NEWMAN AND MANNING: THE STRAINED RELATIONSHIP

Edward Jeremy Miller
Gwynedd-Mercy College

ABSTRACT

John Henry Cardinal Newman (1801–1890) is on the eve of being beatified. His contributions to theology and philosophy of religion are of such stature that many deem him worthy to be named a Doctor of the Church. Henry Edward Cardinal Manning (1808–1892) is thought to be the most illustrious of Westminster's archbishops since the restoration of the Catholic hierarchy in England in 1850. Newman mistrusted Manning, and Manning thought Newman lacked orthodoxy. The strained relationship began in their Anglican days and continued life long. Its story is here recounted and concludes with an explanation of why strain set in. Their very different views on the workings of authority in the Church, the role of the laity in the Church, and the Church's relationship to the world provided a sure recipe for their continued alienation.

As Venerable John Henry Newman's cause for beatification moves forward, there is renewed curiosity about the tense relationship that existed between him and Cardinal Henry Edward Manning. They did not get along easily. This essay tells the story of their relationship and suggests reasons why it was characterized by suspicion and tension.

I. An Experiment Involving "Real Apprehension"

Real apprehension involves the vivid exercise of imagination focused upon what one is seeking to grasp.[1] For grasping the Newman-Manning relationship, I invite you to imagine an analogous situation

[1]*An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1913), 23–30. All references for Newman's books are to the Longmans *Uniform Edition.* In addition to library collections, the *Uniform Edition* can be found at http://www.newmanreader.org

Edward Jeremy Miller, who received both the Ph.D. and S.T.D. degrees from the Catholic University of Louvain (Belgium), is Professor of Religious Studies at Gwynedd-Mercy College (Gwynedd Valley, PA 19437). Previously, he was professor of Catholic theology in the Divinity School and Graduate School of Emory University, a graduate school dean in New York, and an officer of the National Endowment for the Humanities overseeing core curriculum grants. His research and publishing interests are in systematic theology, the thought of John Henry Newman, the thought of Thomas Aquinas, and other scholastic matters.

HORIZONS 35/2 (2008): 228–52

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that could very well happen in academic life—yourself as a tenured professor teaching undergraduates. You have a high and noble view of how this is best accomplished. You have convictions how the general education curriculum ought to be shaped, how adjunct teachers ought to be vetted, and how certain academic decisions ought to fall to the purview of faculty governance. But you work in proximity with an antagonist who happens to be the dean of your school. The dean, too, has convictions about undergraduate education that differ significantly from yours, and the notion of faculty co-governance bridles the dean, although of course the dean expresses reserve only guardedly. You view the appointment of the dean as a mistake needing correction, but the dean has the ear of the provost, and the provost has not been soliciting faculty evaluations of the dean. Therefore your concerns about school administration go unheard.

Furthermore, the dean mistrusts you. But the dean's mistrust has teeth to it. You have been systematically excluded from key committees, because the dean forms them and appoints their members. Perhaps the work ought to be falling under existing faculty governance committees, but the topics have been allocated to task forces instead. Next semester's adjuncts, of course, are identified and appointed during the summer by the dean's office, when you are gone. You feel yourself "out of the loop."

Of this imagined scenario, I must add one other feature that is crucial to the picture. Both you and the dean are committed to the education of undergraduates with your whole hearts. Your visions on how to do it simply differ from each other in rather fundamental ways. And, finally, the dean has not been mean-spirited in marginalizing you successfully from arenas of influence. The dean simply has employed certain powers that come with the job to keep your influence at bay.

If this academic scenario can be vividly imagined—*felt* as it were—then you are close to experiencing a real apprehension of the Newman-Manning relationship. Both churchmen had the good of the Church and its laity at heart. Both differed in construing features of that "good." Mutual distrust ensued. And Manning was able to utilize his power as archbishop and his access to the Roman Curia in order to curb, at least for a while, Newman's influence over the laity. (I refer to Newman's plan for an Oratory mission in Oxford, described below in part three).

II. A Brief View of Manning's Life

Because Newman's story tends to be more widely known, it is incumbent to sketch briefly Manning's life. Henry Edward Manning

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

was born in 1808[2] and died in 1892. Thus he was seven years Newman's junior and outlived him by two years. His father, William, was a successful merchant, Bank of England governor, and for more than thirty years a Tory MP. Coming as he did from a family of wealth and station, Manning became in his later Catholic years, interestingly enough, a champion of the poor against the abuses of power and wealth. He took a B.A. from Balliol College, Oxford in 1830, and was an undergraduate contemporary and friend of William Gladstone of Christ Church. Both were debaters, and Manning preceded Gladstone as president of the Oxford Union. Manning left Oxford to pursue a political career, but after one year in the Colonial Office he decided on a church career. Returning to Oxford, he became a fellow of Merton College in 1832 along with his great friend, James Hope-Scott. Hope-Scott was also life-long friend to Newman. Manning was ordained priest in December of 1832. In 1833, however, he gave up Oxford residence, married Caroline Sargent, and succeeded her father as rector of Lavington.[3] Caroline died four years later, and Manning never remarried. Bishop Shuttleworth appointed him Archdeacon of Chichester in 1840. Although Manning became gradually sympathetic to Tractarian views, he was never a vocal figure in the Movement of 1833 until after Newman's departure in 1845 and even then his voice was circumspect.

In 1848, he equivocated on Renn Dickson Hampden's appointment as bishop of Hereford.[4] In confidential letters to friends, he labeled Hampden a heretic; in public statements, he held an "innocent till proven guilty" posture. But the Gorham Affair of 1850 unraveled his

[2]His designated biographer, Edmund Sheridan Purcell, to whom Manning entrusted his private diary not long before death, makes an interesting case that Manning was born in 1807, even though Manning himself in later years listed his birth as 1808. See his *Life of Cardinal Manning*, 2 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1895), 693, Note A. Sheridan Gilley, "New Light on an Old Scandal: Purcell's Life of Cardinal Manning," in D. A. Bellenger, ed., *Opening the Scrolls* (Bath: Downside Abbey, 1987), 167, maintains that Manning meant J. E. C. Bodley to be his biographer but gave the task to Purcell because Purcell lost much money on Manning's unsuccessful newspaper, the *Westminster Gazette*. Gilley and others (e.g., Wilfrid Ward at the time) judge Purcell's biography biased. In using Purcell, I have restricted myself to the reproduced letters of Manning and others, and I have avoided Purcell's evaluations for the most part.

[3]Manning became a nonresident fellow of Merton by leaving Oxford to replace Henry Wilberforce as curate to the evangelical John Sargent, rector of Saint Mary Magdalen Church, Lavington in Sussex. The four Sargent daughters married Sam and Henry Wilberforce, George Dudley Ryder, and Manning. Ryder and his wife, Sophia, became Catholics in Rome in 1846, and their son Henry Ignatius eventually joined Newman's Oratory. Henry and Mary Wilberforce became Catholics in 1850. Sam Wilberforce, a foe of the Tractarian party, became bishop of Oxford, later of Winchester.

[4]Manning's biographer Purcell thought that he should have been more public in his denunciation of Hampden's heretical views. "Manning's arguments . . . would have exercised, had they been published, no inconsiderable influence in the heat and height of the fierce controversy" (1:477).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Anglicanism. The bishop of Exeter refused to install Fr. George Gorham as a pastor, given Gorham's Calvinist views on baptism. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council overruled the bishop and forced installation. Manning and other anti-Erastian voices challenged such government interference in doctrinal decisions with no success. Manning then resigned his archdeaconry and joined the Catholic Church in 1851, along with Hope-Scott. Two months later, Cardinal Nicholas Wiseman, of the recently established archdiocese of Westminster, ordained Manning to the Catholic priesthood. Unlike Newman, Manning's studies in Rome followed ordination; like Newman, however, Manning founded a congregation for English diocesan priests upon his return from Rome, the Oblates of St. Charles, at St. Mary's Parish in Bayswater. Besides being its superior, he was appointed provost of the Westminister Cathedral chapter although never enjoying the favor of the other canons. He also came to supplant Archbishop George Errington in Wiseman's confidence. Errington had been designated coadjutor with right of succession to Cardinal Wiseman, but the right was later removed by the pope. Without his name being on the *terna* submitted by the canons to the pope, Manning succeeded Wiseman as archbishop of Westminster when the cardinal died in 1865. His own cardinal's red hat followed in 1875. Manning is remembered in secular circles for mediating a successful end to the bitter London Dock Strike in 1889.[5] He is buried in the crypt of the present-day cathedral he built in Westminster.

