

Cardinal Manning

Autor(en): **Lias, J.J.**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Revue internationale de théologie = Internationale theologische Zeitschrift = International theological review**

Band (Jahr): **4 (1896)**

Heft 15

PDF erstellt am: **09.08.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-403352>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

CARDINAL MANNING.

The appearance of Cardinal Manning's Life will be found to mark an era in the relations between England and Rome. The Tractarian movement, which aimed at undoing some of the supposed excesses of the Reformation ("revising the Reformation" as Manning called it at the time), has brought about in England a very great alteration in the manner in which the Church of Rome is regarded. Englishmen, who are apt to boast of their love of fair-play, seem now determined to make amends for their fierce abuse of Rome and all that belonged to her during three centuries, and are displaying an amount of respect for Roman doctrines and practices, and of deference to Roman ecclesiastics, which is almost comic. Nevertheless, the highest Tractarian has been heard to mutter that the Roman perverts are not changed for the better after their perversion, and the sentiment even found utterance on the judicial bench in the celebrated trial of *Achilli v. Newman*. Even that great Cardinal, it was observed, had learned the trick of feminine scolding of which the only genuine professors have hitherto been found at the Vatican. The lesson was not lost upon him, and never again did Newman, at least in public, forget the dignity which he had drawn in with his mother's milk in the Church of England.

Mr Purcell's biography of Cardinal Manning will intensify the impression to which we have alluded. Any one who reads it will see that if Manning were ambitious of fame and position while a member of the Church of England, he never stooped to anything unworthy of a gentleman. Nor could his ambition be described as any other than a noble one. Neither could it

be said that it was not bravely kept under. It was not until he had resolved to join the Roman communion that he began to act a part; it was not until he had actually joined it that he stooped to intrigue and artifice. The pages of this Review have abundantly shown the quarter in which these practices are found reduced to a science. And Manning, it is clear, was an apt pupil in the school to which his perversion introduced him. It seems wonderful that M^r Purcell should have withdrawn the veil which hid the intriguer from all but the discerning few. But M^r Purcell is an honest man, and he desired to paint his hero as he really was. Only, being a Roman Catholic, he had not the least idea of the startling effect his revelations would produce on those who have not had the advantage of Roman training. Had he been able to understand the feelings of an average Englishman in regard to the conduct he has depicted, we may be sure he would have thought twice before he made the facts public. The disclosure, however, has been made, and no amount of ingenuity can undo its effects. The *Guardian*, as its custom is, may minimize the impression produced by the book. It may gently blame M^r Purcell for his indiscreet revelations. It may pass over in silence the scandalous episode of the Gladstone letters. It may refrain from comment on the duplicity which could cause a man to pose before the world as an attached English Churchman, when he was convinced of the claims of the Church of Rome. But the murder is out nevertheless. English people in general are aghast at the discovery. And the leading organ of the Church of England will find that the only result of its attempt to whitewash the Cardinal will be to give additional strength to the already existing uneasiness in regard to its loyalty to the Church it was established to defend.

We can only touch most lightly on the Cardinal's most interesting career. We must not dwell on his early Protestantism, and his gradual awakening to the reality of the catholic idea. Nor must we stop to notice the steps by which his ability and high character, as well as his influential connections, brought him early into the front rank of English ecclesiastics. We must hasten on to the crisis of 1845—1850. Even before this he had displayed a certain tendency toward the double-mindedness which seems to have been a marked feature of his later life, and

