



## Durham E-Theses

---

### *H. E. Manning's ideas on the church as an Anglican*

Rampton, P.M.

#### How to cite:

---

Rampton, P.M. (1973) *H. E. Manning's ideas on the church as an Anglican*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/10111/>

#### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

## ABSTRACT

Manning's Anglican career was essentially a time of transition in which he transferred his allegiance from the Evangelical to the High Church wing of the Church of England. This transition was the result of his working out of certain principles that all his life he was to hold very dear. His fundamental concern was with the unity and authority of the Church. Like the early Tract writers he based this authority on the Apostolic Succession of the ministry and this led him to study tradition and its part in the rule of faith. His view of tradition as the interpreter of the Scriptures marks his break with the Evangelical party in the Church. This view of the role of tradition, in turn, gave way to the idea of the infallibility of the Church, guaranteed by the perpetual presence of the Holy Spirit.

Closely linked with the idea of the authority of the Church was Manning's idea of the unity of the Church. This reached its fullest expression in his book on the subject in which he defended the Church of England as a branch of the true Church. This view he was later to repudiate when he became convinced that the Church of England was in schism.

Manning worked out his ideas while leading a public life which exposed him to the full force of the Erastianism of the times. His thinking brought him to the position where he was confronted by what seemed to be the equal claims of the Churches of England and Rome to be the true Church. But events such as the Hampden affair and the Gorham case were to tip the scales and lead him to repudiate the Church of England and join the Church of Rome.

P.M. RAMPTON

H.E. MANNING'S IDEAS ON THE CHURCH AS AN ANGLICAN

M.A. Thesis, 1973

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.  
No quotation from it should be published without  
his prior written consent and information derived  
from it should be acknowledged.

## CONTENTS

Chapter One.	Succession and Tradition	page 1
Chapter Two.	The Church and the State	page 25
Chapter Three.	Relations with Newman	page 53
Chapter Four.	Manning and the Anglo-Catholics	page 89
Chapter Five.	The Gorham Case	page 119
Conclusion.	The Church of Rome	page 147
Bibliography.		

Chapter One

SUCCESSION AND TRADITION

In 1833 when he took up his incumbency at Lavington after the sudden death of his father-in-law John Sargent, Henry Edward Manning was counted among the Evangelical wing of the Church of England. In 1831 his spiritual progress had received a new impetus following his evangelical conversion, a call he described as "ad veritatem et ad seipsum" which was further strengthened by the shrewd spiritual direction of a Miss Bevan, the sister of one of his friends. His father-in-law, John Sargent, had been a well-known Evangelical and for twenty seven years he had guided the little Sussex parish. The early work of his son-in-law and successor gave no sign that the ethos of the parish would be changed.

But unlike his father-in-law Manning was destined, as far as onlookers were concerned, to move from one extreme in the Church of England to the other and then finally to forsake the Anglican Church altogether, finding his spiritual home in the Church of Rome. But this is an outsider's view and tells only half the story. Manning's Anglican career was the exploration of certain principles that all his life he was to hold very dear. Throughout these years ideas were forming and developing in his mind and it is impossible at any stage to label him neatly with a party tag. In his own words, "I was a Pietist until I accepted the Tridentine Decrees".

We are fortunate in having a statement of his religious opinions in 1833 set down by the Cardinal over forty years

later in an autobiographical note in his "Journal" dated 1878-  
-1882:-

"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. I had rejected the whole idea of the Established Church. Erastianism was hateful to me. The Royal Supremacy was, in my mind, an invasion of the Headship of our Lord. In truth, I had thought and read myself out of contact with every system known to me. Anglicanism was formal and dry, Evangelicalism illogical, and at variance with the New Testament, Nonconformity was to me mere disorder. Of the Catholic Church I knew nothing. I was completely isolated. But I held intently to the "Word of God", and the work of souls. In this state I began preaching to the poor in church, and in their homes." (quoted by E.S.Purcell "Life of Cardinal Manning" vol. 1 page 112)

Certainly no party label could meaningfully be applied to Manning in 1833.

Before his Ordination in 1833 he had spent a year as Fellow of Merton where he read not only the Anglican divines but also the Early Fathers. Even this short period of full-time study was more than was normally required of a candidate for Ordination but with his serious attitude to his calling Manning continued his course of reading throughout his years of parish work. He read mainly the Early Fathers and the Caroline divines and his writings of the 1830's show the depth to which he took his studies.

Another important source of information about the young Rector of Lavington in his first years as a country parson are his letters. His closest friends at this time were Samuel Wilberforce, W.E. Gladstone and S.F. Wood. Manning's earliest letters to Samuel show a growing understanding of the sacrament-

-al principle. In 1835 his writing emphasised the essential link between baptism and confirmation, between regeneration and renewal. He saw two dangerous errors - "the one in preaching baptismal regeneration but neglecting....confirmation and renewal, the other in preaching personal appropriation of God's mercy to the adult, and denying regeneration in Baptism - which involves necessarily Pelagianism or Calvinism". (15th. September 1835, quoted by D. Newsome "The Parting of Friends" page 201.) These views and his course of reading were leading him towards an open sympathy for the Tracts. But at the same time he was not sympathetic towards High Church doctrines, at least as expressed by Samuel Wilberforce's younger brother Henry. Gladstone recalled that when Henry's indignant father consulted Manning about his son's views Manning replied, "Let him become a clergyman; work among the poor, and the visiting of the sick and dying will soon knock such High Church nonsense out of his head." (quoted by Purcell vol 1 page 107)

Like Gladstone, Manning had left Oxford after taking his degree with no suspicion of the religious ferment in the minds of men like Newman and Hurrell Froude and in his year as a Fellow of Merton it seems that he did not even meet Newman. Manning was settled at Lavington when the first of the Tracts for the Times appeared but he was doubtless kept in touch with events at Oxford through his old university friends and especially S.F. Wood of Oriel, once an ardent Evangelical but now a disciple and apologist of the Tractarian movement. Purcell states that it was Wood who first brought

the Tracts under Manning's favourable notice in a letter dated 23rd October 1836 because before that date he knew of them only through the hostile comments of the "Record". There is also the view, however, that Manning read the Tracts themselves regularly from the beginning (see A. Chapeau "Manning the Anglican" page 6 in "Manning: Anglican and Catholic" edited by John Fitzsimons). Whichever view is nearer the truth, we can say with certainty that Manning's interest in the Tracts was known to Newman who wrote asking him in September 1835 to find a bookseller in the Chichester area who would handle them. (quoted by M. Ward in "Young Mr. Newman" page 256). That Newman expected a favourable reply can be seen from the details he includes in his letter concerning the sign that should be erected to show that the Tracts were on sale.

Whatever doubts the inhabitants of Lavington may have had about the new Rector were quickly proved to be groundless. And it is perhaps in his parish work that Manning showed most clearly, in those early years, his serious attitude towards the office to which he felt himself called. He soon knew the name of every one of his parishioners, visiting them in their homes and, aided by his wife, saw to their temporal as well as their spiritual needs. Daily morning prayers were the rule in the church. Gladstone quotes Lord Chichester's words that "Manning was the most exemplary clergyman he had ever known, both for his pastoral zeal and personal holiness." (Purcell vol 1 page 111) His work as a parish priest was to act as a spur to his theological development because it posed for him certain questions that had to be answered:-



"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."

(quoted by Purcell vol 1 page 112)

This is not, as might be expected from a newly-ordained priest, a doubt about his personal vocation, but about the whole order to which he had been called. For Manning the problem was the meaning of his ordination and the authority on which it rested. His final answer to this question is his best known literary work "The Eternal Priesthood" (1883) but his first answer was a Visitation sermon preached in Chichester Cathedral in July 1835 and later published under the title "The English Church: Its Succession and Witness for Christ."

Manning takes his text from Luke 24:48 "And ye are witnesses of these things". First, he reminds his hearers that although the Church and her ministry were one for the first fifteen hundred years of her history, they are now in a time when "men have seemed to sicken at the very name of unity." (page 4) Now every separated fragment claims to be regarded as the Church and the ministry of Christ. With the aid of the Holy Spirit, therefore, he sets himself the task of considering "The witness He has appointed for Himself in the ministry of His Church." (page 5)

This study he pursues under two distinct headings. First he examines "The Character of our Holy Office." It is above all "peculiar to itself" and cannot be compared with any other work in God's service. The Apostles were witnesses and representatives of their Master and to be their successors it is nec-

-essary to show that your testimony is a direct personal testimony and your authority a valid commission from Jesus Christ. This commission must be traced back link by link to Christ.

"Now it is clear that how long soever the line of transmission be drawn out, the validity of all depends upon the soundness of the first, and the union between each successive link: so that if there be any where a break, the whole must fall: and what man dare, on his own authority, renew what the authority of Christ began?"  
(page 9)

But if we can trace back a succession link by link then we "may well nigh sink under the weight of glory that is put upon us".(page 9) For fifteen hundred years in the Catholic Church and in the Church of England to this day, the bishops have been considered the descendents of the first witnesses and the other clergy derive their authority from them.

"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?'"  
(page 10)

Apart from the "futile objections of the Papists" (page 11) concerning the Nag's Head consecration, Manning claims that there is no controversy about the episcopal succession from Augustine's mission from Rome in 596 A.D. to the present day and this alone might be enough to account for the period from the founding of the Church in Britain up to 596 A.D.

"But we are able to show that the churches of Britain also were episcopal, and of the very highest antiquity, even hardly younger in their birth than the apostate and usurping see of Rome."  
(page 11)

He supports his argument with four historical points as well as the testimony of Tertullian, Theodoret, Origen and Eusebius. The line of succession from "the Apostles, from

apostolic or post apostolic men" (page 14) means that,

"there is impressed both upon our ~~commission~~ commission a validity and upon our witness a value, which none may rightfully assume, ~~and~~ who cannot cite the Apostles as the forefathers of their Bishops, and the Catholic creeds and symbols as the standards of their faith." (page 17)

The second major heading of the sermon concerns "What should be the influence of our Holy Office on our mind and conduct." (page 20) The claims made in the first part of the sermon, Manning insists, are made only to impress on ourselves the great responsibility of being witnesses and representatives of Christ, and he now examines this responsibility more closely under three headings. "As witnesses of Christ, we should continually revert to the origin of our commission." (page 20) Through God's providence the Church is national, endowed and established but these are only "accidental adjuncts" (page 20) and nowhere is it promised that these are essential features of the Church. On the other hand Apostolic descent and the ministerial power of the Word and Sacraments are guaranteed in perpetuity. Secondly, "As witnesses of Christ, we should be so much the more watchful over the message we deliver, by how much the more authority we have to treat in his name." (page 23) And thirdly, "As witnesses of Christ, we must continually seek a growing conformity to the mind and conduct of our Master". (page 26) These final pages contain an eloquent plea for the great responsibility of their office.

"What a mission, Brethren, is ours! 'As my Father has sent me, so send I you' to arrest sinners in the career of death; to convert their souls to God; to open and shut the gates of his invisible kingdom; to feed with the bread of heaven; to conflict with every shade of corruption, and to wrestle with every shape of moral evil; .....and joyfully pour out, if need be, even ourselves also, as a crowning libation on our holy sacrifice! (Phil.2:17) (pages 26 and 27)

These are not the words of a man who in entering the ministry had had to "make the best of a bad business" (Lytton Strachey). At the very end of his Anglican career Manning was to repudiate the first part of his sermon. The validity of Anglican orders was the last great stumbling block on his way to Rome and the one that he only overcame after great mental conflict. Throughout his long life his principles developed and he sometimes changed his mind "but his understanding of the fundamental character of the priesthood and the nature of the Church - its unity and independence of secular control - was never shaken". (D. Newsome page 205)

The theme of this sermon, "Magnify your office", is very similar to the appeal contained in the first of the "Tracts for the Times" written by Newman and published on 9th September 1833 nearly two years before Manning's sermon. Newman sees that the times are evil and yet no one speaks out against them. On what is the ministry to rest its authority when the state deserts it? Like Manning, Newman rests this authority squarely on its Apostolic Succession.

Between the publication of Manning's first and second Visitation sermons he published two articles in the "British Magazine". They formed his reply to a course of lectures delivered by Dr. Wiseman in 1836 in St. Mary's Moorfields on the doctrinal differences between the Catholic and Protestant churches. Public feeling was aroused by these lectures and they were widely criticised. Manning's first article was entitled "Dr. Wiseman's Errors or Unfairness" in which he

took him to task for failing to distinguish between the Church of England and other Protestant bodies. Manning also questioned Wiseman's use of the term "Catholic" solely for the Church of Rome. Both these objections follow logically from the train of thought that emerges clearly in his first published sermon. The Church of England through its Apostolic Succession can claim a direct link, equal to that of Rome, with the Apostles, their immediate followers and their Master. It is therefore, like Rome, fully entitled to be called Catholic and Apostolic and cannot be compared with the separate Dissenting groups.

Manning preached a second Visitation sermon in Chichester Cathedral on 13th June 1838. His text was taken from the Epistle to the Galatians (1:8 and 9) "If any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." Although these words were written for a particular situation, namely the controversy over circumcision in the Early Church, yet like the Gospel that they protect, they are everlasting. The danger of erring from the purity of the Gospel Manning reminds his hearers, is just as great today with the heresies, false traditions and divisions that abound. As priests they have a great responsibility to maintain the purity of the Gospel but as weak men doubts must enter their minds as to whether at some time weighty points of doctrine and interpretation have not been changed by time.

"And at such a time, perhaps, the mind has felt about, if haply it might find some rule by which to measure the proportions of the faith, and to ascertain, from the shadows we see, what is the true form of the realities they indicate."  
(page 13)

He is not questioning the specific doctrines of the Gospel but the rule by which they may be ascertained. He discounts without stopping to consider it, the idea that men and churches are perpetually inspired. Instead of this direct inspiration he posits four means through which the Holy Spirit teaches us. "The institution of the Church, and the delivery of the Holy Sacraments and Scriptures" ~~which~~ are "a sufficient proof of the kind of dispensation, and of the media through which it has pleased God to perpetuate and to dispense the knowledge of His truth; and, as to the principle of using them, we begin at once by appealing to the Holy Scriptures as the one sole foundation and proof of the faith." (page 14) The belief in the sufficiency of Scripture for salvation rests on the "constant unanimous witness on which we receive the sacred books." (page 14) The Early Fathers believed that the Scriptures contained the full doctrine of salvation and the Church of England declares that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation". (Article 6) But this does not mean that Scripture needs no interpreter nor does it mean that every man is able to interpret for himself.

Scripture alone might be sufficient to determine what the Apostles preached if the Scriptures were clear and the Church infallible; but neither of these conditions prevail. Churches and individual christians may err and have erred and the Gospel of Christ does not lie in syllables and letters but in their meaning. We need guidance as to which of the many senses the words may carry is the sense intended. ~~And~~ And so we need a further rule to help us find the right

meaning from many alternatives. The Churches, Manning explains, were founded before the Scriptures were written and every Church therefore had both the whole Gospel and also the particular Scriptures delivered to it. In other words each Church held both the Scripture and the "sense". (page 28)

Some of this "sense" would have been gathered up into a summary for affirmation by the baptismal candidates and this summary was the same in all Churches and confessed by all Christians, "and the substance of it, how variously soever expressed in words, was as directly delivered by the Holy Ghost to the Apostles, and by the Apostles delivered to the Church as that of Scripture itself." (page 28) The creed, therefore, was not at first derived from the Scriptures and existed before the Apostolic writings. Over this "rule of faith" the Church possessed only the power of explanation, she could neither add nor take away from it. All that she has ever done has been to harmonise the language in which it is expressed, and when compelled by heresy, reluctantly to expound the sense of points contained in the creed in substance from the beginning.

"Scripture, then, being the proof of creed, and the creed the interpreter of Scripture, the harmony of these is the first rule of interpretation." (page 35)

Although a large part of Scripture will thus receive a clear and fixed interpretation as the proof of the creed, there still remains a large body of doctrines which are not included in the summary of the creed but are nevertheless of major importance, such as Original Sin, Justification, and the Holy Communion. On all these the Apostles were inspired by the same Holy Spirit and spoke in the same way but their teaching, though

it has one meaning, is not clear enough to need no explanation, We must appeal to the same witness which guarantees to us the books themselves.

"And if equal evidence demand equal assent, it will not be easy to show, how any man should accept the testimony which consigns to him the Apostolical Epistles, even in the minutest points of reading and punctuation, and reject the same testimony when it delivers the broad features of interpretation too," (pages 36 and 37)

The canon of Scripture, says Manning, was not fixed when the doctrine of Original Sin was universally received and "the mystery of the holy Eucharist was everywhere believed, while some of the Epistles were not everywhere as yet received as Apostolical." (page 37) It is when men believe that they know better than the early christians who received the Scriptures and before them received the unwritten word of God that "then indeed is not a mere exposition alone at stake, but Christianity itself is secretly undermined." (page 38) The Church of England guides her members in these chief points of doctrine in the Articles "which are not new theological determinations deriving their weight from her sole wisdom or authority but depositions of evidence exhibiting interpretations that have obtained from the beginning." (page 38) In the Articles the Church of England does not expound but witnesses. She requires assent to them not as terms of communion but as conditions upon which to base the teaching of her people.

"And these chief points of doctrine (prima credibilia) which range next in importance to the fundamentals of the creed, she holds herself and delivers to us the witness of those 'who are presumable, by their antiquity, to know the truth, and by their uniform consent, neither to mistake themselves, nor to deceive us.' This is a second rule of interpretation." (page 39 quoting Hammond's Paraenesis chapter 5 section 4 in "Works" vol 1 page 388)



After the guidance of Creed and Articles, there now remains little of the Bible over which disagreement may arise. Where it does the fourth means of inspiration, the witness of the early and undivided Church, is to be used. Wherever any agreement of witness is to be found it brings a corresponding measure of obligation. Just as a unanimous witness from the beginning is not to be doubted, so a witness that is not universal but yet uncontradicted must claim, in some measure, our acceptance. On the lowest level this means that where ever an interpretation exists, it must be removed with sufficient reason before any other can be considered and where there is no such evidence then we must rely on private judgement.

The Church holds that God has spoken fully and completely to man and denies the claims of churches and individuals to "such an immediate guidance of that same Spirit by whom the Scriptures were dictated, as shall supersede this witness in interpreting their sense." (page 42) But in resting upon the external witness of the Gospel, she does not fail to apply, for her own assurance the full force of internal proof. She only forbids God's order to be reversed, knowing that He has ordained first an outward evidence for all to see and reserved the inward corroboration as the privilege of faithful men. (p.43) Her belief rests not on outward proof but upon "inward ever-growing consciousness of supernatural life and power." (page 43) The outward evidence of the inspired books is but the "avenue" It is the "voice of the Beloved, and the breathings of the Holy Ghost" (page 43) discovered within them, that is the "holy place".

It was because of the earlier failings of the Church that in the sixteenth century it became necessary to revert to the witness of antiquity and Church leaders were compelled to put the whole doctrine and discipline of the Church to its test. Manning quotes at length from the testimony of Archbishop Cranmer at his trial, when he declared his veneration for "the most holy Fathers of old" (page 48) whose writings are a clear guide to the minds of the early Church and expose the corruption of "Romish innovations".

The closing passages of this second Visitation sermon, like those of the first, are fiercely apocalyptic. "Assuredly these are times to try our constancy" (page 49) because firstly "men are possessed by an insatiate lust of ever progressing discovery" and secondly they "have acquired an impatience of any fixed standard of religious truth, external to the mind." (page 50) Doctrine has given way to opinion and discipline to custom and out of the confusion has emerged a spirit of false "Catholic" religion which places peace before truth. "For now all truth is resolved into the views of individual minds." (page 53) But in contrast, "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today and forever" is at the head of His Church and "we dare not yield lest He that walketh in the midst of the golden candlesticks remove our candlestick out of his place, and ourselves be accursed in the day of the Lord's coming." (page 56)

If Manning's first Visitation sermon had been well received by his Evangelical colleagues this was not the case with his second sermon. In view of the offence which he had caused,

Manning therefore published a lengthy Appendix largely made up of a list of authorities to support his arguments. But Manning's theories were not only under attack from the Evangelical wing. Shortly after the delivery of the "Rule of Faith" sermon, Dr. Wiseman published an article in the "Dublin Review" challenging the position that Keble and other Tractarian leaders had taken up on the subject of private judgement and Article 6 of the Thirty Nine Articles. This Catholic criticism of the position of Anglicans as representing the faith of the Primitive Church, indirectly attacked Manning's theory of the identity between the rule of faith in the reformed Church of England and in the Primitive Church. Challenged by Dr. Wiseman, Manning for the first time entered the field of public controversy.

In the first chapter of the Appendix its aims are set out. "'The Rule of Faith' is the test by which we ascertain the character of revelation." (page 1) The Holy Ghost teaches us through the institution of the Church and the delivery of the Sacraments and Scripture and Manning again sets out the rule for using these "divinely ordained means". This rule is commonly expressed in the phrase "Scripture and antiquity or Scripture and the Creed attested by Universal Tradition". (Appendix page 3) There are many objections to this rule and Manning lists twenty. Among these are the arguments that it is a departure from the principle of the Reformation and identical with that of Rome, that it attributes infallibility to the Church, or the early Christian writers, and that it is derogatory to God to suppose that He would give us a book that could not be understood by all. To refute such points, Manning sets himself to prove:-

- "1. That the Rule of Faith, as stated above, is the recognised principle of the reformed Church of England.
2. That it was also the universal rule of the Primitive Church." (page 5)

The second and third chapters are taken up with his proof of these two points. In chapter two he supports his first point by citing Cranmer and Ridley and later Anglican divines and he concludes:-

"Until, then, it can be shown that the Reformed Church of England has in fact departed from universal tradition, or that her chief Bishops and teachers have designedly rejected it, we must conclude that Scripture and antiquity is recognised as her rule of faith." (page 36)

From this it follows, he maintains, that against the objections he has stated, this rule does not depart from the principle of the Reformation and is not identical with the Church of Rome, the Church of the early Christian writers is not attributed with the Romish idea of infallibility, the early Christian writers do agree in all important points as do the Catholic Creeds in every detail, the Fathers are witnesses of doctrine as well as fact and can be used constructively to establish truth as well as destructively to overthrow error. Chapter three is taken up with proving his second point from the New Testament and early Christian writers and Manning concludes that,

"the oral preaching of the Apostles was the sole rule of faith before the Scriptures were written, and is so recognised in Holy Scripture itself: that it was the chief rule of faith to the Universal Church, even after the books of Scripture were written; that is until they were collected and dispersed in a canon throughout all the Churches of the world: that it is recognised by the Christian writers of the first four centuries, as a rule of faith in itself distinct from the Apostolic Scriptures, although in perfect harmony with them: that it is attested to us by the universal consenting traditions of the Primitive Church: and that the offspring and representative of the oral preaching of the Apostles is the Creed as we

now receive it, which is in substance older than the Scriptures, and universally used at baptism ~~before~~ in all Churches before the Scriptures were written. Therefore the rule of faith in the primitive Church was Scripture and Creed attested by universal tradition. From this we must conclude further, that this rule of faith was the ordinance of the Apostles, and therefore of GOD." (pages 75 and 76)

From this conclusion, Manning proceeds to refute the remainder of the twenty objections he had listed to the rule of faith.

After looking at the Catholic rule of faith, the fourth chapter is a consideration of "two fallacious rules, which have been, in later ages, adapted by the Church, both therefore modern and condemned as novel by universal tradition: I mean the rule of the Roman Church; and the rule that is held by all Protestant bodies, except the British and American Churches." (page 81) The first of these he calls the "Roman" and the second the "New". From Berington and Kirk's "Faith of (Roman) Catholics" he defines the Roman Rule as follows:

- "1. That there is a living judge of interpretations, guided by an inspiration the same in kind with that which dictated the Holy Scriptures.
2. That the rule by which the judge shall proceed is "what was anciently received".
3. That some points of belief (which, if it means anything more than ~~that~~ the sixth Article of the Church of England, must mean of necessary faith), were not committed to writing in Holy Scripture, but rest on oral tradition alone.  
Acting on this rule, the Church of Rome, at the Council of Trent, added to the Nicene or Constantinopolitan creed, many doctrines which cannot be proved from Holy Scripture; e.g. transubstantiation, purgatory, invocation of saints, veneration of images, indulgences etc.  
A profession of this faith she requires as necessary for communion." (pages 82 and 83)

Having defined the Roman Rule, Manning contrasts it with the Catholic (Anglican) in this way:

"The Church of Rome asserts that oral tradition is a sufficient proof of points of necessary belief.  
The Church of England, that Scripture is the only

sufficient proof of necessary faith.

The Church of Rome says, that the doctrinal articles added to Pope Pius's Creed, may be proved from Scripture, but need not.

The Church of England, that they ought to be proved from Holy Writ, but cannot.

The Church of Rome maintains that they are binding because they are Apostolical traditions.

The Church of England denies that they are Apostolical traditions, in as much as they will not stand the Catholic test; not being primitive, neither have they ever been universal, nor held with consent of all Churches.

(pages 83 and 84)

The "New" Rule he defines as follows:

"The Holy Scripture needs no interpreter, but is plain to all."

