LIFE OF

CARDINAL MANNING

ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER

BY

EDMUND SHERIDAN PURCELL

MEMBER OF THE ROMAN ACADEMY OF LETTERS

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. II

MANNING AS A CATHOLIC

Felix locus, felix Ecclesia;
Ubi Thomæ vivit memoria.
Antiphon, Old Sarum Rite

New York

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

LONDON: MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.

1896

All rights reserved

http://www.liberius.net
© Bibliothèque Saint Libère 2025.
Toute reproduction à but non lucratif est autorisée.

LIFE OF CARDINAL MANNING

VOL. II

COPYRIGHT, 1895,

BY MACMILLAN AND CO.

Set up and electrotyped 1895. Reprinted March, April, June, 1896.

Norwood Press
J. S. Cushing & Co. — Berwick & Smith
Norwood Mass. U.S.A.

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER I

1851–1854

THE NEOPHYTE IN ROME AND IN LONDON. 10

CHAPTER II

1852–1854

LETTERS OF MANNING AS A CATHOLIC TO ROBERT WILBERFORCE 25

CHAPTER III

1854–1858

IN THE SHALLOWS 49

CHAPTER IV

1857

FOUNDING OF THE OBLATES OF ST. CHARLES AT BAYSWATER 60

CHAPTER V

1858–1862

THE ERRINGTON CASE 75

CHAPTER VI

1858–1862

PAGE

BEFORE THE TRIBUNALS OF PROPAGANDA 113

CHAPTER VII

1861–1866

THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE 151

CHAPTER VIII

1863

A NEW COADJUTOR REFUSED BY CARDINAL WISEMAN . . 170

CHAPTER IX

1865

THE DEATH OF CARDINAL WISEMAN 190

CHAPTER X

1865

DR. MANNING'S NOMINATION AS ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER 203

CHAPTER XI

1865

SPIRITUAL DIRECTION BY LETTER—CONGRATULATIONS TO THE NEW ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER—MR. GLADSTONE ON THE TEMPORAL POWER IN REPLY TO MANNING . 237

CHAPTER XII

1865

PAGE

WINNING GOLDEN OPINIONS 252

CHAPTER XIII

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM—CATHOLICS AND THE UNIVERSITIES 272

CHAPTER XIV

1864–1869

ARCHBISHOP MANNING'S RELATIONS WITH J. H. NEWMAN . 304

CHAPTER XV

1865–1869

WORK, ECCLESIASTICAL, LITERARY AND POLITICAL . . 353

CHAPTER XVI

1869–1870

THE VATICAN COUNCIL 413

CHAPTER XVII

1870–1875

THE FALL OF THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE—THE COMMUNE AND ITS CRIMES—"VATICANISM"—MANNING'S RELATIONS WITH MR. GLADSTONE 460

CHAPTER XVIII

1871–1874

PAGE

MR. FORSTER'S EDUCATION BILL—UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, KENSINGTON—BISHOPS AND REGULARS . . . 492

CHAPTER XIX

THE SECOND ENGLISH CARDINAL SINCE THE REFORMATION . 532

CHAPTER XX

1878–1879

DEATH OF PIUS IX.—THE CONCLAVE—ELECTION OF POPE LEO XII.—CARDINAL MANNING AND CARDINAL NEWMAN 546

CHAPTER XXI

1876–1883

REFLECTIONS ON ROME AND THE RULING CARDINALS—THE CASE OF MGR. CAPEL AND THE HOLY OFFICE . . 572

CHAPTER XXII

1871–1890

PHILANTHROPIST, POLITICIAN, AND SOCIAL REFORMER . . 587

CHAPTER XXIII

1881–1890

LIFE AND WORK AT ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE, WESTMINSTER—READINGS AND REMINISCENCES 672

CHAPTER XXIV

PAGE

SELF-CRITICISM AND SELF-JUSTIFICATION 717

CHAPTER XXV

1887–1890

THE JUBILEE OF THE QUEEN—DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH ROME—CARDINAL MANNING'S JUBILEE—THE DEATH OF CARDINAL NEWMAN 732

CHAPTER XXVI

SECULARS, REGULARS, AND JESUITS 756

CHAPTER XXVII

HINDRANCES TO THE SPREAD OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN ENGLAND 772

CHAPTER XXVIII

1888–1890

"A SLOWING INTO THE TERMINUS" 797

CHAPTER XXIX

1892

DEATH OF CARDINAL MANNING 802

ERRATA

Vol. II.

P. 10. L. 18, read "as well" for "not merely."
L. 20, read "and also" for "but."
P. 18. L. 4, read "cite" for "recite."
P. 28. L. 10, read "practical for "piratical."
P. 28. L. 19, after "a mistake" place a full stop, and begin a new sentence.
L. 26, read "and this" for "it."
P. 36. Footnote, l. 1, read "W. H. Mill" for "Hodge Mill."
P. 44. L. 8, read "Meyrick" for "Merrick."
P. 54. L. 30, read "in the case of one" for "to one."
P. 62. L. 11, read "*voti*" for "*vote.*"
P. 95. L. 18, read "*Dominiddio*" for "*Dominidio.*"
P. 108. L. 17, read "*tutti i*" for "*tuttii.*"
P. 126. L. 19, read "1862" for "2615."
P. 127. L. 17, read "*incameramento*" for "*in cameramento.*"
P. 168. L. 5 and 6 from below, read "*Pontificis digna*" for "*Pontifici dignos.*"
P. 173. L. 21, read "*spoliarsi*" for "*spogliare.*"
P. 187. L. 4 from below, read "*Dominiddio*" for "*Dominedio.*"
Pp. 711-712. Transpose letters from Mr. J. Bryce and Mr. F. C. Burnand to p. 709.

INTRODUCTION

THE following letter, addressed by Cardinal Wiseman to Father Faber of the London Oratory, is the most fitting and effectual introduction that can be given to Manning's Catholic life. For in this letter Wiseman describes with pathetic earnestness the grave difficulty which faced him, almost the gravest a bishop has to overcome—the want of priests. Souls were perishing in multitudes before his eyes for lack of pastors. Catholics in the poorest districts were losing their faith because there were no teachers. Where missions were most needed to save the Catholic poor from drifting into practical heathenism, no missions could be held for there were no priests to hold them. With a cry of anguish, Cardinal Wiseman appealed to Father Faber, who had a large number of priests under his control, for help. But since it was contrary to their Rule for the Oratorians to do mission work, Cardinal Wiseman turned to Dr. Manning, and bade him to establish a Community of secular priests, under the bishop's control, for the express purpose of doing such work.

Cardinal Wiseman's desire to establish a Community of secular priests in London afforded Dr. Manning an opportunity of doing good service to the Church in England. Since the community was to be formed after the pattern of similar Italian communities, Manning went to Italy in order to carry out Cardinal Wiseman's design. The result was the establishment of the Oblates of St. Charles at Bayswater. This work brought Manning into constant communication with the ecclesiastical authorities in Rome. He soon became

well known at Propaganda; had frequent interviews with Cardinal Barnabò, and finally with Pope Pius IX.

In one of his autobiographical Notes, Cardinal Manning, in speaking of his visits to Rome for the purpose of obtaining the Pope's sanction to the founding of the Oblates of St. Charles in London, and subsequently, as the official agent of Cardinal Wiseman, said, "These visits made me known to the chief official personages; the ruling Cardinals at Propaganda, and brought me into intimate relations with the Pope. All this led to my becoming what I now am."

To Dr. Manning an opportunity came of doing a great work; and incidentally of making himself known at Rome. Manning was equal to the occasion.

Cardinal Wiseman's letter to Father Faber is a masterpiece of simple eloquence. It is full of zeal and love of souls. It is a pathetic appeal for aid and sympathy. There is a touch of fine scorn at the empty plea or pretext, on the score of their Rule, made by the Oratorians and other religious Orders for standing aloof from him and his urgent claims for help in supplying the spiritual needs of the Diocese. It is the most characteristic letter of Cardinal Wiseman's that I have seen, warmhearted, indignant, full of eagerness and enthusiasm. It cannot be read without emotion even at this distant day, when Wiseman's name is an almost forgotten memory.

In connection with the opportunity which he gave to Manning's Catholic work, I am glad of the occasion of reviving Wiseman's memory in the following letter to Father Faber:—

135 Golden Square, 27*th October* 1852.

My dear F. Faber—Yesterday the doctor did not wish me to do anything, so I was obliged to send you an uncivil message. To-day I am going to write you a long letter, which is at least as great an evil. But, as the Bishop of Southwark has opened the pleadings, by reporting to you our conversation, which I assure you was not held for that purpose, I feel it necessary to open my brief, and go fully into my case. I think I can do it more fully in writing than by conversation; and I want you to see exactly how I find myself situated in the matter to which my interview with the bishop casually led, or rather naturally went, as it was that uppermost in my mind, as indeed it has been for a

long time. You will then be able to judge better, in what manner you can best assist me; for the suggestion *must* come from you, as I think you will see. You must, however, excuse prolixity and simplicity of speech.

When I first came to London, I saw that the neglected part was the poor, and to that I resolved to give immediate attention. After having consulted some zealous priests I concluded on the plan of local missions in the midst of them. At the very same time the Rev. Mr. Hodgson proposed a similar plan, and I embraced it. He gave up the best mission in the district, and gave *himself* up to the work. God blessed it, and three permanent missions arose from it; two most flourishing on this side the water, one on the other. But these permanent results could not be everywhere secured for obvious reasons, as, proximity to the Church, want of a place for a chapel, poverty, etc. I therefore felt more and more the conviction strengthened, that I had from the beginning entertained, that steady, continual, and persevering work among the dense, sinful masses could only be carried on by religious communities. F. Ferrara's missions have brought this out more and more. He does immense good in a locality; but the local clergy cannot keep it up; relaxation ensues, and often the ejected spirit returns with the seven *nequiores se*, and increases the past evils.

I, therefore, spared no pains to secure missionary communities, to help in the work of evangelising the poor; and now I want you to review the past.

When I came to London there was not a single community of men. There were two Jesuits *en garçon* in a house, that was all. Now it is different.

1. The Jesuits have a splendid church, a large house, several priests, besides Westminster. Scarcely was I settled in London, than I applied to their Superior to establish here a *community* in due form of some ten or twelve fathers. I also asked for missionaries to give retreats to congregations, etc. I was answered on both heads, that dearth of subjects made it impossible. Hence we have under them only a church, which by its splendour attracts and absorbs the wealth of two parishes, but maintains no schools, and contributes nothing to the education of the poor at its very door. I could say much more, but I forbear.

2. The Redemptorists came to London as a missionary order, and I cheerfully approved of and authorised their coming. When they were settled down, I spoke to them of my cherished plan of missions to and among the poor. I was told that this was not the purpose of their Institute *in towns*, "and that another order would be required for what I wanted." The plea of "Rule" is one

which I have all along determined to respect; and I had no more to say. They have become, as far as London is concerned, a parochial body, taking excellent care of Clapham (having five or six priests and abundant means for it), and they have given two or three missions with varied success in chapels; but no more than they have done in Birmingham and Manchester.

They have exerted no local influence; and, though lately they have offered to work among my poor (being no longer in the diocese), something seems to have paralysed their efforts.

3. The Passionists I brought first to England, in consequence of having read what their founder felt for it, and of a promise I made to F. Dominic years before. I got them placed at Aston Hall, and thence they have spread. In consequence it was decreed that the principal house should be in London, when I came to it. I gave them a house; after a time they migrated to the Hyde, thence into the fields, and now they have come to St. John's Wood. They have never done me a stroke of work among the poor, and if I want a mission from them, the local house is of no use, and I must get a person from the Provincial, as if it did not exist.

4. The Marists I brought over for a local purpose, and that they are answering well. I hope for much good from them in Spital Fields; but, at least at present, I dare not ask them about general work.

5. And now last, I come to the Institute of which I almost considered myself a member, San Filippo's Oratory. I have never omitted an opportunity of expressing my thankfulness to God for its establishment here, and for the many graces it has brought with it, in the piety it has diffused, and the many it has converted. But, as a matter of fact, you know that external work, the work I have been sighing for, is beyond its scope. You know how rigidly I have respected "Rule," how I never thought of forcing a parish on you, how I have refrained from asking co-operation, even a sermon, because I would ask for nothing which I understood to be incompatible with the Institute's purpose. At the same time I have never interposed a bar to any one, however closely bound to me, joining you, as Dr. Whitty, Butt, Cooke, Gloag, Bagshawe. In fact two things I have always respected in the case of all Orders, *vocation* and *Rule*.

Now look at the position in which I am. Having believed, having preached, having assured bishops and clergy, that in no great city could the salvation of multitudes be carried out by the limited parochial clergy, but that religious communities alone *can* and *will* undertake the huge work of converting and preserving the corrupted masses: I have acted on this conviction, I have intro-

duced or greatly encouraged the establishment of five religious congregations in my diocese; and I am just (for the great work) where I first began! Not one of them *can* (for it cannot be want of will) undertake it. It comes within the purpose of none of them to try. Souls are perishing around them, but they are prevented by their Rules, given by Saints, from helping to save them, at least in any but a particular and definite way. But what makes it to me more bitter still, from *them* comes often the cry, that in London nothing is being done for the poor!

It is clear that the want is not yet remedied; that we have not got what is absolutely necessary; and two reflections come powerfully before me. You will not be offended with my plainly stating them.

1. I sometimes ask myself: Is the view taken by religious of their institutes too literal; or is it really according to the full and comprehensive mind of their founders? Would these holy men themselves have rested contented, while there was no end of misery and vice to cure, and of good to do all about them?

For example, the Redemptorists tell me: "These missions among the poor are not according to our Rule"; that is, probably, have not been foreseen or ordered by it. Certainly not. St. Alphonsus was a country bishop, and therefore, *Pauperum præsertim et ruricolarum misertus*, he instituted his congregation. Suppose he had been placed where there were cities filled with dens of infamy as deep as any robbers' caves in the Abruzzian fastnesses, and vice as inaccessible to common means of grace as a *Castello* or a peak of the Apennines is to human foot, would he then have said, These not being *ruricolæ*, my disciples must not try to save them?

Or again, you remember the *principle* you once quoted to me, as St. Philip's definition of Oratorian duties, "that others hunt, but you must stay at home and fish." This is quite right; but sometimes I think, had dear San Filippo's lot not been cast in happy Rome, the source of faith, the centre of unity, with a copious staff of parochial clergy, with 100 religious houses for every work, with many zealous disengaged priests, canons, beneficiaries, etc., but in naughty London, heretical, schismatical, vicious, depraved, ignorant, profane, with priests at the rate of one to 5000 souls, besides heretics, with *no other* provision, where he heard the cry of thousands of souls perishing around him on every side, would his great heart have stood it, and would he not have rushed out into streets and lanes, and sought to share with St. Antoninus the glorious title of *venator animarum*, as well as of their fisherman?

Now I repeat that I only speak of the *principle*. In point of

fact you *cannot* do more than you do. You kill yourselves with your present work, and I should be the first to cry out against any attempts on your part to labour more. But suppose the Oratory, through God's blessing, comes to count 100 or even fifty members: would the principle be so strong as to overcome zeal and charity, and half a community remain idle at home, while the other half sufficed to do the work? I can hardly believe it, yet I see these principles rise up as insuperable bars to our great work. I have seen how well you can turn their flank, and act up to the spirit beyond the letter. The hospital is one of the Saint's occupations for his sons. We have not such a thing, and you wisely substitute the hospital for the soul—the school. You cannot have a house for pilgrims, so you rightly set up a lodging house for the poor. This is all in the spirit of San Filippo. Why may not other works of charity be, which he knew not of?

And now let me be a little selfish in another illustration of what appears to me a wrong pushing of axioms to uncontemplated extremes. In your last letter but one you excused yourself for often coming to me, because San Filippo warned his followers against going much into the houses of bishops, and therefore *a fortiori* of cardinals. He, of course, said that in a place, and at a time, when a bishop or cardinal's household was called a court, the antechambers of which were filled with cavaliers and chamberlains, etc., and files of servants; when such a visit was a visit to a great man, rich and perhaps immersed in public and secular affairs. But do you think that if he had ever contemplated a bishop in a Protestant country, who, whatever his unmerited dignity, can barely make ends meet; whose whole court consists of one priest; who for his sins, if not for God's Church, is as much howled at, barked at, and scoffed at, as any bishop has ever been for a long time; and who in the ardour of youth having made a promise to him to introduce him into England, had borne concealed for ten or more years of almost hopelessness, this word in his heart, kept it to the best of his power,—good and charitable St. Philip would have intended to put *him* under the ban, and bid his followers to shun him, while he made no prohibition whatever against visiting secular noblemen, whenever good was to be done? I can hardly believe it.

Yet I dare not say that I am not wrong throughout. Every religious body is the best and the proper judge of its aims and its obligations; and I have never contested with any, the plea once made, of incompatibleness with these. I wish all to follow out their Rules. But they impress me strongly with the want of elasticity and the power of adaptation in them. This comes before

me in many other ways. I asked a most respected religious to become one of my council; he replied that his Rule forbade any of the Order to advise a bishop. I asked another to be confessor to a convent; he answered that they were forbidden by their Rules, and so of other cases. Now, could the founders have intended these refusals in a country where the clergy—young, unversed in ascetics, oppressed with work—cannot be so fit to direct religious as religious men, and where there is a dearth of such, or where the bishop has not three persons whom he can consult on theological questions? I think not; but what makes the case worse is this: Almost every religious Community has no end of dispensations, some from fasting and abstinence, some from choir, all from the habit, some have female servants, etc. etc. If you ask them why all these exceptions, you are told the circumstances of the country require them. But who thinks of recurring to the same dispensing power of the Holy See for exemption and liberation from provisions as much intended for different countries as these, from restrictions on the power of doing good in the way that the country requires it?

With most female communities it is the same, yet some are found, like the *Bon Sauveur* at Caen, Mother Margaret of Clifton, and the *Filles du Cœur de Marie*, at Kensington, who *humani nihil a se alienum putant*, and open their arms, in their charitable embrace, as wide as the range of human misery.

2. Then if I am wrong in my view of the adaptability of existing Orders to the peculiar spiritual wants of London, what shall I do? Get a distinct order for every kind of work, or go on trying experiments, and being again disappointed? This would be absurd. Turn founder and institute another Order to undertake all that I want? This would be no less so; I am neither capable nor worthy of such an attempt, nor could I infuse into others a spirit which I have not myself. What remains then but to revive an idea which I formally proposed to Gregory XVI. in 1838, and which he took warmly up, which was chilled and nipt in the bud by some of the bishops, but which I have since seen gloriously carried out in France?

The work which is required cannot be fully carried out except by a Community. I will explain what it is; premising that I have been relieved of one heavy burthen, through the charity of a foreign nobleman, who has funded money for supporting four or five priests expressly for supervision of schools, so that I have now four priests exempted from all parochial duties, and exclusively devoted to the care of schools. But I still wish to provide for the following objects:—(1) Preaching among the poor, and continuing the care of them where they are con-

gregated together, till permanent missions are established there. The work soon dies out, if some constant and persevering effort is not made, *e.g.* by their being visited weekly or so; by newcomers being converted before they corrupt the reformed; and those that leave being traced to other localities and put under care there. (2) Establishing a class of perseverance for our youths after their first communion and leaving our schools, so as to enrol them, and keep them together by various *Industriæ* and some pleasing bond of association. (3) Care of convents and charitable institutions. The *Petites Sœurs* have scarcely any priest going near them, etc. Being confessors to them. (4) Retreats to the clergy, *ordinandi*, religious, etc. (5) Advent and Lenten and May courses of sermons. (6) Missions periodically in congregations.

It is clear that to have these duties carried out, concert and uniformity of plan, so that one person can take up another's work, are necessary, besides prayer and strictness of life. Only in a Community can these advantages be secured. Yet, as it appears, they are not compatible with a religious Order from want of expansive power in this. I am driven to seek for a *quid medium* between the secular and regular state; or, as I described it to Mr. Manning, "an Oratory with external action," and I do not think that dear San Filippo will be angry with me for trying to get it. In fact, when I was last year in Normandy, I slept at the house of the *Missionaires Diocésains*, at La Delivrande (of whom the superior is Père Saulet, and the other Norwood priests belong to them), and found them to be a body of priests in community, ready to undertake any spiritual work which the bishop cut out for them. They gave the retreats at home, and in the colleges for clergy, those for ladies at the convent; they will conduct a *petit seminaire*, they give missions, establish and govern industrial halls for women, and take charge, as at Norwood, of communities. On my recent visit to Cambrai I found every bishop that I spoke to provided with such a body, under the same name or that of *prêtres auxiliaires*, etc., and they confirmed what the Bishop of Bayeux had told me of his, that they did not know what they should do without them. St. Charles had similarly his Oblates of St. Ambrose.

It has appeared to me that Providence has now given me an opportunity of gathering such a band. Mr. Manning, I think, understands my wishes and feelings, and is ready to assist me; several will I hope join him, and I hope also some old and good priests. We shall be able to work together; because there will be no exemptions from episcopal direction, and none of the jealousy on one side, and the delicacy on the other, of interference

or suggestion. I do not see how the multifarious missionary work I have proposed can be carried on without frequent communication with the bishop.

I have now opened my mind, or rather my heart, freely before you. Perhaps it is a little sore in parts, but surely there is reason for it. "Effusum est in terram jecur meum—cum deficerent parvuli et lactentes in plateis civitatis. Dixerunt matribus suis ubi est triticum et vinum?" I cannot suggest anything to you; but I have laid open to you my wants, and you will best know whether, and to what extent, it is in your power to help me, what may be compatible with your Rule and consistent with your power and health. Again I assure you that I do not complain. The work of the Oratory is immense and fruitful, and I do not ask for any sacrifice of duty or of life. But if your zeal and prudence suggest anything to be done, I shall be most happy to receive any offer or advice. If it appear to you that there is nothing to be done, and that I have been wrong in expecting from religious Orders the active assistance which I anticipated, I will beg two or three things from you. *First*, such assistance as your influence will enable you to give towards the establishment of a Community such as I have described, for supplying the wants of the diocese; *secondly*, your prayers for the success of my endeavours and plans; *thirdly*, a charitable judgment of the efforts made.

This I add, because more than once I have had persons much discouraged, by hearing, directly or indirectly, your sentiments as to ecclesiastical affairs, and the state of religion in London. Such reports are of course painful to me, especially as they lead to much murmuring on the part of laymen against their ecclesiastical Superiors. I must draw this long-winded letter to a close, assuring you that in writing it, I have no feelings but those of affection to the Oratory and to yourself. At times I would despair at finding so little help, except the *auxilium de Sancto*, and it has been my wish to lay the state of things before the Holy Father and implore his assistance. But I have made no complaints of any one. You will, therefore, charitably excuse any expressions which may seem to betray want of patience, or a desire to throw blame off my own shoulders; for it is the first time that I have written down any expression of my feelings on these subjects. —Recommending myself to the prayers of the Community, I am ever, my dear F. Faber, yours affectionately in Xt.,

N. CARD. W.

CHAPTER I

THE NEOPHYTE IN ROME AND IN LONDON

1851–1854

"VI benedico con tutto il mio cuore *in tuo egressu, et ingressu,*" were the words of blessing bestowed by Pope Pius IX. on the late Archdeacon of Chichester on his going out of the Church of England and his coming into the Church of Rome.

These words were spoken at the Vatican on the evening of 4th December 1851; in the early morning Mgr. Hohenlohe had called on Manning at 28 Via del Tritone, and said it was the Pope's express desire that the neophyte should commence at once his theological studies at the *Accademia Ecclesiastica.* This Academy, attended chiefly by young ecclesiastics of high rank or of distinguished talents—for it is the school in which the future diplomatists of the Vatican are trained—is commonly called the "nursery of cardinals."

Into this celebrated "nursery" the future Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster entered on the 12th of December.

Manning had not as yet abandoned his ancient habit of keeping a Diary, not merely for the ordinary purpose of taking note of dates or names or of events or circumstances, but as a means of giving expression to his sentiments or of recording his reflections.

The following is an extract of this kind from the Diary 1851-54.

12*th December*.—Came 3 P.M. to Accademia Ecclesiastica. 24 years over again.[1]

---

[1] Manning, twenty-four years before he entered the Accademia Ecclesiastica, went into residence at Balliol College, Oxford.

I feel a human sadness—but it is chiefly from a foreboding, and against what do I fear? In how many ways is this life what I most desire?

1. It is a new beginning.
2. It is a special help.
3. It is a time of retirement and study.

If it is God's will to use me in any way, lasting and true hereafter, this is a means to reality and solidity.—*Prosit.*

14*th December.*—Since I lost my journals,[1] I have no heart to begin again. Also, keeping a journal—

1. Led to self-contemplation and tenderness, and
2. Kept alive the susceptibilities of human sorrow.

Yet it was of use to me in remembering and comparing seasons, and in recording marked events.

This morning the Introit and Epistle, my first mass in the Accademia Ecclesiastica, were, "Rejoice in the Lord."

What memories of Lavington, and Sunday night, and of Advent.

But all is in God's hand.

That was a time of peace, as the time before was a time of beauty and happiness. Now it is all three, but with reality, sharpness, loneliness with God, and a sense of certainty and of eternity.

I used always to feel a self-reproach. I was full of theories of infallibility and unity and of the priestly life, but was in heresy and schism and inaction. Something always broke my peace. As I used to walk up and down that room at Lavington I used to feel a reproach go to my soul. Certainly, if there were no such thing in the world as the Catholic Church, it would have been a blessed life.

I have felt much human sorrow to-day. My softness shames me.

17*th December.*—To-day we kept St. Andrew's Day.

I now am glad I was hindered before. A new grace was in store for me, through his intercession. And I said his mass in this home prepared for me by the will of others.

St. Andrew, 1849. I was Archdeacon of Chichester.

St. Andrew, 1850. I had resigned.

St. Andrew, 1851. I am a priest of the Catholic Church, and in this Retreat, under the eye of the Visible Head of the one Fold. . . .

And further—this evening I went to the Diplomazia Sacra—I found all my old reading from the pamphlet against the Ecclesiastical Commission in its place.

---

[1] See Vol. I. Chapter XXVIII. p. 640.

The more I see, the more I feel convinced that my divine Lord has been preparing me for this place and hour.

One thing I now need is St. Charles's ward in deed and truth.

Christmas Day.—Got up at 4 o'clock. Trinità de Monti by 6 o'clock. Morning fine, starlight. As we went through the streets I thought of "Let us go into Bethlehem." Began mass about 6.10. It was very imposing. Finished by 8¼.

New Year's Eve, 31st December.—On Monday, Feast of St. Thomas of Canterbury. I went to the English College to High Mass. It was very impressive, and I thought of the continuity of the great strife of principles, and thanked God that I am called to share it.

At Ave Maria I went to the Holy Father.

[The excision of a page occurs here.]

This morning I offered mass for forgiveness of the sins of this year. What a year: what a year of grace, not only into the one fold, but into the pastor's office! *Fungi sacerdotio, post hoc nihil restat nisi lumen gloriæ.*

Quinquagesima Sunday.—Not a word since New Year's Eve. I feel that my journal-keeping is broken off.

I am in doubt whether it is a good or bad habit. But certainly it kept alive many thoughts and convictions.

Saturday before Passion Sunday, 26th March 1852.—Last Wednesday, Eve of the Annunciation last year, I went for the first time to a Catholic Church in England as to worship—St. George's Cathedral. Next day, the Feast, I executed my resignation of Lavington and Graffham and the archdeaconry, before a notary in the City.

This day, at 11 o'clock, Hope and I went to Father Brownbill.

To-morrow the anniversary of our reception, and this is the first day of my retreat. *Dirupisti vincula mea. Misericordias Domini in eternum cantabo.*

Passion Sunday.—About this moment this Sunday last year, Hope came into my room in Queen Street, having been just received, 2 or 3 o'clock.

I feel now as I did at Broadway,[1] the past all bright, beautiful and blessed. More than ever.

[Here a line or two erased.]

This I believe to be Satan's work, and favourite snare for me. I am soft, longing, and regretful.

I remember at Broadway what the things which moved me were—

---

[1] The Monastery of the Passionist Fathers, Broadway, Highgate, where Manning made a spiritual retreat before his ordination as priest.

1. To force myself from those thoughts.

2. To fix my mind on Heaven and the new home.

3. To make the Stations as inducing indifference and fulfilling my desire that I may be led direct to our divine Lord, that nothing may be between Him and me.

So now.

28*th March* 1852.—Monday night after general confession in Retreat I could hardly sleep for joy. I had the feelings I remember in 1832-33 [1] down to the summer of that year. My past then seemed to be pardoned—23 years blotted out, and I had a sort of lightness of heart and simple trust in the love of God. Heaven seemed blessed and near, and Holy Scripture heaven upon earth.

Then came years of a loaded conscience, and sorrow, and doubt, and strife, and the movement which has brought me where I am. And now, once more, 20 years again, I am blotted out, and Heaven and God's Word come back in sweetness: "Behold I make all things new." I am now more detached, isolated, cut round about, without future, or thought of home, or desire in life, than ever. God alone and the great Forty Days are all I desire till faith is swallowed up in sight. The one visible, infallible, imperishable kingdom, in which in 1833 I believed *in confuso*, I have found, am in it, and am its servant.

Wonderful grace carrying me through all. If after this I perish, I perish indeed—God be merciful to me a sinner.

I have had since Monday night a strange sense of joy, yet of restraint.

[Here two pages are cut out.]

Saturday.—. . . went down and found the Blessed Sacrament exposed in church. Said Rosary with a hard, absent heart; carried a taper to the altar, and felt as if I had seven devils—Judas—and a hypocrite, and, as I went forward, as if I might fall dead.

It was a profound humiliation; like my first communion, full of fear.

Perhaps to teach me a deeper lesson than all before: to set me on my watch: to take away all illusions and excitements from the exercises that they might lower me on the ground in my sin. *Humilitas.*—Make me humble and keep me so.

This night my beloved brother Charles and his two children have declared their purpose to become Catholics. And Mary put herself into my hands.

---

[1] In 1832 Manning received Anglican Orders; and was curate to the Rev. John Sargent at Lavington till the death of the rector in the summer of 1833.

To-morrow, last year, I was received into the Church.

5*th April* 1852.—Last night I was very much tempted to make example of some one who busies himself in setting about reports of me. But this morning's meditation before mass completely changed me.

And in mass, the prophecy: *Torcular calcare* and *indignatio mea ipsa auxiliatrix est mihi*, and the Gospel—Our Lord's silence—overcame me, and at the genuflexion at *exspiravit*, I resolved by His help never even to defend myself, but to give all my life, person, and energy to *torcular calcare*, and never to allow myself to be diverted and drawn off from this our work by personal attacks, in which I should also lose more than I could gain.[1]

7*th April* 1852.—This day my beloved brother with his three children were received.

Here a page is cut out, and the Diary is not resumed until after Manning's return to Rome from England in the following November. No allusion is made in the Diary to his periodical visits to England, of which hereafter I shall give an account. In the meantime, in order not to break the continuity of the narrative, I shall go on to the end with the story of his life at the Accademia Ecclesiastica as related in this contemporary Diary, and supplemented by the account contained in Cardinal Manning's Journal, dated 1878-82.

Manning's reminiscences of his former life at Lavington as an Anglican, and his reflections on his own state of heart and soul as a Catholic, are of infinitely more interest than would have been a record of his studies, of his friends and fellow-students, or even of the celebrated professors in the Collegio Romano, under whom he studied. It is so, at any ate, to those who prefer a curious psychological study to a ommoner tale of outward events or circumstances. But in act, no such commoner tale is related, at any rate in his ontemporary Diary. No mention is made of the great Jesuit octors of theology, whose names were famous in their day nd still are: far less is any hint given of his personal ntimacy with any of them, or with other great people in

[1] This resolve is another exhibition of the vivid and living faith in Manning, which made him regard the words of the Gospel as the Voice of God speaking directly to his soul on an instant matter of personal conduct.

Rome—Cardinals, Ministers of State, the General of the Jesuits. Beyond the fact of having enjoyed the high privilege of an interview on three occasions with the Pope, there is no record of the highest of honours and privileges bestowed upon him—personal and confidential intimacy with Pius IX.

But if, in his Diary, 1851-54, Manning as a theological student at Rome dismisses such details as of no moment in comparison with his interior life, his spiritual difficulties and trials, and his forebodings and forecastings concerning his future career as a Catholic, Manning, as Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster, in his Journal 1878-82, makes ample amends for such unaccountable omissions. But before giving the graphic and glowing account of the position he held, and the special privileges he enjoyed as a theological student during the four years he resided at the Accademia Ecclesiastica, it is as well to pursue the simple story of his interior life, trials, consolations, regrets, and hopes, as related in his contemporary Diary.

Rome, 22nd November, St. Cecilia, 1852.—Since Friday I have been suffering an intense anguish.

A horror falls on me lest I should be falsely accused of a thing, of which God knows my innocence.

Till two things came to me:—

1. To offer my lifelong shame in union with the shame of my Lord. So His name be glorified and His elect be gathered.

All would be right again in His kingdom and eternally.

2. To conform myself to St. Francis de Sales's example. He was slandered, with apparent proof. He was a bishop in full work; had a house of religious; was believed guilty by all but a few; was three years under the cloud; but would have no defender but God. He waited in silence, and went on as before.

God give me grace so to do.

To-day I specially put myself under St. Francis de Sales's patronage in this point.

Rome, Good Friday, 1853.—Often I have felt inclined to write in this book, but the trouble of taking it out sufficed to stop me.

Since November 22nd I have passed through many a trial, but time has run on, and here I am.

My sensitiveness is so great that I increase all my trials tenfold

This day last year I resigned my office and benefice in the Anglican Church.

My Lord has dealt very lovingly with me. I might have been until now laid aside; but He admitted me at once to His altar, and has given me many beloved souls, and many consolations.

And now, because He would have some praise of me which I do not like, I am dreary and sad. Forgive me, Lord. My desire is to offer myself up to Him with a sincere will.

I have long prayed for humility, and He seems to be answering me by humiliations which I embrace with joy. They are most wholesome and necessary.

Lately I have been troubled in every one of my tender points; and when I was most at ease with myself He has permitted some disquiet and mortification.

My Lord, I accept all, and with a ready heart. Only let me not go on dreaming and deceiving myself, lest I be disappointed of my hope and lose my soul.

In the Diary there is an interruption of about a year. There are no entries from Good Friday 1853 till 3rd April 1854, except three or four pages previous to the latter date, which have been cut out. In the spring of 1853, Manning went to England, and returned to Rome in November. But the Diary is not resumed until just prior to his quitting Rome on the completion of his theological studies.

3*rd April* 1854.—I wish in this Retreat to make for myself a rule by which to begin in England, *e.g.*—

1.	Sleep 7 hours; dressing, etc., 1 hour . .	8 hours
	From this anything I can take for prayer.	
2.	Office 1½ hr., mass 1½ hr., meditation 1½ hr., prayer 1½ hr., study 3 hrs. . . .	8 (*sic*) „
3.	Serving neighbour—answering letters, visits, business	8 „
		24 hours

1. Sleep 7 hours.
2. Food—quantity and quality simply for health.
3. Clothes, etc., simplest.
5. Alms $\frac{1}{10}$th at once.

I wish to record the following as resolutions formed, but not finally confirmed:—

1. To go over every year once a compendium of dogmatic and of moral theology.

2. To read the New Testament at least once a year, and the Old once in two years.

3. To avoid all particular friendships, as (1) weakening, (2) distracting, (3) preoccupying.

4. To make particular examination on complacency and *invidentia. Confirmed.*

5. To pray for *saltem amorem orientem et initiationem mortificationis, et desiderium desiderii.*

6. To verify exactly all theological statements before speaking.

In the concluding paragraph of Manning's Diary, 1851-1854, is the following somewhat singular but candid self-revelation :—

I am conscious of a desire to be in such a position (1) as I had in time past, (2) as my present circumstances imply by the act of others, (3) as my friends think me fit for, (4) as I feel my own faculties tend to.

But, God being my helper, I will not seek it by the lifting of a finger or the speaking of a word.

If it is ever to be, it shall be (1) either by the invitation of superiors, or (2) by the choice of others; and then I desire to remove the final determination from my own will to that of others, according to the resolution of last year.

To the expression on the part of Manning in 1854 of his very natural desire to hold such a position of authority in the Catholic Church as he had held in the Anglican, Cardinal Manning thought it necessary or proper to append to the Diary of 1854 the following explanatory footnote, dated 5th August 1883 :—

"The papers and people had been making a bishop of me."[1]

[1] In the year 1853 or 1854, when Manning was studying Theology in the Accademia Ecclesiastica, Monsignor Talbot of the Vatican, the Hon. and Rev. George Talbot, brother to Lord Talbot of Malahide of that day, met in Rome Mr. James Laird Patterson of Trinity College, Oxford, who, after his travels in the East, had just become a Catholic. Speaking of the most recent English converts, one of whom was then studying at the Accademia Ecclesiastica, Mgr. Talbot asked, half in jest, half in earnest, "Whether a man who was already manœuvring for a mitre would make any the worse a bishop for that?" I do not know whether the future Bishop of Emmaus replied in the words of St. Paul to Timothy, "If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work" (1 Tim. iii. 1).

To complete the story of the life of the Neophyte studying Theology in the Accademia Ecclesiastica; to supply a record of events of public and personal interest omitted from his contemporary Diary; I will now recite a graphic account of the events of those early days, written after the lapse of long years and in the light of after-life by the Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster.

CARDINAL MANNING'S JOURNAL

1878-82

The following extracts from Cardinal Manning's Journal, dated 1878-82, give an interesting account of the time he spent as theological student in the Accademia Ecclesiastica at Rome, of the men of eminence and official position with whom he became intimately acquainted, of the friendly relations he maintained with the Jesuits, and especially of his intimacy with the Father-General of the Society (the "Black Pope"), and, highest honour of all, of the fatherly kindness and condescension shown to him by Pope Pius IX. What makes this supplementary account all the more interesting is, that no mention is made of all these events in the contemporary Diary. Three visits to the Pope, indeed, are recorded, but not a word is said of those familiar conversations which, as a theological student, it was Manning's proud privilege to enjoy.[1]

I went to Rome in the October following my ordination. I was lodging in 28 Via del Tritone when Mgr. Hohenlohe came from the Holy Father to desire me to come to him that evening. He told me that it was his will that I should go into the Accademia Ecclesiastica. These two events—my ordination and my residence in Rome—were decided by authority for me, and I only obeyed, and from these all have followed now for eight-and-twenty years.

---

[1] Manning's early ordination so soon after his reception into the Church was objected to at the time by many grave persons as hasty and ill-advised, and not likely to find countenance at Rome. The bestowal on Manning of the faculties of a missionary-apostolic implies in itself no exceptional favour, for such faculties are given to every priest on going into a mission. The favour lies in the fact that they were given to Manning at Rome by Cardinal Franzoni, instead of by his own bishop at home, Cardinal Wiseman.

I went into the Accademia on December 4, the feast of St. Peter Chrysologus, in whose history is an event which always recalls to me an event in my own life. I remained in Rome from 1851 to 1854, going home during the great heat of summer to England. It was a time of great peace but of great trial. I found myself at forty-two among youths; and a stranger among foreigners—I had broken almost every old relation in the world, and was beginning life over again.

During those three years I received from Pius IX. a fatherly kindness. I saw him nearly every month, and he spoke with me freely on many things, and gave me freedom to speak to him. It was the beginning of the confidence which was never broken. I owe to Cardinal Wiseman and to Pius IX. all that has befallen me in my Catholic life. I never asked of them, or of any one in my former life, anything whatsoever. All that has come upon me has come without any seeking. I was made a rector without being a curate,[1] archdeacon without being a canon, provost without being canon also, and archbishop without being a bishop. During my time in the Accademia I came to know intimately a large number of men, Roman and others, filling public offices, and also the men who are now in chief places of responsibility were my companions and friends. I was at that time more at home in Rome than in England. I knew very well the chief Jesuits at the Gesù and the Collegio Romano, especially the Father-General, Beckx, at whose deathbed I was; Father de Villeput, Rubillon, Miguardi, Perrone, Passaglia, Ballerini, and Father Schrader. They were friends, and some of them my confessors and directors in study. I found the public schools did not give me what I needed. I therefore read as I was directed at home, and went many times a week to the Collegio Romano.

In the year 1853 Cardinal Wiseman wrote to call me home. I went to the Holy Father, who told me to stay on in Rome. In 1854, the Cardinal came to Rome, and renewed his call. He also spoke to the Pope. I went to him again, and he said The Cardinal is so urgent that I will not say no, *Ma il mio intimo pensiero ira che lei rimanasse in Roma perchè io potrai mettarla in qualche posto.*

In a subsequent note in the same Journal of a later date, after stating that "one day a Pontifical carriage came to my lodgings, and Mgr. Hohenlohe delivered a message from the Pope, as noted before," Cardinal Manning repeated his former statement: "The Holy Father I used to see about nearly every month. He treated me with extreme kindness, and

[1] Cardinal Manning had evidently forgotten that he had been for some six months a curate at Lavington under the Rector the Rev. John Sargent.

admitted me to a freedom of speech and a friendship, which made me feel that with many losses I had gained the Vicar of Christ as a guide and spiritual father. He let me come home during the summer heats every year." The auto-biographical Note then supplies further interesting details:—

My companions in the Accademia were Monaco, Azeglia, Cattani, and at the end Howard.[1]

Then came Herbert Vaughan. He served my mass at six o'clock nearly all the time he was there. While there his mother died. We became very intimate, and our affection has lasted and grown to this day. We little thought then of the great work which was before us in England.[2]

During my time in Rome I knew well Father Perrone,[3] and most intimately Father Passaglia.[4]

It was not in Manning's nature to live, even for a brief period, the life of a recluse or of a student. Although, in his first fervours, as a student in theology at the Accademia Ecclesiastica, he put on record in his Diary that such a life of retirement and study as he led there was what he most desired, the instincts of his nature soon propelled him to a

[1] Howard had just resigned his commission in the Guards in order to devote his life as priest to the service of God. And after leaving the Accademia Ecclesiastica entered in due course the diplomatic service of the Holy See; was sent by the Pope to India to arrange the pending difficulties between Portugal and England in regard to the ecclesiastical government of the province of Goa. He was promoted in 1877 to the dignity of Cardinal, and after Monsignor Talbot's death filled to a certain extent his place in Rome. Cardinal Howard was Bishop of Frascati. He was born 1829, and died after a long illness from affection of the brain on 16th September 1892.

[2] The intimacy between Manning and Herbert Vaughan, now Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster, commencing at the Accademia in Rome and ending with Cardinal Manning's death, lasted for forty years. For the first twenty years Father Herbert Vaughan worked with and under Manning, and for the last twenty years as his colleague in the Episcopate. Such an intimacy does not, however, imply that these two zealous fellow-workers in the cause of the Church at home and abroad were always, or on every point, even in grave matters of policy, of one mind.

[3] Father Perrone, S.J., the celebrated Jesuit theologian and writer, was appointed rector of the Collegio Romano in 1853, the last year of Manning's residence in Rome. During the irreligious Revolution in the years 1848-50, under the impious red-shirted misdemeanant Garibaldi, the Jesuits had been expelled from Rome, and Perrone among others found shelter in England.

[4] Passaglia, S. J., a distinguished theologian, was celebrated for his learned work on the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, defined in 1854, the year in which Manning closed his theological studies in Rome.

life of action. It was only in the fitness of things and as a necessary sequence, that, as the convert was made a priest within ten weeks of his conversion, so the neophyte after not five months' retirement and study of theology was to be heard, Sunday after Sunday, preaching and teaching in the churches of London.

The first sermon Manning preached as a Catholic was at the little church in Horseferry Road in the slums of Westminster. In St. George's Cathedral, Southwark, he delivered four lectures which were listened to with special interest at the time, as it was thought he might give a personal account of his own conversion, but Manning confined himself to an exposition of Faith in general terms.[1] But a special distinction was bestowed upon him—almost, if not altogether unprecedented—by Cardinal Wiseman's inviting him—the neophyte who had scarcely commenced his theological training—to preach at the First Provincial Synod of Westminster before the newly-constituted Hierarchy of England. These venerable bishops—one of whom had spent nearly half a lifetime as missionary priest in Australia, and had aided Cardinal Wiseman in preparing the framework of the Restoration of the Hierarchy[2]—were deeply impressed by the earnestness of manner, impressive delivery, and ascetic appearance of Manning, whom they had seen and heard for the first time. On the first day of the Synod, Newman's simple and touching eloquence, lofty ideals, and profound thought, had come to them in their beauty and originality almost as a new revelation. The second convert from the Anglican Church, in the eloquent words in which he expressed his profound and fervent belief in God's help to the Church in England in her hour of need,[3] bore witness to the assembled bishops in his own person and presence at the Synod that the "Second Spring," predicted by Newman, had already in Manning given token and promise of the coming of its first-fruits.

[1] *The Grounds of Faith.* Four Lectures delivered in St. George's, Southwark, 1852.

[2] The late William Bernard Ullathorne, O.S.B., Bishop of Birmingham.

[3] *Help nearest when Need greatest.* A Sermon preached in the Synod of Oscott, July 11, 1852.

During the spring and summer of 1852 and 1853, Manning said mass every day in the Jesuits' Church, Farm Street, and often preached before crowded congregations; as he did in many other churches. In the visits to London he stayed at the house, in Curzon Street, Mayfair, of his friend and fellow-convert, James Hope. At this house, where in earlier days they had often met their troubled Anglican friends in conclave, Manning found many of his old friends once again — some, like Henry Wilberforce, William Dodsworth, Lord Feilding (the late Lord Denbigh), and Mr. Allies, who had preceded him into the Church, and many more, who still stood shivering at the brink of the deep waters which separated them from Rome. To them Manning's firm and loving hand was extended till most of them were led, one by one, to follow his example. The first of these old friends and fellow-workers in his Anglican days, whom he received into the Church, was Edward Badeley, famous at the time as the ecclesiastical lawyer who had defended so skilfully and with such heart and zeal the cause of the Bishop of Exeter against Gorham before the Privy Council. This conversion in May 1852 was among the first in that long line of conversions, which year by year in such large and increasing numbers were the work of Manning's teaching and preaching, of his noble example and personal influence. Even when, in 1865, his work as a missionary priest ceased, conversions, due under God's grace to his teaching and preaching in pulpit and confessional, did not cease. For many still came in those after-years for counsel and comfort in their religious difficulties to the Archbishop of Westminster; and few went away from his presence without bearing in their hearts the seed of God's grace.

On his return to Rome in the winter of 1852, Manning's reputation as a preacher had preceded him. Some, perhaps, were rather disappointed that he did not assume a more aggressive tone in controversy, but his method of presenting Catholic Truth in its fulness and beauty was far more effective. Especially was this the case in the presence of congregations made up for the most part of

non-Catholics, as usually happened in Rome when Manning preached. The first of these long series of addresses which for so many years he was in the habit of delivering was given in the spring of 1853 at the Church of S. Andrea delle Fratte. All the English in Rome interested in Church matters, or moved by curiosity to see and hear the celebrated preacher, crowded into the church. Manning was in the habit, all through his life, of closely scrutinising the bearing of his congregation. He remembered the faces of many of those who came to hear him, and whose names he did not know. In reference to the sermons at Rome, Manning once remarked, "Faces familiar to me when I was preaching in Rome, I often recognised again when I was preaching in London." And he added, "Many of these people who heard me preach in Rome for the first time came to me in London in their religious doubts and difficulties, seeking either comfort or instruction, and many of them I have received into the Church."

Thus early in his priestly life the neophyte at the Accademia Ecclesiastica was busy in sowing at the centre of the Catholic world the seeds of grace in the hearts of his non-Catholic fellow-countrymen; and gathering in due season in London a plenteous harvest of souls.

This twofold work of studying theology for six months in the year, and of preaching and teaching either in Rome or London for the other six months, was brought to a close in the spring of 1854. Manning's residence in Rome as a theological student at the Accademia Ecclesiastica was a period of about two years and a half, or rather less; of this period about six months each year were spent in England, namely six months in 1852 and six in 1853, leaving one year and a half altogether for ecclesiastical study and training. Cardinal Wiseman was naturally impatient. In the two previous summers Manning had shown his quality as a preacher and his capacity for public work. Wiseman was eager and enthusiastic, and wished to see the converts begin their labours for the conversion of England. Newman had so far complied as to deliver, in 1851, those famous lectures on "Anglican Difficulties," but he declined

to come up to London. Placed by Wiseman, when he was Vicar-Apostolic of the Midland district, at Birmingham, from Birmingham, where he had founded the Oratory of St. Philip Neri, Newman refused to move. "Here I was placed, and hence I will not budge." There was no help for it. In appealing now to Manning, Cardinal Wiseman repeated in substance what he had said to him in the beginning—Go out into the highways and byways, and bring your friends and fellow-countrymen into the Church, the one fold of the One Shepherd.

CHAPTER II

LETTERS OF MANNING AS A CATHOLIC TO ROBERT WILBERFORCE

1852–1854

In Rome, Manning as a Catholic and a priest takes up again the dropped thread of his intimate intercourse with Robert Wilberforce. Again the discussions on subjects of the highest spiritual interest, or of controversial questions of vital moment, are resumed by two men of equal earnestness, who in mutual love for many years had laboured together and prayed without ceasing for the solution of religious doubts and difficulties which had entered like iron into their souls. To-day their position was changed. No longer on Wilberforce did Manning "lean all his weight." In the light of Faith his doubts and difficulties had departed from his troubled soul as the dark clouds of night vanish before the rising sun. But Robert Wilberforce was still where Manning had left him; was still beset with perplexities and misgivings of heart; was still held back by the influence of his surroundings—the pathetic appeals of Samuel Wilberforce, and the shrinking fears of his own wife at the thought of his secession.[1] Robert Wilberforce's great heart was troubled not so much about the Anglican Church, which in his eyes stood self-condemned by its acceptance of the Gorham Judgment, as about difficulties, chiefly in matters of detail, which stood in the way of his submission to the Church of Rome.

[1] See Vol. I. p. 627.

With extreme prudence and delicacy of feeling Manning resumed, in letters no longer dated from Lavington but from Rome, his labour of love in helping his friend, fellow-labourer, and fellow-sufferer in so many years of trial, in the hour of his greatest need. As a link between his past and present I rejoice to resume in this Volume Manning's old familiar intercourse with Robert Wilberforce; and still more because the whole of this correspondence, from beginning to end, bears witness to the higher qualities of Manning's noble nature: not only to his earnestness of purpose and tenderness of heart, but to his vivid belief in the supernatural, and to his humility in the presence of God.

The following letter is the first addressed from Rome to Robert Wilberforce:—

ROME, 25*th January* 1852.

MY DEAREST ROBERT—You have been much in my mind, and on St. Hilary's day, at the altar. Would to God that I could transfer the sense, or consciousness of certainty and reality which continually grows upon me. But it is the law that this is to be known each man for himself. "*Gustate et videte quoniam suavis est Dominus.*" I am anxious to hear of you. What is all this I am told of 3200 clergy branding themselves with the Gorham Judgment, and the two archbishops publicly commending? Is not the cup full? What remains? It seems to me that the more men get over the more they will, until they lose perception of all tests and principles of the Church and of its Faith.

The last fifteen years have been full of events, each of which, before they came, people said would be final with them; after they came the same people said they were either nothing, or encouragements and "signs of life." But you will wish me rather to tell you of myself and of things here.

Henn is well, and as good and affectionate as ever, patiently waiting for a letter from you—as am I. I am living in the Accademia Ecclesiastica, College of Priests who are preparing for or employed in the ecclesiastical government. It is the college of the Pope for his public service, as the diocesan seminary is for the clergy of the diocese. I am admitted by an exception in favour of *ultramontanie*. It gives me an apartment, refectory, and chapel, and is like our old life at

Oriel and Merton over again. Our hours are very early, which gives me much time. I say mass at half-past six. We have a good library and I am enjoying my reading greatly, feeling that it is the Will of God that I should be where I am, and employed as I am. I am reading the *Summa* of St. Thomas with Passaglia, who is kind enough to give me his spare time. He is the ablest theologian I have met, and well read in German criticism, which is rare. I have read Perrone's *Compendium*, and am reading Moral Theology, which among us expired with the *Ductor Dubitantium*. How much I wish you could be with me in Passaglia's cell. It is to me a delight to have a living voice to answer the questions which past years have helped me to make. And I am truly thankful to find how, in the main, I have rightly kept to the end of the thread. If you can, get the works Passaglia has published—especially one on Grace, *De Divinæ Voluntatis partitione, etc.*

Before God, dearest Robert, I can say that my whole reason is even more and more filled with conviction that the Catholic and Roman Church is the one only true fold of Jesus Christ, and that every other communion is both in heresy and in schism.

To my dying day I must love the memory of the past, and the idea which I have so long cherished. But it stands before me as an illusion convicted by the light of the Divine Presence. The Catholic unity has re-entered England in the nineteenth as it did in the sixth century. "Light is come into our world."; God grant that all may come unto it. But when I hear of Bennett, and remember his acts and words, I turn in fear to the only One who is ever changeless. Farewell; let me hear of you, and pray for me. . . .—Ever your most affectionate,

H. E. M.

And in reply to a letter from Robert Wilberforce Manning wrote as follows:—

ROME, *6th March* 1852.

MY DEAREST ROBERT—I was very glad to have your letter. No day passes without my remembering you often—and as best I may. Well do I know what you are passing through. And what would I not do to help you? I well remember how "the sight of my eye went from me," and I seemed to taste nothing. With everything round me to make this world peaceful and happy, there was something at heart which made it impossible for me to enjoy it. Unceasingly I felt the consciousness that the Church of England is out of harmony and obedience to the

Truth and Will of our Divine Lord; and all in it that is good and true is of no avail until the act of restitution and submission is made; this is what I see men trying to fly from and to forget, plunging into new parishes, work, reading, schemes for colonial synods, etc.; but the one great debt unpaid stands at the head of the score, and the householder will have that first. It is no question of detail, but of the first absolute vital principle. Does our Divine Lord now teach in the world by the guidance of His Spirit, and by what organs? All the rest, all particular doctrines, and all piratical corruptions and abuses, even though they were as great as those of Jerusalem at our Lord's coming, are all of no weight in the great controversy between truth and conscience. I feel this to be Bennett's case as you describe it. No man ever in my hearing taught the infallibility of the Church more broadly than he. And how does the Church of England recognise and obey that law of His Kingdom? This leads me to say, do not commit yourself in print to a syllable contrary even to the terminology of the Catholic Church on the subject of the Real Presence. It would be a mistake; whether, dear Robert, you can accept or defend its definitions or no, one thing is certain, if the Divine Spirit guides the Church, no individual, unless he be in submission and under the guidance of that Church, can without peril oppose its definitions or even its terms. I know I need not say this to you. But my anxiety is so great that you should not entangle yourself, as I thought you did before on this subject, it makes me say it. And also because what I have fancied myself to be in the turn of your mind, is a disposition to fix on the language of the Church not the sense intended by the Church, but the sense you attach to its terminology.

It seems to me a duty of conscience as well as of plain reason to learn the Catholic terminology as I would the signs of Algebra or the Russian vowels, before we attempt to appreciate them. I say this all the more, because I am convinced that the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence is alone in harmony with reason and revelation, with Scriptures and philosophy; and I think no one can read St. Thomas and Vasquez without coming in the end to that conclusion.

And now, dearest Robert, I have filled my letter without saying half of what I intended. I never venture to press you, greatly as I long for you. But I respect you and your trials as I desired to be treated myself. All I fear for you is chronic doubt, and the dimness which delay spreads over the clearest evidence. I believe nothing will, because nothing can, go beyond the revelations of the last three years to prove that the Church of England is a human society, out of the sphere and

guidance of the Divine Spirit. It has not in it the essential form of the Catholic Church. Just as the Kirk in Scotland. If it were to accept the whole Council of Trent at the next Assembly, it would be a human society. Nothing short of submission to the visible unity of the One Kingdom could make it to be a Church.

Farewell, dear Robert. I hope to be in England at the end of June for some months, and to see you on some island or boat in a neutral river, as great powers are wont to meet.—Believe me always yours very affectionately, H. E. M.

St. Mary's, Oscott, Birmingham,
11*th July* 1852.

My dearest Robert—I have been very often on the point of writing to thank you for your last affectionate letter, which was of great price to me; for I feel towards few as I do towards you. God grant that at least our love for each other may never be less than it is now. I will not be content without also saying may it be much greater; as I feel it one day surely will be.

I pray for you, and remember you at the altar, and watch your every word; but I leave you with God, for since I came within the sphere of faith and grace, I feel that God only gathers soul by soul.

Do not commit yourself *against* even a word in the definitions of faith. I do not ask you to defend, but only not to deny what can be truly seen only from within.

Your kind note of the 6th reached me here to-day, and I am kept here till the end of the Synod, which will be about Friday next, I believe. It is a majestic sight to see the Church after centuries taking up its work again with all the calm and ease as if it were resuming the session of yesterday. I have no words to express what is the divine life and divine reality of the Church in its acts.

I hope to pass through York about 3rd August. Shall you be at home?

We must meet before I go to Rome again, dearest friend.—Believe me, always most affectionately yours,

Henry E. Manning.

In London at 14 Queen Street, Mayfair.

33 Charles Street, Berkeley Square,
2*nd August* 1852.

My dearest Robert—I hope to leave London next week, on a migration which is to end in Dublin. It would indeed delight

me to come to you. Would it suit you if I came about Wednesday week, or the Monday after? This latter would suit me best.

Let me know your best days, and I will make mine square.

I seem to have a whole world to tell you.—Ever yours, dearest Robert, very affectionately, H. E. M.

33 CHARLES STREET, BERKELEY SQUARE,
12*th August* 1852.

MY DEAREST ROBERT—Your kind letter gave me no surprise. I had rather felt it at your former. And I fully enter into the reasonableness of it.

Perhaps we may meet before I go from England. I hope to be in London again about the 14th of September. Saturday week I trust to be with Henry in Dublin.

And now, dearest Robert, I have no will to write the thoughts which you know are uppermost. Having gone through all, I know your trial. But so it must be.

All I will say is, that since I could look upon Anglicanism, and especially on the line of our friends such as Pusey and Keble, as a bystander, and with the guidance of real and certain theology, I am alarmed not so much at the doctrinal errors, as at the false view of moral probation which they inculcate.

Many are coming continually from Pusey's influence in a state contrary, I believe, to the intention of Him who gave us intelligence and will, and grace and truth to be their support.

Your letters have at times suggested the same thought to me. You speak of events doing for you what you fear to do of your own act.

But is not the will a talent? and may we bury it in the earth?

Surely your very trial is, not to be passively carried away, but to act.

And delay brings chronic indecision, and multiplies social and home difficulties, and weakens our power of volition.

I remember long ago saying to you that I believe you have already received all the light ordinarily given before corresponding with it. Forgive me this, dearest Robert; our love, and my having tasted of what you are suffering, alone gives me this freedom.

I truly believe that preventing grace—which illuminates the intelligence, and then tarries for the obedience of the will—has done its work for you.

And that your turn to correspond is come.

Would to God I could transfer to you my changeless convictions!—Believe me, my dearest Robert, yours most affectionately,

H. E. MANNING.

14 Queen Street, Mayfair,
28*th September* 1852.

My dearest Robert—The inclosed paper is by Dr. Russell of Maynooth, the translator of Leibnitz's *Systema Theologicum*: which edition, if you have not seen it, I recommend you to get.

And now I will try to say what occurs to me about your questions.

They appear to me to a great extent needless difficulties foreign to theology.

1. The Council of Trent says that our Lord's Humanity, *secundum naturalem existendi modum, i.e.* in its proper dimensions, etc., is at the right hand of God only.

2. The Church therefore distinguishes *natural* presence from supernatural or *sacramental* presence.

Of the modes of this sacramental presence it defines nothing. It is supernatural.

3. The presence being supernatural is not a subject of natural criteria or natural operations.

4. Within the sphere of natural phenomena and effects there is no change in the consecrated elements.

But a change does take place in a sphere into which no natural criteria such as sense can penetrate.

Of this we are assured by the words of Revelation, "*Hoc est*," etc. The Church is concerned only to affirm this supernatural fact, as Vasquez says "*ut sint vera Christi verba.*"

Beyond this affirmation the Church affirms nothing.

5. It has no jurisdiction in science or philosophy. The Office of the Church is Divine and unerring within the sphere of the original revelation.

But ontology and metaphysics are no part of it.

There are many philosophies, about "matter" and "substance," etc., but none are authoritative. They are many because no one has been defined.[1] . . . Ever yours very affectionately,

Henry E. Manning.

---

[1] In his Anglican days, Manning had already discussed this subject, as the following extract from a letter, dated Lavington, 21st April 1849, shows. Speaking of Robert Wilberforce's Book on the Eucharist Manning, says:—

"What I should wish would be that you should revise your *terms*. In the chapter on the Real Presence you use in opposition such terms as 'bodily contact' and 'spiritual power'; and again 'material' in a way which does not convey a clear view to me. Moreover, they seem to me to be a departure from the usual theological language as used by St. Thomas, Vasquez, Suarez, etc., and therefore to produce verbal and apparent differences, when no real differences can exist. And this seems to me a hindrance to better understand-

On hearing of the death of Jane, Robert Wilberforce's wife, Manning wrote a tender and sympathetic letter :—

ROME, *6th February* 1853. *Quinquag.*

MY DEAREST FRIEND—A few days ago Henn gave me your message, and last Friday brought the tidings that your fears were all fulfilled. Need I say how my heart has turned towards you? Dearest Robert, we have seen long years and many changes together, and it would be strange if anything could touch you without touching me.