III. The Newman-Manning Relationship

Anglican years

John Henry Newman never returned to Oxford University in an educational or pastoral capacity after his 1845 conversion. His absence had Manning's hand behind it, and it captures, as poignantly as anything else between them, what was going on behind the scenes.[6] It is

[5]For Manning's concern for the poor, see J. E. C. Bodley, *Cardinal Manning: The Decay of Idealism in France: The Institute of France* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1912). See also V. A. McClelland, *Cardinal Manning: His Public Life and Influence 1865–1992* (London: Oxford University Press, 1962).

[6]At this point, I wish to offer a posthumous acknowledgement of gratitude to Gerard Tracey, archivist and editor of Newman's letters and diaries. A few years ago he made available to me the Newman-Manning dossier that was utilized in crafting the *Positio Super Virtutibus* in Newman's cause for canonization. The strategy behind such documents is not to cover up someone's possibly unsalutary features but, quite the opposite, to expose in an unvarnished manner incidents in a person's life that appear to need explanation. For this reason the tribunal process of the Diocese of Birmingham needed to know everything about the Newman-Manning relationship because it was known to have been tense. The *Positio*, presented to John Paul II in 1989 by its author, the late Vincent Ferrer Blehl, SJ, incorporates the dossier's findings. Tracey, collator of the dossier, died

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

hard to say what attitudes attended their first contacts. Manning, while at Balliol, would have heard Newman preach at St. Mary's. By 1838, Newman thought that the recently widowed rector of Lavington had sufficiently Catholic sentiments to be the new editor of the *British Critic*.[7] But, had Manning effected a quick about-face? For, in 1836 Gladstone knew Manning to have belonged to the "extreme Evangelicals"[8] and he was regularly championed in their periodical, *The Record*. Evangelicals, however, had become suspicious of Manning's "Romanizing tendencies" by 1843. To mollify attacks in *The Record*, on Guy Fawkes' Day Manning preached an ultra-Protestant "no popery" sermon in St. Mary's pulpit, Oxford, that pained Newman greatly.[9] Newman must have wondered about Manning's high church principles before this fateful 5 November 1843 sermon. Concerning Tract Ninety, Newman wrote to Henry Wilberforce years later, "When the affair of No. 90 happened, Manning said, 'Shut up your controversy, and go to the Fathers, which is your line.'"[10] And in that same year, 1841, Manning refused to take sides on the contest for the poetry professorship between the Tractarian Isaac Williams and the Evangelical James Garbett, refusing even to work with his old friend Gladstone on a compromise solution. Finally, it would never have been Newman's style to work in close association with the low church party, as Manning did in accepting the role of archdeacon to the Evangelical bishop of Chichester. My surmise is that Manning at this early stage likely viewed Newman as belonging to a losing cause; Newman likely viewed Manning as waffling and politically calculating.[11]

unexpectedly on January 20, 2003. In reviewing Gerard Tracey's materials for this paper, I wish to acknowledge the indebtedness of all Newman scholars, and especially my own, to a wonderful person.

[7]See *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, ed. by Charles Stephen Dessain, et al., 31 vols. (London/New York: T. Nelson, 1961—), 6: 170, 175 (hereafter *LD*).

[8]Purcell, 1:116.

[9]Manning claimed he had very little to recant on becoming a Catholic, unlike Newman who published retractions of his anti-Roman writings. Gladstone told Purcell that Manning conveniently forgot this anti-papal sermon, given from the same pulpit associated in Oxford minds with Newman and his Catholic leanings. Some of Manning's friends refused to speak with him, and "on his paying a visit to Littlemore shortly afterwards Newman himself refused to see him" (Purcell, 1:245). Peter Erb, in the 1995 Aquinas Lecture at Emory University, "A Question of Sovereignty: The Politics of Manning's Conversion," argues that the Guy Fawkes sermon was driven by an anti-Erastian principle that made Manning's 1851 conversion its logical upshot (http://web.archive.org:80/web/20030116044219/http://www.pitts.emory.edu/

Publications/erb.html, accessed 10 September 2008).

[10]*LD* 12:357.

[11]In a memoir from many years later, Manning assessed the history of his religious thinking during those years. He was not an Oxford "literary" type but a man of the "parish [and] archdeaconry." He knew the Tractarians, thought like them, but it was from his own reading and "working out the sum by myself," and not from their influence that he converted. His religious ideas had a "constant advance, without deviations," such that

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

One last incident from their mutual Anglican days harbingers Newman's later mistrust of Manning and his feeling that Manning tended to fish for information. The month before his Guy Fawkes Day sermon, Manning wrote Newman a letter calculated to tease out from Newman why he resigned from St. Mary's Church. Surprisingly, Newman responded quite candidly to someone who was not an intimate friend, remarking that he felt like "a foreign material" who could no longer feel connected with the Church of England, and Newman listed the reasons for this feeling.[12] Newman did not want to upset fellow Anglicans pondering their own loyalties to the church; hence, he wrote in confidence to Manning of his feelings. Manning immediately sent Newman's letter to Gladstone, and Newman's inmost thoughts began to circulate.

Early Catholic Period

Manning was among thirty people to whom Newman wrote that he was joining the Church of Rome. Manning responded on 14 October 1845 that adequate words failed him except to say that "I love you" and may we "meet in the court of Heaven."[13] Curiously, the pages of Manning's diary covering this period are ripped out. We do possess, however, Manning's assessment of Newman's book on doctrinal development that removed the final impediment to his conversion. "After reading the book I am left where I was found by it," Manning wrote Robert Wilberforce in December. "I do not believe in the fact of development. . . . I believe that the faith was perfected *uno afflatu* by the inspiration of the Apostles" and that Newman has not made the case for invocation of the saints or the case against the English Church.[14] After 1845 Manning became a symbol of holding firm in the Anglican faith, and he strove to defuse Newman's influence on others.

Many of Manning's acquaintances, including Gladstone and brother-in-law Sam Wilberforce, were unprepared for his own reception into the Catholic Church on Passion Sunday, 1851.[15] He wrote

his becoming a Catholic was the "leading of the Holy Ghost" (Purcell, 1:259–60). Purcell does not see the evidence of such early consistency.

[12]Letter of 14 October 1843 to H. E. Manning (*LD* 9:573).

[13]*LD* 11:8 and Purcell, 1:309. The first editor of *LD*, Charles Stephen Dessain, characterized Manning's reply as "affectionate but guarded" in his footnote to Newman's letter of 8 October 1845.

[14]Purcell, 1:311. Gladstone urged Manning to publish a refutation to Newman's essay on development, which Manning seems to have started but never completed. After Manning's death, Gladstone told Purcell that Manning was "not strong enough to grapple with Newman. Manning was an ecclesiastical statesman; very ascetic, but not a theologian, nor deeply read" (ibid., 318).