But this is felt to be so evidently untenable, that it is generally stated in this form:-

"That the Holy Spirit, which dictated the Scripture, now guides all who seek the truth into a right understanding of it."

"Now here is exactly the same fallacy as in the Roman rule above given. The Church of England carefully distinguishes between the immediate guidance of inspiration, and that guidance which leads men through the means God has ordained for the conveyance of truth. She holds therefore,

1. That neither Churches nor individuals have any warrant to expect that spiritual guidance, while they reject the means through which God is pleased to give it.
2. That those means are Scripture and universal tradition which attests both Scripture and the sense of Scripture.
3. That Holy Scripture is sufficient as 'containing all things necessary to salvation' but not sufficient to prove its own inspiration, authenticity, genuineness, nor the purity of the text, nor its interpretation."

(page 84)

After contrasting the two fallacious rules with the true

Anglican, Manning concludes:-

"But we must go on to a still more instructive topic, namely, the close agreement of these two principles, notwithstanding their seemingly irreconcilable opposition.

In the following six points they closely agree:-

1. Both exalt the living judge or interpreter above the written rule.

2. Both claim a special guidance.
3. Both argue a priori (from our anticipation of what God would be likely to do, that therefore He has done so.)
4. Both oppose antiquity and universal tradition. And as a natural consequence of all these,
5. Both introduce new doctrines.
6. Both in effect, undermine the foundation of faith." (page 85)

Both these groups put the living interpreter before the written rule and the Scriptures have been made to follow the living Church "with too ductile a pliancy." (page 85) And this he sees as the real danger of Papal Infallibility, namely that the meaning of a document will vary with its succession of living expositors "who, under the pretence of interpreting the law of Christ.....doth in many parts, evacuate and dissolve it; so dethroning Christ from his dominion over men's consciences, and instead of Christ setting up himself". (page 86, quoting Chillingworth vol 1 pages 11-13) And the followers of the New Rule do exactly the same by putting the individual before the written Scripture and making him the interpreter of Scripture. This rejection of universal tradition, he sees as the cause of schism and Socinianism. The Church of England, on the other hand, by reviving the rule of faith at the Reformation, has resisted both Calvinism and Romanism by appeal to universal tradition. The Church of England, the Church of Rome, and what Manning calls "the modern school", appeal to the written Scriptures but they differ in their use of them. The Church of Rome appeals to her own infallible definitions while the modern school appeals to personal conviction. The Church of England, however, appeals to Antiquity. "The two former shrink from the ordeal; but we abide it." (page 116) It is only the

Church of England that is accustomed to being subject to any rule. The other two have too much about them that is at variance with the primitive doctrine and are, any way, unused to submitting to an external superior. The "Romanist" and the "Ultra-Protestant" have no right to argue that the Church of England opposes the truth of Scripture when what she, in fact, opposes is their interpretations which must first be proved to be the right sense of Scripture. "The real struggle is between Church infallibility, individual judgement, and universal tradition. There is no other rule except immediate conscious inspiration." (page 117)

Chapter five is concerned with the use of Antiquity in interpreting Holy Scripture and chapter six deals with "the practical and moral benefits resulting from a submission of individual judgement to Universal Tradition." These are firstly "agreement". Religious diversity has led men to deny that there ever was such a thing as unity of opinion and has resulted in exclusiveness leading to division on the one side and liberalism leading to indifference on the other. The very word Catholic has become an exclusive term. Men have forfeited agreement but this could be restored if all would submit to universal tradition in points of dispute. Secondly, acting upon this rule would "throw the Church of England back upon the ground she held in the seventeenth century" (page 130) as shown by men like Ussher, Hammond and Bull and "bring us to a right apprehension of the leading principles of the Reformation". (page 132) And finally, it would restore full agreement with Primitive



Christianity. Apart from these practical benefits, the re-adoption of this rule would cure "the unconscious or overweening confidence with which we measure all truth by our own judgement and opinions" (page 133) and if this outward authority be of God, "the most docile submission is the highest grave". (page 134)

The publication of the Appendix in no way appeased Manning's critics. Mr. Bowdler, the editor of the "Record" accused him of apostasy and declared that "the Sermon was bad enough. The Appendix was abominable." (quoted in J. Fitzsimons: "Manning: Anglican and Catholic" page 9) The sermon and Appendix greatly offended the Low Church clergy of Chichester. As the successor of John Sargent, Manning had naturally been regarded as one of them and this declaration of his religious opinions led to attacks upon him in the press and at public meetings. Complaints were made to Bishop Otter of Chichester who wrote to Manning hoping to stop the publication of the Appendix but he was persuaded by Manning to let events take their course. The Bishop of Chester, however, lost no time in condemning both "The Rule of Faith" sermon and the Appendix.

The objections to Manning's views are best summed up in a letter written by Samuel Wilberforce, who was to see two of his brothers, Robert and Henry, and his wife's brother-in-law, Henry Edward Manning, break with their common Evangelical background and finally enter the Church of Rome. The letter was written in reply to an enquiry by a Miss M.S. Elliott as to his views on Manning's book. It is dated the

18th. May 1842.

"I believe the Bible and the Bible only to be the rule of faith; and I believe that to bring this strongly and sharply out is a matter of the greatest moment. I think the whole school of the Tract-writers fail here; that they speak, and seem to love to speak, ambiguously ~~of the necessity~~ of the necessity of tradition, and the tendency of all which (even if they do not mean what is positively erroneous) must be, I think, and is (1) to lead men to undervalue God's Word ( a tendency on which I enlarged in one of my Oxford sermons); (2) to lead men to regard the Romish view of tradition without suspicion and dread."

(quoted by Purcell vol. 1 page 139)

By 1838 Manning had clearly left the Evangelical wing of the Church with its insistence upon the sole authority of the Bible. For him the Scriptures alone could not be considered the rule of faith. From now on he would be counted among the High Churchmen. But this party label covers many shades of opinion. Manning was certainly not "High and Dry" as the old High Church group was being called. After the crisis of the Reform Bill few High Churchmen felt disposed to cling to the traditional alliance of "Church and King". But at the same time Manning was not firmly allied to the Tractarians. His life was not centred around Oxford and he was not among those who formed the inner core of the movement. While the Tractarians were being baited by C.P. Golightly and his subscription list for the Martyrs' Memorial Manning speaks of Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer as witnesses to the faith on a line with the Fathers of the Early Church. Keble and Newman had stirred up a great deal of public hostility by their publication in 1838 of Hurrell Froude's "Remains", presenting the world <sup>not only a</sup> with vehement denunciations of Rome but also with views that shocked the English people, contained in such phrases as "All the good I know of Cranmer is that he burnt well" and "really I hate the Reformation

and the Reformers more and more." This difference must not be overestimated however. The "Rule of Faith" and the Appendix both won the general approval of Newman to whom Manning sent a copy of the published sermon and the proof sheets of the Appendix. Newman would have approved of Manning's reverence for the Early Church and his view of the Church of England as its natural successor linked by the Apostolic Succession and referring to it questions of interpretation.

But as well as this agreement, their writings show something of the same mood. They were living in troubled times. Every aspect of human life was moving forward rapidly. This generation had lived through the Industrial and French Revolutions and it seemed in the intellectual ferment that the traditional institutions were coming under fire, and not least among them the Church. Newman, in the first of the Tracts, sounded the note of alarm. The clergy must show their power which does not lie in Church property, as is popularly supposed, but in their Apostolic Succession. Newman's language was deliberately alarmist and he concluded with the plea "Choose your side". No one can remain neutral in this struggle.

For Manning too these were troubled times as he clearly states in the closing passages of the "Rule of Faith" and he is prepared to take his side. This meant leaving the traditional allies of his. But the change would not have been as great as a later mind might suppose. The Tractarians were in many ways the successors of the Evangelicals, linked together in their early years at least, by the common pursuit of holiness. Also, at this early stage, high sacramental

teaching need not have been a barrier between them. It was the Evangelicals who had previously recalled Christians to the importance of frequent communion.

Having reached his position by contemplating the divisions that marked the Church, Manning was led to face the same threats that alarmed the Tractarians. He was forced to consider the nature of the relationship between Church and State. This question gave a new focus for his studies and was to make him an important spokesman in Church affairs.

Chapter Two

THE CHURCH AND THE STATE

At the time of the Reform Bill crisis Churchmen were understandably afraid of what measures the government might take to "reform" the Church. In the summer of 1832, Lord Henley the Evangelical brother-in-law of Sir Robert Peel, published "The Plan of Church Reform" which promised among other things a redistribution of ecclesiastical revenues by reducing the establishment of cathedrals and colleges so that poorer clergy might profit, a fairer deal for dissenters and the establishment of an Ecclesiastical Commission to take over the management of Church property and supervise the redeployment of its resources.

It was the Ecclesiastical Commission that became the main target for those opposed to such policies. At the beginning of his own indictment of the Commission in "The Principle of the Ecclesiastical Commission examined in a letter to the.....Bishop of Chichester", published in January 1838, Manning states, "I cannot remember having met any one, who has not expressed his regret and alarm at the very existence of the Ecclesiastical Commission." (page 7) However much this "regret and alarm" might be for the temporal powers of the Church, Manning's concern is for its spiritual authority. He objects to the Commission as "nothing less than a virtual extinction of the polity of the Church, and an open assumption of the principle that all legislative authority, ecclesiastical as well as civil

is derived from the secular power." (page 9)

He bases his arguments on a brief history of the organisation of the Church from which he concludes that the Church is empowered by her Apostolic commission to govern as well as to minister in the name of Christ "and that this power of government is not only judicial but legislative." (page 10) This power he sees as lying in the Diocesan and Provincial Councils. The Church adapted her organisation to fit in with the civil state. This was never forced upon her. With the conversion of Constantine the Church did not yield any of her legislative authority but the Empire added the force of law to the canons of the Church. The Anglican Church struggled to maintain this until the reign of Henry VIII when the ecclesiastical constitution began to break down and since 1664 "the Councils of the Church have existed only in shadow." (page 15)

Manning then turns to an examination of the Ecclesiastical Commission and its powers. It is secular in origin because it derives its being from secular authority, and secular in nature because although five bishops sit with the eight laymen, all the members are equal and the bishops have no authority to represent their brother bishops. They merely sit as members of the Commission. The Commission is also effectively under secular control since the majority of its members may be removed by the Crown. But although, for Manning at least, the Commission is a secular body, it nevertheless exercises powers traditionally held by Provincial Councils, namely those affecting the duties, position and

even the very existence of episcopal sees. Manning sees the Commission's intervention in the internal affairs of the dioceses to divide parishes and reduce Cathedral staffs as a violation of the integrity of the diocese and a breach of the spiritual jurisdiction of the bishop who is the proper authority in these matters.

Having shown that the Commission is a secular body exercising powers that properly belong to the bishops and Provincial Synods, Manning maintains that the Church is reduced to becoming one of a system of "functions" which issue from the centre of the civil power and the Commission will transmit the "popular will" to every part of the Church and make her subservient to Parliament. Where will this end?

"We shall have admitted a principle, which as it establishes a popular expediency in the place of what the Apostles ordained, so will it one day establish also the popular opinion in the place of what the Apostles taught." (page 37)

The Church has seen the supremacy of the Pope. It must now beware of the new supremacy, "the Pontificate of Parliament". Her unchangeableness, the very sign by which the Church shows her divine origin, is at stake here. Men will soon lose faith in a Church and priesthood of their own appointing.

But there is another side to the spiritual climate, namely those who are making a stand on the basis of the Apostolic Succession.

"On the other hand there is a high spirit abroad and stirring far and wide, and men are waking up to a sense both of their blessings and their duties, as members of a Church derived by lineal succession from the Apostles of the Lord." (page 41)

If the principle behind the Commission continues, however, it must one day bring on "the so-called separation of Church and State." (page 42) This is because "the present line of policy must make it, sooner or later, impossible to communicate with the established religion." (page 42) For Manning the only way of checking these false principles is by restoring absolute spiritual power as expressed through the meetings and decisions of all the bishops.

Manning continued this form of opposition to the Ecclesiastical Commission in a second letter to his Bishop entitled "The Preservation of ~~the~~ Unendowed Canonries" published in 1840. He is concerned solely with the assumption that "the alienation of the revenues must needs be accompanied by a suppression of the stalls." (page 6) He sees the proposed redistribution of cathedral resources by the state as usurping the traditional powers of the bishop, whose right it is to decide on the number and distribution of the clergy in his diocese. He bases his right to address his Diocesan on the priesthood's inalienable privilege to confer "even though it be only by way of respectful entreaty" (page 8) with their bishop on such a measure. His main argument is this.

"Most earnestly should we desire to preserve both the moral idea and the endowed character of the Cathedrals. But, if in the end, the revenues cannot be saved from alienation, I believe the body of the Church would cry with one voice - Rather let the whole accumulated property of the Chapters perish, than that the Cathedral presbyteries should be destroyed." (pages 7 and 8)

These two tracts show very clearly Manning's views on the relations that should exist between Church and State. For him they are parallel lines that can never cross. The



Church has adapted herself to fit in with the State but she is in no way dependent upon ~~an~~ nor answerable to the State. Her traditional means of government, the Provincial and Diocesan Councils have lapsed but these could easily be restored and the Church's continuity with her Apostolical commission is guaranteed through the body of bishops linked through the Apostolic Succession. The bishops have the authority to regulate affairs in their own dioceses and meeting together to decide upon questions of more far-reaching importance. It is from them and not from the State that any proposed reforms should come.

But the bishops do not stand alone in the government of the Church. At the end of his letter on "The Preservation of Unendowed Canonries" Manning quotes Lord John Russell's disapproval of the idea of a council of "Presbyters" acting with their bishop on the grounds that it might be a check and hinderance. (The Times of June 30th. 1840) In Manning's view history has shown that the episcopate is strongest when backed by the clergy and morally weakest when isolated from them, even though it be supported by all the powers of Parliament. He has an exalted view of cathedral chapters as the almost exclusive means of preserving the purity of the faith by fostering great teachers, by being teaching centres for candidates for Holy Orders and above all by their main function which is "to pray without ceasing, and by frequent ministrations of the Eucharist, to keep up a standing memory and witness of Christ's holy sacrifice." ("The Principle of the Ecclesiastical Commission Examined..." page 31) These cathedral chapters also bind the diocese to the ~~State~~

Mother Church and the holders of cathedral posts to all the riches of the past, and to one another by the common privileges and common worship that they share. Even if the traditional revenues were diverted from some of these posts, the holders would only have lost the "separable accidents of wealth". More self-denial and sacrifice would be required of them, "but in that very self-denial may be seen the pledge and surety of a more devoted service." ("The Preservation of Endowed Canonries" page 15)

But when this picture of the organisation of the Church has been drawn, it remains to be asked how far it was or could be in tune with the situation in England at that time. In 1837 Manning had been prominent at a clerical meeting at Chichester where it had been agreed to correspond with the clergy of the diocese on the following subject - "That all Church matters ought to be administered by the Church alone, i.e. by Bishops and clergy, and the King and laity in communion with the Church." (Manning's words in a letter to Samuel Wilberforce dated 2nd. May 1837, quoted by Purcell vol 1 page 147) Since the abolition of the Test and Corporation Acts, Catholic Emancipation and the reform of Parliament there was no longer any guarantee that Parliament would be made up of "laity in communion with the Church", and so the idea of Parliamentary interference would be opposed by all those holding a "High" view of the Church. When in 1834 there had been rumours that Parliament intended to legislate over Church rates, Samuel Wilberforce, who was in no sense a Tractarian or follower of Newman, wrote to a friend,

"What right has Parliament to touch my chancel - or to say that because a few empty-headed and strong-hearted babblers make a great outcry - and say that they are half of the Population when they are not one 10th of it: the country shall be taxed to pay for the ancient liabilities of their Property."  
(quoted by D. Newsome "The Parting of Friends" page 213)

However nominal the adherence of some Members of Parliament may have been in the past, there was now a situation where some Members were openly hostile to the Church.

But there was another aspect of the established Church that seemed at variance with Manning's views. One of the four reasons that he gives for preserving the twenty-eight non-residentiary Prebendaries of Chichester Cathedral in his letter on the unendowed canonries, is that they form an important part of those summoned to elect a new bishop.

"By the happy agreement of the civil and spiritual powers, this check has become little else than a theory; and the Statute of Praemunire no more than a dormant threat. Nevertheless, it is manifestly at variance with the practice of the Church in her purer times, that the Presbyters of a diocese should be represented in the election of their Bishop by only five of their brethren."  
(page 13)

But surely the "variance" lies not in the number of presbyters involved but in the fact that by conge d'elire the election has become a mere formality on their part. Although, according to his Journal, written some forty years later, he had regarded the Royal Supremacy as "an invasion of the Headship of our Lord" as early as 1833, nevertheless in his published works of this period he does not go as far as Hurrell Froude who in his "Remarks on State Interference in Matters Spiritual" ("Remains" vol 11 part 1 pages 184-269) attacks not only the system of episcopal election, but also the helplessness of bishops in excluding unfit persons from

livings to which they had been presented by a patron unless heresy or gross immorality could be proved against them.

Both men agree that a compromise is impossible. Hurrell

Froude sums up his attitude in his "Remarks on Church Discipline"

"The body of the English nation either are sincere Christians or they are not; if they are, they will submit to Discipline as readily as the primitive Christians did. If not, - let us tell the truth and shame the devil; let us give up a National Church and have a real one." ("Remains" vol 11 part1 page 274)

It remained to be seen whether this "happy agreement" was strong enough to cover the contradictions that existed between Manning's views on the relations between Church and State, and the reality which he served as an incumbent and later as the Archdeacon of Chichester.

Because Manning and those who thought like him were opposed to the Ecclesiastical Commission, it does not follow that they were opposed to the idea of Church reform. But this reform had to come from within the Church and through its traditional councils and authorities. At the parish level Manning had from the beginning of his ministry tried to educate his parishioners in the doctrine and discipline of the Church. In a letter to Samuel Wilberforce dated 12th. January 1834, he tells him about a course of sermons he is starting on "the Liturgy, the ministerial office, and the doctrine and discipline of our Church." He also took very seriously his duty to maintain this discipline among his flock and this led to his use of the sacrament of Penance and his encouragement of private confession. His dedication was noted by his superiors and in 1837 he was made a rural dean and in 1838, in

recognition of his work for education and the setting up of Diocesan Boards, he was made the Secretary of the Chichester Board. Purcell describes his work during this period thus,

"The variety of his labours shows not only the almost inexhaustible energy of his character, but the courageous hopefulness of his heart. . . . His heart was attracted to every plan or scheme set afloat by himself or his friends for the advancement of the Church. His hand was put in help to every man's plough."  
(vol 1 page 176)

An important contribution to the cause of education was his sermon entitled "National Education" and published in 1838. His main argument was that there was a desperate need for a national educational system and that it was the responsibility of the Church and not the State to fulfil this need. The secular ideal of education is that men should be "good and peaceable citizens, and useful members of the Commonwealth." But faith gives education a much deeper meaning. It becomes a "remoulding of the whole nature a rooting out of evil, a ripening of good, and a shaping of the inward character after an heavenly example." (page 17) And so religious and secular education cannot be separated. Religion is the basis of education; there is not a formal and separate indoctrination but a continual intermixture of the two." (page 20) In this system doctrine must be taught first and the proof afterwards. If the doctrine is true it is a "blessing as great as man can receive." (page 23) Characteristically he does not stop to consider the other alternative. On the question of where the control

of this educational system should Manning is quite definite. "In all spiritual teaching the Church must always have the supreme control." (page 30) For the other forms of teaching, "We have again a rule supplied to us in the Universities, and many endowed schools, in which there is a combined system of management and administration. In them the laity of the Church have their places, and measures of control." (page 32) And there is no doubt that "the Church is thoroughly furnished with everything needful for the education of a great and intelligent people." (page 32)

On Christmas Eve, 1840 the aged Archdeacon Webber of Chichester resigned and much to the joy of the Tractarians, Bishop Shuttleworth, though firmly anti-Tractarian, offered the post to Manning. As might be expected, Manning's understanding of the office of Archdeacon was as exalted as his understanding of the office of Priest, and this, linked with his concern for restoring the Church to her ancient purity, shaped much of his thought and action in the following years. In his first Visitation Charge as Archdeacon, preached in Chichester Cathedral in July 1848, he sets out a history of the Visitations to ascertain their "real character and use" and then poses the question "How can we derive from these yearly Visitations the greatest good to the Church and to ourselves?" (page 9) For the first fourteen hundred years of the Church's history, Manning maintains, there was a "tenacious accumulation of all that was true, and of all that looked like truth." (page 10)

This continued, including such things as national customs and local rites, until the Church's powers of cohesion became exhausted and since that time, for the last four hundred years, the opposite process has been going on. Since the Reformation, that "gracious act of God's providence towards his Church" (page 12) but not caused by it, he is careful to add, there has been an "appalling process of declension, and a strange forfeiture of the powers of truth." (page 13)

In her struggles with these times the Church has incurred two main losses; her Synods and Councils for canonical legislation and the decay and disuse of the Spiritual Courts. With regard to the latter he concentrates on the "penitential office". He quotes Thorndike, "We publicly profess to seek the restoring of Penance, and because we have not effectively sought that which we profess to seek, God hath brought on us that heavy judgement which we have felt." (page 27) The Church of England is founded upon the power of the keys and therefore where that power is not exercised there is "a Church in hope and right rather than in deed and being." (page 27) Manning concludes that although the Church of England preserves "in all its integrity the Apostolical deposit of the Faith and Polity" and her incorporation into Common Law means that "there is no title to power or possession which can prescribe before her" nevertheless "by the suspension of her living administrative power of legislation and correction, it is not to be denied that she is at a disadvantage in the task she has to fulfil as the Teacher and Guide of the People." (page 27)

It is in this situation that he poses the question of the role of the Visitations in the life of the diocese and the Church. Manning proposes four ways in which they can help to compensate for the losses incurred by the Church. Firstly, the duties of the Visitation must be faithfully discharged. To this end he explains in detail the duties of churchwardens. Secondly, they should be regarded as "the public and solemn Chapter of the Archdeaconry". For example, they provide an opportunity to explain the decisions in recent court cases and their relevance to Church life, and this he proceeds to do. Thirdly, by using these conferences, "we shall be able in many most important ways to develop the system of the Church, and adapt its existing provisions to the condition of the people. And this we may do by an uniform restoration of the rules and order to which we are already pledged." (page 39) Fourthly, by their moral power and effect they will produce not only uniformity but above all unity. "A desire for unity is a token that He is with us." "It is in our unity that the Church must be united; and it is in her unity that she will find her strength." (page 43)

As with his other major sermons, Manning ends with an eloquent appeal to his hearers - this time it is for unity. The strength of the Church lies not in civil power but "in the inflexibility of a holy will." "It is not coercion.....but charity, that must bind men's hearts to us." (page 45) The Church has everything necessary for the task before her. "All she needs is the internal organisation



which shall give outlet and guidance to the strong currents of human character; and unity which shall make them harmonious in their many movements, and hold them all in one." (page 48)

Manning's appointment as Archdeacon gave him much wider scope for furthering his ideas on the reform of the Church. As can be seen from his first Visitation Charge these were based not on the redeployment of her resources but the revitalising of her structure, bringing out into the light of day primitive practices that had been neglected in the past. One important idea that came to occupy much of his consideration at this time was the idea of Unity. It was the basis of the appeal in the Charge of 1841 and it was to be the subject of the major literary work of his Anglican days. It was also the basis of his second Visitation Charge preached in 1842.

After expressing his concern about the structural condition of many of the parish churches, Manning deals with two important aspects of parish life setting them in the wider context of the unity of the Church. The first subject that he examines is private pews. Aesthetically they are large and take up a great deal of room in the church. He has even seen places where part of the ancient stonework has been cut away to fit them into the nave. But there is a more important criticism.

"Now in this way the absolute community of the area of the Church has been overlaid by an equally absolute establishment of the theory of private

property. What was once a type of the communion of saints and the courts of the heavenly Jerusalem has, in this way, been too often degraded into a very compendium of exclusiveness and a field of jealous litigation." (page 16)

The poor, also, must either sit in a remote part of the church or else be excluded altogether. There is the argument that pews give privacy and therefore aid devotion, but this he dismisses as being contrary to the whole idea of public worship and as giving the rich an advantage, spiritually, over the poor. However, past experience has warned him against private pews because of the deep feelings that are bound up with them and so he is not prepared to open "an universal warfare" (page 22) against them. But he does appeal to his hearers to set an example by doing away with their private pews. One common seating arrangement exemplifies a very important principle. It is "a manifestation that in Christ all things are united; that in Him there is 'neither bond nor free;' that the mysteries of creation and regeneration are laws alike to all." And again, "From time to time - be it for ever so short a season - all men were reminded of their natural equality, and of their equal need of one and the same atoning sacrifice." (page 12) Underlying, then, what might be considered an architectural question are deep theological issues. The Church does not recognise the State's distinctions of rank or wealth. All men are sinners and when they enter the church building they are equal in their need for the benefits of Christ's atoning work. They have no right to any part of the church for their exclusive use. This is a

further practical application of Manning's ideas on the supremacy of the Church in matters spiritual. Open benches instead of high, boxed-in, private pews are an outward expression of the totally different order that exists within the Church.