You know all I can say, and have already said it to yourself. All I can do is to pray that God may console you, and give you a hundredfold for all He takes away. As indeed He will, for in this He is very good, as I well know: would to God I were more grateful and faithful to His inspirations.

When you have time and inclination let me hear from you.

We have known each other five-and-twenty years. Strange things have passed over us both since we rode together in Port Meadow. Thank God, all seems to me to be full of light and of meaning.

I do not know where you were when your sorrow came and who was with you—and where you may be now—and should much wish to hear.

One thing weighs on me. Do not be in haste to print anything. Review your past and present *in die visitationis.* I can only pray as I do day by day, and more than once.

Farewell, dearest Robert. May all solace be with you; as it will. Pray for me, and believe me always yours very affectionately,

H. E. MANNING.

52 SOUTH STREET, GROSVENOR SQUARE,
13th June 1853.

MY DEAREST ROBERT—Henry gave me your kind message. I should have written last week, but that I waited for your return to Burton Agnes.

I am amused at your Irish territories, and hope when I am driven out of England, you will house me on some of your broad lands.

As yet, I have not done more than look at your book. I

---

ing. I may be wrong, but I should like to go into it with you with books by us. . . . Farewell, my dear Robert, I long to see you. And should more than I can say enjoy a quiet day in these fields and among my books with you."

mean that you should give me one as a lordly archdeacon ought to a poor priest.

Depend on it, they will not molest you. "Stay where you are and print what you like" is the Anglican policy.

Moreover, the Divine Will is that we should attain to Truth and Life, not as footballs, but as agents.

But if I go on, you will put me into the fire.

Henry and Mary are well, and the Bishop has been to them, and seems more like his own self. He and I have also met once and with all old affection.

How I long to see you. When and where is it to be?

I want you to do something with me.

My hope is to find some one or two priests who will give themselves to study, writing, and preaching — to live in community, as Merton and All Souls should have been. Why should not you be Warden? You and I would work together to-morrow with more perfect unity of Faith, than you can find in anybody where you are.

Let me hear from you. I long to know how you are shaping yourself to your lot in life, which to you is both old and new. —Believe me, my dearest Robert, always yours very affectionately,

HENRY E. MANNING.

25 CHAPEL STREET, 18*th July* 1853.

MY DEAREST ROBERT—A letter to-day tells me that our dear William Henn is gone. He died at Marseilles of typhus fever. It is a great sorrow, in which you and I know how to share.

Now, dearest Robert, you will soon be with us. While he was here he could only touch your intellect; now he is with Him who moves the Will, and he will pray for you as greatly as he loved you.

Alas! it is one less to me. I owe him to you, for he loved me more through your too kind representations than through anything he found in me.

In August I hope to move north. Where could we meet? At George Ryder's?—Ever yours most affectionately,

H. E. M.

KINGSTON, 19*th September* 1853.

MY DEAREST ROBERT—I got here Thursday last and find there is no hope of seeing you here. Therefore I write a line to say that I hope to be at Abbotsford on 29th September. Why not write to Hope and propose to meet me? Failing this, I would

meet you, please God, at York, or any place on the line on the 6th of October.

Let me have a line at Carstairs House, Lanark.

I have so much to say to you, that I do not know where to begin. I can only say Mass for you as I did this morning: that you may come and be F. Superior of a community with me in it.

All well here.—Ever yours very affectionately,

HENRY E. MANNING.

ABBOTSFORD, 30*th September* 1853.

MY DEAR ROBERT—I find now that I have no reason to go to Scarbro', so that some place on the main line will best suit me.

Nobody knows me in York, so that you would not be lost by meeting me there, or if there is any place you prefer, name it. I could spend a day with you at some hostelrie. Let me have a line directed to St. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw, Durham. *Not to be forwarded.*

Have you more doubts as to the Catholic Church than you would have for Christianity as a whole, supposing that you approached it in middle life and after forty years of studied objection? Have you less doubts now as to the chronology and history of the books of the Old Testament, or the Chaldee chapters in Daniel?

I believe, as I have long said, that what you call doubt is only the *quality* of all evidence which is not mathematical. For instance, for the six days of creation, etc. Not to act on this is simply not to believe.

What would not be accepted in the Church of England? Is your book accepted half as widely as Hoadlyism was a hundred years ago? To me it is the sign of death that the Church of England suffers you to write as you do, and Archbishop Sumner to be at Canterbury. It is *barbam vellem mortuo leoni.*

But you will begin to swear if I go on.

I would propose Wednesday in next week if that suits you. All well at Kingston and here.—Always very affectionately,

H. E. M.

In the beginning of 1852, acting on Robert Wilberforce's advice, Manning had written on the subject of his conversion to Mr. Gladstone, and to preclude misapprehension wished that circumstance to be explained to him *now* by Robert Wilberforce.

PARIS, 26*th October* 1853.

MY DEAREST ROBERT—Many thanks for your kind letter, which reached me the day before I left London.

I hope you explained to Gladstone my writing last year. Your kind interpretation led me to do so, and I should wish him to know that fact.

Now for yourself, you say you do not know how it is you are so much influenced by those you are with. I have no difficulty as to the reason. First, I think you and Henry are alike *ex parte voluntatis.*

Next, . . . Anti-Catholic persuasions are especially addressed to the fear of making a mistake.

But lastly, and above all, how should you be otherwise? I was so once. Why am I not so now?

For the reason of St. Paul, in what you call my text. You have no foundation but human judgment—your own on one side; Gladstone's or Keble's or Pusey's on the other.

And therefore you are "tossed to and fro and carried about" by words of men.

To me this is simply impossible, because I believe on the basis of a Divine Teacher.

There is therefore no parity or balance between Gladstone, Keble, or Pusey, and the Divine Tradition of the Church.

Your whole state verifies to me my text as well as my own experience.

Now, dearest Robert, do not go on losing yourself, as I once told you, *in details.* Your private judgment has convinced you of the Incarnation, Baptism, the Eucharist. Apply it now to the third and last clause of the Baptismal Creed, "I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church."

Write a book on this next. To go on with details of doctrine is to wink hard at the point.

I have resolved not to speak of individuals. But I find it impossible not to see that there is a key to the present conduct of many.

When you say that the Roman Church is not historically the same, is it not to say *my* view of its history differs from its *own?*

But may not the Catholic Church know its own history better, and by a lineal knowledge and consciousness, to which no individual can oppose himself without unreasonableness?

I am perfectly persuaded that the Catholic Church is historically the same in personal identity and functions.

Details are like grey hairs or wrinkles as compared with youth; or the character of the man with that of the child. But the person is the same. Dearest Robert, find the Teacher sent from God as Nicodemus did. Your Sermon on Church Authority points to the Truth. But grace only can strengthen our will to act.—Ever yours most affectionately, H. E. M.

ROME, 20*th January* 1854.

MY DEAREST ROBERT—I was going to write to you and ask whether you had begun one more of the 1001 nights to prolong your doomed life, when an event turned my thoughts into a graver strain—I mean the death of our friend Mill.[1] It came home to me with great force, when I remember how lately we three stood together—and now are each one alone. Dearest Robert, you know that I have never trespassed on the honour due to a man's conscience and freedom of moral action in your probation before God, but these events alarm me. I see one taken and another left, and for the one taken I have heavy and uncertain thoughts; for the one left often still heavier, for I see men who once believed with even clearer light than I did, now professing not to believe this or that particular; and what is worst of all, I believe they say so truly; for what ought to be obeyed when believed, passes away. I feel no doubt that Robert I. Williams, who, with dearest Sam Wood, had his foot on the threshold of the Truth, is now sincere in saying that he does not believe what he believed then. If I trust the men who speak, I the more fear for them, for the truth has been lost.

I say all this not of you, dearest Robert, though I never feel to be without fear for any soul till it is actually on the shore. I believe that you are true to yourself, but you seem to me to avoid the real question. The question for Dionysius, the Areopagite, was not only whether the Resurrection was a true doctrine, but whether St. Paul was a teacher sent from God.

Moreover, I fancy that you are looking for what God does not give. I mean a conviction which precludes the exercise of faith. Except in figures and numbers there is no conviction which excludes the possibility of the contrary being true. It is not impossible even that Jesus Christ is not come in the flesh. I mean it does not involve a contradiction in its terms to suppose that the Christian History is a myth. It is only contrary to the moral laws which govern mankind, and the evidence of the past. A deist in becoming a Christian has

[1] Hodge Mill, Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge, one of the signatories of the famous Protest against the Gorham Judgment.

no more than a conviction which excludes *reasonable* fear that Christianity may turn out not to be true. Reason can go no further, and until upon the motives of credibility supplied by reason he makes an act of faith, he can rise no higher. This has seemed to me to be your state, and you tarry for what, while you tarry, you cannot have. As a student of Aristotle and Butler you know all this better than I. If the doctrine of the Holy Trinity be true, the Holy Spirit now teaches in the world; and if the Holy Spirit now teaches in the world, the Church of God is infallible! A present and practical divine teacher is in the world, from whom lies no appeal to the Bible or to antiquity.

I do not ask which it is. It is enough to say that it is not Anglicanism.

Forgive me all this, for my heart is sometimes fearful not lest you should be untrue to yourself and to Truth, but lest you should really and sincerely take some turn which should hide even so much as one light in the chain of lights by which God has led us to Himself.

I would very willingly lay down my life for the Truth He has bestowed upon me.

Farewell, dearest friend. I remember you in every Mass at the altar. God hasten the day when you may offer the Holy Sacrifice for me and my many and great necessities.—Believe me always most affectionately yours in J. C.,

HENRY E. MANNING.

ROME, 5*th February* 1854.

MY DEAREST ROBERT—Mary writes me word that you are scandalised with St. Alphonsus.

Do me an act of charity. Wait till you have the whole case before you.

I know the writer of the article in the *Christian Remembrancer*, and I know his measure in St. Alphonsus.

If, after seeing the whole case, you believe him right and St. Alphonsus wrong, I am silent. Only do not be deceived.

I bind myself to prove:—

1. That every word of St. Alphonsus may be justified by Jeremy Taylor.

2. That St. Alphonsus teaches as follows:—

(1) That to speak falsely is under all circumstances and conditions intrinsically and immutably a sin.

(2) That the examples he gives of execrable ambiguity he gives on the ground that they are *not falsehood.*

Anglican tactics are these:—

1. *I* say St. Alphonsus' examples are falsehoods.
St. Alphonsus allows them to be lawful.
Therefore St. A. allows falsehood.
2. St. A. allows them to be falsehoods.
And allows the use of them. Therefore, etc.
I will be bound to show that the whole is reducible to one or the other of these perversions of his meaning.

Dearest Robert, when the Holy See said that in his works there is *nihil censurâ dignum*, it had a longer head, and perhaps more grace, than the *Christian Remembrancer*. But the world loves its own.

I thank God I have a right to share in the reproach of His servants.

Only do not be deceived.

Time is running on, and I hope before long to be once more where my heart is, at least in a mortal sense.—Ever yours very affectionately, H. E. MANNING.

ROME, 28*th February* 1854.

MY DEAREST ROBERT—Your letter is just come, and as I have a cold and am staying at home, I will begin a few words to you.

I am not surprised that you should be troubled on the subject in the form in which it is put before you; and until you have gone over the whole case.

For this reason I asked you to suspend your decision till you have it all before you, and in a matter of such moment I am sure you will.

Before I give any references, for you have all books in your possession, I would say two things :—

1. The Church, as represented authoritatively by Pope Innocent, is clear of all challenge in this matter. It is St. Alphonsus who is at stake.

Though *nihil censurâ dignum* cannot contradict this formal declaration of Innocent XI.

Though it is right to ask how they are to be reconciled.

2. You say quite truly "St. Alphonsus does not say that you may lie, but he says that is truth which is a lie."

Therefore St. Alphonsus

(1) Condemns all falsehood.

(2) Allows certain expressions *because in his judgment they are true.*

You and I are at liberty to think them, or rather to prove them if we can, to be untrue; but we are not at liberty to say that he allows the use of what he believes to be untrue.

This seems to me at once to alter the whole case. And to clear him of everything except, if it be so, an error of judgment.

But let us see whether this is an error.

Before we examine his teaching let us see how others treat the same subject.

I do not know a single writer who has sincerely met the difficulties of this question who has not laid down the same principles as St. Alphonsus, and many have gone beyond him.

And first take Jeremy Taylor. Read from p. 350 to p. 388 of vol. xiii., Heber's edition; or, if you have the folio, it is *Ductor Dub.*, book iii. chap. ii. rule v.

The petulance and irritability he shows against the Catholic Church makes his testimony all the more valuable.

I can defend St. Alphonsus, but I cannot defend all J. Taylor.

Next take Grotius, *De Jure Belli*, etc., lib. iii. chap. i. ss. x. xi. to xvi. Puffendorf, *Droit der Gens.*, lib. iv. chap. i. sec. xiii.

Barbeyrac holds the same; and, I speak from memory, also Baxter. In fact, I know no one except those who shirk the question who do not lay down all the principles contained in St. Alphonsus. They seem to me to be clear as day: as follows:—

1. That to speak falsely is a *malum intrinseci*, and always a sin against God. Nothing can justify it. Innocent III. declares that—*etiam pro vita defendenda nunquam licet mentiri.*

2. That when interrogated lawfully by those who have the right to interrogate, we are bound to disclose all our knowledge in the matter of the interrogation.

3. That when interrogated by those who have no right, or in an unlawful way, we are not bound, but may set aside the questions by any lawful means.

4. That to lie is not a lawful means—as above, No. 1.

5. That to use *restrictio pure mentalis, i.e.* when the words *heard* are false, is falsehood—condemned by Innocent XI.

6. That to use *words* which are *true* but ambiguous, is lawful; this is *restrictio non pure mentalis*, because the words are true without any mental supplement.

All St. Alphonsus' cases come under this head.

The only question is whether the instances are admissible, for the principles are not to be denied.

Look at St. Thomas, 2, 2$^{da.}$ cx., and Billuart upon it.

Also at Viva, *Propositiones Damnatæ* on Innocent XI.'s condemnation of mental restriction.

Gousset, in his theology, has given good instances in illustration.

I am writing in haste to save this post, but I will write

again, and should like to know any point in this of which you would raise a question.

Most earnestly do I pray that you may be delivered from the whole system of insincerity by which you are surrounded. The doctrinal formularies and subscriptions of the Church of England are, to me, harder than St. Alphonsus.

Do you mean that the ground of your faith is *probability?* What, then, is the office of the Holy Spirit? You know that it is a condemned proposition to say that "the supernatural assent of faith can consist with only a probable knowledge of revealed Truth." See Viva, *Prop.* xxi. Innocent XI. Look at my old nonsense on the Analogy of Nature, and your own better sense in the sermon before the University of Oxford at the end of your Erastianism. This is not consistent with the presence and office of the Holy Spirit, the Guide and Light of the Church. I will write again. Meanwhile, dearest Robert, pray more than ever, for all your spiritual enemies are nearer than ever as you draw near to Truth.—Ever yours very unworthily but as affectionately,

H. E. M.

ROME, *Holy Thursday*, 1854.

MY DEAREST ROBERT—Your letter is just come, and I write a few words to say that Monday next I trust to set out homewards and to find myself soon in England, and, I believe, to stay.

How much I think and pray for you I need not say. I never say Mass without a special mention of you, and I feel as if I were going over again this time three years in you.

How I long for the day when you will come and live with me—the sort of life I lead now—having all the gifts and blessings of the Altar, with real theology, not the Thirty-nine Articles. I remember how I used to walk about my study at Lavington, and look at my books, and say This is the intellect of the Communion of Saints—the *Sanctum Sanctorum*—and I am not with them. What would they say to me?

After I wrote to you I was unwell for a time, and went out of Rome. I then forgot my intention to write again, but now will gladly go over the books when we meet.

When I said St. Alphonsus only is at stake, I mean:

The Church is clear through Innocent III. and Innocent XI.

The most could be that the congregation which examined St. Alphonsus' works failed of their due diligence, and that St. Alphonsus is open to censure.

But they were sixteen years upon his works.

And having read every word of St. Alphonsus, I am convinced that they said right *nihil censurâ dignum.*

The question is, who knows St. Alphonsus' meaning? *I know* that he is misrepresented, and that the propositions I gave are his, and common to all theologians.

But enough of this.

After three years I do not speak, as you admitted, like a Mormonist or Swedenborgian when I say, One God, one Spirit of Truth, one Church, one Theology, one Living Judge. *Authoritative* only because *divinely guided.*

Never for one moment in these three years has my reason or will wavered in this faith founded on profuse conviction of the reason, with the fullest counter-proof from experience. Anglicanism is to me human, fragmentary, and a dishonour to our Lord and to the redeemed intelligence. As soon as I arrive, please God, I will write.—Ever yours, dearest Robert, most affectionately, H. E. M.

11 Half Moon Street, 7*th May* 1854.

My dearest Robert—So far as I know I am come home for good. And my purpose is to continue in London the life I was living in Rome, that is, to live in community with three or four, having a library, chapel, and refectory in common. I find this both intellectually and spiritually a great help. And I shall set apart a room for you. My best wish for you is what has been given to myself—to be soon in the daily happiness of offering the Holy Sacrifice. But to be without responsibility for souls, and to have a reason for beginning theology as a science from the first principles, and, if possible, in Rome. I cannot tell you what is the thankfulness I feel to our Divine Lord and his Vicar upon earth for having taken me under the care of the Holy See.

You know the Chapter in the Office for a Confessor *non Pontifex* in the Breviary. It is coming true of you. You have traded well with your talents.

"Justum deduxit Dominus per *vias rectas.*"—The Truth of doctrine.

"Et ostendit illi regnum Dei."—The True Kingdom.

"Et dedit illi Scientiam Sanctorum."—The Faith of His Saints.

"Et honestavit illum in laboribus."—The blessing on your work.

"Et *complevit* labores illius."—This perfect fulfilling and filling up of reason and heart and soul by the science of theology, the Presence on the Altar, and a true Priesthood.

May He bestow it upon you speedily, dearest Friend, and give you heart to suffer gladly for His Name's sake—to choose a sharp path rather than a smooth if both lie before you.

I know what you are feeling for I felt it once. Would to God I could make you feel what I feel now. It is like the rest and certainty after a kind of death to self and the world, and to error.—Ever yours very affectionately, H. E. M.

11 HALF MOON STREET, 19*th May* 1854.

MY DEAR ROBERT—Many thanks for the enclosed, which amuses me much and does not vex me at all.

Now you know me well and for long years. You know how far I am superstitious or a miracle-monger, and therefore you will give to my testimony such weight as you see fit.

I have lived now in Rome the best part of three years, inside the system of which the writer has seen the outside, and I declare on my own knowledge :—

1. That in miracles, legends, and all the things in his satirical catalogue, not one presents to my mind, or to the mind of the poorest Catholic, the sense in which he understands them. In his sense they are as superstitious as you will, in ours they are, as you well know, in a region perfectly distinct from faith.

2. That the devotion of the people in Rome is deep and fervent from rich to poor. The French infidelity of fifty years ago still infects individuals among the classes who in England believe little enough—physicians and lawyers—but the educated classes are firm believers. I wish you knew all I know of English unbelief, since I have seen Anglicanism on both sides.

3. That the educated Romans (Italians generally, French still more) deride the English Church as the lowest form of worldly and inconsistent Protestantism.

4. That there are certain seeds of future trials to the Church from the political state of Rome. But not such as he fancies. His account is like the Frenchman who published his account of the English Parliament in 1825, and said "that Mr. Pitt was the head of the Methodists in the House of Commons, and that Mr. Wilberforce had lost all his eloquence."

5. If you will read any history of the Holy See you will see how absurd it is to take Rome as the representative or creation of the Church. It has been the untamed, half-tamed, untameable world against which the Holy See has been in continual conflict. It is its contrast and antagonist, not itself. Anglicanism is essentially Erastian, and mistakes nations for churches.

6. Now for myself. Ill I was for six weeks—miserable, God knows, never for one hour since He brought me "out of darkness into His marvellous light."

This you know and have watched.

As to unpopular. I have been praying that I might not be spoilt by the kindness which came to me on every side.

I tell you privately that I had free access at any moment to the Pope, who treated me as a father treats a son, with an affection and playfulness of kindness, as well as with a confidence greater than I ever had from an Anglican bishop. And Cardinal Antonelli, I know well, had the same access to, saw often, always agreed with, and whensoever we had to speak on matters which I had to do with, he was with me.

The whole is a silly gossip.

Almost as bad as your talking of your being "required to carry out the system of St. Alphonso." You are an old Yorkshireman, and know that you, as I, are required to carry out the system of no man.

Farewell, dearest R. I will talk about Roman politics when we meet. It is most interesting, but it has nothing to do with the Faith.—Ever yours affectionately, H. E. M.

78 South Audley Street, 21*st June* 1854.

My dearest Robert—Henry is here, and I write a word hoping to bring you up to London. Come if you can.

I saw the report of your Visitation. And put myself back into old days, and realised what you had to deal with.

You were in my mind specially yesterday. We had our Diocesan Synod, which was worthy of its name. The first act after the Mass of the Holy Spirit and the solemn opening is for every priest on his knees before the bishop to make the profession of Faith and kiss the Gospels. I thought of your Hull clergy. Dearest R., you are worthy of a Church which has a mind and will, and is Divine.—Ever yours very affectionately, H. E. M.

78 South Audley Street, 4*th July* 1854.

My dear Robert—You will have received a volume of Billuart which I sent, that you may read what he says about Truth, etc.

Your volume is not come. I suppose it is on authority. Does not authority really mean *evidence* or the *reason* why we believe certain truths? Not *sic volo sic jubes*, etc.

I will gladly read the article in the *Christian Remembrancer* if you will first with me read St. Alphonsus' text.

I have read every word of St. Alphonsus' *Moral Theology*—both the lesser and the greater—and the treatise on equivocation and oaths again and again.

I know that it is misunderstood and misrepresented; that it needs only to be read with sincere attention. But, like everything which is not superficial, if taken up as Merrick has done, it is simply unintelligible. He sought for scandals, and he has made them for himself. I say this because I have abundant proof that he does not understand the elementary principles of moral theology.

When we have read the text together I will gladly, if need be, read the article.

But after all, dearest Robert, what does all this mean? You believe:—

1. That the Holy Spirit teaches in the world at this hour: and

2. That the one undivided Church of the *orbis Terrarum* is His organ.

I am unable to form to myself the view under which you find a difficulty as to St. Alphonsus, in submitting to a Divine Teacher.

You know that the Church claims no infallibility in saying of human writings *nihil censurâ dignum.*

May not those who revised St. Alphonsus understand him rightly and you otherwise?

It is a fact that St. Alphonsus allows certain equivocations, even firmed with an oath.

But he considers them to be *truths* and *therefore* lawful.

. . . . Ever yours affectionately, H. E. M.

ST. FRANCIS XAVIER'S, LIVERPOOL,
2nd September 1854.

MY DEAREST ROBERT—I have this moment opened your letter. My first act was to say a *Gloria.* I know what it must cost you; for I know what it cost me. No one but God alone knows how much. Only one sorrow in life ever approached it. But the consolation is sevenfold, and has grown, deepened, and multiplied year by year. I know now what it means to be "refreshed with a multitude of peace." God will even more abundantly refresh you, dearest friend, and give you a large measure for all you have done and suffered for His Truth. I can bear witness with what singleness of eye, if with many

misgivings and much self-mistrust, you have followed your light, and taught His Truth to those who will not endure His Divine Revelation.

On Tuesday, please God, I will come with great joy. I need quiet, for I have been overdone of late, and I want access to books.

I shall say my Mass to-morrow for you.

You have been and will be a help in great danger to our dear brother. I love him, and am often very heavy for him.—Ever yours very affectionately, H. E. MANNING.

BURTON AGNES, 11*th September* 1854.

MY DEAREST ROBERT—I find that to have come here to-morrow would have thrown me back in my journey northward. So I have risked to-day and missed you.

However, to indemnify myself. Will you let me know something of you, directing to Raigmore, Inverness, where I should be glad to have my letters? I hope to stay there about ten days or a fortnight, and if I knew when your packing is over I would come and meet you anywhere you will name in the line, and go to Birmingham when I go to see Ella.

I find that there is no use in attempting to evade questions respecting you. People know or have settled everything. They suppose you to have made your last step.

God be with you, dearest friend. It is but one more act of Faith and you will then have the strength which out of the One Fold cannot be.

I have marked in your *Paradisus* an act of submission which I used to find a help and comfort to me. I long for the day when you may let your weary reason lie down *juxta aquam refectionis*, and live by the intention and the trust of the heart.

Pray for me, as I do for you.—Ever yours very affectionately,

H. E. M.

Out of consideration for his friends, especially for his brother the Bishop of Oxford, Robert Wilberforce went to Paris to be received into the Church. For more than a year he hesitated before he could make up his mind to become a priest. The following letters were written to him whilst he was studying for the priesthood at the Accademia Ecclesiastica.

78 South Audley Street, 1*st April* 1856.

My dearest Robert—Your letter has given me a relief and a joy which I cannot express, for I have been feeling for some time that I could not share your thoughts. You know that my earnest desire is to see you in the Priesthood, consecrating the remainder of your life wholly to our Lord, to His Truth, and at His Altar. I have felt and still feel that if you do not, your life will be a broken, lowered, and mutilated life. I have never been able to believe that even your own state of grace will be as it ought. Something in my mind so evidently and peremptorily points to the Priesthood as the only completion and ending of your life, that I have been in great anxiety about you. And I know that others have too.

And yet it has not been this that has chiefly weighed on me.

I have felt a multitude of things all of which melt away before your letter.

I have felt that you were in danger of not bearing the shame and sharpness of our Lord. God knows what it has cost me to be a priest, and to do the work of a priest, and to bear the name of a priest, here in the midst of kindred and old friends, and the world in which I lived before. No one I believe had more sensitive shrinking from this peculiar stage of trials.[1] I have thought that you seemed to think that I entered upon this with more willingness or less suffering than you. It was only that I believed that my salvation probably depends upon pressing onward in correspondence with every motion of grace that could have brought me to it.

I have thought that you were yielding just where I remember that I was tempted to give way.

Again I felt that you seemed to deal reservedly and mistrustfully with the Church of God; not I mean in its infallibility and its literal dogma, but in its life of love, heart, and affectionate union with its spirit, instincts, usages, and family traditions.

I may have been all wrong, but this was my feeling. And what you say of your Retreat and the love of the Blessed Mother of our Divine Lord, gives me a feeling that we are all one even in this.

Now, dearest Robert, if you have ever trusted me, do trust me now.

---

[1] Such a confession of feeling ashamed, as it were, at appearing as a priest in the midst of his kindred and old friends and the world in which he had lived as a dignitary of the English Church, is another curious example of how sensitive Manning was to external circumstances and influences.

Your place is at the Altar and your vocation a life of Sacred Study, gathering and guiding on many souls (and very many there will be) whom our Lord draws to you, without you going out to seek them.

I am writing to save this post, or I should say much more. All I will add is that this is your place of work—here where God has given you the confidence and affection of many, and the weight of many years of public integrity, and the respect of numbers unknown.

One thing I would ask, do not decide anything without giving me time to say more to you.

It would be hard to say how much I have loved and trusted your love and prudence and goodness in everything.—Believe me always, my dear Robert, yours affectionately,

H. E. MANNING.

On reading this over I am afraid that I have said more than I ought, and seem to take on myself what I have no right to do, except from old and fast friendship.

78 SOUTH AUDLEY STREET, 16*th April* 1856.

MY DEAREST ROBERT—Your letter has made me far too happy to leave me a moment to doubt that I did not enter into all your feelings, any one of which I perversely believe I had as strongly as yourself, even to the bib-and-tucker, pap and high stool [1] on which I feel to be sitting to this day. But you shall henceforth have it all your own way, for I am far too glad to care or believe what you say.

I am delighted at the thought of your being in the Accademia, into which I went reluctantly, but left it with a regret which makes me long for it now.

Sufficient unto the day is the work before us, and therefore I say nothing of plans, but I seem to see your work as clear as day, and I hope you will not commit yourself to anyone by any promises. It seems to me that the antecedents of fifty years are like the digging and manuring of a field, and that on that field you have to reap and not to wander.

I am rejoiced, too, for your boys, believing that you are doing that which, above everything, will win their souls, and for your own peace. God knows what is the joy of a priest's day, beginning at the altar, and every hour full of the life

---

[1] It is easy to understand how repugnant "the bib-and-tucker, pap and high stool" state of pupillage at the Accademia Ecclesiastica was to the nature of the venerable and dignified ex-Archdeacon of Chichester.

to come. All its crosses, and some are sharp, do not take this away.

Let me hear of you, and pray for me especially at S. Carlo.—Believe me always yours affectionately in the love of our Good Master, H. E. M.

In this happy manner closed the prolonged and intimate correspondence which had passed between Manning and Robert Wilberforce, beginning when both were Anglicans, and ending when both had become Catholics. Manning had been a priest for several years: Robert Wilberforce was in minor Orders, dying in Rome a few weeks before he was to have been ordained Priest. Manning's letters revealed his character in the highest and noblest light. They were simple, earnest, genuine in their revelation of the terrible trials he underwent—of the wrestlings with self, with flesh and blood—before he finally recognised the Divine Will and submitted to the Catholic Church.

CHAPTER III

IN THE SHALLOWS

1854–1858

In the year 1851, when the Archdeacon of Chichester resigned for conscience' sake office and benefice, he was in the zenith of his power and influence. He was spoken well of by bishops; he kept up an intimate correspondence with Henry Phillpotts, the bold and outspoken Bishop of Exeter: he was consulted by Dr. Blomfield, the cautious and compromising Bishop of London. The Archbishop of York, the lowest of Low Churchmen, spoke in praise of him or of his sermons; he had a bishop for a brother-in-law—no mean help. Manning, moreover, was on the most intimate of terms with two statesmen of eminence, one a Cabinet Minister, who, if not at that moment, three years later under Lord Aberdeen, had mitres at his disposal. Had Manning, like his brother-in-law, bent before the storm, or, in hope of escaping the twofold dangers, "The Gorham Judgment and the 'No Popery' agitation," fled in fear, or yielding to temptation, to Jerusalem; or had he parleyed with the enemy in the gate, the enemy of souls, Manning might in due course like Kerr Hamilton have won a mitre.[1] "What an escape for my poor soul!" as Cardinal Manning, recognising the danger, more than once repeated.

From a human standpoint—for I am not now speaking of the spiritual consolations and rewards which filled, as I have related, his soul to overflowing—Manning still stood

[1] Kerr Hamilton was made Bishop of Salisbury in 1854, under the administration of Lord Aberdeen. See Vol. I. p. 531.

on the heights. He was made much of, and rightly, by Cardinal Wiseman: "had gained the Vicar of Christ as a guide and spiritual Father"; was held in high esteem and honour by great people at the centre of the Catholic world. His heart was naturally elated. As a popular preacher in Rome to multitudes of his non-Catholic fellow-countrymen, and as bearing witness in the Catholic pulpits of London before the face of priests and people to the Faith of their forefathers, the celebrated convert received compensation for the loss he had suffered in leaving the Church of England. But as time went on, "conscious of a desire to be in such a position as he had held in time past," Manning began to feel or fear that it was the seventeen years of Lavington over again; and worse, in one sense, for in the diocese of Westminster he did not as yet possess such a foothold "as Lavington." He stood for a while, but happily only for a brief while, in the shallows.

On his commencing in 1854 the work of a priest in the diocese of Westminster, Cardinal Wiseman did all in his power to give full play to the zeal and great abilities which he recognised in Manning. Father Faber, in 1854, invited him to preach at the Oratory on the feast of St. Philip Neri;[1] and at the Second Provincial Synod of Westminster, in 1855, Manning again preached at Wiseman's bidding.

From the spring of the year 1852 down to 1856, Manning occupied a unique position. He was not attached to the Jesuits' Church at Farm Street; neither did he live with the community, nor was he a candidate for novitiate in the Society, but was received for a time by the Jesuit Fathers as a spiritual guest, saying mass every morning in the church, and having a confessional of his own. It was in one sense a position of special advantage, for it placed the newly-ordained convert at one of the greatest centres of Catholic life and activity in London. On his taking up permanent residence in London in 1854, Manning, after being a guest of Mr. Monsell (the late Lord Emly), a recent convert, for a short time in May, went to live with his aunt Mrs. Roberts at 78 South Audley Street. Mrs. Roberts and

[1] The title of the sermon was "The Certainty of Divine Faith."

her son about that time had become Catholics; she was the widow of Captain Roberts, R.N., and sister of the Rev. John Sargent of Lavington, and aunt to Manning's wife. Her son later on became an Oblate of St. Charles under Manning at Bayswater.

During the last two years of Manning's work at the Jesuits' Church in Farm Street his activities were unbounded. He was constantly invited to preach, Sunday after Sunday, or on special festivals. His presence was eagerly sought for by the religious communities, as well as by the secular clergy, and his sermons were listened to with attention and delight. Many non-Catholics, and especially clergymen, some of whom had known him as an Anglican, came to listen to the celebrated convert. Large numbers came to consult him at Farm Street, and how many even in these early days were converted by his precept and example who shall count? As time went on the numbers who were received by him into the Church grew in multitude year by year. His confessional at Farm Street was largely attended by Catholics born as well as by converts. Manning as director of souls led many of his spiritual children, especially of the pious sex, into higher ways of life in the world, or to seek a more perfect state in the cloister.

But in the midst of his zealous work in London, Manning did not forget Rome, where, during the winter months, he loved to preach, sure of finding year by year large congregations of his non-Catholic fellow-countrymen. Visiting Rome in the winter 1854, he preached in the church of St. Gregory, where Father Burder was consecrated abbot of St. Bernard's Cistercian Abbey, near Leicester.[1] Little did Manning foresee that years afterwards the case of Abbot Burder would form one of the difficulties he was called upon to deal with as Archbishop.

Conscious of his aptitude for administrative work, Manning lost no time in making himself useful to Cardinal

[1] The Monastery was founded by the munificence of Mr. de Lisle of Garenden Park. The site was on the top of the Cotswold Hills, an outlying portion of the estate; but the bleak and barren grounds were brought into cultivation by the indefatigable labours of the monks. The Church and Monastery were built by the celebrated Pugin.

Wiseman. The first official work to which his ready and experienced hand was set was in connection with Catholic Chaplains in the Crimea during the war. With Wiseman's sanction he entered into communication with the War Department; after several interviews with Lord Panmure, in which Manning suggested many points in regard to the management of the Catholic chaplains, which required to be carefully considered by the War Office, it was finally agreed that the Catholic chaplains should not be placed under the Protestant Chaplain-General.

In reporting the result of his communications with the War Department, Manning wrote the two following letters to Cardinal Wiseman:—

MANNING TO CARDINAL WISEMAN

78 SOUTH AUDLEY STREET, 16*th August* 1855.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—The plan suggested to Lord Panmure and approved by him is, that the Catholic chaplains in the Crimea should report themselves directly to the Commandant, and not through the Protestant Chaplain-General.

With this view I would ask your Eminence to write a few lines addressed to "the officiating Catholic chaplains at the Hospitals and in the camp," sanctioning this arrangement. It shall be transmitted with a private letter to whomsoever may be at Scutari, requesting him to open it, and to forward it to Mr. Woollett in the Crimea.

The points on which information would be desired would be:

1. The name of the chaplain.
2. Date of appointment.
3. Date of arrival at present station.
4. The division or station to which attached.
5. On what days service for the soldiers, and how many times on such days in the week.
6. What services for the sick and wounded.
7. Present residence.

If your Eminence will kindly send me such a note I will complete the matter with the War Department speedily, lest any new embarrassment should occur to render it less easy.—Believe me, my dear Lord Cardinal, your affectionate servant,

H. E. MANNING.

A few months later, after communication with Dr. Grant, Bishop of Southwark, Manning wrote to Cardinal

Wiseman on the subject of the "Nightingale Testimonial," suggesting with great skill and tact—which showed that the hand of the late Archdeacon of Chichester had not lost its cunning—the line of action most politic to be adopted under the circumstances.

78 South Audley Street, 13*th February* 1856.

My dear Lord Cardinal—The Bishop of Southwark gave me the enclosed letter yesterday, and wishes to know your Eminence's judgment about it, and his proposed answer.

The letter is from Mr. Hayward, the Protestant chaplain at Aldershot, to Monsignor Virtue.[1] And the object of it is to ask him to unite in the Collection to be made under general orders for the Nightingale Testimonial.

The promoters, and the public meetings held for the making of the Testimonial, are various and unsatisfactory enough, but it seems to me that reasons of a public and very extensive kind render it advisable not to separate ourselves from any very general action of the War Department or of the army, if conscience and principle will permit.

Your Eminence will see that the Protestant chaplain also objects to its being a testimonial to an *individual*. He includes the whole body of the Hospital nurses. And this seems to me a safe ground for us.

We are recognised as part of the army; our chaplains and sisters are public persons, their rights, character, and privileges acknowledged both by the civil and military authorities at home and abroad.

Monsignor Virtue has been in the most marked way, and by the express requisition of the Protestant chaplains and officers, placed upon committees and sub-committees for moral and religious matters. They have manifested perfect fairness to him and the Catholic soldiers.

On all these grounds it seems of great importance not to allow the narrow spirit of Miss Nightingale's personal friends to become the interpreter of our public and recognised position in the army.

Moreover, we do not know that she will accept any basis than that on which she is acting with our eight Bermondsey nuns.

It would therefore seem to me best to let the Collection be *passively* made, without any ecclesiastical recognition of it.

Might I ask for a word, as the question presses, for next Sunday?—My dear Cardinal, your affectionate servant,

H. E. Manning.

---

[1] Now the Right Rev. Dr. Virtue, Bishop of Portsmouth.

The following letter is on the same subject:—

78 South Audley Street, 27*th February* 1856.

My dear Lord Cardinal—I have seen Sir Benjamin Hawes, and his opinion strongly is, that I should write to Lord Panmure simply to say that the Rev. Thomas Unsworth will cease to act as Catholic chaplain to the army in the East on the 25th of March next, and to ask his passage home.

Sir B. Hawes wished for the assignment of no reason. And undertook that any letter we desired should be forwarded with one from Lord Panmure to give it effect. With this view it will be most advisable that Mr. Unsworth's recall should be equally without assignment of reasons. I took care to say that it in no way affected his moral character; and that they were reasons of a spiritual sort, having Mr. Gleeson's letter before me.

I would venture therefore to suggest that it might be best if your Eminence were simply to recall him, reserving the statement of reasons until he hears them from you personally. This will preclude a danger both with the other chaplains and with the military authorities.

If your Eminence would oblige me by sending such a letter I will see that it is properly forwarded.—Believe me, my dear Lord Cardinal, your affectionate servant, H. E. Manning.

In the autumn of this year, in recognition of his varied services, Cardinal Wiseman appointed Manning Diocesan Inspector of Schools.[1] Manning, who at this time kept up most active communication both by word of mouth and by letter with Cardinal Wiseman, wrote again, in a letter dated Pendell Court, Bletchingley, August 31, 1855, about army chaplains in the Crimea. He had spoken to several young priests willing to serve as chaplains; to one whose bishop had not given his consent, Manning had written both to the bishop and the priest. About the recall of one of the army chaplains and his treatment at home the following suggestions are made to Wiseman:—

[1] In a letter to Cardinal Wiseman, dated 78 South Audley Street, 2nd June 1856, Manning said:—"My dear Lord Cardinal—I saw Mr. Macmullen on Saturday, and in the matter of the Inspection all stands well. I would ask your Eminence kindly to allow my name to pass for the present. It will give him freer action, and he will be seen to possess full confidence alone. He and I are so closely united that we shall work in common whenever there is need. . . . Believe me always your affectionate servant,

"Henry E. Manning."

I have read Mr. Unsworth's letter with real regret. But return home may be the saving of him. About two years ago I was staying in the same house with him, and saw nothing but what was pleasing. I can hardly recognise the same man in these letters. Would not the best hope for him be to place him somewhere immediately under the eye of two or three friends? At a country mission, all alone, there would be I fear no check upon any habits he may have. . . .

In the next letter Cardinal Wiseman is informed by Manning of the arrangements he had made with Lord Panmure, subject to the Cardinal's approval:—

78 South Audley Street, 9*th October* 1855.

My dear Lord Cardinal—Lord Panmure has sent to me the two enclosed letters, from which your Eminence will see that the arrangement respecting the Chaplains' reports stands thus: They will forward their reports to the senior of their number, and he will transmit them to the War Department.

But in the enclosed letters Lord Panmure suggests the kind of information he desires to obtain.

Now, I do not think it well to write to the chaplains as he suggests, till I have learned from your Eminence how far the reports of the chaplain ought to contain the matter sketched out in Mr. Gleig's instructions to his own chaplains.

May I ask of your Eminence to return to me the enclosed, with such directions as I may follow? It is desirable to give all the information possible without violating or overstraining any principle or rule of the Catholic Church. Some of the points seem to me to be put by Mr. Gleig in a form in which we could not report them; but much of the substance it might be well to give.

It will be well to allow as little time as possible to elapse before completing this arrangement.—Believe me, my dear Lord Cardinal, your affectionate servant in Jesus Christ,

Henry E. Manning.

Manning's letters to Cardinal Wiseman were written, it will be observed, with great tact and delicacy. His plans and arrangements with the War Department were thrown out as suggestions for Wiseman's approval. Wiseman was by nature careless about such details and indifferent or even averse to entering into personal communication with the War Department or with any other department of the State. Such communications and official relations were Manning's

delight. He did such work well, and liked it, as he did in Anglican days. On the other hand, Cardinal Wiseman had a high sense of his own rights and authority; and Manning, in all his present and after relations with Wiseman, even when his health had broken down and incapacitated him from work, was most punctilious in showing due deference to the Cardinal-Archbishop.

The time had not as yet come for Manning to be taken into Wiseman's complete confidence and to be entrusted with the handling of the most delicate and difficult subjects connected with the management of the diocese. The subjoined letter of Cardinal Wiseman to Mgr. Talbot at the Vatican will show not only how pained and perplexed Wiseman was at the time, but the nature and extent of the difficulties he had to contend against. In these and other disputes of a like painful character, Manning, later on, was called upon as Wiseman's friend and defender to take a foremost part:—

LONDON, 16*th January* 1853.

MY DEAR TALBOT—Here is a sad business about to happen. The accompanying correspondence [1] will explain it, and I do not wish to do more at present than ask you to read it, and make known its contents to the Holy Father.

The very idea of a suffragan of the new Hierarchy, almost within a year, going off to Rome to carry thither a cause against his Metropolitan, and that that one should be Dr. Grant, *homo pacis miræ*, put at Southwark because he was my friend, is fraught with scandal. But I regret to say it, after the first few weeks that he was in England, he became estranged, kept aloof, and made those men his counsellors who had always favoured and headed the old party against me before he came, and finally chose for his chapter those very men who, through the disturbance of the "Papal Aggression," were suspected of being the confederates of Lord John Russell, alluded to in his speech, and authors of the letter signed "A Catholic Priest," in the *Times*.

I foresaw all along what would take place. There has been no cordiality, no sympathy; months pass without his calling on

[1] Correspondence between Cardinal Wiseman and Dr. Grant, Bishop of Southwark, on the division of church property and trust-funds consequent on the division of the two dioceses.

me, and every little complaint, every discontent, has gone to him. . . .

You are aware, too, when I was made Cardinal, His Holiness, so far from thinking my income too large for my present position, most generously and munificently added to it. Providence has assisted me in other ways, or I should have been in straits. . . .

But you must be tired with this unfortunate affair—Bishops quarrelling about *meum et tuum, frigida verba.* What I hope is that the scandal of a Bishop starting off for Rome on such an errand and dragging his Metropolitan after him (for if he goes, I suppose I must) may be prevented. Let him be desired to send his case in writing—let me see it, and I will reply in full, and let the Holy See decide between us. I trust the Holy Father will take this into consideration, and *into his own hands.* I fear Dr. Grant may have already written elsewhere. I may remark that many of our Trusts are most difficult to unravel, and are obliged to be kept most secret for fear of the mortmain laws and obligations for masses, so that I cannot even have new deeds or transfers made, as by registering them, necessary to make them legal, we might endanger the whole property.—Yours affectionately in Christ,

N. CARD. WISEMAN.

Manning's connection with the Jesuits at Farm Street came to a somewhat sudden and abrupt conclusion.

In his Journal, dated 1878-82, Cardinal Manning gave a brief account of his connection with the Jesuits at Farm Street and its termination. Speaking of his yearly visits to England from 1852 till he left the Accademia in Rome in 1854, he said: "In my visits to England I had said Mass and had a Confessional in Farm Street. So also in 1855-6, till the number of people who came to me, penitents and converts, made some inconvenience in the Church; and F. Waterworth told me that objection had been raised. Some one in stupid ill-will the other day said 'that I took this ill.' Far from it. F. Waterworth was my confessor and friend, and nothing could have been more friendly on both sides. I said at once I will go as soon as possible, very grateful for the long spiritual hospitality, in which I hope I did them no harm; for I left many people behind me. Then Laprimaudaye and I bought nine small houses in Palace Street, out of which came St. Peter's and St. Edward's Church."

It was, of course, impossible for Cardinal Wiseman to appoint Manning to the charge of any of the large Missions or Catholic parishes in London. He had not as yet sufficient experience to be the Head Priest of a large and populous mission, even had there been a vacancy. On the other hand, it did not seem to Cardinal Wiseman fit or proper, or in the nature of things, to place the late Archdeacon of Chichester in a subordinate position. Had he desired to become a Jesuit, the long novitiate—which would not have been relaxed in his favour—would have kept him for many years out of sight and out of public work; and this delay would not have suited Wiseman's views nor Manning's own wishes. The only acceptable alternatives left to Manning were either to open a new mission in London, or to found a Religious Community.

As time passed, since he now no longer desired to remain at Farm Street, he commissioned an architect to look out for a suitable site for a Catholic Mission. A site was found; but, as Manning's letter to Laprimaudaye shows, there were difficulties in the way:—

MANNING TO REV. C. H. LAPRIMAUDAYE

78 SOUTH AUDLEY STREET, 20*th February* 1856.

MY DEAR FRIEND—I have at last got the details of the houses I spoke of, and I find that *two* are not to be got separately.

The property consists of nine freehold houses, on a site of about 140 feet by 40.

Mr. Foxhall says that they will sell from £2500 to £3000, occupation at Lady Day. But they are all let, and they would yield safely £125 a year to the landlord. I have written instantly, because this changes the case, I fear, beyond our power. But if it were possible to secure the site, it would be about the best which could be found for a house, and a Catholic Church close upon Buckingham Gate—a little withdrawn from sight. I do not know whether your promise to Stroud may not make it impossible for you to change any investments of your money. Let me have a line.—Believe me, ever yours very affectionately,

H. E. M.

In spite of his active ecclesiastical work and the labours

of founding a new Mission, Manning was not unmindful of the near and dear relatives whom he had left behind him on the other side of the bridge. The following letter to his eldest sister, Mrs. John Anderdon, shows how deeply he felt the alienation between brother and sister consequent on his becoming a Catholic:—

78 South Audley Street, 23*rd March* 1855.

My dear Maria—I found your kind note late last night, and write at once to thank you for it.

Until I read it I never knew that you waited for any intimation from me that to see you would be agreeable to me.

I have believed that the separation of the last four years was a voluntary act on the part of yourself and John, arising from some view of duty, and maintained from an idea of consistency.

Many and not light reasons led me to this belief, in which I was confirmed by John's last letter, in which he expressed his hope that I should not misunderstand his "absenting himself from me."

If indeed we have been misunderstanding each other, let us lose no time in making the most sincere and open explanation.

Nothing but this belief would have restrained me from communicating with you, for I have thought that the last four years have been not only sad, but displeasing to our Heavenly Father.

Brother and sister owe to each other not only silent affections and distant good-will, but the kindly expression and interchange of love. And love as well as "faith without works is dead." I do not believe that brother and sister can be as we have been for four years without a spot in the heart with which it would not be safe to die.

Let me say at once that I am not speaking of any communications with your home or your children, but with yourselves. Without ever entering your home again, there has been no just cause why you and I should not have met. I speak only of our personal relation, which is a matter of duty towards each other and towards God.—Your affectionate brother, H. E. M.

CHAPTER IV

FOUNDING OF THE OBLATES OF ST. CHARLES AT BAYSWATER

1857

A MISSION like that of St. Peter and St. Edward, Westminster, with only two priests under him, in an out-of-the-way corner, would neither have satisfied Wiseman's views or needs in the diocese, nor have given scope and play to Manning's activities, nor have afforded an opening or opportunity for the exercise of his administrative ability. To have remained at Westminster would likewise have placed him at a disadvantage in regard to his mission of converting "the Gentiles," as contrasted with the brilliant position which he had occupied for four years at the church of the Jesuits in Farm Street. Cardinal Wiseman, some years before, had contemplated the introduction from Italy of a community of priests for missionary work in England. He now suggested this idea to Manning and desired him to introduce the congregation of the Oblates of St. Charles. In an autobiographical Note, dated 1879, Manning said: "I was slow about it, not from unwillingness or disobedience, but from doubt of myself."

In 1856 Manning drew up the first outline of the Rule from St. Charles — the Milanese Rule. Cardinal Wiseman accepted it. And in November, Manning, accompanied by his nephew, Father William Manning, went to Milan to San Sepolcro, the community of the Oblates of St. Charles, and to Rho, and collected all the information within his reach on the spot concerning the character, customs, and living traditions of the Oblates. F. William

Manning, young as he was, did good service in this preliminary work and in all the first beginnings of the Congregation.

Manning and his nephew were received very kindly by the Archbishop of Milan, who gave them some relics of St. Charles.

In the interesting letter subjoined, Manning reports the progress of his work.

MANNING TO CARDINAL WISEMAN

GENOA, 15*th December* 1856.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—I arrived here last night from Milan, and hope to embark this evening. Your Eminence may wish to know what I have done at Milan, and I therefore write a few lines.

I find that the Oblates of St. Charles have never been suppressed. The French dispersed them in 1798 and 1810, but the direct line was preserved by six Fathers, who were reunited in 1853 by the present Archbishop, in full form.

They have never even lost the Church of San Sepolcro, which St. Charles gave them, for one of the six Fathers is now the Provost of the congregation, occupying the house and church as at first.

They are now about sixty in number, and their works are :—

1. The parish at San Sepolcro.

2. The direction of the four Seminaries, greater and less, of the Archdiocese.

3. A house of Missions and Spiritual Exercises at Rho, twelve miles from Milan.

The Vicar-General, and pro-Vicar-General, and the Penitentiary of the Cathedral are Oblates and Canons.

The Rector of S. Lorenzo, the parish church of Milan, and the Prefect of the Ambrosian Library are also Oblates. They are in no way separated from the clergy of the diocese, but are mixed in with all the chief mission work.

The Archbishop received us very kindly, and has given two relics of the blood of St. Charles. There was no portion of the body to be obtained. He also gave for the congregation a cushion which was used for the missal on St. Charles's altar.

He desired many expressions of thanks to be conveyed to your Eminence for *Fabiola*, which he has read with very great delight, and he has entrusted to me a letter which I will forward by the first hand. . . .

Let me commend myself and my errand to your prayers.—Believe me always your affectionate servant in Jesus Christ,

H. E. MANNING.

On reaching Rome, Manning submitted the Rule which he had drawn up for the Oblates of St. Charles in England to Propaganda. The following account is given in an autobiographical Note, 1879:—"As soon as I laid the Rule before Cardinal Barnabò, he said '*Questi sono le mie idee*'; and from that moment he did all in his power to promote it. He laid it before the Holy Father. In my next audience, the Pope said, '*Senza vote*,' which I took for a command. The Preface, and 'white book,' as we call it, were drawn up by Passaglia, who took great interest in it. The Holy Father then gave it a Benediction, and as it was no new Rule, a *Laudamus*."

In the following letters Manning reports the progress he is making at Propaganda with the work of founding the Oblates of St. Charles, and speaks of vexatious opposition and criticisms.

MANNING TO CARDINAL WISEMAN

ROME, *7th January* 1857.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—The day after your Eminence's letter came, Archbishop Errington went to Propaganda. I therefore put it into his hands; and I do not doubt that he has already reported what steps he has taken.

In a day or two I hope to see Cardinal Barnabò again, and I will take care to put him in possession of the truth of these matters, which are little enough, but mischievous and vexatious. I am very sorry that you should be troubled with them, but they are the ecclesiastical gnats which I find to infest chiefly high places.

I am rejoiced to hear of the hope of a Sagramentato in London.

In passing through Paris I went to the Convent of the Assumption, and had a long conversation with the Mother Superior. I am to see her again as I return, and I hope all is in train for a Convent in London.

I have not as yet heard what is the Holy Father's mind about this affair of St. Charles; and I am waiting until the papers which I am getting into shape are finished. Cardinal

Barnabò entered very fully and kindly into the subject, and promised to give all the help and support it might need. When the papers are ready I shall see him again, probably next Sunday.

Meanwhile I am endeavouring, and I hope with success, to find a Roman and a German well formed in Theology.

I hope your Eminence is contemplating a little Seminary for the lay boys, and a great Seminary for the priesthood only. It seems to me that this may well grow out of the present movement, and even solve some difficulties.

Of all the urgent needs of the diocese nothing seems to me more urgent than this whole subject.

I hope you are well in health and in good spirits.—Believe me, my dear Lord Cardinal, your affectionate servant,

H. E. MANNING.

ROME, 21*st January* 1857.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—I must write a few lines on St. Agnes's Day to keep up the tradition of old times, and also to report another step in our affairs.

Yesterday the Holy Father gave me an audience, and after I had explained the subject generally, gave it his benediction, and desired me to return to Propaganda, saying that he would speak of it to Cardinal Barnabò on Sunday next.

I have an appointment at Propaganda for to-day at one o'clock, to report this to the Cardinal.

I have not yet seen the *Dublin Review*, but I have read the article in the *Catholic Standard*. . . .

I suppose it is the office of the Catholic Church to "gather of all kinds," and to assimilate all diversities, and to suffer much internal trouble in doing so. Certainly we are in a continual fever of criticisms and personal oppositions. And being a society numerically small in England, it is like a small town in which tongues are, if not more busy, yet always more audible and troublesome than in a great city. It has seemed to me that we have a great plague of tongues upon us, and it sometimes gives me much disquiet lest I should in any way or degree (of which I am not conscious, for I detest it) have done the same. And if there be one subject which more than another seems to me odious and immoral it is the comparison of gifts, or cultivation or services rendered to the Church of God by the two classes of Catholics who ought to be indistinguishable in the unity of the faith. And for us it seems to me that we ought to remember the words, "Thou camest in as a stranger, was it to be a judge?" I shall receive it as a great kindness if you will

tell me in what way I have or may hereafter offend in this kind. . . .

Much as I am enjoying Rome, I am counting the weeks to be at home again. — Believe me, my dear Lord Cardinal, your affectionate servant in J. C., HENRY E. MANNING.

From his letters to Cardinal Wiseman and Mgr. Talbot now, and at a later date, it is obvious that Manning was very sensitive to opposition and to criticisms. As in his Anglican days he used to confess that his sensitiveness added tenfold to his sufferings, so now in his work of founding the Oblates every opposition to his plans or criticisms of his mode of action seemed to fill him with anxiety or even vexation.

Fortified by the countenance of Cardinal Barnabò, and by the blessing of the Pope, Manning in the ways of wisdom and holiness laid the first foundations of the Oblates of St. Charles in England. It was the day of great hopes, of high promise, and of a good beginning. But no great work can be achieved without suffering. Suffering is the hall-mark of true worth. Manning had to suffer in this great work of spiritual and temporal progress, sorrow, disappointment, opposition. The battle had yet to be fought in patience of heart. The cross came before the crown.

The first sorrow which befell Manning was the death of Robert Wilberforce in Rome — the first disappointment — for they had hoped and intended as they had passed in intimate union of heart and thought their troubled lives together in the Anglican Church, so in the Catholic Church they might have lived and worked together to the end as Oblates of St. Charles. It was on the eve of the foundation of the community that Robert Wilberforce died.

About a year and a half after his reception into the Church he went to study for the priesthood as Manning had done four or five years before, at the Accademia Ecclesiastica.[1] Although he had always suffered from ill health in Rome, he remained there without change or interruption until January

[1] Whilst Robert Wilberforce was studying for the priesthood in his first year at Rome Manning put the following characteristic postscript to one of his letters :—"I cannot *Squire* you, whether Crow or not."

1857, when, acting on Manning's advice, he went for change of air to Albano. He rallied for a few days, but the gastric fever, from which he had suffered for several weeks, had taken too strong a hold of him, and he died on the 4th of February.

In the following letter to Cardinal Wiseman, Manning in restrained terms—he felt too deeply to speak out all his heart—gave an account of his friend's death :—

ROME, 6*th February* 1857.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—Sad tidings travel so fast that I fear you will have heard all I have to tell you from Albano. Nevertheless, I could not leave you without a letter from myself on a matter in which I know your Eminence will have so much kind sympathy.

On Tuesday evening last, just at Ave Maria, Mr. Wilberforce went to his rest, and I believe I may say, without doubt, to his reward, for he has left but one universal impression by the gentleness and humility of his life.

His illness was a gastric fever, which took firm hold from the first, five weeks ago, but only came out by degrees. In Rome he had always suffered diarrhœa, and this had so much reduced him that he was most anxious to go elsewhere. For some days after his arrival at Albano he was better; but the fever began to show itself with more decisive characters. Still we hoped he was going well, till last Saturday, when a rapid change came on. He received all the last sacraments, and his end was as peaceful and painless as could be.

I know what your Eminence's thoughts had been for him. And I had looked to him as the friend and helper of the rest of my life, as he had been through all the years of trial which hitherto had united us so closely. I had been counting up what gifts and means he had of doing work for the Church in England. But our Lord has seen otherwise, and I now am sure that he will do more than ever, but not in our way.

His body is deposited in the church of the Minerva awaiting his son's arrival. If he has left no directions in his will to the contrary, I hope it may lie with *Martyres et Sanctos Dei*. . . .—Believe me, my dear Lord Cardinal, your affectionate servant,

HENRY E. MANNING.

Manning's hope was disappointed, for since Robert Wilberforce had left no direction in his will, the body was removed to England. Robert Wilberforce, who was a

deacon, had he lived a short time longer would have received priest's Orders.

The death of Robert Wilberfórce was a great loss, not to Manning or the Oblates only, but to the Church in England. Manning lost a loving friend and helper, but the Church lost a son, who by his great intellectual powers, studious habits, and personal influence, might have won many souls to God. Neither of his brothers, Bishop Wilberforce or Henry, approached him in profoundness of thought or in learning. In his Anglican days Manning held Robert Wilberforce's works on the "Incarnation" and the "Holy Eucharist" in the highest estimation, and certainly the work which he wrote as a Catholic, *Principles of Church Authority*, shows still profounder knowledge. And yet, singularly enough, after both Samuel and Henry Wilberforce's death, on being asked by his old friend Mr. Allies the question, "Which of the three Wilberforces do you think, had the greatest intellect?" Cardinal Manning, after deliberation, replied, to Mr. Allies's astonishment, "Henry."

MANNING TO CARDINAL WISEMAN

ROME, 15*th February* 1857.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—I will now give your Eminence an account of what has passed in respect to the congregation of St. Charles. When I last wrote I had really no heart to write of any but one subject.

On the 21st of January I had an audience, and explained to the Pope the object and outline of the work. He gave at once his benediction, and said that he would speak with Cardinal Barnabò further upon it.

I therefore put into Cardinal Barnabò's hands the original address to your Eminence, with a short outline of the congregation, its objects and form, and a supplica to the Holy Father for his benediction in a permanent form. This I received yesterday in a letter from Propaganda. Thus far matters are complete, and I feel very thankful for the great kindness and encouragement with which it has been received.

Cardinal Barnabò told me he had written to your Eminence in the same sense. . . .

Would your Eminence kindly apply or direct me to apply

for the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament for the nuns at Bayswater and at Westminster, for I hope to have them in both places.

I am beginning to wish to be at home, and shall not linger after I have got all matters finally settled.

Since I wrote I have read the article in the *Dublin Review* with very great assent. It is only too kind. In places I recognised old talks with your Eminence. I have no fears of all these squalls and flaws in the *Rambler*. I am only anxious that your Eminence should handle them after the manner of the Holy Office. . . .—My dear Lord Cardinal, your affectionate servant,

H. E. MANNING.

MANNING TO CARDINAL WISEMAN

ROME, 17*th March* 1857.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—My last letter was written to save a post, and I could not add more; but I wish to give an outline of what I have endeavoured to do.

In the rule for the Oblates I have endeavoured to provide for the following points:—

1. That they should be closely united to the bishop, and be as it were his familia.

2. That they should have just so much internal constitution as to raise and preserve their spirit and theological standard, and consolidate both.

3. That they should be completely mixed among the clergy of the diocese.

This last point seems to me of the greatest importance; and I have avoided everything which can distinguish them from the rest of the priests, or in any way generate a different spirit, or put on a grave religious character. For this end the profession of a priest has always seemed to me essential as a base of operations, in which all the common sympathies of the parochial clergy may find a centre. The rules also are so drawn that, dropping only so much as gives continuity and form to the congregation, the *horarium* and mode of life might be adopted by any secular priest, or in any missionary rectory.

I have not asked for any Indulgences, such as the Oblates at Milan enjoy, because I wish that your Eminence should hereafter do so if it be your will. And I would suggest that the same indulgences, or some of them, might be offered to any priest or missionary rector who would adopt this way of life and the *horarium*.