an attempt in 1843 to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds brought upon him a sharp rebuke from Newman. The latter refused to see him after his sermon at Oxford on the anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot. But we find him in 1847 already communicating his doubts to R. I. Wilberforce "under the seal". In 1848 he travelled to Rome, and the extracts from his diary which are given in the biography shew how he had already become dwarfed in mind. The higher qualities of deep and statesmanlike instinct of which in his earlier days he displayed some traces, are now conspicuous by their absence. He has become a mere ecclesiastic. He has no eyes but for services and monasteries, their details and rules. If he attempts to read political events, he reads them wrong. Arrived at Rome during the crisis of 1848, he has no sympathy with a great and noble people, struggling passionately against home misgovernment and foreign oppression. He only laments the unbelief of the Italian people, and cannot see that it is owing to the spurious Christianity which has been forced upon them, and to the wide difference between the principles even of that spurious Christianity and the practice of its professors. Sometimes a little of the truth seems to dawn upon him. The scandalous state of morals among the poor at Rome, in spite of the overwhelming army of priests, monks and nuns to look after them, in spite of the supreme and infallible guide in faith and morals so close at hand, appears to have startled him. Even in 1887 he admitted, what he already knew in 1848, that the disaffection of Italians to their church was due to "laxity of morals" among the clergy (Vol. I, p. 387). Already he had been confronted with the question—to which he never appears to have found an answer—why "Catholic" countries were so behind non-"Catholic" ones in the march of civilization (p. 388). He discovered how the *Obbligo della Pasqua* made more fanatics and formalists than it made saints (p. 389). He even found that the enforced celibacy of the clergy did violence to some very high and holy instincts of our nature (p. 395). How was it, then, that he quitted a communion in which such difficulties either did not exist, or existed only in an infinitesimal degree, for one in which they have attained such portentous dimensions?

The truth is that he never really understood the Church to which he originally belonged. The pages of Mr Purcell's book furnish

us with evidence that he was able to predict with some degree of accuracy the course of political events, but that he was entirely at fault as regards the reserve of strength possessed by the Church of England after the secession of some of the ablest of her members. Thus he predicted the repeal of the Ecclesiastical Titles Act in ten years, a prediction which was approximately true. But he further predicted that this repeal would diminish the political influence of the Church of England to a point considerably lower than that at which it stood at his secession. In reply we have only to call attention to the general election of last year, which has advanced the political influence of the Anglican Church to a point it has never reached since the memorable Reform Bill of 1832.

Mr Purcell's work leaves us in no uncertainty on the reasons for Manning's secession.

In 1847 he already had doubts on the questions of Unity and Infallibility, which he communicated "under the seal" to his friend and Curate Laprimaudaye, and afterwards, as we have seen, to his friends R. J. and H. W. Wilberforce, especially the former. The Hampden incident, which occurred in 1847, greatly increased his doubts of the claim of the Church of England to be a true branch of the Church of Christ. Hampden, in Manning's opinion, was a heretic. And yet the Church of England had no power to prevent him from being consecrated a Bishop. The serious doubts, which for the time he smothered, were brought to a head by the Gorham case. Early in 1850 the Privy Council, reversing the decision of the ecclesiastical Court, decided that the Bishop of Exeter must be compelled to institute Mr Gorham to the living of Brampford Speke. Now Mr Gorham, according to the opinion of the whole High Church party, held heretical views on Baptism. Thus the State, according to their view, was compelling the Church to admit an heretical teacher into her pulpits. She was thus false to her commission from on high, unless she positively refused to consent to his institution. This, at least, was the view of Manning, the two Wilberforces, Allies, Dodsworth, Maskell, and a host of others, lay as well as clerical. And in a few months they had all left the Anglican communion for that of Rome.

There is no doubt whatever that logically these men were in the right. The conclusion they drew followed irresistibly from

their premisses. *If* Mr Gorham were a heretic, and *if* the Church is bound to “reject” all heretics after a “first and second admonition”, then it followed conclusively that the Anglican Church, by permitting Mr Gorham to officiate at her altars, was involved in heresy, and that all who desired to maintain the purity of the faith must quit her pale. And those who refused to do so laid themselves open to the gravest accusations of dishonesty and greed. But sometimes instinct is better than logic. Pusey and Keble, with the vast majority of the clergy of the Church of England, felt that there was a flaw somewhere in the logic of the seceders. They felt that the Church of Rome was not, could not be, the only true Church of Christ¹). They felt that whatever might be said, He had not deserted, and would not desert the Church of England. They did not see, as some of us are beginning to see, that errors on secondary points of theology, as for instance, the manner of God’s working in and through the Sacraments, are not sufficient to cut off those who hold them from Christ.²) But they held nevertheless firm to their faith in the Church of England. There is nothing, to my mind, grander and nobler in the whole history of the Church, than the way in which Pusey and Keble stuck to their posts, and carried on their work precisely as if nothing had happened, undismayed by clamour, unaffected by taunts and sneers, undeterred by the defection of weak brethren on every side, unappalled even by the crumbling away of their logic beneath their feet, but notwithstanding the keenest disappointment, and the rending of the closest and most affectionate ties, remained steadfast in their faith in the high mission which God had reserved for the Church to which they belonged.