[15]Relatively unprepared, that is. Manning wrote Gladstone on 6 December 1850 of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

explanatory letters to many people, but not to Newman. Newman was aware of the event, however, because on letters sent the same day to F. W. Faber and J. M. Capes, Newman adds the brief post script, "So Manning is received."[16] A fortnight later (23 April) Newman's diary bore the brief remark, "Manning and [Henry] *Wilberforce* came for a few hours."[17] Newman's letters during these weeks carry no comments to his friends about Manning's reception or his visit to the Oratory. Perhaps he saw it as simply one more Oxford man "coming over." On Monday, 30 June, the day Newman began his series of Birmingham Corn Exchange lectures, Manning and Wilberforce revisited and stayed the night, Manning having been ordained priest two weeks before.[18] Again, Newman's letters make no reference to Manning, save to ask him, at year's end, to help secure Italian testimonials for Newman's lawyer in the Achilli libel trial.[19] And Manning's letters during 1851 omit mention of Newman. Everything between them, what little mention there is, seems ordinary, above board, peaceful and nonchalant.

The Turbulent 1860s

The decade unfolds peacefully enough. In 1857 Newman had dedicated *Sermons Preached on Various Occasions* to Manning. Manning reciprocates and dedicates *The Present Crisis of the Holy See tested by Prophecy* to Newman in 1861.[20] By August, 1862, Newman begins to mistrust Manning. In a letter addressed to his fellow Oratorian and best friend Ambrose St. John, dated 7 August 1862, Newman relates a visit

his pro-Roman thinking (Pitts Library, Emory University MS501206mg). Manning's diary records his reception on Passion Sunday (6 April) by Fr. Brownbill. One week later, on Palm Sunday, he was confirmed, received first communion, was tonsured, and received all the minor orders from Cardinal Wiseman. On Trinity Sunday (15 June) Wiseman ordained him a priest (Purcell, 1:628). F. W. Faber of the London Oratory, Newman's future nemesis, taught Manning the rubrics for celebrating the Roman Catholic Mass.

[16]*LD* 14:247.

[17]*LD* 14:265. Wilberforce and Manning had married Sargent sisters and were brothers-in-law.

[18]*LD* 14:301. Newman's weekly talks were published as *Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England*. One wonders what Manning would have thought of the final lecture on the duties of the laity in advancing Catholicism, because their views of the laity became so divergent later on.

[19]*LD* 14:482. In a note written in 1872 and attached to his 4 July 1852 letter to Archbishop Cullen of Dublin, Newman records that in October, 1851 he tried without success to get Manning to become his Vice-Rector at the proposed Catholic University of Ireland. There are no other overtures between them during 1851.

[20]Newman wrote of a "memorial of the friendship which there has been between us for nearly thirty years." Manning spoke of their friendship and "to you I owe a debt of gratitude for intellectual help and light, greater than to any one man of our time; and it gives me a sincere gratification now publicly to acknowledge, though I can in no way repay it."

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

from Manning during which Newman shared in confidence some personal disappointments. On the letter Newman wrote years later: "This was one of the last times that Manning wormed things out of me. Our Bishop [Ullathorne] put me on my guard."[21] Ullathorne's caution is repeated in a memorandum Newman made of Manning's visit to the Oratory on 19 December 1864: "Manning never went any where, but in order to find something out."[22] Newman offers others this same advice of being cautious around Manning, as he did years later to Maria Giberne, a Tractarian convert who became a Visitation nun in Autun: "As to H.E.M [Manning] coming to you, it is to fish out something about me. He thinks you my confidant. . . . He is quite violent sometimes in his efforts to gain secrets. He does not fish, but extorts by force. At Christmas 1857–8 he practiced on *me* in this way, successfully. I was always frank with him when he called here, till the Autumn of 1863. He saw *at once* the change . . . *because* he did not get what he came for."[23]

Newman based his distrust of Manning on a series of slights and maneuverings he experienced at Manning's hands. The incidents are recounted in many of his letters during these years. One particular letter of 21 December 1866 to Charlotte Wood captures Newman's thinking best of all and is quoted at length:

> There has been from the first an animus against me—why, I cannot tell, though I may conjecture. Not because I have been strong for a Catholic College at Oxford, for I have never advocated it, feeling more might be said against it than for it. My opinion, however, has never been asked by any one in authority from the first day that the subject of Catholics going to Oxford was mooted. All sorts of people were consulted—the written opinions of several of the London Oratorians were sent to Rome—but mine has never been even asked, though from my connection with the Dublin Catholic University, it would have been natural to have consulted me among others.
>
> It is now more than three years since Dr Manning put an article in the Dublin Review about a Catholic University for England—in the course of it he enumerated all the English Catholic Colleges and Schools, first rate and second rate except one—that one was ours, he simply left out our school altogether.
>
> Two years ago (and since) at our Bishop's wish, I have thought of taking for the Oratory the Oxford mission. It has been carefully

[21] *LD* 20:253–54.

[22] *LD* 21:348.

[23] *LD* 24:33–34. Newman gave similar advice to Thomas Wetherell, a former Oxford man who co-edited the *Rambler* and the *Home and Foreign Review* with Sir John Acton: "Be on your guard against Manning getting any thing out of you. He is a desperate hand at pumping. And avoid all confidential and candid talks with him. And have no confidants, except such as Manning cannot pump" (*LD* 21:413).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> spread about in England and in Rome that I am contemplating *more* than an Oratory, namely a College. Manning is now opposing at Rome the Oratory's going there.
>
> To strengthen this prejudice against the Oratory going there, they actually are now saying in London, by way of objecting that, if I go there, I shall make too many converts, and create a row and so damage the Catholic cause. I have reason to think the Archbishop says this. It is not very long since it was objected to me that I was slow to make converts. Is it not a case of Dr Fell [i.e., you just can't win]?
>
> When I published my Apologia, Dr Manning expressed his regret at it. Afterwards he qualified his reasons for it—he said he only meant my violence against Kingsley. Next, he wrote a pamphlet, which was mainly a covert attack on portions of it. . . . That on this I have the authority of a common friend to whom he showed the pamphlet [in proof sheets].
>
> When I published the [Letter to Pusey], he sent me two letters, one by his secretary, one in his own hand, expressing pleasure at it. Shortly after [,] he secretly attempted to get parts of it virtually condemned by the Bishops. This fact I have from one of the Bishops to whom he applied. . . .
>
> If you ask my explanation of all this, I don't impute to him any animosity to me—but I think he is of a nature to be determined to crush or to melt every person who stands in his way. He has views and is determined to carry them out. . . . Now I have taken a great liberty with you. For I have never written thus plainly and fully to any person yet.[24]

By the summer of 1867, their alienation was widely sensed by Catholics and Protestants. The embarrassment this caused and the reflection it might cast on him as archbishop led Manning to want to mollify matters. Frederick Oakeley, convert, priest of the Westminster archdiocese, and keen admirer of Newman, became the interlocutor.[25]

[24]*LD* 22:327–29. Mrs. Wood (1789–1873) was the widow of a canon of Canterbury Cathedral. She and her daughter, also Charlotte, became Catholics a month after Newman. Her son Granville became a Catholic in 1849 and then a Jesuit. This letter is to the daughter. Regarding Manning's pamphlet, the common friend was Fr. John Walker (1800-73), canon of the diocese of Beverley. Newman, in his *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (1864; London; Longmans, Green, and Co. 1908), 342), termed the Anglican Church a serviceable *breakwater* against doctrinal errors more fundamental than its own. Using the idea, Pusey's *Eirenicon* called Anglicanism a *bulwark* against infidelity. Manning attributed no value at all to the national church. In attacking Pusey's valuation of the church, he was obliquely attacking Newman. After Newman published his *Letter to Pusey*, Manning wrote an anonymous criticism of it for the *Dublin Review* and showed the draft to Bishops Ullathorne and Clifford. Clifford told Manning he agreed fully with Newman. Ullathorne told Manning he would not be so co-opted against his own priest, and if the *Dublin* ran the critique, he would advise Newman to seek an ecclesiastical censure against its lay editor, W. G. Ward, for publishing an attack on a cleric.