The second subject to which he turns his attention is the need in the Church for new revenues to pay for the new tasks to which she is pledged - almsgiving, building and restoring churches, providing parish schools and teachers, propagating the faith throughout the Empire and beyond. These activities need more than the resources provided by the church societies and endowments.

"Where, then, shall we find a principle which shall be universal in its extent, containing in itself the law of proportionate oblations, and interwoven with our acts of worship? Nowhere else than.....in the Offertory of the Church." (page 30)

This will not happen automatically,

"The will to give must, under God, be ripened in our people by the instruction and persuasion on our part; and this is true both of rich and poor." (page 31)

Almsgiving is the right of all and not "a refinement of the rich". And the laity, through the churchwardens, have a say in the disposal of the money which contrary to popular belief does not have to be used within the bounds of the parish. Again Manning's ideas on the unity of the Church find practical expression in the everyday life of the parish church. Just as there is no distinction between christians as regards ~~as regards~~ their place in the church, so there is no distinction between them when it comes to supporting her work. Their contributions are not expected to be equal, but they

are all expected to contribute according to their means. Again, then, the social order and social distinctions have no place in the life of the Church.

His customary final, eloquent appeal is again on the subject of Unity. There are not only divisions in the Church, but there is also diversity within the Church of England. However, diversity does not imply the moral breach of a division and minds heated by controversy do not see that "The unity of the Church as it was impressed in the beginning in this land is still uneffaced." (page 42) The Church has fought and overcome many enemies in the past. The whole history of the Church of England may be a training for the work to be done.

Manning's studies on the question of Unity finally came to fruition in 1842 in the most substantial published work of his Anglican days, "The Unity of the Church". In a letter to Samuel Wilberforce written in 1850 he explains his state of mind when he wrote the book.

"In 1841 I.....had learned that unity is a first law of the Church of Christ and that our position was tenable only as an extreme and anomalous case: full of difficulty and fatal if we could be shewn to be at variance with universal Tradition in Faith and Discipline."

"These three revealed laws, Succession, Tradition, and Unity plainly convinced me of two things.

First, that Protestantism is both a schism and a heresy.

Secondly, that the Church of England is alone tenable as a portion of the Universal Church and bound by its traditions of Faith and Discipline. From which it further became manifest to me (and that on the plainest proofs of Holy Scripture) that as the Universal Church is guided and kept in the Faith by the Holy Spirit it is impossible that any authoritative contradictions of Faith should exist in it."

(Quoted by D. Newsome page 274)

c The book is divided into three parts entitled respectively, "The History and Exposition of the Doctrine of Catholic Unity", "The Moral Design of Catholic Unity", and "The Doctrine of Catholic Unity Applied to the Actual State of Christendom". In the first part, after citing the evidence of the Early Fathers, Manning concludes "that a belief in the Unity of the Church, however expressed in words, was required of every candidate for Christian baptism from the beginning of the Gospel." (page 28) He then summarises the teachings of the "uninspired writers", men like Augustine and Irenaeus, as holding that the Church is made up of two parts, the visible, imperfect part, including in its members evil men and the invisible, perfect part, These are linked by "the most strict and energetic personal union" (page 67) The unity of the former part is "two-fold, organic in its origin and polity and moral in its peace and charity; the visible mark or character of unity being communion with pastors deriving lawful succession from the Apostles of Christ." (page 67) But Manning is not prepared to base his arguments on these writers alone. The main witnesses must be the "inspired writers" of the Bible and these he finds in complete agreement with the "uninspired". At the end of this first part of the work he comes to an important conclusion about the nature of christian unity.

"We have found it to consist partly of a definite form of doctrine and discipline delivered to mankind by Christ and his Apostles, and partly of the relation and order subsisting among those who received it. We have called these the organic and moral, or the objective and subjective unity of the Church: the

organic or objective unity being 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: the moral or subjective unity being oneness of communion internally among the several members of each church, and externally among the several churches throughout the world." (pages 161-2)

The moral unity of Christians is made up of two elements, subordination and charity. The subordination is to their lawful pastors and the charity is towards their brethren. An outline of the first form of Christian unity is given in the words "They continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in the breaking of bread and in prayers". The Apostles's doctrine and fellowship provided the faith and polity and the breaking of bread and prayers provided the moral unity of charity and worship. Moral unity comes about through unity at the local church level transmitted through their pastors to diocesan level and through their bishops to the world-wide Church. This unity is secured through the one Eucharist, letters passing between the churches, and synods and councils whether diocesan or general.

"The moral unity of the Church, therefore, consists in a communion of all Churches in worship and practice, in friendly intercourse and correspondence, and in all judicial, deliberative, and executive acts." (page 161)

The second part of the work is concerned with the Church's part in the plans of God for men. First, and most important of all, "the positive appointment or form in which He has provided for the accomplishment of these ends is His Church." (page 185) The one Church is the earthly witness of the one Holy Trinity. Also, "the objective Unity of the

Church is a means of restoring man to the image of God, by expressing and transmitting the knowledge of that image in the manhood of Christ." (page 254) The unity is impressed upon man through the one gift of regeneration and the one organic discipline. It also unites all nations, bringing them under one authority and restricts the extravagances of man to that unity of rational and moral will that is the image of God in him. But the unity of the Church is also a test of man's faith and will.

"God has promised that His one Church shall be always visible, not that it shall be always internally united. The parables of the wheat and the tares, and of the good fish and the bad, are prophecies that there shall always be the elements of moral division. That these should for a time prevail is according to the nature of probation, and the experience of the Church from the beginning." (page 276)

In the third and final part of the book he applies his studies to the contemporary situation. The title of the first chapter "The Unity of the Church the only Revealed Way of Salvation" shows his approach to the subject. From what he has shown before it is clear that "the one visible Church is of the nature of a sacrament, both representing and making men partakers of the salvation which is in Christ." (page 305) The distinction between the visible Church and the invisible communion of saints is that between "potentiality" and "actuality". All members of the visible Church are regenerate through baptism, They are "in the first disposition towards the mind of Christ".(page 306) They are saints "in posse". Even those who live thoroughly evil lives are of the nature of saints. Though they do not possess

them, they are capable of "the energies and habits of holiness". (page 306) But those who follow the spirit of God and become holy in energy and habit are saints "in esse". They are one with Christ by a conscious choice and their wills become one with His will. Manning illustrates this distinction by comparing the relationship between invisible and visible with the relationship between the invisible fellowship of those who "verily and indeed receive the body and blood of Christ" (page 306) and make up the true mystical body of Christ, and the visible communicants at the Eucharist.

In the second chapter of Part III he turns his attention firstly to those who have rejected the objective unity of doctrine and discipline. They are "not necessarily formal but only material heretics." (page 308) They are descendants of those who originally caused the break and they have inherited their situation without necessarily having been a party to its cause. Their minds have been distorted because they have never known the truth and their lives impoverished through lack of spiritual discipline. But among such sects there are many who appear to lead truly Christian lives. How do they stand in relation to salvation? God has promised to sanctify men through His Church.

"The wisdom of God is manifold; and of all the ways of bringing about the same end, He has revealed but one. And while we know of no other, and can trust ourselves to no other, and dare teach men to rely on no other, yet we may well believe He has reserved many more ways in His own power. We who see men under the energy of God's Spirit without His Sacraments, may well hope that they shall partake of salvation without His Church." (page 311)



Secondly he considers those who have forfeited the objective Unity of the Church only in part and these are of two kinds. There are firstly "those who have in part forfeited the unity of doctrine, but retained the discipline." It must be said that it is necessary for churches to keep both, but even so God can still "gather out many unto everlasting life" from "mutilated" churches. His choosing of them and tending for nearly four hundred years is a sure sign of His favour. Only those who led the churches are responsible for the breach, the ordinary men and women cannot be blamed. With regard to the validity of their orders and sacraments he follows St. Augustine. "To such as are thus morally disposed, we may hopefully believe that, though uncanonical, they are both valid and efficacious." (page 323) Discipline also, still remains among them as "a moral institution bearing upon the formation of the individual character." (page 323) Again Manning sounds a note of hope for those who are separated from all the riches of the Church.

"The dogma, therefore, that in the One Church alone there is salvation, in no way hinders our hopefully believing that many belong to the soul of the One Church who, by forfeiting a portion of their trust, have fallen from the one visible body; nor is the objective exactness of this dogma as a revealed verity infringed by such a hope." (page 323)

The second group of those who have forfeited the objective unity of the Church only in part are "those who have made forfeit of the discipline, but retained the doctrine of the Church." (page 324) It is true that when the word

"discipline" means the detailed orders and rules of administration which may develop out of the Apostolical authority, for example the penitential code, then it may be changed. But when it includes forms of Church government this is completely untrue. Throughout the book Manning has maintained that man may not remould the Church because "it is ordained to remould his very being." (page 325) Doctrine and discipline cannot be separated. God has ordained a means of applying to each man the benefits of Christ's work. In this category are included the Lutherans, Zwinglians, and Calvinists, who, assuming that they have retained their heritage of doctrine intact, have set up a ministry of their own. After a detailed discussion of lay baptism, Manning concludes that these bodies have lost the authority transmitted by succession from the Apostles and that though the original break was not their fault, the Lutherans deliberately rejected Apostolic discipline when they could have received it. The loss of discipline however has also led to a loss of doctrine. "We find in every case that they have forfeited, more or less, the doctrine also." (page 347)

The final chapter of Part III turns from the loss of objective unity to the loss of subjective unity. He now considers those churches which while retaining the objective unity of doctrine and discipline, have forfeited the subjective unity of inter-communion. First, regarding the split between the East and the West, both sides were at fault, the East by violence and the West by ambition.

The East was wrong to denounce the "Filioque" clause as heretical and the West was wrong to require its acceptance as if it had the sanction of a General Council. But the blame for keeping the schism open must be laid at the door of Rome. But, "on neither side is there either formal heresy or schism of such a kind as to cut them off from the one visible Church and from communion with the one Head of the Church in heaven,"(page 359) Although there is wrong on both sides, there may also be salvation there. Both have obscured the light of truth but at the same time they retain the whole discipline of Christ. In the objective unity they are still one but their subjective unity is grievously broken and they have deprived each other of their mutual influence which would have acted as a healthy check upon both of them. He then considers the breach between the Roman and Anglican churches. "The same exaggerated claim of universal jurisdiction was the cause of the division in both cases." (page 361) And like the Orthodox, "There is no one point in which the British Churches can be attainted of either heresy or schism." (page 362) The Church of England, like the Orthodox Church, accepts the canonical Scriptures, the Catholic Creeds, the first six General Councils (although the Orthodox Church also accepts the seventh) and rejects all subsequent Western councils pretending to be ecumenical. "She (the Church of England) has rejected - what the Eastern Churches rejected before her - the arrogant pretence of an universal pontificate rashly alleged to be of divine right, imposed in open breach

of apostolical traditions, and the canons of many councils." (page 363) He therefore comes naturally to the conclusion that,

"The suspension, therefore, of communion between the Churches of England and Rome is no hindrance to the obtaining of salvation on both sides."  
(page 365)

Despite the hard things that Manning has said about the ambition and aggression of Rome he gladly acknowledges that both sides contain the whole system of doctrine and discipline with a valid succession and sacraments and these are not jeopardised by Rome's "corrupt traditions and ensnaring doctrines".(page 365)

In his general conclusion Manning sums up his approach to the unity of the Church of Christ. The doctrine of this unity goes back to the earliest times, witnessing to the fact that this one body must be to us both an object of faith and of sense. It is an object of faith in so far as it is invisible and an object of sense in so far as it is visible in the world. The invisible includes all those past, present and future who are numbered among the saints. The visible includes all those throughout the world professing the catholic faith under their lawful pastors. For, each member of the visible Church, his own part of it represents to him the whole. It is "the pledge of the Church Universal" (page 368) The altar where he communicates receives the love and loyalty that he owes to the One Holy Church throughout the world because it is both a part of and a representative of the whole Church. This doctrine, it is to be remembered, was revealed before the Church took shape unlike "the many pious theories that attempt to find a scheme that will embrace all professing

christians." Men's minds have been bribed by their wishes, or perplexed by their difficulties, into lower and looser conceptions of unity." (page 370) But Manning's arguments are ascribed to the original revelation and so are affected by no such considerations. The doctrine can<sup>only</sup> be shown to be false, therefore, by Holy Scripture and the witness of the undivided Church, that is, the same source as the evidence which attests it. It is impossible to find a scheme which includes all communities within the unity of the Church without giving men the right to make and unmake the conditions as they will. The communities of Christians that have broken from the unity of the one Church must therefore await Christ's judgement. Let us "judge nothing before the time;" still less try to escape our difficulties by changing the ordinances of God. (page 371) As a final point, the doctrine of Catholic Unity is definite like all the other articles of the creed, and direct in its bearing upon our practice as Christians. It keeps men free from becoming entangled in controversies. The Catholic Christian does not need to seek out the one Church, he is already incorporated into it by baptism. Christian Unity, then, for Manning becomes the responsibility of every catholic Christian.

"The baptised man that steadfastly believes his baptismal creed, and in contrition of heart both meetly partakes of the holy Eucharist and watchfully lives in accordance with the rule of that holy mystery, is not far from the kingdom of heaven. These, and no others, are the true conditions of Catholic unity, the only necessary terms of Catholic communion. More than this the Church has no power, and less than this she dare not fail to require of all Christian men." (page 372)

All unity, then, apart from the objective unity of doctrine and discipline, is a "moral habit" (page 373) which produces agreement of opinion rather than being produced by it. The "Unity of the Church" ends with a hope for the future.

"Let us steadfastly trust that our long-lost heir-loom will once more be found when by the grace of God the pride and arrogance, the selfishness, and the contentious spirit of man are brought down to the primitive traditions of the one, holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church." (page 373)

Among the immediate causes of the book had been the publication of Gladstone's "Church and State" and Manning dedicated his work to him. Purcell quotes Gladstone's opinion of the book.

"Manning has never surpassed that work. In writing his "Life" as an Anglican you will find it the best illustration of his religious opinions, though, perhaps in parts, it is somewhat wanting in depth and solidarity." (Vol I page 271)

Purcell also quotes Manning's remarks on hearing these words.

"Mr. Gladstone has good reason for praising that work; for it was the best apology I could make for the Anglican Church - and the last." (Vol I page 271)

In his letter to Samuel Wilberforce, (quoted above, page 40) Manning explains that his state of mind in 1841 was based on his understanding of the three revealed laws of Succession, Tradition and Unity. In 1835 his sermon on the English Church had set out clearly his ideas on the Apostolic Succession. He saw it as the basis of the Church's authority and the guarantee of her Apostolicity. His sermon entitled "The Rule of Faith", and the Appendix that was after published with it, were an exposition of

his ideas on Tradition. Scripture, he never doubted, was the one foundation and proof of faith but it still needed an interpreter in the form of the Creed which had always existed independently. Where this was not explicit, then "depositions of evidence" such as the Thirty-Nine Articles were to be used. With the publication of the work on the Unity of the Church, his exposition of these three laws was complete. The Church of England, he believed, had lost only the subjective unity of intercommunion not the objective unity of doctrine and discipline. She therefore formed one of the three authentic branches of the Church, and like the Roman and Orthodox communions she was one of the means, ordained by God, through which men may reach salvation. He did not maintain a firm "nulla salus extra ecclesiam" being content to assert that it was only within the Catholic Church, the only revealed means to salvation, that one could be sure.

1842 marks a watershed in Manning's struggle to defend the Church of England against the liberal and Low Church tendencies of the time and later against charges of Romanism from the one side and the objections of Roman Catholic thinkers like Wiseman on the other. But it soon became clear that what should have been the summit of his years of research, and a stronghold against the forces that he saw attacking the Church, was to be no more than a temporary resting place. We must now trace the development of his thought in the period that followed and see how he came to reject the views that he had argued for so forcibly. To

do this, and to see more clearly his relations with the great movement of thought at Oxford we shall trace his relations with John Henry Newman from the time when Manning was looked upon as a likely agent for the Tracts back in the early 1830's up to Newman's secession in 1845.



Chapter Three

RELATIONS WITH NEWMAN

Any discussion of the relations between Manning and Newman must inevitably be coloured by their later exchanges when one was the leader of the Roman Catholics in England and the other was living in enforced obscurity. It is very easy to overestimate the essential difference between the two men. In his essay in "Eminent Victorians", Lytton Strachey bases ~~of~~ his study of Manning on this difference between "the eagle" and "the dove." Newman is "a child of the Romantic Revival, a creature of emotion and of memory, a dreamer whose secret spirit dwelt apart in delectable mountains, an artist whose subtle senses caught, like a shower in the sunshine, the impalpable rainbow of the immaterial world." ("Eminent Victorians" page 23) This picture of Newman was meant to heighten Strachey's interpretation of Manning as little more than an ambitious man skilled in ecclesiastical politics. Critics were not slow to point out that whatever may have been the truth about Manning, however, Newman was very far from being like a dove and Strachey later conceded this. He wrote to Augustine Birrell (2nd June 1918)

"Your criticism of the "eagle and dove" passage went home. It is certainly melodramatic, and I should like to alter it. I think perhaps my whole treatment of Newman is over-sentimentalized - to make a foil for the other Cardinal."  
(quoted by M. Holroyd "Lytton Strachey and the Bloomsbury Group" page 185)

But Manning's association with Newman began as we have seen in the early 1830's, around the time when the first of

the Tracts made its appearance. Far from being the aged cardinals of later photographs they were the two young men preserved for us in the paintings and sketches of the artist Richmond. We have also seen that although his thoughts were developing along similar lines to those of Newman, Manning was never a member of that group of friends that surrounded Newman. Once the initial contact had been made, however, the two men kept up a correspondence that was to last for many years.

In his "Apologia" Newman explains that while he was writing his work on the Arians "great events were happening at home and abroad, which brought out into form and passionate expression the various beliefs which had so gradually been winning their way into my mind." (page 118) He lists these as being the overthrowing of the Bourbon dynasty in France, the Reform Bill crisis, the Whig government and Lord Grey's insistence that the bishops should set their house in order, and the threats and insults that Church dignitaries had been forced to endure in public. The vital question had become "How were we to keep the Church from being liberalised?" The meeting at Hadleigh Rectory decided that this should be done through the written word and so began the Tracts for the Times. The foundation of their defence of the Church against the attacks of liberalism was, as we have seen, the Apostolic Succession. This was the argument of the first of the Tracts. These early writings were, in the words of Dean Church, "like the short, sharp, rapid utterances of men in pain and danger and pressing emergency." ("The Oxford Movement; Twelve Years")

pagello) Apostolic Succession was made a rallying cry, an objective fact to stand against liberal subjectivism. That Manning was also thinking along these lines is shown by his use of the priesthood's Apostolic descent as the basis of his sermon on the English Church, preached two years after the publication of the first Tract. Here we have not a clarion call but a detailed exposition investigating the character of the priestly office. The succession is carefully traced back to the earliest times and the Church of England is shown to be standing in a direct line from the Apostles. Like Newman, Manning goes on to exhort his hearers to make the most of their office. Descent from the Apostles is not just of historical interest, it is a spur to the present holders to show that they have received with their office a real spiritual heritage. Both Newman and Manning, however, in their anxiety to set up the Succession as a firm basis for their defence of the Church oversimplify the idea through their uncritical approach to history. They base the Apostolicity of the Church of England on an unbroken chain of consecrator and consecrated going back to the Apostles. One break in the chain, by their arguments, would bring that Apostolicity into doubt. Their refusal to distinguish the permanence of the institution of the three-fold ministry from the exact succession of the individual ministers is a weakness in their theory. They could call upon a long line of Anglican witnesses to the necessity for the Apostolic Succession, but men like Hooker and Andrewes took a broader view, seeing it as only a part of the fundamental bond between Antiquity and the present day.

The Apostolic Succession alone could not be more than a starting point for both Newman and Manning in their consideration of the nature of the true Church. A half way stage between this one-sided emphasis and the later, fuller working out of their principles can be seen in the two tracts written by Newman, numbers 38 and 41, called the "Via Media" Tracts. They take the form of a discussion between Laicus and Clericus. The former is concerned because "The world accuses you of Popery, and there are seasons when I have misgivings whither you are carrying me." (Tract 38 page 13) He then brings forward the popular reproaches of popery. Clericus suggests that the Church has departed from the liturgy and therefore from the spirit of the Reformers. The daily saying of Morning and Evening Prayer is considered by many to be popish and yet it is required by the Prayer Book. Clericus objects to the interference from Geneva at the time of the English Reformation. He does not want to separate himself entirely from the reformed Churches of the Continent but he does not want to be forced into a close alliance with them either.

"The glory of the English Church is that it has taken the VIA MEDIA as it has been called. It lies between the (so called) Reformers and the Romanists;" (page 20)

He then turns his attention to the complaint that his "system" adds to the formularies

of the Church doctrines not contained in them.

"I receive the Church as a messenger from CHRIST, rich in treasures old and new, rich with the accumulated wealth of ages."

"Our Articles are one portion of that accumulation. Age after age, fresh battles have been fought with heresy, fresh monuments of truth set up. As I will not consent to be deprived of the records of the Reformation, so neither will I part with those of former times." (pages 23 and 24)

The Articles are not a "body of divinity" but in the main "only protests against certain errors of a certain period of the Church." (page 24) For example, the inspiration of Holy Scripture, though fundamentally important, is nowhere to be found in the Articles. The first tract is concluded with a list of objections to Rome. Many of these are practical, for example services in "an unknown tongue" but together they form a thorough-going condemnation of her faith and practice. The second of the two tracts maintains the need for a second Reformation because the Church "has in a measure 'forgotten' its own principles, as declared in the sixteenth century;" (page 28) The Church should add protests against Erastianism and Latitudinarianism to the Articles and append a section on the power of the Church to the catechism. These two tracts widen the appeal of Newman's arguments. It is not just a matter of reasserting the basis of Church order. The liturgy, preaching and doctrine of the Church must be re-examined in the light of the "treasures old and new" preserved by the Church.

The full working out of the theory of the Church of England as the Via Media between Romanism and Protestantism was achieved first by Newman in his "Lectures on the Prophetic Office of the Church viewed relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism." The book was published

in 1837 and was based on a course of lectures that he had given in the Adam de Brome Chapel in St. Mary's. His approach is very similar to that of Manning in "The Rule of Faith" preached one year later. They are both concerned to show that the Church of England is a genuine branch of the Church Catholic, and that it stands between the errors of Romanism on the one hand and popular Protestantism on the other. For Newman, the Protestant-s all accept the written word of God as the supreme arbiter of their differences but they cannot agree over it. The Romanists, at the other extreme, hold along with the Scriptures "the existing Traditions of the Church", which are too varied to be reduced to writing. But this cannot be proved and so "as a beautiful theory it must, as a whole, ever remain." (page 33) These two corruptions are quite different. The Roman "assumption" is "the misdirection and abuse, not the absence of right principle" whilst "popular Protestantism is wanting in the principle." (page 41)

Both Manning and Newman have to outline a system for their Via Media that gives against the Protestants a proper place to Tradition and against the Romanists a theory of Tradition that will link the contemporary Church with Antiquity and exclude all innovations. Newman sees that it is necessary to meet the Romanists on the ground of Antiquity where we must "maintain that his professed Tradition is not really such, that it is a Tradition of men, that it is not continuous, that it stops short of the Apostles, that the

history of its introduction is known." ("Prophetical Office" pages 37 and 38) Manning does this by establishing the Scriptures as the sole foundation and proof of faith as interpreted by Tradition in the form of the Creeds and the "depositions of evidence". He makes it clear that the Creeds were not in the first place derived from the Scriptures but that in each local church were the particular scriptures that it had received as well as its witness to the whole Gospel which existed independently and from which the Creeds were derived. Newman too places primary emphasis on the Scriptures and like Manning he sees that they need the interpretation of Tradition. For him, the faith "which was once delivered to the Saints"(page 277) "the treasure and the life of the Church, the qualification of membership, and the rule of its teaching" is the Creed "not in its mere letter, but in its living sense". (page 277-8) To deny or resist this faith is not the lawful use of private judgement but "heresy or scepticism." (page 278) The faith as embodied in the Creed has been accepted as such by the Church from the beginning and this is maintained by all its branches even though divided. It is true that the Roman Church enforces other articles but these are irreconcilable with the doctrine of the Early Fathers. She has "cursed those whom God has not cursed, and defied those whom the Lord has not defied". (quoted page 278) It has been argued that the Church of England has done the same thing by drawing up the Thirty-Nine Articles and imposing them on believers but for Newman they are articles of "religion" and not of "faith". They are not based on divine authority

but ecclesiastical sanction. As a test against Romanism their introduction was more a political than an ecclesiastical act. The decrees of the Council of Trent, on the other hand were not merely the publication of doctrines which lay hidden in the Creed, but the enforcement of them as necessary points of faith and this "presumptuous dogmatism" is far from the sense in which the Articles are adopted by the Church of England as instruments of Catholic teaching and "heads" of important chapters in revealed truth.

v The Creed is a collection, then, of definite articles set apart from the beginning, passed on from believer to believer, repeated at baptism, entrusted to the succession of bishops and brought to the attention of every Christian. "It is received on what may fitly be called, if it must have a distinctive name, Episcopal Tradition." (page 297) But not only does the Church contain the Episcopal Tradition of the Creed, but she also holds the "Prophetical Tradition". This is the beginning of a line of thought that was to lead to his ideas on the development of doctrine. God placed the Apostles or bishops in the Church to rule and preach and the prophets to expound.