The second point has been very carefully examined by Monsignor Cardoni ; it contains just so much as will enable the Congregation to make solid studies and to preserve its spirit. And this is the more necessary, for if it is in any way to serve the secular clergy, it must keep its observance above the common level. *Si sal evanuerit in quo salietur ?*

And for the third, my hope is that it will grow up in this way, first by doing its own parish work thoroughly: next by forming men who may be of use in theology and other ecclesiastical knowledge ; and thus by placing at the bishop's use men who will be *accincti* for anything they are able to do.

Having said all this I will only add that I know that it is nothing but paper and imagination, without the grace which never is withheld from a good work, and the fidelity and devotion which are too often wanting to the best undertaking. And the last is the only element in the matter about which I feel any misgiving or anxiety. But I trust that with a humble and slow beginning it may grow surely and spread. I am the more encouraged in this hope by the fact that those who have examined the matter here consider it to be prudent and practical.

I am prepared to expect trials, without which I believe nothing worth doing can be done ; but I have no personal wish or desire in the matter, and if it is not to be or to succeed, I shall be content if I have done my best.—Believe me, my dear Lord Cardinal, your affectionate servant,

HENRY E. MANNING.

P.S.—Will not some priest be needed for Westminster when Mr. Roberts goes to Bayswater ?

ROME, 14*th April* 1857.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—Monsignor Talbot and Dr. Whitty have not advised my taking any step or waiting for your Eminence to write, and the subject seems therefore to be decided.[1]

I saw the Holy Father last night, and his words leave me nothing to do but to endeavour that neither the Holy See nor your Eminence shall have cause to regret, so far as I am able, what, though done by the Holy Father, must be owing in chief to your great kindness, and I trust not too great confidence in my will to do right. Since I first heard of it I have been going

[1] The subject alluded to was the Pope's appointment of Dr. Manning to the office of Provost of the Chapter of Westminster.

through a good deal, arising perhaps in part from sensitiveness and a dread of leaving the quiet and retirement which after many years of trial I have had in the last six. One thing gives me comfort, which is the hope that I may be of more use to you, and better able to relieve you of some, among your many, lesser employments.

But my purpose in writing was chiefly to convey to your Eminence two expressions intended by the Holy Father to be delivered to you by me.

The first was that your Eminence should not be distressed at the late trial and its results.[1] The Holy Father spoke most kindly, and said that he believed all those troubles were sent as graces of purification, and that they would not come if your work in England were less. He expressed himself most strongly on this point. And bid me say that he hoped your Eminence would not be discouraged or in the least afflict yourself about so manifest an injustice.

The other was in answer to a full explanation which I gave of your projected lectures on Rationalism. The Pope entered fully into it, and expressed his great satisfaction, and added, "say that I bless the work with all my heart."

I did not refer to this in my last letter as I had not then had the evidence.

And now I have only to add that at 6 o'clock A.M. to-morrow I trust to start for Assisi, and if possible to be at home the last days of this month or the first of the next.

I hope that you are better, and that you will go away for a rest and relaxation of mind. These conflicts with evil wills and evil hearts are very wounding and wearing. And I know that you suffer more sensibly than most.

Cardinal Barnabò last night was full of all this in the kindest sense.—Believe me, my dear Lord Cardinal, your affectionate servant, HENRY E. MANNING.

Neither the labours of explaining the object and aim of his work to Propaganda, or of answering objections or vexatious criticisms which already had reached Rome, nor the death of Robert Wilberforce, prevented Manning from preaching his now usual course of Advent sermons. Manning's sermons in Rome were indeed attracting more attention than ever. In the early spring, as Feb-

[1] The Abbé Roux, an insubordinate priest in the diocese, sued Cardinal Wiseman for damages for wrongful dismissal, and obtained a verdict. The Chapter expressed their warm sympathy with the Cardinal, and agreed with his view that an Appeal, though likely to be successful, would not be expedient.

ruary would be counted, Rome was filled with English visitors, and few of any eminence missed the opportunity of hearing the famous convert. Manning had a quick eye; recognised and remembered faces readily. He once told me that preaching in the church of San Carlo on the "Glories of Mary," he saw a lady grow very agitated, swaying her body to and fro, and shaking her head in violent opposition to what he was saying. "I fixed my eye upon her," said Cardinal Manning, "addressing all my words directly to her as if I were reasoning personally with her: presently she grew calmer, was evidently soothed, and listened with rapt attention to the end."

Such cases were not of infrequent occurrence. Manning often saw in London churches faces which he remembered having seen, without knowing their names, when he was preaching in Rome. Many of those who heard him preach for the first time in Rome came to him for instruction in London. One young lady, who wished to be received into the Church, Cardinal Manning remembered in particular on account of her mother's determined opposition to such a step. The Cardinal begged that the mother might come with her daughter and talk the matter over. He at once recognised in her, when she came, the lady who was so agitated at first during his sermon in the church of San Carlo long years before.

"She was a very good woman," the Cardinal said, "but very determined in her Protestantism. Yet, out of love for her daughter, very kindly consented to her becoming a Roman Catholic."

It was at this course of sermons preached at San Carlo on the Corso, in February 1857, that Manning on one occasion saw John Bright. "He was sitting," said the Cardinal, "in the middle of the church; and many years afterwards, meeting him in the Tea Room of the House of Commons, I asked him where we had last met; he replied: 'In the church of San Carlo in Rome, and I liked everything there very much except what you said.'"

About a year after Robert Wilberforce's death, Manning

lost another old and dear friend, and the Oblates of St. Charles another benefactor. The curate of his Anglican days, Laprimaudaye, had joined the Oblates of St. Charles at Bayswater, and whilst studying for the priesthood in the Collegio Pio at Rome, died of small-pox. His wife had died about a year after her conversion and Robert Wilberforce lost his wife about a year before he was received into the Church. Manning, Laprimaudaye, and Robert Wilberforce, joining hands and hearts and substance, founded the Community of St. Charles. The Oblates at Bayswater were familiarly spoken of as the "Widowers' Children." On Laprimaudaye's death, Manning said to a friend in Rome, Miss R. H. Busk, "In losing Laprimaudaye I seem to have lost a part of myself." In losing Robert Wilberforce and Laprimaudaye, Manning lost the two most intimate of his friends. With James Hope he was for a time perhaps on intimate terms, Henry Wilberforce was his brother-in-law, and these two—beyond the circle of family associations—were almost the sole survivors of the intimacies of his Anglican days. From Mr. Gladstone he was estranged, and from Samuel Wilberforce. With Catholics, priests or laymen, friends made later in life, Manning had no real intimacies, with one notable exception—His present Eminence Cardinal Vaughan. Early and late they knew each other's minds and hearts, and worked together for a common cause. If they were not always or altogether in accord even on matters of grave concern, Manning and Herbert Vaughan—as priest or fellow-bishop—when they happened to differ, understood and appreciated each other's motives.

In this comparative isolation of heart, Manning commenced and continued his great work of founding and building up the Community of St. Charles. In the autobiographical Note from which I have already given one or two extracts, Manning gave the following account of the first founding of the Oblates in the district assigned to them by Cardinal Wiseman at Bayswater:—

> On Whit Sunday 1857 we met for the first time at Bays-

water in a hired house, 12 Sutherland Place; and next morning at 5 o'clock said our masses in the unfinished church, and spent the whole day down to 2 P.M. of Whit Tuesday in drawing up our way of life.

Such was the beginning of the Oblates. God has now blessed and chastised us. In Him I trust alone for our future; and I believe what was done in obedience, blessed by Pius IX., dedicated to the Holy Ghost at its foundation, and consecrated once more to the Holy Ghost by its confraternity, founded for His Service, cannot come to nought, unless we all be reprobates."

During the rest of the year 1857 and the following year Manning was mainly engaged in carrying on the work of developing the Community he had founded, or of going to Rome to meet objections or accusations. In his letters to Monsignor Talbot long accounts are given of "the persecution to which he was subjected." At Bayswater, the district assigned to him, there was the shell of a church, without pavement or windows, a schoolhouse, and a field or two. Mass was said on Sundays and once a week. A few months before Manning came Father Moore had opened a school of about 40 poor children. The Catholic population was established at 2000 in 1857.

As Father Superior of the Oblates of St. Charles, Manning for eight years watched over the growth of the young community, and formed and guided their minds. Schools were established and convents, the Convent of Franciscan nuns was under his special spiritual direction. His nephew, Father William Manning, founded and built, and conducted until his premature death, St. Charles' College. For eight years the Church of the community at Bayswater was the centre of Manning's spiritual activity. The church was crowded Sunday after Sunday when he preached. Many non-Catholics, especially of an evening, came to hear him; many came to him for instruction, and week after week were received into the Church. In his letters of that date to Cardinal Wiseman, frequent references are made to bringing converts for private confirmation to the little chapel in York Place.

Even in the fiercest years of contentions and disputes, and of diplomatic work as Wiseman's "Procurator," or in acting in defence of himself and his Congregation, Manning, on returning from the battlefield in Rome, found peace and quiet and spiritual consolation, such as he never felt elsewhere, in that little room of the Community House, at Bayswater. Here in the retirement of community life, inspiring with higher ideals the sons of St. Charles, or exorcising from their midst the evil spirit of restlessness and rebellion, the spiritual side of his nature was nurtured and developed. From his spirit the Community which he had founded received its higher stamp and permanent character.

Of this great and salutary work Manning was fully justified by the result in speaking with the highest satisfaction, as having rendered good service to the diocese. This Community, with its offshoots and developments, may perhaps not unjustly be regarded as the most permanent memorial to Manning's life and labours.

After the battle had been fought and won; after he had taken off his armour towards the close of his active career, Cardinal Manning indulged, fortunately for us, in the pleasant habit of fighting his battles over again, like Uncle Toby, or of recording his triumphs, or of proclaiming the defeat or dispersion of his foes, or, in a more placid and homely mood and fashion, of chronicling such a creation of his hands as the congregation of the Oblates of St. Charles.

In a Journal, dated 1879, Cardinal Manning wrote of the Oblates as follows:—

> There remains one work in which I have hope and consolation beyond all others—I mean the congregation of the Oblates of St. Charles. It was begun almost blindly, so little did I see then what I see now. It was begun in obedience to my bishop, it was shaped in Rome, it was specially blessed by Pius IX. It was at once sorely tried by a very formidable opposition. It was confirmed by the trial. If it had not been God's will, it would not have been assailed; and if it had not been His work, it could never have endured the assault. It grew steadily; and having survived all trial from without, it was more perilously

tried, as I foretold, from within. Minds without humility destroyed their own stability, and that of others. They sowed division which vexed and lowered and saddened the community. Nevertheless we have been blessed, multiplied, and preferred beyond measure. We began five priests and two clerics. With a schoolhouse for mass, a poor school of forty children. What we have grown to let others see and say, and let it not be forgotten that St. Joseph's Missionary College, St. Bede's College, are the works of the Bishop of Salford, and that he is an Oblate of St. Charles. Nor ought St. Charles's College be forgotten, nor the Rector of the English College in Rome. When Herbert Vaughan and I were in the Accademia Ecclesiastica, and he served my mass at six in the morning, we little thought of the works from 1857 to 1881. Others will write how it all grew up. The eight years I was at St. Mary's were the happiest of my life. Hard indeed and full of anxiety, but full of high peace and independence of the world. My name has been always over my door, and I never feel so much at home as when I am in that little room. I lived in it only eight years, but these eight years were a work and a life which cannot be measured by dial time.

CHAPTER V

THE ERRINGTON CASE

1858–1862

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN MANNING AND CARDINAL WISEMAN AND MGR. TALBOT

ON the 8th of April 1857, Manning was appointed by Pope Pius IX. Provost of the Chapter of Westminster. Dr. Whitty, who was at Rome, had just resigned the office in the view of joining the Society of Jesus. In a letter dated Rome, 8th April 1857, Manning wrote to Cardinal Wiseman as follows:—

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—. . . . To-day a Rescript of Propaganda came to me, not in the tenour of your Eminence's kind letter of some time ago—but of the provostship. I cannot but believe that there has been some departure from your intention in this; remembering our conversation about Dr. Maguire, to whom I shall rejoice to transfer what I think must have been intended for him. I have not yet seen Dr. Whitty or Monsignor Talbot, or spoken on the subject to any one, except at the Propaganda, where I first heard of it. But I will see them to-morrow, and will wait here or not until your answer can come, according as they may advise.—My dear Lord Cardinal, your affectionate servant, H. E. MANNING.

The office of Provost, which opened up to Manning prospects of elevation and ecclesiastical preferment, did not cause him such searchings of heart as the offer of the sub-almonership to the Queen had excited in his Anglican days. In obedience to the call of duty he had no scruple or hesitation to break the contemplated retirement of

community life in order to take an active and prominent part in the administration of the diocese.

Cardinal Wiseman, out of prudence or love of peace, had intended to make Dr. Maguire, on Dr. Whitty's resignation, head of the chapter; but in his heart rejoiced that, without consulting him, Pope Pius IX. had taken the appointment into his own hands.

Manning's promotion was not perhaps the cause of, but the signal for, letting loose the long, pent-up waters of strife. His growing intimacy and influence with Wiseman was resented by some on personal grounds, by others for public or ecclesiastical reasons. This intimacy, however, arose just too late to prevent the greatest mistake in Wiseman's life—the appointment of Dr. Errington as his coadjutor, with right of succession. At the time of this unlucky appointment, Manning's attention was absorbed by his work with the Jesuits at Farm Street. His mind at that time was, perhaps, not made up as to the policy or line of action to be pursued. He was still feeling his way. After the break with the Jesuits, however, he was drawn to Cardinal Wiseman; founded the Oblates; was made Provost by the Pope. But it was too late, Dr. Errington was already in possession.

The Church in England was in a transition state—always an uneasy, often a dangerous position. The Hierarchy had not long been established. Rights and duties had yet to be adjusted. Men had come into possession of new powers, the limits of which, as in the case of the Chapter of Westminster, had as yet to be ascertained. There was friction between the bishops and the archbishop. It took the form most trying to men, be they bishops, priests, or laymen, of money disputes. There were, however, deeper causes of disquiet at work. Men's minds were in a ferment. New ideas were coming in; new principles of action; new life, or rather new developments of life struggling for expression. In the nature of things this new energy of action ended in a struggle for mastery. Equally, as a matter of course, there was action and reaction. The two opposing sides were roughly described as old Catholics and converts. But the definition was as inaccurate as such definitions generally are. For

among Manning's opponents, or opponents of extreme views, were many converts as there were many hereditary Catholics among his supporters. There were jealousies and prejudices, suspicions and misunderstandings, it must be confessed, on either side alike.

It was Manning's hand that lighted up the smouldering flame, either by accident, or by over-zeal on behalf of his new community.[1] For he placed his Oblates, of course with the concurrence of Cardinal Wiseman, in St. Edmund's, the seminary of Westminster and Southwark. Bishop Grant resented this act as an unlawful intrusion, so did Dr. Errington.

The Chapter at once called upon Manning as Father Superior of the Oblates to produce their "Rule" for examination by the Chapter, both in regard to its bearing upon the diocese and the seminary.

This was the beginning of strife, the opening of the flood-gates of controversy, in which Cardinal Wiseman was soon involved, as well as his coadjutor and the other bishops.

Speaking of Manning in these early days of his Catholic life, a priest of the north, not Canon Walker of Scarborough, as reported at the time, but a man of a like outspoken stamp, the President of Ushaw, said: "I hate that man; he is such a forward piece."

To liken Manning to a pawn on the ecclesiastical chess-board, pushing his way through hostile lines to the goal of his desires was, if a rude, not altogether an inaccurate description of the late Archdeacon of Chichester and of the newly appointed Provost of the Chapter of Westminster. When this sarcasm reached Manning's open ears, as every-thing of the kind, early or late, did reach him, his reply was: "Poor man, what is he made of; does he suppose in his foolishness, after working day and night for nigh upon twenty years in heresy and schism, that on becoming a Catholic I should sit in an easy chair and fold my hands all the rest of my life."

It was not in Manning's nature to sit all the day idle:

[1] To direct seminaries was one of the "Rules" of the Community. In the view of carrying out this object Manning prematurely, perhaps unwisely, placed his Oblates in the seminary of St. Edmund's.

his busy hands were ever at work. On becoming a Catholic a man can no more change his nature than a leopard can cast its spots. His motives, under the grace of God, may be purified, his intellectual vision be enlarged by a larger faith; but his mode and methods of action, in the main, remain what they were.

Not only secular priests like the President of Ushaw, but members of the Religious Orders, like Father Coffin of the Redemptorists, afterwards one of Manning's most intimate and active supporters, in these early years regarded with mistrust and dislike the manner and methods of the "new convert," the late Archdeacon of Chichester. Though not a Yorkshire man, Father Coffin was as blunt and outspoken in his criticisms of Dr. Manning as the northern Ecclesiastic, as the following "Note[1]" will suffice to show:—

When Mr. R. A. Coffin, towards the end of 1845, resolved to give up his Oxford living and enter the Church, his father insisted on his son's going to see Archdeacon Manning to consult him. He set out accordingly to Chichester, and there went first of all to inquire at Miss Lockhart's, the Debora of the Tractarian Movement, whether he could get to see the Archdeacon. Miss Lockhart answered that that very day he was to be her guest. Mr. Coffin therefore confided to her the object of his visit, and begged her to put to the Archdeacon the following question: Whether he who believes all the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church may still remain in the Establishment or go over to Rome? The answer which Miss Lockhart communicated on the part of the Archdeacon was: Who believes all the dogmas of the Catholic Church ought to become a Catholic. Such was the straightforward answer of the future Cardinal of Westminster.

Mr. Coffin that very year became a child of the Church; seven years had to pass ere the Archdeacon went over. Meanwhile the opinion of Catholics in England was that Archdeacon Manning would never take the step. He had many critics on this score, and amongst them F. Coffin, who was already in the Redemptorist novitiate in Belgium, when the glad tidings reached him that the Archdeacon had followed the light of God,

---

[1] "Notes of the Right Rev. R. A. Coffin's conversations, while Provincial of the Congregation of the Holy Redeemer. Taken at the time by Father Lubienski." These Notes were kindly placed at my disposal for the "Life of Cardinal Manning."

and he was full of joy at it. Nevertheless, he did not get rid of a deal of distrust towards the converted F. Manning, and shared the opinion of many in London at the time, that the old Archdeacon was left in him, that Cardinal Wiseman had ordained him too quickly, etc.

The first time they met in London on some business, F. Coffin found F. Manning "stuck up, cold," as he said, "and he did not make a good impression on me." About the year 1853, F. Coffin had sent to the press his volume of St. Alphonsus on the "Incarnation," having written for it an introduction. Soon after, they chanced to meet at Burns and Lambert's book shop. After exchanging some words, F. Manning said, "By the way, I have read something that you have written, and I must have a good talk with you about it."—"Any day you wish to choose, come to St. Mary's, Clapham," was the answer; and the day and hour for the visit was fixed.

F. Manning arrived; and they went into the Community garden. F. Coffin perceived that the visitor wanted to be very confidential. Thereupon he said: "Stop; before you begin, it is I who must first let you know that I am full of temptations against you, and that I often spoke against you on account of this and that;" and here he poured out against F. Manning all that he felt, and told him right out: that he was stiff, cold; that he had the parson in him still; that he received too quickly Protestants into the Church, without instructing them thoroughly; and so forth.

With true humility F. Manning listened to all, and, won by F. Coffin's sincerity, took him by the hand, and said: "Now you must promise me one thing."—"I will, if I may," answered F. Coffin. "Well," said F. Manning, "it is that for the glory of God, you will always speak out to me thus the truth." "I shall," answered F. Coffin. And on the spot F. Manning opened himself most entirely to him.

From that day forth, F. Manning was frequently seen at St. Mary's, Clapham. He hardly ever missed coming down for St. Alphonsus's day: often preached beautiful panegyrics of the Saint, for whom he had a special devotion. One day he said in conversation, after reading on one of his journeys to Rome the treatise of St. Alphonsus *on prayer*, "Never did I so well understand God's economy of man's salvation until I read that little book."

But the Saint whom F. Manning above all loved was St Charles. And when, in 1856, he founded the community of the oblates of St. Charles at Bayswater, he consulted on many points F. Coffin, who gave him much advice as to the ordering

of that admirable Community that gave two Archbishops to Westminster.

Such an estimate of Dr. Manning's hardness and stiffness of manner, as that of Father Coffin, does not seem to have been uncommon in those early days. In the following letter, Lady Herbert, who was on intimate terms with Manning both as an Anglican and a Catholic, bears similar testimony :—

Via PORTA PINCIANA, ROME, 8*th June* 1892.

MY DEAR MR. PURCELL—I shall be too glad to give you every information about our dear Archdeacon Manning in those days, when no one knew him more intimately than my husband and myself. . . . It is curious that his "Protestant hardness" clung to him in those first years to such an extent, that I recollect the present Archbishop,[1] who was travelling with him at that time to Rome, getting out of his carriage at Lyons into another one, because "he could not stand him."

To me also the change for some years was most painful. He had written to me when consecrated (this very day 27 years ago) that "one of his greatest joys was to think, that I was one of his new children." Yet he thought it right to assume a coldness and hardness of manner, which was utterly unnatural, as if he feared any affectionate intimacy with a woman. All this wore off as years went on; but I can consequently enter into Father Coffin's feelings at that time, better than most people. . . . I remain very faithfully yours, M. E. HERBERT.

In the Catholic Church, Manning had now found a larger Lavington—the community of the Oblates of St. Charles, which he had founded at Bayswater. In the provostship of Westminster he enjoyed an office of influence equivalent to that of Chichester. Moreover, his field of action was larger by far, for it included Rome, the centre of the Catholic world, and all that Rome implies in work and worship; and since evil must needs exist in high places or low, Catholic or non-Catholic, all that Rome in times of turmoil implies as source and centre of ambition and intrigue. For Manning, however, the land of promise into which he had entered at home was not altogether a land overflowing with milk and honey—the milk of human kindness—the honey of peace and brotherly love. "It is well," as Manning

[1] Now His Eminence Cardinal Vaughan.

in a letter about this date wrote to his friend at the Vatican, Monsignor Talbot, to whom he so often complained of the English laity, "that the Protestant world does not know how our work is hindered by domestic strife."

But before giving the interesting reports which constantly passed for a long series of years between Manning and Monsignor Talbot as to the state of things existing among English Catholics, or what Manning called "the domestic strife," it will be as well, for the sake of clearness and brevity, to give an outline of the "Errington Case," as the conflict which was carried on in England and at the Propaganda in Rome, nominally between Cardinal Wiseman and his Coadjutor, was called. In this prolonged struggle—in which Manning in reality was the prime mover—to deprive Dr. Errington of his right of succession to Westminster, was symbolised and summed up all the other pending disputes between Cardinal Wiseman, the Chapter, and his suffragan bishops. Behind this opposition to Wiseman, as Manning contended, lay what he styled the "anti-Roman and anti-Papal spirit of English Catholicism." The removal of Dr. Errington was therefore not merely the removal of a man, but the overthrow of a false or vicious principle. Besides Manning himself, who played the most active part in this ecclesiastical drama, in which spiritual aims and motives were mixed with human passions and weaknesses, first among the *dramatis personæ* was Cardinal Wiseman. Large-hearted and generous, impulsive to a fault, his whole heart and mind possessed with the sanguine belief of the great things which, on the restoration of the Hierarchy, might be achieved in England, Wiseman paid little or no heed to the counsels of the more prudent, or to the ignoble fears of the timid or cowardly, but carried out his own views and principles in a fashion, perhaps, too autocratic. At any rate he was accused at Rome of treating his suffragan bishops with too little consideration or deference. Again, Cardinal Wiseman was no man of business. The Trust-funds under his charge were, as was alleged against him, mismanaged, or not always strictly applied to their several uses.

Dr. Errington, a member of the Yorkshire family of that

name, was nominated Bishop of Plymouth in 1851—the year of Manning's conversion—and was the centre, like the city of Troy for Greeks and Trojans, round which the battle raged, not for ten but for six years, between the two opposing ecclesiastical factions. At Cardinal Wiseman's express desire, Dr. Errington was appointed his coadjutor, with right of succession, by the Pope in the year 1855. On resigning his See the Bishop of Plymouth was created titular Archbishop of Trebizond. Errington was a man of strong character, simple and upright, and governed by a high sense of duty. He was, moreover, a thorough man of business. In striking contrast to Wiseman, he showed himself perhaps in the details of administration too much of an ecclesiastical martinet. Though they had been great friends for years, when brought into closer relations Cardinal Wiseman soon discovered that he and his coadjutor disagreed on almost every point. Dr. Errington was very tenacious of his own opinions, especially on matters of business, and very active in urging Wiseman to carry out on the spot reforms suggested. Cardinal Wiseman's procrastination, due in part to ill health, irritated his impatient coadjutor. There was no longer peace or quiet in York Place, where both lived under the same roof. Wiseman, sensitive by nature and made nervous by illness, dreaded the constant visitations which he was subjected to. He could no longer call an hour in the day his own. He had sown the wind and was reaping the whirlwind. His Coadjutor, in fine, was an uncomfortable neighbour. There was no help for it. An archbishop can no more get rid of an uncomfortable coadjutor with rights of succession than a man can rid himself of an uncomfortable wife. In either case alike there is only the proverbial way of bearing such an infliction. In those first days of his trouble, it never entered into Cardinal Wiseman's head to seek to deprive his coadjutor of his rights. He knew, none better, that no bishop can be removed from his See except he be proved guilty of a canonical offence. To moot even such a question in Rome as Errington's removal called for the exercise of the highest arts of diplomatic skill. To carry it into effect required something beyond skill—audacity.

Wiseman possessed neither diplomatic skill nor audacity. Moreover, he was too loyal to his colleague in the administration of the diocese to attempt to undermine his position by such arts. What, however, was unbecoming in Wiseman, might be considered by another, bound by no such ties of delicacy, as a supreme duty.

The next foremost actor in the drama was Canon Searle, Wiseman's constant companion, friend, and adviser. They were at one time almost inseparable. Wiseman and Searle —if not in intellectual gifts, for Searle was a man of business, not of letters—in genial humour and social habits, as well as in bulk and gait, bore a certain resemblance to each other.[1] He was a man of firm will, of quick temper, not prone to offer his cheek to the smiter, more especially if that smiter was Manning, rather rude or overbearing, perhaps, in manner and speech. In Mgr. Searle, Manning found, when he was appointed by the Pope over the heads of all the canons Provost of the Chapter, a determined opponent.

On one occasion, the Chapter drew up a petition or protest addressed to the Holy See. Manning, contending that the Chapter was acting *ultra vires*, refused, as Provost, to sign the petition. He was requested to leave the chair, but refused, as the Chapter had no authority over him. "I was not appointed by you," he said, "but by the Pope." The Chapter adjourned to another room, and sent their Address to Rome with the statement that the Provost refused to sign it.

The dispute soon took a wider range, and Cardinal Wiseman was involved in disputes not only with his Chapter but with his coadjutor, Dr. Errington, and the other bishops. No sooner had Mgr. Searle discovered that Manning was working at York Place and in Rome for the removal of Dr. Errington, than he entered into active relations with the bishops and with the coadjutor himself, warning him of what he described as "Manning's intrigue."

In a letter to Mgr. Talbot, Manning related an encounter he had had with Mgr. Searle at Leyton, where Cardinal

[1] Walking one day, arm-in-arm, with Mgr. Searle in Portman Square, to Cardinal Wiseman's great amusement a gentleman, taking off his hat, said: "Your Eminence, I congratulate you on your fine son."

Wiseman was lying prostrate from the effects of an operation. Searle, blunt of speech, accused Manning of not acting in a straightforward manner. Manning retorted, charging Searle with communicating in an underhand fashion with bishops opposed to Wiseman. Searle asked what right Manning had to interfere with bishops. The retort came quick: Every right to defend his bishop against attack and misrepresentation. In his letter to Mgr. Talbot, Manning said: "We both spoke with great heat, at all events I did, for I was indignant."

In truth, Manning was provoked, and justly, into one of his "Berseker rages," by Searle's manner. Manning had the advantage of telling his own story in letters to Mgr. Talbot, with the full knowledge that they would be duly reported "in the proper quarter." Searle was accused in these letters of intimidating Cardinal Wiseman by his rude and overbearing manner. Much as he desired to be by the side of the Pope in his day of danger, Manning declared that he could not leave Wiseman unprotected in the hands of Searle: that Searle was jealous of everybody: that so long as he continued to live with him, Wiseman's house was nearly inaccessible. In these letters, Cardinal Wiseman's state of health was described as such as to render him incapable of independent action; left him open to influence; "his life," it was related, "hangs by a thread." All this was five years before his death. But it was a question of grave importance at the time—the question who should have sole or supreme influence over Wiseman? Searle was in possession, if I may use the term, and fighting hard to retain his hold. Manning—I am not now speaking of motives or justifying reasons, but simply of facts—was striving might and main to dislodge him from his position. The issue at stake was of vital consequence to both sides in the dispute, for Cardinal Wiseman's life was said to be hanging on a thread, whilst Dr. Errington was still coadjutor-bishop, with the right of succession to Westminster not as yet repealed. The fierce hand-to-hand conflict between Manning and Searle at Leyton, where Cardinal Wiseman was lying prostrate, reminds one of the famous contest before the walls

of Troy between Hector and Achilles, over the body of Patroclus, only at Leyton the contest was over not the dead but the dying body of poor Wiseman. It was, however, no mere petty, personal squabble. To Manning's mind tremendous issues were at stake, for he believed implicitly not only that Wiseman's work was God's work in England, but that they who opposed it, whether they knew it or not, were the enemies of God.

Many of the bishops, described in letters to Mgr. Talbot as "malcontents," sympathised with Dr. Errington and took sides with Canon Searle and the Chapter. The most influential of the bishops who opposed Cardinal Wiseman and sympathised with Dr. Errington was Dr. Ullathorne, Bishop of Birmingham. He had friends in Rome, especially in Cardinal Barnabò, who was opposed alike to Wiseman and Manning.

Among the other bishops who espoused the cause of Dr. Errington, was Bishop Grant of Southwark; he had grievances of his own against Wiseman which whetted his appetite for battle. How fierce the battle was it is a useless attempt to conceal even if suppression were justified. Not Dr. Errington, nor Mgr. Searle, nor Bishop Grant enjoyed a monopoly of abuse. In his letters to Mgr. Talbot at the Vatican, Manning, to say the least, was just as censorious; in his noble rage against shortcomings and backslidings he spared neither Bishops nor Synods, nor such lesser bodies as Chapters either of Westminster or of Southwark. In reply, Mgr. Talbot coarsened Manning's barbed criticisms. For instance, Manning might describe Bishop Grant as tainted with the Gallican spirit; but Mgr. Talbot would bluntly declare that "Grant, who had lived for seventeen years in Rome, had imbibed all the cunning and duplicity of the Italian character without its noble loyalty to the Holy See."

Mgr. Talbot cannot be excluded from the *dramatis personæ*. But what part is to be assigned to him? He did not play the part of Greek chorus to the drama we are witnessing. He possessed neither the elevation of character nor the sublime sense of justice, nor the holy hate and scorn of

wrong done even in a good cause, for such a noble office. He occupied rather the position of an oracle, which on being consulted gave not only the replies desired, but such replies as in spirit had been carefully and artistically suggested or devised by an inspiring mind long before the event. The Hon. and Rev. George Talbot, a younger son of Lord Talbot of Malahide of that day, was received into the Church in the year 1847 and ordained by Bishop Wiseman, to whom he was devotedly attached. Mgr. Talbot's position at the Vatican was unique. He was not only chamberlain to Pope Pius IX., but an intimate friend, and his constant attendant. That alone gave Mgr. Talbot singular influence in Rome, which was neither warranted by any special strength of character nor of intellect. For a long series of years, until indeed his mind gave way, the report of Catholic affairs in England reached the Pope's ear through this channel. During the whole of that period Manning supplied in a series of letters to Talbot the whole history from his own point of view of the Church in England; of the difficulties it encountered from the opposition of "malcontent bishops, insubordinate Chapters;" from the action of the Jesuits; from the influence of Newman, the illustrious Oratorian; from the spirit of Gallicanism, or of a low order of English Catholicism in clergy and laity—all this and more, year after year, through Mgr. Talbot reached the Pope's ear. But the office of managing English affairs rested, at any rate in the first instance, not with the Pope but with the Congregation of Propaganda. Mgr. Talbot had influence, chiefly arising from the knowledge that he possessed the Pope's confidence, with many of the Cardinals at Propaganda; and he duly reported to Manning the proceedings of the Congregation; what English bishops had brought cases or grievances to Rome —charges against Wiseman, or against Manning and the Oblates; and whether their action had received countenance or support. He was alert, too, in giving timely warning whenever Manning's presence as Procurator for Wiseman's defence, or for the promotion of his own interests, or those of the Oblates, was needed at the Vatican.

By such services and activities Mgr. Talbot played no mean part in the management of Catholic affairs in England. It did not require much time or trouble on the part of a man of such infinite tact and skill as Manning to gain supreme influence over Mgr. Talbot. If Mgr. Talbot had the ear of the Pope, the tongue which spoke in whispers was not Talbot's.

To a man of Manning's singular penetration and knowledge of affairs, of such wide experience gained in the Anglican Church of the rivalry of parties, it was not difficult as soon as he had made himself at home among English Catholics, to appraise at their right value the contending views as to the policy or line of action to be pursued by the Church in England. Manning, heart and soul, cast in his lot with Wiseman—with Wiseman and the Pope. Cardinal Wiseman's lofty ideals, high hopes, and sanguine expectations, of the successful work to be done by Catholic action, of the conversion even, by the aid of the converts, of England, fell in with Manning's own views. In such a work he could play a foremost part. It was congenial to his nature. The principle of authority was the rock on which his foot rested. Even as an Anglican, the infallibility of the Church was the ideal which his soul had longed for, and which he pursued until it brought him to the home where he now found rest from doubt and spiritual peace. Having found at such cost an infallible teacher, it was not in Manning's nature to make light of the principle of authority. This principle in England was represented by Cardinal Wiseman. They who opposed Wiseman or criticised his action, or lodged complaints against him in Rome, were in Manning's eyes, be they bishops or Chapters or unruly-tongued priests, "malcontents," or "disloyal to the Holy See," or "tainted with Gallicanism." If Cardinal Wiseman were somewhat too autocratic in action, too high-handed even in dealing with his fellow-bishops, what was that to Manning, in whose breast a like fault or failing was deeply rooted.

Surprise has often been expressed that Manning, who, in the Anglican Church, was accounted the most moderate

of men, in the Catholic Church should have held the extremest of views. But the explanation is easy:—One of the most marked elements in Manning's character was adaptability to circumstances and environments. Moderation is the most prominent and valued characteristic in the Church of England—the *beau ideal* of bishops and church dignitaries as well as of its civil rulers: whilst in the Church of Rome extreme views were the most prized and praised; at any rate in the days when Pius IX. was Pope. Hence, quite naturally, Manning as an Anglican was the most moderate of men, and as a Catholic the extremest.

Manning's spiritual nature, his vivid belief in the supernatural, the communings of his soul in its higher moods with God, found response and satisfaction in the aspirations, tendencies, and teachings of Cardinal Wiseman. On the other hand, his ecclesiastical activities in church building, founding convents, establishing colleges and schools, were welcomed by the Cardinal with warm approbation and encouragement. Manning took, whether rightly or wrongly is not now the question, a pessimist view of the state of Catholicism in England. In his eyes, a Gallican or Anti-Roman spirit prevailed. The state of practice and faith among those, both priest and people, who claim to be "Old Catholics,"[1] Manning declared, from facts within his own knowledge, to be one of the gravest evils in England; and if it gained head would paralyse the Church in the moment of its growth and expansion.

In their opposition to Cardinal Wiseman and their support of Dr. Errington, Manning detected in the bishops, if not the Gallican spirit, a low form of English national Catholicism. In his eyes, the whole movement, headed by Dr. Errington and supported by most of the bishops, betrayed an anti-Roman and anti-Papal spirit. If it succeeded it would have an injurious effect not only upon English Catholics but upon England. It would throw back the progress of religion for

[1] The term "Old Catholic" did not in that day bear the odious signification attached to it since the days of Dr. Döllinger and the schismatic "Old Catholics" of Germany. In Manning's mouth it meant little more than hereditary Catholics, who were opposed to his views and line of action.

a generation. It was not "zeal for religion, for the greater glory of God and the salvation of souls," which inspired the "Old Catholics," bishops, priests, and people, as Manning declared, and Mgr. Talbot reported to Rome, "but jealousy and prejudice against the converts."

The laity fared but little better than the bishops in the estimation Manning in that early day had formed of their character and conduct; they were too indolent and luxurious to take an active part in Catholic life. An invitation to dinner, or a dinner at home, more than sufficed to keep them away from public meetings for the furtherance of Catholic interests. All they cared about was "the key to Grosvenor Square." The more educated were falling off from the secular clergy to the Jesuits. Entering again into the social and secular life of England, the need of a higher system of education was brought home to English Catholics. They felt keenly their position. They showed anxiety and discontent. There were many highly educated men, chiefly converts, active, not to be put down, requiring firm treatment; but for such men, as Manning declared, the clergy for the most part were unfit guides, for they themselves were wanting both in spiritual and intellectual training. From the candidates for Holy Orders little improvement under the existing state of things could be looked for, since they were "a shifting and discordant body, living under no rule."

Manning, it must be confessed, was at that time a pessimist of the deepest dye. He even repeated to Mgr. Talbot the cry of despair he once uttered as an Anglican: "Until the present race of bishops expires there is no hope." For in his reply Mgr. Talbot remarked: *I agree with you*, more and more . . . that until the old generation of bishops and priests is removed . . . no great progress of religion can be expected in England."

Persuaded in his own mind that the whole movement, or as he called it "conspiracy," against Cardinal Wiseman was anti-Roman and anti-Papal: that the main hope and aim of the "malcontent" bishops was to undo all Wiseman's work, and to throw back the Church in England for a generation: that the head and front of this movement was

Archbishop Errington, Manning considered it his bounden duty and obligation of conscience to remove at all costs and hazards Wiseman's coadjutor and successor from his position at Westminster. No less complete and crushing a blow, Manning contended in a letter to Cardinal Wiseman, would save the Church in England from disaster.

To replace him in the Episcopate would not be the restoration of a person but the reversal of a whole line of action in favour of its opposite. To appoint Dr. Errington to any other See in England, as Dr. Ullathorne had urged upon Cardinal Barnabò, and Cardinal Barnabò had proposed to the Pope, Manning regarded as the reversal of the Pope's judgment in everything but form. Such a proposal, if carried out, would give new hope and life to the old party, who were not only biding their time but exulting in the hope of changes and of reaction. Nothing short of Errington's absolute exclusion from the Episcopate in England would secure safety to Wiseman's work, still precarious and at stake, was the argument which Manning pressed again and again upon the reluctant Cardinal. After such a struggle, so fierce and prolonged, if the victory were not complete, nothing in reality would have been gained. For, as Manning pointed out with considerable justice and truth, if Dr. Errington were to obtain, as the price of present peace, a foothold as bishop in England, his name and cause would soon become the rallying cry of the rebellious, and his See the centre and stronghold and breeding-place of the malcontent party—bishops, priests, and laymen.

In a cause in which not to gain an absolute victory meant defeat, Manning's firmness and tenacity of purpose stood him in good stead. His courage was not daunted nor his diplomatic skill abashed by the difficulties which stood in his way. It was not in his nature to rush blindfold on a danger. He had long beforehand examined carefully and from every standpoint all the risks and difficulties which attended the removal of Dr. Errington. Dr. Grant, Bishop of Southwark, on behalf of the other bishops, protested in the name of justice and of canon law against such an act. The Chapter of Westminster

were in this as in other matters, in direct and open opposition to Manning, their provost. The laity warmly supported Dr. Errington against what they called the arrogant temper and arbitrary proceedings, as they believed, of Cardinal Wiseman. But in truth the primary difficulty was Wiseman himself. Glad as he would have been to be rid of his coadjutor, much as he may have complained of the irksomeness of his position, of the way in which his own work and Manning's was frustrated by the line of action pursued by Dr. Errington in accord with most of the suffragan bishops, yet Cardinal Wiseman could not bring his mind to have recourse to the extreme measures pressed upon him by Manning. To petition the Holy See to grant him as a favour relief from the presence and aid of his coadjutor, in the hope that Dr. Errington would assent to an amicable separation, was the most that Wiseman would willingly assent to. But when Dr. Errington absolutely refused to resign his right of succession unless he was convicted by the tribunals of the Holy See of a canonical offence, Wiseman shrank from initiating such proceedings. The charge of "conspiracy" alleged by his opponents against Dr. Errington, as resisting in conjunction with eight bishops the authority of the Archbishop, was described by Cardinal Barnabò, the Prefect of Propaganda, as amounting to a "schism in the episcopate."

Under these circumstances, Manning himself drew up a Memorial for presentation to the Pope, setting forth various charges against Dr. Errington, both in regard to his conduct or line of action as coadjutor and his opposition to the work of the Oblates at St. Edmund's College.

Unwilling to engage personally in these and other charges against his coadjutor, and thinking it better and safer, on account of his state of health, not to go to Rome in answer to the charges and complaints brought against him at Propaganda by his Chapter and his suffragan bishops, Cardinal Wiseman, in 1859, appointed Manning "procurator"—that is, entrusted to him the

office and duty of appearing before the courts or tribunals of Propaganda as the defender of the Cardinal's cause. This official position, which Manning held for three years, gave him a foothold at Propaganda, brought him into closer relations with the leading cardinals and official personages at the Curia, and led to frequent and friendly interviews on Wiseman's and his own behalf with the Pope. At the first opportunity Cardinal Wiseman obtained from the Pope a brief, appointing Manning Proto-notary Apostolic, in order that, as a prelate acting for Wiseman, he might have a better standing with the bishops.[1]

Wiseman became more and more dependent on, or bound up with, his zealous, skilful, and unresting advocate. During these years of fierce conflict and controversy, in which the Errington Case played the foremost part, Manning was going continually backwards and forwards to Rome. During these anxious years, in Manning's letters to Cardinal Wiseman, and Monsignor Talbot's to Manning, frequent reference is made to Wiseman's "inertness of will," his "incapacity, owing to his state of health, of independent action." At a critical juncture in the conflict between Dr. Errington and his opponents, Mgr. Talbot wrote to Manning insisting on the necessity of Wiseman's writing a strong letter to Cardinal Barnabò, protesting against the interference of the other bishops in the question of the removal of the coadjutor.

Anxious beyond measure as to the fatal results which must needs ensue if anything were to happen to Wiseman before Errington had been deprived of his right of succession, Manning during these years sent constant and alarming reports to Rome of Wiseman's failing health: "his life hangs by a thread," or "a change for the worse may take place in forty-eight hours," or "he will never be the same man again." Manning's love for promptness in action, natural to his character, was

[1] I was made Proto-notary Apostolic in 1860, without my knowledge. Sitting at dinner with the Cardinal at the English College, he put the brief in my hands. I was silent, and afterwards apologised for seeming ungrateful. In truth I had always desired not to receive the title of Monsignor, and in 1852 had refused it.—"Cardinal Manning's Journal," 1878-82.

rendered tenfold more urgent by the terrible risks of delay. His impatience chafed under the slow processes of Propaganda. Unlike the impatient and impetuous Archdeacon of Chichester, the Provost of Westminster kept no Diary in which outbursts of anger might have been confessed and repented of.

As a last resource, Wiseman was urged to come himself to Rome. The canonisation of the Japanese martyrs afforded a fitting opportunity. He went to Rome, but, unfortunately, he fell ill, and had to undergo a dangerous operation for carbuncle at the English College. Again Manning had to act for him both at Propaganda and with the Pope. This was Cardinal Wiseman's last visit to Rome.

In the meantime Dr. Errington was not idle; neither were his friends. Dr. Grant, Bishop of Southwark, who had been at one time, in succession to Wiseman, Rector of the English College at Rome, and was well known at Propaganda, "poured in," as Manning reported to Talbot, "numerous reports to Propaganda." Ullathorne, Bishop of Birmingham, on behalf of the other bishops, visited Rome in support of Dr. Errington's cause, and was favourably listened to by Cardinal Barnabò and the Cardinals of Propaganda. Bishop Clifford, also well known in Rome, and "the two Dr. Browns,"[1] as Manning reported to Talbot, took sides with the coadjutor.

Dr. Errington wrote asking that he might be invited to Rome to defend himself. But first of all he wanted to know what he was accused of. Mgr. Talbot reported that Dr. Errington complained that he was defamed and calumniated at Rome, but Talbot, writing to Manning, avowed that he had never spoken against the coadjutor to the Pope, except, he naively admitted, by declaring that Dr. Errington was anti-Roman and retrograde in his policy. And in like manner in regard to the Bishop of Southwark, who complained also to Manning of being calumniated, Talbot explained that he had only said, in a note to Searle, that "Grant was made a tool of by his Gallican Chapter."

The Cardinals of Propaganda sought to find a solution

[1] Dr. Brown, Bishop of Newport, and Dr. Brown, Bishop of Shrewsbury.

of the difficulty by the diplomatic ways of compromise and conciliation. It was clear to them that Cardinal Wiseman and his friends could not get on well with the Coadjutor, but it was equally clear that the Coadjutor had forfeited by no canonical offence his right of succession. Therefore an offer was made to Dr. Errington of the Archbishopric of the Port of Spain, Trinidad. He bluntly refused to resign his rights. A compromise was suggested by the Bishop of Birmingham to the Prefect of Propaganda, to the effect that Dr. Errington should be appointed to another English See. This compromise was refused with equal obstinacy on the other side. Manning insisted that such a victory would be a defeat. In the name of Cardinal Wiseman he declared that under no conditions must Dr. Errington be allowed to rule as bishop in England. Supple and compliant Italian cardinals, unaccustomed to the sturdiness of the English character, were amazed and even somewhat amused at two obstinate and pugnacious but honest Englishmen ready, rather than yield a point or budge an inch, to fight their battle out to the bitter end.

Since the entanglement between the claims of Archbishop Errington to retain his rights, and the demands advanced by Manning in Wiseman's name to remove the Coadjutor not only from Westminster but to keep him out of the Episcopate in England, was beyond the power of Propaganda to unravel, the solution of the Gordian knot was remitted to the Pope.

In the first instance, Dr. Errington was removed in 1860, at Cardinal Wiseman's request, by a decree of Propaganda from his office as Coadjutor. The demand made on Wiseman's behalf that Dr. Errington should be deprived of his rights of succession was referred to Propaganda. The accusations made against him by Manning as Wiseman's Procurator, as well as Manning's own memorial addressed to the Pope, were closely examined. The protests of the majority of Cardinal Wiseman's suffragan bishops and of the Chapter of Westminster were duly weighed and considered. Lastly, Archbishop Errington was heard in his own defence against his accusers. The case against Dr. Errington was

under examination for about three years. Finally, the Holy Office came to the conclusion that Dr. Errington had committed no such offence as under the Canon Law warranted the forfeiture of his right of succession to the diocese of Westminster.

Dr. Errington was then requested, and advised for peace sake and for public policy to resign his rights.

On his refusal, Pope Pius IX. took the case into his own hands, and on 9th June 1862 commanded Dr. Errington to resign his right of succession to the diocese of Westminster. Dr. Errington obeyed the Pope's command, and resigned.

Pope Pius IX. described to Mgr. Capalti the final act of this strange ecclesiastical drama in the fewest of pregnant words.

In writing to Mgr. Talbot on this great victory, Manning says :—

It was as the Holy Father said to Mgr. Capalti—"*Il colpo di stato di Dominidio* . . ." Certainly, as you say, the time from about 25th May to 9th June one can never forget. I am hardly able as yet to get it into any order.

The removal of Dr. Errington by the supreme act of the Pope was a stretch of Papal authority not easily forgotten on either side. It was in truth what Pope Pius IX. called it: "A *coup d'état* of the Lord God."

Had it not been for Manning's high courage, splendid energy, and dogged perseverance, and, it must in justice be confessed, his somewhat unscrupulous methods of attack, this victory over Errington would never have been won. The odds were against the desperate game. Manning, it is true, fought under the *ægis* of Wiseman and in his name. In Mgr. Talbot there was a careful and constant *amicus curiæ* at the Vatican. But Cardinal Barnabò, the Prefect of Propaganda, and many other Cardinals, influenced by the English Bishops, were against Manning. He stood up well-nigh single-handed. That tremendous force was against him—the *vis inertiæ*, that famous engine in the hands of Rome which, by wearing out the patience of opponents, has gained so many a bloodless victory; or, on the other hand, by its seeming indifference or cruelty has broken the heart of so

many a friend. Yet how many a vexatious or difficult cause has not been settled by mere flux of time. *Solvitur ambulando.* The Errington Case would have settled itself, had Manning's unresting energy allowed Propaganda to put off a decision for two or three years more. The fear of such a fatal settlement was to Manning worse than the fear of death. He was quickened in his action, inspired, it is not too much to say, by a belief, rooted deep in his heart and soul, that Dr. Errington's succession to Wiseman would be even more disastrous to the Holy See itself than to England. For it would revive, as he declared to Mgr. Talbot, not in England only, but in France, Italy, Rome even, a Gallican or anti-Roman spirit. The Cardinals of Propaganda, famous for their world-wide diplomacy, found, however, their match in Manning. Had it not been for his indomitable will, fertility of resource, and fine diplomatic skill, the Church in England, at least if his fears and predictions had been fulfilled, would have been thrown back for a whole generation; for not three years later, on Wiseman's death, Errington by right of succession would—and not Manning—have become the second Archbishop of Westminster. What a narrow escape! For good as he was, heroic in his patience and submission, yet Archbishop Errington at the best would have made but a sorry substitute for Manning. No lesser man would have been in place as Wiseman's successor. The strife which ended so unexpectedly, at least to most men, in Manning's favour, had Cardinal Wiseman been left to his own devices, would have died a natural death, for he was either too inert, as Manning asserted, or too magnanimous, or too just, to have struck down his Coadjutor with his own hand. The voice, indeed, which complained at the Vatican was the voice of Wiseman, but the hand which struck the fatal blow was the hand of Manning. Eye-witnesses of the event still attest that there would have been no Errington Case at all had it not been for Manning.[1] It was wholly and solely the work

[1] The late Canon Morris, who had been Cardinal Wiseman's private secretary for two or three years, and had acted in a like capacity for a time to Archbishop Manning, said to me, "Your statement is the simple truth; had it not been for Manning there would have been no Errington Case."

of his hands. Had it not been for him the rule of the Church in England for a generation would have fallen into the hands of—what in his heart he believed it to be—the Anti-Roman and Anti-Papal party. Men may agree fully and heartily with Manning's aims and ends without always or altogether approving of his modes or methods of action.

If the victory at the Vatican over Archbishop Errington was Manning's first diplomatic triumph on a large field, it was, as the annals of his combative and turbulent life show, by no means the last. Indeed, the dragon's teeth—the seed of future fight—were sown in a rich soil on the day of Errington's defeat. Not three years later a still fiercer battle, with wider issues, was fought over again by the same hosts on either side, on virtually a like issue—the succession to Wiseman in the See of Westminster. The throne of an Episcopal See—not to speak of the Chair of Peter—is oftener exposed to wars of succession—though happily fought with bloodless weapons—even than the thrones of kings.

In the correspondence between Manning and Cardinal Wiseman on the one hand, and between Mgr. Talbot and Manning on the other, are related the dissensions and disputes between the Bishops and Chapter of Westminster on the one side, and Cardinal Wiseman and Manning on the other, which beset the closing years of the Cardinal's life. Manning even declared that the attacks of the Chapter of Westminster broke down Cardinal Wiseman's health.

Over this correspondence the Errington Case hangs like a dark cloud. It is always coming and going; lifting or falling. Whatever subject is discussed in these letters, an allusion of some kind or other—often with more than a touch of personal bitterness—is sure to be made to it in passing. Manning did not like to put down on paper what he had to say about Dr. Errington; it was a subject he preferred discussing as a rule by word of mouth with Mgr. Talbot at the Vatican. Since the case was unformulated against Dr. Errington it was a subject rather for diplomatic discussion than for written statements or definite accusations.

The following Letters or Extracts show more effectually than any outside description could do the principles on

which Manning acted, the effective part he took in the struggle, both by counsel and act, as well as the influence which his testimony exerted at the Vatican. Moreover, they exhibit, in a form the most authentic and graphic in detail, the strained relations which existed at the time of the "Errington crisis" between himself and Dr. Errington, as well as the other Bishops, and the Chapter of Westminster especially, as personified in Mgr. Searle. As Wiseman's friend and defender: as the opponent on principle, as I have already shown, of Dr. Errington, it was Manning's duty to baffle or expose the determined efforts made to undermine Wiseman's position both in Rome and in England, or to involve him, as Mgr. Searle was accused of doing, in fresh disputes with his suffragan bishops. From this duty, imposed upon him by principle, as well as by friendship, Manning never flinched. The most striking element, perhaps, in his character, which the Errington crisis in those years of turmoil and conflict brought out into the fullest light was tenacity of purpose. In the firm conviction that in opposing Dr. Errington he was fighting for God's cause, his courage never failed. He was ready to incur any risk in the discharge of duty; and none, on the other hand, were more persuaded than Manning that, if the Errington or Opposition party triumphed, he would find scant mercy. In such a contingency, as he stated in one of his letters to Mgr. Talbot, "some of the best men would have to leave the diocese." Or, as Mgr. Talbot more bluntly expressed it, if Errington gains the day, "*Povero voi* and the Oblates of St. Charles."

EXTRACTS FROM A LETTER FROM MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

ST. MARY'S, BAYSWATER, 18*th August* 1859.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR TALBOT—. . . . The chief matter I wish to mention is, that ——— has written his impression of what is passing at Propaganda, to the effect that it (Propaganda) will support Dr. Errington, and that some umbrage is taken there on the subject. He does not mention his authority, but by the rule *Benedictinus ad Benedictinum*, I suspect it transpires through Dr. Smith; but I have no evidence.

Dr. Errington, I hear, is delaying his visit to Rome; and

my expectation is that he will resist to the last. I expect that when he goes to Rome he will make a defence by examining the Cardinal's administration, and much more besides. It will become then just and necessary that the Cardinal should speak for himself with equal fulness and on the spot. This I foresaw last winter; and nothing else I believe will enable Propaganda to estimate at their just rate the representations which I feel sure are poured in from here,—chiefly, I believe, by Dr. Grant.

I sent a letter cut from the *Morning Star*, because it is detestable, and will show which way things are going here.

It is by an "Old Catholic," from the internal evidence, and it appreciates truly the line taken by the Cardinal and "the Converts," which is simply to uphold the Holy See.

I wish I could think this an isolated case. I am resolved not to speak on the subject unless forced, and then I will simply narrate a series of facts which have come to my knowledge as to the state of practice and faith among them, both priests and people, who claim to be "Old Catholics." I look upon them as one of the greatest evils in England, and if it gain head I believe the Church, as far as it can be, will be paralysed in the very moment of its growth and expansion. It is the old story—the division of Catholics in Ireland in Panzani's time; and in England, ever since the Reformation, it has been one main cause of the depression and defeat of the Church in every movement of revival.—Believe me always affectionately yours,

H. E. MANNING.

ST. MARY'S, BAYSWATER, 17*th September* 1859.

. . . We are in a crisis in which, if the spirit represented by Dr. Errington, Dr. Grant, and Searle prevail, the work of the Church in England will be done by the Religious, and the secular clergy will, for a generation to come, lose ground in all the points most essential for their action upon the people in England. They will continue to administer the sacraments to the almost exclusively Irish population now in England, but the work and mission of the Church as contemplated by the Holy Father in the Hierarchy, and as demanded by the state of England, and I will say by the manifest will of God shown in His providential acts, will be thrown back for a whole generation.—Believe me always yours very sincerely, H. E. MANNING.

MGR. TALBOT TO MANNING.

ST. EUSEBIO, 12*th June* 1859.

MY DEAR PROVOST MANNING—. . . . I have written to the Cardinal to urge him to write a firm and strong letter to

Cardinal Barnabò, protesting against the intrusion of Dr. Grant and the other bishops in England in this affair. Few of the bishops in England like the Cardinal, and they would be glad to get rid of him.

Dr. Grant, the Bishop of Southwark, has written in the name of some of them to Cardinal Barnabò to beg the Holy Father not to remove Dr. Errington. This embarrasses the Pope, although he is firm in his intention to remove him. A strong letter from Cardinal Wiseman to Barnabò stating that, as he has written to the Holy Father himself, he protests against the intrusion of the bishop, will settle the matter.

Pray urge the Cardinal to do so, as it is a matter of the greatest importance for the greater glory of God, the exaltation of the Church, and the salvation of souls.

You may be certain that most of the English bishops would be delighted if Cardinal Wiseman was out of the way. At least so they would at first; but when he had left them they would feel his loss, because no one but he is capable of governing the Church in England in its present state of transition.

I have nothing more to say, but that Dr. Errington has been invited to Rome, as he wishes to justify himself. As you say, who has accused him? I have not made any accusation against him to the Pope or Propaganda. The worst thing I have done has been to tell Mgr. Searle in a private letter that my opinion is that he is radically anti-Roman and retrograde in his policy. I have explained the meaning of anti-Roman in the way always understood here, namely, that he has not that *generous, indulgent* spirit in administrating the diocese which is characteristic of Rome. Nevertheless, he says he has been defamed and calumniated.—Adieu, believe me very sincerely yours,

GEO. TALBOT.

EXTRACTS FROM A LETTER FROM MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

BAYSWATER, 14*th September* 1860.

. . . Dr. Errington has been to St. George's (Southwark), and to Liverpool, and is now, I believe, in Dublin. He says that he does not know what he is accused of, which is like talking a horse blind. He said, I hear, to Frederick Rymer,[1] "I am Hoored. The faction was too strong for me." Dr. Brown, Bishop of Newport, said that there was not a bishop in England

[1] The Rev. Frederick Rymer, D.D., is a most zealous and learned priest, who in Cardinal Wiseman's time was Prefect of Studies at St. Edmund's College, and, at a later period, in succession to Dr. Weathers, President of the College until 1870, when St. Edmund's was reorganised by Archbishop Manning.

who would not be glad that they were not to have Dr. Errington as their Metropolitan. . . . So long as the Cardinal lives I do not anticipate any great attempt to make a reaction; but if he were taken away, I think you and I, and those who have stood together in this contest, will have to look about us. It is of the first importance that we should be foresighted, and that we should keep the Propaganda fully informed of everything. It will be of vital importance that there should always be in Rome some one to do the work you do now. Humanly speaking, those whom God has brought into the Church would have been mistrusted, and suspected, and misrepresented for a generation to come if you had not been upon the spot. All this is very sad. Thank God the Protestants do not know that half our time and strength is wasted in contests *inter domesticos fidei*. We have two great antagonists: the Protestant Association of Bayswater and the Chapter of Westminster. This is very grievous and must displease God.—Believe me always very sincerely yours,

H. E. MANNING.

MGR. TALBOT TO MANNING.

VATICAN, 13*th December* 1860.

MY DEAREST MONSIGNOR—. . . . I agree with you more and more, and see that until the old generation of bishops and priests is removed—to Heaven I hope, because they are good men—no great progress of religion can be expected in England.

I have watched the religious movement which exists there for twenty years, and now that I can calmly and coolly look back to what has taken place, I can see how the older progress in piety, in Roman spirit, in conversions, etc., has been in spite of the rulers of the Church, and the priests who used to be looked upon as oracles. With the exception of Cardinal Wiseman, who has been the great instrument in the hand of God to help the movement, there is not an improvement in the spirit of the Church which was not opposed, and the motive which caused the opposition certainly has not been zeal for the greater glory of God and the salvation of souls. No, it has been *prejudice, jealousy!* The priests in England, and the bishops too, are good men, but *prejudice* and *jealousy* are the failings of good men; all the religious Orders have them in a high degree. Adieu, my dear Monsignor Manning.—Believe me very sincerely yours,

GEORGE TALBOT.

In 1861 Cardinal Wiseman's illness gave grave cause for alarm—all the more distressing to Manning because as yet Dr. Errington had not resigned his right of suc-

cession to Westminster. As long as the question remained unsettled the hopes of the Opposition party were kept alive. Manning, as sentinel on the watch-tower, kept a vigilant outlook, and reported to Mgr. Talbot at the Vatican the movements or manœuvres of the enemy.

EXTRACTS FROM A LETTER OF MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

BAYSWATER, 1*st February* 1861.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR TALBOT—. . . . The Cardinal, thank God, is getting over the attack, and the serious symptom of inflammation is giving way. To-morrow he goes to Leyton. . . . Still I cannot help seeing that he is at a lower point than before, and he seems to acquiesce in a state of inaction more than I have seen before in former illnesses.

It is impossible not to be anxious about him.

Next, as to the newspapers. I do not attach much importance to any of the paragraphs, except to the two last—one in the *Daily News* about Dr. Grant, and the other in the *Chronicle* commenting upon it. These two show that some of our own, and, I fear, some priest or priests, must have forgotten themselves.

One thing is certain, that the Southwark people are busy; and I am told that Searle has been often there during the time he has been at Leyton, and that without letting the Cardinal know that he was in London. Also, I hear that Dr. Grant has set his nuns to pray that he may not be removed to Beverley.

I am only desirous, first, that all this should be known to Propaganda, and next, that no more than its real importance should be given to it.

I suspect that communications have been made to Propaganda in the sense of exaggeration and alarm, as last year, when we heard of the *Otto Vescovi*, etc.

And I daresay they are encouraged by the Cardinal's state of health and inactivity.

But there is no importance in all this, unless they can succeed in frightening Bò, and I hope you will keep him well informed.

One or two of our best laymen have spoken to me about all this with great regret and full sympathy with the Cardinal.