Has that faith been justified by the event, or has it not? Manning’s prescience, before he merged the statesman in the ecclesiastic, may answer the question. These are the words in which, in July 1841, Manning depicted the future of the Anglican Church in a Charge he issued when Archdeacon of Chichester :

¹) “I could not say my prayers there”, said Keble to Manning in 1850.

²) Mr Purcell’s statement that the Privy Council had abolished an article of the “Creed” (p. 594) is an absurd misrepresentation of the facts.

“We are charged with the fulfilment of no light commission; every year has brought out into a broader outline the destiny of the English Church. Can we doubt that she is reserved and raised up for some great movement among the nations of the earth? It may be that she shall build again the tabernacle that is fallen down, and purify the Catholic world. Who can be familiar with her true character and not read the admonitions of her Divine Master? Who can not see that she is primitive and yet purified; the treasury of things new and old; having the ripeness of age and vigour of a new-born youth; that she is, as it were, the link of the past and the future; a central point between the old world and the new; and how in all the inclinations of Western Christendom to one or other of the great religious extremes, she has been impelled forward in a middle path: and how the power of faith which is on the one side, and the more positive system which is on the other have both in her a share and a sympathy: and how at every ebb and flow of religious life the minds of men have been subdued and settled down nearer and nearer to that rule of faith which was conferred and vindicated in the Anglican restoration of Catholic Truth: and how at this time she is standing out in a bolder relief, and stamping her own character in all the worldwide precinct of the British Empire:—who, I ask, can ponder these things, and not feel a consciousness stronger than all reasoning, that if she be loyal to her heavenly Lord, she shall be made glorious in His earthly kingdom, as the regenerator of the Christendom that seems now dissolving, and the centre of a new Catholic world”? (p. 208.)

It is useless for members of the Roman Church to pretend that these prophetic words have not been fulfilled. They *have* been fulfilled, they are being still further fulfilled, and a completer fulfilment of them still is impending in the future. Logically, of course, the Church of England ought to have given way and collapsed after the Gorham judgement and the secession of Manning and his friends. She *ought* to have done so, but she has not. Like Blücher, she “does not know when she is beaten”. And like him, she may survive to behold the headlong rout, the *sauve qui peut*, of her brilliant and doubtless formidable antagonist. But however this may be, whether in accordance with logic or against logic, our communion is spreading

all over the world with our race and speech, and is every day becoming a more formidable rival to the power of the "Roman Colossus". And all this is probably due to the fact that, while she remains devoted to the Catholic Creed and the Catholic organization, she attaches more importance to spirit than to form. "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life".

To return, however, to Manning. He seems, from the moment in which doubts as to the Catholicity of our Church assailed him, to have played a double game. To Laprimaudaye and the Wilberforces he confessed that he had lost all faith in the Anglican Church; but to the world at large, to his penitents and those who sought his advice, and—most scandalous of all—to his dear and bosom-friend Gladstone, he was the pillar of Anglican orthodoxy, the firm supporter of the claims of the Church of which he was a dignitary. He even brought a man back from the Church which at that moment he believed to be the Catholic Church. And Mr Purcell imagines (p. 460) that all this is compatible with sanctity, with the "sacramental seal and stamp" of the "supernatural character" impressed on "Manning's brow". May we not here find the reason why, in spite of her discipline, her system, her powers of impressing the imagination, the Church of Rome finds that notwithstanding of her utmost efforts, her antagonists continue to prosper and increase?

It is not insinuated that Manning's secession was not the offspring of deep and genuine conviction. The pain it caused him was deep and real. He struggled far longer than any other of the seceders did against what he nevertheless felt to be an overwhelming necessity. As he himself says, and no doubt truly says, "My love for the Church of England is the strongest affection I have, except the love of truth" (p. 599). This clinging to the Church of his earliest recollections, and above all the clinging to her orders after he had renounced her communion, do honour to his heart. What we must condemn is the fact which Mr Purcell does not attempt to disguise, and for which he makes not the slightest apology, that Manning deliberately concealed his real opinions not only from the world in general, but from those whom he allowed to believe themselves his dearest friends. His conduct to Mr Gladstone is simply unworthy of a gentleman, to say nothing of a Christian. Not only did he keep up