"Prophets or Doctors, are the interpreters of the revelation; they unfold and define its mysteries, they illuminate its documents, they harmonize its contents, they apply its promises. Their teaching is a vast system, not to be comprised in a few sentences, not to be embodied in one code or treatise, but consisting of a certain body of Truth, permeating the Church like an atmosphere, irregular in its shape from its very profusion and exuberance; at times separable only in idea from Episcopal Tradition, yet at times melting



away into legend and fable;.....This I call Prophetical Tradition, existing primarily in the bosom of the Church itself, and recorded in such measure as Providence has determined in the writings of eminent men. This is obviously of a very different kind from the Episcopal Tradition, yet in its origin it is equally Apostolical, and equally claims our zealous maintenance." (pages 298-9)

Prophetical Tradition, however, may have been corrupted in details, in spite of its general accuracy and its agreement with the Episcopal, and so there will be points where an individual may possibly dissent without incurring condemnation. Though the Prophetical Tradition comes from God and ought to have been "religiously" preserved, no special measures were taken to ensure its preservation like those for the Creed. It was more "the thought and principle which breathed in the Church, her accustomed and unconscious mode of viewing things, and the body of her received notions, than any definite and systematic collections of dogmas elaborated by the intellect." (page 300) In part it was fixed in formal articles or doctrines as events made it necessary and it is preserved to a considerable extent in the writings of the Fathers. But the original agreement shared by the whole Church was replaced by the various branches, over the centuries, which developed for themselves with varying degrees of accuracy different truths from the common heritage. Though all these truths deserve our attention they are entitled to very different degrees of acceptance. Those which the Church recognised at an early date carry more authority than later ones, and those which were

sanctioned dispassionately carry more authority than those which were motivated by fear, anger or jealousy. Some councils then speak with more authority than others. The decrees of Trent claim to be Apostolic "but the very lightest judgement which can be passed on them is, that they are the ruins and perversions of Primitive Tradition." (page 301)

Newman is unable to draw a clear line between the authority of Scripture and Tradition. While it is still true that "Tradition teaches, Scripture proves" the chief proof of the divine origin of the Scriptures is the witness of the earliest Fathers of the Church and so the Scriptures themselves become in part a part of Tradition. This was a weak point in the Lectures as a defence against Rome and is shared by Manning in the "Rule of Faith". He too sees that the same Tradition attests the authenticity of the Scriptures as gives us doctrines such as Original Sin and Justification. But although the Scriptures to some extent become a part of Tradition, the Church is not a judge of the sense of Scripture but a witness to it. For Newman, the Church bears witness to a fact "that such and such a doctrine, or such a sense of Scripture has ever been received and came from the Apostles." (page 321) The proof of this lies in her own unanimity of witness throughout her different parts and in the writings of the Early Fathers. She acts upon her witness and is responsible for it but she has no immediate power over it. The Protestant and the Romanist use Antiquity as though

they were above it and had the right to dispose of it but the Church of England considers Antiquity and Catholicity to be the real guides and the Church is their organ.

The witness of the Apostolic Succession has now been replaced by the broader idea of Antiquity as expressed by Vincent of Lerins "that that is to be received as Apostolic which has been taught 'always, everywhere, and by all'". (quoted by Newman "Prophetical Office" page 51) Arguing from the Articles, Newman maintains that that the individual may not presume to determine for himself what is saving from Scripture. The Articles are clear that doctrines of faith are contained in Scripture and must be pointed out there but they do not suggest that individuals may presume to search the Scriptures independently and determine doctrines for themselves. The Church has the prior claim to do so "but even the Church asserts it not, but hands over the office to Catholic Antiquity." (page 323) On less important matters Newman, like Manning, sees that the individual may be free to decide for himself though such an exercise of judgement is not a boast but a responsibility. One essential points, however, such as the Trinity and the Incarnation, where the Church's witness is unambiguous, the individual must submit. The Catholic Church has the promise of infallibility in matters of faith and this is witnessed by both the Creeds and Scripture. But this ceased when the Church became divided. It is therefore to the undivided Church that we must look for the true faith. The interpretation of the Bible, then, for both

men is neither for the individual alone nor is it achieved through unconditional submission to Rome.

With his theory of the Prophetical Tradition, Newman has broken through the static conception of the Church as the receptacle of a fixed body of doctrine passed down through the ages by a guaranteed succession. Neither Newman nor Manning had intended to be original nor to find new ground to stand upon. They had intended only to strengthen the position which had been maintained by the old High Church party. Both men had been studying the Fathers and both were impressed by Vincent of Lerins' definition of Catholicity and Apostolic doctrine. Manning does not go as far as Newman. For him Tradition is clearly defined and not the shapeless mass of the Prophetical Tradition. Manning has not yet completely broken through the static conception of the Church but like Newman he was to find himself compelled to consider more closely the nature of the undivided Church and to look around to see which of the groups in Christendom came closest to it. A major difficulty with the idea of a Via Media was acknowledged by Newman in the introduction to the "Prophetical Office".

"the Via Media has never existed except on paper, it has never been reduced to practice; it is known, not positively but negatively, in its differences from the rival creeds, not in its own properties."

"....but, whatever its merits, still, when left to itself, to use a familiar term, it may not 'work'".  
(pages 20-1)

In the "Apologia" Newman tells us that it was the affair of the Jerusalem Bishopric, the setting up of an Anglo-Prussian see whose holder was to be consecrated by

Anglican rites but subscribe to the Augsburg Confession and observe the order of the German Evangelical Church, that finally brought home to him what he had suspected, namely that "The Via Media was an impossible idea; it was what I called 'standing on one leg'; and it was necessary, if my old issue of the controversy was to be retained, to go further either one way or the other." (page 211) The Jerusalem Bishopric was equally objectionable to Manning who did his best to help Gladstone in opposing the scheme. Forced to abandon the Via Media, Newman turned to a new defence of the Church of England in the form of the "Note of Sanctity", "with a view of showing that we had at least one of the necessary Notes, as fully as the Church of Rome." ("Apologia" page 211) Sanctity, however, was far from a new idea for Newman. Underlying the course of the Oxford Movement and linking it with the earlier Evangelical Revival, was the pursuit of holiness and this comes out very clearly in the sermons of both Manning and Newman. Manning's sermons were published in four volumes and one important source of Newman's sermons is the eight volumes of "Parochial and Plain Sermons."

The first of Newman's sermons in these volumes, entitled "Holiness Necessary for Future Blessedness", describes holiness as "to be separate from sin, to hate the works of the world, the flesh, and the devil; to take pleasure in keeping God's commandments; to do things as He would have us do them; to live habitually as in the sight of the world to come, as if we had broken the ties of this life,

and were dead already." (vol 1 pages 2-3) There are those who say "We know something of the power of religion - we love it in a measure - we have many right thoughts - we come to Church to pray; this is a proof that we are prepared for heaven." (page 13) But to such people Newman replies that "a man who is contented with his own proficiency in Christian Holiness, is at best in a dark state, or rather in great peril." (page 13) He exhorts them, " Be you content with nothing short of perfection; exert yourselves day by day to grow in knowledge and grace; that, if so be, you may at length attain to the presence of Almighty God." (page 13) Manning echoes the seriousness of the Christian life. In a sermon "On Falling From the Grace of Baptism" he tells his hearers that "As the judgment on Lot's wife, so likewise shall be the doom of apostate Christians." (volume I page 35) Salvation and holiness are not easy. His sermon entitled "Salvation A Difficult Work" links holiness with self-denial, "for it is not more certain that without holiness no man can serve Him, than that without self-denial no man can be holy." (volume I page 92) Manning describes his idea of holiness most fully in "The Holiness of Common Life". He maintains that "the holiest of men may to all outward eyes appear exactly like other people" because holiness is made up not of extraordinary acts but the "due fulfilment of the relative duties of our state in life, and in spiritual fellowship with God." (vol II page 223) Of the saints of

all ages, "There was nothing uncommon about most of them but their holiness." (page 229)

The idea of the holy people of God in all ages was linked in the minds of both men with the idea of the visible and invisible Church. Manning's sermon "God's Kingdom Invisible" investigates this invisible aspect. Jesus was born unnoticed save by a few, and by this coming of the kingdom men were tested "whether they had eyes to see the shadow of His hand, and ears to hear His voice." (vol I page 175) And in the same way the Kingdom of God is among us today.

"Men may think, and do think, to spread His kingdom by the stir and noise of popular excitement; but God's kingdom, like God himself, when He communed with His prophet on the mountain-height, is not in the boisterous and fleeting forms of earthly power. As its coming and its course, so its character. It is not in any of these: but verily it is in the midst of us; in the still small voice of the holy Catholic faith; in the voiceless teaching of Christ's holy sacraments, through which mysteries of the world unseen look in upon us; in the faithful witness of the Apostles of Christ, who through their ghostly lineage, live among us still." (vol I page 178)

The Invisible Church then is present among men. It is to be found in the hearts of men, in their thoughts and actions. Many seem to believe that God's kingdom is secular or at least can be promoted by secular means, but this is not so. Neither can it be spread by "visible excitement of people's minds." (page 180) Stimulating books are no substitute for the moral action of the Church and outward systems cannot replace the work done by the inward power of regeneration and the presence of the Holy Ghost. "There has been from the beginning of the Gospel, an inwardness, and an invis-

-ibleness, about all great movements of Christ's Church, which ought to abash the hasty, talkative zeal of men into a reverent silence." (vol I page 185) The kingdom of God can only be spread when we have it ruling in ourselves, and this comes through a life of inward holiness. The Visible Church is a symbol of Christ's presence just as the water of baptism symbolises the new birth and the bread and wine of the Eucharist symbolise the body and blood of Christ. And just as one may partake of the water or the bread and wine and have no part in the saving grace that they bear, "so may we partake of the holy Catholic Church, which to the eyes of faith is visible in all lands under heaven, and have no fellowship with the saints of Christ, seen or unseen." (vol I pages 182-3)

The idea of the holy people of God in Newman's thought is that "In this Visible Church the Church Invisible is gradually moulded and matured." (vol II page 240) The Invisible Church is formed individually and these parts still depend upon the Visible Church as "there is no Invisible Church yet formed; it is but a name yet." They are known only to God and we cannot now "associate in one the true elect of God." (page 241) These people "cannot but feel, most painfully, the presence of that worldly atmosphere which, however originating, encircles them." They are witnesses "as light witnesses against darkness by the contrast" and they need the support which the Visible Church seems unable to give them. But "what a world of sympathy and comfort is thus opened to us in the Communion of Saints!", when the



Christian thinks of himself as one with men like Joseph, Saul, Job and Jeremiah and the troubles that they endured. Also, we have the promise that Jesus is with His Church and the means of this is the Apostolic Succession.

The idea of the Apostolic Ministry as the outward mark of the Invisible Church is continued in a later sermon on "The Communion of Saints". We have, says Newman, "something outward as a guide to what is inward" in the "Christian Ministry, which directs and leads us to the very Holy of Holies, in which Christ dwells by His Spirit." (vol IV page 173) It was the ministry which "when He ascended up on high, He gave us as a relic, and let drop from Him as the mantle of Elijah, the pledge and token of His never-failing grace from age to age. The Ministry and Sacraments and the bodily presence of Bishop and people are the means by which we come into the presence of the great company of saints but they are not identical with that company. Neither do they guarantee inclusion in the Invisible Church. Manning insists that "We see that it is not enough that we belong to the one visible Church. Many partake of the visible unity who in the invisible have no portion." (vol I page 342) He continues, "The true Church has both a body and a soul: the body is that one, uniform, organised, universal polity, of which the succession of the apostles is the essential first condition: the soul is that inward unity of energetic faith, hope and charity, which knits all saints, from the highest to the lowest, in one spiritual family." (vol I page 342)

This sermon contains another aspect of Manning's thought closely linked with the idea of the Visible and Invisible Church. Before the end of the world, "He has shadowed out to us the nature of the work that He has to do before the end come; that is, to make up a certain number whom God has foreseen and predestinated to life eternal." (page 335 vol I) At the heart of the mystery of this world is the fact that "He is drawing the children of the regeneration, knitting them in one fellowship, in part still visible, in part out of sight." (page 337) "That holy fellowship is not more perfect in the integrity of its number, than in its absolute perfection of holiness. And the prolonged duration of this world is a school of discipline, to liken them to their perfect Lord." (page 338) The same thought is present in Newman.

"There are in every age a certain number of souls in the world, known to God, unknown to us, who will obey the Truth when offered to them, whatever be the mysterious reason that they do and others do not. These we must contemplate, for these we must labour, these are God's special care, for these are all things;....They are the ~~ANGLICAN~~ true Church ever increasing in number, ever gathering in as time goes on; with them lies the Communion of Saints." (vol IV page 153)

This is borne out by history which seems to show that "success in the hearts of many is not promised to her." (page 154) But the Church "has laboured for the elect, and it has succeeded with them. This is, as it were, its token." (page 157) Both Manning and Newman had been influenced by Calvinism and were very conscious of personal election. Newman had had a conversion experience at the age of fifteen

and Manning at the age of twenty-three, and their sense of a call remained with them throughout their lives. This aspect of their belief serves, for both of them, to break down the static institutional view of the Church, although the outward mark of the apostolic Succession is still vital, and concentrates their attention on the Church as the body of the elect. The most important thing now is that the Church be put in the right relationship with the timeless body of the saints.

A third important source for any study of the relations that existed between Newman and Manning in their Anglican days, is their letters, and these, together with their published works and their sermons, make the three main sources for a comparison of their thoughts about the Church. One of the earliest of these letters is from Manning to Newman in connection with a translation of Pearson's "Vindiciae" which he had undertaken. He explains that he has been reading Vincent of Lerins with a view to writing something about Tradition "its use, authority, and limit in the Church of Christ, with an application to the Church of England, showing how much we necessarily and unconsciously depend on it, while we anathematise it in Popery." (15th September 1835, quoted by Purcell vol I page 220) After only two years at Lav-  
-ington, then, he had begun to study one of the major principles that was to concern him for most of his life and whose exploration was to dictate the changes in his allegiance. Manning continued to help Newman by acting as one of the translators for Pusey's "Library of the Fathers", accepting

responsibility for the works of Justin Martyr. He also provided a Catena Patrum on the subject of Catholic Tradition which was published as Tract 78 with additions by Charles Marriott. But at the same time he maintained his respect for the Reformers. In a letter dated the 29th January 1836 S.F. Wood had written to him describing a visit he had received from Newman and his repudiation of the ~~of the~~ Reformers and their work. He asks for Manning's opinion on the subject. Purcell, who quotes the letter in full, does not give Manning's answer. But we may assume that he provided a good defence of the Reformers since Wood agrees to "knock under to the advice given." (vol I pages 222-3) It was Manning's custom to send copies of his works to friends and important figures in public life. He often sent, to his closest friends, the proof sheets of such works for their comments. Newman was certainly among the latter since Manning sent him his sermon on the "Rule of Faith" before he added the notes and Appendix. Apart from certain criticisms both of the sermon and later of the Appendix, Newman gave both his general approval.

Another aspect of the correspondence between the two men concerned the question of Penance. As early as 1839 Manning had assumed the office of spiritual director. He was, naturally, inexperienced and at this time he became so concerned about the determination of a lady penitent to become a Roman Catholic, that he looked to Newman for guidance. The difficulty of keeping his penitents back from Rome was to be a problem for Manning until his own

secession in 1851. In his reply, Newman wrote "Our blanket is too small for our bed" and "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." (quoted by Purcell vol I page 233) He lays the blame for this on the Protestant section of the Church who must meet these needs by making the Church "more suitable to the needs of the heart, more equal to the external." He is quite clear how this should be done.

"Give us more services. more vestments and decorations in worship; give us monasteries; give us the signs of an apostles, the pledges that the Spouse of Christ is among us. Till then you will have continual secessions to Rome." (Purcell vol I page 233)

It is only patience and dutifulness, he believes, that keeps such people in the Church of England. This letter makes it clear that the movement of thought led by Newman and his friends was having a far-reaching effect at the parish level. They were stirring up enthusiasms that could not be satisfied in the Church of England. At this stage Newman still believed that the answer lay in the restoration of externals. But even these were not forthcoming from a largely hostile bench of bishops.

Purcell sees a significant change in the two men's relationship in Manning's letter announcing his appointment as Archdeacon of Chichester. He writes to Newman, referring to his new bishop, a firm anti-Tractarian, "I trust I may give him full satisfaction." (Purcell vol I page 235)

Purcell reads into this apparently innocent remark that Manning is attempting to serve two masters, his Tractarian friends and his Low Church bishop, But it is not necessary to find sinister undertones in so simple a phrase. Manning's position would have been well known not least to the bishop who appointed him and who must have believed that he would, indeed, give full satisfaction. This glimpse of things to come, however, is necessary for Purcell's thesis that in the crisis that followed the publication of Tract 90 Newman was deserted by Manning who was more concerned about the chances of preferment than supporting those who publicly professed beliefs that he himself shared.

In February 1841 Newman published Tract 90. His aim was to keep people who were responding to the ideals set out in his teaching within the Church of England. It seemed that so much Protestantism had become embedded in the Church of England that it had invalidated its claim to be a branch of the Church Catholic. This seemed to be so above all in the Thirty-Nine Articles. Newman wanted to show that rightly interpreted the Articles supported his teaching and did not tie the Church down to a Protestant interpretation.

"That there are real difficulties to a Catholic Christian in the Ecclesiastical position of our Church at this day, no one can deny; but the statements of the Articles are not in the number; and it may be right at the present moment to insist upon this." (page 2)

On the supremacy of Scripture he concludes, after quoting authorities such as Laud and Bramhall, "In the sense in which it is commonly understood at this day, Scripture, it is plain, is not, on Anglican principles, the Rule of Faith."

(page 11) Concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Images, Relics, and the Invocation of Saints, he maintains that it is the "Romish" doctrine that is objected to and not the Primitive. The five rites that the Romans call sacraments are not denied this status by the Articles but may be held to be "sacraments in the sense in which Baptism and the Lord's Supper are sacraments", that is, in that the Church has the right to dispense grace through rites or ceremonies. All are outward signs of invisible grace but only two are "sacraments of the Gospel" as the Articles put it. He is also definite about Article 31 concerning Masses.

"Nothing can show more clearly than this passage that the Articles are not written against the creed of the Roman Church, but against actual existing errors in it, whether taken into its system or not."  
(page 59)

The Article does not speak of the sacrifice of the Mass but "the sacrifice of the Masses", that is, "certain observances, for the most part private and solitary...which involved certain opinions and a certain teaching." (page 59) Newman realises that he may be accused of giving anti-Protestant explanations to Articles that were intended for the establishment of Protestantism but he maintains that we have no duty towards the framers but must take the Articles in the most Catholic sense that they will allow. He also argues that by giving them a Catholic interpretation we bring them into harmony with the Book of Common Prayer. In all he gives seven arguments to support his approach and the final one is that the Articles were constructed to include the more moderate Protestants of whom the Anglo-Catholics are but

"the successors and representatives" (page 82) This line of thought is the natural successor of the Via Media Tracts. The pure doctrine and worship of the Church of England have been overlaid with Protestant excesses. Far from trying to re-shape the liturgy and thought of the Church in accordance with Roman Catholic ways, his aim is to re-cover the primitive purity of the Church as she stands in direct line from the Early Church and is a branch of the Church Catholic.

Although this type of argument may have helped those who were moving towards Rome, it secured only universal condemnation from those who saw the Articles as the bulwark of Protestantism in the Church of England. Despite his arguments in support of such an approach he was still accused of dishonesty and deliberately twisting the meaning of the Articles to suit his own ends. His dry, logical interpretations and paring down of language seemed to many in the words of Dean Church "like sapping and undermining a cherished bulwark." ("The Oxford Movement" page 288)

Purcell maintains that Manning broke with Newman over Tract 90 and chose to take his stand by the protesting bishops with a view to future preferment. He quotes Manning's Visitation Charge of 1841 as an example of facing both ways. He suggests that the praise for the Reformers that it contains was specially intended to dissociate him from Newman. But it is more likely that this praise was simply another example of Manning's consistent regard for their work. He had never subscribed to Newman's condemnation of them.



He had defended them in his letter to S.F.Wood, in 1836 and there is no evidence to suggest that he had changed his mind.

Manning's Charges of 1842 and 1843 are also taken by Purcell as being deliberate assaults upon the Tractarian position. The Charge of 1842, he argues, is an attempt "to throw cold water....on the hot headed defenders of Tract 90." (vol I page 213) However, Manning's appeal is for more than an end to divisions within the Church. He goes much deeper and sees that these may be part of the Church's training for the work to be done.

"Men are asking us for controversial reasons to prove that our spiritual Mother is a true and life-giving branch of the Catholic vine."

"Let us give something better than reasons; let us show unto them the fruits of the Spirit and exhibit the note of Sanctity, which is the broad 'seal of the living God'." (page 47)

Purcell claims that the Charge of 1843 is an even more emphatic <sup>p</sup>reudiation of any connection with Newman and Pusey and he supports this with the following passage.

"Be it that there are heard sharp and discordant voices, even among our teachers. What matters it to us, who are called by no man's name; to us who have no rule of truth, but 'the faith once delivered to the saints'? 'Nemo me dicat, O quid dixit Donatus, O quid dixit Parmenianus, aut Pontius, aut quilibet illorum: quia nec Catholicis Episcopis consentiendum est, sicubi forte fallantur, ut contra Canonicas Dei Scripturas aliquid sentiant," (quoted by Purcell vol I page 214)

Purcell interprets these words as meaning, in the mouth of Manning,

"Let no man call me a follower of Newman, a follower of Pusey, or of Ward, or of any other of them;

for did I not take my stand by the side of the protesting bishops in condemning Tract 90, as contrary to the sacred Scriptures and to the Thirty-nine Articles?"

However, these words come not from the Charge of 1843 but from the Charge of 1842. In its context Manning is playing down the diversity within the Church of England.

"The opposition of individual teachers is a condition inseparable from all energetic and manly struggles for the recovery and reassertion of forgotten truths."  
(page 40)

And again,

"All we need is low thoughts of ourselves, much love one to another, a penetrating sense of God's presence, and of the awful guilt of a bickering and controversial temper; and, in such a preparation of heart, to wait God's time of healing us."  
(pages 40-1)

The tone of the Charge of 1843 is completely unlike Purcell's interpretation. Manning continues to put the present divisions within the Church in their historical perspective. The Church has never been completely united. "And at what period in its whole history has it been free from the rivalry of communities or sects claiming to be the true Church?" It is a matter of historical fact that "in all periods, even of its most compacted unity, the Church has had to lament the instability of individual minds, and the dropping off of particular members. The case is so now, and always will be." (page 39) But we must keep things in proportion. Even if twenty times the number were to leave the Church, the Church of England would still be the Church of millions of English people.

On the 5th. November 1843, Manning preached a sermon

at St, Mary's, Oxford at the customary commemoration and thanksgiving for the defeat of the Gunpowder Plot. He had recently written to Newman when the latter had retired to Littlemore and had received a reply that both he and Gladstone had interpreted as indicating secession. Manning described his 5th. November sermon in a Note written in 1885.

"On 5th November 1843 I preached before the University, and I denounced Gunpowder Plot and the Spanish Armada, and the authority which wielded these weapons. I saw that, given the Temporal Power of the Pope, his spiritual jurisdiction was granted, the recovery of England to the faith was a supreme duty to be attempted even by the Armada. I did not then believe or understand the Temporal nor the Spiritual Power. I believed it to be of the earth earthy, and the cause of schism, as I had published in my book on the "Unity of the Church"....I remember I had just heard of J.H.N.'s intention to become Catholic. It threw me back."  
(quoted by Purcell vol. I page 253)

The tone of the sermon is certainly anti-Roman. In the West he argues "the holy boldness of earlier days" has settled down into "the worldly policy of later Pontiffs." ("Sermons Preached Before The University of Oxford" 1844 page 78)

It was argued that the Church needed temporal powers to maintain her independence but from "this principle a manifold secularity spread itself in the Western Church." (page 81) He lays the blame for the break between England and Rome at the door of Pius V for attempting to depose Elizabeth. Harsh words he insists are necessary and judging by a series of providential acts, "it would seem to be the will of Heaven, that the dominion of the Roman Pontificate may never be again set up in this Church and realm." (page 89) For Purcell this is another of Manning's desperate attempts to rid himself

of the odium of being labelled as a follower of Newman. But it seems easier to interpret his words in the light of his own spiritual progress.

He had not yet reached Newman's position. His own secession was to be six years later and he was not convinced that the Church of England was in schism, nor that the Roman Church was not corrupt. He must, therefore, have seen it as his duty to undo any harm that his former assurances about the safety of Newman's teaching might now do. The sermon was not aimed at the person of Newman but was the result of a genuine fear that men might be led by him into what Manning still regarded as a corrupt form of religion. In a letter to Pusey dated the 22nd. Sunday after Trinity 1843, Manning explains his predicament.