One thing is certain: all attacks from within and without fall on him, for nobody else is big enough to be assailed. This, too, ought to be well understood by Bò. . . .

The Chapter is quiet.—Believe me, my dear Mgr. Talbot, yours very faithfully, H. E. MANNING.

Manning was by nature quick of temper, and in his

Anglican days, as we have seen, strove hard by prayer and penance to suppress outbursts of natural irritability. In these days of constant stress and strain on his mind, is it to be wondered at that, at times, he spoke out his mind? Provoked beyond endurance by Mgr. Searle's persistent opposition, by his overbearing manners, and by a suspicion that he was playing false to Cardinal Wiseman, Manning came, as the following letter shows, into collision with Mgr. Searle. And Searle was not the man to turn his cheek to the smiter:—

EXTRACTS FROM A LETTER OF MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

BAYSWATER, 21*st March* 1861.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR TALBOT—I am thankful to be able to send you a better account of the Cardinal. I saw him to-day at Leyton. He got out in a garden chair, and on St. Joseph's Day he said mass for the first time since Christmas.

While I was there Mgr. Searle provoked a collision, which will give you a sample of what is passing.

Three months ago Dr. Ullathorne wrote to me twice, and came to me once, saying that the Cardinal was reviving the old question about the Funds of the Midland District,[1] and claiming money as due to him, and he, Dr. Ullathorne, intended to refer the case to Propaganda.

I immediately saw that such a course would be most injurious to the Cardinal, both here and in Rome, for reasons both you and I know, and I felt convinced that it was not the Cardinal's doing.

On the first opportunity I asked him. He disclaimed all such intention, and said that nothing would induce him to revive the old variances.

It seemed that I was right. . . . The disclaimer of the Cardinal through me was then written to Searle. . . .

He began upon it very curtly to-day. I said that I believed that I had accurately repeated the Cardinal's words. This he denied. I then said that the Cardinal ought to be the interpreter of his own meaning, and if he said I was inaccurate I should at once say that I was mistaken.

He then began by saying that my writing to Dr. Ullathorne

[1] Before the establishment of the Hierarchy, Dr. Wiseman had been Coadjutor Bishop of the Midland District, afterwards included in the diocese of Birmingham, of which Dr. Ullathorne was appointed Bishop.

was not "straightforward." . . . I then felt that he had passed his limits; and I told him that I had for two years considered his conduct in circumventing and undermining me, both in the Chapter and out of it, as not straightforward.

He then said I ought to have spoken first to him. I answered that I owed him no relations: that I had a duty to the Cardinal and none to him.

He then asked whether I considered that I had a right to judge of questions between bishops. I said, certainly, if one is my own, whom I see being compromised in a way to do him great harm, and if the other brings the case to me. This is a sample of what we said, with much heat I believe on both sides —certainly on mine, for I was very angry at the whole affair.

I found afterwards from the Cardinal that I had with perfect accuracy reported his words: that he fully saw the danger of reviving such a discussion here and in Rome, and that he would rather give up everything than allow it to be revived.

Now, I told the Cardinal openly that I had been very angry and had spoken with great warmth. And I could see in the way he listened that he was not sorry for it.

I must, therefore, express what I have long felt, and for distinct reasons known to me, that Searle assumes too much, and that in the weakened state of the Cardinal's health and nerves he is overborne by Searle's assumption. This has been already said to me by a layman and professional attendant of the Cardinal's, a friend of Searle's, but a man of delicate feeling and sense of what is due to the Cardinal. But this you will kindly not quote.

Now, I have written this because it is well you should see how things are. Here is the Cardinal liable to be involved in a controversy with one of his suffragans about money and an old feud, and to be delated once more to Rome.

I see no cure to this but the putting some restraint upon Mgr. Searle. These *pettigolezzi* would be miserable enough, if they were not so mischievous.

The Cardinal is very nervous and dreads other contentions impending over him, which Dr. Munk says will certainly kill him. . . .

Since I wrote thus far I have had a conversation with one of the Cardinal's oldest and best friends—a layman—who has confirmed all I have said of Searle. It is my deliberate judgment that Searle's rude and overbearing manners have intimidated the Cardinal; and that his state of nervous depression puts him more than ever in his power.

I feel, too, that the funds and trusts of the diocese ought to

be known to some two new persons—otherwise Searle will be left in sole possession, and the Cardinal's successor will be in a false position.

But I see no hope of the Cardinal's initiating any such measure. He would do anything which is recommended by Rome; but he shrinks from any new step in everything. I write this the more strongly because I find laymen and persons who have always been on terms of kindness with Searle holding all the same judgments as myself. I wish I could see you, and I would come to Rome, but I do not like to leave the Cardinal, and he evidently does not like my leaving him; and in truth I wish to be on the spot to keep things straight, for if anything happens I am resolved to carry it through. I will not allow anything which is contrary to the Cardinal's will or peace.—Believe me always yours very sincerely, H. E. MANNING.

On the margin of the above letter, in confirmation of the statements it contains in regard to Mgr. Searle, the following note appears :—

MY DEAR TALBOT—Manning has read me this letter. I endorse *every word* of it, so far as my knowledge enables me. I think Searle's conduct is and has been for years a bane and a misfortune to his master, but how this can be checked is another question.—Yours very affectionately, J. L. PATTERSON.[1]

These strained relations between Manning, Provost of the Chapter, and Canon Searle were not of recent growth, for they dated from the Petition addressed in 1858 to the Holy See by the Chapter for the removal of the Oblates from St. Edmund's College. In Searle's whole course of action, both against the Oblates and the Cardinal, as well as in his active support of Dr. Errington, Manning saw the work of an enemy, fatal, as he firmly believed, to the highest interests of the Church in England. In a letter dated three months earlier than the one I have just quoted, Manning said—

There are numerous mischiefs I fear for the future in such men as Searle, whose conduct is such that I should remove him at once from any place in which I had to do with him. I wonder at the Cardinal's forbearance. Searle's manner to him

[1] Now the Right Rev. Monsignor Patterson, Bishop of Emmaus.

is so rude and off-hand that people speak of it. And he is jealous of everybody. I am afraid the Cardinal will take no step; and as his health lingers on, his disposition to act grows less.

The removal of the Oblates from St. Edmund's College, which Dr. Errington as coadjutor bishop had demanded, and which Mgr. Searle had worked for in the Chapter, did not make, as Mgr. Talbot reported to Manning, a favourable impression on Propaganda, because they look upon it as a kind of justification of the accusations made by Dr. Errington.

In reply to this observation, Manning, in a letter dated August 1861, wrote as follows:—

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR TALBOT—. . . . I see what you say about the apparent justification of Dr. Errington. However, it is one thing to go out of St. Edmund's for his reasons, and another to yield to the wishes of more friendly persons.[1]

But I have much to say which I do not like to write. We are in a very uncertain and unsteady condition. There is an inertness in the will which was the mainspring, which puts everything in risk; and I see a return of the old way in many things.[2]

I hope, however, to tell you all these things; for your letters and the need of taking a time of rest have decided me to be in Rome after St. Charles's Day.

On his arrival in Rome, Manning soon discovered that an attempt was being made by Dr. Ullathorne, acting on behalf of the other bishops, to restore Dr. Errington to the Episcopate in England. Cardinal Barnabò had espoused the cause of Dr. Ullathorne, and the Pope even was disposed to accede to the appeal of the bishops.

Manning at once perceived that such a restoration would be a virtual triumph of the Opposition party, and undo the effects of Dr. Errington's removal from Westminster, obtained with such difficulty in 1860. In this

[1] Manning removed the Oblates from St. Edmund's College in 1861, in obedience to Cardinal Wiseman's desire. Before the decision against Manning and the Oblates was pronounced, the Cardinal received a friendly warning from Propaganda not to appeal to the Pope on their behalf. The removal of Dr. Errington had been a stretch of Papal authority which would not be repeated.

[2] On many previous occasions, in letters to Mgr. Talbot, Manning had lamented the inertness of will produced in Cardinal Wiseman by illness, and his growing reluctance to take action in any matters which might involve him in fresh troubles or disputes.

emergency Dr. Manning made the following urgent appeal to Cardinal Wiseman :—

MANNING TO CARDINAL WISEMAN.

ROME, 13*th December* 1861.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—Cardinal Barnabò last night read to me a part of a letter from Dr. Grant, stating that he had received from your Eminence a payment from the Mensa. Cardinal Barnabò had in the morning read it to the Holy Father, who was much pleased.

He then opened a subject of some importance. He said that Dr. Ullathorne had spoken to him on the subject of the restoration of Dr. Errington. Cardinal Barnabò answered that he had never thought him fit for Westminster, and had always opposed the appointment. Dr. Ullathorne said he did not speak of his restoration to Westminster but to some other See in England. He then asked Cardinal Barnabò if he would lay it before the Holy Father. Cardinal Barnabò said that, considering the past, it was difficult to propose it to the Holy Father, but, as Cardinal Barnabò said to me (to tranquillise the bishop), he consented to do so. Yesterday morning in his audience he opened the subject. The Holy Father answered very strongly, "*Non lo voglio per Westminster*," "*non e capace per quel posto*," etc. Cardinal Barnabò then said, "But for some other See." The Holy Father answered, "That alters the question"; and seemed disposed to entertain the idea.

Now it seems to me that your Eminence ought to know these facts.

It appears to me that at some future day Dr. Errington's return to the Episcopate would be a question very different from what it is now.

At this moment it would appear to be a reversal of the Holy Father's judgment in everything but form.

It would seem to be the reaction of the bishops against your last visit here, and against yourself.

It would give a head and an impulse both in England and in the Episcopate to that which you have endeavoured to temper or to withstand.

It would seem to convey the approval of the Holy See upon a course of administration which, if I know anything of England, would hinder the work of the Church, both in itself and upon the English people more than anything but scandals; and if I know anything of Rome, would not be what they desire or intend.

But your Eminence sees all this far better than I do. As to

Dr. Errington, I wish to see him treated with all respect due to a man who is personally good and upright; and if hereafter, where no danger would result, he were replaced in some position I should see it with satisfaction, but at this time when the whole conflict is still under arms, and everything gained still precarious and at stake, and your work not consolidated, and in many ways already affected by reaction, and the old party (*sit venia verbo*) not only biding their time, but exulting in the hope of change, and in their supposed gains in the diocese, and the bishops sending a *procura* to Rome avowedly against your Eminence, I should look on any replacing of Dr. Errington not as the restoration of a person but as the reversal of a whole line of action, and the consolidation of its opposite.

If this is your Eminence's judgment I think no time should be lost in conveying to the Holy Father your hope that some day Dr. Errington may again be employed, but not for all these and other reasons at the present, nor till after a lapse of time sufficient to avert grave and moral effects adverse to the original motives of the Holy Father's judgment in this case. It is also an anti-Roman and *anti-papal* movement.

I strongly suspect that Dr. Grant has been writing on this subject to Dr. Ullathorne.

Dr. Roskell has written to me, saying that his signature to the *Procura* was not as against you, but only for direction, and that he objected to the Deputation.

I told Cardinal Barnabò last night, and showed him that, deducting Dr. Roskell, Hexham, and Beverley vacant, the *tuttii vescovi* are reduced again to the *otto vescovi;* and moreover now the defection of Dr. Ullathorne on the colleges, for he has fully adopted the other view, and admitted that he went wrong, of which Barnabò said, "*Ma questo e molto per lui.*" I must say, however, for Dr. Ullathorne, that he is very kindly and friendly, and not disposed, so far as I ever hear, to aggravate the difficulties of the case. I shall read this letter over to Talbot before I post it.—Believe me, my dear Lord Cardinal, your affectionate servant,

H. E. MANNING.

In the meanwhile Manning brought all his persuasive influence to bear on Dr. Ullathorne, and not without success, as the following letter, dated Rome, 16th Dec. 1861, shows:

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—. . . . On the subject of Dr. Errington, it will be best not to take any step till I can write to you again.

I have fully informed Mgr. Talbot, and I have had a long

conversation with Dr. Ullathorne. I find that he had no idea or desire to promote any steps on the subject, nor has any thought of Dr. Errington's restoration at this, or any time except a distant one. He spoke on the subject because some of the bishops had desired it, and did not intend Cardinal Barnabò to take the matter up so practically, and will, I think, take care to counteract what he has done.

I think, therefore, it will be best to let him act without any expression from you; but I would ask you to write, if you approve it, a letter addressed to Cardinal Barnabò, but *to send it to me*, to be used if there should be need: and to give me permission to communicate a copy of it to the Holy Father.

My last letters will, I hope, have relieved you of much anxiety. I think the decision of the Trust questions will be in a form to uphold what you have done. And on the personal part of the subject a great change and mitigation has taken place. I have had full and open conversations with Dr. U., and I think he understands many things of which before he had no explanation, and the state of his feeling to you is kindly. He has told me the line he has taken in many things which relate to your Eminence, and I think he has acted fairly and in a friendly way.—Believe me, my dear Lord Cardinal, your affectionate servant, H. E. MANNING.

In the spring of 1862 Bishop Grant of Southwark joined Bishop Ullathorne and other supporters of Dr. Errington in Rome, to plead his cause before Propaganda. Cardinal Wiseman, in answer to Manning's appeals, came to Rome in his aid in order to prevent "the great danger of permanent division in the Episcopate and permanent opposition."[1]

There was a rallying of hosts on either side for the final battle. The last week in May to the second week in June was a period of supreme tension and excitement. A new compromise was offered to the effect that if Dr. Errington was appointed to an English See, he should of his own accord relinquish his rights of succession to Westminster. The compromise was refused. Again Dr. Errington was earnestly besought for the sake of peace and the public good to accept the Archbishopric of Port of Spain, Trinidad. With Dr. Errington's resolute and reiterated refusal, approved of by Bishop Ullathorne and Bishop Grant, the negotiations were broken off, and Pope Pius IX., as I have already stated,

[1] See letter, Dr. Manning to Cardinal Wiseman, dated Rome, Jan. 17, 1862.

took the decision into his own hands. Dr. Errington's loyal submission to the Pope's command brought the fierce struggle to a dramatic close.

Mgr. Talbot fittingly, in his character as chronicler, in a letter to Manning, dated Castel Gondolfo, 18th July 1862, speaks of the triumph of the one side and the rout of the other as follows:—

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR MANNING—There is no doubt that we enabled Cardinal Wiseman to gain a great triumph in Rome; but I hope he will make proper use of it. I hope he will not boast of it, so that what he says should get to the ears of the other bishops.

I shall never forget their look after their last audience, in which the Pope gave them a severe lesson. Dr. Ullathorne was very bitter after it, and so was Grant. They both received a solemn rebuke to meditate upon. . . .—Very sincerely yours,

GEO. TALBOT.

In justice to the memory of Archbishop Errington, whose conduct was somewhat roughly handled in the heat of the battle, it is only fair to show the estimate of his work and character formed by his friends and supporters. The esteem in which he was held was expressed in an Address which conveyed the views not only of the Chapter of Westminster, but of many of the other clergy of the diocese. It was drawn up in the critical year 1859, when the coadjutor was absent in Rome carrying on his suit against Cardinal Wiseman before the tribunals of Propaganda. Out of prudential motives the Address was not actually presented to Archbishop Errington. Nevertheless, as a testimony and a tribute of esteem and reverence it answers the purpose I have in view.

The Address is as follows:—

To His Grace the Most Rev. GEORGE ERRINGTON, Archbishop of Trebizond.

WE, the undersigned secular clergy of the diocese of Westminster, feel it our duty to address your Grace under the trying circumstances in which you are placed. In doing so we are most anxious to disclaim any factious motive, and to avoid expressing any opinion on the subjects which have unfortunately

caused so much dissension in the diocese. Our only motive in presenting you with this memorial is to express our sympathy with you in your trials, and to satisfy you that a large portion of the Westminster clergy in no way concur in the imputations that are reported to have been made against you. In acting thus we feel that we are only discharging a duty which we owe to the cause of truth, and are offering you the tribute of that high esteem to which your conduct towards us as our Episcopal Superior has justly entitled you.

I. It has, we understand, been alleged against your Grace that the Visitation of the diocese which you made during the years 1857 and 1858 was conducted with little regard for the feelings of the clergy. With regard to this imputation (1) we feel it should ever be borne in mind that it was not to be expected that any one could accomplish the arduous task committed to you without occasioning considerable dissatisfaction, considering that no Visitation had been made for many years, and that, in the meantime, each priest had been left almost to his own discretion in the conducting of his mission; (2) we bear testimony that during the Visitation we never experienced anything from you but the greatest condescension and most marked kindness. On all occasions you showed yourself willing to listen to our representations and to assist us in our difficulties.

II. In your conduct as our Episcopal Superior we bear a most willing testimony to the paternal interest you have always manifested towards us. At all times and in all places we have met with a most gracious reception. However intricate the affairs that brought us to you, we were always sure of a patient hearing, and were always assisted by your learning and advice; and, what was oftentimes of more consequence to us, we felt that in you we had a Superior who interested himself about us and sympathised with us in all our difficulties. You have been in the midst of us as one of ourselves, and the youngest and most unimportant priest felt that he was as sure of being received and assisted by you as the most distinguished by dignity, position, or learning.

III. Finally, we cannot forego this opportunity of expressing to you our sincere admiration of the zeal, energy, and singleness of purpose with which you have devoted yourself to the arduous duties of your ministry. For many months we have seen you, forgetful almost of your Episcopal rank, supplying the place of an ordinary priest in one of the poorest missions of London, catechising and confessing the poorest. Day by day we have witnessed your indefatigable exertions, acquainting yourself with the state of our various missions, penetrating into the courts and

alleys, visiting and ministering to the poor in their wretched hovels. Nor was this all: when the day had been spent in labours such as would tax to the full the strength of an ordinary priest, you still had vigour and zeal to devote to the cause of God and His Church, for the exact and clear arrangement of the notes you had made on your Visitation prove that a considerable part of the night must have been devoted to labour.

Having thus given expression to the sentiments we entertain towards your Grace, and borne most willing testimony to your virtues and worth, we beg to subscribe ourselves your Grace's most respectful and devoted servants.

On his return to England, after Dr. Errington's resignation, in a letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated Bayswater, 17th August 1862, Manning wrote as follows:—

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR TALBOT—. . . . The rumours here about Dr. Errington are, that he is not removed; that he cannot be; that he is to be absent only for the Cardinal's life; that the Canon Law would be violated by his removal. That is from Dr. Grant—that he has been unjustly treated, etc. But the decree is becoming known, and all these impostures will soon be gone. I am told that Searle speaks of the Cardinal in an unpardonable way; that he and C. D. express themselves to be "bystanders" and indifferent in the matter, and such like. Meanwhile all the working priests are full of thankfulness, and the laity also. I believe that the old party will be dissolved within a year. . . .

We had a tremendous campaign together—the last, I hope, I shall ever have. But I see such vast good already from it that I would willingly go through it again. I was very glad to see so much of you, and I feel that we came to understand each other. Until the last two years we did not do so, as I hope we do now, and always shall. . . .—Believe me always yours very sincerely,

H. E. MANNING.

In a letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated Bayswater, 24th August 1862, Manning reported that—

There is no excitement about Dr. Errington. I hear that even Oakeley thinks it best that he should be removed. The whole affair has fallen dead, and I believe in a short time will be forgotten.[1]

[1] Dr. Manning was too sanguine in his belief. The wish was father to the thought. Dr. Errington, as subsequent events amply prove, was not forgotten, nor his removal forgiven.

CHAPTER VI

BEFORE THE TRIBUNALS OF PROPAGANDA

1858–62

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN MANNING, CARDINAL WISEMAN, AND MGR. TALBOT

BESIDES the Errington Case the complaints brought before the Tribunals of Propaganda were:—

I. The Chapter of Westminster's complaint against the work of the Oblates of St. Charles at St. Edmund's College Seminary. In this dispute between the Chapter and Manning, Cardinal Wiseman became involved. Dr. Errington, the Coadjutor, and Bishop Grant of Southwark, who had students from his diocese at the joint seminary, objected to the presence of Oblates as a distinct and separate body exercising authority in the College. Dr. Errington likewise raised objections to W. G. Ward teaching as a layman dogmatic theology.

II. Cardinal Wiseman's charges against the Chapter of Westminster.

III. The registration of charitable and ecclesiastical funds.

IV. The Colleges and the Ushaw Case.

V. Allegations by the bishops against Cardinal Wiseman.

The Propaganda in its wisdom is slow in its procedure. But it does its work thoroughly: every complaint or charge is examined in all its bearings. Before issuing a decree or decision the cardinals of the Congregation of Propaganda seek to discover a means of conciliation or compromise between the parties to the dispute.

In the case of the charges brought by Dr. Errington, the Coadjutor Bishop, and the Chapter of Westminster, and Bishop Grant of Southwark, against the establishment of the Oblates of St. Charles, a religious community in the diocesan seminary of St. Edmund's, Propaganda decided in favour of the Chapter and Bishops, and ordered the removal of the Oblates from the seminary.

Cardinal Wiseman's charges against the Chapter of Westminster that they had exceeded their powers in discussing the acts of the bishop in the administration of the diocese and in withholding from his inspection the entire Capitular Book, were decided in his favour by a decree of Propaganda. This decision, which was not pronounced until 1863, was conveyed to the Chapter (in reply to two questions addressed to the Holy Office) in the following letter to the Very Rev. Provost Manning by Mgr. Rinaldini, one of the secretaries or officials of Propaganda:—

Before making any answer to the *Supplicas* of the Chapter of Westminster, dated 3rd December 1858, I have thought it right to wait until the *S. Congregatio de Propagatione Fidei* should have examined and decided on the question of the Colleges in England.

This and no other cause has been the reason of the delays, and I hope the delay may have had its advantages.

I now proceed briefly to reply to the two questions proposed to me:—

1. As to the right of Chapters to present petitions to the bishop of the diocese: it is clear that the filial and paternal charity which must subsist between the bishop and his canons will always ensure a sufficient freedom of communication to enable them to make known their mind to their ecclesiastical head on all subjects on which it is their duty to speak.

But this does not in any way invest the Chapter with any right in office to examine or to discuss any matters relating to the diocese or its administration, much less to initiate any discussion or examination of any acts of the bishop in his administration. It is for the bishop to signify to the Chapter when he desires their counsel. And there are laid down in the Pontifical Law certain matters in which the bishop is required to obtain the counsel *audire tenetur sed non sequi*, and some in which he is bound also to obtain the consent of the Chapter. It rests upon the bishop not upon the Chapter to conform himself to this prescription.

But after a full, accurate, and prolonged examination of the particular subject examined and discussed by the Chapter of Westminster, I am bound to declare my opinion that in so doing they exceeded their competence; and that the subject matter is one which, by the Pontifical Law, does not require the consent or even the counsel of the Chapter, but is strictly within the limits of the Episcopal administration alone. I feel sure that the canons of Westminster had no intention to infringe the administration or jurisdiction of their archbishop, and I can easily understand how the novelty of their position and of the Hierarchy in England may give rise to errors of judgment; but I cannot conceal from them that any such acts of Chapter beyond their competence are exorbitant, and cannot fail to produce the gravest evils to the Church in all countries, and I must add most of all in England.

While I respect the motives with which I believe they were animated, I cannot but cordially regret the course they believed it to be their duty to pursue.

2. As to the other question respecting the obligation of the Chapter to exhibit the Capitular book, I have to reply that it has been decided by the Sacred Congregation in previous cases that the bishop being *intra civitatem* may require not extracts only but the entire Capitular book to be exhibited to him at his residence; and that in his canonical visit he may require the archives to be open to him, it being his duty to see *ne quid fiat a capitulo contra jus.*

I am therefore bound to add that the Cardinal Archbishop, both in recalling the Chapter within the limits of their competence, and in requiring not only extracts of the capitular book, but the book itself to be delivered to him, has acted strictly within his right and his duty.

Trusting that this answer will produce peace and reconciliation, and will serve as a normal rule to the Chapter of Westminster and to the other Chapters, so as to avert the recurrence of any like painful divergence in the future, I am, etc.,

ACHILLE RINALDINI.

The Commission appointed by Parliament in 1860 to inquire into the state of the law in regard to Charitable Trusts, decided on the registration of all charitable trusts. A law to that effect was passed. Such a law affected Catholic interests very injuriously; for if their charitable trusts and ecclesiastical funds were registered they would, on their disclosure, be liable to confiscation under the

Mortmain Act. Cardinal Wiseman, regarding the law as penal in its consequences, refused by a spontaneous act to disclose the charitable trusts. Dr. Errington and other bishops insisted on registration of the trust funds. The matter was referred to Rome for decision, and Manning acted in an official capacity on Wiseman's behalf.

In August 1862 Propaganda decided in conformity with Wiseman's contention, that in all cases where the trust property would be placed in jeopardy by registration the charitable trusts were not to be registered; and instructions to that effect were sent to the bishops.

In regard to the College of Ushaw, and the other colleges, Cardinal Wiseman claimed, as Apostolic Visitor, the right to visit and inspect the colleges; but the bishops demurred to the exercise of this right on the ground that the colleges were Diocesan Seminaries, and therefore under the sole and exclusive rule of the bishop in whose diocese they were located; or if they were joint seminaries for the training of divines or ecclesiastical students from more than one diocese, the bishops concerned had the sole right of supervision. A *Ponenza* or formal complaint was addressed to the Congregation of Propaganda by the bishops against Cardinal Wiseman. Dr. Ullathorne was deputed as their "Procurator" or official agent to conduct their cause before the tribunals of Propaganda. In due course Propaganda issued a decree adverse to Cardinal Wiseman's claim, declaring that diocesan seminaries were under the exclusive control of their respective bishops.

And lastly, the allegations or charges brought before Propaganda by his suffragan bishops against their Archbishop, Cardinal Wiseman, led to a formal inquiry. Wiseman deputed Manning to act as "Procurator" in his defence before the Congregation of Propaganda. The bishops sent in their *Scritturas* or formal Letters of Complaint; and after examining these documents Manning replied in a *Scrittura* or Letter of Defence. Cardinal Wiseman, on Manning's advice, also sent in a *Scrittura*.

Propaganda in the end suggested a compromise; and the Prefect, Cardinal Barnabò, prescribed terms of recon-

ciliation, according to which, on the withdrawal of their complaints and charges by the bishops, Cardinal Wiseman was to make an apology of the most ample character, and in a most demonstrative form a profession of peace and good-will towards his suffragan bishops.

The judgment of Cardinal Barnabò, Prefect of Propaganda, on the dissensions between Cardinal Wiseman and his suffragan bishops, as summarised by Manning in a report to Mgr. Talbot, is as follows:—

1. I find Cardinal Barnabò full of the old notion of the "*Scissura nell' Episcopato.*"

2. He believes that the *substance* of the difference between the Cardinal and the bishops is the contrariety of two systems and of two spirits.

3. But that this has been aggravated by accessories of a personal kind, to which he has listened, as the year before last in another case.

4. His summary of the case is—

(1) That the bishops feel the superiority of the Cardinal.

(2) That most of them having been his pupils, the Cardinal perhaps may not defer to them as much as they wish.

(3) That perhaps his superiority may be made more sensible than it need be by manner.

(4) That as nobody is free from infirmities, the Cardinal may have his.

(5) That the manners of Monsignor Searle have much contributed to the susceptibility of the bishops.

He thought that it would be most prudent for the Cardinal as soon as he arrived, to invite to him all the suffragans who may be come, and to say—

(1) That he is glad to meet them here.

(2) That he is indifferent as to the decision.

(3) That he has reason to believe that some have been displeased, he wishes to disclaim any intention to displease, and to express his regret if anything on his part should, contrary to his intentions, have had this effect.

(4) That the present movement of union from all parts of the Catholic world is an auspicious one for effacing the memory of the past and for beginning with a renewed spirit of mutual brotherly affection and confidence.

The *more generously* this is done, and the *sooner*, the better, before any communication is made by Propaganda or by the

Holy Father, as its effect will most depend upon its most perfect and evident *spontaneity*.

Cardinal Marioni and Cardinal Reisach both approve this course.

6. It will be well to see the Holy Father as soon as possible, and to say that the Cardinal is ready to wash the bishops' feet and to kiss them, and on his knees to ask forgiveness for any personal faults.

7. But that this does not touch the *substance* of the question.

8. And that the Cardinal must be supported against the effect of perpetual delations.

Before giving the correspondence which passed between Manning and Cardinal Wiseman and Mgr. Talbot in reference to the various charges or complaints brought before the highest ecclesiastical tribunal in Rome, it will be as well to summarise in a few lines Dr. Errington's charge against Manning and the Oblates, and Manning's defence.

Dr. Errington's charge, in which he was supported by Dr. Grant, the Bishop of Southwark, and by the Chapter of Westminster, was that to set up a religious community in the midst of a seminary for the training of the secular clergy was contrary to the Decrees, or Ordinances of the Council of Trent. On the other hand, Manning contended that it was one of the objects in "the Rule" of the Community of St. Charles "to direct Seminaries": that the Seminary of St. Edmund's was in a state of lax discipline: that the intellectual and spiritual training was below the proper standard: and that there was no rule of life for the students in divinity. With the concurrence of Cardinal Wiseman the Oblates of St. Charles had already done good work in improving the discipline and in raising the moral and intellectual standard of the college. And hence their removal from the seminary, as Dr. Errington demanded, would be injurious to the highest interests of the diocese.

If Dr. Errington's right of succession to the See of Westminster was, on the one hand, the primary motive of Manning's line of action in seeking to have that right annulled, the opposition of the Coadjutor to the presence and work of the Oblates in St. Edmund's College was, on the other hand, a secondary motive, if less wide in its range,

less deep in its character, yet, as touching Manning nearly as Superior of the Community, not less effective.

In the following letter, Manning gives a full and graphic description of his conflict with the Chapter:—

MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

ST. MARY'S, BAYSWATER, 3*rd December* 1858.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR TALBOT—. . . .

1. Since the month of July the Canons in Chapter have occupied themselves with an inquiry into the state of St. Edmund's, so far as the members of the Congregation are involved, and with an examination of our rule in its bearing on the diocese and the college.

2. For two sessions I resisted this, on the ground that the Chapter had no power to enter upon an examination of the administration of the bishop.

At the same time I offered to them, *extra capitularly*, copies of our Rule, and all the information and facilities they could desire or I afford.

3. They were not content, but insisted on proceeding capitularly. I then entered a written protest in the Chapter-book, and ceased to oppose.

4. They then called on me to cease to preside, on the ground that the question affected me.

This, for reasons fully stated, I declined.

The Canons then adjourned, met in private, drew up an address to the Cardinal, returned and passed it.

5. It was presented about two months ago, and the Cardinal reserved his answer till he had consulted eight or nine cardinals, archbishops, and bishops in Belgium, France, and Italy, who all alike declare that the Chapter has no competence in this matter of their petition.

6. The Cardinal then required the Chapter-book to be exhibited to him.

It was twice withheld.

7. His Eminence then presided in a Chapter, in which he read his answer, with the replies of the Cardinals, and decided to receive the address.

8. He then pointed out that the Chapter had exceeded its limits and established a highly dangerous precedent, for which reason it was his inevitable duty to cancel the proceedings either by inducing the Chapter to do so voluntarily or by a decree.

9. The Canons consulted for an hour, and replied that they could not undo what they had done; but asked for delay.

10. The Cardinal then signed a decree to annul proceedings then entered in the minute-book.

11. An extraordinary Chapter was held to-day, in which two petitions to Rome were signed and sent.

12. I was called on as Provost to sign them.

I declined on the grounds (1) that the decree of the bishop had not been obeyed; (2) nor his requisition of the books complied with; and that as the Chapter were, in my belief, in contumacy, I could not give formality to their act.

13. I was then asked to leave the chair, which I declined.

14. The petitions were then signed by Dr. Maguire, *renitente Proposito* being added.

This is a brief outline, which needs a very large supplement.

I wish only to add—

1. That the petitions and documents sent to Rome present a wholly inadequate representation of the proceedings, their antecedents, and nature.

2. That no adequate knowledge of them can be obtained without a full narrative of the state of the College, and an examination of the minutes of the Chapter.

3. That the whole is the movement of a spirit and line of ecclesiastical action opposed to that which I understand to be the will of Rome.

4. That grave and painful as these events have been, they form a crisis which is, I believe, essential to the future welfare and healthy progress of the diocese.

I have acted in this matter with great anxiety. I trust I have not exceeded my duty. It is my single desire to know and to do what the Holy See may will. And to it beforehand I submit myself in everything.

I hope you will be so kind as to communicate to Cardinal Barnabò so much as will make him wait for the full statement of the whole of this case.—Believe me, my dear Monsignor Talbot, yours very faithfully, HENRY E. MANNING.

MANNING TO FATHER WHITTY, S.J.

ST. MARY'S, BAYSWATER, 10*th December* 1858.

MY DEAR FRIEND—I write again to you, because, since I wrote, events I looked for have come.

And now the information I wished you to obtain from Butler—

(1) As to Father Vaughan and his work;[1]

(2) As to the Rule in its effect upon him and his work;

---

[1] Father Vaughan was Vice-President of St. Edmund's.

(3) As to the future of the College, if his work grows or is overthrown; information will be immediately needed.

A positive step to undo all that he has done is already made. It is so made as to reach Propaganda. And it is of the highest importance that Cardinal Barnabò should know all the *personnel* of the affair. He cannot know the state of St. Edmund's, nor the qualities of Dr. Errington. . . .

I think it therefore of great moment that you should see him personally.

F. Vaughan was your own selection:[1] and you can speak of the whole matter as no other person can, and with the obvious impartiality of one who, as a Jesuit, can have no prejudices or mistrust in the matter.

And whatever is done should be done promptly.

But before you act, see Monsignor Talbot and ask his opinion. —Believe me always yours affectionately, H. E. MANNING.

In a letter, dated Bayswater, 16th March 1859, Manning wrote to Mgr. Talbot as follows:—

The Cardinal has told you of Archbishop Errington's illness. I hardly know when anything has seemed to me more remarkable than the failure of his powers at this moment and in full work. If he were to continue there would be much difficulty hereafter on all questions, for I have reason to think that he has been active among the other bishops.

MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

ST. MARY'S, BAYSWATER, *7th September* 1859.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR TALBOT—The chief facts since I wrote are two Chapter meetings on 31st August and 1st September. In the first the decision of the bishops that the Chapter had exceeded its competence was communicated, and an address of regret voted to the Cardinal.

It was not adequate or explicit as to the matter.

In the second the Cardinal's answer was reported, but neither was this adequately nor explicitly stated.

The Cardinal, however, has prepared all his points, and will not leave any of them in ambiguity.

But it will linger on until his visit to Rome. Patterson has probably written to you before this. I cannot say that I see

---

[1] Before he joined the Society of Jesus in 1857 Father Whitty was Provost of the Chapter of Westminster.

any real change in Searle, of whose activity I am almost daily hearing some new evidence.

The others, I believe, would willingly be out of it. But they are kept up I think by Searle.

Dr. Maguire is like a good man, pugnacious by character, who has gone too far and cannot heartily and generously say so. But his mind is far better than Searle's, whom I regard as the least peaceable or excusable. . . .

EXTRACTS FROM A LETTER OF MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

ST. MARY'S, BAYSWATER, 17*th September* 1859.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR TALBOT—. . . . There has been an investigation at St. Edmund's by the Cardinal and Dr. Grant . . . . Even Dr. Grant was compelled to say that F. Vaughan (Vice-President of St. Edmund's) had been the preservation of the discipline of the College. This having happened, I went three days after to Dr. Grant, believing that he would be in a better position to judge of other matters. I said, "I am come to answer any questions you like to put respecting our work and my own acts: and I beg you to ask me because I believe that you have received the statements of those who are opposed to me, and that you have shared in the opposition." We talked for more than an hour. He used many professions of friendship and kindness; but I could get nothing from him. I came away with the full conviction that he has committed himself so far on the other side that he would not come to the point.

And I cannot clear my mind of the belief that he has been writing to Rome in this sense: and without so much as hearing anything except the representations of the Coadjutor and the Chapter.

At the end of 1859 Manning drew up a paper on the charges brought by Archbishop Errington, Bishop Grant, and the Chapter, against the work of the Oblates at St. Edmund's, and placed it in the hands of Cardinal Wiseman. In a letter dated London, 30th November 1859, Manning wrote on the subject as follows:—

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—. . . . By this post I send the paper I spoke of. I leave it in your hands. And your kindness and prudence will judge for me. It is the first time I have spoken; and I trust I have not spoken intemperately. I feel no resentment or unkindness, but a sense of wrong, and of,

I hope, a calm and increased opposition to those who have done it. I have ascribed to them no motives; and I desire nothing more than leave to lay all I have done open to any tribunal the Holy See may direct.

Thanking you for all your constant kindness—I am, my dear Lord Cardinal, your affectionate Servant, H. E. MANNING.

MGR. TALBOT TO MANNING.

VATICAN, 29*th January* 1860.

MY DEAR PROVOST—I have advisedly, and purposely, not answered your letter of 1st December, in which you make a statement giving a history of the institution of the Oblates of St. Charles in London, and you very justly show that you have been undergoing a severe persecution during the last two or three years.

I think you have perfectly justified yourself, having acted throughout with authority, and under obedience.

Therefore, as I think that your personal character is being attacked, and your whole conduct has been assailed, together with the institution itself, I have thought it expedient to send your letter to Cardinal Barnabò, the Prefect of Propaganda, and by him to have it translated into Italian for his own use.

I did so, because you said in it that I might make whatever use I thought proper of it, and until now I have only kept it as my guide, in order to answer any accusation made against you.

You have, however, had a very powerful defender in Cardinal Wiseman, who is advocating your case, although he has to contend against a heartless and ungenerous antagonist.

I have no doubt that all will end well, but nevertheless, in the meantime, we have always much anxiety before an affair of such importance as the present is settled.

Rome is properly called the Eternal City, because they never decide a question before they have heard all the *pros* and *cons*, which sometimes occupies much time. There is no place in the world where they are more impartial than in Rome. This I have repeatedly heard confessed by persons who have lost their cause, although it is the fashion in England to say that in Rome all is got by influence and favour. If you speak of decorations, trifling privileges and honours, that may be the case sometimes, but in matters of importance nowhere do they give a more patient hearing to both sides of the question than in Rome.

As you know, I have never been your partisan. My principle has always been to support to the best of my power zeal wherever I see it, and I must be blind not to see the good that the Oblates

of St. Charles have already done and are doing in London. I have carefully watched the formation of your congregation. I have studied your Rule, and I cannot see anything but what will forward the greater glory of God and the salvation of souls in your Institute. I cannot conceive how a man animated by the Spirit of God can oppose such manifest good as you are doing in London.

I am attacked *also* in the *meanest* manner for supporting the Cardinal. My antagonist holds it as a principle that everything but actual sin is lawful to defend his cause. I have known him to suggest the shabbiest acts, in order, as he said, to do good.

Nevertheless, I have no fear of the result of this affair, and I am certain that justice will be rendered to the Cardinal and to you, but you must remain firm and not flinch, because some hard things will be said against you, and are being said at this moment.

It is remarkable that the attack upon three of the leading converts should coincide, yourself, Newman,[1] and Faber. Although I think Newman in the *Rambler*, and Faber in his works, have laid themselves open to this attack, nevertheless the motive of the attacks, I am certain, is more jealousy than zeal for the greater glory of God. I believe the attack upon the converts now is only the *sfogo* of the latent feeling of jealousy which has been brooding for years in the hearts of many of the old Catholics. It was to be expected, so that I only hope the converts will remain firm under their persecution, and I have no doubt that they will triumph in the end. Their zeal, their energy, their superiority in many respects to the old stock, is the cause of the jealousy.—Believe me, very sincerely yours,

GEORGE TALBOT.

MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

BAYSWATER, 17*th August* 1860.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR TALBOT—I got home Friday night last after spending a week or ten days at Paris. . . .

As yet I have not seen many of the priests, but from one very competent informant I hear that the staff of St. Edmund's is worse than ever. I am told . . . and that smoking goes on

---

[1] Mgr. Talbot's habitual residence in Rome and unfamiliarity with the love and reverence in which Newman was held alike by "Old" or hereditary Catholics and converts, led him into the error of believing that Newman was attacked by those who attacked Manning. Just the reverse was the fact. It was Manning's friends of the extreme faction, like W. G. Ward, who attacked the illustrious Oratorian.

contrary to the known rule: that H. Y. was barred out of a room where the boys were drinking and smoking: that the Cardinal is "detested" by the boys, and Dr. Grant in great repute: this is the work of Dr. G. and his Southwark friends: that the Oblates are hated as "sneaks," because they enforce rules: that if a student makes a visit to the Blessed Sacrament he is an Oblate; at which I say *Deo gratias.* Hearn also says that St. Edmund's is a scandal. . . . —Very sincerely yours,

H. E. MANNING.

BAYSWATER, *6th September* 1861.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR TALBOT—When I last wrote to you I was going to Homburg to drink the waters and get a little rest. I came home last Saturday much the better.

I have no home news to send you. London is perfectly empty. The only one subject[1] of all our thoughts you know already better than we do, and it is not one to write about. I am now looking on to talking with you about it, for after St. Charles's Day, when all our house here is in order and at work, I hope to start for Rome.

Father Whitty has been here staying with us, and his remarks on the diocese are very true. He said, "All I tried to do in introducing a new way and set of men has been undone. Dr. Errington is gone, but he has revived the old system, and it is carried on by Dr. Hearn." This is most true; and in this, the removal of the Oblates from the College is a step backward.

But we never could have gone onwards till Southwark is out of St. Edmund's, which will *never be.*

. . .—Believe me always very sincerely yours,

H. E. MANNING.

MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

BAYSWATER, *4th October* 1861.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR TALBOT—. . . . I am going to write to Cardinal Barnabò giving a statement of the reasons of our withdrawal from St. Edmund's: for I can see, as you said, that it is liable to be misunderstood. But if you were here you would see our state. At a distance no one can sufficiently see it. There is no concealing the fact that we, *i.e.* the diocese, are going backwards, and that Father Whitty's estimate was true.

The Cardinal wrote us a very kind letter acknowledging the services of the Oblates in the College, and disclaiming the act of their withdrawal. I wrote to thank him, and said that I believed

[1] The "Errington Case."

that it was an act of peace for him, and for ourselves, but a step backward for the diocese, which I never could have advised: but that one step back in 1861 might be followed by two steps forward in 1862.

For ourselves it is a great advantage. We have now all our men together under one roof, and I believe that we shall be far more efficient for any future work. What is most wanted in England is a staff of men who will choose the work of a seminary as their work and end in life. And this, I hope, we shall have in twelve or eighteen months, in a higher than average efficiency, and with a common spirit, and perfect agreement of principles. —Believe me always very sincerely yours, H. E. MANNING.

Though Propaganda lost but little time in deciding, in compliance with the petitions of Dr. Errington and Bishop Grant, on the removal of the Oblates of St. Charles from St. Edmund's, they were unconscionably slow, in Manning's opinion, in coming to a decision on the disagreements between the Chapter and Cardinal Wiseman. In a letter to Cardinal Wiseman dated Rome, 21st April 2615, Manning wrote as follows:—

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—. . . . I have spoken to Cardinal Bò and to Capalti about the Chapter *supplicas*, and arranged that I should send a letter to Cardinal Bò to provoke the answer. I have drawn it up, and will send it this week. I will take it to him to renew his memory of all the facts. He spoke very satisfactorily, as did Capalti, as to the danger of Constitutionalism in England; and I think they feel themselves also at stake in the question.

If you would write a similar letter to Cardinal Bò reminding him of his conversation with you, and his promise about *Questi Signori* at the English College two years back, it would be a very great help. It need not be long.

I have read your letter about Dr. Grant; but Cardinal Bò has not yet spoken of it.—Believe me, my dear Lord Cardinal, your very affectionate Servant, H. E. MANNING.

Manning, painfully affected by the slow processes of Propaganda, was naturally eager to obtain, before leaving Rome, the decision on the Chapter question. But Cardinal Barnabò, well versed in the ways of the world, and knowing that Manning was, as Provost, personally concerned in the dispute, refused to issue a Decree during Manning's presence

in Rome. In reply to a subsequent application Cardinal Barnabò said—"When you are well at home in England Propaganda will send its Decree."

In the matter of the Commission appointed by Parliament and the Charitable Trusts, grave questions were involved as to the right of the State over Church property, and as to the duty of bishops in regard to the recognition of the claim. In a letter dated Bayswater, 19th April 1861, Manning wrote on this grave subject as follows:—

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—. . . . Now there is one subject pressing for decision—the Charitable Trusts.

1. The law of England claims the *altum dominium* of all property for the State.

2. The Canon Law vests all church goods in the Church.

3. To submit the *accounts* to a Commission is to recognise the *altum dominium* of the State.

4. This is the *in cameramento dei beni ecclesiastici* of Cavour's Government.

5. Did not the Holy See condemn that Act; and if so, in what terms?

6. How can the bishops submit their Trusts to the Commission if they thereby recognise the *altum dominium* in the State—that is, deny it to the Church?

Would you kindly let me know the answer of any competent person to these questions?

I was ten days in Paris, and have much I should like to say to you, but so little to write.—Believe me always very truly yours,

H. E. MANNING.

ROME, 10*th January* 1862.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—Your letter of 4th January came yesterday. Dr. Melia is not yet arrived.

I put in my answer to the bishops on Wednesday, and it is to be printed at once, but I am to see the proofs. As soon as I can get a copy to send, your Eminence shall have it. I think I have covered all the points you touched in your last letter. . . .

The question is reduced to one point: "Whether, when no danger to the property exists, the sacred Congregation will direct a spontaneous conformity with the Commission, armed with all the powers already described?"

I ended by quoting the end of your letter of 10th August, by which you place yourself at the Holy Father's feet.

My belief is that Propaganda will be very slow to decide anything contrary to what you have advised.

They may not direct a removal of funds out of England, and perhaps after 1860 you might not have thought the need so urgent as in 1854; but certainly I do not think they will direct any spontaneous communications with the Commission. I hope the answer does not omit any of the chief points or principles of the question. It is about 46 pages, or 20 or 25 Ponenza pages. And now I am getting on with my *riservata*, which will only be a parachute to yours; but it will give the appreciations of a bystander who has seen a good deal in the last ten years, and I shall not waste words or use weak ones.

Herbert Vaughan tells me that he has presented a petition through C. Barnabò to the Pope from your Eminence on the subject of the Congregation of S. Charles, and that in it you kindly speak of me. I thought it best not to see it, but I thank you for it and for all it contains.—Believe me, my dear Lord Cardinal, your affectionate servant, H. E. MANNING.

In a letter dated Vatican, 9th August 1862, Mgr. Talbot informed Cardinal Wiseman that at last the Charitable Trusts had been finished, and the instructions would be sent off to the bishops by Propaganda as soon as possible. In addition to the instructions, the account in writing which Cardinal Wiseman had left with Barnabò of the audience of the bishops, would be sent also, and, as it had been approved by the Holy Father, it would be a most important document.

How deeply afflicted and disturbed Cardinal Wiseman was by the Decree of Propaganda, declaring that Ushaw and the other Colleges were independent of his control or supervision, is shown in some of the following letters.

In a letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated 16th August 1862, Manning said—"Certainly the College question is the greatest next after the Hierarchy." Mainly, it would seem, on the ground that it was a trial of strength between Cardinal Wiseman and the opposing bishops.

Manning, as Cardinal Wiseman's "Procurator" or official agent, defending his cause before Propaganda, or conducting negotiations with the representatives of the opposing bishops, was in constant communication with the Cardinal.

MANNING TO CARDINAL WISEMAN.

ROME, *2nd May* 1863.[1]

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—Dr. Clifford (Bishop of Clifton) and I have had three conferences, and drawn up an agreement, and I hope we have reduced the matter to a narrow limit.

We agreed to ask—

1. That the Colleges should be preserved in all their integrity.
2. That the rights of the Ordinaries should be recognised:
   (1) In all spiritual jurisdiction and matters of a spiritual kind.
   (2) In all discipline, moral government, and teaching of the Colleges.
   (3) In the nomination of the rectors and professors, *de consilio, sed non de consensu aliorum Episcoporum.*
3. That the beneficial interests of the dioceses *cointeressati* should be secured by an allotment of their proportions sanctioned by the Holy See.
4. That the obligation of forming Diocesan Seminaries be expressly enjoined.
5. That when any bishop shall have founded a greater seminary, he may petition the Holy See for a transfer of so much of his beneficial interest in the college in which he is partaker as the Holy See shall see fit to allot.
6. That until diocesan seminaries be founded the Colleges have faculty to retain such subjects as are necessary to fill the offices of professors, etc.

On all these we agreed, and I left it to Dr. Clifford to draw up the statement.

On the third we differed only as to the manner of carrying it into effect. Dr. Clifford recommended that it should be done by annual meetings of the bishops, with assistants from the clergy.

I objected to this as a recognition of a character not possessed by them, and as leading to many inconveniences, and as alien to the government of the Church.

We each put in our reasons upon this point of divergence. Capalti, I think, inclines to Dr. Clifford's view, but not Cardinal Barnabò.

MANNING TO TALBOT.

BAYSWATER, *5th June* 1863.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR TALBOT—The Cardinal has shown me part of your last letter.

---

[1] In a previous letter Manning had written—"Dr. Clifford, deputed by the bishops, is, I hear, to come on the College question after Easter. We shall have a duel."

The result of the College question does not surprise me, for I saw that there was a want of facts in respect to the funds. I cannot suppose that the decision faltered about the rights of the Ordinaries. Still it is much better not to publish an inadequate decision; and a final settlement is cheaply bought by a little further delay. Shall we have to come to Rome again about it? . . . .—Believe me always, faithfully yours,

H. E. MANNING.

MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

BAYSWATER, 8*th June* 1863.

Your last letter reached me Wednesday night. I gather from it that the decision on the Colleges is all safe as to the two first points, on which alone I was anxious. As to the temporalities, I wish the bishops to be contented by every concession possible. But I am sure that meetings and joint-administration will breed no good.

CARDINAL WISEMAN TO MANNING.

8 YORK PLACE, 1*st August* 1863.

. . . . I wish I could see the decision in the same light as you do. I will wait with patience. For at present it seems to me that the Northern Bishops may rush into Ushaw and overhaul everything; make new laws; and, in fine, rule *in solidum*. Unless, indeed, a modification of the Decree is made conformably to your compact with Dr. Clifford. . . .

All the bishops have accepted the invitation to Oscott for next week, upon the English and Lisbon colleges, except Dr. Goss, who writes from Sligo a letter in his own style, uncourteous and rude.

MGR. TALBOT TO MANNING.

VATICAN, 22*nd August* 1863.

. . . . As I told you the Decree of the Synod[1] about the Colleges is approved almost without any modifications. The Holy Father himself would not have it altered; and I will tell you the reason why when you come to Rome.

---

[1] At the Third Provincial Synod of Westminster, held at Oscott in 1859, the majority of the bishops, including the Coadjutor, Archbishop Errington, passed a decree on the management and control of the Colleges in direct opposition to Cardinal Wiseman. The decrees of a Provincial Synod are not published until they have received the approval of the Holy See. The decree in question, as it was opposed by Cardinal Wiseman, was not published until September 1863. At that Provincial Synod Manning was in attendance on the Cardinal.

It is indeed a severe blow to Cardinal Wiseman; so you must soften it down as much as possible. The only thing to be done is for him to agitate the question of the erection of Seminaries. At any rate, Southwark, Salford, and Liverpool ought to begin at once.

The College Decree, however, was not published until the end of September. It had a very painful effect on Cardinal Wiseman.

MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

BAYSWATER, 26*th September* 1863.

. . . . Yesterday the Cardinal was so unwell that I could not see him. The night before I saw him for only a moment. He told me he believed the cause of his illness to come from the head; and, though he did not say it, Canon Morris ascribed it to the College Decree, which has affected him very much. I have no doubt that this is one chief cause.

As to the College Decree, he feels it very deeply. I have only read it once, and hastily; but I see nothing about the future erection of Diocesan Seminaries, nor that this regimen is only provisional.

Still, I think that a frank and cordial acceptance of this Decree would work all round; and when he is better I hope he will see it so.

The chief and permanent difficulty is Ushaw. As for St. Edmund's, the matter could be settled by a little vigour; but for the last three years he has not given his mind to it, waiting for this Decree, and now he says he has no heart for it.

MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

LEYTON, 3*rd October* 1863.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—. . . . On Thursday night last week I saw the Cardinal between eight and nine o'clock for five minutes. He was restless and ill, and so depressed that he could not speak. He tells me that Dr. Munk came after I went; that he then had either a long heavy sleep or a time of unconsciousness; that Dr. Munk told him afterwards that he had been on the verge of delirium; that it could not be accounted for by medicines nor by the leg, but that he was certain the Cardinal had had some great mental shock. The Cardinal admitted that he had been tried by some business, but did not say more. Dr. Munk went on to say that he

had been on the verge of brain fever; and that unless he will consent to withdraw from work and from anxiety his life cannot be prolonged; and that if he will do so it may be preserved for many years. . . . Hawkins last night confirmed all this. He said, "He is very ill. . . . He is pulled down by something." The Cardinal trusts Hawkins, and gave him in outline, but I told him fully about the College question. He ascribes the Cardinal's illness to this fact. Since F. Vaughan went I have not seen the Cardinal till to-day. He has been shut up in himself, having no one to speak to on the matter. Hawkins said that it is more mind than body; and that to speak to anyone whom he can trust is more to him than medicine.

He cannot bear to talk on the College question. But in the hour I have just had with him I have tried to cheer him by saying (what I fully believe) that the decision is neither all for him nor all against him; that, taken with submission and frankness, great good will come out of it. But as yet he will not listen. I am anxious and, I may say, alarmed about him. . . . I have never been so anxious about him since that terrible year in Rome. I never saw anything so patient, so gentle, and so kind as he is.—Believe me always, very sincerely yours,

H. E. MANNING.

The fact that Cardinal Wiseman was involved in disputes with his suffragan bishops, and their delation of him before the tribunals of Propaganda, was beyond question a matter of grave import. It is rare in ecclesiastical history for an archbishop to be delated by his suffragan bishops before Propaganda. That Cardinal Barnabò was inclined to look upon these disputes, which for nearly five years, from 1858 to 1863, were pending before the highest ecclesiastical tribunal in Rome, as symptoms of a schism in the English Episcopate is scarcely to be wondered at. It is open to question whether Cardinal Wiseman was altogether prudent in incurring such an opposition, provoked, in the main, by Dr. Errington's removal.

In defending Cardinal Wiseman before the Courts and Congregations of Propaganda, Manning displayed singular zeal, skill, and ability, as the following letters, selected out of many, clearly indicate.

In a letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated St. Mary's, Bayswater, Ascension Day, 1859, Manning wrote:—

You have heard of the Bishops' meeting, and of the mediation of Dr. Turner; and of the deputation of the six Bishops; and of Dr. Turner's *ex post facto* admission that nothing can be done to combine the Cardinal and Dr. Errington.

The Cardinal will have told you of Dr. Errington's last expressive letter, for which, however, he has expressed his regret. But the Cardinal is firm in his conviction and purpose. Dr. Errington's stay here would undo the whole onward movement of the Church in and upon England. I find nobody, beyond the few who have been about him in the late affair, with any other view—from Macmullen to Father Kelly. And if it be possible, I trust he will not be at the Synod. He has, I hear, asked to be called to Rome to defend himself. But no one has accused him. The accusations have been all the other way. I know not what he has not said, or been reported to say, of the Cardinal and myself; and if the day ever comes I must have my say too. . . . But if Dr. Errington makes any statement about our Rule and Work I feel that I ought to know it; and to answer for our undertaking, on which I asked and received the benediction of the Holy Father. I believe it is this which has so signally prospered it; and I believe that its prosperity has been the reason of this attack.

Manning to Mgr. Talbot.

St. Mary's, Bayswater, 8*th August* 1859.

. . . . I know all that can be said about or against the Cardinal; but all said, and said sevenfold, he is the man who has led the Mission of the Church in England for twenty years. Since his Moorfields Lectures his has been the hand to execute the restoration of the Hierarchy, the organisation of the whole ecclesiastical system, and the work of all the synods. It is perfectly true that he is the Holy See in England, in a way to call down on himself in a glorious isolation the reproaches of this letter,[1] and all who are in any degree near or afar share in it. And I thank God as a convert that the converts are identified with him; and this, too, is turned to his reproach.

In the heat of the conflict, feeling keenly the opposition of his suffragans to Cardinal Wiseman and their vexatious proceedings in delating him more than once to Rome, Manning commented with some asperity on the conduct

[1] A letter by an "Old Catholic" in the *Morning Star*, attacking Cardinal Wiseman and the converts already referred to.

and principles of the bishops in the following letter to Mgr. Talbot:—

BAYSWATER, 14*th September* 1860.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR—. . . . Patterson and Howard will no doubt have written to you about the bishops and their manifestation at Belmont. I do not think it of any importance, and I do not believe that it will happen again. It was inevitable that it would come out the first time of meeting after the Synod of last year. It is, moreover, confined to Dr. Goss and the two Dr. Browns. But of these Newport has written to the Cardinal a weak peacemaking letter since the *sfogo*. The state of the case I believe to be this: on the one side is the Cardinal with Dr. Ullathorne, Hogarth, Roskell; on the other Dr. Goss and Dr. Brown of Shrewsbury. All the rest, for various reasons and in various degrees, but all of them from a desire to keep their peace with Rome, will refrain from any active expression against the Cardinal.

As it is the new mortal sin[1] to say that they are Gallican in spirit, I must put it otherwise. But the end is the same. It appears to me that as the Hierarchy was cheaply purchased by the uproar of the Papal Aggression, so the wound inflicted on the old, national, exclusive English form of Low Catholicism is cheaply purchased by the present personal opposition and sufferings. It seems to me that all we need is good temper and firmness. If we quarrel or give way we shall lose all the good and ground we have gained. I hear that the bishops spare the Cardinal, and fall upon you and me. We, I am glad to say, are his conductors. I daresay we shall both hear more of it and have to look to our tackle. I only wish the bishops, or one of them, would give me a fair hearing; but that I am afraid they will not do. . . . —Believe me always, very sincerely yours,

H. E. MANNING.

BAYSWATER, 13*th December* 1860.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR TALBOT—. . . . The Chapter is feeble, and for the most part weary of contention. If Searle were gone we should have no more; but his jealousy of every one, Morris, Thompson, Howard, Vaughan, I suspect also of Hearn, would be laughable if it were not troublesome to others. I am convinced that he compromises the Cardinal with all sorts of people; and the Cardinal's house will never be accessible as it should be as long as he is there. But this a minor evil. The

---

[1] The bishops had made complaints in Rome at being described as Gallicans.

diocese is quiet and much good doing. I cannot, however, overstate the comparative disadvantages of the missions round Farm Street, and the way in which the educated laity are passing from the secular clergy. . . .

As to our whole education work, it is very inadequate; and half our children are still in the streets. The Protestants are succeeding with many of them. Nothing but a Diocesan Council of Education and a number of active men can check this great mischief. But the laity never meet together. . . . I am convinced that all needed is good temper and firmness. The former is sometimes hard to keep, for the malicious chatter of half a dozen, of whom ——— is the type, is sufficiently foolish and ill-natured. . . .

I have seen Dr. Ullathorne for a long morning. He is friendly, and strong about the Colleges. Also Plymouth,[1] who is reasonable and quiet. The Belmont demonstration has ended in smoke. Only Dr. Goss holds out with temper. Shrewsbury[2] keeps aloof, but wishes, I believe, to enter again into civilised relations. . . . —Believe me always, very sincerely yours,

H. E. MANNING.

MANNING TO MONSIGNOR TALBOT.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR—. . . . You will probably hear from Howard and Patterson an account of the sayings and doings of the bishops at Belmont. Patterson frightens himself, and then frightens Howard, with what I believe has no real or lasting importance. There is not one of them, except Dr. Goss and Dr. Brown of Shrewsbury, who would either stay away from a provincial Synod or tell the Holy See that they have no confidence in their Metropolitan. So, however, some of them talked. I feel as sure as I can be of anything that not one of them would do so; and if any did that they would be liable for censure.

In truth, they are beginning to be conscious of the relation of the Episcopate to the Holy See. The exaggerated Episcopalianism of France has found its way here, and is for the first time finding the action of the Holy See in the way of a higher direction. It is as necessary for the bishops in England to feel the weight of Rome as it was ten years ago for the priests in England to feel the weight of the Hierarchy.

This is the account of the matter; and as I said in my last

---

[1] The Right Rev. Dr. Vaughan, Bishop of Plymouth, an uncle of His Eminence Cardinal Vaughan.

[2] The Right Rev. Dr. Brown, Bishop of Shrewsbury.

letter, all we want is temper and firmness. It would be a fatal mistake to be frightened either into half measures or into a conflict. I have all along wished that more guard were kept on the way in which people speak. For words do ten times more to irritate people than the strongest acts. I can only say again that I see no cause for any alarm. . . . —Believe me always, yours very sincerely, H. E. MANNING.