[25]Oakeley (1802–1880) was such a staunch advocate of *Tract Ninety*—he and Ward

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Manning had so often voiced his regret to Oakeley over the estrangement from Newman that Oakeley, on his own initiative (or perhaps having been egged on unwittingly), wrote Newman on 27 July of the archbishop's wish for reconciliation. A spate of letters ensued (Manning and Newman to each other; Manning and Newman to Oakeley about each other) over the next six weeks.

Only the main contentions of the two principals can be listed, omitting the nuanced argument each used; otherwise, my report would approach in length the original words. But sequencing that captures assertion, rebuttal, and counter rebuttal is needed:[26]

(1) Newman to Oakeley: I lack trust in Manning from his treatment of me. The examples are too many to recount or would betray confidences. Therefore I simply reference the pervasive Catholic sentiment that he thwarted my setting up an Oratory in Oxford. If he was not involved, let him remove any obstacle to my going.

(2) Oakeley to Newman: Can I show your letter to Manning?

(3) Newman to Oakeley: Yes, but if he says he took no *literal* part against our Oratory, the question is whether his entourage spoke against me and he did nothing about it, thus inviting people to identify him with his entourage.

(4) Manning to Newman: False things about each other have been told the other. To retrieve our old friendship, can we explain *via* letters our actions, or better yet, in face to face meeting?

(5) Newman to Manning: Let me be frank. Your words, your actions, are difficult to understand, and I am not alone in thinking it. Consequently, the loss of confidence I have in you cannot be restored by discussions between us but only by new deeds undoing old ones over time. There is no short cut to restoring confidence.[27]

thought Newman's Catholic readings of the Articles to be the natural and only readings of them—that his bishop suspended him. He converted just after Newman and was confirmed with him at Oscott. He was first a canon of Westminster and later a pastor in a parish in Islington. He remained friendly to Newman life long.

[26]Since I paraphrase, footnoting is omitted; further, referencing each letter invites overwhelming clutter. The interested reader will find the letter material in Purcell, 2: 327–42. A more recent rendering, with critical annotations, is provided in *LD* 23:276–330.

[27]At this midpoint, Newman wrote to James Hope-Scott on 13 August 1867: "Manning has written me wishing that we should meet and give him an opportunity of explanation. Of course I seem to put myself in the wrong by declining—but I seriously think it would do more harm than good. I do not trust him, and his new words would be the cause of fresh distrust. . . . I have said that the whole world thinks him difficult to understand . . . that friendly acts would be the best preparation for a friendly meeting—and that I should hail that day, when the past had been so far reversed, that explanations

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(6) Manning to Newman: I experience the same thing with you; you are difficult to understand, and others think so, too. But I am ready to talk it out any time. On the same day (14 August) Manning sent Oakeley his supporting reasons: (a) *The Rambler* in 1862 attacked my pamphlet on the temporal power of the pope, and I was told from a good source Newman approved. (b) Peter le Page Renouf's pamphlet addressed to Newman attacked my article that was against Catholics going to Oxford; so everyone pits him against me on the question. (c) In his *Letter to Pusey*, he implied I was as excessive as Ward and Faber, whose views he attacked. These three actions against me have caused the public to reckon us estranged. As to an Oxford Oratory, I have been only against Catholic youth going there, not the Oratory. If my entourage, without telling me, opposed him as is their personal right, I cannot restrain what I did not know would happen.

(7) Newman to Oakeley: I would not defend my friends as having a right to an opinion if they undermined another and then I claim I am for peace with the other person. (A) I never saw *Rambler* manuscripts after July 1859, except one, and I "plucked" it. And in 1862 I was writing people in position to do something that the *Rambler*'s tone had gotten out of line and needed quick change. (B) I cannot recall if Renouf asked permission to address his pamphlet to me, but if he did, I would have agreed because this genre does not make me answerable for its contents. [One recalls the famous *Letter to Jelf* just after Tract Ninety.] Nor do I see harm in temperate criticism about topics where differences are allowed. I do see fault when someone puts out his ideas first, and strongly, and then cries foul when critiqued.[28] (C) I had to

would be natural and effectual" (*LD* 23:296–97). It is a remarkable letter because (a) Hope-Scott is a dear friend to both men, (b) in refusing to meet, Newman realizes he could be blamed for prolonging the alienation, and (c) of the common sense psychology that distrust is obliterated only by opposite actions over a long period, not by explanations.

[28]Newman faced this conundrum when Manning published his interpretation of Vatican I's dogma on infallibility immediately upon returning from the Council. Newman disagreed with the interpretation but could not publish his view without seeming to attack the archbishop, who participated in the Council. So he waited for a providential opening. In 1875, William Gladstone published an "Expostulation" questioning whether a British Catholic could be both loyal to the Pope and to the Crown. Newman had his opening. His *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk* gave a moderate interpretation of infallibility, ostensibly to rebut Gladstone but covertly to correct Manning's public view. In the *Letter*, Newman makes a veiled reference to those [i.e., Manning, Ward, Herbert Vaughan] who have "done their best to set the house on fire [and] leave to others the task of putting out

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

allude to Manning in my *Letter to Pusey* because the only two English writers he quoted were both converts and younger in age than I. So I needed to say it was unfitting to involve an archbishop in controverting with Pusey, but not so Ward. Therefore, Manning misunderstands that my acts have been unfriendly to him.

(8) Manning to Newman: I never said you knew of the *Rambler* article or the Renouf pamphlet. That it was publicly known an opposition held between us was stated by you. I simply gave three instances feeding such public opinion.

(9) Newman to Manning: Since, in your words, the *Rambler* article was the first event which shook confidence between us because other people thought me behind it, your last letter gives me the great satisfaction of knowing that you yourself did not share in that utterly unfounded piece of knowledge. I am glad my letter had this effect on you. I suspect I could also prove to you that the extensive public opinion you reference has as little existence as the pretended facts you say it reflects. I think you are picking up nothing more than provincial London gossip that neither reaches Birmingham nor has wide effect.

(10) Manning to Newman: I, too, would be satisfied if your letter cleared away the three points I wrote to Oakeley, but it does not. Persons believed close to you criticized me, and I remain convinced that this perception fed the public opinion we were in opposition. Your letter accomplished one thing: I am assured you did not participate in the *Rambler* article; nevertheless, its article began the damage.

(11) Newman to Manning: Your last latter does not make the case any stronger than your earlier one. Thinking, albeit wrongly, I was connected with the *Rambler* article does explain your bearing toward me "if retaliation be an explanation." It does not prove other people shared your misapprehension, and even if they did, you would have to prove people considered the *Rambler* hostile to you, so hostile in fact that their perception that you are now thwarting me stemmed from the *Rambler*'s and my earlier thwarting you. The world judges the present by present actions, not past actions. I propose to celebrate seven Masses for your intentions.

the flame" See *Certain Difficulties Felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching*, 2 vols. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1900), 2:177.]

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(12) Manning to Newman: I shall say a monthly Mass for you for a year. This, more than anything else, will effect what we both desire, I am convinced.