"I have been using his books, defending and endeavouring to spread the system which carried this dreadful secret at its heart.....I am now reduced to the painful, saddening, sickening necessity of saying what I feel about Rome." (quoted by Purcell vol I page 251)

It is true that when Manning paid a visit to Littlemore the next day, after preaching the November 5th. sermon, he was told that Newman was not at home, but after less than two months Newman is thanking Manning for his "Most kind letter" and replying in a similar vein. (see Purcell vol I page 254) Perhaps Newman had realised what Manning did not, that a meeting at that time would only have been a painful experience for both of them. Newman was beyond the help of eager friends.

Manning himself sums up his relations with the Tract-

-arians in an autobiographical Note written some time after the events they describe.

"I had never been one of the company of men who were working in Oxford. I knew them all, I agreed in most things, not from contact with them; but because at Lavington I read by myself in the same direction. I therefore acted with them in Hampden's condemnation, in opposing Ward's degradation, and the like. But, as Newman said, I was an external independent witness; for my work and field were my parish, archdeaconry, and frequent work in London. I was related to some 200 clergy, and to many persons and duties, especially official duties, which cut me off from Oxford, and made my line wholly unlike an Oxford and literary life. I went on reading, and working out the sum by myself; and on looking back, seem to see a constant advance, without deviations, or going back; so that my faith of today rests upon the work of all the chief years of my life. I can see one principle and a steady equable advance. This I believe to be the leading of the Holy Ghost. Nothing but this would have preserved my intellect from wandering and my will from resistance." (quoted by Purcell vol I pages 259-60)

Purcell finds it difficult to accept that Manning's thought shows a "steady equable advance" and Stanley Roamer in a book published in 1896 entitled "Cardinal Manning as presented in his own letters and notes" sums up his career thus,

"A staunch Protestant 1833 to 1836; 1837 to 1839 secretly a Tractarian, publicly an Evangelical; 1840 more openly siding with the Tractarians; 1841 to 1842 "unlabelled" secretly Tractarian; 1843 publicly a strong Evangelical, abusing the Tractarians, but at the same time maintaining their secret practices." (page 28)

He concludes, "The last two sentences (of the Note) are past criticism." (page 28) This extreme view need not be taken too seriously as the early part of the book at least seems to be based entirely on Purcell. But it shows how misleading a view of Manning's life emerges when it is seen solely in the light of parties within the Church. Manning's views

changed radically in the years between 1833 and 1851. There is a world of difference between the young country parson who told Gladstone that he had come up to London to defend the Evangelical cause (Purcell vol I page 116) and the former Archdeacon of Chichester who knelt beside him for the last time in a small chapel off the Buckingham Palace Road. But if one accepts that his Anglican days were ones of searching and development, done for the most part alone, then it is not necessary to read into his life the calculating manoeuvres of a power-seeking ecclesiastical politician. It is true that he was not always consistent, but like Newman he was forced to try different possibilities in the hope of establishing a safer ground for the Church of England between the excesses of Protestantism and Roman Catholicism. These changes were the result of long and careful study and it was only when he felt that he had exhausted the possibilities that he followed Newman to Rome.

It was the affair of the Jerusalem Bishopric and the condemnation of Tract 90 that led Newman to retire to Littlemore. This was a year before the publication of Manning's "Unity of the Church" in 1842. But it was not until the summer of 1843 that Newman realised his true position. On 4th. May of that year he wrote to Keble expressing his view that the Roman Church was the Church of the Apostles and that the Church of England was in schism. He still feared that he might be under an illusion, especially when men like Keble and Pusey did not join him in his views, but slowly his conviction that modern Roman doctrines were legitimate develop-

-ments became fixed. At the end of 1844 he decided to work out fully his theory of doctrinal development and see if at the end his convictions remained. This he did in "An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine". Before he had finished the work he realised that he would have to seek admission into the Church of Rome and he was received on 9th. October 1845.

In the Essay he first considers the rule of Vincent of Lerins. It had been useful because it "lays down a simple rule by which to measure the value of every historical fact as it comes, and thereby it provides a bulwark against Rome while it opens an assault upon Protestantism." (page 8) But its value may not be as great as has been thought.

"It admits of being interpreted in one of two ways: if it be narrowed for the purpose of disproving the catholicity of the Creed of Pope Pius, it becomes also an objection to the Athanasian; and if it be relaxed to admit the doctrines retained by the English Church, it no longer excludes certain doctrines of Rome which that Church denies." (page 9)

In other words, "It cannot at once condemn St. Thomas and St. Bernard, and defend St. Athanasius and St. Gregory Nazianzen." (page 9) Another theory that cannot help the situation is that of the "Disciplina Arcani" which holds that "doctrines which are associated with the later ages of the Church were really in the Church from the first, but not publicly taught, and that for various reasons" such as reverence. But this also is no answer because variations continue beyond the time when it is conceivable that the discipline was in force. It is necessary therefore to find

a new theoretical basis on which to trace the doctrinal developments that have occurred within the Church. The theory contained in Newman's work is,

".....that the increase and expansion of the Christian Creed and Ritual, and the variations which have attended the process in the case of individual writers and Churches, are the necessary attendants on any philosophy or polity which takes possession of the intellect and heart and has had any wide or extended dominion; that, from the nature of the human mind, time is necessary for the full comprehension and perfection of great ideas; and that the highest and most wonderful truths, though communicated to the world once for all by inspired teachers could not be comprehended all at once by the recipients, but, as received and transmitted by minds not inspired and through media which were human, have required only the longer time and deeper thought for their full elucidation. This may be called the "Theory of Developments";" (page 27)

Newman sets out seven rules to distinguish legitimate developments in doctrine from those which are not - preservation of type or idea, continuity of principle, power of assimilation, early anticipation, logical sequence, preservative additions, and chronic continuance. He concludes,

"On the whole, all parties will agree that, of all existing systems, the present communion of Rome is the nearest approximation in fact to the Church of the Fathers, possible, though some may think it to be nearer to it still on paper." (page 138)

"Did St. Athanasius or St. Ambrose come suddenly to life, it cannot be doubted what communion they would mistake for their own." if they came to this country, would they not "turn from many a high aisle and solemn cloister which they found there and ask the way to some small chapel where mass was said in the populous alley or forlorn suburb?" (page 138)

The Essay is significant less for its positive argu-



arguments than for its method of approach to the whole problem of Christian doctrine in its relation to the New Testament. It was published fifteen years before Darwin's "The Origin of ~~the~~ Species" and yet it applies the basic principles of organic evolution and the influence of the environment. Newman's chief aim was apologetic. He was increasingly drawn towards Rome but he had to overcome the problem of her apparent innovations upon the teachings of the Early Church, the authority he had always insisted, on matters of doctrine. The Vincentian Canon and the *Disciplina Arcani* could not help him and so he was forced to find a new theory. But his argument is seriously weakened by certain assumptions that he makes and upon which he bases his theory.

Firstly, he is concerned only with Roman developments. He is clearly impressed by her massive presence in history and her powers of survival. And yet he does not stop to consider that what may be true of the West may equally be true of the East. He knew very little about the Orthodox and apart from two casual references to her stagnation and infertility, he chooses to ignore the East. Newman also lays himself open to the charge that if you allow Roman developments, you should also allow the "developments" of men like Luther, Calvin and Wesley. Newman's seven tests for determining proper developments are hardly convincing. These seven tests change the whole idea of development. It ceases to be organic and becomes logical. The argument is not "History shows that change has occurred

therefore we must adopt mutability instead of immutability as a general principle", but "The less mutability has occurred the truer is the modern church: but since history shows that some mutability has occurred, even in the least mutable of churches, we need a theory..." (This is an argument from O. Chadwick "From Bossuet to Newman, The Idea of Doctrinal Development" chapter 7) This is basically a form of the Vincentian Canon that Christianity is always the same. Newman is arguing that though history shows that none of the modern churches is identical with the ancient Church, it does show that one of them is more nearly identical than any of the others.

A second assumption is the idea of infallibility. Newman insists that there is an infallible authority which controls the course of doctrinal development.

"This is the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church; for by infallibility I suppose is meant the power of deciding whether this, that, and a third, and any number of theological or ethical statements are true." (pages 78-9)

For Newman "the essence of all religion is authority and obedience" (page 79) and this need he must have felt especially urgently in the troubled times in which he was living. Only authority could bring order to the surrounding chaos and this had to be an external authority, outside the course of development of which it was to be the judge. But the doctrine of infallibility is itself an example of development. Its history shows a definite evolution in which the authority has been transferred from the councils to the pope whose authority shifts from that of "primus inter pares" to that of "primus". And so that which is itself a development

cannot stand outside~~of~~, and judge, other developments. Newman's approach to the subject is historical but this is warped by his feelings for his subject matter. He puts the historical development of the Roman Church on a different level from the developments of others. Elsewhere truth and error may be mingled but in the Roman Church infallibility, which he cannot prove, ensures that error is excluded. Newman's conclusions are thus determined by his initial assumptions. What the Roman Church is, must be what the Church of Christ was intended to be because she alone is preserved~~from~~ error.

The Oxford Movement was a call to the Church to reme<sup>m</sup>ber that she was not an establishment providing a respectable profession for gentlemen. It was an appeal to the true nature of the Church, independent of the State and characteri~~s~~-ised by the desire for holiness. The movement had no official organisation and no official leaders but Newman soon became a natural centre for those who responded to such appeals. He won this position by his unique ability to set out the ideals of the movement both in the written word that carried his influence throughout the country and also through his preaching and teaching that inspired the under-graduates who came to listen to him. Dean Church claims that Newman's four o'clock sermons in St. Mary's were the most powerful instrument in drawing sympathy to the movement. ("The Oxford Movement" page 129) The Oxford Movement as a whole made little original contribution to Anglican theology but it was Newman who developed the insights and emphases

into a systematic approach to the doctrine of the Church. But in the end Newman was to follow his heart. He went where he felt the ethos of the fourth and fifth centuries was preserved still. But for those who remained in the Anglican fold the immediate question was who would rally the Tractarians, shocked by their leader's secession and who would undertake a formal answer to Newman's ideas on the development of doctrine?

Chapter Four

MANNING AND THE ANGLO-CATHOLICS

With the publication of the "Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine" some sort of answer had to follow from those whose names were linked with Newman's but had not gone over with him to Rome. In a letter dated 21st. November 1845 Gladstone wrote to Manning suggesting that he might undertake this work.

"MY DEAR MANNING - My chief object in writing is to suggest to you the possibility that you may have to entertain the idea of answering Newman's book ....After reading it I may have to write to you again on the subject. It will probably be a real and subtle argument, backed by great knowledge, and it must not, if so, be allowed to pass unnoticed, nor should the task be left to those who will do mischief." (quoted by Purcell vol I pages 313-4)

There is a sense of urgency in the letter. If Manning feels that he could undertake a reply he should make it known that an answer would be forthcoming. The tone of the letter shows the gravity with which the Tractarians regarded the situation. Newman's secession was a blow to them. They were faced with the possibility, they thought, of mass secessions and the discrediting of their teaching as being only a stepping stone to Rome. It was vital therefore that a respected figure should show the world that the case of Newman was the exception and that his theory of development was not the natural successor of their teaching.

Gladstone was right to approach Manning for a public reply. Manning admired the book but was not convinced by it. In a letter to Robert Wilberforce dated 30th. December

1845, he sets out his views on Newman's work. He describes it as "a wonderful intellectual work" but "Newman's mind is subtle even to excess, and to us seems certainly to be sceptical." "After reading the book I am left where I was found by it." He sets out five points to set against Newman,

"I do not believe in the fact of development in the Roman and Lutheran sense, for they are both alike, with the advantage on the Roman side. I believe that the faith was perfected uno afflatu by the inspiration of the Apostles.

2. That it has existed ideally perfect in the illuminated reason of the Church from then till now.

3. That development, as in the creeds, has been logical and verbal, not ideal or conceptional.

4. That the spiritual perceptions of the Church through contemplation and devotion have become more intense, but always within the same focus.

5. That the facts and documents of Revelation have been codified, harmonised, distributed, and cast into a scientific order, capable of scientific expression. But that the omer of manna (as St. Irenaeus says of the regula fidei) is in quantity unchanged, "He that gathereth much hath nothing over," etc."

(Purcell vol I pages 311-2)

Manning, then, does not feel the full force of Newman's arguments. He cannot accept that the body of doctrine in the Church "develops" in the sense that Newman would have it. He sees it as having existed from the first and the only development that he will allow is logical and verbal. After discussing Trench's Hulsean Lectures he concludes,

".....I feel for myself that nothing but a deep and solid foundation such as the Catholic Church has laid (as in St. Thomas Aquinas, Melchior Camus, etc.) can keep a man from intellectual uncertainty and fluctuation. So it is with me. I have never found rest for my foot till I began to see the foundation of systematic theology; and I feel appalled at the thought how little I know i.e. in its principles."

Soon, however, Manning was writing to Gladstone to say that he was losing confidence in his ability to produce a reply. But Gladstone did not take this very seriously. He assured Manning, "I am more sanguine than you about the ultimate issue", and he predicts, "you will find your confidence grow as you proceed." (Purcell vol I page 315) Manning was not able to answer Newman's book as he had hoped. Gladstone many years later attributed this to his lack of learning. Purcell quotes him as saying "Manning was an ecclesiastical statesman; very ascetic, but not a theologian, nor deeply read." (vol I page 318) This judgement seriously underestimates Manning's intellectual powers and perhaps goes some way towards explaining why Purcell's biography was favourably received by Gladstone. During the last five years of his Anglican life, Manning had been using every spare minute for study. Robert and Henry Wilberforce both sought his help on theological questions and were not disappointed. During the 1830's he had studied the Fathers and the Anglican divines and during the 1840's he turned to Roman Catholic writings. For Gladstone the secession of Newman was the loss of a great leader and a blow to the Church, but for Manning it was more than this, it brought home to him with a new force the thoughts that were unsettling him. His published works had not, after all, given him the sure foundation that he sought. At the time of Newman's secession he wrote,

"If our position be tenable, let us work onward with all hope. If not, let us abandon it. 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." (Shane Leslie, "Henry Edward Manning. His Life and Labours" quoted page 65)

But this was just what he was forced to do, at least in his private study. Between October 1845 and August 1846 when he wrote to Gladstone finally abandoning the project, Manning seems to have experienced the first of a series of doubts that were to afflict him. In his letter to Gladstone he admitted that he had been shaken by the recent secessions, including the whole Ryder family, and he concluded, "I have a fear, amounting to a belief, that the Church of England must split asunder." (quoted by Purcell vol I page 317) Gladstone, on the other hand, was not a prey to such fears.

"Nothing can be more firm in my mind than ~~that~~ the opposite idea, that the Church of England has not been marked out in this way and that way for nought, that she will live through her struggles, and that she has a great providential destiny before her."

(Purcell vol I page 317)

Purcell adds that from that time until the Gorham Judgement Manning does not again confess his doubts to Gladstone.

If Manning was destined to have serious doubts about the position of the Church of England at this time, he was also destined to play a part in rallying the ranks of the Tractarians after the loss of their leader. That this was not a role that he desired is shown by a contemporary entry in his Diary for November 1845.

"I feel that I have taken my last act in concert with those who are moving in Oxford. Henceforward I shall endeavour, by God's help, to act by myself as I have done hitherto, without any alliance. My duty is to live and die striving to edify the Church in my own sphere." (Purcell vol I page 324)



The period after 1845 was not as arid as has sometimes been suggested. Rather, these were years of "Dispersion", alive with activity. Succeeding years of undergraduates had come under the influence of Newman, Pusey and their followers and they had carried their ideas with them when they left the University. This dispersion had been going on before 1845 but it is in that year that the centre of the movement shifted and leaving Oxford became diffused throughout the country. Pusey was prominent in seeing the need for ministering to the urban masses and that the existing system would never commend the Gospel to the poor nor reach their hearts. In a letter to Charles Marriott he wrote,

"If there is not some change in the practice, we shall be losing people to Rome and Rome will be beforehand with us in making the effort to rescue our manufacturing population from its utter irreligion." (C.P.S. Clarke, "The Oxford Movement and After", quoted on page 133)

Pusey himself contributed generously to church building projects, most notably to St. Saviour's, Leeds, built in a poor industrial area. The leaders of the movement had a strong evangelistic desire which came to the fore in these years. They put the sacramental system of the Church, including Penance, in a prominent place and used such Catholic practices as they could. Religious communities were founded including the sisterhood at Wantage that was a special concern of Manning's. With this change in emphasis, Manning became an obvious person to turn to for help and guidance. Whatever he may have wished, his name was linked

again and again with those of Keble and Pusey. He was able to supply a leadership that was beyond the other two men. Pusey was still accorded great respect but his inability to control the excesses of the clergy of St Saviour's, Leeds, caused him to be looked upon with not a little suspicion. Archdeacon Manning, on the other hand, was known to be "safe". His approach was not much different from that of Pusey, namely, "confession, dogmatic firmness, love of system and authority, an ardent, compulsive yearning for sanctity." But "he was more gentle and tender as a physician; he tried to keep the peace with his fellow practitioners; he did not thrust his cures upon a reluctant patient;" (D. Newsome "The Parting of Friends" page 318) His temperate opinions seemed to make him a reconciler of factions and many regarded him as the one man with the theological ability to supply them with an informed account and explanation of Roman doctrine and practice. This authority and temperament appealed to his contemporaries, although some saw even his moderation as a fault. Manning himself wrote "I was regarded and even censured as slow to advance...cautious to excess, morbidly moderate as one said." (quoted Fitzsimons, Manning Anglican and Catholic page 18) William Dodsworth regularly sought Manning's advice whilst disapproving of Pusey's borrowing of practices from Rome. (see A.M. Alchin, "The Silent Rebellion" page 64) W.J. Butler allowed himself to be guided by Manning in the formation of the sisterhood at Wantage and apart from close friends like Robert and Henry

Wilberforce, Manning's advice was also sought by dignitaries such as Bishop Phillpotts of Exeter. If Manning was not a thinker of the originality of Newman he had the great ability to translate the theories and ideas of the Anglo-Catholics into fact.

In the Diary for the years 1844-7 Manning describes the period as "Declension - three and a half years - secularity, vanity, and anger." An entry for 30th. January 1846 has,

"How hard it is to know exactly what is the or the chief motive on which we act! Could I be content to live and die no more than I am? I doubt it. I do feel real pleasure in honour, procedure, elevation, the society of great people. And all this is very shameful and mean." (quoted by Shane Leslie page 75)

Purcell makes much of this period of "Declension". He paints a picture of the worldly Manning whose nature "instinctively shrank from them that were falling, or were down" (vol I page 24L) throwing in his lot with the winning side and abandoning the unfortunate men at Oxford. Purcell does not stop to consider any other motive Manning may have had for entering London society at this period. Whether, perhaps, Manning felt that what he called "elevation into a sphere of higher usefulness" was really just that at a time when Newman's approach was failing, and not the single-minded desire for preferment alone. Purcell admits that "Manning held that the interests of the Church he loved so well could be better advanced by action at headquarters, than by controversy at Oxford." (vol I page 265) But he over-parses his hand by continuing "To the ecclesiastical statesman, what

were the subtleties of theology, the study of the Fathers, the claims or disclosures of Catholic antiquity, compared with the unloosing of the locks of action at Westminster?" Manning's public contribution to the revival of Church life at this time was his vigorous and untiring opposition to Erastianism in all its forms, but his thought went much deeper. All his public work was grounded in his extensive studies. His desire for the independence of the Church from secular control was the natural result of the views that formed slowly in his mind as his reading continued. The attraction that pomp and precedence held for him at this time cannot be denied but these feelings, which he confesses in his most private writings, are only part of the force that relentlessly drove him into activity during these years.

If Manning was to make any real impression on London society and its notables it would be necessary for him to have a foothold in the capital. He had a village church and a country archdeaconry and so he was dependent, in the capital, upon the hospitality of others for his public speaking. It happened that the much-coveted Preachership of Lincoln's Inn fell vacant and in 1843 Manning's name was put forward. Gladstone was a powerful ally but the opposition to Manning finally won the day. Two years later he was offered the post of Sub-Almoner to the Queen, usually regarded as a stepping-stone to a bishopric. The post had recently been vacated by Manning's brother-in-law Samuel Wilberforce on his appointment as Bishop of Oxford. Manning's diary is full of minute examinations of the issues involved. One of

the arguments against accepting the post is "That anything which complicated my thoughts and position may affect the 'indifference' with which I wish to resolve my mind on the great issue. Visions of a future certainly would." (quoted by Purcell vol I page 279) He elaborates this point in a letter to Robert Wilberforce, perhaps his closest confidant at this time, dated 30th. December.

"I owe to you more reasons for not taking the sub-almonry than I need give to others, and therefore under the seal of the relation existing between us I will tell you. The reason I assigned is a true real and sufficient reason. I feel that I owe it to my Flock and to my own soul to avoid absence and distraction at the season of Passion week and Easter. Also I feel it would be no good example among those with whom I am working to sit so loose to the Easter Communion. But beyond this. It is no unsettlement, I thank God, which makes me wish to avoid new bonds. But I feel it safest for my own soul, both in regard to a clearer perception of the truth of our position, and to a simpler line of practice to keep myself just as I am. The Lincoln's Inn affair convinced me that my duty is to have only one field and one work. And besides I am aware that others wished me to be in a more prominent place, with kind thoughts. A word or two in your letter looked that way. This taken alone would decide me. I know myself and am afraid of secularity. In my past life I have great causes of self-reproach: and, with God's help, I propose to keep myself from all ways which are not within the compass of the Altar."  
(quoted by D. Newsome pages 320-1)

Manning, then, did not yet suspect that the Church of England was in schism but he did fear entering upon a course of action leading to further preferment and so clouding his judgement in assessing the true position of the English Church.

By the beginning of 1847 unsettlement had shaken him in the form of his inability to answer Newman and his real-

-isation that he could not accept higher office in the Church of England. The third blow was to come in February of that year when he was taken seriously ill and it seemed that he might die. This long illness and the sudden enforced solitude brought about a great change in him.

"Blessed time! I never was so alone with God; never so awakened from dreaming; never so aware of the vain show in which I have been walking; never so conscious of the realities of the world beyond the grave....

I was never so long alone; and so wholly thrown upon my own soul and upon Him. And He did not leave me nor forsake me." (quoted by Purcell vol I page 330)

His sensitive conscience had time to meditate, almost morbidly at times, and indulge in self-examination. The pages from his diary of this period quoted by Purcell, though carefully expurgated by the Cardinal, set any temptations to worldliness in the context of what even Purcell admits was a "sensitive and scrupulous conscience, and a God-fearing spirit." (vol I page 330) Among the other entries are two attempts by Manning to set out the most important events in his spiritual life.

"Lady Day 25th. March 1847

Chief agents in my conversion

- 1.2.3. Lines erased by Cardinal Manning 1886
4. My admission to Lavington, 1833
5. Entry erased (year of wife's death), 1837
6. The hearing of confessions, 1844
7. The growing up of hope, 1845
8. My illness, 1847

These are, I think, the chief agents under God in my conversion."

(quoted by Purcell vol I page 334)

"26th March.

Psalm lxxvii. 10

God's special mercies to me.

1. My creation ex num; possibs.
2. My regeneration, elect from mankind.
3. My pure and loving home, and parents.
4. The long-sufferings which bore with me for twenty years until my conversion, restraining me, preventing me.
5. The preservation of my life six times to my knowledge.
6. By preserving me from great public shame, 1827-44.
7. By calling me to holy orders, and suffering me to be on His side against the world.
8. By afflicting me, 1837
9. By prospering me, as a token of forgiveness.
10. By chastening me now."

(quoted by Purcell vol I  
pages 335-6)

Even at death's door Manning never gave up his firm belief that God was directing his life. Lytton Strachey seems to think that Manning was being callous in numbering the death of his wife among God's "special mercies" but, in fact, he looked upon it as an affliction in exactly the same way as he looked upon his present near-fatal illness.

Manning used this period of enforced inactivity to continue his studies with a new intensity. At a later date he wrote,

"During that long illness I read S. Leo through - and much of S. Gregory, S. Aug. and S. Optatus. All brought me in greater 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."

But there is also the familiar air of uncertainty,

"But I profoundly mistrusted myself....I was afraid of following what seemed to be a theory of my own ....In this state of self-mistrust and fear of going wrong, I went abroad."

(quoted in Fitzsimons page 23)

Manning's idea of the work of the Holy Ghost in the Church is set out fully in his sermon entitled "Christ's Going Away Our Gain" (Sermons vol IV page 86 on) based on John 16:7, "It is expedient for you that I go away". He proceeds to expound the reasons why this is so. First, "because by His departure, His local presence was changed into an universal presence." (page 89) The disciples had been limited in their appreciation of their Master, bound and restricted by their senses. But after the Ascension His presence was enlarged through that of the Holy Ghost. Second, and most important in this context, "His departure changed their imperfect knowledge into the full illumination of faith." (page 93) During His earthly ministry Christ communicated with His disciples by word of mouth and His hearers were slow to understand. But when the Holy Ghost came they no longer interpreted everything in a worldly way.

