpo Místico de Cristo según el primer esquema "De Ecclesia" en el Concilio Vaticano', *Revista Española de Teología*, III (1943), pp. 159-181.

- Mansi, J.D. (ed.), *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vols. XLIX-LIII (Arnhem & Leipzig, 1923-1927).
- Maskell, W., *What is the meaning of the late definition on the Infallibility of the Pope?* (London, 1871).
- Mathew, D., *Lord Acton and His Times* (London, 1968).
- Mersch, E., *The whole Christ. The Historical development of the doctrine of the Mystical Body in Scripture and Tradition* (London, 1949).
- Misner, P., 'Newman and the Tradition concerning the Papal Antichrist', *Church History*, 42 (1973), pp. 375-388.
- *Papacy and Development: Newman and the Primacy of the Pope* (London, 1976).
- Mohelher, J.A., *Symbolism: or exposition of the doctrinal differences between Catholic and Protestants, as evidence by their Symbolical writings*, 2 vols. (London, 1843).
- Morrish, N., *Wiseman on Sacred Scripture and the Authority of the Church*, unpublished S.T.D. Thesis (Pamplona, 1984)
- Mozley, T., *Reminiscences. Chiefly of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement*, 2 vols (2nd ed., London, 1882).
- Murphy, J. *The Education Act 1870* (Newton Abbot, 1972).
- *Church, State and Schools in Britain, 1800-1970* (London, 1970).
- Newman, J.H., *The Via Media of the Anglican Church. Illustrated in Lectures, letters and Tracts written between 1830 and 1841*, 2 vols. (London, 1885).
- *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (London, 1906).
- *Apologia pro Vita Sua* (Oxford, 1913).
- *Certain difficulties felt by Anglicans in Catholic teaching*, 2 vols. (London, 1897-1898)
- *The theological papers of John Henry Newman on Biblical Inspiration and on Infallibility*, J.D. Holmes (ed.) (Oxford, 1979).
- *On consulting the faithful in matters of doctrine*, J. Coulson (ed.) (London, 1961).
- *Correspondence of John Henry Newman with John Keble and others 1839-1845*, J. Baccus (ed.) (London, 1917)
- Newsome, D., *The parting of friends. A study of the Wilberforces and Henry Manning* (London, 1966).
- *The Convert Cardinals. Newman and Manning* (London, 1993).
- Nockles, P., *The Oxford Movement in context* (Cambridge, 1994).
- *Continuity and Change in Anglican High Churchmanship in Britain 1792-1850*, D. Phil. Thesis, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1982).
- Norman, E., *The English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford, 1985).
- *Anti-Catholicism in Victorian England* (London, 1968).
- O'Gara, M., *Triumph in defeat: Infallibility, Vatican I, and the French minority bishops* (Washington D.C., 1988).
- O'Gorman, C., 'A History of Henry Manning's Religious Opinions 1808-1832', in V.A. McClelland (ed.) *Henry Edward Manning (1808-1892)*, in *Recusant History*, vol. 21, n. 2 (October 1992), pp. 152-166.
- Ollivier, E., *L'Église et l'État au Concile du Vatican*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1879).
- O'Meara, Kathleen, *Thomas Grant, First Bishop of Southward* (2nd ed., London, 1886).
- Ornsby, R., *Memoirs of James Hope-Scott*, 2 vols. (London, 1884).
- Palmer, W., *A Treatise on the Church of Christ* (3rd ed., London, 1842)
- *A Narrative of Events connected with the publication of the Tracts for the Times* (2nd ed., Oxford, 1843).