To understand aright Manning's line of action in his opposition to Dr. Errington, and to the bishops opposed to Cardinal Wiseman in the conflict with the Chapter, and in the establishment of the Oblates of St. Charles in St. Edmund's College, it is necessary thoroughly to enter into the frame of mind, and to obtain a clear conception of the principles, on which Manning acted throughout the whole course of these dissensions. He was possessed of the idea that Catholicism in England, speaking broadly, was affected by Gallicanism. The Gallican spirit, more or less latent, was to be found in the clergy and the bishops as well as in the laity. From the constitution of his mind Manning judged of things not in the abstract, but in the concrete. What he saw before his eyes, in immediate action, was to him, without taking a wider and deeper purview of things, sufficient evidence for the broad conclusions at which he arrived. He saw in Wiseman the manifestation of the Roman spirit, its broader views and bolder line of policy; in those who opposed him, Manning perceived nothing less than the embodiment of Gallicanism, or of a low order of English National Catholicism. With this conception in his mind—and his belief in his own ideas, once formed, never faltered or wavered—there was no room for hesitation; no room in one so tenacious of purpose, so thorough of heart, for compromise or for half-hearted measures; no room, even in speaking of bishops, to mince his words. Manning saw likewise, it must be ever borne in mind, what was unseen of duller eyes, that under the Hierarchy a new spirit was begotten: a new invigorating life in the Church; a wider range of action, imposing upon its rulers new duties as well as new responsibilities. Catholics were emancipated, not, as in

1829, from the restrictions of the Penal Laws, but from social restrictions, or a self-imposed isolation from the public life or intellectual movements of their fellow-countrymen.

To all this fuller life with its wider opportunities, and, if so be, unfamiliar dangers, of which Wiseman was the pioneer, there was an obstinate opposition, not, needs be, inspired, as Manning imagined, by Gallicanism, but rather arising from a fossilised habit of mind averse to change of every sort. Men who welcomed the Hierarchy, and were proud of the Cardinal, were disturbed, annoyed, irritated even, that things were not allowed to go on as before in the old humdrum way. It never entered into their minds that the restoration of the Hierarchy implied anything more, anything deeper or higher, than an improved ecclesiastical organisation. The Protestantism of the day had a keener and truer insight into the meaning of the movement than they had. It was, in a true sense, a Papal Aggression; not an aggression on the civil rights, as was asserted and believed, of the Established Church; but an aggression on unfaith and spiritual deadness. It was a new crusade; an assertion by Rome of its ancient, inalienable right to the obedience of every baptised Christian; a proclamation in the face of the people of England of the truths of the Gospel as preached to our forefathers by St. Augustine, an apostle sent from Rome by Pope Gregory the Great.

Such a view of the movement when carried into action by Wiseman, as far at least as his opportunities permitted, was resented by many, as disturbing the peace and quiet of the Church in England; as introducing foreign customs and practices; and as exhibiting restlessness, if not ambition, on the part of Cardinal Wiseman.[1] They mistook expansion or growth for innovation; and owing to their narrow views and insular habits denounced Wiseman as an innovator in favour of foreign ideas and

[1] The Rev. M. A. Tierney, the leader of the opposition to Dr. Wiseman's appointment in 1847 as Pro-Vicar Apostolic of the London district in succession to Dr. Griffiths, had often accused Dr. Wiseman "of always running to Rome after the purple stockings."

practices, instead of taking his stand on the ancient ways of English Catholicism.

If by no means a few, and among them many bishops and priests, were opposed to Wiseman's policy, they resented tenfold, a hundredfold more Manning's influence over Wiseman, and accused the eager and zealous convert of urging the reluctant Cardinal on to extreme courses. In his latter days, when he was suffering from lethargy and inertness of will, they even accused Manning of usurping the Cardinal's authority, or of acting, though not without his consent, in his name.

In the correspondence between Manning and Mgr. Talbot, as I have shown, it is frankly acknowledged that the bishops in their action in Rome, and in their complaints at Propaganda, were attacking not so much Wiseman, as Manning himself and his agent at the Vatican.

Again, Manning saw, with a deeper intellectual vision than did the more blind and obstinate opponents of Wiseman's policy, the changes and developments which were coming over the Catholic Church in England. There was a stirring among the dry bones. At Oscott, under Dr. Wiseman's presidency, an intellectual awakening had taken place independent of external influence. The Catholic revival and the Oxford movement were concurrent, and undoubtedly reacted upon each other. The Catholic revival, of which the restoration of the Hierarchy was the result as well as the outward symbol, and the Tractarian movement, which gave its illustrious leader—a host in himself—to the Church, and in so many of his followers added to her service new intellectual and spiritual forces, were events which, like the inrush of many waters into a still and somewhat stagnant stream, had a disturbing as well as beneficial effect. Catholics brought into closer relations with the educated classes of English society soon began to feel the limitations of their own intellectual resources, the want of university education, and the absence of higher guides or spiritual directors, capable by their intellectual culture of sustaining them in their contact or conflict with English thought.

A letter, given below, is important, because it was not an after-apology, but was written by Manning in the beginnings of the strife with the Opposition party. As a clear and definite statement of his views at the time, it shows how fully and firmly Manning had realised the need of new forces, intellectual and spiritual, in the Church in England, to meet the opportunities and developments, freer thought and more independent action, created or opened up by the combined influence of the Catholic revival and the Oxford movement. It was this fuller insight into the new life which was dawning upon Catholicism in England, with the new duties and higher responsibilities imposed upon its leaders and guides, which impelled Manning to treat with infinite scorn the advocates of a standstill or retrograde policy. They had not, it must be acknowledged, the faintest conception of the mischief of their policy. Manning, on the other hand, had the most intense conviction of the evil they were preparing for the Church in England. They sometimes imputed, in their ignorance, unworthy or ambitious motives to Manning's line of action. He ascribed to them in his impetuosity, too often wrongfully, a Gallican or Antipapal spirit.

In the following interesting letter will be found the keynote to Manning's line of action,—the interpretation of the motives which impelled him into the prolonged conflict with the opponents, bishops or others, of Wiseman's policy :—

MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

ST. EDMUNDS, 17*th June* 1859.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR TALBOT—. . . . It seems to me that the work of the Church in England has so rapidly become both so much larger and so much more exacting, that men are needed now who, twenty or even ten years ago, were comparatively not required.

The first thing I see is that the Church has begun to touch upon the English people at every point, and that entirely new demands are made upon it.

Before the Emancipation, and even until the Hierarchy, the work of the Church consisted—

1. In ministering to the old Catholic households, and missions on family estates; and—

2. In ministering to the Irish settlers driven over by poverty or drawn by industry into our large towns, etc.

Now, for these two works the English priests were eminently fit from their great goodness, devotion, and detachment from the world.

But since the Church has re-entered into the public and private life and order of the English people, entirely new kinds of work are demanded.

1. First, the contact, and sometimes conflict with English society in all its classes, from the lowest to the highest—the most educated, intellectual, and cultivated—requires a new race of men as teachers, directors, and companions.

2. Next, the whole work of the Church in relation to the Government in all the public services, civil and military, at home and in the colonies, needs a class of men of whom we possess very few.

3. Thirdly, the Catholic laity, including Catholics by birth, are beginning to be dissatisfied with the standard of education, both in themselves and in their priests. The close contact with the educated classes of English society forces this on them.

4. Again, a large number of our laity, chiefly converts, are highly educated, and our priests are, except individuals, not a match for them.

5. This touches on a large subject, which I can only put in few words. The educated laymen, in London at least, are passing out of the spiritual direction of the secular clergy of the diocese. They find their spiritual and intellectual wants insufficiently met, and they go to the religious bodies. I think this a very serious matter for the diocese, and for all its active works; and I see no hope of redressing it, unless Spanish Place, Chelsea, and Warwick Street can be made vigorously efficient, both spiritually and intellectually, before five years are out. This, too, makes me so strong in urging that Westminster should be held and some work done in it by the bishop for the diocese.[1]

6. Now, there is another matter which gives me real anxiety, and that is the state of many of our ablest and most active laymen. There is a tone in matters of education, government, politics, and theology, which is free up to the boundary of legitimate freedom, if not beyond it, and they are men who deserve a good and fair treatment. Moreover, they cannot be put down or checked like boys. I am seriously afraid that we

[1] The small church at Westminster, which, by the aid of Mr. L' primaudaye, Dr. Manning had established before the founding of the Oblates of St. Charles.

shall have a kind of De Lamennais School among some who, like him, were intellectual champions of the Church, and nothing will produce this so surely as snubbing. They could be easily directed by any one whom they thought fair or friendly, especially if, in the way Dr. N. has done, he grapples with their intellectual difficulties.

I could add a great deal more, for the subject is so large and varied that I have only begun it.

It seems to me that all this comes round to what we used to talk of, namely, the raising the standard of the future secular clergy. The first step to which is Council of Trent seminaries, of which we have not yet got one. And I do not believe that seminaries will ever be what they ought to be in England unless they are directed by secular priests who have learned to live by rule, and who can act with unity of mind and purpose. I do not think any one has a fuller sense than I have of the imperfections of our Congregation; but I only say, "Let somebody do better, and we will gladly give place." At least such a body as ours is better than the discordant and shifting set of men who are looking to go out upon missions. These changes are the ruin of all stability of discipline and spirit. Besides, no man really devotes his whole powers and life except to the one work in which he intends to persevere. You have a sample of the men we should put into a seminary in Butler and Denny. But if the Seminary were offered to us now, we would not take it yet, and that because we hope to do it one day, and to do it as it should be done. To try too soon would be to fail; and a failure would be the greatest obstacle to succeeding one day when our men are ripe.

I have written on these subjects because you hear all personal matters from the Cardinal and Patterson, and I do not like talking about Dr. Errington and Dr. Grant,—the latter I think disproportionately mischievous, and I think he will be a thorn in the Cardinal's side as long as he is so near to London. I trust that the former will soon be where he can really be of use. In England I believe he would be an obstruction to the work and expansion of the Church. If he were in the diocese I am sure that many men would leave it.

I hope the Holy Father is well. We are full of all manner of anxiety; but I trust all will be well.—Believe me, my dear Monsignor Talbot, yours very sincerely,

H. E. MANNING.

In a letter to Manning dated Eaux Bonnes, Bas Pyrenées, 1st September 1862, Mgr. Talbot wrote as follows:—

. . . . I was prepared for Dr. Ullathorne's having a version of the last audience he had of the Pope. Nevertheless, Cardinal Wiseman's version of it has been confirmed and approved by His Holiness. Dr. Ullathorne, when I bade him good-bye, attributed all that had taken place to Cardinal Barnabò and me.

MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

BAYSWATER, 17*th October* 1863.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR TALBOT—. . . . What you say of Dr. Errington is, I believe, certain. Father Barge the other day told me that he had heard, I believe from the persons in whose presence Dr. Errington had said that the right of succession remained in him; and that, on the Cardinal's death, he should enter as a matter of course. He added that Dr. Errington had gone among the Bishops of Ireland and possessed them with this side of the case. Father Barge wished this to be known as much as he does not wish for its fulfilment.

If King Stork comes the frogs must look sharp: I should regard such an event as a disaster for the diocese and for the mission of the Church in England—as a return of the old narrow spirit which made the Catholic Church in England act and feel like a sect of Dissenters. The brunt would fall, as you say, upon the Oblates and upon me. But we are not weak. I should ask a hearing before the Holy See, for which I was prepared two years ago, and am still more prepared now. And two years have given to us a root and a growth which it will take two Dr. Erringtons to pull up. Nothing but the Holy See could do it. If the Holy See so wished we should submit joyfully and at the first word. But I believe the Holy See will never undo its own work. Therefore, though I see the grave crisis which hangs upon the Cardinal's life, I have no fear. . . . —Believe me always, very sincerely yours,

H. E. MANNING.

P.S.—Mr. John Bethell and his family, the Chancellor's brother, and a very good Catholic, is coming to Rome. Would you receive him with all kindness, and give him an introduction to the society of Rome, the Borgheses, etc., as you may safely so do.

MGR. TALBOT TO MANNING.

ST. EUSEBIO, 12*th June* 1859.

MY DEAR PROVOST MANNING—I write a line from St. Eusebio, where I have been making a Retreat, which is just concluded, to say that I am delighted to hear of the good that the Oblates of

St. Charles have already done in England. Denny and Butler are the edification of the Collegio Pio and English College. Butler has made this Retreat with me in St. Eusebio, and I have watched his demeanour throughout, and I have been immensely edified by him. If the Archbishop of Trebizond remains in London all this will be knocked on the head.

MGR. TALBOT TO MANNING.

VATICAN, 13*th December* 1860.

MY DEAREST MONSIGNOR—. . . . It is incredible that Grant should have acted as he has done; but, I regret to say so, the practice of St. George's has been always to support rebellious priests, *e.g.* Boyle, Errington, Bernin, and others.

There are thousands of excellent souls in Southwark, and many ripe for the grace of God, but I am afraid that until a *radical* change takes place nothing will be done for them.

Bò says that he has written a strong letter to Grant, and has ordered him to remove Bernin.

P.S.—The Italian paper which is about to be set up in London will be most useful to keep Rome *au courant* to what is going on in London. Give it all your help. G. T.

MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

BAYSWATER, 1*st February* 1861.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR TALBOT—Patterson will have written to you about the Cardinal's health, and will have also sent you some newspaper extracts. Nevertheless I write a few words.

The Cardinal is, thank God, getting over this attack, and the very serious symptom of inflammation in the vein is giving way. To-morrow he goes to Leyton, and we hope much from change of air. Still, I cannot help seeing that he is at a lower point than before, and he seems to acquiesce in a state of inaction more than I have ever seen before in former illnesses.

It is impossible not to be anxious about him.

Next, as to the newspapers, I do not attach much importance to any of the paragraphs, except the two last, one in the *Daily News* about Dr. Grant, and the other in the *Chronicle* commenting upon it. These two show that some of our own, and I fear some priest or priests, must have forgotten themselves.

One thing is certain, that the Southwark people are busy, and I am told that Searle has been often there during the time he has been at Leyton, and that without letting the Cardinal know that he was in London.

Also I hear that Dr. Grant has set his nuns to pray that he may not be removed to Beverley.

I am only desirous, first, that all this should be known to Propaganda; and next, that no more than its real importance should be given to it.

I suspect that communications have been made to Propaganda, and in the sense of exaggeration and alarm, as last year, when we heard of the "*otto vescovi*," etc. And I daresay they are encouraged by the Cardinal's state of health and inactivity.

But there is no importance in all this, unless they get hold of Cardinal Bò again and frighten him with their tales of a schism in the Episcopate.

The following correspondence, especially Manning's letters to Cardinal Wiseman, bring out not only several interesting details concerning the different questions in dispute before Propaganda, but some important statements in regard to the hostile attitude—of which for seven years he was a witness—of the bishops towards Cardinal Wiseman.

MANNING TO CARDINAL WISEMAN.

ROME, 16*th December* 1861.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—Your letter of the 7th reached me only to-day. Why I cannot tell, as the postmarks seem in order till the Roman date.

I have written a full statement to Cardinal Barnabò on the Southwark funds, and also to Mgr. Talbot for the Holy Father.

To-morrow I hope to see Cardinal Barnabò, and to get the *scrittura* of the bishops.

ROME, 21*st December* 1861.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—I took my letter to C. Barnabò this evening. I asked in your name—(1) either the whole of the bishops' *scrittura*, or (2) the same privilege of secrecy as to personal matters.

C. Barnabò at once chose the latter, saying that it was in his judgment the most pacific course, and desiring me to write fully and freely, as it was well that the sacred Congregation and the Holy Father should have all the information possible on the personal questions. He was most kind and very open. I thanked him in your name for what he had said last week, on which he said, "I have always felt great regard for the Cardinal;"

and then he spoke of you in the highest terms, and of your work in England, and with a full perception of the real point of the strife.

Now then is the time I have often spoken of and long wished for. I will do my best, and write as full a review and estimate as I can of the whole contest of the last ten years. I have watched them as closely as I could, and through your kindness I have been so mixed into them that I think I can judge of them, and I have been so irresponsible that I believe I can judge them impartially. What I can write shall be written, but this will only serve as a preface. The time is come for you to write what you projected last year, a *Scrittura riservatissima* to the Holy Father. The privilege of secrecy has been established by the Bishops. It is therefore by no means invidious that you should use it. This need not give you much trouble. It would be necessary that the paper should not exceed twenty pages or so. If I could have this *dopo le Feste*, which will give us a good fortnight or more, it would be in time. I can see that Cardinal Barnabò wishes for information of this sort.

I narrated to him the three endeavours that I have seen to remove you from England. He was aware of most of it, and added facts. I said that in the last ten years two processes had been going on: one the restoring of the Episcopate, which had elicited opposition from many among the priests and the laity; and, secondly, the action of the Holy See upon the Episcopate, of which you were necessarily the instrument, and therefore the object of many episcopal complaints. He saw this, and said: "I have always said that if there had been any other Archbishop the Hierarchy would not have been carried through." This is only a passage out of a very long conversation. After this he went off and outdid himself in things which it is impossible to write. Now I shall expect some Paper without fail. I think it would be best, and would gratify him, if the letter were addressed to him, with the request to carry it to the Holy Father. He again spoke with satisfaction about the Southwark case, and said that this had strengthened you here and with the Holy Father.

I am just going to see Lord Chelmsford, and I mean to make sure of my law without giving him any light in return.[1]

I hope you will have a merry Christmas and a happy New Year, and many of them, in all the *abundantia et multitudine pacis*. —Believe me, my dear Lord Cardinal, your affectionate servant,

H. E. MANNING.

---

[1] Manning consulted Lord Chelmsford, who was spending Christmas in Rome, as to how far the law under the Commission on Charities affected Ecclesiastical Trust funds.

ROME, 17*th January* 1862.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—I have received Canon Morris's two letters, your Eminence's long letter by Dr. Melia, and the telegraphic despatch, which woke me up at 12½ last night and gave me a fright, for I could not imagine what had happened.

1. First, I think I can relieve you still more about the main question. Rinaldini and Capalti have read my answer to the Bishops, and have expressed themselves satisfied. I think all the points respecting the *Ponenza*, the instructions, and the letter of Propaganda in August last, are made out so as to make your position so far perfectly safe. . . .

I told him that he should have next week your Eminence's *riservata* respecting *l' interno dell' Episcopato*, and mine, which only touches the outside. But it is pretty strong, for I have kept the promise I made in my last letter. I hope to send you copies of both my Papers by Melia.

4. Cardinal Barnabò then spoke of the two Bishops. He said that when they came they were full of prejudices against your Eminence; but that they had come down 99 degrees. This is certainly true.

5. I will as soon as possible draw out for Cardinal Barnabò all the questions as to the relations between the Metropolitan and the bishops, and give it to him, and get his answers; and also as to the privileges of the Archbishop towards Rome. It is obvious that your Eminence must have rights and duties towards the Holy See which suffragans have not. What else does the Pallium mean?

6. Cardinal Barnabò has given me leave to see the *Ponenza* and *Sommario* of 1853 (which is the date of your papers, 1854 being the date of the instructions founded upon them), but your long letter gives me nearly all I want. I had already anticipated much of it by my own memory.

7. Dr. Melia and I have gone over the case of the Italian Church once with the Papers of the Pallotini. But we are to meet on Monday, and go to Bò about it.

8. I have found this difficulty, that in Italian they do not use our word (enroll) *arruollare* in that sense, so that *registrare* takes its place. But with us the "registration" regards the Middlesex and Yorkshire Acts as distinct from "enrolment." I think I have everywhere confined the "registration" to the case of perfecting titles; but I will go again over my Paper and make sure.

9. I still think it well that your Eminence should write me a short letter about Dr. Errington, to the effect that you foresee great danger of permanent division in the Episcopate and per-

manent opposition, and that in a sense contrary to all that you have endeavoured to do.

10. Capalti assures me that nothing in the part of the *Scrittura* of the bishops not communicated to me can affect the decision on the Trusts.

May I ask your Eminence to tell Canon Morris, with my thanks, that I will write soon; but I have had little time lately; for, in addition to two *Scritturas*, I have Mgr. Primecerias sitting on my head, like the Old Man of the Sea, and making me preach on Sundays in his Basilica of Monte Santo.

I am glad to have Dr. Melia's account of your health.—Believe me, my dear Lord Cardinal, your affectionate servant,

H. E. MANNING.

MGR. TALBOT TO MANNING.

VATICAN, 20*th June* 1862.

MY DEAR MGR. MANNING—I write a few lines to say that Cardinal Wiseman starts from Rome to-morrow, after having, I think, met with complete success in everything he has done here.

I am afraid the bishops have not gone away in good humour, as they have been completely foiled in all their endeavours to ruin him here; especially one, I am sorry to say, is very sore at not having succeeded. The Cardinal himself will tell you all about it. I think his Eminence in future ought to try to be as civil as possible to them, always, however, maintaining his rights. . . .

After the excitement we have been going through I shall not be sorry for a little rest. Nevertheless, all that has lately taken place has left an impression upon my mind which I shall never forget.—Believe me, etc.

GEO. TALBOT.

MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

BAYSWATER, 11*th May* 1861.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR TALBOT—. . . . Since I last wrote to you I found the instructions of Propaganda in 1854, and a copy has been sent to each bishop.

They are directed not to reveal, or to give up books of the Catholic Trusts.

I am afraid that the principle of right is gone.

As to Ushaw, anything to put an end to a contest is good, and when Rome speaks all must be silent.

MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

BAYSWATER, 1*st July* 1862.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—. . . . The Cardinal gave me an account of his audience in Paris.[1] It is indeed a complete success, and places him where he never stood before, both in Rome and in England. But all depends on his not being elated, and upon his winning the hearts and wills of the bishops.

I have not yet seen any of them, but have written a common-place note to Dr. Ullathorne. They will be sore and dissatisfied, and I foresee the danger of discontent not only against the Cardinal, but more.

I will—as I have already—say all I can to the Cardinal; but I find him more open-hearted and amenable when he is in trouble than when he is in prosperity, and this success will be a danger. . . .

Father Vaughan is not yet come from Vichy; I expect him in a week. We shall then hold our Chapter and begin upon our Seminary. I am very glad that the Holy Father bestowed a medal on Mr. Henry Wilberforce, for he wishes to do good service, and has been more abused than he deserves. The *W. Register* has often done good service, and sometimes more than the *Tablet*, which is of little use and circulation except for Catholics. The *W. Register* is used also by others, and it is most necessary to have a general paper which does not smell of incense and talk of nothing but ceremonies and sacristies. There has been also much opposition and rivalry to him. In truth, partisan politics are doing the devil's work among us in London. . . . —My dear Mgr. Talbot, yours very faithfully, H. E. MANNING.

MGR. TALBOT TO MANNING.

CASTEL GANDOLFO, 18*th July* 1862.

MY DEAR MGR. MANNING—. . . . There is no doubt that we enabled Cardinal Wiseman to gain a great triumph in Rome, but I hope he will make proper use of it. I hope he will not boast of it, so that what he says should get to the ears of the other bishops.

I shall never forget their look after their last audience, in which the Pope gave them a severe lesson. Dr. Ullathorne was

---

[1] Cardinal Wiseman's friendly interview and intercourse with Napoleon III. at Paris, and the Emperor's professions in regard to the Temporal Power of the Pope, raised high hopes in Rome. These illusions, which Wiseman shared to the full, converted the Cardinal into an ardent Napoleonist.

very bitter after it, and so was Grant. They both received a solemn rebuke to meditate upon.

I suspect that many of the English-speaking bishops from England, Ireland, and America tried to injure Cardinal Wiseman at Propaganda; and when you bespatter a man with mud, always a certain quantity sticks to him. I do not think that Propaganda was much pleased at Cardinal Wiseman's taking so prominent a part in getting up the Address to the Pope. As for myself, I am delighted that he did so. It was a great move making him preside over the Commission; and, as it turned out, it was most fortunate that he was staying in the Doria Palace, as otherwise how could he have received the bishops, and where could the cardinals have held their meeting? How amusing all the observations in the papers are! . . .

I shall be much obliged to you if you can help the Archbishop of Corfu,[1] who is a pet of Barnabò.

Dr. Gillies has been staying at Castello, and I have seen a great deal of him, as I daresay you know he is come to Rome on business.

I think there is much to be said on both sides, but I see that very much of the same spirit exists among the Scottish clergy as exists in England. . . . —Very sincerely yours,

GEO. TALBOT.

MGR. TALBOT TO MANNING.

VATICAN, *9th August* 1862.

MY DEAR MGR. MANNING—. . . . I cannot but think that Cardinal Wiseman's coming to Rome for the Canonisation of the Japanese Martyrs has been a most providential circumstance, as he has been completely restored to the position he held before the row.

I am glad to hear he is so well in health, and I hope he may continue to be so for many years longer. Certainly the position he occupied in Rome at the Canonisation was one of the greatest events of his life.

---

[1] The Archbishop of Corfu, "conforming to all things," as Manning said, "like a good Oblate of St. Charles," stayed a month at the Community House, Bayswater.

In a later letter Manning wrote:—"I saw the Duke of Newcastle, and obtained an interview for the Archbishop of Corfu. We then put his business in official form, and I have hopes of some good success.

"We are looking out for a house for our Seminary, and hope to find one before the summer is over. All our affairs, thank God, are going well. . . . The Franciscan nuns at Bayswater hope to be in their new convent this autumn."

I see in the papers that Dr. Ullathorne has been making a speech at Stafford, in which he made a eulogy of the Cardinal very different to what he said of him when he was in Rome. Poor man, he is a very difficult person to understand.

I suppose you will be coming to Rome next winter about the College question, which I must say is one of the greatest importance, on which the future of the Church in England much depends. . . . —Adieu, believe me, very sincerely yours,

GEO. TALBOT.

MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

BAYSWATER, 16*th August* 1862.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—. . . . The Cardinal is well, and you will soon see his Address to the clergy, which is excellent —one of his best productions.

I have seen Dr. Ullathorne, and spent two days with him. He was very friendly, and spoke kindly and guardedly of the Cardinal. He gave me his version of the last two days in Rome, through which I could perceive a certain sense of fiasco; he said he had seen no bishop except James Brown since his return. I know of no communications among them. James Brown has written to me civilly; and I have seen Dr. Grant, who is very friendly. The Cardinal will tell you of certain little *busy-nesses* of his which vex the Cardinal out of proportion; but they are very inconsiderate of Grant, and his doings with the Government[1] are more than that. Still I have advised the Cardinal not to write formally to Rome about them, for he who throws the first stone will damage himself. . . . —Yours very sincerely,

H. E. MANNING.

"Not to throw the first stone," was wise advice given to Cardinal Wiseman; for none knew better than Manning that the "Errington Case" was not settled by Dr. Errington's enforced resignation of his right of succession. The interchange of "courtesies and confidences" between the belligerents, if not imposed, recommended by Cardinal Barnabò, was not, as he would have it, "the placing of a stone over buried dissensions," but only a truce; and as the sequel shows, a truce of short duration.

[1] In the first instance Cardinal Wiseman, knowing that he was a *persona ingrata*, had deputed Manning to act on his behalf; but the bishops, objecting to be represented by Dr. Manning, deputed Dr. Grant, the Bishop of Southwark, to act in their name, in transacting official business with the Government.

CHAPTER VII

THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE

1861–1866.

THE Pope's Temporal Power, attacked with such ferocity by the Revolution—a cosmopolitan conspiracy against the Church—found in Manning a constant and undaunted champion. The defence of the Holy See, and of its Temporal rights and privileges, was a work after his own heart. The Temporal Power was to him almost as sacred as a dogma of faith. Its defence brought him into the forefront of the battle between the friends and foes of the Papacy. The invasion of Sicily and Naples by the red-shirted marauders, led by Garibaldi, was acclaimed by the infidel press of Paris; the lawless advance of Victor Emmanuel's armies into the South of Italy was applauded by English newspapers and countenanced even by English statesmen. The secret Societies of Europe had concentrated all their subterranean forces in Rome. In that evil day they dominated the councils of kings, and corrupted, by their intrigues and calumnies, the hearts of the peoples of Europe. Cavour was a past-master in the art of political intrigue. The presence of Napoleon's soldiers in Rome enabled the Italian Minister to excite the jealousy of other States, especially of Austria, against the policy of France. Rome's weakness was that the Temporal Power rested on the support of foreign Powers. To free Italy from the presence and power of Napoleon, whose army of occupation was in Rome, not out of religious motives but simply

and solely to further his own personal ends, was a cry which excited the blind enthusiasm of the lovers of liberty, and even reached the hearts of those whc were not otherwise unfavourable to the cause of the Papacy. The Republican instincts were satisfied; for their leaders knew well that in striking down the most ancient and most legitimate monarchy in Europe the throne of every King tottered under the recoil of the blow levelled against the Sovereign of the States of the Church. The enemies of revealed religion in every land rejoiced. In England, out of love of their own religion, and an antiquated hatred of the Papacy, happily long since obsolete, ultra-Protestants joined in the hue and cry of less honest men against the Temporal Power of the Popes.

Manning, as the most prominent defender of the Temporal Power, drew down upon himself the abuse of the newspapers, the friends and backers of Revolutionary Italy. In the Church of St. Mary of the Angels, Bayswater, he preached a series of sermons on the Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes.[1]

These sermons and lectures were widely reported in the newspapers, and afforded to the enemies of the Temporal Power ample materials for attack and abuse. Manning exulted in this sort of martyrdom. It only added a fresh stimulus to his zeal and enthusiasm. Men, unaccustomed in that day to Catholic retort, were astonished at his audacity, for, unabashed, he struck back blow for blow in defence of the Papal cause.

Manning sent these Lectures to Mgr. Talbot, and had them translated into Italian, and published in Rome. Unfamiliar with the subject of the Temporal Power, he not unnaturally fell into some mistakes. His zeal outran his discretion or knowledge. In one of the sermons delivered at Bayswater he committed himself to the statement that the Temporal Power of the Pope would in due course

[1] *The Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes:* Three Lectures, 1860. *The Last Glories of the Holy See greater than the first:* Three Lectures, with a preface, 1861. *The Present Crisis of the Holy See tested by Prophecy*, 1861.

be defined as a dogma of faith. There were other somewhat exaggerated statements or inferences, as well as a prophecy which gave no little offence, that Rome might become the city of Anti-Christ. To Manning's astonishment and dismay these Lectures were censured in Rome—threatened even with the Index.

In this dilemma Manning had recourse to his friend at the Vatican, Mgr. Talbot; and, as the following interesting correspondence shows, the sermons on the Temporal Power, after some slight amendments and alterations, met with approval at Propaganda.

In a letter, dated 13th December 1860, Manning wrote to Mgr. Talbot:—

> In the last audience I had, the Holy Father was pleased to speak of the Lectures I was publishing on the Temporal Power, and to wish to see them. I said that the bookseller would bring a copy to you. I told him to do so; I have heard nothing from him, and do not know whether he ever did or not.

MGR. TALBOT TO MANNING.

VATICAN, 3*rd January* 1861.

MY DEAR MGR. MANNING—I write in answer to your letter of the 13th December, to say that your Lectures on the Pope's Temporal Power were very fairly translated into Italian. I presented a copy, bound in white, according to the practice here, to His Holiness, and he read every word of them, and was much pleased with them; although perhaps there are one or two things rather hazardous in them, about which however he made no observation.

I also gave a list of Cardinals to the bookseller to whom I thought he ought to present a copy, which he did, and besides, the work was well advertised in the *Giornale di Roma*, and in large characters on the walls of the houses in blue, yellow, pink and white paper, various copies of which are still to be seen in various parts of the city. So that you see your Lectures have been sufficiently well known, and will duly again be reproduced in the collection of documents which the writers of the *Civiltà Cattolica* are publishing on the Pope's Temporal Sovereignty.

. . . . Cardinals Barnabò, Marini, Reisach, and others speak to me of "*nostro buon* Manning." With Barnabò I am thicker

than ever. Bedini is a most *inconcludente* man, and he only took the part he did against Errington because he knew the wishes of the Holy Father. As for the question, and every other English question, he knew nothing about it, and ne takes no trouble to know. His aim is to become Cardinal one way or other.

MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

BAYSWATER, 13*th June* 1861.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR TALBOT—Many thanks to you for your kind letter, which I take as a true act of friendship. I beg you always to use all openness with me in such matters, for I desire nothing but to serve the Holy See. If anything I have written needs correction or suppression it should be done with the greatest promptness. I should rejoice, not in the need, but in the opportunity of giving an example of docility in opinion at a time when we are in great danger from the contrary spirit, and in England where we have neither censorship nor even counsel.

A second Edition will probably be needed, and the Lectures are being translated into French at Paris, so that I shall take it as a great kindness to have any remarks, which shall be gladly complied with.

I sent the proofs to Dr. Maguire to read over before publication. I thought him the most learned and prudent man in that way we have. He returned it without a word, only marking the margin here and there, which I changed so far as I could conjecture his meaning. Now I have endeavoured to guard the main subject in a letter to the *Weekly Register*, and in these Sermons in the *Tablet*. One thing makes our work in England difficult: we are overwhelmed by the newspapers all anti-Catholic; and our Catholics are completely stunned and seduced by the Protestant exultation at the success of Cavour and Garibaldi. I wanted to meet this. . . . —Believe me, my dear Mgr. Talbot, very sincerely yours, H. E. MANNING.

MGR. TALBOT TO MANNING.

VATICAN, 18*th June* 1861.

MY DEAR MGR. MANNING—I write a few lines in answer to your letter of the 4th June, to say that a good deal too much talk at Rome has been made about some expressions you made use of in your Lectures on Anti-Christ, in which you said that Rome would some day return to Paganism. I have traced the

origin of the ill-natured things said to the Irish College. I am told that it has been reported even to Propaganda. Although I am sorry that you did make use of some expressions in your Lectures, yet I cannot attribute the animus manifested against you to zeal for the greater glory of God and the salvation of souls. You may be certain that *prejudice* and *jealousy* are the root of the unkind things said about you. This you must expect. More you rise in England, more enemies will set themselves against you to criticise all you do, so that I recommend you to be constantly on your guard.

I am sorry to be obliged to say so, but the way in England is to make use of you as a preacher, and afterwards abuse you behind your back.

I am glad to hear that you are going to commence a Seminary for your Oblates. Such has always struck me as the most sensible plan; as it will be impossible for you to do anything at St. Edmund's, which they tell me is the hotbed of the Old School notions, and which it will take a good while to eradicate. . . . . At Rome we are constantly living in the same state of anxiety. Perhaps it is the will of Providence that we should be always dying and "Behold we live."—My dear Mgr. Manning, very sincerely yours, GEO. TALBOT.[1]

Extracts from a letter from Mgr. Talbot to Manning dated Vatican, 6th July 1861:—

MY DEAR MGR. MANNING—. . . . I think the affair about your Lectures on Anti-Christ has been settled satisfactorily. It was an intrigue of your enemies in order to injure you in Rome. I wrote a long letter to Cardinal Bò on the subject, explaining the nature of the Lectures, and attributing what had been said about them to a certain party in England, who act more from motives of prejudice and jealousy than from zeal for the Salvation of souls and greater Glory of God.

---

[1] The following remarks of Mgr. Talbot on Father Faber are worth recording:—"What a beautiful sermon Father Faber preached on the Feast of Pentecost! I read it with great interest, and I have had it translated into Italian, as I think it quite as applicable to the Romans and Italians as it is to the English. Really, one of the great characteristics of the age is to ignore the existence of the Holy Ghost in the Church. Even here, in Rome, there are those who criticise the acts of the Holy See as if the Church was a mere human institution; therefore it will do no harm to call the attention of the Romans to the fact that they are most especially called upon to be careful of what they say and what they do, for fear lest they should be sinning against the Holy Ghost."

As I wrote in virtue of my being Consultor of Propaganda, I received an official answer from the Secretary, Mgr. Capalti, to the effect that your "Lectures on the Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes, and the Present Crisis of the Holy See, Tested by Prophecy," had been carefully considered by Propaganda and approved of, though some statements were considered as inaccurate. Mgr. Capalti expressed regret at the prophecy which you had introduced that the City of the Popes would relapse into Paganism and become the city of Anti-Christ. This statement Mgr. Capalti held to be inopportune.

Besides now I am having translated your most admirable Sermons on the *Latter Glories of the Holy See*, which I consider to be the best publication on the subject, so that I shall have them printed, and send a number of copies to Propaganda.

All this shows how careful you must be, as you have enemies in every quarter, not merely amongst the old Catholics, but also amongst many converts, who are jealous of you because you have gained for yourself such an European reputation, and go ahead of them. Your study, therefore, should be to stand well with the Holy See, and this you will do by showing yourself every year in Rome. Your being made Proto-Notary Apostolic will always give you an excuse, and at the same time increase your influence in the Curiâ. . . .

MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

BAYSWATER, 12*th July* 1861.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR TALBOT—I received your letter last night, and I thank you for it very much; for I had been somewhat anxious on the subject of our friends at the Irish College knowing that, as Cicero says, "*res surda et inexorabilis accusatio*"; and somehow the most evident injustice does its work, and is never corrected. I was not anxious about the matter of which I spoke, for there is not a principle or a proposition which is not taken from works printed at Rome with the *imprimatur* of the master of the Sacred Palace; or from Suarez, *i.e.*, all the objections I have heard are against quotations from them, not matter of my own.[1] I thank you much for writing as Consultor

---

[1] "At this time the controversy on the Temporal Power was blazing in pamphlets and newspapers. The *first Red Book* [large folios, in which Manning bound up cuttings from the newspapers] contains endless attacks on me, and my answers. I then published the three things, afterwards united, on *The Temporal Power of the Pope* which was attacked in Rome

of Propaganda. It was the kindest and best service you could do me; and for the quotation you send me of Capalti's answer.

It is a satisfaction to me that you like the sermons in the *Tablet*. They are now in the press, with a third which is, I hope, more to the point, as it is upon the Pontificate of Pius IX. You shall have the set as soon as possible; and I shall be very glad to have them translated into Italian. They will be put here with the last four, so that the latter will not be sold without them. This, I hope, will guard against misunderstanding, so far as that may be; for I fear you are right as to the root of all these *miserie*. However, so long as I give no just cause, I am willing to bear anything for my own humiliation; and I trust in God that I may never write a word *minus caute*. . . . —Believe me always, my dear Mgr. Talbot, yours very sincerely, H. E. MANNING.

MGR. TALBOT TO MANNING.

VATICAN, 13*th July* 1861.

MY DEAR MGR. MANNING—As I intend to have translated into Italian and published your last three discourses on the *Last Glories of the Holy See*, I wish you would send me them by post as soon as they are published.

Indeed, I look upon them as admirable, and perhaps the best publication on the subject. I have already had the first discourse translated by Padre Brunengo, but I have begged him to wait patiently until I can receive the two others, revised and published as they will be by yourself.

I hope these excellent discourses will undo the bad impression made by the false interpretation of some expressions in your Lectures on Anti-Christ. When I have had them translated and printed in good Italian, I will give a copy to the Holy Father and all the Cardinals and Prelates.—Adieu. Believe me, very sincerely yours, GEO. TALBOT.

(See Mgr. Talbot's Letters). P. Ferrari, Dominican, wished omissions. The Franciscan Bishop of Potenza, P. Antonio di Rignano, wished it to be published as it stood. The attack was on the quotations from Suarez and Malvenda—as inopportune. A Jesuit wrote *De Bello Romano* to clear Suarez, which he does not do. My book was translated, and published at Propaganda, and approved by Pius IX.; Cardinal Barnabò and P. Pinirillo commended it very much to our Cardinal. P. P. was the Editor of the great collection of volumes on the Temporal Power."—*Cardinal Manning's Journal*, 1878-82.

BAYSWATER, 19*th July* 1861.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR TALBOT—I have to thank you once more for your kindness to me in this little mortification, which I am sure is for my good, and have no doubt will work for the best. It is very good of you to take so much care for my sake, and I feel that but for you I might have remained under suspicions which, however unjust, would have been painful and perhaps incurable. No doubt it is to teach me double caution, for it never crossed my mind that I was in danger of saying anything capable even of misinterpretation on the subject of the Holy See. In this country no one that I have heard of has said anything. Dr. Brown of Newport read them at my request after the censure in Rome, and said that he could find nothing open to attack except the quotations from Malvenda, and my paraphrase of them.

Now, I am anxious to know what parts are thought open to misinterpretation or censure, as the Lectures are being translated in France, and a second Edition may be asked for here. If anyone would kindly score the margin and send it to me by post, I shall take it as a real act of charity. I heard that Dr. Moran had censured them, and wrote to him; but he put the censuring on others, and does not state them. Perhaps Dr. Smith would do me that kindness, and if you advise it, I will write and ask him.

The other three, with a preface, will be, I hope, ready to send by next Saturday. The two first are nearly as they stood in the *Tablet*. The changes are so few that the translation had better go forward, and add the notes and the few changes afterwards. It is a real comfort to me that you think them to the point. The subject is so vast and so *fine*, for the theological part is very intimately connected with the Incarnation, that I have found as I went on how much ought to have been said in the first three Lectures which have been translated. I am going to print them all in a volume, with a general preface.

I have never said what you would at once perceive, but in Rome people are less aware of, that the subject of Anti-Christ is one with which our people here are stunned and perplexed by Protestants. My Lectures are an answer and a return of the attack.

Now I am ashamed of having written so much about myself, but your kindness has drawn it upon you.

Of course I have understood from the first that you will oblige me by desiring that all the cost of translating and printing be sent to me. I will send the draft for it through Cholmondeley.
—Believe me, my dear Mgr. Talbot, very sincerely yours,

H. E. MANNING.

Extracts from a letter of Manning to Mgr. Talbot, dated Bayswater, 26th July 1861:—

. . . . By the same post I have sent the full proofs of the three Lectures, with a preface.

The translator will find no great changes in the two first, except the notes and the new translation of St. Gregory VII.'s letters taken from the original. The other I found to be garbled.

Pray use your judgment upon them, especially on the preface. Print it or not as you think best, and whole or in part.

I have sent the proofs to Bishop Brown of Newport to read over before publication.

The three first are out of print, and I am going to put them all into a volume; but now that I have read somewhat more about the subject I wish I could begin all over again. Not that I doubt any of the principles or propositions, but because it ought all to have been done better.

I have now to thank you for another act of kindness. Rinaldini has written to me a most friendly letter, of which I see your kindness was the cause.

Extracts from a letter from Mgr. Talbot to Manning, dated Vatican, 30th July 1861:—

. . . . I think you need not trouble yourself about your Lectures on Anti-Christ, as the matter will blow over quietly. I called at Propaganda, and had a long talk with Rinaldini about them. He said that he had the greatest esteem for you, and had read the Lectures, and was pleased with much that they contained; but thought that, at a moment when the whole Catholic world had declared itself so unanimously and generously for the Holy See and its rights, and indeed whilst in Rome itself there was such an impulse given to religion, it was not opportune to show from the prophecies that Rome would lose the faith. I do not think that anyone except the Bishop of Waterford has impugned the orthodoxy of your lectures; at Propaganda they only said that, "*Non era opportuno.*" And indeed myself I was sorry that at the end of your last Lecture you should have prophesied the apostacy of the city of Rome (although citing many authorities), as I was afraid that it would have been made a handle by your enemies. But "Heaven deliver me from my friends," the reviewers of the *Weekly Register* are the persons who did you the greatest injury, as it appears that the persons who spoke against you had not read your Lectures, but only the review.

I have sent your Lectures to Dr. Smith, and he has been much pleased with them. He told me that he could find nothing in them to condemn, and he attributed the row merely to the Irish College, who were delighted to find an excuse for delating you to Propaganda. *Jealousy* is the motive, not zeal for salvation of souls and the greater glory of God. . . .

I have had your two first Lectures on the *Glories of the Holy See* translated into Italian. . . . These two are admirable and most suitable and opportune. Cardinal Barnabò and Mgr. Capalti like them very much.

Extract of a letter from Manning to Mgr. Talbot:—

BAYSWATER, 5*th August* 1861.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR TALBOT—I have been away for a few days, and on coming back found your letter of July 30th. You have been a true friend to me in this little trial, which, but for you, might have been blown up into a great one. I cannot thank you better than by making a memento for you every day, which, to tell the truth, I have done by name for many years, and I think it has brought me your great kindness in this and other matters. If I ever know how to return it I shall count it a happiness.

It is a pleasure to me to know that the matter came not from Dr. Smith, but from the Bishop of Waterford. He and I were very good friends, and I do not feel anything personally about it. I have but one wish—to end what remains to me of life in working for souls and serving the Holy See. The one truth which has saved me is the Infallibility of the Vicar of Jesus Christ, as the only true and perfect form of the Infallibility of the Church, and therefore of all divine faith, unity, and obedience. Perhaps this made me more grieved at anything inopportune in what I endeavoured to do.

By this time I hope you have the third Lecture and the preface; and now I am fairly ashamed at writing more about myself.—Believe me, always affectionately yours,

H. E. MANNING.

The correspondence between Manning and Mgr. Talbot on the criticisms to which his Lectures on the Temporal Power of the Pope were exposed, bears a striking testimony to Manning's alacrity, on this occasion, to take counsel and correct or suppress any statements in them which might be considered erroneous or inopportune. Public attention was thoroughly aroused on the question of the Temporal Power;

and the general interest taken in his lectures, not only in England but in Rome, bears witness to the influence and authority to which, by his writings, Dr. Manning had already attained.

The volume entitled *The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ*, which embodied the sermons and lectures delivered in 1860 and 1861, was the first publication of Manning as a Catholic which excited public attention. It was a bold outspoken defence of the rights and privileges of the Pope as a temporal sovereign. It maintained the principle, attacked and denied by the revolutionary and irreligious press, that the Temporal Power was necessary to the liberty of the Church and the spiritual independence of the Papacy. The attack was so fierce and universal, the danger so imminent, that even any exaggeration in statement was easy to be accounted for and condoned. In his correspondence with Mgr. Talbot, Manning candidly admitted that these lectures were delivered to meet attacks and misrepresentations made by Protestant speakers and writers in a spirit most hostile to the Pope's Temporal Power. Manning was a man of action. He spoke and wrote on the spur of the moment, and did not always give himself time, as in the preparation of these lectures on the Temporal Power, to weigh his statements or to define with perfect accuracy the propositions he laid down.

But besides all his work in delivering sermons and lectures and establishing Reviews in defence of the Temporal Power of the Pope, Manning brought his personal influence to bear in discussing the Italian question with politicians and statesmen. "I met Mr. Gladstone yesterday," he wrote to Mgr. Talbot, "the first time we had met since I became a Catholic, and had two hours' talk with him about the Temporal Power of the Pope."

On Manning's conversion, his intimacy with Mr. Gladstone came to an end. For twelve years they never met; their copious correspondence, confined only to subjects of Anglican interest, ceased. On the other hand, some of Mr. Gladstone's intimate friends who had become Catholic, like James Hope and Mr. Monsell the late Lord Emly, remained in friendly

relations with him. Mr. Monsell's intimacy with Mr. Gladstone especially was not interrupted. Indeed he was at the time Under-Secretary at the War Office.

In an autobiographical Note Manning said: "I was walking in 1861 (see my letter to Talbot) with Monsell, and in the passage between the Horse Guards and Downing Street met Gladstone on his way to the House of Commons. He shook hands warmly and said, 'I hope I shall see you again.'"

Manning, in doubt whether Mr. Gladstone really meant what he had said, or whether he had only spoken out of courtesy or friendliness, on going home wrote to Mr. Gladstone saying, "Were your words deliberate, or only a formula? If the latter, I will forget them; if the former, I shall be happy to renew our relations. Mr. Gladstone answered in substance, 'Though our relations must be affected by your being a priest, I did mean what I said.' From that day we corresponded, and sometimes met."[1]

As the question of the Temporal Power of the Pope was at the time the uppermost subject in Manning's mind, he entered into a brisk controversy with Mr. Gladstone on the Italian question. Manning's weighty arguments in favour of the Temporal Power failed to move Mr. Gladstone from the determined position he had taken up as a supporter of the Italian movement; but he conceded that the Pope, as head of the Catholic Church, was entitled to a position of security and independence. The controversy between them was renewed from time to time.

In Manning's communications to the Vatican, and Mgr. Talbot's reports as to the fears and anxieties excited in Rome by the invasion of the Papal States by Garibaldi, and the spread of the revolutionary spirit in the states and nations of Europe, subjects of political interest interrupt or enliven the discussion of graver ecclesiastical matters. As contemporary witnesses of the beginnings of the Revolution which ended in the annexation of Rome by the Piedmontese, Manning's and Mgr. Talbot's passing allusions to the events of the day, or of the spirit which begot them, are not without interest.

[1] Cardinal Manning's Reminiscences.

In the following letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated Bayswater, 5th January 1861, and in subsequent letters, Dr. Manning speaks in a tone of despondency, which about this period was not uncommon in him, on the public feeling in England against the Temporal Power of the Pope; on the want of union and of political capacity among English Catholics; and on the rise of a "mischievous" Tory Catholic party:—

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—. . . . The Protestant political spirit is very confident and overbearing, encouraged by the state of Italy and the belief that England is at last succeeding in overthrowing the Pope's temporal power and influence over Catholic nations. Also the Volunteer movement has taught Government that it need not depend on Ireland for an army. My belief is that the Catholics in this country have not been so weak in politics for fifty years. Ireland is also very much divided, and the Irish members in Parliament either neutralise each other or support the policy of Lord Palmerston. When I look at all this I am more than ever convinced that bad times are coming, and that all hangs on the Holy Father. He is *totius Christianitatis caput et compendium*, and if his position among the nations and powers of this world be destroyed, I believe we shall soon feel the weight of all the governments of Europe upon the Church. . . .

All these things would be of no moment if we were united among ourselves; but unhappily, as you say, we are tormented by prejudice and jealousy. If we yield to it, all the gain we have made is in risk, and much will be lost. The incapacity of most of the Catholics to deal with the altered state of the Church in England is every day more apparent; and I fear many of them prefer the old state of the Church when it hardly ventured out of its inactivity to the present conflict with the English people. . . .

You say I am always in proximate occasions of coming to Rome. I confess I should enjoy very much to be there at this time. It is a great grace to be near the Vicar of Christ when the world is upon him; and if I could be in two places at once, as the saints and the birds, I would come. . . .—Believe me always very sincerely yours, H. E. MANNING.

Extracts from a letter of Mgr. Talbot to Manning, dated Vatican, 3rd January 1861:—

Here we are living in a state of constant anxiety; at any moment something might happen to send us all a-skipping. In case of a row how I long to die a martyr for the Holy See.

The Note of Lord John Russell is the most unprincipled document that ever was written by a minister of any civilised court. He maintains in it the principle that the end justifies the means, and that evil can be done if those who do it have good intentions—that robbery and rebellion is lawful. This principle applied to the British Empire would liberate Ireland, the Ionian Islands, India, and New Zealand, which are all sighing for independence. I hope the Opposition will knock over Lord John Russell on account of his Note. "O that my enemy had written a book." . . .

By the bye your sermon at the Dirge for those who died at Castel Fidardo created a sensation in Rome. I think it was one of your best. I am surprised that you do not publish it, as you have done your others. . . .

The Dirge celebrated in London at the Church of St. Patrick's, Soho, for the repose of the souls of those who fell at Castel Fidardo in defence of the sovereign rights of the Supreme Pontiff, was crowded by representative Catholics of England, and by the zealous sons of St. Patrick, for many Irishmen were among the gallant Zouaves who fought and fell in the Papal cause. Dr. Manning preached an eloquent sermon describing the assailants of the Holy See and of the sovereign rights of the Papacy as the enemies of Christ. The Sermon, in accordance with Mgr. Talbot's advice, was afterwards published.

Extracts of a letter from Manning to Mgr. Talbot, dated Bayswater, 7th March 1861:—

Some time ago I told you that politically Catholics are weaker at this time in England than since 1830; and every day convinces me that political Protestantism is stronger. The Italian policy against the Holy See could never have been carried out but for Lord Palmerston, and he never could have done it without exciting the Protestantism of Parliament, as Lord John did ten years back. The *Times* is driving this on, and writing up the Reformation in Italy. I feel sure that we are going to have a crisis in England. . . .

The Government is weak in everything except in its anti-Catholic foreign policy; and in this it has Parliament and the

country with it, simply because it is a national and anti-Roman movement. . . .

Since writing the beginning, the debate on Pope Hennessy's motion has confirmed all I fear. Excepting Maguire's speech nothing can be feebler than our position in the face of Parliament and the country. Maguire alone made any stand, and then he seems to have no argument—no definite basis to stand on God help us.

Mgr. Talbot to Manning. Extracts from a letter, dated Vatican, 10th May 1861, on the Temporal Power and the *Rambler* :—

MY DEAR MGR. MANNING—. . . . There is another point to which I have been requested to draw your attention, in order that you may speak about it to Cardinal Wiseman. It appears that a most offensive article against the temporal power of the Pope has appeared in the *Rambler*. The article is attributed to Sir John Acton. I really do think that the bishops ought to take notice of it, because after the Pope has spoken, as he has done in his encyclicals and allocutions, after the whole Catholic episcopate have declared themselves unanimously for the maintenance of the temporal power, it is rather presumptuous in a layman writing an article against it in a Catholic periodical, with the approval of the English bishops.

I have not yet read the article, but when I have I shall be obliged to delate it to the proper authority, if it assert propositions which have been quoted to me by persons in Rome who have already read it.

What a beautiful Pastoral the Cardinal's last is! It is a sign that his mind remains the same as ever.

MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

BAYSWATER, 23*rd June* 1861.

Another great danger we are in is the rise of party politics among us. We are in danger of being torn asunder between Whig and Tory; both, I believe, seeking their own ends. If this Government stays in we shall have the anti-Catholic foreign policy. If it be thrown out, we shall have a dissolution and a second Durham Letter agitation. This I know from a direct source. If Lord Derby comes in, the foreign policy will not be better, but the agents would; but then there would be Orangeism in Ireland and a "No Popery" cry in England. It is a hard choice. I dislike both and trust neither.

There is an evident change for the better towards Catholics in private life. But public opinion and Parliament are worse than for twenty years, except during the Papal aggression. The reaction of the foreign policy and the Italian movement is very strong. Free trade and the hostility to Rome are the two ruling political feelings at this moment. I am afraid Hennessy is going to provoke another discussion on the latter, and that just as negotiations are pending.

In a subsequent letter, dated 19th July 1861, Dr. Manning bade Mgr. Talbot not to fail to read Mr. Gladstone's speech on the Italian policy (19th July). It is an expression of the whole public opinion of England.

MGR. TALBOT TO MANNING.

VATICAN, *6th July* 1861.

At Rome we are always in the same state of anxiety. Our fate depends on the Emperor of the French. Yet nevertheless, as you say in your sermons, the Holy See and the attitude of the Holy Father was never greater than it is at present. Nine hundred bishops have written to him. There never was a moment when the episcopate was more vigorous or more united with the Holy See. No doubt the time is coming when the Holy See must throw itself more and more on the episcopate and the faithful for support, as all the Powers on earth have abandoned her. . . .

In a letter dated September 1861, Manning reported to Mgr. Talbot that his stay at Homburg had done him good and that the doctors had told him he had no organic mischief, but needed food, rest, and good air. He was about to start for Rome and should be very glad to renew his old talks, for there was plenty to say. He then added:—

In truth, I have had a hard time for the last four years . . . I know I need a holiday, for besides work the miserable contentions of these last years have had their effects, though while the Cardinal was suffering, I had no time or will to think about it. . . .

We are here in a lull of events; and the only subjects worth speaking of are those on which I do not like to write.

Then referring to Rome and the Temporal Power, Manning wrote as follows:—

The only hope I see is in a coolness between France and England, which the bullying of Lord Palmerston and the newspapers has already in part produced. But English public opinion is blind, deaf, and unanimous against us.

In the following year, in a letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated Bayswater, 1st July 1862, Manning wrote on Montalembert's attitude in regard to the Temporal Power as follows:—

When I was in Paris I saw Montalembert. He gave me a volume he has written on Lacordaire. The half I have read is very interesting, and contains a sentence I am glad to see; and I mention it because he has been thought unsteady about the temporal power. He calls the idea of its surrender an "aberration," like the excesses of the early Lamennais party. Also his conversation was satisfactory about it. I think it would be well that the Holy Father should know this. He also said that he thought it would be of good effect if some expression of respect from Rome were made to Guizot for his book, for which he has suffered a persecution in France. A direct expression would be difficult, but if he were to know through a third person that his intentions in his book were kindly regarded it might be well.

Speaking of Garibaldi's reception in London in a letter dated Bayswater, 13th November 1862, Manning said:—

We had a curious episode about Garibaldi, in which his portrait did much, and made him an estate in the realm.

Extracts from a letter of Manning's to Mgr. Talbot dated Bayswater, 10th January 1863.

I have been delighted by the report of the Holy Father's words to the French officers[1] about Jacob and the angel. It is *propriamente un detto di Pio IX.*—wonderful for truth and beauty.

In a letter dated Via del Tritone, Rome, March 1863, Manning reported to Cardinal Wiseman some facts about the contemplated resignation—which caused no little sensation at the time—of Cardinal Antonelli.

[1] On the occasion of the reception by the Sovereign Pontiff of the officers of the French Army of Occupation on New Year's Day 1863.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—. . . . I saw Mgr. Franchi this morning and asked him about Cardinal Antonelli. He desired me with all *ossequj* to assure you that Cardinal Antonelli will take no further steps as to resignation. Mgr. Franchi tells me that it was never formally tendered. But certainly it was contemplated. He took *occasion* of Mgr. Pilas's *mancanza* in Fausti's case. But the sore is an old one. Merode and Pilas have been acting without reference to their principal in various instances; and this lit the fire. But public reasons have prevailed with Cardinal Antonelli to rest quiet, if not content. It is a sad affair at this moment. That Franchi was compromised, I hear is beyond doubt. . . . —Believe me, my dear Lord Cardinal, your very affectionate servant, H. E. MANNING.

Mgr. Talbot in a letter to Manning, dated Vatican, 6th June 1863, reported as follows:—

In Rome we are all well. The Holy Father's visit to the southern provinces was wonderfully successful. He met everywhere with a most enthusiastic reception, and the way he was received when he returned to Rome baffles description. I am more than ever convinced that the great majority of his subjects are attached to him and his government as strongly as can be.

Manning in one of his letters described in terms of warm admiration the dignified attitude of her Majesty the Queen, in regard to the way in which Garibaldi, the Italian Revolutionary leader, was welcomed and *fêted* even by responsible statesmen. Disraeli, to his honour be it said, refused to receive Garibaldi. Manning, in a letter to Mgr. Talbot, said, "Her Majesty acted as a Queen and a woman in putting a stop to all this seditious tomfoolery about Garibaldi."

In a letter to Cardinal Wiseman, dated Rome, 26th 1863, Manning wrote as follows:—

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—. . . . The Holy Father is wonderfully well. He sang the Mass as strongly as ever, and afterwards in the Chapel of the Pietà said some words *Pontifici dignos.* Cardinal Mattei wished him peace . . . He said—"Peace is very precious to the Church; but it has had very little of it since the beginning. In every age it has been in conflict; but with different enemies, and always conquering with the same arms. The last century gave us our chief

enemies, infidelity and impiety, and we have to combat these with their proper opposites, faith in all Christians, wisdom in the pastors, firmness and constancy, which I pray God to pour out upon you all, and upon myself also; for I also have a share in the battle."

The Queen of England and the Pope, it will be noted with satisfaction, were of one mind in repudiating the Revolution as personified in Garibaldi.

CHAPTER VIII

A NEW COADJUTOR REFUSED BY CARDINAL WISEMAN

1863

THE question of succession to Cardinal Wiseman, first Archbishop of Westminster, had for several years before his death preoccupied the mind of all those, whether in Rome or in England, who were concerned either by office or duty, or by public or personal interests, in the choice of a successor. It was not merely a question of persons; it was something more and far higher—a question of principles. In restoring the Hierarchy, Cardinal Wiseman had introduced into the Church in England broader views; had broken down its somewhat narrow insularity; had opened up the gateways of more intimate communication and union with Rome. He had by precept and example infused a higher, a more Roman spirit into the English Church. It was feared lest Wiseman's successor might undo or retard Wiseman's work. There was to a certain extent legitimate grounds for this suspicion or fear. Suspicion, amounting to mistrust in the English bishops, was, however, fostered and exaggerated by the private communications made to the Vatican. As time went on and the struggle grew closer and fiercer, it came to pass that the name of no candidate put forward as Wiseman's successor escaped censure. It must needs be so—it is one of the common-places of human experience—that where the partisan spirit is let loose, or personal feeling runs high, there the be-littling tongue is ever busy. Party spirit can no more be

exorcised in things ecclesiastical than in secular affairs. An anti-Roman or Gallican spirit, or a low order of English Catholicism, or a spirit of worldliness was freely imputed, even within the walls of the Vatican, to this candidate, or that, or the other, even though they were bishops, supposed to stand in high favour with the ruling cardinals at Propaganda. High motives as well as lower, or spiritual unction, or fear of evil results to the Church may sometimes inspire such a line of action, even though it cannot be denied that mixed motives too often under stress of circumstances govern the conduct of men. No sooner had Dr. Errington at the Pope's command resigned, in June 1862, his rights of succession to the See of Westminster than efforts were made both at Rome and in England to force upon Cardinal Wiseman, weary of strife, a new coadjutor with right of succession. It was feared in Rome that on Wiseman's death Dr. Errington's claims might be revived. Dr. Manning, as Provost of the Chapter of Westminster, knew well that the opinions of the canons, irritated at his removal, and for other reasons, were in favour of Dr. Errington. The bishops who had opposed, as well as the Chapter, the enforced resignation of Wiseman's coadjutor, would not fail, it was foreseen, to make common cause with the Chapter. To avert such a catastrophe as the election, on Wiseman's death, of Dr. Errington, Manning was prepared to reopen the strife. With his practical sagacity, he perceived that the results of the victory attained with such difficulty were little more than nominal as long as Dr. Errington remained as a bishop in England the head of the opposing party. It was a mere truce. The struggle must needs recommence afresh on Cardinal Wiseman's death. It is needless to repeat that Manning regarded Dr. Errington as the embodiment of "a low order of English Catholicism, national and anti-Roman," and believed that his accession to the See of Westminster "would undo all the work Wiseman had done since the restoration of the hierarchy, and throw back the progress of Catholicism in England for a generation." With such a conviction in his heart, Manning was not the man to sit idle or to lose

courage. The imminence of the danger—for Wiseman's life was hanging on a thread—quickened his zeal. The Cardinal's despondency and inertness of will only served to kindle in his eager lieutenant new hopes and fresh activity. All the resources of his skill and diplomacy were called into play. Though prepared to fight to the bitter end, Manning had far liefer win by the ways of conciliation. In this view he suggested to Cardinal Wiseman to write a letter to Propaganda to renew the offer to Dr. Errington of the Archbishopric of Port of Spain, Trinidad. It had been offered to him by Monsignor Talbot in the beginning of the quarrel as an inducement to resign of his own accord his claims to Westminster. But the offer had been declined. If, however, Dr. Errington could be induced to accept it now, the victory would be secured, and the kiss of peace would have passed and made all things smooth.