With this mutual promise to offer Masses for each other, the exchange of letters and this fencing with each other ended. It is instructive to discover what each man said to his confidants immediately afterwards. Manning wrote to Msgr. George Talbot on 14 September 1867: "I have made an attempt to soften Dr. Newman, but he is very difficult. We ended by a promise to say masses for each other."[29] One could interpret Manning's use of *soften* variously except for the fact of his 25 February 1866 letter to Talbot (see below) in which Manning describes Newman as a real danger to the Catholic cause. Thus, *soften* means to quiet or eliminate the opposition, a Manning stratagem Newman detected and described to others. Newman's confidant is Fr. Ambrose St. John of his own Oratory. "My correspondence with Manning . . . confirms what I thought all along—viz that, where there are real differences, explanations make things worse. . . . Any how I have been able to make out my case far more effectively than if I had begun by expostulating with him, e.g. on the omission of our School in the Dublin—and, if he really does *wish* to be at peace with me, I think I have so inflicted on him his shortcomings, that he will be clever enough to see what will mend matters, and what won't."[30] Newman's sole wish was to have "York Place" (Manning's residence, hence his entourage) cease detracting him and impeding his efforts. Newman denies ever working against Manning *via* himself or minions; Manning never denies the same. Neither does Manning deny that there is truth behind the public opinion that Newman is thwarted by York Place. He writes only about the factual existence of the public opinion. Newman, of course, reminds him that public opinion in 1867 is about Manning's thwarting him, not vice versa.

[29]Purcell, 2:342. George Talbot (1816–1886) became a Catholic in 1842. Wiseman ordained him in 1846, and he was later appointed a canon of St. Peter's Basilica. He became the agent in Rome, first for Wiseman and then for Manning. His hostility to Newman is documented. He had applied to join Newman's Oratory in 1847 but was refused. Was his hostility a case of *post hoc, propter hoc*? He was removed to a French asylum in 1868. In 1887, Manning wrote a "summary of his variance" with Newman (see Purcell, 2:346–351). The last sentence reads, "If I have been opposed to him, it has only been that I must oppose either him or the Holy See." Manning had an ultramontane view of the papacy; he actively opposed Catholics, such as Newman, who did not. Purcell points out memory lapses in Manning's memoir about when he first knew Newman in Oxford. Some recollections appear self-serving.

[30]*LD* 23:330.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Views of Each Other as Expressed to Third Parties

Manning's concern for the working poor and for the religious education of young Catholics was widely recognized and justly celebrated. Writing in 1865 to a friend and member of parliament, William Monsell, Newman acknowledged that the new archbishop will concern himself with education for all classes, "and he will have so much to do for the education of the clergy and the poor 20,000 children in London."[31] Newman was hoping that such a vast pastoral project would cause Manning's constant opposition to the sons of the "old Catholics" attending Oxford, such as Monsell's, to be "simply ignored." Newman also recognized Manning's great preaching abilities that are "indefinitely better than [mine]."[32] On the other hand, Newman wrote of Manning's serious shortcomings. James Spencer Northcote was a widowed convert who became a Birmingham diocesan priest and president of Oscott College, which provided secondary and seminary education. Newman wrote him some years after Manning became archbishop: "I can never forget the question which some one [Manning], very near the late Cardinal in his late weeks, put into his mouth, to address Catholic parents with, 'Do you wish your children better educated than your priests?' There is no reason why both should not be well educated for their respective duties in life; but, for want of a clearer account of the matter, I am inclined to think that the Archbishop considers only an ignorant laity to be manageable."[33]

The *Rambler* and its successor, *The Home and Foreign Review*, were outlets for the voices of educated Catholic laity. Although Newman deplored the *Rambler*'s stridency at times after he resigned its editorship—taking a "false position" he termed it—he deplored even more the *Review*'s eventual suppression in 1864, leaving alone in Catholic journalism *The Dublin Review*, which was controlled by the archbishop and edited by the equally strident ultramontane, W. G. Ward. Commiserating to its editor, Sir John Acton, on the *Review*'s

[31]*LD* 21:477.
[32]*LD* 16:75.
[33]*LD* 26:65–66. Newman's assessment was true, as the Manning-Talbot correspondence shows. Oscott was founded in 1794 as St. Mary's Seminary. It became known as Maryvale when Bishop Walsh built "New Oscott" in 1835. Wiseman was an earlier president of Oscott. The first Westminster Synod, at which Newman preached his famous "Second Spring" sermon, was held there after the Catholic hierarchy was restored in 1850. Northcote, a former Corpus Christi Oxford man, reshaped its educational structure. For Newman's own vision of the laity, see my article, "Newman on the Voice of the Laity: Lessons for Today's Church," *Newman Studies Journal* 3/2 (Fall 2006):16–31.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

suppression, Newman wrote of Manning: "But good may come out of this disappointment . . . It seems impossible that active and sensible men can remain still under the dull tyranny of Manning and Ward."[34] Newman never thought Manning was immoral, as if he had lied or was mean-spirited.[35] He thought, rather, that Manning's "first principles" (Newman's phrase for someone's basic orientation or instinctive ways of sizing up matters) were wrong or at least were not as conducive to a church's mission as were Newman's principles. They differed over the fundamental view of the church (e.g., the role of the laity), as the final section will illustrate.[36]

Manning's assessment of Newman, expressed confidentially to others, is more calculating than it is prudential, and less respectful. On the occasion of Newman's *Letter to Pusey*, Msgr. Talbot had written Manning from the Vatican on 20 February 1866 that "to be Roman is to an Englishman an effort. Dr Newman is more English than the English. His spirit must be crushed." Manning's response of 25 February to Talbot is noteworthy:

> What you write about Dr Newman is true. Whether he knows it or not, he has become the center of those who hold low views about the Holy See, are anti-Roman, cold and silent, to say no more, about the Temporal Power, national, English, critical of Catholic devotions,

[34]LD 21:84. For a fuller account of Newman's views on the laity, journalism, and freedom of expression, see Edward Jeremy Miller, *John Henry Newman on the Idea of Church* (Shepherdstown: Patmos Press, 1987), 75–98.

[35]Newman's canonization cause document, the *Positio Super Virtutibus* (obtainable from The Oratory, Hagley Road, Birmingham B16 8UE), describes Newman's attitude to Manning as "motivated by prudence and not resentment." See the *Positio Super Virtutibus* 2:27 and the references made in its footnote 21 on the same page.

[36]Manning's 1887 memoir claims he fostered Newman's preferment in the church, as when he urged in Rome in 1859 Newman's consecration as a bishop. The memoir also records that Newman made Manning promise not to push his preferment if Newman agreed to come to Manning's installation as archbishop. Newman did exact this promise (see the 31 May 1865 letter to Manning in *LD* 21:478–70). But Newman's wager is understandable. In today's argot, Newman did not want to be "kicked upstairs" and lose his independent voice if made an English bishop under Manning's metropolitanship. Also, in the letter to Charlotte Wood quoted above is this sentence: "He has views and is determined to carry them out—and I must either go with him or be annihilated. I say this, because he long wished to get me made a Bishop (in partibus)—I believe because he knew it would be (as it were) putting me 'in the House of Lords'" (*LD* 22:329). Finally, regarding whether Manning was really Newman's *padrone* in Vatican circles is the incident of Newman's being sounded out if he would accept a red hat. The Gerard Tracey dossier, "Documents Relating to Newman and Manning," summarizes thusly: "Manning intercepted Newman's letter to the Pope regarding the cardinalate, omitting Ullathorne's letter, putting his own interpretation on Newman's letter, and publishing widely this interpretation (or allowing it to be published)" (Private Papers of G. Tracey, Archives of the Birmingham Oratory). Manning made Newman appear to refuse the red hat. See details in Ian Ker, *John Henry Newman: A Biography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 714 ff.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> and always on the lower side. . . . I see much danger of an English Catholicism, of which Newman is the highest type. It is the old Anglican, patristic, literary, Oxford tone transplanted into the Church. It takes the line of deprecating exaggerations, foreign devotions, Ultramontanism, anti-national sympathies. In one word, it is worldly Catholicism, and it will have the worldly on its side, and will deceive many.
>
> Now Ward and Faber may exaggerate, but they are a thousand times nearer to the mind and spirit of the Holy See than those who oppose them. . . . The thing which will save us from low views about the Mother of God and the Vicar of our Lord is the million Irish in England. . . . I am thankful to know that they have no sympathy for the watered, literary, worldly Catholicism of certain Englishmen.[37]

One wonders against whom the charge of having "low views" can stick when Talbot's views on the laity are examined. Talbot's letter of 25 April 1867 to Manning was prompted by an *Address* of public support for Newman by leading laity of England, published on 6 April. It said that "we, the undersigned, have been deeply pained at some anonymous attacks which have been made upon you. . . . We feel that every blow that touches you inflicts a wound upon the Catholic Church in this country," and it concludes expressing their "gratitude" for Newman's services to "our holy religion."[38] Manning wrote Talbot to not let the Vatican be taken in by this Address from "our chief laymen." Talbot's answer to Manning has become classic.