"Their very faculties were enlarged: they were no longer pent up by narrow senses and by the succession of time, but were lifted into a light where all things are boundless and eternal. A new power of insight was implanted in their spiritual being, and a new world rose up before it;" (page 95)

The inward illumination of the Holy Ghost "united the consciousness of man with the Spirit of God." The illumination



comes through the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. The result was that things which had been perceived partially or imperfectly became united in "a full and perfect orb."

"All these divine realities stood forth in substance and in truth before the illuminated intuition of the Church." (page 96)

Through the Holy Ghost has been opened up "a ministry of interior and perfect faith, which has guided His Church in all ages and in all lands unto this day." (page 97)

This guide, he emphasises, is "unerring, though teaching through human reason and by human speech."

With his confidence shaken, then, by Newman's arguments, by his refusal of the post of Sub-Almoner and by his serious illness, Manning went abroad to convalesce. This was not his first journey abroad. He had been forced, again through ill health, to spend the winter of 1838-9 out of England. There is a marked difference in his attitude to the Roman Catholic Church in his record of these two visits. In the first his main interest was in hearing sermons and he found Roman devotions and practices repugnant. The first service that he attended had left only a memory of "chanting, monotonous and harsh" (Shane Leslie page 55) In his diary for the second journey he has copious notes of sermons that he heard but he also shows an interest in rites and ceremonies. Wherever he went, Manning seems to have been welcomed and explanations and answers seem everywhere to have been forthcoming. It is significant, that unlike

Newman, Manning at the time of his secession was not only well read in Catholic theology but had also experienced

its worship and practice at first hand. It was not long before the liturgy began to make an impression on him. He set out from London on 8th. July 1847 and on 10th. he was describing the worship in a Belgian cathedral,

At the cathedral, Saturday evening; the Salut and Exposition; the procession gave me a strong feeling of the reality of the Incarnation and of their way of witnessing to it. This morning high mass with much splendour. The Elevation very solemn and impressive; vivid by exhibiting the One Great Sacrifice." (Purcell vol I page 349)

And later, on 17th. "I cannot but feel that the practice of Elevation, Exposition, Adoration of the Blessed Eucharist has a powerful effect in sustaining and realising the doctrine of the Incarnation." (Purcell vol I page 352) In complete contrast he writes about a church in Basle, "The effect of Protestant worship is dreary; want of object, aim, intelligibility; cold, dark, abstract." (Purcell vol I page 356) On 9th. September Manning became ill again and fearing that he might die, he hurriedly returned to England. He recovered, however, and was able to set out again. On 7th. November he again records his impressions of Benediction.

"There was something very beautiful and awful in the lighted altar, with the incense seen from without through the open door.

A sad contrast to our Evensong, where everyone, so far as I saw, sat throughout their prayers." (Purcell vol I page 359)

The lengthy extracts from the diary, quoted by Purcell show how meticulously Manning noted his impressions of the devotions that he saw and the answers to his many questions about services, ceremonies and shrines.

Amid the details of visits and conversations recorded in the diary is the short statement "11th, May. - Fine. At eleven had audience at the Vatican;" (Purcell vol I page 401) The very brevity of this statement has given rise to speculation. Lytton Strachey finds it easy to imagine the "persuasive innocence" of the Pope's "Ah, dear Signor Manning, why don't you come over to us? Do you suppose that we should not look after you?" ("Eminent Victorians" page 56) But the mystery begins with Purcell who asks the question "Was the wise and cautious archdeacon afraid that, if once committed to paper, an account of his conversation with the Pope might somehow or other reach suspicious ears, and arouse perchance against him the clamours of a too susceptible Protestantism at home?" (vol I page 416) Purcell himself, however, supplies the answer on the next page. He quotes the Cardinal's later explanation that he saw the Pope because he had been commissioned to present him with an Italian translation of a pamphlet on the government's action during the famine in Ireland. Purcell further attributes the brevity of Manning's reference to his audience to the offence which the Pope unwittingly caused him by his apparent ignorance of Anglican customs. He was surprised to hear that the administration of the Holy Communion was in both kinds. This ignorance hurt Manning and tells against the theory that the Pope was concerned about the secession of a relatively junior member of the Anglican hierarchy.

Perhaps the incident that most impressed itself upon

the mind of Manning happened at the end of his tour, at Milan and the shrine of St. Charles Borromeo.

"In Milan happened what I have always felt like a call from St. Charles....I was thinking in prayer 'if only I could know that St. Charles who represents the Council of Trent was right and we wrong'. The Deacon was singing the Gospel and the last words et erit unum ovile et unus pastor, came upon me as if I had never heard them before." (Fitzsimons pages 25-6)

On his return to England, then, in June 1848, Manning's views on the Church had been enlarged in a way that was almost unique among the Tractarian leaders. He had had the opportunity of studying and experiencing the ethos of catholic worship, and the experience was to play an important part in his attitude towards the events that followed his return to England. This attitude is summed up in a letter written to Dodsworth while Manning was still abroad.

"Don't tell any soul what I add now. The sacred beauty with which things are done here is beyond all places. And certainly if the exterior of worship can exhibit the beauty of Holiness it is to be seen in the Pope's Chapel, and St. Peter's, and even in the Parish Churches of Rome. I say this freely to you, because you and I feel alike that there are things of no weight in the scale of conscience." (Fitzsimons pages 24-5)

From 1847 until 1851 Purcell tells us that Manning spoke with a "double voice" to the two sets of people with whom he had to deal. In his public capacity as a teacher and preacher he was the defender of the Church of England. His opinion was sought by the clergy of the area and his ecclesiastical superiors alike. He was also a spiritual director to the penitents who put their trust in him. In public he was busy defending the independence of the Church

from control by the State, setting up diocesan boards and theological colleges and arguing for the Christian basis of education. In private he was doing his utmost to keep his penitents within the Church of England and reassuring them of its position as a part of the universal Church. But to set against this picture of the public figure and the spiritual director we have the other "voice", himself a penitent, writing under the seal about his doubts and difficulties to his curate Laprimaudaye and Robert Wilberforce.

The two-faced nature of his utterances may seem dishonest but Manning's position was not an easy one. Since 1833 his mind had been in a state of transition but now his thoughts were moving faster than ever before just at the time when he was being called upon by those who needed his reassurances. "Until his mind had grasped the reality of things; had probed his doubts to the bottom; had reached solid ground, consistency or coherency of statement was perhaps scarcely to be expected." (Purcell vol I page 464) But as an acknowledged teacher he was expected, and he expected himself, to give answers to those in difficulty. He had formed the habit of speaking, in public at least, with assurance. Newman had been able to retire to Littlemore to think through his position, but Manning felt that to make his doubts public would be disloyal as a dignitary of the Church of England. In a letter to Robert Wilberforce he writes of the people "rising up all over the country" who are appealing to him for help, over problems

which unsettle him too. "But if I leave their appeals unanswered, they will think that I am as they are." (Purcell vol I page 464) Doubtless Manning was not completely free of his old love for precedence and honour but to see such feelings as the only reason for his "double voice" is to oversimplify his very difficult position. J.E.C. Bodley defends Manning's actions.

"If an officer in time of warfare, or an advocate in the course of litigation, comes to feel in his heart and conscience that the cause for which he is fighting is not the righteous one, he has no right to help the other side until he has changed his uniform, or sent back his brief."  
("Cardinal Manning" pages 27-8)

Even to remain silent in such a situation would have been to aid "the other side". This situation was in marked contrast to that of Pusey who, whilst he had no thoughts of going over to Rome, nevertheless went much further in trying to engraft Roman practices onto the Church of England. "Whilst he drew the pay of the Establishment Manning tried to make out the best case, but Pusey was all Jeremiad. His only sign of cheer was at the death of some Low Churchman, as, for instance, 'What an awful dispensation this sudden removal of Dr. Arnold! One does not speak of it, but it must have much meaning!'" (Shane Leslie page 76) Cardinal Manning, who in later life, went through his papers carefully destroying pages and passages and adding explanatory notes, does not seem to have seen anything wrong in his "double voice" of these years, as many of the papers displaying it remain without any explanation.

The course of Manning's doubts and difficulties can be traced back at least as far as 1845 in his letters to Robert Wilberforce, and in his diary. Two days before Newman's reception Manning was writing to Robert Wilberforce, "Everything my dear Robert, has conspired to draw us together in brotherly love." (6th. October 1845 quoted by Purcell vol I page 504) He is certain about the position of the Church of England "for nothing can shake my belief of the presence of Christ in our Church and sacrament. I feel incapable of doubting it: again, the saints who have ripened round our altars for 300 years make it impossible for me to feel it a question of safety." Like, Newman Manning at this stage was putting his trust in the "Note of Sanctity". But at the same time he admits "our theology is in chaos, we have no principles, no form, no order, or structure or science. It seems to me inevitable that there must be a true and exact intellectual tradition of the Gospel, and that scholastic theology is (more or less) such a tradition, we have rejected it and substituted nothing in its room." This concern for the lack of order which seems to take no account of the Protestant scholastic theologians, for example those of the seventeenth century, comes out again in a diary entry for May 1846 as does his changing view of the Church of Rome.

"I am conscious to myself of an extensively changed feeling towards the Church of Rome. It seems to me nearer the truth, and the Church of England in greater peril. Our divisions seem to me to be fatal as a token, and as a disease. If division do not unchurch us it will waste us away. I am conscious of being less and less able to preach dogmatically. If I do so, I go beyond our formularies. Though not therefore Roman I cease to be

Anglican.

I am conscious that my sympathy and confidence are much lessened.

There seems about the Church of England a want of antiquity, system, fulness, intelligibleness, order strength, unity; we have dogmas on paper; a ritual almost universally abandoned; no discipline, a divided episcopate, priesthood, and laity."

(Purcell vol I page 484)

The great attraction of Rome, then, is her order and system. How attractive these must have been to the Archdeacon who was struggling to restore parts of the heritage of the Church of England that had been allowed to fall into dis-use, holding back would-be converts to Rome on the one hand whilst resisting the encroachments of the State on the other and all the while handicapped by a lack of the order which seemed to be displayed by the Church of Rome.

At the same time he felt himself drawn to Rome in a deeper sense,

"I seem to feel something by an impression of consciousness not to be reasoned out:

1. If John the Baptist were sanctified from the womb, how much more the B.V.!
2. If Enoch and Elijah were exempted from death, why not the B.V. from sin?
3. It is a strange way of loving the Son to slight the mother!

Apart from the attraction of the system and order of the Roman Church, Manning is also feeling the force of her emotional attraction. This is reflected again in an entry for 5th. July 1846 (Purcell vol I page 485). He lists twenty-five "strange thoughts" that have visited him. He finds greater difficulty in arguing against the Church of Rome. But his sixth point is significant,

"6. I feel as if a light had fallen on me. My feeling about the Roman Church is not intellectual.



I have intellectual difficulties, but the great moral difficulties seem melting."

The emotional pull of Rome is stronger than his intellectual appreciation of her order but even this emotional pull is not wholehearted,

"8. And yet I do <sup>not</sup> feel at all as if my safety requires any change, and I do feel that a change might be a positive delusion."

"11. Is all this listening to the tempter?"

"13. Is instability and love of novelty the set-off and counterpoise to ambition?"

If the choice were between the Protestant bodies and the Church of Rome, Manning would have no doubts about joining Rome, but the Church of England stands far enough away from the Protestant bodies to make her still the most acceptable choice. His position is summed up in this passage.

"23. Yet I have no positive doubts about the Church of England. I have difficulties - but the chief thing is the drawing of Rome. It satisfies the WHOLE of my intellect, sympathy, sentiment, and nature, in a way proper, and solely belonging to itself. The English Church is an approximate."

But the position is not easy. "The meshes seem closing round me". He is also aware of the harm that he may do his parish. "I feel as if I had shaken the confidence of my people. And I am unable to restore it by anti-Roman declarations. It is probable that my parish may be troubled". "I feel sad and heavy, tongue-tied and worsted."

For Manning the true Church must bear the marks of holiness, high sacramentalism and a true priesthood. He was satisfied that the Church of Rome bore these but the question still remained whether the Anglican Church bore them also? If not, did she bear them potentially and were her

obvious deficiencies a greater or lesser evil than the corruptions which he believed to exist in Rome? In August 1846 he could write of the Church of England,

"Wherever it seems healthy it approximates the system of Rome e.g. Roman Catholic Catechism, Confession, Guidance, Discipline." (Purcell vol I page 484)

He sees that "these things are potentially ours, but actually we have forfeited

them. Using is having, and the

Roman Church has them." After three hundred years the

Church of England has failed,

- "(1) In unity of doctrine.
- (2) In enforcement of discipline.
- (3) In training to the higher life.
- (4) In holding the love as distinct from the respect of the people.
- (5) In guiding the rich.
- (6) In folding the people.

(Purcell vol I page 484)

In an entry for 20th. April 1847 he reduces his doubts to two questions,

- "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?" (Purcell vol I page 487)

If he accepts the principle of infallibility then he meets with difficulties over details such as Transubstantiation. But "If I judge of the detail, I can find no principle." He sees that Rome has a principle and that the Church of England does not and that this principle excludes private judgement over the details. His problem is weighing up whether, if the Church is infallible and the Church of Rome is the Church, the parts of the Church's faith that he would have to accept on the authority of her infallibility

alone are as many as the difficulties that he feels about the position of the Church of England.

In an autobiographical note, Cardinal Manning wrote in 1887 "The state of my mind in 1847 is carefully stated in a letter to the clergyman to whom I made a general confession." (Purcell vol I pages 467-73) The clergyman, Laprimaudaye, was the recipient of the letter written 16th. July 1847. He describes his "active" work as a parish priest for fourteen years and as an archdeacon for six and a half. His doubts are the result of of a "life of over work" and not "a retired, reading, speculative life." He lists some of the people that he has kept back from Rome and insists that he never shared Newman's feelings about her. Only over the question of Ward's degradation did he work in concert with those at Oxford. He sums up "So wholly and sincerely from my soul has all my heart and strength been given against the Roman tendencies and temptations to them." He strongly denies that he has now been influenced by Roman books of devotion or deprecating language about the Church of England. His two main theological interests have been unity and infallibility which he took up in 1835 and 1837-8 respectively. He then gives his own account of the attempt to answer Newman's book.

"When Newman's book was published, Gladstone urged me to answer it. I declined p̄redging myself; but it forced me again into the two same subjects. To which I have continued to give all the thought and reading I can.

And I am bound to say that I could not republish wither of the two books as they stand. They are

inaccurate in some facts; incomplete as compared with the truth of the case; and concede some of the main points I intended to deny."

He sees the Anglican position as being based on the Vincentian Canon, the interpretation of Scripture by Antiquity as expressed in the canon of 1562, the faith of the Church before the division of East and West as stated by Bishop Ken, and that Roman doctrines cannot be proved from the first six centuries as argued by Bishop Jewel. Having read extensively in the Fathers, however, Manning feels that he could no longer defend Ken or Jewel in this respect. Again he centres his doubts around two points. First, there is the argument that the infallibility of the Church is the natural result of the presence of the Holy Spirit which began at Pentecost and is attested by 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."

Second, there is the argument that it was the revealed will of Jesus that the episcopate should be united with a visible head in the way that the Apostles were united with St. Peter. He is concerned not with the primacy but the unity of the episcopate.

"Now these two questions are two principles, which involve all details. And the course of examination which has led me to them is the canon of 1562, i.e. Scripture interpreted by antiquity. The Council of Chalcedon, which the Church of England recognises, exhibits them both in a form and distinctness which I cannot at present reconcile with what I have hitherto believed to be tenable."

But if Manning was attracted by the ethos of the Roman Church he was also head back by, if not faith, at least fidelity to the Church of England. His letter continues, "All bonds of birth, blood, memory, love, happiness, interest, every inducement which can sway and bias my will, bind me to my published belief. To doubt it is to call in question all that is dear to me." It is only a mass of evidence all pointing, he believes, one way that forces him to call into question the trust that he has in the Church of England. It is in Antiquity, where the Church sends him for proof, that he encounters his difficulties, not in the months spent in Italy nor his contact with Catholic Roman books of devotion.

Doubts of another kind still troubled him. Was his judgement biassed by worldly expectations? At the beginning of 1848 he wrote to Robert Wilberforce because he believed him to be free from the temptations that might be influencing him. (Purcell Vol I page 508) In the same letter he explains that his thoughts are beginning to take a definite shape in his mind.

"Things seem to me clearer, plainer, shaplier, 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 consolidates all old convictions, and keeps throwing out the premisses of new ones."

But, "Still I can say I have never felt the fear of safety or pressure of conscience which alone justifies a change."

Only one example of the other side of Manning's

"double voice" is needed to make the contrast between his public and private utterances. As late as July 1850 he was writing to a lady penitent setting out reasons for putting one's trust in the Church of England.

"When I come to look at the Church of England, I see a living, continuous succession of Christian people under their pastors, descending from the earliest ages to this day; and although it has had to bear mutilations and breaches in its external order and in its relations to the other churches, yet it seems to me to possess the divine life of the Church, and the divine food of that life, the Word and Sacraments of Christians."  
(Purcell vol I page 481)

This is the public voice of Manning but all his doubts were not confined to his private voice and all his confidence in the Church of England was not confined to his public voice. It cannot be denied that he did speak in two different ways to two different sets of people, but the dividing line is not as clear as some critics would have us believe. A half sheet of note paper dated 5th. Sunday after Trinity 1849 contains this profession of faith in the Church of England,

"I believe one holy Catholic Church, and I hold the Faith of that One Church, believing all it believes anathematising all it anathematises.  
I believe the Church in England, commonly called of England, to be a member of that One Church.  
As such I hold to it.  
If I did not so believe it, I should at once submit myself to the Holy Roman Church. H.E.MANNING"  
(Purcell vol I pages 464-5)

Perhaps such a signed document testifies more to the doubts Manning was struggling to hold back than to a calm assurance, but still it stands as a witness to the complicated

state of his mind.

If we consider Manning's thought at this stage certain weaknesses become apparent. Like Newman his view is distorted at the outset because he pays so little attention to the Orthodox Church and its claim to be the true Church. Both men ignore the long tradition of contacts between Anglicans and the Christian East. In the eighteenth century a correspondence took place between some of the Non-juring bishops and the four Eastern patriarchs and the Holy Synod of Russia. The bishops made proposals for a concordat in which they expressed their agreement with the teachings of the Orthodox Church in many things and received lengthy and considered replies from both Russia and Greece. William Palmer of Magdalen College, Oxford (not the William Palmer of Worcester College, who wrote the "Treatise on the Church of Christ") spent six months between 1840 and 1841 in Russia studying the Church life there. It was Newman himself who was to edit his notes when they were published in 1882. Such contacts were always isolated events and there was a long period of stagnation before the beginning of the Oxford Movement, but since the Reformation the Orthodox Church had possessed an increasing attraction for Anglican churchmen, separated from Rome and looking for links with other traditions.

Manning was impressed by the history and spirituality of the Roman Church and the fact that she stood in marked contrast to the Church of England as he saw her, but he had not asked himself whether the very elements that he found

so attractive in the Church of Rome, were present also in the East. The Orthodox have always been proud of their changelessness and their determination to remain loyal to the past. In the words of John of Damascus "We do not change the everlasting boundaries which our fathers have set but we keep the Tradition, just as we received it." (quoted by T. Ware in "Orthodoxy" page 204) In the past, it is true, this uncritical attitude has frequently led to stagnation but the Eastern Church has jealously guarded its inheritance of Tradition in the form of Bible, Creed, decrees of the Ecumenical Councils and the writings of the Fathers, the Canons, service books and holy icons. The Roman Church can be matched in the East by a whole system of doctrine, Church government and worship. If Manning's perspective had been wide enough to include the whole of Christendom then the Church of Rome would not have stood out as a unique vehicle for the transmission of doctrine as she does when compared only with the Protestant bodies. The East maintains traditions as old as those cherished by the West. Her worship is marked by a deep spirituality and she is free from control by secular powers. Manning's narrow approach belongs to the age in which he lived but he cannot be wholly exempted from blame. To omit a large portion of the followers of Christ from any serious discussion about the Church suggests that his reasoning was not the basis for but the result of his conclusions.

It has been suggested that in the process of Manning's conversion, "There was a wealth of reasoning, but a paucity



of reasons;" (A.M.Fairbairn, "Catholicism: Roman and Anglican" page 259). This certainly seems to be so with regard to his acceptance of infallibility. Although he could remain unconvinced by Newman's work in 1845, he soon found that he could not refute it, even though it assumed the very infallibility that it set out to prove. Newman had shown that there was great diversity in the history of the Church. Therefore, there must be development and this meant, in turn, that the Church must be guided. Manning's own approach, the idea of the continuing presence of the Holy Ghost in the Church, inaugurated at Pentecost and ensuring a "perpetual infallibility" also assumes the very fact he wishes to establish. The route by which, he insists, infallible truth comes to us is open to criticism. He has no warrant for confining it to the Roman Church and neither can he confine it to official pronouncements. These may be wrong while the mind of a thinker, and his conscience, may be right. Similarly, the kind of infallible certainties Manning gives us are open to criticism. They are not necessarily a complete exposition of the truth at any one time before the coming of the Kingdom. Secondly, the Church is not necessarily given complete exemption from error in these matters. Instead there is the promise that the mind of the Church will be drawn from error back to truth by the Holy Ghost.

The position of the see of Rome was important for Manning. He claimed to be more concerned with the unity

of the episcopate than the primacy in his letter to Lap-  
-rimaudaye, but it is a unity with a visible head. He  
sees this as part of the revealed will of Christ. A pope  
is the first among bishops just as St. Peter was the first  
among the disciples. We cannot be certain either about  
St. Peter's position in Rome or about the forms of ministry  
before the end of the second century, but we can say that  
St. Peter's pre-eminent position did not exempt him from  
censure by St. Paul and that the evidence of the New Test-  
-ament does not necessarily support the claims of the Papacy.

But Manning's views must be taken in the context in  
which he was forced to work. Rightly or wrongly, he had  
decided to continue as a public figure and defender of the  
Church against the encroachments of the State and this ex-  
-posed him to the full force of the Erastianism of the times.  
The supreme authority of the Roman Church in spiritual  
matters must have seemed all the more attractive to him  
at a time when Parliament seemed to go, almost unchallenged,  
after greater powers in Church matters and the University  
of Oxford seemed to hound the Tractarians. The apparent  
spirituality of Rome must have contrasted sharply with the  
parish churches in his archdeaconry where he longed to  
remove the great private pews and restore greater reverence  
and order. Above all, these years saw a succession of in-  
-cidents in which the Tractarians found themselves in opp-  
-osition to authority. On Manning's return to England he  
was plunge into the "Hampden Controversy".

Chapter Five

THE GORHAM CASE

Renn Dickson Hampden was a comparatively unimportant theologian of the nineteenth century but he was nevertheless the centre of two bitter controversies which, far more than his published works, have caused his name to be remembered. His appointment as Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford in 1836 had raised such a storm of protest that Lord Melbourne had nearly been forced to give in to it and withdraw his offer. Hampden was accused of unorthodoxy and Newman provided ammunition for the charge by hurriedly writing a pamphlet called "Elucidations of Dr. Hampden's Theological Statements". The appointment, however, was confirmed and the University responded by passing a statute declaring its lack of confidence in his theology and depriving him of the right to choose university preachers. This condemnation has been scorned as meaningless, but though Hampden was left unaffected it did serve as a public condemnation of Melbourne and the system by which such appointments were made.

With this background, it is not surprising that controversy broke out afresh in 1847 when Lord John Russell nominated Hampden as Bishop of Hereford. The two sides of the dispute can be seen clearly in the letter of protest drawn up by the thirteen bishops and in Lord John Russell's reply. The bishops express the "apprehension and alarm" in the minds of the clergy at the nomination.

of one whose doctrine "the University of Oxford has affirmed by a solemn decree, its want of confidence." (The letter and reply are quoted in full by A.O.J.Cockshutt, "Religious Controversies of the Nineteenth Century" pages 102-6)

The Prime Minister's reply reminds the bishops that their argument is based upon lectures delivered fifteen years ago and that since that time many bishops have indicated their approval of Hampden's lectures and sermons, that the Archbishop of Canterbury did not discourage the nomination, and that withdrawing it would mean that "a decree of the University of Oxford is a perpetual ban of exclusion against a clergyman of eminent learning and irreproachable life; and that, in fact, the supremacy which is now by law vested in the Crown is to be transferred to a majority of the members of one of our universities." He concludes by reminding the bishops that many of Hampden's most prominent opponents have now gone over to Rome.

The centre of both controversies was not Hampden's Bampton Lectures and his theology, although both sides went to them to find support for their arguments. Rather it was the question of the Royal Supremacy. Lord John Russell regarded the Church as a department of state. His reply to a long letter from the Dean of Hereford, who was to vote against Hampden, was simply,

"Sir, - I have had the honour to receive your letter of the 22nd instant, in which you intimate to me your intention of violating the law." (Cockshutt page 106)

He regarded opposition from the Church dignitaries as no less than mutiny. The Tractarians felt that matters of doctrine

were being decided by a secular official from whom there was no appeal. Hampden's supporters were prepared to give absolute power in Church matters to a man who might know no theology because they believed that the Royal Supremacy was the only guarantee of the Church's national and Protestant character. The great difficulty of the Tractarian position was that as Anglicans they were committed to a belief in the Royal Supremacy in some sense and so in the last resort would be bound to submit to its decision even when it went against them. If they could not do this, then they could hardly remain as Anglicans.