Dr. Manning without loss of time set out for Rome to open fresh negotiations at headquarters. In a letter, dated 28 Via del Tritone, 24th Feb. 1863, to Cardinal Wiseman, he wrote as follows:—

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—. . . . The Holy Father is fairly well. I am going to an audience this evening. Talbot is also well.

1. On Saturday I saw Cardinal Bò, who gave me a very hearty *benvenuto* and two great hugs. He was in very good humour, and this I hear also from Mgr. Talbot and Father Coffin. He talked of Port of Spain strongly in the sense of the *letter* you wrote. The congregation was held yesterday; and I afterwards saw Cardinal Reisach who repeated the same very strongly, and I do not doubt such was the decision. . . .

At the Capella I saw Cardinals Marini, Di Pietro, Mertel, and four or five others. Many inquiries after your Eminence, which is always the first question. Cardinal Franchi was in high spirits about the moral effects of the events of last June.[1]

P.S.—This evening I had an audience. The Holy Father asked much about you and the bishops. I said that everything was calm, and that Dr. Ullathorne was very friendly, and the late troubles buried. He talked of Port of Spain, and said that

[1] The resignation by Dr. Errington of his rights of succession at the Pope's command.

Dr. Errington would not go. I said, *No; se non di!tro un Suo comando.* He said, *Comando non do; ma mio consiglio e desiderio.* He said he wished it for your sake. . . .

I have just had a long talk with Mgr. Capalti, who is all right: full of inquiry about *le Fiducie* and the *pietra sopra.*[1]

On his return to England, Manning related to Cardinal Wiseman a part of the conversation which he had had with Cardinal Barnabò on the great question of the appointment at once of a new coadjutor; and in a letter, dated 25th May 1863, Manning reported the result to Mgr. Talbot:—

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—I got home Friday night and next day saw the Cardinal. . . . He spoke about Dr. Errington. I told him what had passed down to the time you left Rome; and also what Cardinal Barnabò said to me the day before I left. Barnabò did not show me the Cardinal's letter. I did not ask to see it; but he spoke very strongly about it, and still more so on the dangers ahead to the diocese, to England, and to the Holy See in the event of the Cardinal's life and the Holy Father's failing. Barnabò desired me to repeat all this to the Cardinal, and to add that though he had expressed his unwillingness to have another coadjutor, yet *bisogna spogliare della sua personalità* for the avoiding of these imminent dangers. I told the Cardinal the first part; the latter I have not yet said; it is a difficult subject for me to speak of, but I will endeavour to do so. Morris could tell you of the Cardinal's dispositions, for he has shown him your last letter. I believe the Cardinal is still unwilling to look the question in the face. But it ought to be done. Morris told me that Dr. Maguire had spoken to him of Dr. Errington's letter to Propaganda, showing that he had seen it, and that it was a common work. It was dated a few days after the bishops' meeting in Low Week, when Dr. Errington was staying with Dr. Goss and Dr. Turner at Richmond, and was also in London.

In reply Mgr. Talbot wrote a letter, dated Vatican, 6th June 1863, from which I need only recite a passage or two. After some caustic remarks on the little "veneration the English episcopate has for the wishes or even decisions of the Vicar of Christ," he says:—

---

[1] An allusion to the "Confidences" exchanged between Cardinal Wiseman and his suffragan bishops, and the "stone" placed over the buried troubles.

This brings me to the subject of Dr Errington, with whom nearly all of them seem to sympathise. I am afraid that Cardinal Bò's apprehensions are too well founded, and, in the event of the Cardinal's death, I fear that they will manifest the English national feeling working within them, and try to put him (Dr. Errington) at their head in order to oppose the wishes of the Holy See. This scandal must be prevented. Cardinal Bò, every time I see him, says that the Cardinal must name a coadjutor. Cardinal Marini says the same, and I think all the Cardinals who know the circumstances are of the same opinion.

By this post I write to Morris to beg him to do what he can in order to induce the Cardinal to act in this matter.

In a letter dated 5th June 1863, Manning was able to report more hopefully of Wiseman's disposition to yield to the pressure brought to bear upon him:—

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—The Cardinal has shown me part of your last letter. . . . The Cardinal is, I think, now seriously disposed to do what Cardinal Bò and you have advised. I understand that Dr. Errington's letter was seen by Dr. Maguire, and is in the hands of Bishop Brown (Benedictine) in copy, who, I am told, takes his part.—Very faithfully yours,

H. E. MANNING.

Mgr. Talbot seems to have translated Manning's hopes into realities, for in a letter dated Vatican, 13th June 1863, he wrote:—

MY DEAR MGR. MANNING—I have just received your last letter, dated on the 5th inst. I am delighted to hear that Cardinal Wiseman has made up his mind to do what Cardinal Bò advises. But it is a most delicate matter and requires the greatest secrecy, because, if it were to get abroad, there would be a great row among the bishops. Cardinal Bò advised, and I am of the same opinion, that Cardinal Wiseman ought to write a letter to the Pope himself, couched in the kindest terms, and begging as a favour that he would generously grant him a coadjutor. It will be better also that he should *name* the person he wishes, as it will never do to allow the Chapter to send a *terna*. It is also important Cardinal Bò should not be consulted, because he is so timid and so much afraid of the English bishops that he would be afraid of a really fit man being chosen. All the Pope's past acts he has been opposed to, before they took place.

I feel convinced that if the Cardinal writes a letter such as he is so capable of doing, he will carry his point and prevent a great scandal in England at his death. I feel convinced that all the bishops in England would write to recommend Dr. Errington for Westminster, not from liking the man, but from an English feeling of triumphing over Cardinal Wiseman and gaining a victory over the Holy See. Perhaps Dr. Ullathorne might not join from private motives, and perhaps Dr. Cornthwaite from real goodness, but all the rest have not sufficient veneration for the Holy See so as to bow to its decrees, and not act against their spirit. . . .—Believe me, sincerely yours, GEO. TALBOT.

From the following report to Mgr. Talbot, at the Vatican, Dr. Manning, it appears, had been too sanguine in his anticipations, for instead of yielding to the advice and solicitations of his friends and asking for a coadjutor, Cardinal Wiseman, on further pressure, declared that he wished to end his days in peace and quiet. On this new difficulty Manning reported as follows:—

BAYSWATER, 12*th June* 1863.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—. . . . The Cardinal will write to you. He would be relieved if the Holy See would decide for him. He is timid and wishes to end his days without any more troubles. But this is the way to greater troubles when he is gone. I feel restrained from speaking to him on the subject; but I can see that he would be very glad that the Holy Father should act. Apart from the future, it is very necessary that what he can no longer do, or never had the turn to do, should be done.

The "old priests" are reduced to a handful; but being encouraged by the hope of Dr. Errington's return, may give trouble. I think the Cardinal is hardly aware how few they are, and how little weight they have in the diocese. A new race has grown up, and the Orders and Congregations have overpowered them. The public feeling of the diocese is against the old spirit, which is dying out. But some who are near the Cardinal, I suspect, intimidate him. And Searle is Searle. . . . —Very sincerely yours, H. E. MANNING.

In a letter from Mgr. Talbot, dated Vatican, 18th June 1863, is the following suggestion:—I have not yet heard from Cardinal Wiseman upon the great question. What he

ought to do is to write a confidential letter to the Pope, and send it through the Nuncio at Paris, as I have always done when I have written to the Holy Father.

After Cardinal Wiseman's refusal, in spite of urgent solicitations, to ask for a new coadjutor, "the great question" came for a time to a standstill. Having got rid of an uncomfortable neighbour in Dr. Errington, and more especially since he had been deprived of his rights of succession by command of the Pope, Cardinal Wiseman was satisfied. He knew only too well, were he to name a new coadjutor and successor, he would excite afresh the opposition and hostility of both the Chapter and of his suffragan bishops—a new and worse storm would break out and destroy the last hope of ending his days in peace. "Let sleeping dogs lie" was the desire of his heart.

But the dangers ahead to the Church in England were in Manning's opinion too imminent to let the question of succession sleep. In a letter to Mgr. Talbot, he, in his dread lest all Wiseman's work in the past should be undone by Dr. Errington, raised again a warning note :—"I hear through the Passionists that Dr. Errington is believed in Ireland to look forward to his succession, and that the Irish bishops side with him. I do not know, but I fancy that Drs. Cullen, Kirby, and Smith influence the Propaganda in this sense. Has the Cardinal told you how unwell Searle is? If not, it may be well not to notice it."

But Cardinal Wiseman's alarming illness put an end to hesitation or reticence. It was an imperative duty on all concerned in the question of succession to make a supreme effort before it was too late to induce the Cardinal to name a coadjutor.

The following alarming account of Wiseman's illness was given by Manning in a letter dated Leyton, 3rd Oct. 1863 :—

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—I am writing from Leyton by the Cardinal's desire. He sent Mr. Hawkins to me last night desiring to see me; and he commissioned me to write to you about himself and his illness. But what I write he has said to no one, and he wishes you to make it known. He did not say to whom, but I could see that he meant to the Holy Father

and to Cardinal Barnabò; but he does not wish it publicly spoken of.

In truth he has been on the verge of the greatest danger; not from the leg, which is of slight moment, but from an affection of the head, which might have become brain fever. . . . I am anxious, and I may say alarmed about him. If anything were to renew his illness there would be great danger. . . . —Believe me always yours very sincerely,

H. E. MANNING.

VATICAN, 10*th October* 1863.

MY DEAR MGR. MANNING—I have just received your distressing letter about the Cardinal's health. Of course I mentioned what you said about him to the Holy Father, and he was much grieved. Cardinal Barnabò, you know, takes such matters very lightly, but even he fears the consequences of his death (*quam Deus avertat*). . . .

I think the uncertain state of the Cardinal's health shows how important it is that he should have a coadjutor, but he will not ask for one. I feel certain that Errington will try to fight his right to the succession; and if he is proposed by the Chapter, backed by the bishops, with the support of Dr. Cullen and Co., I know Rome well enough to fear that the decree of removal might be reversed. If such be the case, *povero voi* and the Oblates of St. Charles.

In a letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated Bayswater, 17th October 1863, Manning wrote as follows:—

BAYSWATER, 17*th October* 1863.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR TALBOT—Many thanks for your letter of the 10th.

The Cardinal is at Broadstairs—and yesterday I received from him a letter of which the following is the chief part:—

"I arrived safe on Monday, but so fatigued that I am only slowly recovering. My appetite completely left me again. I have been reduced to great weakness, and only to-day, in spite of dreadful weather, I have felt the first symptom of rallying. But I am far from being myself, and I have a sort of languid despondency, which makes me feel as if I shall never be so again. Of course I am lonely, and have no means of keeping my thoughts out of the two extremes of over activity and self-devouring, except inward efforts and contests, which feels like

riding a very hard-mouthed horse along the top of a cliff by way of recreation. However I must bear my cross as it is shaped for me: but only God knows what I suffer inwardly at times. I could not write it.

I wish I could get a quantity of prayers, as I had before from Convents, etc. I need them much."

This makes me anxious, for I have never known him so low since his great illness, and then he always rose above it, and had no despondency. There is no one about him to whom he can speak. Searle is worse than nobody, and is a burden and a trial. The Cardinal has an old affection for him, and Searle has become identified with his *material* affairs, so that the Cardinal cannot bear to remove or to deprive him; but his illness, strangeness, and contrariety of mind make him a constant wear. Also he comes between the Cardinal and those in whom he finds what he needs. F. Vaughan being gone, there is no one who can be with him but Ball, and sometimes Patterson or Gilbert. But this does not give him what he needs. I cannot say how sad all this is, to see so great a man all alone, and yet so dependent. There is a great deal more I will say, please God, when we meet. I have written to say that I will come to-morrow till Wednesday. I am unfortunately obliged to come back.

Cardinal Wiseman's gentleness and heroic patience as well as piety are shown in every line quoted from this pathetic letter, written in illness at Broadstairs. He was beloved especially by those of his own household. He was from beginning to end on terms of the closest intimacy with Mgr. Searle, and, far from being a burden and a trial, as Manning puts it, to Cardinal Wiseman, Searle was his chosen companion. His genial temper was like a balm to Wiseman's bruised spirit. Though Manning was always held in the highest esteem, was honoured, admired, and liked by Cardinal Wiseman, yet the two men, not being of congenial natures, were never on terms of closest intimacy. Mgr. Patterson, to whom Manning alluded, was, as perhaps he did not know, a special favourite whose visits were ever welcome to Cardinal Wiseman.

Manning, impressed by Cardinal Wiseman's despondency and isolation, wrote the following sympathetic and affectionate letter:—

MANNING TO CARDINAL WISEMAN.

ST. MARY OF THE ANGELS, 16*th October* 1863.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—I was rejoiced to have your letter this morning, and write at once to ask whether you will let me come to Broadstairs on Sunday afternoon till Wednesday —not to your house. I shall bring some writing I have to do, and go somewhere as near as I may, and so see you when you like.

I knew that you would be very lonely, and that you would be *θυμοβορῶν φίλον ἦτορ.*

Mr. Hawkins was saying to me yesterday that this is not good for you. But he does not know this half so well as I do. I have hardly any desire so strong as to show you the love and gratitude I bear you by any consolation or sympathy you will accept. What I can offer is I know but little, but it is from my heart, and has never varied. Years of trial in which I have had the privilege of suffering with you have confirmed it, and when you allow me to express it I have one of the liveliest satisfactions which remain to me.

I see in your letter that you view things and yourself through the colour of illness; and I am fully convinced that there is no real proportion between your anxiety and the event which causes it. I am satisfied that things will work out peacefully and happily.

I will set many prayers going, without mentioning your name to avoid *chilfso.*

Before long, my dear Lord Cardinal, I hope to see you full of bright and cheerful thoughts as in other days.—Believe me always your most affectionate servant, H. E. MANNING.

The year 1863 was a year of trial and disappointment alike for Manning and Cardinal Wiseman. The decrees of the Provincial Synod of Westminster were ratified by the Holy See. Dr. Errington and the opposing bishops had gained the day. The Oblates of St. Charles had been removed from the seminary of St. Edmund's; and Ushaw and the colleges, after a prolonged struggle, were declared to be independent of Cardinal Wiseman's control. To avert or modify this decision all Manning's zealous and skilful labours — his *scritturas* to Propaganda, his conciliatory discussions with Cardinal Barnabò, his conferences with Bishop Clifford—had in the end proved unavailing. But what Manning felt more deeply in this disastrous year

was his failure, in spite of the most strenuous efforts, to induce Cardinal Wiseman either to accept a new coadjutor with right of succession, or to nominate his own successor. The apprehension of the evils threatened to the Church in England by the election after Wiseman's death of Dr. Errington as Archbishop of Westminster, was quickened by the Cardinal's dangerous illness, caused in no small measure by the adverse Decree on the college question. Manning had already reported to Mgr. Talbot more than once that the Cardinal's will was so weakened by illness and trouble as to be incapable of coming to a decision, or of taking any steps in matters vital to Catholic interests and pressing for solution.

In a letter, about the end of October or beginning of November, Mgr. Talbot again insisted on the necessity of settling the question of succession, not by means of Propaganda but by a direct appeal to the Pope. He wrote to Manning as follows:—

> Cardinal Bò is still anxious that Cardinal Wiseman should ask for a coadjutor. I have spoken to the Holy Father, and he expressed to me the same wish. Mgr. Bartolini, who has just come from Paris, says the same. It will be the only way to prevent a great scandal.
>
> I think all the difficulties the Cardinal makes could be got over, and I believe that if he was to write such a letter as he knows how to write to the Holy Father himself, with *reservata* over it, so that it may not go to Propaganda, and send it through the Nuncio at Paris, that he could get named as his coadjutor *whom he chooses.*[1] He still stands well with the Pope. —Believe me yours sincerely, GEO. TALBOT.

Soon after St. Charles's Day, Dr. Manning started for Rome, and took into his masterful hands the question of coadjutorship. He was convinced that Wiseman would not stir in the matter of his own accord. To Manning the danger which threatened the Church in England, were Errington to succeed the Cardinal, was a matter of far more moment than Wiseman's personal wishes or feelings. To a man

[1] Cardinal Wiseman knew only too well were he to appoint Manning, there would be such a hubbub as to destroy all chance of living or dying in peace.

ever ready to sacrifice his own desires to a high sense of duty, the question was not one to admit of doubt or delay. Manning had not been more than three days in Rome before he had twice discussed with Cardinal Barnabò, Prefect of Propaganda, the question of Cardinal Wiseman's successor. In the following letter to the Cardinal he opened up the delicate subject:—

ROME, *4th December* 1863.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—. . . . Cardinal Barnabò has twice spoken to me on a matter which he desired me to communicate to you. It is that on which Talbot has already written, as I understand.

Cardinal Barnabò said that he had wished that some provision had been made three years ago, simultaneously with the decree respecting the *jus successionis*, so as to preclude not only all risk of future complications, but the suspicions and party feelings which have been kept alive.

This not having been done he feels it all the more strongly now, and that because of the refusal of Trinidad,[1] the terms of the refusal, and the state of feeling which exists both in England and Ireland. Added to this the anxieties from time to time about yourself. On all this he said much which your Eminence will understand.

He then spoke of the steps which he thought ought to be taken—naming one of the bishops. Of all this I have reason to think you have full information.

I trust and believe that we shall have you many years among and over us; and I always feel that it does not shorten our life to make our will. Nevertheless what Cardinal Barnabò said has been my strong and settled conviction, which, but for a certain delicacy, I should have more strongly expressed. I feel that I may and ought to do so now after what he said.

It seems to me that, if the bishop referred to were invested with the right of succession, and *at once*, many great benefits would follow. It would put an end to all doubts, and all the *seditions* which spring from these doubts, and there are many, and near home. Also it would extinguish many *suspicions*, which are very mischievous and very painful, and very injurious to those whom they affect. It would also tranquillise the bishops. This I said to Cardinal Barnabò, adding that the bishop named is acknowledged by all, including his colleagues,

[1] Dr. Errington's refusal to accept the Archbishopric of Port of Spain Trinidad.

to be the best and ablest; and that I hoped your Eminence could consent to its being done; as during your life, *quam Deus magis magisque extendat*, it would involve nothing to affect your peace.

I hope in this I have not erred. As yet I have not had my audience, but am expecting it from day to day. It is probable that the subject will be mentioned, and if so, Cardinal Barnabò thought I might say the same as I said to him. Your Eminence shall know at once anything which may pass.—Believe me, my dear Lord Cardinal, your very affectionate servant,

H. E. MANNING.

St. Nicholas' Day—*Buona Festa.* I have just said mass for you: *Multos multosque annos.*

Knowing only too well with what feelings Cardinal Wiseman regarded Dr. Ullathorne, the Bishop of Birmingham, first, as the head of the opposing bishops, and secondly, as the staunch supporter of Dr. Errington, whose removal he had bitterly resented, Manning, with his usual tact and delicacy, had carefully avoided in his first letter mentioning him by name as Wiseman's successor. But in his second letter the obnoxious name was indicated by its initial. After his audience with the Pope, Manning reported the result in the following letter:—

ROME, 8*th December* 1863.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—I had yesterday an audience of three quarters of an hour. . . . The Holy Father spoke most kindly of your Eminence and of the respect with which the English people have come to regard you; and referred to the article in the *Times.* He inquired much about your illness. . . . After other matters of less moment the subject of my last letter came up. He expressed his great desire to provide against any possible contingency at once by appointing a successor, saying that he hoped you would long outlive him, but that he wished to guard against any complications. Dr. U. was then spoken of. I said that I had heard you say the last time I saw you, that the Holy Father could conclude the matter by a stroke of his pen; and that I was sure that any wish or judgment formed by the Holy Father would have your entire assent. I said that in such an arrangement with Dr. U. it could only take effect hereafter; that *durante vita* he would remain where he is. The Holy Father said that he considered that to be necessary. He did not desire me to communicate anything to you, so I am simply reporting what passed.

He then spoke of the great importance of your presence and influence in England both within and without the Church. Whatever you may write on the subject the Holy Father would receive with the utmost consideration.

2. I saw Cardinal Barnabò again last night, and he spoke of you far more heartily and kindly than ever before. I do not think you have any need to be at all disturbed; and I still more than ever wish you could come here, if you decide to go to Spain. You would find yourself as you always did, save only that some old friends are gone, and a race who "knows not Joseph" have come up. This is inevitable. But with the Holy Father you would find yourself, as you always have, the object of very great affection and respect.

3. I hope I have not gone against your wish in saying everything both to Cardinal Barnabò and to the Holy Father in support of the appointment of Dr. U. I could do so with all my heart, for I have a very high sense of his goodness both as a man and a bishop; and I think him beyond all compare the fittest man to come after you. . . .—Believe me, my dear Lord Cardinal, your very affectionate servant, H. E. MANNING.

In regard to this important interview with the Pope, at which Manning, at the instigation of Cardinal Barnabò, proposed Dr. Ullathorne as Wiseman's successor, Cardinal Manning, in an interesting Note, dated 23rd December 1882, gave the following explanation:—

I was sent again to Rome in 1863, and Cardinal Barnabò urged me to speak to the Holy Father and ask for a Coadjutor for Westminster. I refused, unless he told me to speak in his name. I then did so, and named to him and to Pius IX. the Bishop of Birmingham, with succession. I wrote a full account to the Cardinal. He was much displeased; and when I came home said, "I felt as if my last friend had left me."

Manning shared Mgr. Talbot's fears that, owing to adverse influences brought to bear upon Propaganda on Wiseman's death, Rome might reverse the decree of removal, and instal Dr. Errington as Archbishop of Westminster. To avert this disaster from the Church in England—for he was convinced without a shadow of doubt that Dr. Errington's advent to power would call forth or revive a "Gallican or anti-Papal spirit" among English Catholics, lay and ecclesiastical—Manning braced all his energies

to the difficult task of inducing Cardinal Wiseman to name his successor, and thwart, before it was too late, the designs of his opponents. In the following exhaustive letter Manning once more made use of all his persuasive skill to induce Cardinal Wiseman to take action:—

28 VIA DEL TRITONE, 31*st December* 1863.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—Many thanks for your kind letter which I found on coming home from the Te Deum in St. Silvester's. I thank you for it all the more because I have been anxious about you, and feared that you would feel sensitively, and with reason, some of the things you mention.

Cardinal Bò's correspondence with Dr. U. does not seem to me to be considerate towards you. (Jan. 2. I do not think Cardinal Bò wrote to Dr. U. about *himself*.) But I believe the whole case lies between you and the Holy Father. And I feel more than ever that the occasion is such as to make your coming to Rome both good for you, and for the future. . . . In my audience of which I told you, I said what I did not then write—namely, I prayed the Holy Father, if you ever uttered the word *renunzia*, to command you to live, die, and be buried among us as the first Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. The Holy Father heard all my reasons, and then added others of his own, saying, "Nothing would ever induce me to permit such an idea. His simple presence in England, even if he were unable to work, would be of the greatest importance as the centre of the Catholic movement and spirit, and the witness of the truths and principles he has taught." He then repeated, *Egli è l' uomo providenziale per Inghilterra.*

But, thank God, you are able to work, and may probably see those younger than yourself go before you. Whatever arrangements may be made now, you may outlive it, and see the whole aspect changed. I hope, therefore, you will not eat your heart. I feel calmly certain that this is one of the *causæ majores* in which the Holy See is especially guided and our Lord is especially present; so that after writing straight to the Holy Father, or, what is far better, speaking *facie ad faciem*, I feel you may rest in perfect peace. This I hope you will do, because I see that here there is a strong judgment, in which Cardinal Reisach and others partake, that a provision ought to be made, and that with all *fitting promptness*. And I know that party feelings exist in England, which can only be extinguished by putting an end to their cause. It was my strong conviction that when Dr. Errington was removed the succession ought

to have been declared. This would have averted many domestic mischiefs which have been working *sordamente*, and are working now, and will still more, because of the correspondence of Cardinal Bò and Dr. U. and the newspapers. It seems to me a matter of great importance that these things should be promptly extinguished. We shall then be able to mind our own business and work in peace.

Moreover, as I said, the scheme proposed is like making a will, not a jocund affair, but it does not shorten life: and your life, I hope, will be long spared to us; perhaps to make codicils when others are gone.

2nd January.

I have shown your letter to Mgr. Talbot, and he will probably write by this post.

The more I consider the subject, the more I am fully convinced of two points—the one that to close this question promptly is of the highest importance. There has been much party spirit about it, and there will be much more until it is finally done, and that not only in the diocese but in a higher region; the other, that the person whose nomination would extinguish the possibility of these feelings is Dr. U.

I know all you feel about him, and about the question, but there seems to me many reasons why that nomination would ensure union among the bishops and peace for yourself.

1. He is the man whom they have already chosen as their best, and their procurator.

2. He really is so beyond comparison.

3. It would be a visibly disinterested act on your part; and even more than this.

4. If any other man were archbishop, Dr. U. would always be a difficulty in the episcopate. The others would work with him. I doubt his acting with any other archbishop. This I say not in censure; but such is his character *etiam ex parte meliore.*

5. He would not undo anything you have done. Things might not move onward fast; but they would not go back.

6. It is an appointment which would give to the Chapter neither victory nor defeat, but a master.

7. It would render his relations towards you neutral at least; I think friendly for the future.

8. It would be to the bishops who were impatient about Dr. Errington a sort of concession, a consideration which would content many feelings.

9. As a *tutiorista* it is a safer nomination than any other you might think personally more fit.

Finally, it would be a *pietra* on many old questions.

I can anticipate much you would say to all this.

But the conclusion on these two points seems to my mind evident as the safer course.

Pray excuse all this, which I cannot help writing. Of one thing I am still more convinced, and this is, that your Eminence's surest course is to come here, and to hear and weigh the mind and will of the Holy Father, so as to know and to distinguish it from all others, and to act in the *fullest light of his counsel.*

If there was ever an occasion in your archiepiscopate which is more grave than another, and more full of the future, it is the choice of your successor, a choice seldom granted to men, and in this crisis of your work and mission most important. It will be better for you to go to Spain when the cold is over, and *Rome always does you good.*—Believe me, my dear Lord Cardinal, your very affectionate servant,

H. E. MANNING.

Had any human power or persuasion availed to induce Cardinal Wiseman to name his successor he would have yielded to the arguments, appeals, and supplications of one whom he regarded with such affection and esteem as Manning. But the Cardinal had an insuperable repugnance to re-open the strife which he had hoped was ended by the removal of Dr. Errington.

Dr. Ullathorne, the Bishop of Birmingham, was the last man whom Wiseman would have chosen as his successor. He wrote strongly to Cardinal Barnabò, protesting against the proposed arrangement. If he went to Rome, as Manning had so earnestly implored, the Cardinal knew only too well that the pressure put upon him by his friends to name a successor would be more than he could bear or resist. He wished to end his days in peace, and instead of going to Rome went on a short visit to Belgium —his last earthly journey.[1]

Rumours of the nomination of a successor reached

[1] In Belgium Cardinal Wiseman met with a most enthusiastic reception. In a letter to Manning, dated Bruges, 20th October 1864, Cardinal Wiseman wrote as follows:—"MY DEAR MANNING—Our two days of trial are passed—those of the five hours' consecration and five hours' banquet, and of the solemn processions—and I am happy to say that I have got over them well. Indeed, Belgium seems to have done me great good in body and mind. I need not say that I have met with a reception more than cordial, almost enthusiastic.—Your affectionate friend and Father in Christ, N. CARD. WISEMAN."

the Chapter at Westminster, and, as the Cardinal foresaw they resented it, as Manning reported in a letter, dated 28 Via del Tritone, 1st Feb. 1864, from which I give one or two passages:—

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—. . . . Cardinal Barnabò told me last week that the Chapter of Westminster had written to him asking why they had not been consulted about the supposed coadjutor. He was much excited about it; called it *una impertinenza* and said *sono matti*, and said that he should answer them at once, telling them that they have nothing to do with it.

Did your Eminence know this fact? . . .

I told your Eminence, I believe, that Cardinal Barnabò declared he had *never written to Dr. U.* on the subject you wrote about. What can be the bottom of this?

On Monday night the Holy Father asked very kindly after you, and I told him I had done my best to induce you to come to Rome. . . .

In the following letter the welcome news is given to Cardinal Wiseman that, in compliance with his urgent appeal and prayers, the Pope had decided against the nomination of a coadjutor:—

28 VIA DEL TRITONE, 17*th February* 1864.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—. . . . You may consider the coadjutor question as ended, and as in your own hands. I believe also that, though many painful things have happened in the course of it, yet what has passed has done good, and brought out much that will be of use.

I feel sure that the Holy Father is as much alive as ever to the fact that your work in England is a whole, and that it has been a counteraction against an old spirit, and I must say an old party, who at any moment might, in your absence, reverse or retard a great deal of your work since the Hierarchy, and through the Hierarchy.

When I left England I saw that you were suffering and pained with the thought that your hold here is not what it was. Do not think so again for a moment. I can assure you from observation that, except *pettigolezze* at Propaganda, everything is with you as much as ever. . . .

My dear Lord, *Dominedio* has given you many things in this world, but the εἰρήνη καὶ γαλήνη He has kept back for the world where there is "no more sea."—Believe me always your very affectionate servant, H. E. MANNING.

In Manning's letters to Cardinal Wiseman there are many other anxious and critical matters discussed besides the coadjutor business—"the great question," as Mgr. Talbot not unfittingly described it; for many other questions hinged on the point who was to be Wiseman's successor. But all these questions will come in their proper place at the close, which is now at hand, of the succession difficulty. For Manning had come at last to the end of the intricate negotiations, and reported to Cardinal Wiseman the final results in the following passages of a letter, dated 28 Via del Tritone, 26th Feb. 1864:—

On the subject of the coadjutor you may consider the matter as in your own hands. Cardinal Barnabò read to me your letter, and said that the Holy Father had no intention of pressing anything; and that he should answer, leaving it to you.

Also the Holy Father said the other day that he expected your Eminence in Rome, and that it would then be easier to consider the matter.

This is perhaps the best way in which it could rest. And if you were to write in this sense it would keep it in your own hands. . . .

Since I had your letter of injunction I have been silent.

Cardinal Wiseman was relieved to find that the coadjutor question was left in his own hands. Not for any special trust in the canons, but for peace' sake, he had made up his mind to leave the nomination of his successor to the Chapter of Westminster. His letter forbidding Dr. Manning to agitate any further the question of the appointment of a coadjutor bore happy fruits. The final struggle over the right of succession was adjourned till Cardinal Wiseman's death.

On his return to England, Manning, in a letter to Mgr. Talbot, reported as follows:—

I got home on Tuesday in time to hear the Cardinal's lecture in the Accademia. He is well and full of lectures. . . .

The Cardinal seems to have got over the coadjutor business. I told him that I knew he wished to scold me for urging Dr. U. upon him, and that he had better begin at once. So he had his say, and I think he is satisfied.

Curiously enough Dr. Ullathorne also appears to have been satisfied, as the following anecdote told by Father Coffin shows:[1]—

Manning was in the habit of going down to Clapham and confiding all his troubles and difficulties to Father Coffin, beginning with this introduction:—"I speak with you now *sub sigillo confessionis.*" Father Coffin said:—"I did not feel myself bound precisely by the seal of confession, but I never broke the secrecy except once, and that was forced from me by Dr. Ullathorne, and that was on the following occasion." On Cardinal Wiseman's becoming more and more ill and helpless, the question came up of his having a coadjutor. Different candidates were spoken of, among them Dr. Ullathorne. Some also named Mgr. Manning, the Provost of the Chapter. Wearied with these rumours Mgr. Manning went on a visit to Leamington. Father Coffin was just then at Bishopston, near Liverpool. Mgr. Manning begged him to come and stay with him at Leamington, as he had important business to talk over with him. Father Coffin went to him and consoled him. On the termination of his visit he had to go to Birmingham to settle with Dr. Ullathorne about some missions of the Fathers of the Congregation.

It is well known how Dr. Ullathorne esteemed Father Coffin, with whom he was wont to have long conversations. On the occasion of this visit, after leaving the refectory, the bishop led him into the library and said:—"So you have been at Leamington, and therefore you know everything." Father Coffin looked vacant and knew not what to say. "You can't deny it," added the bishop. "This is what I do know," said Father Coffin, "Mgr. Manning has proposed your lordship as Coadjutor of Westminster."

Father Coffin thought that he was doing a service to Mgr. Manning in telling his secret to the bishop.

When the bishop heard that news he changed the conversation.

It is needless to add that Father Coffin, either because he did not know it himself, or because he thought it expedient, did not mention the fact that Cardinal Wiseman had already refused the proposed appointment of Dr. Ullathorne as coadjutor.

[1] *Notes on Father Coffin's Conversations*, by Father Lubienski.

CHAPTER IX

THE DEATH OF CARDINAL WISEMAN

1865

In the last three or four years of his eventful and active life Cardinal Wiseman had lost much of his ancient vigour of mind and body. Enfeebled by illness and sufferings, mental and physical, his will, once so masterful, had grown inert, and especially during the last year or two he was dependent in no small measure on the aid or advice of others. The courage which, in his vigorous days, had led him triumphant through many a stubborn contest, had now deserted him. In his declining years he no longer cared to look things which troubled him in the face. His tenacious grasp by slow degrees relaxed its hold. He shrank from action. Hope, which had buoyed him up through life, forsook him at its close. Despondency, painful in the extreme to his sensitive nature, fell upon him. His largeness of heart however, his tender affection for his friends, his trust in those who had through thick and thin stood by his side, remained to the last.

In January Dr. Manning left England for Rome, leaving Wiseman very ill, but not in danger. James Hope was staying at Hyères, and Manning remained there for a day or two. On leaving for Rome a telegram overtook him at the station announcing that the Cardinal was worse; but Manning went on and found at Genoa a letter from Canon Morris, and the Reverend Mother who was in attendance on Cardinal Wiseman. These letters relieved Manning's anxiety.

The following letter, dated Genoa, 24th Jan. 1865, the last written by Manning to Cardinal Wiseman, not only contained a noble recognition of the public services which he had rendered to the Church by restoring the Hierarchy and reviving the Catholic spirit in England, but bore likewise a touching testimony of Manning's love and loyalty towards the great Cardinal.

GENOA, *Jan.* 24, 1865.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—I have just arrived at Genoa and found letters from Canon Morris and the Reverend Mother. I had made up my mind, if the accounts were not better, to turn back over Mount Cenis. But, thank God, they relieve me from the anxiety in which I have been for the last four days. I trust now to hear at Rome of your steady recovery, and that we may lay aside our fears.

The Reverend Mother has given me your kind message, which makes me all the more wish to be with you. It reminds me of those old days in Rome, which I shall never forget. I count it a great happiness to have been with you in all your great illnesses of the last years, except this one; and had I in any degree foreseen it, I should not have left home. When we parted I thought you so much better that my anxiety was gone. I beg you to make Canon Morris and the Reverend Mother keep me well informed about you. How I wish you were here. We are in spring weather, at least for a time.

I trust, my dear Lord Cardinal, that you will still be over us for many years, and see the maturity of many more of your works. These last twelve years have been a great time, and full of a great future. I said very little of what I think in the article on your sermons. What we owe to you in the rooting and development of the Hierarchy, and in rousing the Catholic spirit and practice of England towards the level of Rome will be known only hereafter.

But it is not only on public grounds that I pray in every mass for your restoration to health and prolonged life. In talking with you I am always restrained, partly by something on your part, and partly by something on my own from saying how much I prize the friendship to which you have so kindly admitted me. In these thirteen years, and, above all, in the last seven years, it has been my chief support in very hard times and very hard trials. To do anything to lessen your burdens has been among my chief desires.

I hope to be in Rome by Friday and to find letters.—Believe

me always, my dear Lord Cardinal, your very affectionate servant, H. E. MANNING.

On arriving in Rome at the end of January, Manning found worse accounts about Cardinal Wiseman's illness.

In an autobiographical Note, dated 1879, Cardinal Manning wrote as follows:—

I went on to Rome and found a worse account. I proposed to Cardinal Barnabò to go back; he dissuaded me, but told me to ask the Pope. I did so; and he told me to stay. I was there one week. Then a telegram came just after midnight and waked me. The Cardinal desired me to come home. The next morning I saw the Pope. He said it was too late and bade me stay. I begged, however, for permission to go. I started in the evening and got home on the morning of the 15th February, the very day on which he died.[1] He knew me, I believe, when I first came in, but not afterwards.

During his stay in Rome, besides his interview with Pope Pius IX. and Cardinal Barnabò, and writing a vigorous letter to Mr. Gladstone in defence of the Temporal Power, Manning had many "confidential talks" with his friend Mgr. Talbot. In these conversations the results, which might ensue from the fatal termination of Cardinal Wiseman's illness, were discussed with a foreboding heart, for Manning had but little hope of the Cardinal's recovery, and Mgr. Talbot still maintained his opinion of Dr. Errington's nomination on Wiseman's death.

On the first day of his arrival in London, Manning wrote to Mgr. Talbot as follows:—

8 YORK PLACE, 13*th Feb.* 1865.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—I was too true in my fears. I found the Cardinal rapidly sinking. He had become unconscious. And was only so far roused as to know me and to understand that the Holy Father sent him his blessing. He said, "I thank him," two or three times, and then became unconscious again. We are now waiting the end, which may come at any moment, or it may last hours—12, 24, 48, but hardly more. I don't think it will be so long.

---

[1] Manning arrived in London on the morning of 13th February. Cardinal Wiseman died two days later.

Would you kindly read this to the Holy Father?

Nothing can exceed the patience and submission he has shown. The few words he has said have been beautiful and edifying, and his end is truly the death of the just.

The sympathy, both private and public, is great. Among others Gladstone called to inquire yesterday.

I had 68 hours without lying down. But a long sleep has made me all right again. The cold, by the way, was very great. All France was under snow—and snow here.

I hope you will read some good letters on the University question in the last *Tablet* of the 10th. Do not let Propaganda alarm itself: the majority of the laymen are sound. All they want is to be firmly led and plainly told what to do. To hesitate or to be timid would be fatal; and it is this that a handful of forward men are trying to do, like Farini at Parma.

Do not let Dr. Clifford again frighten them. I am told that the Thynnes and the like have been about him. All this is poor work.

I will add a word to-morrow as late as I can.—Believe me always, very sincerely yours, H. E. MANNING.

Feb. 14.—The Cardinal has been in agony all night. 9.30 *a.m.* —Going fast. 4 o'clock p.m.—No change.

In the morning of 15th February 1865, Cardinal Wiseman died. His end, as Manning had truly described it, was the death of the just.

Manning despatched a telegram conveying the sad news to Mgr. Talbot. As Provost of the Chapter, Manning wrote likewise a letter to Cardinal Barnabò announcing Cardinal Wiseman's death.

In reply Mgr. Talbot wrote as follows:—

MY DEAR MGR. MANNING—At last the sad news has reached us of the death of Cardinal Wiseman. I never felt so much in my life the loss of any one. I wished to have followed you to London by the Wednesday boat, but I found that my wish did not meet with approbation; otherwise I should have gladly made the journey to London, and returned to Rome immediately. In my position I am terribly hampered; I am not a free agent. I will tell you much by word of mouth which I cannot by letter. I have not met with the sympathy for Cardinal Wiseman in the quarters where I might have expected it. There are many reasons for this.

As for myself, I shall ever treasure up my memory of him, and think of him with regret and gratitude all my life.

Cardinal Wiseman received my abjuration,[1] baptized me, was my first confessor for three years, confirmed me, gave me my first communion, took off my canonical censures, tonsured me, gave me all my orders from *ostiarius* to the priesthood, so that I have ample reason to be grateful to him for all my life; and to repay my debt by praying for the repose of his soul, which I have done ever since I heard of his death. The Holy Father has promised to say mass for him, which is something. Immediately after hearing of his death a mass was sung for the repose of his soul in the English college, but another more solemn one will be celebrated next week. . . .

After this warm-hearted tribute of regret and gratitude, Mgr. Talbot, as is the way with diplomatists and statesmen, turned his head to business—"The king is dead; long live the king."

Now we must think for the future. Of course, you will keep me *au courant* of all that is being done; and you may depend on my secrecy. Cardinal Bò told me that when he dined at the Irish College they brought forward Dr. Errington as the proper person to succeed Cardinal Wiseman. He says that he answered them sharply, and repeated the whole story of his fighting the Pope, and of the seventy-two hours which he had with him, with improvements.

You may depend upon it that the Irish are anxious that he should succeed, but what business is it of theirs? I think that both the Holy Father and Barnabò have set their minds on Dr. Ullathorne, who certainly is the only bishop in England at all up to the position.

The Chapter of Westminster must be careful, otherwise the Holy Father will take the matter in his own hands. You and Canon Morris will have a difficult task, but you must protest if improper names are sent to Rome. Adieu.—Believe me, very sincerely yours, GEO. TALBOT.

On Cardinal Wiseman's death, the Chapter of Westminster elected, not Provost Manning, but Canon O'Neal, the Vicar-capitular, to rule over the vacant see. On him fell the responsibility of making arrangements for the solemn obsequies of Cardinal Wiseman at the pro-Cathedral of St. Mary's, Moorfields. The Chapter were of one mind in making every effort to pay a public tribute of homage and

[1] The Hon. George Talbot, fifth son of the third Baron Talbot de Malahide, born in 1816, was received into the Church in 1846 by Dr. Wiseman.

veneration befitting the solemn occasion to their cardinal-archbishop. Though unhappily of late years there had been serious differences between Cardinal Wiseman and his Chapter on matters of ecclesiastical policy, their personal regard and reverence for the great bishop who had founded the hierarchy and had ruled over the diocese with such loving care for fifteen years had survived every variance. And as death is the greatest of all peacemakers, their old affection and veneration came back again with all their ancient strength. Among the elder members of the Chapter, Mgr. Searle was deeply affected, for between him and Cardinal Wiseman there had always existed from the first beginnings of their public life and common action the closest bonds of affection and intimacy.

The first difficulty which beset the Vicar-capitular and the Chapter was the arrangement about the preacher of the funeral sermon. Every Catholic in England naturally expected that the illustrious Oratorian would have been solicited to preach on the occasion. The Chapter for the most part shared this desire. It was intimated unofficially to Dr. Newman, of the Oratory, Birmingham, that he was expected to preach Cardinal Wiseman's funeral sermon. Consent was implied in a letter of Father Newman's begging timely notice, since at his age in winter the choice of a day for coming up to London was a matter of importance to him. In the meantime the Chapter was informed that, at Cardinal Wiseman's express wish, Dr. Manning was to preach the funeral oration. This was a deep disappointment to many who had hoped that a sermon by Newman on Cardinal Wiseman's perfected life would have offered a noble sequel to the famous sermon, "The Second Spring," delivered in the beginning of Wiseman's career as head of the church in England, at the First Provincial Synod in 1352.

It was stated officially some years later, when the subject was discussed in the newspapers, that Dr. Newman had not been invited to preach the late Cardinal Wiseman's funeral sermon. It is true that, though asked whether he was willing to preach on the occasion, Dr. Newman was not officially invited. "Some one had blundered." Many

years afterwards Father Newman wrote to me saying, "No, I was not invited to preach on the occasion of Cardinal Wiseman's funeral."

The solemn *requiem* mass was celebrated on the 23rd of February at the pro-Cathedral St. Mary's, Moorfields. All the bishops attended. The ancient religious Orders introduced into London by Cardinal Wiseman were well represented; the modern Congregations which had sprung up under his fostering hand—the Oratorians at Brompton, the Redemptorists at Clapham, the Oblates of St. Charles at Bayswater, the Passionists at Highgate, the Fathers of Charity or Rosminians at Kingsland Road, and the Oblates of Mary, Tower Hill—bore evidence by their presence in large numbers to their filial gratitude. The secular clergy, filing through the church in long and almost endless procession, manifested their love and reverence for their departed father in God. The church was filled from end to end by the laity of every class and condition. Hereditary Catholics and converts united in the bonds of brotherhood in the faith—their ancient rivalry or antagonism long since buried and forgotten, if indeed it ever really existed save among a few extreme partisans—joined heart and hand in paying a common tribute of esteem and homage to the great prelate, the first English cardinal who had ruled over them as their spiritual head since the days of the Reformation. The day before the burial, when the body was placed in St. Mary's, Moorfields, multitudes of the people surrounded and filled the church, and during the day it is said that 30,000 persons passed by the bier.

The church of St. Mary's, Moorfields, on the day of Cardinal Wiseman's funeral, presented an impressive spectacle. It was filled from end to end with reverent and sorrowing men and women who had known and loved him. It was in that church where his body now lay that Dr. Wiseman commenced in 1836 as a controversial lecturer his brilliant career in England. His eloquent voice, now still in death, had often been heard, almost up to the last, in the church which he loved so well and was so fond of as his pro-cathedral. The impressive and touching offices for the dead

appealed to the senses and to the imagination. The last absolutions, the last prayer for the repose of the soul of their dear dead cardinal, touched every heart. Throughout that vast congregation of his spiritual children emotion was everywhere visible. In the bowed heads and clasped hands of a few, here and there, there was touching evidence of profound personal sorrow.

To preach on such an occasion would have been a trying task to any man. It was more especially so to Manning, for, besides his personal affection for Cardinal Wiseman, the dread conviction of the dangers and disasters long contemplated as but too likely to accrue to the church in England on Wiseman's death, now that the event had actually taken place, came back in all its force and filled the preacher's mind with the acutest apprehensions. He stood now in the presence of the dangers and difficulties he had long foreseen. Another difficulty had to be faced. He was speaking before the bishops, most of whom he had described as Cardinal Wiseman's opponents, and as bent upon undoing Wiseman's work. He knew, too, that many of them had long looked upon him as the cardinal's evil genius. One pang, one difficulty, he was happily spared in the absence of Dr. Errington, whose delicacy of feeling had prompted him to absent himself from Cardinal Wiseman's funeral. But the Chapter was there—his ancient opponents—more formidable than ever, for they were invested with power, ready and able to make use of the opportunity now placed in their hands.

It speaks well for his tact and delicacy, for his courage and skill, that he succeeded in overcoming difficulties which would have unnerved a lesser man and entangled the tongue of a less practised speaker. He spoke with much feeling as well as with prudence and self-restraint. With great skill he avoided touching upon topics uppermost in his own mind and in the mind of many of his hearers. Throughout the carefully-prepared address there was not a jarring note, not an allusion open to misconstruction. The result was that Manning's sermon on Cardinal Wiseman was accounted at the time as not unworthy of a great occasion.

In the pulpit of St. Mary's, Moorfields on that memorable occasion, Manning's manner and appearance offered a curious and interesting study. For the first few moments he displayed a slight nervousness not unnatural and not unbecoming at such a moment. It bore testimony to the gravity of his surroundings, to the circumstances of the hour, and to the position which he occupied. His eager searching eye was riveted for a moment on the more prominent of his listeners, as if he would discover the secrets of their heart. His manner was perfect, impressive, and dignified, without the slightest assumption of authority, which he instinctively felt would be out of place on such an occasion and in such an assemblage. His voice was clear and penetrating. After the first few sentences he recovered his self-possession, which he retained to the last syllable of a well-delivered and effective address.[1]

Not the Church of St. Mary's, Moorfields, with its vast congregation, its mitred prelates, and its religious Orders, not the solemn dirge with its plaintive music, not the chaunting in unison of hundreds of surpliced priests, appealed to the imagination or touched the heart with such electric force as did the vast procession which followed Cardinal Wiseman through the heart of the city of London to his last resting-place at Kensal Green. There was no regular procession, no organised parade, no plan; or, if there was, it was lost in the vast crowds which followed Cardinal Wiseman's funeral car or lined in dense masses four or five miles of street through which the procession passed. The people were Cardinal Wiseman's body-guard. The long procession which passed from Moorfields through Holborn and Oxford Street and Harrow Road to Kensal

[1] In the following passage in *Omnia pro Christo*, the funeral sermon preached at Cardinal Wiseman's *requiem*, Manning explained that he would not have ventured to preach on that memorable occasion had it not been "for the command of authority":—"If the command of authority had not bid me to speak, I should not have ventured on this task. It would be a hard task to any one. It is a harder task to me. It is beyond the power of any of us to speak as we ought of the great prince of the Church who lies here in the midst of us. It is altogether beyond mine. I have, moreover, a further hindrance—the private sorrow for the loss of the kindest of friends, the last of this kind I can ever have in life."

Green was headed by two tall young priests acting as cross-bearer and censer-bearer—to-day high dignitaries or canons in the Diocese of Westminster—and behind as far as eye could reach a surging sea of people slowly moving or standing still; and in their midst towered—every head bared in reverence as it passed—the open funeral car. Every lesser object, carriages, or cabs, which bore bishops in their purple robes or high church dignitaries in ermine, were simply lost to sight; were swallowed up in the vast crowds which filled the streets. Two objects alone arrested attention—Wiseman's funeral car and the people of England, represented by the orderly, respectful, reverent masses of every class and condition, which on that memorable day lined the streets of London. Traffic was suspended for two hours and more in two of the busiest thoroughfares in the busiest part of the day, that Wiseman in death might receive tokens of homage, or of regard, or of recognition at least, from the generous and warm-hearted people of England. One who passed through those miles of street as a mourner on that memorable day, published at the time a "Memorial," from the concluding passage of which I take the following touching tribute to Cardinal Wiseman. The writer of the "Memorial" in the *Dublin Review*[1] was Dr. Manning:—

> In the great concourse which streamed along those miles of street, there was, we believe, another sense awakened. One who passed through them as a mourner said truly, as we believe, "I was convinced that, whether they knew it or not, multitudes felt that as they looked upon that funeral procession, 'This was the old religion of England. This was once the religion of our forefathers.'" They who had read the history of their country could recall memories of Pole, Wolsey, and Langton. They who were simplest saw before them the living presence of the great Catholic Church which once filled the land. The English poor have it as a proverb, "The Catholic religion was the first religion, and will be the last." Its reappearance on that day in such wide-spread sympathy of men of every class preached to them on that homely prophecy. What Nicholas Wiseman had prayed, laboured, and suffered to do, he did that day more

[1] "Memorial," *Dublin Review*, p. 278, April 1865.

powerfully and persuasively than ever before. He had spent his life to make the people of England know and love once more the Church of their fathers: that day was the noblest and worthiest close to such a life. And thus we leave him, with the tribute of our grateful and loving veneration, as the dusk of evening made more purely bright the tapers round his grave, greater in its humility than all the glories of Westminster, as it now is, where St. Edward, whom he loved so well, still holds his own for God and for the future—so we leave as the *Miserere* is ascending to heaven like the voice of many waters, sweet, plaintive, but strong as the hope of the Church in England; as the truths he has taught us, and as his prayers, which ascend for us before the eternal throne.[1]

Long before his death, Cardinal Wiseman had won the goodwill and esteem of the English people. After a temporary outburst of fanatical passion they had come to recognise in him the qualities which they most admire—courage, singleness of purpose, and good humour. His force of character, his high tone of mind and wide and warm-hearted sympathies endeared him to all with whom he was brought into closer contact. His fealty to Rome, his uncompromising faith was of the very essence of his nature. It was manifest in every act and word. It was

[1] In the following passage of the above article, Manning bore his testimony of respect and honour to Bishop Blomfield, with whom in his Anglican days the Archdeacon of Chichester was on friendly terms:—In our lifetime an Anglican Bishop of London, who had been publicly known to the population of that city during a longer incumbency than the eighteen years episcopate of Cardinal Wiseman, was carried to his grave. He was a learned, cultivated, eloquent, benevolent, exceedingly laborious, large-minded, and warm-hearted man. He was surrounded by all the traditions and circumstances with which the Church and State of England could invest him. He deserved at their hands a great and noble manifestation of affection and respect; he had served them so as we remember no other to have done. He wore himself out in their service. His last years were especially touching. Broken with faithful toil for the Anglican Church in London, he withdrew to await his end in feebleness and out of sight. We are glad in passing to bear this testimony to one whose personal memory is, and ever will be, dear to many who were parted from him. And yet when he passed to his grave the stir and business of London held on to its way. He deserved another response, but it was not in the millions of London to give it. Again, two Archbishops of Canterbury have been borne to their burial. Did London rise up to meet them? Were the roads lined for miles? Were their thousands and tens of thousands for days before Lambeth Palace?—"Memorial," *Dublin Review*, p. 276, April 1865.

the original offence which for a time set the heart of the people of England against him. But he taught them by his way of life, by his working in their midst, by the common interests which he shared with them rather than by words, that the highest fealty to Rome was not only not incompatible with, but rather heightened and deepened, his love and loyalty to Queen and country.

Besides his large-heartedness and large-mindedness, his varied intellectual gifts, his writings and picturesque lectures on Art, on Archæology, on Industry fascinated the popular imagination. "Cardinal Wiseman is full of his lectures," as Manning wrote to Mgr. Talbot at a time when Cardinal Wiseman was one of the most popular lecturers of the day. Yes, he was full of his lectures, and of the interest which people were taking in them, and of the applause with which he was welcomed and rewarded at the different institutions or societies before whom he lectured. It was a relief to this warm-hearted man, wearied and worn out by the ecclesiastical conflicts in which, during the latter years of his life, he was involved in Rome, to meet face to face in learned or artistic societies representatives of English thought, and speak out his mind and heart.

In keeping with his characteristic hopefulness and enthusiasm, Cardinal Wiseman repaid the regard and esteem in which he was held by the English people by instituting in every church of his diocese prayers for the conversion of England. It was not for the sake of controversial triumph; but for the love he bore to his country and the sanguine hope he entertained of reconciling once more England with Rome. He even expressed in his enthusiasm a hope that, if not he himself, his successor might live to sing High Mass in Westminster Abbey.

When Cardinal Wiseman's death was announced the people of England were taken by surprise. Their regret was deepened by the instinctive feeling that scant justice had been done to him during his life-time. At his death ample reparation was made by a just and generous-hearted people in the public manifestation of honour and regard shown at his funeral. As a demonstration of feeling it was

second only to the funeral twelve years before of England's greatest soldier. That was a State ceremony attended by all the pomp and circumstance of a grand military pageant with flags and banners and trophies of war. The minute-guns, the beat of the muffled drum, the Dead March in Saul appealed in their solemnity to the imagination. It was followed by the greatest and noblest of the land. But behind and beyond all this outward pomp and show, were the people in their tens of thousands, their hearts filled with almost personal sorrow at the death of England's greatest soldier, the Duke of Wellington.

Cardinal Wiseman's funeral was wholly unorganised, simple and plain. The solemn and sublime pageantry of the Roman ritual, which no military pomp or parade can surpass, was of course dispensed with in a non-Catholic country at the funeral of a Prince of the Church. The demonstration of public feeling was wholly spontaneous and unexpected. Wiseman's funeral and Wellington's had one almost unique element in common, which raises such pageants into a higher region—the heart of the people was touched at the death alike of England's great soldier and of the great English cardinal.[1]

[1] 8 York Place, Portman Square,
London, W., *6th June* 1865.

My dear Lord Archbishop—On behalf of the executors of our dear friend Cardinal Wiseman I beg your Grace's acceptance of His Eminence's dressing-case, which we know you will value and appreciate.—And believe me to remain, your Grace's most obedient servant and sincere friend,

Henry R. Bagshawe.

CHAPTER X

DR. MANNING'S NOMINATION AS ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER

In due course after Cardinal Wiseman's funeral the Chapter of Westminster met on 14th March to elect a successor to the late archbishop; or rather, more strictly speaking, to present the names of three candidates, technically called a *terna*, to the Pope, for the nomination of one of them to the vacant See. The Pope's power of selection is however not limited to the three names presented to him by the Chapter. He may pass them over and appoint an ecclesiastic of his own choosing. But generally, unless for a grave cause, one of the three candidates is nominated. Mgr. Manning, the provost, was of course present at the meeting of the Chapter presided over by the Vicar-capitular. The canons are bound under an oath of secrecy not, during the election, to divulge the proceedings. On the commencement of the business of election, Canon Morris stated that he had that morning received a friendly message from Rome warning the Chapter not to send up the name of Dr. Errington. Canon Searle observed that he, too, in answer to inquiries, had received an intimation from Propaganda that the Chapter had full liberty to select any candidate they chose. After all the formalities had been duly observed the Chapter selected the names of three candidates to be submitted to the Pope. The names of the three candidates, placed, as the custom is, in alphabetical order, were—the Hon. and Right Reverend William Clifford, Bishop of Clifton, the Most Reverend George Errington, Archbishop of Trebizond, and the Right Reverend Thomas Grant, Bishop of Southwark.

The names of the elected candidates were, according to custom, presented on 21st March to the bishops of the Province of Westminster, assembled in formal meeting presided over by the senior bishop. It is the duty or office of the bishops to draw up a report on the merits and demerits of the candidates, adding any observations they may think fit to make for the information of the Holy See. Their report, together with the names of the candidates elected by the Chapter, was then sent to Rome.

The leading newspapers, which at the time of his death had spoken in the highest terms of the character and abilities and personality of Cardinal Wiseman, speculated not unnaturally on the choice of his successor, prophesying, too readily as the event showed, that it would not be possible to find a candidate fit or able to fill his vacant place in England.

The Government, too, was alive to the importance of selecting a proper successor to the first Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster. Lord Palmerston accordingly communicated to Mr. Odo Russell, the semi-diplomatic agent or representative of the English Government at Rome, the name of the candidate most agreeable to the English Ministry. Odo Russell carried out his instructions and interested Cardinal Antonelli in favour of the candidate suggested by the English Government.[1]

The centre of interest was now shifted from the Diocese of Westminster to Rome, and to the proceedings of the cardinals of the Congregation of Propaganda. It is their office in the first instance to consider the names of the candidates to a vacant see presented by the Chapter; and to study closely the report of the bishops, to which great weight is attached; or carefully to examine any documentary evidence which may be presented. Propaganda is proverbially slow in its proceedings, but it was unusually so in the difficult case of appointing a successor to Cardinal Wiseman. It was nearly two months after the meeting

[1] The nomination of Dr. Grant, Bishop of Southwark, as successor to Cardinal Wiseman, was recommended by the Government, with which Dr. Grant had been in official relations.

of the Chapter of Westminster that Rome came to a decision on this momentous question—momentous at any rate to those who looked upon the choice of Wiseman's successor as "the gravest crisis which had befallen the Church in England since the restoration of the hierarchy."

Mgr. Talbot was very much on the alert; for, three days after Wiseman's death, as I have already shown, he begged Manning to keep him *au courant* with all that was going on in London, whilst he undertook, on the other hand, to supply Manning with information concerning the proceedings of Propaganda. The letters between Mgr. Talbot and Father Coffin at Rome, and Dr. Manning and Canon Morris tell their own story, and such a tale is best told in their own words without note or comment.

Nine days after Wiseman's death, and three weeks before the Chapter of Westminster had met to elect a successor to Cardinal Wiseman, the Provost, Dr. Manning, wrote to Mgr. Talbot, expressing his belief that the Chapter would nominate Dr. Clifford, Dr. Grant, and perhaps Dr. Newman, and deprecating, even more than that of Dr. Errington, the election of Dr. Clifford on grounds alleged in the following letter:—

BAYSWATER, 24*th February* 1865.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—Your letter of the 16th is just come. Many thanks for it.

I will keep you informed, and send you now briefly all I can.

1. For the funeral look at the Catholic papers. It was beyond all expectation solemn, and has made a deep impression upon all kinds of people. I can in no way describe it. One paper says that there has been nothing like it since the funeral of the Duke of Wellington.

2. The change of public feeling is marked. All the papers are fair except the *Times*, and even that in great part. They assail me by pure falsehood as you will see from the Catholic papers. It is evident that they feel we have given a great blow to them.

3. As to the dear Cardinal's papers. He has left every book, paper, M.S., and letter (except those which relate to the business of the diocese) to Mgr. Thompson and myself. We will take care of what is to be done as to a Life and his works.

4. Now for business. The Chapter election is postponed till 14th March, the bishops to meet on the 21st.

5. They *may* put Dr. Errington into the *terna*, but I do not expect it; because it would be too direct an opposition to the Holy See. I do not think they will put in Dr. Ullathorne, for he is not popular. My belief is they will put in Dr. Clifford, Dr. Grant, and perhaps Dr. Newman, for Oakeley and Dr. Maguire have been literally playing the fool about him in this Kingsley affair.[1] I cannot for a moment even fear that the Holy See would accept any one of these names. I have chosen the three whom I believe in the sight of God to be the most attached to Rome, and to have the most love of souls.

Dr. Ullathorne is not one of them, for what happened lately has made me mistrust him on the University question; and I think he was wanting in discernment of our great intellectual dangers.

Still if the Holy See appoints him I shall feel that all is right. Indeed I hardly deprecate any appointment, except Dr. Errington and Dr. Clifford—and the latter even more than the former. We should be overrun with worldly Catholics and a worldly policy without his meaning or knowing it.