> I look upon the Address of the English laity as the most offensive production that has appeared in England since the times of Dr Milner. . . . To say that a blow that touches Dr Newman is a wound inflicted on the Catholic Church in England, is an insult to the Holy See [and] to your Grace. . . . [The laity] are beginning now to show the cloven foot. . . . They are only putting into practice the doctrine taught by Dr Newman in his article in the *Rambler*. They wish to govern the Church in England by public opinion. . . . What is the province of the laity? To hunt, to shoot, to entertain? These matters they understand, but to meddle with ecclesiastical affairs, they have no right at all. . . . Dr Newman is the most dangerous man in England, and you will see that he will make use of the laity against your Grace.[39]

[37]Purcell, 2:322–24. To anyone familiar with Newman's sermons and his writings on Mary, Manning's view must seem astounding. But Manning's view does describe ultramontanism then and now.

[38]Purcell, 2: 313.

[39]The Manning-Talbot letter exchange is in Purcell, 2:315–18.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Manning's response to these reproaches was cautious and circumspect. He tells Talbot that the only way to counter unsound opinions is for him to keep the English bishops perfectly in lockstep, that it would be fatal if the laymen behind the "Address," which included lords of the realm and members of parliament, got an episcopal appointment of their persuasion—so much for Manning's memoir claim that he tried to urge a bishopric for Newman—that his strongest course toward Newman is to have the bishops lined up "so that what I do, they do," and that he must treat Newman so calculatingly lest "a word or act of mind towards Dr Newman might divide the bishops and throw some on his side."[40]

An Illustration: Education at Oxford

Nothing defined the tensions between Newman and Manning as clearly as their common alma mater, Oxford University. It was throughout their lifetimes a religious institution under the auspices of the Church of England. For centuries one could not take a degree from the university without professing the 39 Articles of Religion. This "religious test" had stopped, however, by the time Newman and Manning were Catholics, though the Anglican ethos remained, as it does to this day. Thus, the question of young Catholic men attending Oxford was an open possibility in the early 1860s.

The "Oxford Matter" has been retold frequently in biographies of Newman and Manning and can be summarized briefly. Cardinal Wiseman was open initially to Catholics attending Oxford, either matriculating into one of its traditional colleges or residing in a newly built Catholic hall.[41] Manning feared Oxford's "Protestantizing" young Catholics, and he turned Wiseman's thinking around. Wiseman assembled the English bishops during Lent, 1864, and they came to two decisions: (a) building our own Catholic university was impractical; (b) Catholics should be "discouraged" from attending Oxford. Manning desired a strict prohibition against matriculation but certain bishops thought extenuating circumstances demanded flexibility. Manning was also distressed at the decision against a Catholic university and wrote Talbot that it would not do to be against Oxford without providing an alternative. Leading Catholic families would choose Oxford, resulting

[40]Ibid., 2:319.

[41]For the French translation of his *Apologia*, Newman wrote an appendix on how Oxford University "works" and how it is so different from universities elsewhere. David De Laura's critical edition of the *Apologia* (New York: Norton, 1968) reprints it from W. Ward's 1913 edition on pp. 367–69.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in "a very unsound school of thought and principle among our laymen, of which the *Rambler* is a type."[42]

Remaining unsatisfied, Manning lobbied the Vatican to have Wiseman reassemble the bishops, and Cardinal Barnabò of the Congregation of Propaganda obliged. The 13 December 1864 meeting was preceded by a mailing to laity and clergy with loaded questions such as whether Catholics wanted their sons better educated than their clergy.[43] The bishops decided to prohibit any thought of a Catholic hall at Oxford and they expressed more strongly their discouragement of sending Catholic youth there.

Why the focus on a Catholic hall? One again has to suspect that Manning was behind it. Five acres of property near Worcester College came on the market (present-day Wellington Square), and Newman purchased it on 20 September. He envisioned any number of possibilities for it, one of them being a Catholic hall (recall that Newman's thinking predates the 13 December prohibition). In October, Newman wrote a circular announcing plans for an Oratory in Oxford. It was never published, but its contents got out to Manning and others. Manning knew that if Newman went to Oxford in any capacity, he would draw young Catholics there as if a magnet. One must remember that Newman's *Apologia* appeared earlier in 1864, and his stature among Catholics and Protestants was restored. He would be returning to Oxford a hero—the *Apologia* pleased many resident Oxford fellows and heads of houses—and Catholic intellectual aspirations would circle around him. This Manning feared and quite correctly. The tone of the bishops' December prohibition against a Catholic hall and their unease with his unpublished circular led Newman to conclude that he lacked their confidence even for an Oratory presence in Oxford. He decided to resell the land on 28 December.

Leading Catholic families continued to send sons to Oxford (and Cambridge, London, and Trinity College, Dublin). In 1866, Bernard Ullatthorne, Newman's bishop in whose diocese Oxford lay, asked Newman to build an Oratory in Oxford. (Newman's preferences were consistent throughout: a British Catholic university would be inferior if not impossible, a Catholic hall is better than nothing, an Oratory or religious order supporting Catholics in Oxford colleges is best of all.)

[42]Purcell, 2: 291.

[43] In a confidential letter to Thomas Gaisford, on 16 December, Newman remarks of the questionnaire: "Such a paper of questions is deplorable—deplorable because they are not questions, but arguments—worse than 'leading questions'—They might as well have been summed up in one, viz. 'Are you or are you not one of those wicked men who advocate Oxford Education?' for they imply a *condemnation* of the respondent, if he does not reply *in one way*" (*LD* 21:343). Newman's memo on the bishops' meeting is given in ibid., 346 ff.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Newman wanted pre-approval for the Oratory from Rome, lest the planning be in vain. Ullathorne petitioned the pope, via Propaganda, on 11 June 1866. On 18 December Propaganda granted approval to Ullathorne but with a special clause prohibiting Newman's involvement. Not telling Newman of the secret clause, Ullathorne advised him to wait until he, the bishop, traveled to Rome and obtained more strongly worded encouragement for the project. Before this could happen, however, Manning and Talbot warned the Vatican afresh about the danger of fostering "English Catholicism."[44] Cardinal Barnabò then wrote Ullathorne mandating he must never allow Newman to relocate to Oxford because Newman would attract Catholic youths to a Protestant place. One hears Manning's voice in Barnabò's.[45]

What precisely is this "English Catholicism" that preoccupies Manning and alarms Rome? We ascertain it in an earlier letter from Manning to Talbot. "Every week . . . some new evidence of the growth of an English party appears. . . . The old jealousy of Rome, and the desire for independence, is coming up again under the form of conciliating the English people and giving to the intellect its due freedom in all but dogma."[46] In one sentence, Manning conflates Newman's principles with those of the breakaway Anglican Church. Newman's "ecumenism," to use the term anachronistically, was to overcome division (conciliate) by explaining Catholic doctrines in manners understandable to the English mind, as the rhetoric of the *Apologia* illustrated and as Tract Ninety attempted. As for dogmas, Newman employed the old church aphorism against doctrinaire people like Ward: "unity in essentials, freedom in non-essentials, and charity in all." Newman was felt to be too flexible explaining the Catholic faith, for Manning's good. Such tendencies, to Manning, simply revive that old jealousy of Rome and desire for independence, as if Newman were Thomas Cranmer *redivivus*. Manning feared a resurgent English Catholicism morphing slowly into the Anglo-Catholicism he had quit fifteen years earlier. For Manning, every papal statement was as if infallible, and for W. G. Ward it actually was. For Ward and him, there was only one legitimate theological school of thought, the approved professors of the Roman seminaries. Newman did not think as the latter did. His spirit was of the

[44]For Manning's 23 March 1867 letter to Talbot, see Purcell, 2:300–01. See also p. 298 for the lobbying occurring at the Vatican.