The Hampden controversy had begun while Manning was in Rome, but this did not lessen his concern. In December 1847 he wrote to Robert Wilberforce about the gravity of the affair which involved "the highest relations of the Church and the Civil Power and the most vital principles of the Church." He maintains that "Though not the best mode of selecting Bishops, the recommendation of the Crown is in England not a point to be contested, but the compulsory election and consecration under pain of praemunire, for such it is in effect, is unrighteous and fatal to the Church." The heart of the matter is that it is "monstrous and unspeakably irreverent" to Jesus Christ that the bishops should be chosen by "any layman who may chance to lead the House of Commons." (letter quoted by D. Newcome pages 337-8) Apart from the larger issues raised by the Hampden controversy, Manning has no doubts about Hampden's unorthodoxy. On 12th. February 1848 he wrote under the seal

of the confessional to Robert Wilberforce. He begins on an ominous note,

"I feel my position altered by this event, and unless the reasons which I will give can be shown to be without force, I am afraid of thinking of the future."  
(Purcell vol I pages 508-10)

He is convinced that Hampden's Bampton Lectures are heretical both in matter and form and that the whole Church is made a partaker in the heresy by his consecration. The denial of catholic doctrine and the Church of England's links with Protestantism as in the Jerusalem Bishopric affair have meant that Manning has been unable to claim for his Church "the undoubted guidance of the Holy Spirit along the path of Catholic tradition." It is from books and private judgement that such guidance comes and not the Church of England, with its "impotence and uncertainty of witness in the highest doctrine of the divine revelation."

"It is in vain to speak of the Church of England as a witness, except as an epitaph. Its living office and character are tampered with; and its living, speaking testimony is not trustworthy."

Manning finds himself without a defence for his Church. He can still give it his intellectual assent, but it is no longer an object of his faith. He is confronted with the "miserable truth" that the civil power is the ultimate authority for deciding doctrine in England.

In a letter dated 11th. March 1848, from Rome, a new note enters Manning's writings. He is finding it very hard to remain silent. "Truth is a trust to be laid out and accounted for, and the time is spending fast." (quoted by Purcell vol I pages 513-5) People are interpreting his

silence as acquiescence and are encouraged by it to reject the beliefs that he holds dear. "What I feel is, that a broad open avowal of principle may probably suffice to clear us individually of responsibility, guide others to the right way, make our position personally tenable, and begin a correction of evil." It must be a broad statement, not "fine distinctions or theories unintelligible to the pauperes Christi for whom we exist."

Manning's public statement on the controversy is contained in his Visitation Charge of July 1848. It begins with a warning based on the words "Judge not, that ye be not judged," and this sets the tone of the address. He distinguishes between Hampden's doctrinal opinions and the manner of his consecration. The former are not in question because the Church as such has never passed judgement upon them. Even the University of Oxford's condemnation is not a formal decision on heresy, and since then there have been no charges. Recently the proper authority in such matters has decided not to proceed with a trial and, anyway, Hampden publicly subscribed to the Catholic creeds at his consecration and so condemned all heresies.

"No man is a heretic to us who is not a heretic to the Church; and no man is to the Church a heretic but one who has been condemned in foro exteriori for heresy. This does not hinder us from using all means, as it was our duty to do in this case, to obtain a full examination of suspicious teaching, nor of protesting against acts which ought only to follow upon such enquiry; but when, through error, such acts are finally completed, individuals may rest within the sphere of their responsibility. They can do no more, and are therefore free."

(page 11)

His argument, then, rests upon the manner of Hampden's consecration, namely that the Commissary of the Metropolitan was in error in not hearing objections before proceeding to confirm Hampden's election. The civil power was not at fault because its only part in the affair was to refuse to interfere.

"The case, therefore, assumes the form of a claim set up in behalf of the Crown, to a power absolute and unlimited in the choice of persons to be recommended for election as Bishops, without submitting the fitness of the person elect, according to the law of the Universal Church, to any Judge or Tribunal whatsoever." (page 13)

Manning draws out three main principles. Firstly, the Apostles alone held the Apostolic office and the power of succession from Jesus. Secondly, the power of succession involves both the choice of persons to be ordained and their admission by ordination. Thirdly, Church history shows that the electors may be any members of the Church but the candidates must also have judicial approval of their election, and ordination. During the Hampden controversy it had been falsely argued that the civil power has the right to make a final and absolute choice of the person to be consecrated. But rather, the electing power is in two parts, "the crown possesses the power to choose out and recommend; the people, including the clergy, possess the power of hindering by active objection, or of sharing by tacit consent in the election of their bishop." (page 31) For Manning, then, the State was not at fault. The error was that of the Metropolitan sitting in his court. But the situation may be remedied easily by ensuring that a



true exposition of the law and a regular application of its principles occurs on the next occasion.

It is not difficult to criticise this approach to the controversy, quite apart from the question of whether Manning's double voice has not gone beyond the confusion of a distraught mind and become deliberate time-serving. One critic was quick to point out that Manning's arguments about Hampden's legal innocence could be used to defend a murderer or pickpocket who had only escaped punishment because of a defect in the legal administration. (letter from W. Dodsworth to Manning 10th. August 1848 quoted by Purcell vol I page 479) In a letter to Robert Wilberforce (8th. November 1848. quoted by Purcell vol I page 480) Manning says that he is unmoved by the criticisms levelled at his charge. "But I have misgivings in my own mind about it. The parts of what I say which have not been found fault with, are by no means satisfactory to me. And I get no better satisfaction the more I think of them."

Although the Hampden controversy was a cause of great unsettlement to the Tractarians it proved to be little more than the prelude to a much greater crisis that was to centre round an even less important event. On 11th. March 1848 Bishop Phillpotts of Exeter refused to institute a Mr. Gorham to the living of Bramford Speke. The Bishop had insisted upon holding an examination of Mr. Gorham's doctrine to determine whether it was sound. The examination, concerned solely with the doctrine of baptismal regeneration lasted for thirty-eight hours and involved the answering of

149 written questions as well. At the end Phillpotts declared Gorham to be unsound and refused to institute him. Gorham then appealed to the Court of Arches to compel the Bishop to carry out the institution. After four and a half months, the Dean of Arches, Sir Herbert Jenner Fust, delivered a judgement in favour of the Bishop of Exeter. Gorham then appealed to the Privy Council's judicial committee, which included the Archbishops and the Bishop of London, and the decision was reversed.

The Gorham case raised two important questions. Was Gorham a heretic? Who or what had the right to determine whether he was or not? The decision and the method of arriving at it involved fundamental principles for all the parties within the Church. A decision in favour of the Bishop meant condemning the Calvinist approach to the Thirty-Nine Articles and might have led to a movement away from the Church by men holding such views. They saw the language of the liturgy as conditional when it spoke of regeneration in connection with baptism. They associated the word with the conversion of those who had already been baptised. By condemning Gorham's views the Church would be condemning them "en masse". A decision in favour of the Bishop of Exeter would also have been a blow to the Latitudinarians who held that the Church of England permitted a wide breadth of interpretation when it came to doctrine. The condemnation of an important approach to the idea of baptism would have made nonsense of the claim. The Tractarians, who may have considered Gorham rightly condemned by the Court of Arches,

were now confronted with a court of appeal whose very nature was suspect and whose verdict was in doubt. They had to face the problem that if the Privy Council upheld Gorham, then the claim of the Church of England to be the guardian of Apostolic teaching would become questionable. It would mean that a bishop had no right to insist upon a particular interpretation of Article 27 on baptism and so he could not insist upon the interpretation of Articles 25 and 29 either, which refer to the reception of the sacraments. The Tractarians were also faced with the fact that the question had been brought before a secular court, showing that the Royal Supremacy gave it the right to define the limits of the Church's teaching. This problem would remain, irrespective of the decision. When they decided in favour of Gorham, the Privy Council believed that they were not deciding an issue of doctrine, but were reasserting the idea of the Church as a national institution as opposed to an autonomous body. They were safeguarding a clergyman against having views imposed upon him by a bishop. It is easy to see how completely different would be the approach of Manning and his supporters. For them the office of bishop was the Church's link with Apostolic purity. The united episcopate, sitting in synod, should be the highest court of appeal. The presence of the two Archbishops in no way mollified the hostility of Manning and his supporters to the action of the Privy Council. They regarded their participation as more serious than any state interference. Unlike the Bishop of London, they had voted for Gorham. The traditional faith

of the Church of England, they believed, was being betrayed by its own leaders.

Before looking at Manning's reaction to the Gorham case and the underlying principles that were at stake, it is interesting to note the views of the two great Tractarian leaders still alive and within the Church of England. Manning quotes Keble as saying, "if the Church of England were to fail, it should be found in my parish." (Purcell vol I page 529) For both Keble and Pusey the affair caused much sadness but no uncertainty. If others gave the Church of England their loyalty only so long as she could prove herself to be a part of the universal Church, for Keble faith in the Church of England came first and the universal Church had to be built up around her. Keble was concerned above all with the work of his own parish. Pusey, unlike Keble, who had always considered that the Oxford Movement was merely carrying on a tradition that he had been taught in his childhood, had adopted such doctrines only after very careful adult thought and study. He was satisfied that the Church of England was historically Catholic and part of the universal Church and that it was impossible for her to deny her faith. Not all the powers of England together could commit the Church to heresy. The universal Church was primary and since it was now divided into fragments, no one could formulate a doctrine that would carry the final authority which lay with the undivided Church alone. Neither Keble nor Pusey, then, suffered from the heartache and despair that was to afflict Manning, and this explains their reservations in the ensuing protests and their staying within the Church of

England.

For the few months before the judgement was known, Manning's thoughts are to be found in his letters to Robert Wilberforce. At the end of 1849 he writes of his overwhelming belief in "the indivisible unity and perpetual infallibility of the Body of Christ." and that the "Hampden confirmation and the Gorham appeal show me that the Church of England, supposing it to continue in esse a member of the visible Church, is in a position in which it is not safe to stay." (quoted by Purcell vol I pages 515-6) But he continues that even these would not be sufficient to make him move if he could justify the relationship between the Church of England and the visible Church.

This appeal has brought out "long and secret thoughts in a critical and urgent way" and in a later letter he explains the course of action he has decided upon. It is to submit two questions to certain lawyers.

- "1. 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?
2. Does the Oath of Supremacy bind those who take it to recognise and accept the supremacy so claimed and exercised? (Purcell vol I page 518)

If these questions are answered in the affirmative, then he will submit to his bishop a request for a trial as to his fitness to hold office. In a letter dated only six days later (18th. January 1850 quoted by Purcell vol I pages 518-9) Manning sees the crown as having the ultimate power of interpretation of formularies, a power as great as that of the Council of Nice to interpret the Apostles' Creed, a power that can only be checked by the crown itself. "I feel this to touch my

feel this to touch my faith as a Christian and my conscience as a priest" and he sees no alternative but to declare that he cannot accept such a supremacy. This letter must have alarmed Robert Wilberforce because on 22nd. January Manning was writing to reassure him (Purcell vol I page 519) Shortly after this their correspondence ceased because they both met in London along with other like-minded friends to plan their opposition. It is not surprising that these letters were exchanged even before the decision of the Privy Council was known. Whichever way the judgement went, the major issue of the crown as a court of appeal for such matters would still not be resolved.

Purcell quotes a letter to Manning from James Hope (vol I pages 524-7) which he claims convinced Manning that far from being the victim of the gradual encroachment of the civil power as he had supposed, the Church of England had, in fact, accepted the Royal Supremacy at the time of the Reformation. Manning's studies had certainly brought him towards this view already. In his letter to the Bishop of Chichester on the Ecclesiastical Commission he had traced in outline the relations between Church and State in England and the breakdown of the ecclesiastical constitution that had begun in the reign of Henry VIII. For Hope, the Hampden and Gorham cases merely exemplified what had long been a part of the structure of the Church. "The subject of it (the Gorham appeal) may indeed develop more fully the scandal of the system, but the system has long existed

and been an offence in the Church." (Purcell vol I page 526) Until the end of their Anglican careers, Manning and Hope were to work together in their pursuit of common aims and they were received into the Church of Rome together.

When the Privy Council gave its judgement in favour of Gorham, Manning and his friends decided to draw up a declaration expressing their views. Manning presided at a meeting in the vestry of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge. But it soon became apparent that it would be difficult to obtain signatures. Men who would unite to oppose the Gorham judgement differed in their ideas as to the form that opposition should take. After many modifications and amendments, a form was agreed upon and signed by thirteen men headed by Manning and including Pusey, Keble, Robert and Henry Wilberforce and James Hope. ( see Purcell vol I pages 532-3) At the last moment Gladstone found himself unable to sign. The document has nine points. The Church of England must "openly and expressly" reject "erroneous doctrine" sanctioned by the judgement. Remission of original sin by baptism is an integral part of the article, "One baptism for the remission of sins". The judgement renders the "benefits of Holy Baptism altogether uncertain and precarious". To admit the lawfulness of holding a view of an article that contradicts its essential meaning is to abandon that article. The deliberate abandonment of an article of the Creed destroys the divine foundation of the faith of the Church. Any portion of the Church which does this forfeits

its authority as a member of the universal Church, and becomes formally separated from it. All measures "consistent with the present legal position of the Church" ought to be taken to obtain an official declaration by the Church of the doctrine of baptism called into question by the recent judgement. If this fails, the episcopate must make this reaffirmation in its spiritual capacity.

As Archdeacon of Chichester, Manning called a meeting of the clergy of the archdeaconry and they voted to protest, almost unanimously, against the judgement. Manning's scheme, in line with his opposition over ten years earlier to the Ecclesiastical Commission, was for full authority to be given to a Church Synod made up of the bishops and convened by the Church and not the State which would make them commissioners of the crown.

"What appears to me to be requisite in this case is such an Appellate Court as shall carry with it the authority of the Church determining its own sphere. I will go into no particulars as to whom it shall consist of, but only that it shall include the whole Episcopate." (Purcell vol I page 534)

In another part of Manning's speech at the meeting he explains his reasons for glossing over the difficulties of the Mampden case in his charge of 1848.

"I so deeply felt that case, that if the English Church could have been convicted of either consecrating a heretic, or of giving up to the State the power of finally determining the fitness of men for the pastoral office, it would have been a betrayal of her divine trust. I tried to deny both these accusations and in denying them I confess I strained every plea to the utmost, feeling the necessity of the case to be so vital



.....I am glad now to be able to say that in so speaking I did not defend Dr. Hampden, but the Church of England." (Purcell vol I page 535)

Although the meeting could not agree on his proposal for a new final court of appeal, the majority did put their names to an address to the Bishop of Chichester, urging that the doctrine of baptism be proclaimed and maintained and steps be taken to relieve those troubled by the recent events.

It was decided to follow up the first declaration signed by the thirteen men with another one. This time Pusey and Keble were not invited to suggest modifications. The document was signed by Manning, Robert Wilberforce, and W.H.Mill, the Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge. In it they declare that they now acknowledge and have always acknowledged the supremacy of the crown in the temporal matters of spiritual things in the Church. They refuse to acknowledge the power recently exercised by the crown over doctrine which is the task of the Church alone. They conclude by acknowledging the Royal Supremacy in the first sense and no other. The declaration was then circulated to every beneficed clergyman and layman who had taken the Oath of Supremacy, inviting signatures. In an autobiographical note dated 1885, Manning records the response.

"About 1800 clergymen signed out of 20,000; and I saw that the game was up. It was a fair test fully applied; and it received next to no response."  
(Purcell vol I page 543)

Manning's most important contribution to the debate is contained in a long and closely-reasoned letter to the Bishop of Chichester, which was published as a pamphlet.

He had used this method before over the questions of the Ecclesiastical Commission and the future of the unendowed canonries. In 1850 he published the letter under the title "The Appellate Jurisdiction of the Crown in Matters Spiritual". He states his aim in the opening pages. It is to set out the "principles on which we believe the Church of England, as a portion of the Universal Church, to be founded; and next, the facts which have been established in the course of the late proceedings. I will endeavour to show, that essential principles of the Church have been thereby contravened." (page 3) The submission of the Church of England to spiritual jurisdiction is founded upon the following points. Under Christ, the Church possesses sole power over doctrine and discipline. The Church of England shares this power and has "no need to go beyond itself for succession, orders, mission, jurisdiction, and the office to declare to its own members, in matters of Faith, the intention of the Catholic Church." (page 5) The office of the Civil Power is to "protect, uphold, confirm, and further this." (page 6) The Royal Supremacy is simply temporal power over temporal things in so far as they are involved in ecclesiastical matters.

He concludes that the Supremacy is Legislative, Executive and Judicial. The point of dispute is not about the first two, but where the judicial power is claimed as the power of immediate jurisdiction and as the power of appeal in the last resort. After referring to many cases and

authorities, Manning concludes that the first point "cannot be justified by any precedent in our law or history" (page 15) and that on the second point "the appellate jurisdiction . . . is not only at variance with the office of the Church, but is also new even in its principle and form." (page 18)

By statute law the crown may hear any case referred to the Court of the Archbishop and so there is no spiritual question which it does not claim to be able to hear. The spiritual element of the Gorham case, the soundness of his doctrine, was heard by the Privy Council.

"This proves, beyond controversy, what character is thereby openly claimed for the Crown, namely, that of Supreme Ecclesiastical Judge in matters the most intimately and purely spiritual and divine," (page 27)

The judges denied that they were judging the soundness of the doctrine before them, but they never denied their legal competence to hear and judge what is the doctrine of the Church of England. Manning accepts that the State in alliance with the Church has the right to verify the doctrines it has agreed to legalise and that all the judges have done is to pronounce that Gorham's doctrine is not repugnant to that of the Church of England, "as known to the law". Properly understood, however, the appellate jurisdiction of the Crown means that an appeal can come to it from an ecclesiastical court only on a civil issue and that the judge may hear only the civil aspects of the case. But now the crown can declare admissible a doctrine which the Church itself has declared inadmissible. The distinction between

"as known to the law" and as known to the Church is a fiction and in no way solves the problem.

One defence of the Gorham judgement has been that it leaves the doctrine of the Church untouched. But for Manning, doctrine is not a written but a living truth. The books and forms without their true interpretation are nothing.

"It (i.e. doctrine) is the perpetual living voice of the individual pastors uniting as one. The Church is the collective teacher, and doctrine is its oral exposition of the Faith." (page 36)

These thoughts go back to Newman's ideas on the development of doctrine and Manning's own increasing awareness of the presence of the Holy Spirit within the Church guiding her into all truth. Doctrine, for Manning, is not only the written formulae but also the oral teaching of bishops, clergy and even schoolteachers and the heads of families. It is "the living, ever spreading, and perpetual sense which is taught at our altar and from house to house all the year round." (page 36) How can one say that the doctrine has remained untouched when it is now equally lawful for clergy to say that in baptism all infants do or all infants do not receive spiritual regeneration? He concludes that in this exercise of the Crown's power, three evils become apparent. The Church of England's divine office as guardian of doctrine and discipline is violated. Legal protection has been given to the denial of an article of the universal Creed. By rejecting one doctrine, the whole has been rejected. It is not a matter of removing one from an

"assm~~e~~blage of opinions" but of offending against the whole.

As an example of the reaction in some circles to Manning's publication, there is a letter, also published, from the Reverend Frederick Vincent, the Rector of Slinfold and chaplain to the Bishop of Chichester. The letter was addressed to Manning on the announcement of his resignation as Archdeacon in 1851 but it is concerned primarily with his letter to the Bishop of Chichester. Like Manning, Vincent quotes a large number of authorities for his views and draws up detailed arguments against him. He holds that even before the Reformation, the so-called ecclesiastical independence was subject to some limitations<sup>2</sup> and that in the earliest times these were very considerable. He also affirms that "many very faithful and judicious writers, men of clear and honest minds, fully recognized the royal supremacy, since the settlement of our ecclesiastical status at the Reformation." (page 35) These men acknowledged that princes and rulers were supreme in the last resort "over all matters and persons whatsoever within their realms. Hence they have an initiative, and an appellative, and a directive jurisdiction, in all matters of religion which concern their people." (page 35) He cites Gladstone's book on Church and State for evidence of this. He concludes that the only answer to the questions Manning poses may be found in the action of all the clergy who have not felt obliged to follow his example and resign. Perhaps more interesting than Vincent's arguments are his concluding

words. He has set out to answer Manning at his own level, that of research into the historical precedents, but he cannot maintain this to the end.

"You think we are bound to the State with an ever-tightening chain, and now is the time to shake it off. Yet have you not taught us by your acts that the time when the fight becomes most critical, and the hardships most severe, is the moment for the captain to desert his post, and the soldier to throw away his arms?"

He cannot see Manning's resignation as anything less than desertion just as Lord John Russell could not see the Dean of Hereford's refusal to vote for Hampden as anything less than mutiny. Expressions of religious feeling do not look well when expressed in military terms. But according to Vincent, Manning has not just deserted, he has spread dissatisfaction in the ranks.

"Have you not whispered to many unquiet spirits themes of distrust and suspicion, jealousy of rulers, and inflation of themselves?"

"Have you not, too, (for this sole blot on one point of judicature, or at the most, for a possible defect of doctrine on one point) unsettled hundreds of minds with the chimaera, that the whole scheme of doctrines they have learnt, is broken up?"

(pages 48 and 49)

But Vincent does not accuse Manning of dishonesty as some might have done.

"That what you have done, has been done conscientiously none can believe more than I: but wisely, or beneficially, I dare not say." (page 49)

These two pamphlets show most clearly that the solution to the problem was not to be found in the critical examination of historical precedents. Both men argued very plausibly from history, because the evidence was sufficiently

uncertain to support them both. Manning's appreciation of the Roman Church was matched in Vincent by an equal appreciation of the Church of England. What Manning could interpret as the lukewarmness of the Anglican clergy in not making a stand against state interference, Vincent saw as solidarity in the defence of their Church. This wide divergence of views, Manning looking towards Rome and Vincent looking towards England, led naturally to their taking different views of the point at issue. For Vincent a possible defect of doctrine could never be sufficient to call into question the whole scheme, but for Manning divergence in that one point was enough to invalidate her claim to be part of the Church Catholic and to sever the links with the rest of the Church that were for him tenuous at the best. This divergence of views also becomes apparent over the question of integrity. Vincent sees Manning as having sown the seeds of doubt in men's minds deliberately. He has no way of appreciating the complicated state of Manning's mind that is made clear in his confidential letters to Robert Wilberforce. Instead, he imagines that those with doubts who have consulted him and received some loyal statement of faith in the Church of England, are in fact people who have been burdened with doubts by Manning himself.

From the standpoint of a later age it is possible to look back on the Gorham case in perspective and out of earshot of the emotional furore that it caused. Manning and Vincent represent two important groups within the established Church. Manning represents the Tractarians whose unpop-

ularity stemmed from their willingness to sacrifice the Church's material interests in the atmosphere of unease that followed the Reform Bill of 1832. Vincent represents that large body of opinion that had never really thought out their own position in the way that the Tractarians had done, because they were convinced that loyalty and custom were better guides than reasoning.

The search for authority that underlies these events was made necessary by the inadequacy of the authority provided by the framework of the establishment. The bishops, so important for Manning and Newman before him, were divided. The Archbishop of York sympathised with Gorham and yet under his jurisdiction were clergy whose views were those of Bishop Phillpotts. It was, then, no more than an accident of geography that the controversy came when and where it did. Later the Bishop of Exeter was forced, to maintain the logic of his own position, to take the extreme step of excommunicating the Archbishop of Canterbury.

But the only authority that the courts might use in deciding such questions was not the bishops but the Prayer Book and Articles. Ward and Newman had successfully shown that the Articles could be interpreted in a Roman as well as a Protestant sense, or at least in a Catholic sense. This meant that the judges were forced to use criteria whose inadequacy for such a task had only recently been demonstrated. By their very nature the Articles were vague and aimed at compromise because they were the response of the Church to the threat of doctrinal divisions. At the same time the



Articles were not meant to stand alone, but pointed to the Bible as the true rule of faith. It was impossible to expect lawyers, however able, to go back to the Bible and sort through the mass of controversies that have surrounded its interpretation for centuries, assessing the many different claims of the different groups within the Church. The judges, therefore, kept to the Articles, but even here as we have seen, they were not on safe ground. Strictly interpreting them with the Prayer Book, as Newman had shown in Tract 90, many who were considered loyal Anglicans broke the law, for example by not saying Morning and Evening Prayer daily. On a strict interpretation of the sources of law available they too must be held guilty of breaking the law.