6. One thing I feel, that is, how disastrous an arrangement it is that the choice of the archbishop and metropolitan, affecting therefore, not Westminster only but all England, should be even remotely effected by Maguire, Searle, O'Neal, Oakeley, Weathers, and Last. These six can outvote every one. I wish the Holy Father would reserve the Archbishopric in perpetuity to the Holy See. For it is perfectly certain that whoever comes, it is a question of a change of policy. It is Tories out and Whigs in, with all the consequences. And I know no six men less acquainted with Rome, or England, or the needs of the Church in England. They are busy together and mean mischief. But God will take care of us. And this makes me very quiet and without fear.

7. I know how you loved the Cardinal, and how much you have felt his loss. We shall never again have such a friend to the end of our lives. No, there was little sympathy for him, where it ought to have been. Yet I can understand it. I wish we could talk, for I do not like to write many things I could say. So far as I can see I shall not return to Rome now. I have advertised my book, and shall begin at once to print it. And also shall begin a course for Lent. I will write regularly to you: and I trust to hear from you.

---

[1] "This Kingsley affair," alluded to by Manning, was Father Newman's famous *Apologia pro Vitâ Suâ*, in which he not only demolished Mr. Kingsley's calumnious charge of teaching as a priest that "truth is not a virtue," but dispelled for ever the cloud of prejudice which had settled round the head of the famous Oratorian.

Do not let Propaganda pay any attention to this lay Memorial. It is in no way the act of our laymen, but of a few converts and obscure persons, with one or two who do not know what they do. Mr. Wetherell is bringing it to Rome.—Believe me, always very sincerely yours,

H. E. MANNING.

If you think what I said at the funeral worth translating, I had rather F. Brunengo did it. He does it very well.

Pray ask of the Holy Father his forgiveness for my having repeated two things His Holiness said to me about the Cardinal.

MGR. TALBOT TO MANNING.

VATICAN, 18*th March* 1865.[1]

MY DEAR MGR. MANNING—I have been disappointed at not receiving the telegram from you, because the Holy Father wished to hear as soon as possible what names the Chapter had put in the *terna*. I suppose you had scruples about sending them. If I had thought of it, I should have got permission for you, but I was not aware that you took an oath. I thought it was only a solemn secret, which of course does not bind regarding communicating something to the Pope. I do not think that even an oath of secrecy binds in such a case. You must reveal it to the bishops, *a fortiori* you may reveal it to the Holy See.

Nevertheless, I do not think that Errington's name will appear. If it does, the Holy Father will be very angry. An English priest came to him the other day, and in the presence of two witnesses the Pope said to him, that if Dr. Errington's name appeared in the *terna* he would look upon it as *un insulto al Papa*. This he repeated three times. This you can tell the Chapter, without quoting my name.

A hint was sent to the Vicar-capitular at Cardinal Bò's suggestion, which, I suppose, has prevented Errington's name appearing. If it has not, the Chapter may expect to have a severe lesson, especially after they have been warned in kindness to them. They could not offer a greater affront to the Pope.

Cardinal Bò told me yesterday that the Holy Father has spoken to him in the strongest terms, and said that he would give the Chapter a severe *castigo* if they were guilty of such an act. He complained that the *terna* had not been telegraphed.

Dr. Clifford has been writing to Rome recommending Erring-

---

[1] Between the 24th of February and the 18th of March there is a break in the correspondence between Dr. Manning and Mgr. Talbot. Either no letters were interchanged during those weeks of suspense and speculation, or the correspondence has not been preserved.

ton. This must also be told the Pope. He, of course, knew all the circumstances of Errington's removal, yet nevertheless he has the audacity to recommend him. Capital ought to be made out of this fact. Two things he has been guilty of lately, which will be strong facts against him—writing in favour of Catholics going to the University, and recommending Errington. Both these acts show that he is very weak in principle, and that he does not see that proposing Errington is virtually condemning a solemn act of the Holy See, and compromising the Holy Father.

Cardinal Reisach is very thick with Father Coffin, who is much opposed to Clifford. Last night, speaking with the Holy Father, Cardinal Reisach entered into the whole question, and gave him all the views of Father Coffin; so that I think the affair is going on well. Nevertheless, I suspect that some of the bishops will still recommend Dr. Errington. They go upon the ground that he is the only man capable to fight the Government. Now I really do think that the true policy is not to make war against the Government. To be firm and uncompromising, but not to court a conflict, which probably he would do. . . .

Cardinal Bò is delaying the affair of the approbation of your institute. I suppose that he has been intimidated lest Dr. Errington's name should come forward, and is waiting to see who is to be archbishop. You know how timid he is. What a pity it is that you are not in Rome at this tremendous crisis. Since the erection of the hierarchy, it is the greatest moment for the Church that I have yet seen. I wish you were here. As for the "Memorial,"[1] you need not trouble your head about it. Cardinal Bò has been acting in his usual way, but there is no fear of any harm being done. Lord Petre and Mr. Langdale have written to me protesting against it, and I have told this both to the Holy Father and Cardinal Barnabò. . . .—Believe me, yours very sincerely, GEO. TALBOT.

On finding that Cardinal Barnabò was so furious against the Chapter for naming Dr. Errington, and indignant with the bishops for supporting him, Mgr. Talbot was emboldened to suggest Manning as a candidate. But Cardinal Barnabò at once repudiated the suggestion, and declared that from the letters and reports sent to Propaganda it was evident that Manning's nomination would inevitably provoke dissension and schism in the Church in England. Mgr. Talbot

[1] The Memorial was a petition to Propaganda, signed by a large number of influential laymen in favour of Dr. Errington. Dr. Errington's friends and supporters were called by their opponents "The Memorial Party."

was exceedingly distressed, not only at Cardinal Barnabò's opposition, but at the tone of hostility which he adopted towards Manning. To lessen the pain which such a communication would, he feared, cause to Manning, Mgr. Talbot wrote to Canon Morris to break the news, that there was now no hope or chance for Manning. In answer to this letter Manning wrote as follows:—

Manning to Talbot.

Bayswater, 31*st March* 1865.

My dear Mgr. Talbot—Canon Morris sent me your letter; and I thank you sincerely for your kind thought about me, and your fear of giving me pain. It gave me none.

If I were to say that the subject of it has not been before my mind, I should go beyond the truth; for in the last years, both in England and abroad, people have, out of kind but inconsiderate talk, introduced the subject.

But if I say that I have never for a moment believed the thing to be probable, reasonable, or imaginable, I should speak the strict truth.

I have therefore never, as you once said people thought, "aimed at it," or desired it. God knows, I have never so much as breathed a wish to Him about it. And in all this time I have been as indifferent as if nothing were pending.

I believe I may say that God knows I have lived for work and not names or promotions. If I had refused what the Holy Father has hitherto given me, men would have believed this without my saying it. But if I had refused it, I doubt if I should have done the will of God.

The work, if any, that I have been able to do, does not stand upon the favour, or name, or countenance of anyone under our Lord or His Vicar, but upon its own feet; and nothing can affect it so long as we keep in the grace of God. I therefore have no fear of what Cardinal Bò may turn to He may give me trouble, but nothing more. If the Holy Father wished our work dissolved, it would be gone before sunset. If he did not, nobody in the world, I believe, could undo it.

For the future, therefore, I am without a moment's fear.

If I had wished for my reward in this world, I should not have spoken out to the last syllable what I believe to be true. I have consciously offended Protestants, Anglicans, Gallican Catholics, national Catholics, and worldly Catholics, and the Government and public opinion in England, which is running

down the Church and the Holy See in all ways and all day long.

You are the man who can best know and say whether this was the way to my reward in this world.

And in this I hope to go on to the end. And I know that nothing can take off the edge of the truth, and that, under God, is all I have ever trusted to, long before I was a Catholic. Now your kindness has drawn all this from me. Be sure I look for nothing. And be sure, too, that as long as I have life and strength you will find me going straight on in the same road, in which I have always felt you have gone yourself without fear.

That is more than enough about myself. We are, indeed, in a crisis. But I care less who the next archbishop may be than to see six or eight incompetent men, who have crossed the Cardinal's great work, caressed and encouraged. This I think unworthy, and a stain on the Cardinal's memory. Cardinal Bò has let him die under an injustice, and that after the strongest language of promise and support in what he knew to be right.

I have reason to know that the Memorial party is as busy as ever and encouraged by the silence here, and, I must *add*, the *timidity* of Propaganda.

I will send you a letter from the last *Union Magazine* to read to the Holy Father.—Always very sincerely yours,

H. E. MANNING.

MGR. TALBOT TO MANNING

VATICAN, 28*th March* 1865.

MY DEAR MGR. MANNING—As diplomats say, the situation is clearing. The letter of Morris to Cardinal Barnabò was a great move, and if you can write one in the same style it would be of great importance. If the other capitulars who did not vote for Errington did the same also, it would be most useful. The consequence has been that the Holy Father and all the Cardinals of the Congregation of Propaganda are furious against the Chapter. Even Cardinal Bò, who, when he sees how the wind blows puts himself on the winning side, is very angry with the Chapter. I had an hour's conversation with him last night, and he spoke in those terms.

I do not know yet the opinions of all the Cardinals, but I do not think they approve of the other names. They say, "Grant *è una piccola testa e pettegola ;* Clifford *è un buon ragazzo.* Cardinal Antonelli, however, is urging Clifford. It appears that Lord Palmerston, through Odo Russell, has been recommending

Clifford and Grant; and as Antonelli has no ecclesiastical spirit, never having worked as a priest, he takes the diplomatic view of trying to conciliate the English Government by accepting one of the names proposed to him, and at the same time to sympathise with the worldly Catholics. It is the concordat of Portugal over again. He would have ruined the Church in India to please the Portuguese Government; and so now he thinks it more important to conciliate the English Government and Lord Palmerston, than to convert and sanctify souls. As I say, he merely takes the diplomatic view of the question.

Now the great point of anxiety with me is whether a Congregation will be held, or whether the Holy Father will perform a Pontifical act. He himself is doubting. I therefore say mass and pray every morning that he may have the courage to choose for himself, instead of submitting the matter to a Congregation.

Although all the Cardinals are determined to reject Dr. Errington, nevertheless I am afraid lest they should select one of the others. You know very well that Congregations are guided by the documents which are placed before them, and are not likely to take the initiative in suggesting a name which is not in the *terna;* it is for this reason that I should prefer the Pope's acting himself. The Congregation would probably choose Clifford.

Nevertheless, as yet we do not know what was the result of the Bishops' meeting, and a great deal will depend upon that. I should think that both Grant and Clifford will refuse to have their names sent to Rome, in hopes that Errington will be chosen. Perhaps they may suggest the name of Ullathorne; but in the *Ponenza*, Cardinal Bò tells me, he intends to put in the letter of Cardinal Wiseman, in which he protested against Ullathorne's appointment.[1] If such is the case, the Cardinals will find themselves in a fix, and the Pope will be obliged to act. You see that this is a tremendous moment. I think that the only choice is between yourself and Ullathorne. Cardinal Bò told me yesterday the reason of the delay about the approbation of your Institute. At Propaganda it has been thought desirable to wait for the nomination of the archbishop, as they do not wish to approve it *sede vacante*. . . .

I wish you to show this letter to Canon Morris, because it is desirable that he should be *au courant* to what is being done in Rome in this most important crisis. Since the establishment of

---

[1] In 1863 Cardinal Wiseman wrote a strong letter to Propaganda against the proposed appointment of Dr. Ullathorne as coadjutor with right of succession.

the Hierarchy, it is the most important moment for England that I have known. So much depends upon who will be archbishop. I wish it were you; but it would be a strong measure for the Pope to give a *schiaffo* to the Chapter and to the whole Episcopate united against you with perhaps only two exceptions.

I cannot think that the clergy of London sympathise with the Chapter. I do not think that they wish to have Errington back again.—Believe me sincerely yours, GEO. TALBOT.

MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

BAYSWATER, *3rd April* 1865.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—Your letter of 28th March has just come. Mine of Saturday will have expressed what I feel of your delicate consideration and kindness towards me. But I cannot write again without repeating it, and renewing my thanks for all you have done for our Oblates in Rome, especially about the chapel. When this great crisis is over I will tell you more what I think our work may do hereafter.

Now for the main subject. You have said truly this is another concordat with Portugal.

1. If the Government finds it is listened to, we shall have it meddling in England and in Ireland in the appointment of bishops. Meddling both for and against the men it can rule, or that it fears.

2. Also we shall have priests making up to Government and shaping their course so as to stand well for promotion.

3. This will be the worst of *Vetoes* and will bring a corrupt and worldly spirit into our clergy and form two parties, a Roman and an English, which is our danger already. If we are divided we are ruined. If the man recommended by Lord Palmerston were in every way fit, I trust the Holy See would never listen. It seems to me that a high principle of our religious independence is violated by such an attempt.

The Papal Aggression saved us from this danger once. God forbid we should give away our independence now. You have saved British India from one concordat. Save us from this. As to writing to Cardinal Bò I feel an unsurmountable reluctance. I have never written to him since I announced the Cardinal's death. What you said most justly of him in your letter to Morris makes me hesitate all the more; though I knew it before.

He knows what I think, and that I look upon the whole *terna* as Dr. Errington in three, and that it is a struggle to

gain the ascendancy over the Cardinal's work and name, and to justify their past insubordination. It is a grave affront to the Holy See, and Rome is far more at stake than the diocese of Westminster.—Believe me always yours very sincerely,

H. E. MANNING.

P.S.—I saw Gladstone last night for two or three hours. He is, I think, greatly calmer about Italy; and I do not think will speak again as he used.

FATHER COFFIN TO MANNING.

ROME, 8*th April* 1865.

MY DEAREST FATHER MANNING—*Gaudia Paschalia* to your Reverence and our Community.

Each post day since my arrival here I have wished to write to you, but I have had always too much to say, and, as you will understand, much that I could not put on paper.

On the 9th of last month, the day after my arrival, I had the happiness of seeing the Holy Father. He made no secret of what would be his feelings, if the *terna* should be what it has turned out to be. His Holiness said to me twice, and once to Father-General, "If the Chapter nominates Dr. Errington it will an insult to the Pope—*un insulto al Papa.*"

All is now going well. The Holy Father is praying and having many masses offered. Father-General begs me to tell your Reverence that he is also making a special momento every day, and we all feel sure that the Holy Ghost will assist the Holy Father in an especial way to make this most important nomination.

The displeasure at what has occurred in the Chapter and elsewhere is extreme at Propaganda. But it is wonderfully providential, as His Holiness is now perfectly free.

Mgr. Talbot is saying mass every day for this intention.

Hence there is every reason to believe that we shall see not a *coup d'état*, but what I call *un colpo del Spirito Santo*. . . .

I must not forget to add that Cardinal Reisach has been interesting himself heartily in the great affair; and has spoken out on several occasions to the Holy Father. On my arrival here I spoke both to His Eminence and Mgr. Talbot what I believed, before God, it was my duty to say on our present position, wants, difficulties, and dangers in England. And the substance of what I said was repeated to His Holiness.

And now what can I say more except that we are in God's hands, and those of His Vicar; and hence I have no fear for the result.

I pray every day for your Reverence—do not forget me—I do not at present know when I shall be back—probably not before the end of May or beginning of June.

I shall be glad to hear from you if you can find time to send me a line.

Praying our dear Lord to give your Reverence a most perfect conformity to His holy will, and the grace to leave yourself unreservedly at His disposal.—I am always, your very affectionate and servant, R. A. COFFIN.

MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

BAYSWATER, 11*th April* 1865.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—Your letter of the 3rd and 4th came yesterday. I thank God for what it tells me. And I trust you will be sent to us. It will be my happiness to work with you and for you; for I believe that the love of souls and the love of Rome are your two motives, and I know well your uprightness and true kindness. I shall say a mass of thanksgiving as soon as I hear it.[1]

If the diplomatic *mezzo termine* had prevailed, the Chapter would have been masters to the dishonour of the Cardinal, and, I must add, to the grave diminution in England of the authority of the Holy See.

As I have had for years to bear their conduct, I have refrained from saying anything which was not absolutely my duty. But the spirit of contumacy inspired by Dr. Errington against the Cardinal, and now turned against the Holy See, will be fatal, if it be not with a calm and firm hand subdued.

Do not let any one alarm you or any one else with notions of dissension and schism and the like. It is all absurd: I would answer for the union and peace of the future, if only the Holy See acts for itself. I cannot tell what may come, if it yield to, or caress, this spirit of contumacy, which from Westminster would spread to all the chapters and clergy in England. But I trust that our Lord, and I must say under Him, the Holy Father above all, and you in the next degree have saved us. I will go on praying to the end, for I have known no such crisis.

---

[1] Mgr. Talbot had told Manning that "the Pope had suggested as the best solution of the difficulty the nomination of one who, whilst imbued with Roman principles and intimately acquainted with English affairs, had held himself aloof from both parties to the dispute in England." But Cardinal Barnabò soon convinced the Pope that Mgr. Talbot was too deeply implicated in promoting Manning's candidature to be popular in England.

And I know that nothing has been left untried to mislead the decision of Rome. Oakeley has been getting Bellasis to write. I *suspect* More O'Ferral, and the political Catholics here have been prompting Government. May God keep us from a Dublin Castle in London; and from listening to any Government in England.—Believe me always, my dear Mgr. Talbot, yours very sincerely, H. E. M.

Morris has seen this letter.

Father Coffin, at that time Vice-Provincial of the Redemptorists in England, was in Rome during the whole period the question of appointing a successor to Cardinal Wiseman was discussed and agitated. Arriving in Rome on the 8th of March 1865, and not leaving until after the end of April, Father Coffin took an active part in promoting the appointment of Manning. The decision rested in the first instance with the Cardinals of the Congregation of Propaganda, with one of whom, Cardinal Reisach, Father Coffin had several interviews and conversations. He also had an audience of Pope Pius IX., and has left on record observations made by the Pope on the election of Dr. Errington by the Chapter of Westminster. These and other interesting details are taken from *Notes of Father Coffin's Conversations by Father Lubienski*, kindly placed at my disposal.

Father Lubienski introduces the subject in the following words:—"Father Coffin took a very distinct part—a part little known hitherto—in the election of Provost Manning to the See of Westminster. Now that both are in eternity, these details, as related by Father Coffin himself, and noted immediately by one who was present at this narration, may be of utility.

"In the spring of the year 1865, the great Cardinal Wiseman went to his reward. Great were the expectations in England as well as in Rome, great the curiosity to know whom Pius IX. would nominate as his successor. On the 8th of March 1865, Father Coffin arrived in Rome, called by the Father-General to attend a meeting of the Provincials of his congregation. A few days after, the Father-General obtained an audience at the Vatican, and went with all the

Provincials to the Holy Father. Pio Nono received them altogether in a large state-chamber. The conversation turned on Austria and the poor Emperor of Mexico, soon afterwards murdered.

"The audience seemed finished when Pius IX. turned to Father Coffin, and asked Father-General who he was?

"'This is the Vice-Provincial of England,' was the answer.

"'What a pity that Cardinal Wiseman is dead,' said the Pope, and then added, 'but who will now be Archbishop?' Father Coffin answered, 'Dr. Errington is talked of.' Upon this Pius IX. cried out, 'That would be an insult to the Pope. *Non è vero, Padre-Generale?*' turning to Father-General. Then drawing himself up the Pope beat his breast thrice with indignation. After a while he added, '*Ma c' è il Mgr. Clifford,*' and then, as if checking himself, said, '*Ma lasciamo tutto al Spirito Santo,*' and then, '*che Dio vi benedica.*'

"After this audience Father Coffin returned to St. Alfonso's house, making sure that no other than Dr. Clifford would be Archbishop. Father Coffin had not then the shadow of ill-feeling against Dr. Clifford. On the contrary, he felt a special esteem for him; for Dr. Clifford was the acolyte who held the basin when Mgr. Brindle baptised Father Coffin conditionally at Prior Park, when he was received into the Church in 1845.

"But Father Coffin, knowing as he did the frame of mind of Catholics in England at the time, was convinced that Dr. Clifford was too young, and not ripe enough then to occupy the position of Archbishop. And though he knew how great was the opposition against Provost Manning, a convert, being named, Father Coffin felt he was the right man for that place.

"Full of these thoughts in his mind, Father Coffin went to the Father-General to lay before him all that passed in his own (F. Coffin's) mind, and asked whether it was not his duty to make his representations in the proper quarter.

"On being encouraged in his purpose by the Father-General, Father Coffin went to Cardinal Reisach, then

Prefect of Propaganda,[1] and had with him three long hours' conversation on this topic. The Cardinal listened eagerly, and then said: 'Now you will have to say all this to the Holy Father himself.' 'Never.' 'Why not?' asked Cardinal Reisach. 'Because it is not our custom to do such things.' 'We will ask the Father-General,' was Cardinal Reisach's reply.

"A few days afterwards Cardinal Reisach came on a visit to the Father-General, and made his petition; but the Father-General excused himself, and said that the Cardinal himself would say all that Father Coffin had reported, and that would suffice for the Holy Father.

"Some days after Cardinal Reisach was again at Father-General's. Father Coffin was called down and had to take a drive with his Eminence. The Cardinal then told him that Pius IX. had listened to his report, and had taken it into consideration.

"Then came the day of the Congregation at Propaganda, when the *terna* were sat upon. Cardinal Reisach proposed Mgr. Manning; but all the Council was against him, and Dr. Ullathorne was proposed to the Holy Father. Nevertheless the advice given by Father Coffin triumphed with the Pope.

"Needless to add that this fact welded the heart of Mgr. Manning still more than ever with that of Father Coffin.'

In a Note in one of his Journals, dated 8th July 1879, Cardinal Manning said he had no wish to write the history of that time—the interval between Cardinal Wiseman's death and his own nomination—either in England or Rome. But in another Note, dated 23rd December 1882, he gave an interesting account of what Pope Pius IX. said to him on his visit to Rome about his appointment as follows:—

In my first audience on reaching Rome, Pius IX. said: "When Cardinal Wiseman died I was greatly embarrassed. One urged me to appoint A. (? Clifford), another B. (? Ullathorne), and so on. Finally I ordered a month of prayers and masses." He then

---

[1] Cardinal Barnabò, not Cardinal Reisach, was Perfect of Propaganda.

looked up as if thinking, and not speaking to me, and said: '*Mi sono trovato propriamente ispirato a nominar lei: E io crederò sempre di sentire una voce dicendo, 'Mettetelo là, Mettetelo là.'*"

This he said looking not at me, but upwards, as if speaking to himself.

Referring in this Note to his being sent by Cardinal Wiseman, worn out by the opposition of his Coadjutor and of Mgr. Searle and others, to Rome as procurator to answer for the Cardinal and for himself, Manning says:—

This fact changed all my future. I believe I should have lived and died in Bayswater. But this contest took me to Rome two or three successive years. . . . All these years had brought me into the closest relations with Pius IX. He had charged me with commissions of a very delicate kind. All this gave me an experience of Rome and a knowledge of people there, which led on to my being where Pius IX. placed me in 1865. The Chapter of Westminster did it.

Whether, to use Cardinal Manning's homely phrase, "the Chapter did it," or whether Father Coffin's advice prevailed over the Pope, or Cardinal Reisach's influence, or the adroit and persistent tongue of Mgr. Talbot; or, on the other hand, whether the "contumacy" of the Chapter of Westminster in electing, and the "audacity" of the bishops in supporting, Dr. Errington provoked Pope Pius IX. to appoint by a Pontifical act Manning, Archbishop of Westminster, matters but little. In all things human, whether ecclesiastic or no, human motives and agencies play their subordinate part. If in Manning's favour human agencies were called into play, to a far wider extent like agencies were worked in opposition to his nomination.

Under influences secular and spiritual alike; under the grace and guidance of special prayer, Pope Pius IX., on the 30th of April 1865, named Henry Edward Manning as Wiseman's successor to the See of Westminster.

What Manning had described as the greatest crisis he had known for the Church in England, was now brought to an end in the most satisfactory, if most unexpected, manner.

Mgr. Rinaldini, one of the secretaries of Propaganda, was instructed to send a letter with the news of his nomin-

ation to Mgr. Manning. Before the actual nomination took place, the Pope's choice was known to the Chapter, as appears from a letter of congratulation sent to Manning by Canon Hearn, dated 25th of April. Two or three days before the official letter, Father Dillon brought the news from Rome, as is indicated by a letter of Manning's to Talbot, dated May 6.[1]

On the morning of Monday, the 8th of May 1865, after saying Mass, Manning received Mgr. Rinaldini's letter. As soon as he opened it by the door of the Community room, he saw its purport. He went up into the tribune, and knelt before the Blessed Sacrament in St. Charles's Chapel. In a few minutes his nephew, Father Manning, came up, and took the letter from the hand of the Archbishop-elect. He then read aloud to the delighted Community of the Oblates of St. Charles Mgr. Rinaldini's official letter, and a private note from Mgr., afterwards Cardinal, Capalti. The following is Mgr. Capalti's letter.

PROPAGANDA, ROME, *6th May* 1865.

MONSIGNORE MIO VENERATISSIMO—To the preceding letter of our good Professor Rinaldini may I be permitted to add a few lines of a most confidential character to express to the esteemed Mgr. Manning my warm congratulations on his merited promotion to the primary See of England. I rejoice greatly at this promotion, whether in considering its origin, or in looking for the good results I hope from it. Its origin was an immediate inspiration of the Vicar of Jesus Christ, after many and fervent prayers to the Father of Light. What doubt is there that this promotion be truly from God? This consoles me, and ought to console you likewise, if not inspire you with the greatest confidence and the firmest courage in your elevation, it will not, I believe, be without some thorns, at any rate in the beginning. Your promotion, coming then from God, and knowing the many not common qualities with which you are gifted, I at least cannot but augur the happiest results for the Church of Westminster from your zeal and from your future pastoral labours. These are the true reasons which make me rejoice *toto corde et animo* at your promotion; and hoping that you will accept these my sincere expressions, I have the pleasure

---

[1] For Canon Hearn's and Manning's letters, see p. 244.

to subscribe myself with great esteem and friendship.—Your devoted and affectionate servant, A. CAPALTI,

Secretary of Propaganda.

The first telegram announcing the glad news was sent to Ward, Manning's staunchest supporter, especially in defending the Temporal Power of the Pope in the *Dublin Review*. In a letter to Manning, Mgr. Talbot described Ward as the only layman in England who was imbued with the Roman spirit; the only one who had written to him in support of Manning's nomination. On receiving the telegram, Ward was carried away by his enthusiastic delight. Cheers rang through the house, and shouts of joy; a loud *Te Deum* was sung. On friendly neighbours inquiring the cause of such a demonstration, Ward called out: "Henry Edward Manning, by the grace of God and favour of the Holy See, is Archbishop of Westminster." Such enthusiasm, however, was not shared by many beyond the immediate circle of his friends and supporters.

Similar reports to those sent from Rome to Dr. Errington and the Bishops reached, it appears, the Oratory at Brompton, for, three or four days before the official letter arrived, Father Dalgairns wrote as follows:—

THE ORATORY, LONDON, *Thursday.*

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR MANNING—We are continually tantalised with reports that you are archbishop. Do please tell me the truth. I can only say that if it be so, I shall thank God with all my heart for giving us an archbishop whom I can serve heart and soul.—Yours most affectionately,

J. B. DALGAIRNS.

In a passage of a subsequent letter Mgr. Talbot gave the following account to Manning of the circumstances of his nomination as archbishop:—

VATICAN.

. . . . *My* policy throughout was never to propose you *directly* to the Pope, but to make others do so; so that both you and I always can say that it was not I who induced the Holy Father to name you, which would lessen the weight of your appointment. This I say, because many have said that your being named was all my doing. I do not say that the Pope did not

know that I thought you the only man eligible; as I took care to tell him over and over again what was against all the other candidates; and in consequence he was almost driven into naming you. After he had named you the Holy Father said to me, "What a diplomatist you are to make what you wished come to pass."

Nevertheless I believe your appointment was specially directed by the Holy Ghost. When I consider that all the cardinals, with the exception of Reisach, from prudential motives, were against it; that Dr. Kirby and the Irish College, Nardi, Dr. Neve, Mgr. Weld, and almost all the English in Rome opposed it, I cannot but see the hand of God. Every free mass I offered up for you; but at the same time I told them all that I thought you had no chance, in order to silence them. And I did not tell them an untruth, as I did not think the Holy Father would have had the moral courage which it required to name you against so much opposition.

I have many more things to tell you about this matter, but I shall wait till we meet.

The day after his appointment, in keeping with the warm affection he always maintained for his near relations, Manning wrote the following letter to his sister, Mrs. Austen:—

ST. MARY OF THE ANGELS,
BAYSWATER, *9th May* 1865.

MY DEAREST SISTER—The old and true love we bear each other tells me that anything affecting me will affect you. I would not therefore that any other hand should make known to you that the Holy Father has laid on me the heaviest burden I have ever had to bear, the Archbishopric of Westminster.

You must pray for me that I may save many souls, and not lose my own.

May God ever bless you.—Believe me, my dearest sister, your most attached brother, H. E. MANNING.

On the same day, as bound in gratitude and affection, he wrote to Mgr. Talbot as follows:—

ST. MARY OF THE ANGELS,
BAYSWATER, *9th May* 1865.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—Notwithstanding all that you have written, Rinaldini's letter came upon me yesterday as something which I hardly yet believe. I had fully hoped that you would

be sent to us; or if not you, I looked for Dr. Ullathorne. But God has willed otherwise. I hardly know what to write. But before all, I must express my sense of your uprightness. I know all you have wished and done; but I know that you have acted for no human kindness, but for the salvation of souls and the service of the Church. God grant I may never fall short of your trust and hope.

I have now one great desire. It is to see you in the place of power and usefulness—I will not say of dignity, because both you and I look at the first, not at the last—to which your career leads you. I trust that we may then end our lives labouring together, as indeed for years we have already done, for the Church in Rome and in England. I shall feel unsatisfied until I see this.

Now tell me whether I could venture to ask of the Holy Father the last grace he can bestow on me—by consecration. I desire this greatly; and think it of great moment that I should come to Rome, and have the limits of all jurisdiction and faculties before I do any act.

You will be glad to know that I have met with the greatest kindness from Hearn, Hunt, Oakeley, the Oratorians, the Passionists, Carmelites, Italians, among others. I trust therefore that the alarmists will cease to fear; except for my faults, from which I pray God to keep me.

I have to preach next Sunday for Macmullen, but I could start at once after.

Now I have not asked you to place me most humbly at the feet of the Holy Father. This token of his confidence goes beyond any words I have. I pray God I may never give him the lightest cause to repent of his trust in me.

I have written a letter to His Holiness; but I keep it back as the official letter is not yet come.

Pray for me, as I never fail in every Mass to do for you, and believe me always affectionately yours, H. E. MANNING.

It speaks well for the loyal submission of the Chapter of Westminster when such staunch supporters of Dr. Errington up to the last, as Canon Hearn, Canon Hunt, and Canon Oakeley, should have seized such an early opportunity as the first day after his nomination was known in England to manifest "the greatest kindness" towards the newly appointed archbishop-elect.[1] He might therefore

[1] In Cardinal Manning's Journal, dated 9th July 1879, is the following passage:—"The first priest of the diocese who came to me was Father

well gladden the heart of Mgr. Talbot, and still more the Vatican, by making known his trust "that the alarmists will cease to fear."

MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

ST. MARY OF THE ANGELS,
BAYSWATER, 12*th May* 1865.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—Till I got your letters on Wednesday night, I felt that there must have been some error. I wish I could see you and speak, for I can hardly say what I would in writing.

All my desires are to receive the last grace at the hands of the Holy Father.[1] I feel that it would give me an especial light and strength; and I should be glad not to enter upon anything until all was completed by him. On the other hand, I see that it might be well to make this great sacrifice, for so it will be, for the sake of the work before me.

I do not mean the conciliating of anybody, for that is of a lesser order. But it might put a seal upon the state of feeling which this act of the Holy Father has created.

I ascribe altogether what has passed, and is passing, to the same prayers and masses which, as you say, has caused the Holy Father to elect me.

You bade me to expect a storm, and I was prepared for it. But none has come; on the contrary.

Before forty-eight hours elapsed every religious Order came by their superiors, or others, with words I cannot repeat—one only excepted—the Jesuits of Farm Street. But five Jesuits have written to me most warmly.

All the chief convents wrote at once.

Nearly half of the secular priests of the diocese, all the head priests of London, have come or written. In the next days, no doubt, many more will.

All the canons, except Maguire and Last, and these may still.

Five of the bishops—Newport, Birmingham, Southwark, Shrewsbury, Hexham—the last four most kindly, especially Dr. Ullathorne.

Dolman, and soon after, Canon O'Neal. I bade him go on as Vicar-General. I forget what happened during the next weeks, or who came to me." Cardinal Manning meant Vicar-Capitular, for he could not make a Vicar-General before he had taken possession of the See by showing his Briefs to the Chapter.

[1] The grace of consecration by the Pope.

Then professors and students of St. Edmund's and of Ushaw, and Dr. Northcote. I am told also that the change of feeling is openly expressed, and not a word is said for the Chapter.

I mention these facts because I think it my duty. The Holy Father may well be anxious to know that his act has made no storm. There is none, and except through my future fault, will not be. God knows how full of anxiety I am never by word or deed to recall the past, either with the Chapter or among the bishops. My belief is that we shall be in true and sincere union, and for this I would lay down the trust the Holy Father has laid on me, and more than this.

Now it may be that to be consecrated here may bind all this together, and for this I will sacrifice the greatest desire of my heart about it. May I ask you to lay all this before His Holiness?

I say nothing of the laity who have written and come in numbers. The old Catholic families, Lord Herries, Lord Petre, Mr. Langdale, and many more; and lastly, all the lawyers and physicians, with only one exception. I can ascribe all this only to the act of the Holy Father and the prayers which went before it.

But before I enter upon the administration I shall come and place myself at the feet of the Holy Father. Till then I shall do no act except of form. I am not able to write of many things as yet. And I am longing to hear about yourself.—Believe me, my dear Mgr. Talbot, always affectionately yours,

H. E. MANNING.

P.S.—If the Holy Father called me to Rome all would be done. Nobody would fail to wish it so; and the installation would be all but equivalent to the consecration. But subject to the command of His Holiness, I have made the sacrifice of my personal wish. Patterson has read me his letter, and I feel the force of his reasons.

Manning was doomed to be disappointed in his great desire of receiving the grace of episcopal consecration at the hands of Pope Pius IX. It was suggested by Mgr. Talbot that under the circumstances such a request had better not be preferred. If consecration by the Pope was denied to him, Manning, in the following letter, proposed going to Rome two or three days after consecration, in order to receive the pallium at the hands of the Pope:—

MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

ST. MARY OF THE ANGELS,
BAYSWATER, 23*rd May* 1865.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—Many thanks for the telegram, for which I am in your debt. Please to telegraph in answer to this, and keep an account for me of all I cost. . . . I thank you much for your last, with the history of this act of the Holy Father. It makes me more than ever feel how little human agency was in his mind, and how much human opposition was against it. The result is to give me great consolation and strength; and this is my chief support under God, together with the way in which the Holy Father's act has been received in the diocese and in other parts of England. Every bishop except Dr. Goss, who is at Vichy, has written, all kindly and some most warmly, above all Dr. Ullathorne, with whom I am in real friendship and frequent correspondence.

All the Chapter, including Dr. Maguire, who came to me with Canon Last. The past is really effaced by their kind expressions. With Mgr. Searle I have had the most honourable communications, and I hope I have provided for his future comfort. He will not live with me, but Canon Morris as secretary, and some other priest. Father Gallwey has written twice with full expressions of desire to work with me, and the Provincial of the Jesuits (Weld) wrote promising cordial co-operation. For the rest of the priests they have now come, or written with the fewest exceptions, out of the 214 at least 190. Of the laity there was not much fear; and the *old* Catholics are making fun of the *Times*. I mention all this because I know you and others must be anxious, and because I feel that I owe it to the prayers of the Holy Father.

I will now tell you my plans.

Assuming the consecration on 8th June, I go into retreat next Sunday and on the 9th or 10th, I propose to start for Rome with Morris and Father Richards. I count upon a Consistory being held late in June, at which I might supplicate for the pallium. My wish is to receive the Holy Father's blessing and direction before I enter upon work. I might stay over St. Peter and St. Paul, and then turn home. In truth, I need a little fresh air before I begin.

Now if there is anything in this to be changed, please to telegraph with speed.

I reserve all I have to say till we meet; much about Rome and Cardinal Bò; much about things here, which are in many ways very hopeful.

My first thought on that Monday, when the letter from Propaganda came, was of the 20,000 poor children in London; and I hope, with God's help to do something for them. The Government is introducing a Prisons Bill, *compelling* the magistrates to admit our priests. But it has to be fought. Sir G. Grey and Gladstone are behaving very well about it.

I have much I could write, but it must wait.—Believe me always, my dear Mgr. Talbot, yours affectionately,

H. E. MANNING.

P.S.—I am trusting to see you where you ought to be. No one will rejoice so much as I shall.[1]

The Brief has not come, and we are getting anxious lest there should be a hitch.

In reply to Mgr. Talbot's advice, that for many reasons it would not be wise to ask of the Pope such a favour as consecration, the new Archbishop-Elect wrote as follows:—

ST. MARY OF THE ANGELS,
BAYSWATER, 26*th May* 1865.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—I have had a hard decision to make; but I cannot doubt that if I were advising another man I should say that the present time and growth of feeling here demands the sacrifice of my own personal desires, which, though strong as they can be, are after all personal, and must not be weighed against the public good.

I therefore give up what I desire beyond all words, because I believe that in so doing I shall better serve the mission the Holy Father has laid upon me in this diocese of England.

I would beg you to place me very humbly and gratefully at his feet, and to say these words for me.

I have this consolation that I may ask for the pallium in person, and receive the Holy Father's blessing before I set a foot upon my work.

Patterson and Morris will perhaps tell you how things are going here. It is beyond all I could have hoped. Above all the kindness of the bishops and the reconciliation of all the canons consoles me with the hope of true and lasting peace. . . .

---

[1] In reply, Mgr. Talbot wrote, "In my present position in the Vatican as private Chamberlain I have the Pope's ear, and exercise a hundredfold more influence than I could do as Maestro di Camera, or in the College of Cardinals." To this Manning assented, writing as follows: "So long as you can be with the Holy Father you have a higher mission; and I shall be glad to see you stay to the end."

It will be a great happiness to me to talk of all the things which are in your mind and my own.—Believe me always, my dear Mgr. Talbot, affectionately yours, H. E. MANNING.

I am trusting that leave will be granted for the consecration on 8th June.

In answer to this proposal Mgr. Talbot, for judicious and prudential reasons, advised Manning to postpone his intended visit to the Holy See until the autumn.

Then came another letter as follows :—

VATICAN, *3rd June* 1865.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP—I wrote a few days ago to say that I had been desired to let you know that you had better put off coming to Rome till later in the year, as if you come now you could not receive the pallium from the Holy Father ; and it would not be worth your while to come here in order to return in September, which probably will be the time when the next Consistory is likely to be held.

In order to anticipate any preparations that you might be making, I telegraphed to that effect to Canon Morris, at the same time as I let him know that the leave he had applied for had been granted. . . .

Proper faculties will be sent you, together with the Rescript, enabling you to administer your diocese before you have received the pallium.

What I should recommend you to do would be to go on quietly, merely attending to your necessary duties until you come to Rome. You might even, as you require rest, go somewhere else to breathe a little fresh air, as I suppose you require to do so, after all you have gone through lately.

In this advice that I give you I am acting very much against my own wishes, as I was most anxious to have an *abboccamento* with you, in order to make some arrangements with you regarding our future correspondence in order not to excite the susceptibilities of Propaganda.

As a general rule, I must tell you that in every matter of faculties you ought always to write direct either to Barnabò or Capalti, who are the official organs of the Holy See, and they are very jealous of faculties being obtained direct from the Pope. I have had to use all my diplomacy in order to get you permission to be consecrated on the Thursday in time ; and at the same time not to offend Propaganda.

I am of use in Rome in my position to remove any false

impressions that the Holy See may have formed; to defend you in case you are calumniated, which you are sure to be, as Wiseman often was, and all persons high in position constantly are. . . .

I am of use also in such matters as the choice of bishops, in the promotion of canons and the like, as I can support persons whom you recommend. . . . Adieu.—Believe me, affectionately yours, GEO. TALBOT.

Saturday, 3rd June 1865.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—In greatest haste. I have just received your telegram to delay coming to Rome; and will therefore do so, unless you send to the contrary.

It is my strong wish to ask the pallium in person unless the Holy Father will otherwise; and then I have no will at all but his.—Always affectionately yours, H. E. M.

Not twelve days after his nomination by the Pope as Archbishop of Westminster, Manning found time and perhaps relief after his somewhat disappointing correspondence with Mgr. Talbot to write to Lady Herbert, one of his spiritual children, announcing in touching terms how, "not only without human influences, but in spite of manifold and powerful human opposition," the heavy burden had been laid upon him by our Lord. The letter is as follows:—

BAYSWATER, 20*th May* 1865.

MY DEAR CHILD—This letter will, I hope find you at Venice, to tell you that if all prospers the Consecration will be on 8th June. I hope you will be here by that time for I know you will pray for me.

If, indeed, it were the will of our Divine Lord to lay upon me this heavy burden, he could have done it in no way more strengthening and consoling to me. To receive it from the hands of His Vicar, and from Pius IX., and after long invocation of the Holy Ghost, and not only without human influences, but in spite of manifold and powerful human opposition, gives me the last strength for such a cross. It is as if I had heard our Lord call me. And in this I can forget my own self and my manifold unworthiness.

It has also here put me and my unworthiness out of mind: and the Bishops, the Chapter, and the Diocese have received the Holy Father's Will, and me in it, in a way which I cannot repeat.

I am so pressed that I can write but little, yet in that little I must say what joy it is to me to count you one of my Flock, and one of the true Flock, and of the one Fold. Life is wonderful, and I feel as if I should wake up, and find I had been dreaming.

Be sure that all I can ever do for your guidance I will. When you return I shall be at York Place; but I shall keep my little room here. It is a great wrench to leave this house.

I will write to Cardinal Reisach. I know his affection and goodness towards me.

God be with you and with your children. Have great faith and great trust in the love of the Sacred Heart to them and to you, and in the prayers of our Blessed Mother.—Always very affectionately yours, H. E. MANNING.

Before his consecration Manning went into Retreat at the Monastery of the Passionist Fathers at Highgate. In a blank book he wrote down, during the time of the Retreat, as was his wont in his Anglican days, his thoughts and resolutions, and desires. It was his great desire, which was gratified, to be consecrated on the Thursday in Whitsun week. He wrote to Dr. Newman inviting him to be present at the consecration, to which Newman assented in the following letter:—

THE ORATORY,
BIRMINGHAM, 31*st May*, 1865.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP—On hearing of your appointment I s. d mass for you without any delay. I will readily attend your consecration,—on one condition which I will state presently. As I come as your friend, not as a Father of the Birmingham Oratory, I do not propose to bring any other Father with me. I am sure you will allow me to escape dinner or other meeting, as such public manifestations are so much out of my way. Nor do they come into the object of your asking me; which is, as you have said, to have my prayers at the function itself.

The condition I make is this:—A year or two ago I heard you were doing your best to get me made bishop *in partibus;* I heard this from several quarters, and I don't see how I can be mistaken. If so, your kind feeling towards me is not unlikely to make you attempt the same thing now. I risk the chance of your telling me that you have no such intention, to entreat you not to entertain it. If such an honour were offered me, I should persistently decline it, very persistently; and I do not wish to

pain the Holy Father, who has always been so kind to me, if such pain can be avoided. Your allowing me then to come to your consecration I shall take as a pledge, that you will have nothing to do with any such attempt.—I am, my dear Archbishop, yours affectionately in Christ, JOHN H. NEWMAN,

Of the Oratory.

P.S. I suppose the *hour* of the Function will be advertised in Saturday's papers.

During his Retreat at Highgate, in the monastery of the Passionist Fathers, Manning wrote to an intimate friend, who, together with her husband—converts like the Archbishop—had always shown themselves his ardent friends and supporters, the following characteristic letter:—

HIGHGATE, 1*st June* 1865.

MY DEAR CHILD—I have just read over the Paper you wrote at my desire.[1] I have in these last three weeks felt as if our Lord had called me by name. Everything else has passed out of my mind. The firm belief I have long had that the Holy Father is the most supernatural person I have ever seen has given me this feeling more deeply still. I feel as if I had been brought, contrary to all human wills, by the Divine Will, into an immediate relation to our Divine Lord. The effect on me is one of awe, not fear; but a conscious nearness to God and to the supernatural agencies and sufferings of His Church.

I have long had a fixed belief that a persecution is impending over the Church. When, I cannot say, whether in our time or not. But I believe it might come any day.

I pray God that I may be found in my lot at that day.

I believe I can say that what has come upon me has not raised my pulse one beat; that it has given no joy or personal gratification. I have lived long for work and little else, and I look upon this as so much work. It has brought me some sadness, for I must lose for ever much of the happiness of a pastor's life, and nearly all my peace and rest.

If anything has consoled me, it is the feeling that if the

---

[1] The "Paper" was a letter addressed to Religious Communities, Convents, and Pious Confraternities, asking special prayer at this momentous crisis, for the election or appointment of a successor to the vacant See of Westminster, endowed by the grace of God with the disposition and the ability to carry on and complete Cardinal Wiseman's work in England.

Vicar of our Lord trusts me, our Lord does not distrust me. And, if He has not lifted me up for my greater reprobation, He has chosen me to do Him some service in the few years of my time, whether by life or by death.

I feel great joy in the hope that our Lord does not distrust me, and after all this gall and vinegar I have had to drink, this thought is unutterably sweet.

You will not cease to pray for me, and if I can serve you in our Lord, you know it will be my happiness.

May God bless you and yours.—Always yours affectionately in J. C., H. E. MANNING.

In his Journal 1878-82 is the following entry, the only note on his consecration:—"I made my Retreat in the Passionist Convent at Highgate, and was consecrated on 8th June, the Thursday in Whitsun week, by the Bishop of Birmingham, in St. Mary's, Moorfields. As I went down the church at Moorfields among the people, a poor Irish woman said, 'What a pity to take all this trouble for three weeks.' I looked like a corpse after twenty-four hours of fasting."

The newly consecrated archbishop whispered to a friend, "I think I have fifteen years work in me yet."

The consecration of Manning as Archbishop of Westminster took place at the pro-Cathedral, St. Mary's, Moorfields, 8th June 1865.

The two bishops who assisted Dr. Ullathorne in the consecration were Dr. Grant, Bishop of Southwark, and Dr. Clifford, Bishop of Clifton. Unobtrusively kneeling among the crowd of secular clergy was the most remarkable man of the day—John Henry Newman.

On the day of his consecration Archbishop Manning received a characteristic letter from Dr. Ward, the Editor of the *Dublin Review*, denouncing Father Newman as "a disloyal Catholic." The occasion chosen for making such an attack showed, to say the least, singularly bad taste. If any further reference to this exhibition of fanaticism be necessary it will only be as an illustration in another chapter of the attacks to which Father Newman was subjected.

LORD WARDEN HOTEL,
DOVER, *9th June* 1865.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR TALBOT—I write a line from Dover, just crossing over to get a fortnight before I go to work; for the last month has been a severe one, and though, thank God, I am well, I have been hard worked just at the outset.

The time will not be lost, because I am going to beg at Paris and Lyons of the Propagation de la Foi, for our poor children, and at Bruges of Sir John Sutton.

Canon Morris will write to you about yesterday. I feel sure you did not forget me. I would rather he should give you his account of what passed.

But I may say that all the bishops except Goss (out of England). Shrewsbury and Hexham (unwell) were present, with Bishops Morris, Waring, and Regan, and 300 priests at least.

We met afterwards at a dinner in the school, and the kindness of the bishops, and of the diocese exceeded all my hopes. I think I may say that unless by any future fault of mine, the fear of disunion may be laid by.

Before the consecration began the Chapter met *capitulariter* to read the Brief. After this Dr. Maguire addressed me with great feeling and kindness, and with cordial promises of future union and co-operation. We then gave the kiss of peace all round, and with great warmth.

Now I have to thank you for your last kind letter, and advice about Propaganda. I fully understand and see its necessity, and I will most watchfully observe it. I have to-day written to Cardinal Bò a letter which I hope will be acceptable to him, and I will strictly give him his due. I know he will be my cross, as he was the Cardinal's, and that if I make a slip he will not spare me, nor the Holy Father, for whose sake I will be doubly on my guard, let alone yourself.

I have named Canon O'Neal Vicar-General for many reasons which you would I know approve. So long as I have health and strength it matters little who is Vicar-General. If I were to fail I know what to do. This appointment has done its work in the diocese, and taken from the Chapter and the old clergy a possible grievance. Also Canon O'Neal is good, and to me has shown himself most compliant. Pray for me.—And believe me, always affectionately yours, H. E. MANNING.

I readily give up coming to Rome till a future day, and I hope I should as readily give up more for the peace and good of the Church here.

Manning was accepted as archbishop, at least in the first instance, by an act of faith on the part of the majority of the Catholics of England—Bishops, priests, and laymen. He came to them sent by the successor of St. Peter—as an Apostle appointed of God. He bore on his brow the Papal *imprimatur*. "Peter had spoken: the cause is finished." The strife of the last five years ceased, at any rate for a time, as if by the touch of a magician's wand. The storm which had agitated the hearts and minds of many men in England and in Rome subsided. The kiss of peace was given. This manifestation of peace and concord bore happy witness before the eyes of men to the undiminished power of faith and of the Catholic spirit in the hearts of the Catholics of England.

Archbishop Manning bore his part nobly. It was something far higher than grace of manner and speech which was winning for him the "golden opinions" spoken of by Canon Oakeley to Bishop Grant. The nobler side of Manning's nature revealed itself. His force of character was brought out to the full by the difficulties of his position. His office imposed upon him a deep sense of personal responsibility. He was impressed to the depths of his soul with the consciousness that it was given unto him to make or mar God's work and cause in England. He held himself alone of men as accountable for the issue of things placed by the Divine Will under his control and charge. He was the sole trustee for the things of God in England. He would not lessen by an iota his own responsibility by sharing it with others. He never chose—never thought it right or fitting—to consult the will of men. What was their will to him? For him, it sufficed to consult the Divine Will; and to conform to its dictates, his heart and soul, his mind and thought, and his line of action as chief ruler of the Church in England. His unfailing belief in the supernatural—in the actual guidance of God's hand in all that appertained to his sacred office and its public duties gave, aided perhaps half unconsciously by the bent of his own nature, a concentrated force to his will and rule which would have been almost despotic, had it not been tempered, at least to his own mind, by a vivid belief in Divine direction.

Manning's intellectual capacity, as shown by his skill in organisation, by his singular power in forecasting a line of policy, and in adhering to it with a tenacity which rarely or never gave way before obstacles, and his infinite patience in creating means—or in renewing them when they broke under his hand—for the working out of his ends, showed how well equipped he was for the work and office he was called upon to undertake under circumstances so grave and in such trying times.

His zeal for religion, known unto all men, his untiring energy, his capacity and love for work were surpassed by none of those over whom he was set as ruler. His example, which never fell short of precept, was a spur to the heart and a light to the steps of every priest in his diocese. All through his life—as priest, as archbishop, as cardinal —Manning's home by predilection was not in the houses of men, where, as he has himself recorded, he ever heard a voice saying unto his soul, "What doest thou here, Elias?" but in the House of God. He was most at home at the altar, in the Confessional, in the pulpit. As a preacher, especially as a distinguished convert from Anglicanism, he attracted great public attention, and his sermons gained a higher repute than their intrinsic value in originality or depth of thought altogether warranted. But they fulfilled the purpose for which they were delivered: they served the cause of God in England. The high moral courage and the readiness of resource displayed by the convert-priest in defence of the rights of the Holy See and the claims of the Catholic faith in England were pledges, accepted first in Rome, afterwards in England, that Wiseman's successor in boldness of speech and action and in loyalty to Rome would not fall short of the first great English Cardinal.

Personal appearance and bearing count for not a little in creating a favourable first impression. As in those far-off days, when he first appeared as archdeacon in the Cathedral of Chichester, Manning's ascetic figure, austere countenance, and impressive delivery, coupled with an earnest profession of faith in the Anglican Church as the future regenerator of a dissolving Christendom, did much

to soften prejudice and ill-will against the unexpected promotion of one, reputed at the time as having been intimate with Newman and more or less addicted to Tractarian leanings. So, in like manner, when in the pro-Cathedral, St. Mary's, Moorfields, in the presence of a large congregation of representative Catholics, the new Archbishop of Westminster received at his enthronement the homage of the canons, men were deeply impressed by the asceticism, the austerity, and the unassuming dignity of Wiseman's successor. This favourable impression was still further enhanced as, standing on the altar-step, vested in cope and mitre, and bearing the crozier in his left hand, he delivered an address to the canons of his Chapter and the clergy of his diocese in tones so earnest and touching as to move not a few even to tears.

Even they who, like Canon Oakeley, did not trust him as much as they liked him, soon came to recognise the wisdom of the Pope's appointment. As indeed they well might, for who was so fit under the circumstances to succeed Cardinal Wiseman? Who so able and willing to carry on the traditions—to continue and complete Wiseman's work in England? or who—to take another consideration—so capable of filling the place left vacant in English life by the death of the first Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster?

In some respects Manning was superior to Wiseman. As head and representative of the Catholic Church in England he enjoyed opportunities which, in the nature of the case and from the bent or mould of his own character, were denied to Wiseman. Educated at Oxford, familiar with English life and society, intimate with public men and their way of looking at things, to whom practically Wiseman was an alien, Manning was just the man by nature, habit, and training to bring the Catholic Church, its character and claims, social if not religious, face to face with the public life and official world of England. If Wiseman's was the pilot's venturesome arm to steer the bark of Peter through heavy seas and stormy winds to a safe anchorage on the angry shores of England, it was Manning's part, after the storm had subsided, to make smooth the way by tact and skill and intimate knowledge of the land, for the ad

vance of the Church and her sons into the heart of the nation—into the fulness of English life. He showed, when occasion called for it, not only the diplomatic skill of a great ecclesiastical statesman, but the fearless courage of a soldier of Christ. Though he loved the ways of peace he quailed before no attack.[1]

Such was the man called upon, for good and sufficient reasons, which were fully justified by the event, to rule over the Church in England in succession to Wiseman.

To say that Manning was not exempt from faults and failings is merely to admit that in him the old Adam struggled for mastery, and, at times, not altogether without success. It is, however, no part of my duty to indicate his shortcomings. I am not the judge, but simply the chronicler of events. The events, recorded in his life as Anglican and as Catholic, speak for themselves, and afford ample materials for the reader, without any promptings of mine, to form his own judgment. But this much I am bound, or at least entitled to say—and to say once for all—that without fear or favour I am narrating all I know in Cardinal Manning's life of public interest or importance. I have suppressed no facts material for the elucidation of truth or the manifestation of character; withdrawn no documents or letters lest, in bearing witness to facts or events in his life, such letters might haply give offence to the timid or the weak, or to them that shun publicity as bats shun the light of day; or, still worse, practised what is called a "system of judicious suppression," out of a vain or unworthy desire of creating unduly or untruly a more favourable impression upon the general reader than was warranted by facts.

On the other hand, I have not set aught down in levity or on hearsay, or out of keeping, I trust, with the fitness of things, far less, I need scarcely add, in malice.

As good wine needs no bush, so a good and noble nature stands in no need of suppression of truth.

[1] *Punch*, then as now wise in its generation, said: The Bark of Peter wants *Manning*.

CHAPTER XI

SPIRITUAL DIRECTION BY LETTER—CONGRATULATIONS TO THE NEW ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER—MR. GLADSTONE ON THE TEMPORAL POWER IN REPLY TO MANNING

1865

In spite of the preoccupations preceding and following Cardinal Wiseman's last illness; in spite of the hopes and fears, anxieties and misgivings which beset his heart whilst the nomination of Wiseman's successor was still trembling in the balance, Dr. Manning found time to discharge the kindly offices of friend and father to his spiritual children. More especially was this the case in regard to Lady Herbert—a spiritual child of his, in his Anglican days—who after a prolonged delay, owing to family difficulties, had just been received into the Church. In answer to her's, Dr. Manning wrote the following letters full of kindness and wise counsel. Such letters afford a typical illustration of the manner and method he pursued in his spiritual guidance of his penitents, especially of converts. They are all the more interesting, as like most of Manning's letters they contain references to himself; as for instance, in a letter, dated not much more than a week before his nomination to Westminster, he said, "Nothing is yet known. I expect always to be at Bayswater."

28 Via del Tritone,
Rome, 31*st January* 1865.

My dear Child—I arrived here yesterday, and to-day have received your two letters from Mgr. Talbot. I lose not a moment in replying. You know me so well that I need hardly

say what joy they gave me, or how I thank God to know that you are safely in the only true Fold, and within the light of the only true and perfect Faith. I have indeed prayed for you and hoped, and waited, and done what I could by words of mine; but I knew that nothing would avail but the Spirit of Grace, who alone can convert the soul from sin and the world, from all dear to us, and finally from ourselves to God. And now He has completed the work which he began, and under Him I have perhaps been the instrument of bringing it to its perfection. For this I feel a great joy and a great thankfulness. And I can now look back and believe that long ago He began to draw you towards Him through me, so that I may count you in the fullest sense as one of my children in Jesus Christ.

I shall to-morrow say Mass for you, and commend you to the Sacred Heart. I trust it may be God's Will that I may see you grow in grace and in the love of God for the rest of my days, be they many or few. And now I will answer your questions.

1. There is no need whatsoever for the conditional baptism, nor therefore for the delay of Holy Communion.

First, if your Baptism were reasonably doubtful, you would have been incapable of Absolution.

But your Baptism was sufficiently certain for the sacrament of Penance. It is therefore equally so for the sacrament of the Altar.

I will therefore write to Canonico Turano and ask him that no further delay take place; but that you begin to communicate every week as often as he sees fit.

In giving this answer, I am proceeding upon the practice of Rome, and the principles by which I have been directed to act in the case of persons I have received here.

2. Next, as to the permission you ask, about the organ, etc., let it all wait till we meet, please God, in England. The case will not arise till then; no permission is needed from Rome; whatsoever is needed we can give in England; but let the matter sleep till that time comes. You can assure the guardians that everything shall be done according to your husband's will as to the religion of the boys. You have done well in writing openly to your brother. The opener and the bolder, the safer and the more peaceful your path will be. It will make all charges of concealment impossible, and they will respect you for your fidelity and uprightness.

3. And now as to coming to Palermo. If it were necessary, I would do it at once. But no necessity exists. Indeed if I

had received you in Rome, the Holy Office would not have permitted the Baptism under condition, unless positive reasons for its doubtfulness could be adduced. I would also come with joy for the consolation of seeing you and giving you Holy Communion. But I have two reasons which hinder it. The one is that I may at any moment be called back to England. Indeed, I almost turned back on my way. The Cardinal has been in great danger; and received the last sacraments. He is better, but not out of danger. I am getting my work done here, so as to be able to start at any moment.

But I have another. Your submission to the Church will be ascribed to me. And in the highest, truest, and fullest sense under God it is so, and I thank Him for it, and accept all the responsibility with all my heart. But I am glad that you have taken the last and formal steps all alone, in perfect freedom, with no influence upon you but the grace and presence of God. And I am learning what St. Paul meant when he said "I thank God I baptized none of you save Crispus and Gaius, lest any should say that I baptized in my own name."

I shall be all the more able to help you at home, and to stand between you and what may come when every one knows that you acted by no urgency or even intervention of mine.

Now let me judge this point, and you will see hereafter that in this too I am not wrong.

And now you must let Countess Apponyi know, under promise of silence. She has great love for you, and has done much towards bringing you home.

And I think St. Gabriel did you a service. He was put up on Christmas Eve, and rung at the Elevation on Christmas Day. Our people had made their offerings so as to get a very large bell, and to put it up.

You will need much piloting in the storms ahead. But keep as close to God as you can, and humble yourself lower and lower. Be very silent, trust greatly in the Sacred Heart, and not much in anything below it; least of all in friends. When the sun goes in they change colour. But the Sacred Heart is the same yesterday and to-day and for ever. May every blessing be with you.—Believe me always yours very affectionately,

H. E. M.

Mgr. Talbot sends his kind regards. He was greatly rejoiced, and spoke most kindly of you.

1*st February*—I said mass for you this morning at the Altar of the Crocifisso in little St. Giuseppe, where you used to come with Madame Apponyi, with great thankfulness.

BAYSWATER, 16*th February* 1865.

MY DEAR CHILD—1. On 30th January, I reached Rome; on the 31st I read your letters, and wrote that day a full reply.

2. It ought to have reached you that week.

3. 5th Feb., the Cardinal recalled me by telegraph to England: after sixty-eight hours day and night I came in time to watch by him for three days and three nights. He once recognised me.

4. I am here fixed, and have no intention of leaving home unless called away.

Now let me say in a word, your letters gave me the greatest of consolation, and I have thanked God for you with all my heart. I feel too that it is most important that your act has been abroad, alone, independent, among strangers, with no influence upon you but the spirit of God.

This will give you great strength hereafter, and will silence half the opposition.

As you say since 1848 I have led and taught you; and in the last two years God has perfected His own will by my words. It matters not who acts ministerially in giving the Holy Sacraments. And I count it as if I had done so myself. I believe that in the world where Truth has no shadows upon it, dear Sidney's prayers have helped you into the full light which he is now gazing upon.

Your last note is also just come. I am compelled to write briefly, for I am pressed beyond measure, as you may believe.

But believe the joy and thankfulness I feel for you; and that I remember you by name in every mass. God bless you. Let me hear from you.—Believe me, always affectionately yours,

H. E. MANNING.

ST. MARY'S, BAYSWATER, 1*st March* 1865.

MY DEAR CHILD—Your letter of the 23rd is just come.