[45]Apropos Newman's comment to Charlotte Wood above that Manning will push relentlessly till he gets his way, Manning was not above using a ploy to stop Newman from getting to Oxford. He began an ultramontane newspaper in 1866, the *Westminster Gazette*, with Purcell as editor. Manning inserted a fabricated rumor in its first issue that Newman had abandoned his plan to go to Oxford. See Gilley, "New Light on an Old Scandal", 169.

[46]Purcell, 2:300.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

church's Patristic Age, not of its post-Tridentine Baroque Age. He did not champion the temporal powers of the pope during the agitation that was leading eventually to the unification of Italy. For Manning, Newman was not excessive enough in his Catholic thinking because he was a "minimizer" of Catholic doctrines. Newman's approach "to make Anglicans remain where they are"[47] is the way Manning had characterized the *Apologia*.

IV. Appraising the Newman-Manning Relationship

In the analogy with which this essay began, Manning is the academic administrator, of course, and Newman the tenured professor. Since Newman was not of Manning's diocese, he enjoyed a certain freedom to challenge Manning much as tenure emboldens and protects professors. But the analogy intends to focus attention on why there was tension between this dean and this professor; it should be clear enough. They thought differently about academic matters. Such differences can cause tension and trouble as when, for instance, a dean approaches questions from a business mentality (shaping the core curriculum by enrollment considerations) and a professor from a pedagogical mentality (shaping the core from a theory of the liberal arts). When two people differ so markedly, resolution (recall Manning's use of *reconciliation* in their exchange of letters) rarely occurs. Something like a chess game takes over, or intellectual fencing.

That Newman and Manning had a tense relationship is not news to anyone knowing their stories. What caused them to differ is the more important question we should face. My answer wishes to abstract from such obvious observations as "they had different experiences growing up" (true enough for the resident Oriel fellow and the married nonresident fellow of Merton) or that "their personalities differed" (again, true enough but one enters an impenetrable thicket in constructing psychological portraits. Was Newman really morose? Was Manning severe?) It was their differing views of the church, their respective ecclesiologies, that separated them from each other to a sufficient degree that tension and suspicion ensued and reconciliation of viewpoints proved impossible.[48] I conclude my appraisal, however, with

[47]Purcell, 2:326.

[48]It would take a book to cover each man's ecclesiology and another monograph to provide the full contrasts. Two such books are Miller, *John Henry Newman on the Idea of Church*, and James Pereiro, *Cardinal Manning: An Intellectual Biography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998). Sheridan Gilley, *Newman and His Age* (London: Darton, 1990) and David Newsome, *The Convert Cardinals: John Henry Newman and Henry Edward Manning*, (London: John Murray, 1993) are biographers who contrast the two. Still timely

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

one somewhat psychological portrait, more as addendum than consequence of their ecclesiologies.

Manning is the more conservative man, and it is usually a particular virtue of conservatives to point their finger very accurately to the source of the trouble with the opposition.[49] In utilizing the imagery of *high* and *low*, Manning is absolutely right in saying that Newman took a lower view of matters and a more minimizing approach in explaining Catholic teachings than Manning himself adopted. If the connotation that "high is better" is stripped from the contrast between them—as obtains elsewhere when contrasting "high" and "low" Christologies—Manning does put his finger on their differences.

One can speak of a "high ecclesiology" and have Manning as its exemplar. What are its characteristics? Dutiful awareness of the prerogatives of the pope would be a key characteristic and likely one of the first elements to be described in any exposition on the nature of the Catholic Church. Newman, too, championed the Petrine office, but he did not paint it on as large a canvas as Manning did. This point of contrast bears closer examination.

Over many years Manning and Talbot, building on existing suspicions, fed Rome the impression that Newman did not value the papacy as Catholics ought. Newman's 1859 *Rambler* essay "On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine" had been delated to Rome for heresy, the fact and reasons for which were never told him. We know some in the Vatican read the essay as denying the need for papal infallibility. And Msg. Talbot reminded Rome often that Newman was no champion of the temporal powers of the pope, at a time when the *Risorgimento* of Garibaldi and Victor Emmanuel had recently reduced the Papal States to the city of Rome alone. William Gladstone was prime minister when the Vatican I decrees on papal primacy and infallibility appeared. After leaving office, he issued a challenge (the *Expostulation*) that Catholics loyal to a foreign power (the pope) could not be loyal to the Queen. How Newman maneuvered against Manning to write his *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk* was explained above. Newman brilliantly defused the accusation, and the public reception to his *Letter*, in England and on the continent, was overwhelmingly positive. Manning, shortly later, wrote his own response to Gladstone, quoting writings of Bishops

is Wilfrid Ward's "Newman and Manning" in his *Ten Personal Studies* (1908; reprint, Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1970), 260–98.

[49]Over thirty years ago I heard Fr. Raymond E. Brown, the renowned scripture scholar, make this comment about Catholic conservatives who criticized Catholic biblical scholars using contemporary hermeneutics. It was not that the criticism had no answer. It was that the criticism went right to the pastorally sensitive point: Was there really a star of Bethlehem or not? If not, what about everything else in the holy Bible?

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ullathorne, Clifford and Vaughan, but never once quoting Newman. On 16 February 1875 Father O'Callaghan, one of Manning's Oblates of St. Charles who became Talbot's replacement in Rome and rector of the English College, wrote Manning that the pope had seen Newman's *Letter*. "He had heard, he said, that good had been effected by it, and that the notion of Newman's opposition to the Pope was completely dispelled. To all of this I gave my respectful assent."[50] Neither Archbishop Manning nor Fr. O'Callaghan ever communicated such good news to Newman, which would have been like a balm of Gilead coming from the mouth of Pope Pius IX, given the ostracization Newman had been experiencing from the Vatican since 1859.

Manning's higher view of the papacy would be detected in the pope's role as teacher and in the corresponding obedience owed it by Catholics. In his 1865 book, *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost*, he maintains that all papal bulls, apostolic briefs, and encyclicals "to many or to one person undoubtedly emanate from a divine assistance, and are infallible."[51] Newman on the other hand delineates levels of papal magisterium; some do not come to us with the claim of infallibility. Newman also describes other sources of ascertaining God's revelation, as in his *Rambler* article "On Consulting the Faithful." Finally, regarding magisterium itself, however exercised in the church, Newman describes a sort of checks-and-balances schema, to which the three branches of American government are somewhat analogous. Modeling Christ himself, the church possesses a priestly office (Catholic devotional life), a kingly office (church teaching and authority) and a prophetic office (the role of theology and theologians). Any misuse of one of these offices is offset by the workings of the other two offices. Hence, the exercise of church authority, when overstepping its bounds, is checked by the claims of the theological and devotional elements of the church.[52] In Manning's high ecclesiology, church authority is at the apex and cannot be checked "from below."

Manning's reaction to Newman's *Essay on Development* gave a hint as to how the two churchmen would differ years later over papal magisterium. For Newman, revelation is an originally communicated reality (i.e., the Incarnation) that unfolds over time in the church's explicit awareness of it. Historical circumstances draw aspects of the

[50]Purcell, 2:486. Since O'Callaghan was a Manning disciple, "respectful assent" undoubtedly means begrudging assent.