- Pawley, M., *Faith and Family. The Life and Circle of Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle* (Norwich, 1993).
- Paz, D.G., *Popular Anti-Catholicism in Mid-Victorian England* (Stanford, 1992).
- Penelhum, T., *Butler* (London, 1985).
- 'Butler and human ignorance', in C.J. Cunliffe (ed.), *Joseph Butler's Moral and Religious Thought* (Oxford, 1992).
- Pereiro, J., 'S.F. Wood and an early theory of development in the Oxford Movement', *Recusant History*, vol. 20, n. 4 (October 1991).
- Prickett, S., *Romanticism and Religion. The Tradition of Coleridge and Wordsworth in the Victorian Church* (Cambridge, 1976).
- Purcell, E.S., *Life of Cardinal Manning*, 2 vols. (4th ed., London, 1896)
- *Life and Letters of Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle*, 2 vols. (London, 1900)
- Pusey, E.B., *Case as to the legal force of the judgment of the Privy Council re Fendall v Wilson* (London, 1864).
- *An Eirenicon. In a letter to the author of 'The Christian Year'* (London, 1865).
- *First Letter to the Very Rev. J.H. Newman, D.D.* (London, 1869).
- *Is healthy reunion impossible? A second letter to the Very Rev. J.H. Newman, D.D.* (London, 1870).
- 'Quirinus' (Döllinger), *Letters from Rome on the Council*. Reprinted from the 'Allgemeine Zeitung' (London, 1870).
- Reardon, B., *From Coleridge to Gore. A century of religious thought in Britain* (London, 1971).
- Rowell, G., *The Vision Glorious* (Oxford, 1983).
- (ed.) *Tradition Renewed* (London, 1986).
- 'Remember Lot's wife — Manning's Anglican Sermons', in V.A. McClelland (ed.), *Henry Edward Manning (1808-1892)*, in *Recusant History*, vol.21, n. 2 (October 1992), pp. 167-179.
- Ryder, H.I.D., *Idealism in Theology. A review of Dr. Ward's scheme of dogmatic authority* (London, 1876).
- Schatz, K., *Vaticanum I, 1869-1870*, 3 vols. (Paderborn, 1992-1994).
- Schiefen, R.J., *Nicholas Wiseman and the transformation of English Catholicism* (Shepherdstown, 1984).
- Snead-Cox, J.G., *The Life of Cardinal Vaughan* (London, 1910).
- Stuart, E.B., *Roman Catholic Reaction to the Oxford Movement and Anglican Schemes for Reunion, from 1833 to the Condemnation of Anglican Orders*, unpublished D.Phil Thesis (Oxford, 1987).
- Thils, G., *Primauté et infaillibilité du Pontife Romain au Vatican I et autres études d'ecclésiologie* (Leuven, 1989).
- Ullathorne, W.B., *Letters*, ed. by the nuns of St. Dominic Convent, Stone (London, 1892).
- *Notes on the Education Question* (London, 1857).
- *The Anglican Theory of Union as maintained in the Appeal to Rome and Dr. Pusey's 'Eirenicon': A Second Letter* (London, 1866).
- von Arx, J.P., 'Manning's Ultramontaniam and the Catholic Church in British Politics', *Recusant History*, vol. 19, n. 3 (May 1989), pp. 323-347.
- 'Archbishop Manning and the Kulturkampf', in V.A. McClelland (ed.), *Henry Edward Manning (1808-1892)*, in *Recusant History*, vol. 21, n. 2 (October 1992), pp. 254-266.
- Ward, B., *The Eve of Catholic Emancipation*, 3 vols. (London, 1911-1912).

- *The Sequel of Catholic Emancipation*, 2 vols. (London, 1915).
- Ward, W.G., *The Ideal of the Christian Church considered in comparison with existing practice* (London, 1844).
- *The Authority of Doctrinal Decisions which are not Definitions of Faith* (London, 1866).
- Ward, W., *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman*, 2 vols. (new ed., London, 1912).
- *The Life of John Henry, Cardinal Newman*, 2 vols. (London, 1912).
- *William George Ward and the Catholic Revival* (2nd ed., London, 1912).
- Webb, C.C.J., *Religious Thought in the Oxford Movement* (London, 1928).
- Wilberforce, R.I., *The Doctrine of the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, in its relation to Mankind and to the Church* (London, 1848).
- Wiseman, N., *Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church*, 2 vols. (London, 1836).
- *Essays on various subjects*, 2 vols. (London, 1853).
- Woodward, E.L., *The Age of Reform, 1850-1870* (Oxford, 1949).