an affectionate correspondence with him for years without allowing him the slightest glimpse of his true opinions and feelings, but by some discreditable *ruse*, of the nature of which Mr Purcell does not inform us, he managed to get his compromising letters to Mr Gladstone into his hands, and unscrupulously destroyed them all!¹⁾ Well may Mr Gladstone express his regret that he ever trusted the Cardinal with them. Well may he call the information of their destruction, which reached him after the Cardinal's death, "most startling information, for which I am quite unprepared". The Cardinal's reason is plain enough. Those letters, as Mr Gladstone avers, contained distinct statements that Archdeacon Manning at that time believed the Anglican to be "a living portion of the Church of Christ" (p. 570). The underhand way in which the Cardinal got these compromising documents into his hands, and then disposed of their evidence against him, has some parallels in the history of criminal jurisprudence, but is simply disgraceful in a Bishop of the Catholic Church. It is such facts as these, by no means uncommon, in which the bad faith of Roman ecclesiastics is displayed, which explain more than anything else how it is that the prayers so fervently offered up for the conversion of England, are offered up in vain. We English may be wrong, but it is the belief of a vast number of us that the Church of Rome is honey-combed with fraud and deceit. And such a conviction is and will remain an effectual barrier against reconciliation with Rome.

Manning's entrance, then, into the Roman communion is marked by an act of bad faith in glaring contrast with the principles of his whole former career and training. We shall see how rapidly the leaven worked in him when he had fully imbibed the principles of what the present Archbishop of Canterbury has happily called the "Italian mission" in this country. It has been my own personal experience during the last forty years, as it has been the experience of Englishmen in general, that as a rule—not, however, as I cheerfully admit, without occasional exceptions—the character of those who have left us for Rome can only, after their change of faith, be described

¹⁾ Mr Purcell does not state *when* the Cardinal obtained possession of these letters.

by one word—declension.¹⁾ We cannot follow Manning's career through the eight hundred pages of Mr Purcell's second volume. But the discreditable altercation between Manning and Canon Searle (Vol. II, p. 104); the extraordinary intrigues which resulted in the Pope's command to Archbishop Errington to lay down his position of Bishop Coadjutor to Cardinal Wiseman, involving as that position did the right of succession after the Cardinal's decease, and the very unworthy squabbles between Newman and Manning, together with the persistent attempts of the latter to undermine the position of the former at Rome, as well as the remarkable intrigue concerted between Manning and Mgr. Talbot to remove Dr Neve from his position at the English College at Rome²⁾, are simply amazing to an ordinary Englishman. When in our communion, Manning, as an English gentleman, had his tongue and temper fairly under command; as a Roman ecclesiastic, with the assistance at hand of an infallible guide in faith and morals, as well as of the systematic use of the Confessional, both tongue and temper appear to have strangely betrayed him. His opposition to Archbishop Errington's appointment as successor to Cardinal Wiseman was doubtless due to a profound conviction on his part that the provincialism, or as he frequently called it the "Gallicanism", the "anti-Roman and anti-Papal tendencies", of the Roman communion in this country, were fatal to the spread of Romanism in England. Already those tendencies had received a check. Wiseman, when made Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, was dissatisfied with the somewhat inert condition of English Romanism. He was "imbued", Mr Purcell tells us, "to the fingertips with Roman ideas and principles" (p. 670). He spread the use of the Rosary. He introduced "spiritual retreats and Missions, the Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, the devotion of the Forty Hours' Adoration, and the habit of more frequent communion". On the other hand, he prohibited the interpolation

¹⁾ Manning himself has left behind him a striking testimony to the high toned purity of the life of many Anglicans with whom he came into contact, and "contrasts their lives with the lives of multitudes of Catholics, in spite of the grace of the Sacraments, in France, Spain and Italy" (II, 691).