[51]See Pereiro, *Cardinal Manning,* 227 (for citations) and 230 (for docility to church authority being the primary characteristic of the "Catholic Spirit").

[52]Newman's treatment of the church's three offices is found in his 1877 Preface to his republished lectures of 1837 on the church's prophetical office. See volume 1 of *The Via Media of the Anglican Church* in the Uniform Edition (London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1901).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mystery into sharper consciousness.[53] For Manning, revelation was infused into the apostles "*uno afflatu*." By an initial divine communication it was fully in the consciousness of the first apostles, and the only future articulations of it came by way of logical deductions from the original deposit of knowledge. For Manning, the magisterium already has the "answer" to the religious question; for Newman, the church must discern the answer, from multiple sources, and there may have been centuries when the answer was hidden from the church's explicit consciousness.

The ecclesiologies of Manning and Newman differed in seeing how the church related to society. Bear in mind the social upheavals that affected the Christianity Manning and Newman knew. The French Revolution and the Napoleonic conquests (recall that Napoleon arrested Pius VII and deported him to France for five years) were relatively recent. From 1848 to 1851 revolutions convulsed the European continent and shook concordats. Mazzini's *Risorgimento* would eventually make Pius IX a "prisoner of the Vatican" by 1870. The effects of the Enlightenment (the autonomy of secular thought and the overthrow of tradition, especially the church's tradition) were a staple of the intellectual *Zeitgeist* of the nineteenth century.

For Manning this was a great evil against which the church was in mortal combat, and one of the strongest weapons in its arsenal was the power of papal infallibility. Its truth quashed error. Accordingly, he was among the staunchest proponents for making a dogma of it at Vatican I.[54] For Newman, the *Zeitgeist* is more problematic than downright evil. It leads to skepticism and this eventuates in atheism. The prevailing culture does not need to be attacked but must be shown its trajectory and implications if it continues operating from false first principles. Newman wants to convert this post-Enlightenment intellectual world, not quash it. As he said in his speech on receiving the cardinal's red hat, liberalism (in the manner he defines it) has been his lifelong foil. He viewed error (or heresy) differently than Manning did. Heresy had a seed of truth to it. A heresy positions the element of truth in its assertion in an unbalanced way.[55] (Elements in proper balance are a key to understanding so many things in Newman's organic view of things.) For Manning it was imperative to have papal infallibility

[53]The finest study continues to be Jan H. Walgrave, *Unfolding Revelation* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972). See my review in *The Thomist* 37 (1973): 378–83.

[54]Wilfrid Ward reports being told by Manning himself that the bishop of Ratisbon and he, sitting in St. Peter's in 1866, vowed to bring about a dogmatic definition of papal infallibility (*Ten Personal Studies*, 274).

[55]See *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius in Controversy with the Arians,* 2 vols. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1903),, 2:143, and *Historical Sketches,* 3 vols. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1906–08), 3:192–93.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

defined at Vatican I because the arsenal needed it. Newman thought dogmas emanating from ecumenical councils should be rare happenings, and only when the internal well-being of the church was at jeopardy should a council formulate an infallible dogma. Almost all Catholics were at peace with the workings of the papacy, so the faithful did not need dogmas about the pope. Non-Catholic propagators of error were outside the church, so they would not heed dogmas. Newman was against defining papal infallibility when the First Vatican Council began its deliberations in 1869, although he personally believed in it as a Catholic doctrine.[56]

Because of the continued assaults on Catholic truths and values, not to mention assaults on personnel, that began at the Reformation, Catholicism had constructed for itself a sociological shape that took the form of a "counter-society, legitimated by a counter-culture" as a response to this onslaught.[57] Manning's view of the world emerges from this kind of "counter-society" church. In the Constantinian establishment things were different. "The spiritual and civil powers stood side by side . . . The laws of Christianity were part of the laws of the land. . . . Such was Christendom once. Such it is no longer."[58] The societal situation now has not only departed the embrace of the church but it rails back against the church. Manning calls the situation "the desecration of civil society" and it harbingers the appearance of Antichrist.[59]

Newman's view of the church-world relationship is neither as apocalyptic nor as counter-cultural. Newman had a keen sense of sin and how sinfulness deranges society, but secular society makes positive contributions to human flourishing, as does the church. "*Mundum in maligno positum*" (evil infects the world) is a frequent expression of his but not a dire expression. It expresses Newman's appeal for realism, for taking things as they are, as the Christian or the church works on behalf of a mission to the world, not against the world. Take, for example, Newman's great defense of liberal learning in his *Idea of a University*; it makes for the gentleman, it makes for the "imperial in-

[56]See 19 July 1872 letter to Alfred Plummer, *LD* 26:138–39.

[57]The descriptors are from Joseph A. Komonchak, "Modernity and the Construction of Roman Catholicism," *Cristianesimo Nella Storia* 18 (1997):353–85, from whom the Manning citations come. He is at pains to distinguish the Catholic world Manning and Newman knew from an earlier period, post-Tridentine Catholicism. Thomas O'Meara makes the same distinction, calling the epoch after the post-Tridentine church Baroque Catholicism. See his "What Can We Learn from the Tridentine and Baroque Church?" in Michael Himes, ed., *The Catholic Church in the 21st Century: Finding Hope for Its Future in the Wisdom of the Past* (Liguori, MO: Liguori Press, 2004), 56–64.

[58]*Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects* (London: Burns & Oates, 1873), vol. 3, 92-93.

[59]*The Four Great Evils of the Day* (New York: Kenedy, 1896), 89. Ward, *Ten Personal Studies*, 268, describes Manning painting the world in "Apocalyptic colours."

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tellect" that can map this piece of knowledge with that piece of knowledge. But liberal learning can no more tame the power of human sinfulness than a silken thread can moor a large boat to a dock, in Newman's memorable image. This is an application of "*mundum in maligno*" without ever concluding that the effort of university studies is nugatory; the university simply requires a pastoral presence to complement its academic effort. And the same tone holds for the church's engagement with the world. It seeks to Christianize it, but not to re-Christianize it. By this aphorism I simply mean that Newman does not long for a return to a golden age as one might surmise Manning does. Newman's sentiments did not lie, for example, with the neo-Gothic revival then going on, which looked to the Middle Ages as Catholicism's apogee. When Newman built his university church on St. Stephen's Green in Dublin, he resisted appeals to have the neo-Gothic devotee Augustus Pugin design it; he designed it himself as simply suitable to the university project he envisioned.

I conclude with a final contrast between Manning and Newman, perhaps more psychological than ecclesiological, yet illustrative. In his "Reminiscences" of the First Vatican Council, Manning wrote:

> Some who ought to have led the right side went wrong. The world worshipped them, and every word they spoke or wrote. They were "the greatest theologians of the day" . . . But the Church decided against them . . . But we, the ignorants, the fools, the flatterers . . . were right after all. . . . They puffed each other, and blew upon their opponents. They were the "men of culture," the "scientific historians". . . . They were wise, and we were fools. But . . . it turned out that the wise men were always blundering, and the fools were always right. At least the wise men have had . . . to submit and to be silent.[60]

Certainly Manning had Ignaz von Döllinger in mind as one of the "scientific historians." Döllinger could not accept the council definition on infallibility and left the church. It was a sad story and sadly is how Newman reacted to the news. Manning seems to gloat in the victory of the infallibilists over the anti-infallibilists. Newman is pained by the effect on Döllinger and others like him. Newman did not agree with Döllinger's reading of the papal history but he had compassion for him. He had compassion for many people who were hard pressed by the definition of papal infallibility and were being pressured to either accept it forthwith or leave the church. "Give them time to assimilate it," he urged people in his letters. Such a different response to a pastoral crisis. Such a different man.

[60]Purcell, 2:457–58.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0360966900005466 Published online by Cambridge University Press