Men like Manning could make out a strong case against the Erastianism of the times, but in practice state interference was never as bad as they feared. Judges disagreed when they had so little to guide them and final judgements were not rigorously enforced. The practical ineffectiveness of legal and ecclesiastical decisions meant that the machinery of Church government came, in effect, to a standstill. The situation resulted, indirectly, in practical freedom but this was based on a confusion of legal decisions and not on a smooth-working system of compromise. The non-Tractarian Anglicans too had a point of view and history perhaps, has not always been fair to them. It was, after all largely the Tractarians who brought upon the Church all litigation and the problems of authority by deliberately

making use of the machinery of the law to reduce the traditional limits of recognised opinions within the Church. The non-Tractarians could argue that the Church had got on very well without heresy trials and episcopal synods to define doctrine and could accuse the Tractarians of being deliberate troublemakers. The Tractarians were attracted to Rome by its authoritarianism and clericalism and consequent simplicity. But the absence of this authoritarian and clerical form of government is not necessarily a bad thing, and it may be argued that it is inconsistent with the nature of the Body of Christ which functions through the cooperation of all its members and therefore cannot be either authoritarian, or clerically controlled or simple. It may have to work more slowly, more clumsily, by consensus and not by decree, but this may be more fully Catholic.

It is easy to denigrate the idea of the partnership of Church and State in a single Christian community as "State control" or Erastianism. The Tractarians objected to such control when it went against them but they claimed loudly that the State's duty was to support the Church, and by that they meant the Church as they thought it ought to be. The State on the whole, however, favoured the Church as it was or at least as the great majority of its members thought it ought to be. The growth of dissent, Roman and Evangelical, the removal of political disabilities from dissenters, and the growth of "Rationalism" were beginning to make the partnership much less satisfactory in theory

than it had been, and the Tractarian movement was important in highlighting this. But the movement is usually judged to have begun with Keble's Assize Sermon which affirmed the duty of the State to protect and uphold the Church and condemned a very mild and greatly needed reduction in her material vested interests as "National Apostasy".

Perhaps the crucial fact about the whole question of the relations between Church and State at this time is that except in the United States of America, and the experiment there had not really been taken note of elsewhere, the idea of the separation of Church and State and religious neutrality by the State was almost unknown. Even in revolutionary France the progress had been from State-controlled Catholicism with the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, to the persecution of the Church in favour of the State religion of Reason. Neither the Tractarians nor their opponents, then, had any clear alternative to a mix-up of Church and State and so it was a confused argument about the details of the mixture.

After the Gorham judgement, the High Church movement was beginning to be demoralised. It had entered the Hampden controversy as a powerful pressure group but now men from the front ranks were going over to Rome. Not least to be affected by these secessions was Manning. Robert Wilberforce, it is true, had not yet reached Manning's advanced state, but this only increased his sense isolation as he

watched friends and penitents leaving the Church of England, including his own confessor Laprimaudaye and Henry Wilberforce and his wife. Nothing had happened to increase his trust in the Church of England. The Reformation, seen as a gracious act of God in his Visitation Charge of 1841 has become "a Tudor statute carried by violence and upheld by political power; and now that the State is divorcing the Anglican Church, it is dissolving." (letter to Robert Wilberforce 27th. May 1850 quoted by Purcell vol I page 556) He continues with the objection, so often expressed, that the Church of England's discipline and doctrine are in chaos. If one asks why Manning still remained within the Church of England, the answer is forthcoming in the next paragraph.

"But, alas, every morning when I open my eyes my heart almost breaks. I seem to be divided between truth and love. All my soul cleaves to my old home, but inexorable laws of reason and revelation stand over against me without shadow of turning. Can this be illusion?"

But even this doubting cannot hold him for long. On 18th. October 1850 he was writing to Robert Wilberforce, admitting that even if the Royal Supremacy were reduced to the limits they called for, the Church of England would still be a local Church, irreconcilably divided from the main body. Even the presence of men like Keble in the Church cannot dissuade him from condemning it. This letter (quoted by Purcell vol I page 562) shows a new sense of confidence in Manning's utterances. At an earlier stage he had been impressed by the godly men whose lives had added to the

character of the Church of England. Now he can state categorically that the Church of England is not under the guidance of the Holy Spirit and the presence of men like Keble cannot affect his judgement. (Purcell vol I pages 564-5) The temporary defence of the "Note of Sanctity" failed for him just as it did for Newman.

When Manning had returned from his journey to Rome, he had been faced with two bodies that approximated to the truth, in his mind. By the end of the Gorham case we may say that the balance had tipped decisively in favour of Rome. But he was to remain in the Church of England until April of the following year. The months which followed the judgement were a period of comparative quiet. He retreated from London and the centre of the storm because he believed that any opposition would be merely bargaining with the truth. His official position was the same as that of Pusey and Keble but in private these were months of activity. Not only was he corresponding with Robert Wilberforce, but men like his brother Samuel and Gladstone were sparing no effort in their attempts to win back his loyalty.

Manning's position in the Church of England had withstood the condemnation of Tract 90 by the bishops, the affair of the Jerusalem Bishopric, the secession of Newman his own serious illness, the influence of Roman worship, the appointment of Dr. Hampden and even the Gorham judgement with the secessions that followed it. The final blow, or impetus

that he needed, however, could not be long in coming.

On 7th. October 1850 Cardinal Wiseman issued a pastoral letter "From the Flaminian Gate" and the Pope himself joined the turmoil of religious opinions in England.

Conclusion

THE CHURCH OF ROME

Until the year 1850, England and Wales were divided into eight Roman Catholic districts, each one under a Vicar Apostolic in episcopal orders. On 29th. September of that year, the Pope created thirteen sees at places not occupied by an Anglican bishop. The chief of these was the Archbishopric of Westminster and its first holder was to be Dr. Wiseman who was made a cardinal. The new Cardinal's first pastoral letter declared that "Catholic England has been restored to its orbit in the ecclesiastical firmament, from which its light has long vanished." Such emotional language was interpreted as being a challenge to the English people thrown down by the Roman Catholic Church rather than a letter to faithful Catholics. Popular indignation was roused and at anti-papery meetings the Tractarians were also denounced as traitors within the Anglican Church. In the heat of such emotion, many believed that the Pope had been encouraged to act because English Protestants were seen to be weakened by the presence of the High Churchmen. It was in this situation that the Prime Minister irresponsibly fanned the flames by allowing the publication of a letter he had written to the Bishop of Durham. In it he made it clear that his main concern was with the danger within the Church from clergy who led their flocks to the very brink of Rome, rather than with

the papal aggression. This letter helped to divert public hostility from Wiseman to men like Manning and Pusey.

The clergy of the diocese of Chichester requested their Bishop to summon a meeting to protest at the papal aggression. Manning in his official capacity was instructed to call them together. His reaction to this command is contained in a letter to Robert Wilberforce (15th. November 1850, quoted by Purcell vol I page 578-9) He describes an interview with the Bishop of Chichester at which he told him that he was convinced about the un-lawfulness of the Royal Supremacy which, he believed, was responsible for keeping the Church of England and the Church universal apart. He also made it clear that he regarded the papal action as the legitimate consequence of this separation and that he could not oppose it even though he knew that the views of the clergy were different. His only course was to call the meeting, state his dissent and then resign. That he had finally turned his back on the Church of England is shown by the closing words of a letter written less than a month later, to James Hope (11th. December 1850 quoted by Purcell vol I page 590)

"It is Rome, or licence of thought and will."

Intellectually Manning was in Rome, but he still needed a final act of will to leave the Church of England. He planned, perhaps to give himself the opportunity of averting this, to go abroad, visiting Gladstone in Naples. By nature Manning shrank from violent conflict like the one



surrounding the question of papal aggression. But his leaving England at that time would have led to misunderstanding. He was therefore forced to stay and see things through. Another possibility was suggested by Robert Wilberforce. A scheme was proposed to withdraw from the Church of England and set up a free church. But for Manning there were only two alternatives - a reconstructed Church of England, no more than a dream by this stage, or the Church of Rome. He dismissed the scheme with a piece of bitter humour.

"Three hundred years ago we left a good ship for a boat; I am not going to leave the boat for a tub."  
(Purcell vol I page 592)

By 28th. January 1851, when he wrote a cautious letter to Laprimaudaye, he had, according to Purcell, made up his mind to become a Roman Catholic. He talks off some duties that he must discharge before he can" stand before God all alone, with no responsibility but for my own soul. And then I trust I shall not be wanting to the inspiration of His will." (Purcell vol I page 597) His next step was to offer his resignation. Encouraged to wait for a few days, he did so but it made no difference and the resignation was reluctantly accepted. In March he legally resigned his office and his benefice and on 6th. April he was received, with James Hope, into the Roman Catholic Church. On the same day he wrote to Robert Wilberforce,

c "With the fullest conviction, both of reason and of conscience, we have sought admittance into what we alike believe to be the one true fold and Church of God on earth." (Purcell vol I page 620)

But these words disguise the fact that even at this late

stage he could not enter the Roman Church without a struggle. The last stumbling was the question of the validity of Anglican orders. In his own words, he believed in them "with a consciousness stronger than all reasoning." (Purcell vol I page 619) For five hours he argued the point, at times scarcely able to keep his temper. In the end he gave in and sacrificed one of his most deeply held convictions. Manning, the leader and teacher, was required to submit and surrender his will unconditionally. The attitude of Father Brownbill, who received them, re-emphasised this subjugation. Both men were made to feel that they brought nothing with them, Instead they were to receive everything from the Church.

If Hope's future in the legal profession looked as promising as ever, Manning's prospects of preferment were bleak indeed. He had as a precedent the example of Newman, a much more illustrious convert, who was reduced to the status of a theological student. There is no reason to suppose that it was false modesty rather than his true feelings that caused him to tell James Hope after their reception, "Now my career is ended." (quoted by Shane Leslie page 99) In a later note Manning records more fully his feelings on that day,

"I thought my life was over. I fully believed that I should never do more than become a priest; about which I never doubted, nor ever wavered. But I looked forward to live and die in a priest's life, out of sight." (Purcell vol I pages 627-8)

When the time came for Newman's biography to be written

he was fortunate in having the Anglican, Miss Mozley to edit the material relating to the first part of his life. Not only was she in sympathy with Newman's beliefs at that time, but also, through her brothers, she had known him personally. Manning was not so fortunate. Although he had probably intended his friend J.E.C. Bodley to write his official biography, it was Edmund Sheridan Purcell who undertook the work. Critics have not been kindly disposed towards his efforts. His aim was to present the world with the entire papers of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. He presents his reader with a large amount of correspondence, most notably in his Anglican years that with Robert Wilberforce, but there is little attempt to analyse it or present it as a coherent whole. Another fault, for which he cannot be blamed however, is that he mistakenly believed that he had all the material available. It was hardly surprising, then, that as more material was made public, Purcell was proved wrong where he felt justified in filling gaps with conjectures. At the same time his inability to assess the huge amount of material at his disposal led to an exaggerated emphasis on Manning's human characteristics. He believed, we must presume, that his subject was sufficiently great to be presented to the public without any attempt to gloss over his shortcomings. But Purcell is more than candid, at times he puts the worst interpretation possible on Manning's actions. In his Anglican days he is again

and again presented as a cautious and prudent figure, if not a tim<sup>e</sup>-server, most clearly seen, in his Anglican years, in his desperate attempts to rid himself of the odium of being labelled a Tractarian, when he was prepared to abandon his friends at Oxford and compromise his own beliefs lest he should jeopardise his chances of preferment. It is largely from Purcell that critics have been able to find support for their charges of self-importance, the "double-voice", the lack of human feeling and the conversion based on ambition, that have been levelled at Manning. Purcell must have had a genuine admiration for his subject but his superficial treatment of a period of great difficulty for Manning has contributed substantially to the general lack of sympathy expressed in its most extreme form by Lytton Strachey.

Shane Leslie's shorter but more balanced work makes available some new material and is clearly intended, by the author, as a corrective to the one-sided impression given by Purcell. His introduction contains a critique of Purcell's work in which, apart from the broader issues, he warns that Purcell's dating is not always accurate and that he seems to suffer from the great disability of being unable to read his subject's handwriting. But Shane Leslie himself has not escaped the critics unscathed, In his essay on Manning as an Evangelical in "Essays in Positive Theology", T.A.Lacey argues that his sneering attitude, his errors, ~~and his errors~~ and lack of style and order hinder him from being compared favourably with Purcell. However

Purcell's wealth of unedited material and Shane Leslie's more balanced approach together form the major published sources for the life of Manning.

Any discussion of Manning's views on the Church must take account of his characteristics as a man and as a priest because it is vital to decide whether his views are those of a consistent thinker or a mere ecclesiastical opportunist justifying his changes of allegiance. Perhaps the most deep-rooted of these characteristics was his consciousness of being called by God. The effects of his Evangelical conversion and the counsels of Miss Bevan remained with him for the rest of his life and he saw a very real continuity in his spiritual progress.

"The so-called Evangelical Movement is in the spirit of the Catholic Church. Who restored frequent communion? St. Francis de Sales, Fenelon, Henry Venn, and Henry Blunt." (quoted by T.A.Lacey page 65)

It has been suggested that both Manning and Newman, after their conversions, found themselves in an impossible situation in the Church of England (see David Newsome pages 208-10) They were influenced by Calvinism and also by Catholic sacramentalism and in their attempt to unite the two they combined the severer elements and did not take the corresponding comforts from either system. They had a real sense of personal election but could not accept the comfort of final perseverance. They felt the power of sacramental grace but they were held back by fears of reliance on good works.

Like his brother-in-law Samuel Wilberforce, Manning was a man of action and like him he had to fight against the lure of worldly ambition. With their natural ability, both men had only to keep silent to be assured of preferment and there can be little doubt that if Manning had remained in the Church of England he would have been made a bishop. Quite apart from his own great ability he had the friendship and admiration of the politician Gladstone to support him. Manning's temperament made him a natural leader and one who would not willingly have his authority limited. Throughout his life he fought for independence, whether it be as an Anglican clearly defining the duties and authority of an archdeacon, or as a Roman Catholic resisting the influence of the Jesuits. His defence of the autonomy of the Church of England against the Erastianism of the times and his later defence of the temporal power of the papacy were mirrored in his attitude to his own office within these bodies.

We have seen that Purcell seriously underrated Manning's intellectual abilities. It is true that he did not have the subtlety of thought shown by Newman. Later generations have come to appreciate Newman's works while Manning's are largely forgotten. But during their lives it was the reverse. In the Roman Church Manning was understood and appreciated while Newman was misunderstood and suspect. Manning has been described as "a scholar without a scholar's disposition".(Newsome page 18) He used to study a problem by approaching it in an academic way but when he

had reached his conclusion he closed his mind to further argument. Above all he was an idealist, preoccupied throughout his life with his personal sanctity and the infallible authority and unity of the Church. As an Anglican he was forced to compromise but once in Rome he was free to pursue his ideals unfettered.

"When I was in a system of compromise, I tried to mediate, reconcile, and unite together those who differed. When I entered a system which, being Divine, is definite and uncompromising, I threw myself with my whole soul and strength into its mind, will and action." (quoted by A.Lunn, "Roman Converts page 93)

This passage also brings out the aspect of his character that Purcell interpreted as prudence bordering on time-serving. As an Anglican, Manning was by nature peace-loving and a reconciler of factions. But at the same time the positions that he defended were clear and unsubtle unlike Newman's hesitant and delicate thoughts.

As a man, Manning was endowed with all the social graces necessary for his position. He was tall, a distinguished figure who rode well and was an acknowledged expert on horses. He was very good company and could be relied upon for a never-ending stream of anecdotes that were always suitable for the occasion. He was only forty-three when he was received into the Roman Church and although his high-domed forehead and lack of hair may have added to his age, he was far from the octogenarian cardinal whose likeness comes most readily to mind. He was capable of great emotion, but he was also capable of great restraint. It was easy for Lytton Strachey to sneer at the young widower writing his sermons by his young wife's

grave, but there is ample testimony to his very genuine grief at her death, in the contemporary letters of his friends and family. He has been accused of callousness over her premature death but it was a bitter blow to him. He never forgot her, but after his initial grief he threw himself wholeheartedly into his work and this singlemindedness remained with him for the rest of his life. At the same time Manning had few intimate friends and many, especially opponents, found him cold and aloof. Many years later in his Roman days, his friend Herbert Vaughan was to write to him.

"I hope you are not at all sharp or severe with those who are against you, or rather I should say coldly reserved and ominously civil. When you are that it stirs up all their bile; they hardly know the cause themselves, but it is in my two adverbs."  
(quoted by T.A.Lacey page 57)

Newman and Manning never really understood each other. Newman could write to Ullathorne, about Manning,

"I think that, as a matter of prudence, I shall ~~I shall~~ never trust him till he has gone through Purgatory and has no infirmities upon him."  
(T.A.Lacey page 57)

No discussion of Manning's character as it bears upon his secession would be complete without a consideration of Lytton Strachey's essay in "Eminent Victorians". His thesis is summed up in one passage,

"When Manning joined the Church of Rome he acted under the combined impulse of the two dominating forces in his nature. His preoccupation with the supernatural might, alone, have been satisfied within the fold of the Anglican communion; and so might his preoccupation with himself: the one might have found vent in the elaboration



of High Church ritual, and the other in the activities of a bishopric. But the two together could not be quieted so easily."  
(page 55)

He continues, that though the Church of England is a "commodious institution", "she has never managed to supply a happy home to superstitious egotists."

"To one of his temperament, how was it possible, when the choice was plainly put, to hesitate for a moment between the respectable dignity of an English bishop, harnessed by the secular power, with the Gorham Judgement as a bit between his teeth, and the illimitable pretensions of the humblest priest of Rome?"  
(page 55)

From these extracts it may be seen that Lytton Strachey has done the opposite of what Purcell achieved. Instead of presenting the reader with a mass of original material with little attempt to organise it according to the writer's interpretation, Strachey has carefully worked through the material and presented his reader with a definite approach while not burdening him with the evidence for his arguments. It would not be true to say that he has deliberately falsified the evidence. He could have added a plausible list of quotations to support his conclusions. Instead, encouraged by Purcell's work, he has seized upon two aspects of Manning's character and re-presented them. Manning's belief in a divine call, his strenuous efforts to attain personal sanctity, his belief in his role as a leader and teacher, and his battle with worldly ambition, are reduced by Strachey to a preoccupation with self and the supernatural. With such reductions how could Manning escape the charge of being a "superstitious egotist"?

This is Strachey's groundwork for the theory that Manning went over to Rome motivated solely by secular ambition. But when the groundwork is so manifestly faulty, or rather over-simplified to the point of distortion, then the theory must collapse. It cannot be denied that from his reception Manning was groomed by Wiseman to convert his fellows, but there is nothing to suggest that this was part of a pre-arranged plan and all the evidence points to Manning's sincerity. It need only be added that Strachey's approach is seriously limited by his refusal to consider the theological issues involved. He maintains the narrative at the level of ecclesiastical politics and the changing views are seen as no more than changes in allegiance. Strachey's real theme is not an indictment of Manning but of an age that could permit a ruthless opportunist to rise to a position of such authority.

At the beginning of this consideration of Manning's ideas on the Church it was suggested that his Anglican career was the exploration of certain ideals and these can be summed up in the words Unity and Infallibility. He had very soon become dissatisfied with the Evangelical rule of faith which consisted of the Bible as interpreted by the Spirit-guided mind of the individual. By the time that he had published "The Rule of Faith" he had come to recognise the importance of tradition in interpreting Scripture. Tradition he found in the years of the undivided Church, but it was his study of the Fathers that

led him to see the Roman Church as the more faithful witness to the truth there revealed. He also came to believe that if the Church formulated tradition, then it must be guided by God in the form of the continuing presence of the Holy Spirit. He could only conceive of such guidance in the form of a guarantee of infallibility to the Church in matters of doctrine and this infallibility he saw as lying with the more faithful witness of the Church of Rome.

At the same time Manning was feeling the increasing pull of Rome, he was trying to justify the separated position of the Church of England. In his major work on the unity of the Church, he could do this by distinguishing between subjective and objective unity. By using these two categories he could maintain that the Church of England held the complete doctrine and discipline of the Christian faith just as Rome did, and had forfeited only the subjective unity of intercommunion. This distinction served its purpose for a while but events in England were against him. Newman had shown that the Articles could be stretched to cover a Roman Catholic interpretation of many aspects of belief but the general hostility of the Church of England showed that for most of its members he had gone too far. The Gorham case and the Hampden affair reinforced this by showing that the Church was prepared, on Manning's premisses, to forfeit her guardianship of divine truth. The insignificant response to his call for signatures protesting against the Gorham judgement and the

very significant response to the threat of papal aggression finally convinced Manning that the Church did not want to strengthen her links with Rome, so destroying his only hope of remaining where he was. At the same time it became clear that the Church did not share and did not want to share the autonomous character of Rome. For Manning, any secular control over matters spiritual was intolerable.

For years Manning had two very real possibilities before him, the Church of Rome and the Church of England claiming what was her rightful inheritance. But in the end he was left with only one choice. The Church of England did not want to claim what, he believed, was her birthright. The logic of his new position, when he finally admitted it, allowed no compromise. The Church of England did not even possess a valid ministry. The thinking and conclusions of Manning are open to criticism, but given his premisses and his self-imposed narrow approach, it is difficult to see what other conclusion he could have come to.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALLCHIN, A.M., "The Silent Rebellion" (1958)
- BEST, G.F.A., "Temporal Pillars. Queen Anne's Bounty, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and the Church of England." (1964)
- BODLEY, J.E.C., "Cardinal Manning and Other Essays" (1912)
- BRILLIOTH, Y., "The Anglican Revival, Studies in the Oxford Movement" (1925)
- "Evangelism and the Oxford Movement" (1934)
- BROSE, O.J., "Church and Parliament. The Reshaping of the Church of England 1826-1860" (1959)
- CHADWICK, O., "From Bossuet to Newman. The Idea of Doctrinal Development". (1957)
- "The Mind of the Oxford Movement" (1960)
- "The Victorian Church" (two vols.) (1966)
- CHAPEAU, A., "Manning the Anglican" in "Manning: Anglican and Catholic"; edited by J. Fitzsimons. (1951)
- CARPENTER, S.C., "Church and People 1789-1889" (1959)
- CHURCH, R.W., "The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years 1833-1845." (1891)
- CLARKE, C.P.S. "The Oxford Movement and After" (1932)
- COCKSHUTT, A.O.J. "Anglican Attitudes" (1959)
- "Religious Controversies of the Nineteenth Century" (selected documents) (1966).

(ii)

- COULSON, J. and ALLCHIN, A.M., "The Rediscovery of Newman - An Oxford Symposium" (1967)
- DESSAIN, C.S., "John Henry Newman" (1971)
- DONALD, G., "Men who left the Movement" (1933)
- FABER, G., "Oxford Apostles" (1954)
- FROUDE, R.H., "Remains" edited by Newman and Keble (four volumes) 1838-9
- FAIRBAIRN, A.M., "Catholicism: Roman and Anglican" (1899)
- HOLROYD, M., "Lytton Strachey and the Bloomsbury Group: His Work, Their Influence." (1971)
- HUTTON, A.W., "Cardinal Manning" (1892)
- LEASE, G., "Witness to the Faith - Cardinal Newman on the Teaching Authority of the Church" (1971)
- LACEY, T.A., "Essays in Positive Theology" (1931)
- LIDDON, H.P., "The Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey" (four vols.) (1894-8)
- LUNN, A., "Roman Converts" (1924)
- MANNING, H.E., "The English Church, its Succession and Witness for Christ" (1835)
- "The Rule of Faith" and "Appendix" (1838)
- "The Principles of the Ecclesiastical Comm-  
-ission examined in a letter to the...Bishop of Chichester  
(1838)
- "National Education" (1838)
- "The Preservation of Unendowed Canonries" (1840)
- Visitation Charges for 1841, 1842, 1843,  
1845 and 1848.
- "The Unity of the Church" (1842)
- Sermons (four vols.) (1845-50)

"Christ's Kingdom not of this World. Sermon for 5th. November 1843"

"The Appellate Jurisdiction of the Crown in Matters Spiritual" (1850)

NEWMAN, J.H., "Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church viewed relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism." (1837)

"An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine" (1887)

"Apologia Pro Vita Sua" (1972) (Fontana p.b.)

"Parochial and Plain Sermons." (eight vols.) (1868)

NEWSOME, D., "The Parting of Friends" (1966)

"Justification and Sanctification: Newman and the Evangelicals" Journal of Theological Studies N.S. Vol. XV April 1964.

PURCELL, E.S., "Life of Cardinal Manning" (two vols.) (1895)

REARDON, B.M.G., "From Coleridge to Gore" (1971)

"Religious Thought in the Nineteenth Century" (1966)

ROAMER, S., "Cardinal Manning as presented in his own letters and notes." (1896)

LYTTON STRACHEY, "Eminent Victorians" (Penguin p.b.) (1948)

SYMONDSON, A., "The Victorian Crisis of Faith" (editor) (1970)

STORR, V.F., "The Development of English Theology in the Nineteenth Century 1800-1860" (1913)

SHANE LESLIE, "Henry Edward Manning. His Life and Labours" (1921)

TRISTRAM, H., "Newman and His Friends" (1945)

TREVOR, M., "Newman. The Pillar of the Cloud" (1962)

TREVOR-ROPER, H. R., "Historical Essays" (1957)

Tracts for the Times, by Members of the University of Oxford (six vols.) (1839-41)

VINCENT, F., "A Letter to the Rev. H. E. Manning..." (1851)

WARD, M., "Young Mr. Newman" (1948)

WEBB, C. C. J., "Religious Thought in the Oxford Movement" (1928)