²⁾ I well remember being introduced to Dr Neve at the English College in 1856 and the vigorous attempts made by him and his associates to confound and ultimately convert a boy of 21, as I then was.

of English prayers at Mass, Vespers, and Benediction. He had already, so Mr Purcell tells us, exorcised Gallicanism, which Mr Purcell politely designates as an "evil spirit" (p. 674). Under these circumstances one would have supposed that he scarcely needed Manning to prompt him to take the steps necessary to make the "exorcism" perpetual. But he shrank, it appears, from putting pressure on the Pope. It was Manning's duty to "screw his courage to the sticking place". One is struck with the boldness, not to say audacity, on the part of a convert of some seven or eight years' standing in the Roman Church. He is ready to instruct those who were born in its pale, and who might be presumed to have inherited its ancient traditions, in the faith in which they had been born, and in which they might be supposed to have been fully instructed already. His confidence in himself becomes still more remarkable when we remember that at that time (1858—1861) the decree of Infallibility had not yet been promulgated. Mr Purcell, however, has very kindly drawn aside the veil which has hitherto concealed the bitter antagonisms and low intrigues which exist beneath the surface in the very communion which seeks to lure the unwary into it by the specious pretence of its unruffled peace, its unbroken unity. We do not blame Manning for the intrigue which resulted in the substitution of himself for Archbishop Errington as Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. It appears quite clear that he conscientiously believed the policy of Archbishop Errington and his party to be detrimental to the best interests of the Roman communion in England, and it does not appear that—at all events at the outset—he expected such substitution to be the result of his efforts. That he intrigued against Errington was due to the fact that the constitution of the Roman Church leaves no other way but backstairs intrigue open to an able and energetic man who wishes to carry his point. And certainly, in the relations maintained for years between Manning in England and Mgr. Talbot in Rome, we see that very admirable system of government carried to its highest perfection. The unedifying dispute between Manning and Newman was only a part of the same conflict. Manning was convinced that the Roman Church could not conquer the world until she put the cap-stone on her system by decreeing the Infallibility of the Pope. Minimizers like Döllinger and Newman must be crushed at all hazards.

And so Manning, with the assistance of the irrepressible W. G. Ward, the master of paradoxes and subtleties, the inventor of what may be termed the jovial, free and easy, slap-dash school of theology in the Roman Church, set to work to disparage Newman, to injure his character and destroy his influence, although his name, career and writings had done more to advance the cause of Rome in this country than a thousand successful intrigues. Well might Newman say on a memorable occasion, in his significant way, that "the atmosphere of Rome did not agree with his constitution",¹⁾ and declare that however much he had suffered while a member of the Church of England, he had had far more to endure since he had joined that of Rome. The student of Church History, if he wants to understand the true spirit of the Roman and English Churches respectively, can do no better than study carefully, first the history of the Tractarian movement and next the career of those of its members who left the Church of England for that of Rome. Thanks to Mr Purcell, we have now before us, not a series of feeble and dishonest panegyrics, but the honest and unvarnished truth. And it certainly is hardly possible, even in the case of the Church which can boast of infallible guidance, to say of its members: "See how these Romans love one another". "Thank God," wrote Manning himself on Sept. 14, 1860, "the Protestants do not know that half our time and strength is wasted in contests 'inter domesticos fidei'." They know it now. And though "honesty" is unquestionably "the best policy", we may venture to doubt whether Mr Purcell's honesty will be found as serviceable to the prospects of the communion to which he belongs, as it undoubtedly will in the end be found to the interests of truth.

As a specimen of Mr Purcell's fair and outspoken way of dealing with his subject, for which he deserves the praise, not perhaps of his co-religionists and their sympathizers, but certainly of all those to whom the claims of truth are paramount, we may take the following description of an episode in Manning's career. That episode is not easily explained. But I see no reason to abandon the explanation which occurred to me at the time, that Manning, oppressed by the failure of his dreams of, and schemes for, an England reconciled to the Holy See, became

¹⁾ Manning, when at Rome in 1877, describes himself as being "sick of the heat and the intrigues".

restless, and tried with feverish eagerness the experiment of bringing "the Church", as impersonated by himself, continually to the front, and of associating her with every phase of the national life. The experiment was not altogether unsuccessful. But the advantages gained by it could of necessity only be Pyrrhic victories.

"This unique but brief episode with its various sidelights, during which Archbishop's House, taken possession of by advocates of almost every fad or folly under the sun, was proclaimed upon the house-tops as Liberty Hall, open to every comer who had or thought he or she had a grievance against society as established; or a cause to advocate; or a mission or message to deliver; or a new code of morals or a new gospel to reveal, belongs not to the social, of which I am now speaking, but to the public life of Cardinal Manning in his latter days.

"In speaking of the social isolation of Archbishop's House, Westminster, I do not for a moment intend to infer that the Catholics of England were in any respect wanting in their duty to Cardinal Manning, or in the courtesies of life. In truth, in his latter years Cardinal Manning was out of touch with the leading Catholic laity. They took no interest in the social and political questions which he had taken to heart, and consequently stood aloof. None of them were on such terms of personal intimacy as to warrant, or allow of, an adverse expression of opinion. Cardinal Manning, moreover, in his earlier days had not thought fit to consult the laity on public affairs of Catholic interest, or to take them into his confidence. The natural result was that, as time went on and divergencies of opinion arose, active public relations between them practically ceased.

"In reference to what he called the apathy of English Catholics, I remember Cardinal Manning once saying, 'When I was Archdeacon of Chichester I had only to lift up my hand and forty men sprang to my side, ready to do my bidding; aid me in any work I had on hand. But Catholics to day take no interest in Catholic affairs of a public character. Some pious and prominent men and women, never too many, during the Season are most zealous and active; superintend or organise schools in the East End, help in the opening of new missions or in establishing refuges or homes for the sick or poor; but in a month or two, when the Season is over, they go away and leave me to work alone.'

“Cardinal Manning has left on record, as evidence of the indifference or apathy of Catholics in regard to social movements and philanthropic reforms, the fact that the name of no English Catholic is to be found among the records of the great social Reformers of our times, beginning with the abolition of Slavery in the West Indies by Wilberforce, the great philanthropist. All the great social and philanthropic reforms down to our own day were the work of Nonconformists or Anglicans; but, Cardinal Manning added, the names of Catholics, on the other hand, are to be found as opponents to almost every social movement or reform of the day” (pp. 714, 715).

We cannot dwell on Manning's subsequent treatment of Newman, when in his loneliness and isolation he humbly asked whether there was nothing whatever he could find to do on behalf of what he had brought himself to believe was the Church of God, his preference to Newman of Mgr. Capel as Principal of a Roman Catholic University, and what Mr Purcell calls the “disastrous failure” of the scheme under Mgr. Capel's auspices. Neither can we dwell on the Cardinal's controversies with the Jesuits and other regulars. These histories will be found at length in Mr Purcell's second volume. His worship of the rising sun—the servile spirit which Rome engenders in its votaries—is admirably illustrated by his condescending to kiss the man whom for years he had belittled and maligned, when the new Pope advanced him to the dignity of Cardinal (p. 571).¹ The Vatican Council, and Manning's part in it, is forcibly, though briefly, mentioned. His line as a Social Reformer is described at length. So is his political career, though in this we are not told how, in his later years, it was his wont to pose as a patriotic Englishman, proud of the history, the liberties, even the religious character, of his country. Where that history, those liberties, those religious principles would have been had the Church of which he was a dignitary had her way, he always very wisely refrained from informing us. We can only say that

¹ Manning's carefully composed statement of facts in regard to Newman is full of omissions and evasions (pp. 346—351). He says nothing of Newman's refusal to see him in 1843, after his Gunpowder Plot sermon. And Mr Purcell himself (p. 532) comments on the duplicity of the statements that he had never hindered Newman's being prominent in the Church, and that he had never opposed him save when it was necessary to do so in the interests of the Holy See.

those who believed that in his public capacity the Cardinal was acting a part, will find considerable support from the volume before us. We ought not, however, to omit the observation, that the nobler side of Manning's character is very graphically and touchingly described in Mr Purcell's pages. And in regarding it we may almost say "his faults were those of his Church, his virtues were his own".¹⁾

Some concluding reflections on the extraordinary career before us, and the yet more extraordinary revelations of its inner history, may not be out of place. The first is, that the idea of the Eastern Church never seems to have occurred to Manning when on the point of leaving the Anglican communion. He saw nothing whatever beyond England and Rome. The next is that migration from England to Rome does not improve a man's character. He leaves the breezy hill-sides of a healthy and vigorous freedom for the vitiated atmosphere of *salons*, Courts and ill-ventilated churches. Neither Newman nor Manning would, or even could, without rendering themselves ridiculous and even contemptible, have condescended in the Anglican Church to the petty interchanges of personalities which occurred after their abandonment of what Dr Newman once called "the city of confusion and the house of bondage".²⁾ The next is that in reading the history of these ceaseless intrigues, these sordid squabbles, which have disquieted the Roman Church in England ever since the Reformation, one wonders how any one can remain within her pale. One is almost tempted to reason like Boccaccio's Jew, who was baptized on his return from Rome because he felt that a religion which could survive such scandals as he had seen there could be no other than divine. How

¹⁾ One particular point, however, stands out very clearly from Mr Purcell's narrative;—the advantage in point of breadth of view, of belonging to a world-wide communion over the narrow insularity which is so apt to dominate the Anglican mind. As Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster Manning recovered the breadth of view, the statesman-like grasp of passing events, which as an Anglican clergyman he had begun to lose. Our Bishops are unfortunately so overburdened with official duties that in spite of themselves they are often reduced into mere administrators. This, Mr Purcell informs us (II, 803), Manning resolutely refused to be. He saw the danger and avoided it.

²⁾ In a petulant letter to the *Times*, drawn from him by a report of his approaching return to the Church of England, a step which he politely informed the world that he should be a "precious fool" to take!

any one who had left the Church of England because of the "unhappy divisions" to be found in her, could remain in the Church of Rome when he found those divisions intensified by a display of feminine spitefulness, a spirit of backbiting which any honest Englishman would despise from his heart, is a problem which I cannot attempt to solve. A good deal of the persistent adherence of Romans to their Church is no doubt due to their refusal to learn anything about the actual condition of other Churches. I readily admit, however, that there is to be found among some of the members of the Roman communion a noble self-devotion, a touching humility and patience under oppression and persecution which is beyond all praise; and which puts most of the members of other communions to shame. Of the first, Father Thomas, mentioned in Mr Purcell's first volume, may be cited as an instance, in his wonderful self-abandonment during the cholera in 1833. Of the second, Archbishop Errington and Newman are examples, when suffering unmerited treatment at the hands of the hero of this biography. But English people should not allow themselves to be hoodwinked by the attractive pictures so often drawn for outsiders of the "happy family" at the Vatican. "You English Church people are very much divided," said a Dominican monk some thirty years ago, to a friend of mine, well known in his day as a theologian, a commentator, and an anti-Roman controversialist. "You have", the Dominican continued, „your High Church, your Low Church, and your Broad Church." "Yes," replied my friend, with bluff geniality, "we have our differences, I admit, but I fancy we get on quite as well together as the Dominicans and the Jesuits." The Dominican fairly staggered under this home thrust, and then, seeing that my friend was in the secret, he suddenly seized him with both hands, and burst into a hearty fit of laughter. "You are quite right", he exclaimed, and with that the two fell into an amicable comparison of the merits and shortcomings of their respective systems.

The last reflection suggested to us by Manning's life is one made to me many years ago by the friend I have just mentioned, and fully accepted by Mr Purcell in his biography of Manning, that *the Roman Church in England owes her regeneration to a movement born of her Anglican sister*. Up to the time of the Tractarian movement the Church of Rome in England

was in a fossilized condition. From that condition the large and influential body of Oxford converts awakened her—for a time. But what is likely to happen now the Oxford impulse has died out, and no other secessions on a like scale are in the least degree to be expected? Especially does this question become a searching one when we bear in mind the largely augmented activity and influence of the Anglican communion throughout the world—her growth, albeit almost infinitesimally slow at present, in the cosmopolitan spirit. It is true that even yet the Anglican Church has not awakened to a full consciousness of the work she is destined to accomplish. Even yet the effects of the narrow insularity to which she has been condemned for centuries are crippling her and preventing her from rising to a comprehension of her appointed place in the affairs of Christendom. But the march of events will bring about this comprehension of her true position, just as in secular politics the march of events has at length made Englishmen comprehend the true nature and interests of the British Empire. The Catholic revival in England, the Catholic Reform movement abroad, are two streams the confluence of which is imminent, and the result of that confluence will be a lasting benefit to Christendom. Mr Purcell's volume will be found to have brought that event nearer. We cannot fail to observe its extraordinary carelessness, its almost innumerable blunders in names and things, and above all that capital blunder which persists in attributing all that was good in the Tractarian movement to Newman, instead of to those who remained in the Church in which Newman was born, and in which the movement originated. But we may pardon these endless mistakes in consideration of the valuable light it has thrown on the true nature and condition of the Church which excommunicates all others, and arrogates to herself alone the proud title of "the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of the Saints".

J. J. LIAS.