I thank God for you in many ways.

(1) First, for the great grace of faith which he has bestowed upon you, which is better than life itself.

(2) Secondly, for the grace by which you have been faithful to Him.

(3) Thirdly, for the grace which has kept you from losing your light while as yet you lingered.

(4) Fourthly, for the courage with which you have followed your conscience in the face of a great opposition.

(5) Fifthly, for the openness with which you have spoken out to your family and to all the world.

(6) Sixthly, for the faith given to you to trust your children in God's hands.

(7) Seventhly, for the appreciation God has given you of Himself, your own soul, the truth and grace of His kingdom above all things.

(8) Lastly, for all the charity, helps, and peace He has given you at Palermo. Here are eight Beatitudes.

2. Now be as calm, silent, and kindly as possible towards your people. They will resolve to put you in the wrong as being excited, controversial, and bitter, as they have me. Let it be with even less reason. Answer all their *questions*, but volunteer nothing about religion.

3. As to your Communion, my practice is to make people begin three, four, five times a week, and then daily. But I am glad you have begun at once, and I should wish you to continue it. A day without communion is a day without sun; and you need it at this time. If I were not sure that all things were for the best, I could wish to be in Rome when you come. But it is plain that your being and acting all alone is of great importance. Of course I am the mischief-maker.

3. Only wish for me to do the Will of God, and to die in peace. No change here will include me. But that will not lessen the little good I can do.

4. I got your letter about your Confirmation, and I am glad you had two sisters instead of two duchesses.

Do not forecast or alarm yourself. Not half of the things you look for will ever come, and the other half will be light to bear, and God will bear both you and your cross together. We are very faithless, and judge by human prudence, and alarm ourselves with worldly fears. The seven gifts of the Holy Ghost teach us that it is more prudent to go against human prudence for our Lord's sake.

Thank Canon Turano for his letter and your Confirmation and Communion, and say how fully I unite in all he has done and advised.

And offer my *distintissimi ossequii* to the Archbishop. God be with you and yours.—Always affectionately yours,

H. E. M.

BAYSWATER, 21*st April* 1865.

MY DEAR CHILD—Your letter of the 12th reached me a few days ago in the midst of our Easter week, so that I was obliged to delay till I had a quiet day, and this is the first moment I have had.

I cannot say how glad I am to know that Lord Clanwilliam

has behaved so justly and kindly to you. I fear you must look for no other sympathy in your family, for the English people on this subject have lost their own nature. Even the tribunals of justice are unjust, and kindred are the unkindest of all. Still our Lord knew all that by His own experience, and foretold it for us—"A man's enemies shall be those of his own household." The thought that I have never suffered anything for Him till I became a Catholic has made all that I have had since not only light but sweet; and the thought that for three hundred years He laid the burden on the old Catholics who confessed Him through suffering, and now lays the same on us the new Catholics, who succeed to their post of honour, gives great dignity to it.

First I will answer your questions.

By all means ask in Rome what you ought to do on the four conditions. On the two first I see no difficulty. On the third I cannot pass it as a roll-call. But as the hymns and prayers are Catholic, it is in fact your household joining with you, not you with them, in an act of Catholic devotion led by yourself. In this I see no difficulty.

But if it is led by a clergyman you cannot join in it as a religious act. You could only be present as organist, and to see that the household attends regularly.

As to the fourth, it is permissible that you should go with your children in case of necessity, but only as their guardian. No participation in the service as a religious act is permissible under any conditions whatsoever. You would say your own prayers.

So likewise in respect to harvest homes, etc. What is called *civilis assistentia*, if lawfully permitted, may be allowed, and in this you will do well to ask in Rome. But the *civil presence* excludes all *religious participation* in the acts of separated worships, like Naaman in the house of Rimmon. I am the more anxious on this point for you because I know how every act of yours will be watched and interpreted against you. And I have had long experience of the path on which you are entering. It is a path blessed and sweet, but withal thorny as the crown of our Lord. Nevertheless, if you go onward as you have begun you are safe. You have acted in the last months with an openness and fidelity which has won the respect of many, and stopped the mouths of many more. What I advise is that you write out in Italian the four conditions, expressly saying that you ask leave *prestare soltanto l' assistenza civile*, in the case of three and four. Ask Mgr. Talbot to get an answer from the Holy Office.

The whole case is simplified by your open and courageous profession and practice of your faith. This, as you remember, was the point on which I always insisted as the insurmountable difficulty to all permissions.

And now, God be praised, you by His grace have removed it. I shall be very glad to see you, and to hear much more than you can write.

Do not fail to go to Rome. It will give you a strength nothing else can, and the blessing of the Holy Father will be as a helmet of salvation to you in England.

P. Turano has done right in hindering you from doing more. I should compel you here to do less. This has been a time of grace to you. Use it well, for it is like the first profuse watering which is given to a young tree when it is transplanted.

As to confessors at Rome, go to P. de Veilca first and use my name, or to P. Rubillon at the Gesù. In travelling you may wait till you have opportunity, and go to your Communion (unless any great cause or fault be on your mind) during a fortnight. When you come home come at once to me, as I think I can foresee for you what your difficulties will be, and what line will be safest. But do not forbode or fear, our Lord will keep His word—"My presence shall go before thee, and give thee rest."

And now for other matters. I have nothing to tell you about myself, except that I am as I expect always to be at Bayswater. Nothing is yet known. Our Lord will take care of us. Still do not give up praying for me, for I need all the prayer I can get, not only to get out of purgatory, but even to get into it.

We have had illness in our house—fever—hard work, and fewer hands this Lent, but by God's goodness the largest Lent harvest we have ever got in.

The poor Lears; I hope I am not losing patience or charity, but unrealities of this sort lessen my interest in people. Still you must watch over them. And now a great blessing be with you and your children.—Believe me, always affectionately yours,

H. E. MANNING.

I have seen Gladstone. We are most open with each other. But his obstinate narrowness of mind is phenomenal. We did not speak of you.

The earliest congratulation which Manning received came, strange to say, from one of the members of the Chapter of Westminster which was so opposed to him. The letter

was written by Canon Hearn five days before the actual nomination, on hearing from Rome that Pope Pius IX. had determined to take into his own hands the appointment of Cardinal Wiseman's successor. The tone and spirit of the letter must have been a surprise to Manning, if not a rebuke.

24 GOLDEN SQUARE, 25*th April* 1865.

MY DEAR PROV.—I hasten to congratulate you on the news just come from Rome. Long live the new Archbishop of Westminster. Now, the memory of the poor dear Cardinal is honoured. Now the Holy Father has proved that he really loved and admired him. One thing augurs well for you, you are the appointed of the Holy Ghost—for the Pope has had prayers and masses said beyond number, and has himself been in communion with God for days and days. May our Lord guide and bless you ever.—Most faithfully and affectionately yours, EDW. HEARN.

Two days before the official letter from Propaganda had reached Manning, he wrote to Mgr. Talbot, as glad tidings, "that we are all as still as a mill-pond." This letter clearly indicated that private advices had forestalled the official announcement:—

BAYSWATER, 6*th May* 1865.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—You may like to know that we are all as still as a mill-pond. I am thankful to say that there are no contentions or manifestations of anxiety and disturbance. The act and the attitude of the Holy Father has silenced everybody. And the sense that the Chapter has done wrong is, so far as I can hear, universal. I have never heard a word in their favour.

We had a Chapter some days ago, at which they were all very civil and seemed disposed for no more fighting. The Pope, and not Propaganda, has done justice to the Cardinal in this unhappy past opposition to him. Neither in Dr. Errington's affair, nor in respect to the Chapter, has Cardinal Bò done what was due to the Cardinal. The Pope alone has made them feel the justice of the Cardinal's course. I think I know, too, that at least four or five of the Bishops are glad of what has happened. You will like also to know that we hear no more of Oxford and Cambridge. But we must not stop here. And I trust the Holy See will go on urging the Bishops to form higher lay studies.

As to your letters to the Cardinal I cannot tell what has been done. Mgr. Searle has assumed a kind of sole Executorship

about the papers, and has tried to claim everything *written from Rome* as for the Diocese. But it is now postponed till the Archbishop comes. . . .—Believe me, always very sincerely yours,

H. E. MANNING.

F. Dillon came last night, full of your kindness to them. Many thanks.

The following interesting and warmhearted-letter from Father Vaughan, now the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, was the most welcome of the congratulations which Manning received on his nomination :—

HOSPITAL DA MISERICORDIA,
RIO JANEIRO, 6*th June* 1865.

MY DEAREST F. SUPERIOR—I suppose I should say Archbishop. Mr. Ward, in a little note sent off by the sailing mail, let me hear the good news. Thank God, what a relief and what a realisation of all my hopes and prayers! My first impulse was to start by the packet which will carry this letter. It would be such a gratification to me to be near you, and to watch the beginning of that Pontificate which I have so worked for and looked forward to. It would indeed be a deep and intense pleasure. But, finally, I have come to the conclusion on cooler thoughts, that my presence could be of no real value in London, and that I had, therefore, better finish my work here as quickly as I can, and then go home. I propose to leave this, next week, and to be in England, after visiting Bahia and Pernambuco, in the beginning of August.

This must be the most perfect compensation you could receive for all you have suffered—this expression of the confidence of the Holy See, this power to carry out those noble inspirations for the Church in England of which we used to speak. But I am sure while admitting fully these considerations, you will be almost entirely preoccupied by the burden which is now upon your shoulders. It could not well be heavier just now, nor could you have taken it up at a more critical moment. But the Holy Ghost, whose Apostle you have become in England, will be your Light, Strength, and Consolation. I suppose by this time more than half of those who used to bite their lip on seeing you have humbly bent their knee, and forgotten their former thoughts. You will have trouble from a few of the —— school, perhaps, but it will be as nothing. You have been splendidly trained, however, to suffering and contradiction, and public abuse and misrepresentation, and I suppose all this has not been in order that it should cease now on this side of the Grave

station. As you near the terminus the stronger may be the heat of the fires, but it will enable you surely to draw in after you the vast train of spiritual interests and human beings which must receive its motive power to Heaven through you Our Lord's greatest sufferings were in the end, and so may it be with His servant. Would that I could share them ever so distantly with you. It always seems to me more glorious to be a partner with a man in his sufferings than in his triumphs.

The Cardinal had quite finished his work. His last four years appear to have been a mere waiting till circumstances should ripen for you to begin yours. Yours is the more difficult and the less popular, but the more ecclesiastical and the more spiritual. England wants to see an Archbishop whose house and way of life is such as we read of in St. Charles, and in the B. Bartho. de Martyribus. You must do for the Episcopate what you have done at Bayswater for the clergy. I cannot write now all that is in my mind, nor indeed is there any reason that I should do so, for you have much better thoughts and more perfect inspirations than mine.

And to utter expressions of attachment, affection, and obedience to you as my new Archbishop would be superfluous in me, for I think you must know them better than I could express them

Poor Searle! I wrote a very kind letter to him on the death of the Cardinal; I think he must have been nearly broken-hearted —at least he ought to have been, reviewing all the past—and I wrote to him as such. I am sure you will be magnanimous to him, and a hundred other poor devils who will think "*you are come to torment them before the time.*" I am looking forward to the first Pastoral.

I look upon this as the final seal set upon the Congregation. It now may do its work. What a wonderful retrospect is the past, leading up to the present moment!

I heard of your appointment on Whitsun eve. I am saying mass for you all the Octave. Perhaps you were consecrated on Whit-Sunday.—Begging your Grace's blessing, I remain, yours most affectionately in J. M. C. HERBERT VAUGHAN.

Cardinal Reisach, who with Mgr. Talbot and Father Coffin had been very active in promoting Manning's interests at Rome, wrote likewise a very friendly letter of congratulation.

MY VERY DEAR MONSIGNOR—If I did not at once answer your letter, it was because, in accordance with what you had mentioned to me, I expected to see you very shortly in Rome. Having now heard from Mgr. Talbot that your coming has

been deferred, I avail myself of the departure of the worthy F. Coffin to address you these lines, for the purpose of making known to you the satisfaction I felt when I knew that the Holy Father had named you as successor to our excellent Cardinal, —a thing which had ever been my most earnest wish, though I could not conceal from myself that to you it will prove a burden all the more heavy, inasmuch as your promotion to the episcopacy will withdraw you from that life of retirement for which you have so great an affection. But God's Will be done, which has been so manifestly made known to us in your promotion. You can well imagine that that promotion formed the subject of the conversation I had with the good Lady Herbert, who left here a few days ago, who will be very glad to see you in London—for with tears in her eyes she expressed her regret at being obliged to leave Rome just when you were about to arrive. I really think that it has been most wisely arranged that your consecration should take place in London. It will help to strengthen that accord which manifested itself on the occasion of your promotion, and will assist you in overcoming the difficulties which will not fail to be excited on the part of the factious opponents to the views of the Cardinal.

F. Coffin will tell you what I am unable to express in these few lines, which I have put on paper in haste and with difficulty, on account of the trembling which has seized my hand through the intense heat which we are suffering.—Believe me to be with all my heart, your affectionate servant and friend,

C. Card. Reisach.

Mr. Charles Manning, who, on Christmas Day 1840, wrote a warm letter of congratulation on his brother's being made Archdeacon of Chichester by Bishop Shuttleworth, now, on Dr. Manning's being nominated by the Pope Archbishop of Westminster, wrote the following affectionate letter:—

Brighton, 8*th May* 1865.

My dearest dearest Brother—I feel deeply your kindness in writing to me at once. It has pleased God to lay this duty on you, and He will give the strength. It will be less heavy than you think; perhaps those who loved you most wished for it the least, though they will rejoice the most.

It will cause less surprise than we may think, for all men have looked for it, which is at least a testimony that it is right.

May God be with you. With all and ever increasing affection.—Your loving brother, C. J. Manning.

The following letter from the clergy of the diocese of Birmingham was for special reasons most gratifying to Archbishop Manning:—

BIRMINGHAM, *9th June* 1865.

MY DEAR LORD—The Clergy of this Diocese held their usual annual meeting at Sedgley Park, on Tuesday the 30th of May, and I, as Provost, was requested to convey to you the expression of their congratulations on your Grace's elevation to the See of Westminster.

Under ordinary circumstances, it would perhaps have been hardly decorous for us to step beyond the limits of our own diocese in an affair of this kind; but, as the Protestant press has sought to sow division amongst us, by insinuating that it already exists on the occasion of your Grace's appointment, we think the assurance of the good wishes and prayers of so large a body of clergy may afford you consolation and encouragement under the many trials and difficulties which must needs beset the high office to which his Holiness has been pleased to appoint you.

As at the time of our meeting your Grace was in Retreat, I did not wish to interrupt you for a moment in your holy preparation; but as the great day of your consecration has now passed, I take the earliest opportunity of writing to you in the name of the Clergy of the Diocese, and, may I be permitted to add from myself, *ad multos annos*.—I remain, my dear Lord, yours most respectfully, R. PROVOST BAGNELL.

LYONS, 21*st June* 1865.

VERY REVEREND AND DEAR PROVOST—On arriving at this place yesterday I found your letter of the 9th inst., written in the name of the Clergy of the Diocese of Birmingham, and I lose no time in thanking you for it, and through you the Clergy, whom as Provost you represent. Such an expression of kindness and sympathy from the Clergy of one of the chief Dioceses in England could not fail to be grateful to me, and to give me courage in the arduous charge to which God has called me. It would be so at all times. It is especially so at this when I can be sensible of little except the responsibility which is laid upon me. To know from you and from them that I have their prayers and their confidence will give me no little strength in the work which lies before me.

I feel also the delicacy of your kindness for the reason which, as you say, prompted you to express it. A certain class of persons, who watch the expansion of the Catholic Church with no good-will, have thought to find or to make divisions among us.

No doubt they imagined to have the best of opportunities at this moment. But division among us they can neither find nor make, not even at such a time as this. And your act, wholly unlooked for, without any of the ordinary motives of personal friendship or of ecclesiastical relations, or of services rendered by me, to call forth such an expression on your part, is an evidence of the union of heart and mind which, as no system but the Church of God can produce, so none who are out of it can understand.

Let me add that this act of the Clergy of the Diocese of Birmingham is all the more grateful to me, because it comes from a body of Priests who have for their Bishop one whom it is my happiness and my honour to possess as a tried and valued friend.

Let me therefore beg you to convey to your Very Reverend and Reverend brethren in my name this expression of my gratitude, and the assurance that my prayers shall not be wanting to obtain for them every good gift of our Divine Master. Commending myself to their intercession. — I remain, Very Reverend and dear Provost, your affectionate servant in Xt.,

H. E. MANNING.

The letters of congratulation which Manning received on his nomination as Archbishop were comparatively few, as he was not generally popular at the time among Catholics, and his Anglican friends knew him no more.

The following letter from Mr. Gladstone has no relation to Manning's nomination, for it was written two days after Cardinal Wiseman's death in reply to a home-thrust contained in a letter written from Rome on 5th February. This letter of Manning's was, in fact, a *tu quoque* argument, contending that if the Pope's subjects were under the coercion of the French army of occupation, the people of Ireland were under the coercion of the English army.

Manning does not appear to have continued, at any rate at the time, the controversy. The following is Mr. Gladstone's letter:—

11 CARLTON HOUSE TERRACE, S.W.,
17*th February* 1865.

MY DEAR MANNING—I do not know where my note may find you, and I need not assure you of the concern with which I heard of Cardinal Wiseman's illness and death; but I must not flinch from the question thrust home in your letter of the 5th. It may be lawful, however, to begin with saying that I think our surrender in the teeth of any lingering national or

military prejudices of the Ionian Protectorate indicates pretty clearly our disposition to practise ourselves the precepts which we hold that others should follow.

As respects Ireland :—

1. I do not admit that the Queen holds it by coercion. Vaguely asserted this may be, proved or made evident it has never been. Ireland has 105 representatives in the House of Commons, many more in proportion to her wealth and population than Scotland. They are chosen without interference from England or rather Great Britain. How many of them will say that we hold Ireland by coercion? Will the Pope stand a like criterion, and let *his* people speak by a representative assembly?

2. Even were Ireland held by coercion I should deny that the coercion of one part of a country, politically constituted for 600 years by the general force and will of that country, was the same thing as the coercion of a country by foreign bayonets.

3. If one portion of a regularly united country desires to separate from another, and is prevented, the preventing part is bound to see that the other part has justice. So would come up the question, Has Ireland justice? My answer would be, in material respects it has justice, and even more than justice, (though I by no means say that in such a case indulgence is always improper). In several other respects I think it has *less*; and I, for one, am ready to do it justice, to the best of my belief and light, in any matter when it may be desired, and a reasonable plan proposed, or where I may see injustice that it is in my power to remove.

4. But if I am told England should erase the history of six centuries, and withdraw from Ireland and leave her to settle her own affairs, besides all other answers, I answer thus: If England is in Ireland, it is pre-eminently for the protection of the Irish *majority*.

I think then I have answered your appeal, though you did not answer mine, and I am loath to renew the mention of controverted matter.

But you make another appeal, not *ad rem.*, but purely *ad hominem*, and that I will answer too. I have no intention whatever of breaking with the traditions in which I have grown up, which I have learned from Oxford, which I have learned from four writers far beyond any, perhaps all, others—Butler, Aristotle, Dante, Saint Augustine, my four doctors. I think myself more truly loyal to those traditions now, when I would act in a spirit of trust, rather than of mistrust, towards the people, of course with due regard to time and measure, than when in my youth, partly misled by the authority of Mr. Burke and

Mr. Canning, I, like many older and wiser men, took fright at the Reform Bill. I do not conceal from myself the enormous difficulties that are before me, in the (I hope) short remainder of my political life; I am quite aware that I am hemmed in by limits and conditions of action which attach to no other man; nevertheless, I trust, from day to day, that God will provide.—Always affectionately yours, W. E. GLADSTONE.

I am very glad to see by a letter from Garibaldi that he is not coming here. Am I not now a good boy? My four doctors are doctors to the speculative man, would they were such to the practical too.

In his defence of the Temporal Power of the Pope, Manning was hampered by his belief in the old Whig doctrine of the "Sovereignty of the People." Having conceded to the Revolution the principle of Legitimacy,[1] he based his argument in support of the Papal sovereignty on the higher ground that it was a Providential dispensation in order to secure the spiritual freedom of the Church. But since the Temporal Power was a spiritual right, Archbishop Manning deprecated the use of carnal weapons in its defence. In his arguments against imposing by foreign intervention and foreign arms the Temporal Power upon "the Italian people," Mr. Gladstone had on his side, to a certain extent, the sympathy of his opponent. But when in a subsequent letter, of a somewhat later date, Mr. Gladstone challenged Manning's defence of the Temporal Power as a Providential dispensation by reminding him how, on a memorable occasion, as Archdeacon of Chichester, he had denounced the Temporal Power of the Popes as an usurpation of Divine authority, and a violation of civil rights and liberties, the controversy naturally assumed a very hostile tone. It was on this occasion, I believe, that Manning likened Mr. Gladstone's attack on the Temporal Power to the work of anti-Christ. With the following rhetorical flourish Mr. Gladstone concluded his defiant letter:—"I appeal from the Son of Loyola to the Child of Oxford."

[1] In a letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated 8 York Place, 14th March 1867, Archbishop Manning said:—"I am most thankful that the Roman Question has come to be understood and separated from the mere Legitimist politics. Nothing has damaged it more; nothing has made it more odious in England.'

CHAPTER XII

WINNING GOLDEN OPINIONS

1865

THE day after the consecration, following Mgr. Talbot's advice, Manning went abroad for a month, not to Rome, where he had hoped to spend the Feast of St. Peter and St. Paul, but to France and Switzerland. Accompanied by Dr. Cornthwaite, Bishop of Beverley, and by two Oblates of St. Charles, his nephew, Father William Manning, and Father Richards, he visited Paris, Poitiers, Lyons, Annecy, and Geneva. From Geneva the new Archbishop wrote to Mr. De Lisle, the enthusiastic Apostle for the conversion of England, as follows:—

GENEVA, 29*th June* 1865.

MY DEAR MR. DE LISLE—Your kind letter has followed me abroad, and I have been waiting for a quiet day to answer it. Let me thank you sincerely for all its kind expressions, which I sincerely return.

I have not forgotten our walk in the woods, nor the subjects we spoke of, nor our visit to the Calvary. Nor have I ever forgotten your kindness in offering me hospitality whensoever I could come; which I have often thought of in these fourteen years without ever being able to enjoy, from hard work.

I thank you also for wishing in my behalf the spirit of St. Francis of Sales, as you did that day; and I do so the more because I am just returned from Annecy, where I said mass at his shrine. I believe I may say that I would lay down anything for the conversion of England; and that what time remains to me shall be spent for that end. I may say, too, that all my natural affections, and whatsoever charity I have, are sincerely

turned towards those who are still where I once was; and for their sakes I would gladly make any sacrifice except of Truth. Whatsoever it may be in my power to do to spread the Truth without the tone or the taint of controversy I shall count it a grace to be able to do. I endeavoured to express this in the first pastoral I published. And when I come home I will send you two other little matters in the same sense. Your kind words have drawn thus much from me. And I felt it due to you because of the zeal I know you have for the salvation of souls.

Pray offer my kind regards to Mrs. de Lisle.—Wishing you every blessing, I remain, my dear Mr. de Lisle, yours very faithfully, ✠ HENRY E. MANNING.

Rest and relaxation—idleness he called it—was not congenial to Manning's nature. In Rome his hands were ever busy, but a month in France was to the new Archbishop a month wasted. His heart and spirit were at home. He was eager to commence work—the work on which his mind was now set—the work of conciliation.

For years it had been Manning's business to fight his own battle and Wiseman's—Wiseman's against "an insubordinate coadjutor, a refractory Chapter," and "suffragan bishops" alleged by Manning to be "in conspiracy" against their metropolitan. How loyally he stood by Wiseman's side, or in the forefront of the fight, it needs no telling; nor how unflinchingly he held his ground against tremendous odds; nor how unsparingly, perhaps, he used his weapons in that eager day, not always stopping to pick and choose his mode or method of action, but striking out against all comers, be they bishops or no, whom he looked upon in his anger as enemies of the cause of God—as labouring to undo Wiseman's work in the Church in England.

But that was in the day of battle, when a soldier's first duty is to strike and spare not. Victory is not won with rose-water. At any rate, neither Dr. Errington nor Mgr. Searle was susceptible of such treatment. But to-day is the day of victory. *Væ victis!* never was Manning's cry, either as Anglican or Catholic. He would far liefer win the cause dear to his heart by means of conciliation, and gentleness, and goodwill, than by the strong arm.

Yet the strong arm was "aye ready." But after victory no man could be kinder, more gentle, more conciliatory in act or manner than Manning. He laid himself out to please; to win the hearts of men, even of those who had offended most; or to turn aside wrath by an act of personal kindness, or by conferring a benefit or boon on his opponents.

In his new position as Archbishop of Westminster he made the most of his opportunities to do or say kind things, especially to those who had been set against him. Tact, courtesy, persuasiveness of manner were great gifts which Manning possessed in a singular degree. They stood him in good stead to-day, as had done yesterday boldness, skill, and tenacity of purpose. The position which he had attained to, in the teeth of such opposition, was beset with no small difficulties. It required talents of no mean order to keep things smooth. Manning himself was not as yet aware in these early days of the full extent at least of the opposition which had been raised against his appointment at Propaganda. The Holy See had taken, if a wise, a bold step. Pope Pius IX. even had misgivings, not as to Manning, but as to the circumstances of the nomination. Hence the warning which was given to him to be prudent and circumspect, and to avoid exciting undue attention by coming to Rome in hot haste or in exultation of spirit.

Archbishop Manning's early reports to Mgr. Talbot of "the kindness of the bishops" and "the reconciliation of all the canons," and "the hope of true and lasting peace," gave great satisfaction in Rome.

Indeed, no higher tribute could be paid to Manning's con-iliatory manners and methods than that such a reconciliation hould have been effected within two or three weeks of is appointment. Rating even at its highest the effect f Manning's good-will and grace of manner, it is somewhat lifficult to conceive such a sudden transformation on the part—I will not say of Mgr. Searle and the Chapter, for that may perhaps in part be accounted for—but of the bishops, unless, indeed, they were not as black as they were painted in the heat of the conflict.

Bishops who were tainted with a "Gallican or Anti-Papal spirit," or whose religion was "a low order of English, National, Anti-Roman Catholicism," would surely not have shown such prompt and loyal submission to the Holy See, or have manifested, as Manning himself testified, such kindness to the Pope's nominee.

As to Archbishop Errington, it is surely not out of place, amidst the triumphs I am recording, to say that his conduct was worthy of a holy and zealous priest. With loyal submission, in humility and heroic patience, he spent the rest of his life working for years as a parish priest under his friend, Dr. Goss, Bishop of Liverpool, at Douglas, Isle of Man; until at a later period, on the restoration of Prior Park, he was called by his staunch friend, the late Bishop Clifford, to be professor of theology in the college. Dr. Errington, after passing an edifying life in peace and silence, died in the year 1886. He nursed no resentment in his heart. He did not even attempt to vindicate his ways or tell his own story. His tongue left no sting or stain behind.

Dr. Errington, with the other bishops, was engaged, however, it must be remembered, in a war, partly of principle, partly of persons, in which, though finally worsted, blow was given back for blow. Neither side was exempt from misrepresentations or exaggerated statements. The balance of blame was more fairly held in Rome than perhaps was generally known at the time. Words and actions were closely scrutinised, even in men whose aims and motives were recognised as pure. If Manning's formula, in his letters, "Make this known where you are," served to remind Mgr. Talbot of the opportunities of his office, the pith and purport of these communications reached the ear of Propaganda. Propaganda has a long memory.

Manning's mode and method of action was never altogether forgiven or forgotten by the Holy Office. It was even remembered against him at the Vatican Council.

How his ancient and formidable foe, Mgr. Searle succumbed, stands recorded in a note of Cardinal Manning's Journal, dated 9th July 1879, as follows:—

I remember that I told Mgr. Searle to go on as œconomus, and to make up his income to £300. He said, "I have long been looking with anxiety to this day; but you have changed my anxiety to consolation." *Verba volant.*[1]

The confidence of Canon Oakeley, Searle's staunch supporter in the Chapter, was not so lightly captured, as the following letter to Bishop Grant shows:—

7th June 1865.

MY DEAR LORD— . . . .

I have not yet wished you joy of Manning's appointment, of which, personally, I am very glad. I have had some very frank and pleasant correspondence with him since his nomination.

I wish I could confide in him as much as I like him.

He seems to be winning golden opinions by his extremely conciliatory and moderate *début.*

I have not seen J. H. N.'s note. Manning spoke to me of him in the warmest terms!!! in a very confidential communication I had with him at the Oratory spread.—Yours affectionately,

F. OAKELEY.

P.S.—Everybody is talking of a poem by J. H. N. in the *Month.*

On Manning's return from France Mgr. Talbot resumed his correspondence. A few passages here and there, conveying information as to how Manning stood at Rome, and especially as to his relations with Propaganda, will, however, suffice.

VATICAN, 10*th July* 1865.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP—Now that you are returned to England I must write a *confidential* letter, as I have been greatly disappointed in not having seen you in Rome; and I see no chance of seeing you before September, if even then, as all depends on when a Consistory will be held. . . .

Your letters to Cardinal Bò have done good. He has come round, and is in a good humour with you; but you know he is not a man to be trusted. As for myself, during the whole of the last affair, I have been on good terms with him; and we had only one little spar, when I told him after the death of the Cardinal that you were the man to succeed him. At that time he was strongly opposed to you; but he watched the mind

[1] A few years later Archbishop Manning deprived Canon Searle of his office. In consequence of some error in management, the Archbishop wrote to Mgr. Searle,—"You are no longer œconomus of mine."

of the Pope, and came round at last. I think that Capalti and the rest of Propaganda are true to you, and we are very glad of your appointment. . . .

The real motive why the Pope named you is because he thought you were the man to introduce a new spirit into the Church in England, which required it, as was seen by the conduct of the Chapter and the bishops.

Your mission is the conversion of England, and therefore what you said in your consecration Pastoral was admirable, and I took care to report it to the Holy Father. Your appointment has been a severe blow given to the club theory, I mean the view that the Catholic body, as it is called in England, is a kind of club, and that the dignities in it ought to be the property of the Cliffords and other Catholic families. You must not care about the cynical articles of the *Times* and the *Saturday Review*. More conversions you make, more bitter will they become.

Preach and write away, because the eyes of all Europe are upon you, and expect great things from you. . . .

Now, my dear Manning, I need hardly repeat that you may depend upon the support from me which I have given you now for many years. As you say in your letter, I hope we shall work together for the conversion of England. Of course you must not neglect the poor, but many can do *that* work; few have the influence which you have—I may say, no one—on the upper classes of Protestants.

One thing, however, is most wonderful—the change of the opinion of Catholics in your favour Your greatest enemies have entirely come round. I received the other day a panegyric of you from Searle. This change of feeling I cannot attribute to anything but the Holy Ghost.

Yourself you are not aware of how many opponents you had; and amongst them a great number of those whom you thought your friends. I feel most happy at having removed all the obstacles which lay in your way.

However, I cannot say half of what I have to tell you by letter. I must wait till you come to Rome. I have just heard that there is some chance of a Consistory in Septemper.—Believe me, sincerely yours, GEO. TALBOT.

Manning, who had now, as Archbishop, taken possession of Wiseman's House in York Place,[1] wrote in reply to

[1] The lease of the house in York Place was purchased and presented to Cardinal Wiseman, soon after her conversion, by Miss Gladstone, sister of the ex-Prime Minister.

Mgr. Talbot a long letter, from which I give the following extracts :—

8 York Place, 18*th July* 1865.

My dear Mgr. Talbot — Your letter of the 10th came yesterday, and I thank you much for it. . . . Now I will come to Rome when you write to that effect, and then we can speak freely. Meanwhile for all you write in your last, I will only say that I hope we may be spared to work together. I feel that we have one aim and one mind ; and I have the comfort of being able to rely upon your help, which I have long known and trusted. If I know myself, I have no wish but to end my life in work for the Church and for souls, and in charity and peace with all, above all with the bishops. In this I have had much consolation. And the clergy of the Diocese of Birmingham and the Chapter of Salford have written to me in a way which gives me good hope. In the diocese everything is as you already know. And I ascribe it as you do to the prayers of the Holy Father and to the grace of God. . . . Mgr. Howard and Mgr. Stonor and others are coming to dine here to-night, and the priests come in the evening. I cannot tell you how strange and sad I felt on entering this house the day I came from abroad. I felt as if everything belonged to the Cardinal, and as if he would come into the room every moment. . . . I hope you see the *Dublin Review*. It is doing good work, and its circulation is doubled.

The elections are going favourably for the Government, and yet they will be weak enough to need our help. Gladstone is losing Oxford, which will cast him off from much of his Anglicanism. On the whole I think things look well for us. I have not voted at all. Both parties have sent to me, but I declined to move. They will neither be able to do without the Catholic votes, and will not willingly offend us.[1]

We have got our prisons open to priests, and we shall get the workhouses next Parliament.—Believe me always, my dear Mgr. Talbot, yours affectionately, H. E. M.

---

[1] In a letter, dated 25th July 1865, Manning wrote as follows :—"The elections are over. Government has certainly gained. The chief remarkable facts are : (1) There has not been a word of 'no Popery' except in about three places, and that of no moment. (2) Not a word of United Italy and Rome, nor of the temporal power. (3) Strong declarations of equality in religions, naming Catholics, especially from Gladstone. (4) Strong against the Irish Protestant Church from Protestants in Ireland. (5) The Government not strong. (6) The Opposition strong enough to be serious. The result, I believe, will be that both will need us ; and neither will venture to offend us."

You tell me to write, and I hope my book will be out in a month or two. The Bishop of Beverley has read it, and thinks it will be useful. It will be a nut for some of our reviews, I hope. I do not complain at all of their treatment. They have for the most part been very fair and courteous. But they show that we make them feel.

The book which Manning hoped would be "a nut" for the reviewers was, *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost; or, Reason and Revelation.* As the first volume published since he became Archbishop, it attracted considerable attention and was freely reviewed. Like most of Manning's publications, it was the substance or main idea of sermons delivered on various occasions, chiefly at St. Mary's, Bayswater. The work was a clear and able statement of Catholic teaching on the relations between revelation and reason, and a bold attempt to grapple with the difficulties of modern scepticism.

Since he had to give up the idea of going to Rome to be consecrated by the Pope, or to receive the pallium after consecration on St. Peter's Day, Manning wished to put off his visit until after Christmas. In autumn Rome was empty, at least of its English visitors; little or no business was doing; the more convenient time, therefore, for the new Archbishop, who had much to do in England, was to go to Rome in the winter, his usual period for preaching controversial sermons, or delivering Lenten lectures.

In the following letters Mgr. Talbot had to explain the necessity for an immediate visit to Rome:—

CASTEL GANDOLFO, *2nd August* 1865.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP— . . . . As for your coming to Rome, I do not see how you can help coming in September when the Consistory will be held. The Holy Father himself has promised to give you the pallium, and says that you ought to be here at about the middle of September. It is very doubtful when there will be another Consistory. Last year there was none after September. After what has taken place the sooner you come to Rome the better, and probably you would like to return in 1867 for the canonisation, so that the longer the interval between your two visits to Rome the better. . . .

The Propaganda seem *now* to be in good humour about your appointment. Even Cardinal Bò pretends to be so, but who knows what he really thinks about it? You do well in writing to him constantly. No bishop has said a word against you, although there are several who still keep to their opinion, Capalti, I think, is true to you. . . . Whenever I see Cardinal Roberti he asks to be kindly remembered to you. He is one of your great friends.—Adieu, believe me, affectionately yours,

GEO. TALBOT.

8 YORK PLACE, PORTMAN SQUARE, LONDON,
19*th August* 1865.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—In my last letter I said that I will start for Rome on September 10th or 11th. And so I will unless I hear from you that I may defer coming. In truth, I have such a press of business which the cardinal could not settle; and I have brought it to the point of settlement that I most desire to see it finished, for if I move it may all get again entangled. Moreover, I am just working up the account of the funds, which is an enormous work of trouble.

Also I am taking the first steps about the poor children.

Further, all business is suspended in Rome till November, and I have much to ask. Lastly, I fear we shall soon have great sickness and trouble here, and I ought not to be absent.

These and many more reasons make me wish to come at the beginning of January.

But only say the word and I will come next month.

Could you ascertain "*il sommo volere*," and give me one word *promptly*.

Thank God we are in perfect peace and hard at work. . . .
—Always affectionately yours, H. E. MANNING.

CASTEL GANDOLFO, 17*th August* 1865.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP—I have just received your letter of the 10th inst.; and I write to say that I am glad to hear that you have made up your mind to start for Rome on the 10th of September. You ought not to put off your leaving England after that day, because the Holy Father says you ought to be in Rome at about the middle of the month, and you will be obliged to come by land, because in consequence of there being the cholera at Marseilles, at Cività Vecchia there is the quarantine. . . .

The Pope is anxious to see you, as he asked your Oblates about you, whom I presented to him a few days ago. . . .
—Believe me, sincerely yours, GEO. TALBOT.

CASTEL GANDOLFO, *24th August* 1865.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP—I have just received your letter of the 19th inst., and I immediately referred the contents of it to the Holy Father.

Now if you wish me to tell you confidentially what I think of your coming, or not, to Rome for the Consistory in September, I cannot conceal from you that I think your delaying till after Christmas would make an unfavourable impression on the mind of the Holy Father.

Of course if you formally asked the permission to do so, it would not be denied you, as the Pope never refuses when asked a thing of that kind, but as there is a long story about your appointment, with which your coming to Rome is connected, I have strong reasons for saying that I do not think it would be politic on your part not to come to Rome at the time mentioned by the Holy Father.

No one knows the mind of the Holy Father better than I do, I therefore think it is a matter of great importance that you should do nothing at the commencement of your archiepiscopal career which may prejudice him against you. Already I have had to defend you against whisperers.

After all, you need not be absent from England for more than a month or six weeks.

If I consulted my own wishes, I should like to have you here at Rome during the winter, in order that you might have preached at St. Maria in Monte Santo, but I forego my own wishes in order to serve you in this matter.

When I read your letter, and submitted the contents of it to the Holy Father, what struck him immediately was: "If he does not come now, when will there be another Consistory?" Again he added, "He wanted to come as soon as consecrated, and now he wants to put off coming." So you see from these expressions the Holy Father was not much pleased.

I have told you now what *I* think about this matter in the strictest confidence. Nevertheless do what you like. If still you wish not to come now, what I should recommend you to do would be to write an official letter to Cardinal Bò, as Prefect of Propaganda, and state your reasons, which he would officially submit to the Holy Father, and the affair would be treated as a matter of business.

During September and even October you will be able to do your business with Propaganda, because, although there are no Congregations held, Cardinal Bò is always in Rome, and the officials are always to be seen. Mgr. Capalti goes every Sunday to the Pope, and Cardinal Bò has his usual audiences.

The Consistory will be held on the 25th of September. All the cardinals are anxious to see you. Those who are specially interested in you are Cardinals Altieri, Patrizi, Roberti, de Luca, and Antonelli. Mgr. Barnardi is very anxious to see you also for political reasons. . . .—Believe me, my dear archbishop, affectionately yours. GEO. TALBOT.

The above letter, intimating the Pope's displeasure at Manning's desire to postpone his coming to Rome until after Christmas, decided the question, as the following reply shows :—

ST. EDMUND'S, *3rd September* 1865.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—Many thanks for your letter of yesterday, which was exactly what I wanted. I had no desire but to do what was best. If I had known that the Holy Father had any wish about it, I should not have hesitated.

But it is clear that the time in England has been of great importance. The extent to which our old dissensions are healed is beyond all my hopes, and is, I trust, the beginning of better days. I am home, having had an ordination this morning. Everything here is kindly and quiet. . . .

Hope to reach Rome by the 18th or 19th, and to have long talks with you. . . . As I hope so soon to see you, I will not add more than my thanks for all you have continued to do for the Oblates. I trust they will prosper both in Rome and here; and I have all hope of it. The opposition to them is as good as gone, except that which will never go. . . . Hoping soon to see you, believe me, always affectionately yours,

H. E. MANNING.

The new Archbishop could not convey more gratifying news to the Pope, and especially to Cardinal Barnabò and Propaganda—less sanguine of such results—than the healing, rapid beyond hope and expectation, of the old divisions in England; the cessation of opposition to the Oblates; the restoration of peace and kindliness even in St. Edmund's, so long the battlefield of contending Parties — all this healing work consummated within the brief space of four months! Either the wounds were not so deep and venomous as depicted, or, with Mgr. Talbot, we must ascribe the rapid healing to a miracle. There is, however, a middle term which may perhaps offer the safest solution. The

dissensions of yesterday, maybe, were not so deep and desperate as they were described; and to-day's sudden healing, likewise a little exaggerated, was, perhaps, more apparent than real.

Accompanied by Mgr. Drinkwater and Mgr. Lambert Clifford, Manning went to Rome, and did homage as archbishop at the feet of the Pope. On this occasion Pope Pius IX. said to Manning:—"I had the greatest difficulty in making you archbishop. The opposition to your nomination was of a very serious character. Therefore be very prudent in word and act."

The Pope repeated these words of warning three times. During his short stay in Rome, which was empty, especially of English, and therefore afforded no opportunity for preaching, Archbishop Manning paid great attention and deference, not so much to such of the Cardinals as were friendly as to those who, like Cardinal Barnabò, were opposed to him, or to such personages of influence, of the type of Mgr. Nardi, whom he regarded as his chief enemy in Rome —on the principle, I suppose, that there is more joy in heaven over the conversion of one sinner than over ninety and nine just persons.

The old alliance between Manning and Mgr. Talbot was strengthened and extended, and arrangements were made, as suggested by Mgr. Talbot, for carrying on their communications in the future without exciting the jealousy of Propaganda, with which Manning, as archbishop, had now entered into official relations.

In these long conversations on the expediency of carrying out a policy of conciliation, Archbishop Manning mentioned that he had entered into friendly communications with Bishop Ullathorne and Bishop Clifford, and he did not think their kindness was superficial. With Bishop Grant he was on friendly terms, and nothing on his side, Manning declared, should be wanting to keep them so, for the separation of the funds was now brought to a satisfactory conclusion. Mgr. Talbot stated as a warning to Manning, that nothing in the whole of Wiseman's administration had produced such an unfavourable impression

as the dispute with Dr. Grant about the Southwark funds. Mgr. Talbot added:—"The Pope was on the point of recalling the £400 a year which I had obtained for Cardinal Wiseman, and he would have done so if I had not interfered."

On Archbishop Manning's return to England, "the league offensive and defensive" between himself and Mgr. Talbot was formally accepted on either side as "a compact for mutual support," as the following letters show:—

MGR. TALBOT TO ARCHBISHOP MANNING.

VATICAN, 11*th November* 1865.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP—I have to thank you for your kind letter of 29th October from Calais, and I hasten to say that I am much obliged to you for the promises you make to do all you can to assist the Sisters of the Most Precious Blood, and to forward the church of St. Thomas, because these are two works for which I feel myself in some manner responsible, and therefore I am obliged to do all I can to make them succeed, especially as the latter was specially confided to me by the Holy Father. I daresay I shall have many opportunities to serve you in Rome, because I see many questions brooding in the distance which will require my aid, and I do not think that my support will be useless to you, especially on account of the peculiar character of the Pope, and the spirit which pervades Propaganda, therefore I wish you to understand that a compact exists between us; if you help me, I shall help you, and make you stand well in Rome, which in your position will be of great importance to you, as you have more secret opponents in England than you think you have, and you will see this before very long.

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

8 YORK PLACE, 20*th November* 1865.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—Many thanks for your letter of the 11th. I very readily accept your league, offensive and defensive, and I will do all I can for St. Thomas, and for the nuns, both for their sakes and for yours. As to the former, I will write a Circular recommending it; and will preach for it at Bayswater, and anywhere else I can. I will also pay an instalment of my £50 As to the nuns, I hope soon to have the work of the poor children on foot. You will see a Pastoral about it in the next *W. Register*. I am happy to say it is well taken.

I believe that I can now tell you of the site for the Cathedral —namely, the Chelsea Cemetery. It is a square of 300 ft. by 340, which could not have been got anywhere in London for £60,000 or £80,000. London is travelling westward. From Belgrave Square to Kensington will be the best part of London. It is within ten minutes walk of Eaton Square, and twenty of Westminster. Upon the whole I cannot doubt that it is the best thing we can do. It would give room for a bishop's house and seminary. We are advertising for plans for a monument over the Cardinal's grave, at the cost of £500.

MGR. TALBOT TO ARCHBISHOP MANNING.

VATICAN, 1*st December* 1865.

MY DEAR DR. MANNING—Many thanks for your last letter dated 20th November. I am glad that you accept the league. As I have already done for years, I shall support you, and I have a hundred ways of doing so. A word dropped at the proper occasion works wonders. At present your chief enemy in Rome is Mgr. Nardi, but he has committed so many blunders that he has not much power.[1]

1. The church of St. Thomas is what I wish you to support with all your influence. I want to raise at least £5000 in five years. I do not think there ought to be much difficulty in this, as it is a national undertaking, and all in England ought to take an interest in it, if they have any sympathy with Rome. Our posterity will appreciate the act when they read an inscription saying that the English nation raised this church in honour of St. Thomas, during this tremendous crisis for the Holy See. Thanks for the Circular you are going to write, and for your promises to preach at the London Oratory on the 3rd Sunday after Epiphany. The English, alas! are sadly utilitarian in all their views, and have little faith.

VATICAN, 26*th December* 1865.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP—1. Many thanks for your note of

---

[1] In a subsequent letter, dated 26th January 1866, Mgr. Talbot gave a disparaging, and in justice to the memory of a distinguished Prelate, I must add, a most unfair description of Manning's "chief enemy in Rome" in the following terms:—"Have you read what Merstone says about Nardi and yourself in the *Tablet?* it is very inimical, but very clever. Poor Nardi is a busybody, who is very busy about every man's business but his own. They tell me he neglects the Rota terribly. He is a warm partizan of Dr. Errington and hates you. But he has no weight in Rome, every one thinks him a bore." To this attack Manning replied, "Poor Nardi; I have just seen the *Tablet*."

the 11th inst. I may as well tell you that I have had to defend you against two absurd charges. One was that you were against the Temporal Power, because in your Pastoral you say that the attitude of the Pope in his present simplicity is more striking than that of the Popes of the Middle Ages; the second was that you had inspired the *Weekly Register's* review of the *Eirenicon*, because in it there were some things which ought not to be said, and the spirit of it is uncatholic, although Dr. Newman calls it admirable. Pray send me by post the review of the *Times* on the *Eirenicon*.

2. More publicity given to the letter of the Holy Office the better. It is not exactly the thing, because it is almost impossible for an Italian to understand an Anglican mind, but it will do. The Holy Father likes it very much. Dr. Ullathorne has written to me a letter praising it. Certainly it is very extraordinary that the English Bishops never executed the first letter of the Inquisition which was directed to them. It is just like them. All official letters written to them by the Holy See of late years have remained as dead letters. Therefore I am glad that you have published them in your Diocesan Synod, which I long to see.

3. When the papers about the hospital reach me, I shall attend to the matter. Bowyer is a madman, and I have ceased all correspondence with him.

4. I am glad to hear that you are turning your attention to the poor of London. It is a work in which I have taken the greatest interest during the last twenty years. You will find many to co-operate with you in a work of *that* kind, because it speaks to the hearts of the majority of good Catholics, who are in general utilitarians, and cannot understand what are the *high* interests of the Church. All parties will join to help you in that work,—Romans, Anglo-Gallicans, and Semi-Rationalists, as represented by the *Home and Foreign Review*. Even "Smellfungus" will help you.

5. I am glad to hear also that you have bought a piece of ground for your Cathedral at so cheap a rate. Now I think that if you were satisfied with a large church costing £50,000, it would not be many years before we shall see your Cathedral built, and it would serve all purposes until we get St. Paul's or Westminster Abbey. Nevertheless, I do not think that Mgr. Clifford will get the money you require. He is merely amusing himself in Rome. He has hired a carriage by the month, and going out amongst the English every night, eating their good dinners, and gossiping at all their parties. The Abbé Dumase told me that when the Père Faure begs

for the French church in London he sometimes spends the whole night in prayer before the Blessed Sacrament. The contrast between an English and a French priest begging is striking.

6. I have read through with immense interest Canon Husenbeth's *Life of Dr. Milner;* that book, together with Butler's *Memoirs of English Catholics*, shows evidently that if it had not been for Dr. Milner, almost a schism would have taken place in England. Notwithstanding your sermon at Wolverhampton, which was excellent as an Eirenicon, the same feeling still exists in England, dormant it is true, but if they had a Gallican Archbishop instead of you, it would easily come out. Roman principles go very much against the grain of English Catholics, and this is one of the reasons why they cannot see the greatness of the act of restoring the church of St. Thomas in Rome. As you said years ago, they sympathise more with Henry II. than they do with St. Thomas. Nevertheless the church shall be built as a sterling protest against this feeling. The first stone will be laid with great *éclat*, and the Pope has almost promised to lay the first stone himself, but experience has taught me so many lessons in Rome that I do not reckon on this great favour. Something may happen to prevent him. Nevertheless we are preparing for it.

7. I think you left Rome with false impressions regarding the Holy Father and Merode. The Holy Father is a very good man, but, as I said to you, he is not a saint. He has his weaknesses, but in the Merode affair he was perfectly right. All government of Rome was impossible whilst Merode was minister. Merode had become king of Rome. His moral influence in being Cameriere Segreto, his command of the Papal army, and also of the police, his command of the money, had turned his head, so that he did not even obey the Pope, and had reduced the Council of Ministers to a bear-garden. No business could be treated because he opposed every measure, and called every one who did not agree with him *biotante*. This he did once even in the presence of the Pope, which led to his dismissal, because the Pope could not stand it any longer. Nevertheless, as Merode is a good man, notwithstanding his factious spirit, I have done all I could to calm him, and I hope he will go away to the Holy Land for two or three months. Since his dismissal all has been going on quietly. The new Ministers are good men, and some government exists in Rome.

8. I think the situation is improving. The speech of the King of Piedmont, the agitation at Florence, the resignation of the Ministers, and many other facts, have reduced the Convention

to a dead letter. I do not expect to see the French leaving Rome for years to come.

9. I have sent Patterson a letter for the Nunzio at Vienna. I am afraid that he will be disappointed in Germany. Nevertheless, I shall do what I can to help him. I do not know what took place between him and the Holy Father, but I have remarked that he does not stand in such high favour as he did once when he was staying in the Vatican.

I recommend every one to read and meditate upon Bianchi's *Polizia della Chiesa.* It is the standard work most esteemed in Rome, and I think it meets many of the questions of the day in England.

I wonder whether Newman has ever read it. It would rectify some of his ideas. I long to see his answer to Pusey; I wish you would send it to me by post as soon as it comes out. Ask Morris to do so. I shall pay for the expense, or make up for it by telegrams.—Believe me, affectionately yours,

GEO. TALBOT.

Manning was by nature and habit averse to soliciting petty favours for others, even for those to whom he was most beholden. Yet as Archbishop he recognised the expediency of bestowing marks of ecclesiastical distinction, or titles of honour, attached to offices in the Papal Court, on priests who had done good service, or Papal Orders on laymen of distinction. In Mgr. Talbot he possessed a convenient friend ready and able to obtain from the Vatican such honours and titles. The new Archbishop wanted to have Canon Morris "made a *cameriere ad instar*, to whom such a token of confidence was due, and it would give him a standing towards Bishops and foreigners. Besides, any link with Rome and the Holy Father would be especially grateful to him." Manning was even asked to obtain titles for foreign priests. Sir John Sutton of that day, who dispensed his large ecclesiastical gifts through the hands of Mgr. Boone of Bruges, asked Manning to obtain for him the title of domestic prelate to the Pope. Even Bishops like Dr. Ullathorne of Birmingham later on used to obtain for priests or canons in his diocese ecclesiastical titles or distinctions through Manning's influence at the Vatican. He was relieved from the irksomeness of such patronage or from the risk of refusal by the ready aid of

Mgr. Talbot, who presented the Archbishop's *supplicas* to the Pope.

Mgr. Talbot, on the other hand, gave his advice freely to Manning on the formation of his Chapter, the choice of canons, and the promotion of priests in the diocese of Westminster, and undertook to secure the appointment of all persons recommended by Manning, even the nomination of bishops within the *terna* presented to the Pope. The following letter dated Vatican, 10th Feb. 1866, is a sample of Mgr. Talbot's counsel and of Manning's vigilance :—

Poor Dr. Hogarth is dead. He was a good man. Now, you must have all your eyes about you in the choice of a successor. The interests of the Church in England depend upon the bishops, so that the Chapter of Hexham ought to have a warning to propose the best men. I think myself that there is so narrow a spirit in the North of England, that a new element ought to be introduced, in the same way as the Pope chose you. If a man is chosen from amongst their body this spirit will be perpetuated. The canons, however, are sure not to propose the best men that can be found in the whole of England.

Archbishop Manning was not slow in making use of Mgr. Talbot's promise. Within the first year of his Episcopate, Manning wrote, strongly urging the nomination of Dr. Chadwick to the vacant See of Hexham, describing the other two candidates named in the *terna* as unsuitable for various reasons for the episcopal office. After the Chapter of Hexham had sent the names to Rome, in a letter dated March 4, 1866, York Place, he wrote as follows :—

My dear Mgr. Talbot—By last Tuesday's post I sent to Propaganda the Hexham election ; and now tell you that you may do what you will. But it would be well to learn it from Propaganda. 1st Platt, 2nd Chadwick, 3rd Knight. The first and third are impossible, the second is good. He is a man of interior spirit, love of souls, a true missionary, and ecclesiastical in every way. In all questions he is on the higher side. I should be very glad to see him bishop. This, I may add, is the judgment also of the Bishop of Beverley.[1] I have said nothing

[1] Dr. Cornthwaite, in like manner, was appointed to the See of Beverley on Manning's recommendation even before the latter was Archbishop.

to Propaganda, but have left them to ask me if they will.—
Always affectionately yours, ✠ H. E. M.

Mgr. Talbot, who was as good as his word in securing the nominations of candidates recommended by Manning to a vacant See, wrote in reply, "You will be glad to learn that Dr. Chadwick has been appointed to the See of Hexham." In reply, Manning said, "I am quite contented with Chadwick's nomination. I think if Mgr. Eyre were made Archbishop of Sydney it would ease the way in the Diocese for the new Bishop. But Mgr. Eyre will not give trouble; he is a true priest." A few illustrations of the method pursued will suffice, and obviate the necessity of referring again to the subject. In reply to an announcement by Manning that Canon Maguire was dying, Mgr. Talbot wrote as follows:—

CASTEL GONDOLFO, 2*nd Aug.* 1865.

. . . If Canon Maguire dies another Canonry will be vacant in the Westminster Chapter. The last affair showed me the immense importance of choosing proper persons for canons. The Chapters are a growing power in England.[1] If Dr. Errington's name had not been in the *terna*, neither the Congregation of Cardinals nor the Pope would have dreamed of rejecting the *terna*.

If I had to name the new canon I should name Dr. Gilbert. He strikes me as being a thoroughly good hard-working priest, and at the same time takes a broader view of Catholic matters than the generality of English priests.

In reply Archbishop Manning wrote as follows:—

10*th Aug.* 1865.

. . . It was my intention to carry out the cardinal's intention about Dr. Gilbert, and I propose to do so, though if the cardinal had not committed the question, I should have first put forward some older priests who have strong claims for long services, and have been overlooked. There has been a want of consideration

[1] Manning in later years used to look upon Chapters as obsolete institutions. The method which he preferred and practically pursued was the government of the Church by secretaries. The Canons of Westminster, like frozen-out gardeners in winter, when they met periodically in Chapter used to say, "We have no work to do."

of some of our best men from the cardinal's illness and other causes.

Mgr. Talbot warned Manning against falling into Cardinal Wiseman's error "of making a set of old fogies canons." At the late election "we saw the consequence." Dr. Gilbert ought to be "made a canon at the first vacancy." In the same letter, 17th August 1865, Mgr. Talbot said that he did not see any objection to Manning's asking the Holy Father to make Canon Morris *cameriere segreto*. He added, "I am thinking of getting Patterson made also, as it will add much to his influence on the Continent if he is going to collect funds for the Cathedral; and, as he is your master of ceremonies, it would suit his position in your diocese."

On the 29th of September, the fifteenth anniversary of the restoration of the hierarchy by Wiseman, Archbishop Manning, with befitting pomp and ceremony, received the pallium from the hand of Pope Pius IX.

Returning from the threshold of the Apostles invested with the pallium, the symbol of jurisdiction and authority, conferred age after age in the long history of the Church on every archbishop throughout the Catholic world, Archbishop Manning, in the plenitude of his power, took formal possession in succession to Wiseman of the See of Westminster.[1]

[1] Bishops sometimes receive the pallium as a mark of the Holy See's approbation of them, but they receive no jurisdiction thereby. Indeed, strictly speaking, an archbishop has jurisdiction and authority independent of the pallium, and before he receives it; but he must not make use thereof in certain cases: that is, he cannot summon a Provincial Synod, nor ordain publicly.

CHAPTER XIII

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM—CATHOLICS AND THE UNIVERSITIES

MANNING'S first official act as Archbishop of Westminster was to convene a Diocesan Synod. It was held at the pro-Cathedral, St. Mary's, Moorfields, on 14th December 1865. The decrees of this Synod were entirely made up of Roman documents, together with the decrees of the Third Provincial Council of Westminster, which had not yet been published in that diocese. The decrees of the Diocesan Synod were as follows:—(1) The Third Provincial of Westminster; (2) the Universities; (3) the Corporate Reunion; (4) Mixed Marriages; (5) Secret Societies; (6) the Encyclical *Quanta Cura*. In the Appendix the Encyclical, together with the Syllabus of Errors, was printed at full.

The Encyclical, with the Syllabus, promulgated 8th December 1864, created a great stir in the religious, literary, and political world. Politicians denounced it as a declaration of war against modern society. Men of light and leading in literature and science looked upon the condemnation of Rationalism, Pantheism, and of the public repudiation of the Divine government of society as incompatible with the progress of science and with modern civilisation. Whilst men who disbelieved in revealed religion, or were altogether indifferent to theological questions or interests, vied with each other in denouncing the Pope's action as rank absurdity. In the din and hubbub created or fostered by avowed enemies of Church and Papacy, no one took time or thought to consider seriously the grave theological proposi-

tions laid down in the Encyclical; or to discover, as they might, if they had cared to study the Papal document, that the Syllabus anathematised no new errors, but only such as had from time to time been condemned as essentially hostile to the doctrines and dogmas of Christianity. Human passions and party spirit intruded themselves once again into the concerns of religion. Grave theological questions were made the sport of the hour, or held up in mockery to the amusement of ribald multitudes. The Syllabus was a plaything on one side, or a weapon of offence on the other. Party spirit was not confined to the enemies of religion, or even to non-Catholics. An intolerant and turbulent faction of Catholics in France, headed by Veuillot and the *Univers*, put their own extravagant interpretation on the Syllabus of Errors, and made use of it to assail and calumniate with the most passionate rhetoric and bitterest abuse such eminent and zealous Catholics as Mgr. Dupanloup, the Bishop of Orleans; Montalembert, the recognised champion of the Church; Lacordaire, Falloux—every Catholic, in a word, who resented the dictation of a knot of fanatics.[1] The bishops were treated with scant respect. Not the bishops, it was proclaimed from the housetops, were the teachers, as heretofore, in the Church, but M. Veuillot, and Abbé Gaume, and their yoke-fellows in arrogance, for they claimed to be the Pope's only true interpreters; on his words, on his teaching, they put their own meaning, and denounced all those Catholics who refused to accept the new gospel, according to M. Veuillot, as "enemies of the Pope," or as "hypocrites desiring, like the Jansenists, to remain in the Church without belonging to it." A like intolerant spirit was exhibited in England by Ward, the editor of the *Dublin Review*. Following the congenial example of Veuillot and the *Univers*, he put an interpretation of his own on the Encyclical and Syllabus, amplifying on this and other

[1] The *Univers*, though it attracted in periods of religious excitement considerable public attention, had but a small following. Its normal circulation at the time of its tyrannical suppression by Napoleon III. was estimated at about 8000. On the suppression of his paper, Pope Pius IX. sent a handsome sum of money to M. Veuillot, who quietly paid it over to the Peter Pence Fund.

occasions[1] in the most extravagant fashion the extent of Papal authority and infallibility, denounced all those Catholics in England who refused to accept his extreme theories, even Father Newman, the illustrious Oratorian, as minimizers of Catholic doctrine.

By his position, by his high repute as the foremost champion of the Papacy, Archbishop Manning was singled out by the enemies of the Church and made the mark of abuse and of ignorant ridicule. He remained firm as a rock; he kept his temper, and abstained from heedless conflict. He delivered, however, a powerful sermon in defence of the Syllabus.[2]

The archbishop, though he may have discountenanced, did not think fit to suppress the extravagant assumptions of the *Dublin Review*. Undoubtedly, Manning's popularity among English Catholics was not promoted by his close relations with the *Dublin Review* and its pugnacious editor.

The two Decrees on mixed marriages and secret societies have only so far an interest as showing traits of character. Manning's aim was not to relax but rather to impose fresh restrictions on mixed marriages, as the Decree indicated. Fenianism was included in the Decree on secret societies, and condemned. But the difficulty was to enforce the condemnation; for many experienced priests in London feared that if Fenianism was vigorously treated in the tribunal of penance, many of their Irish people addicted to Fenianism would stay away from the confessional, and incur grave dangers of falling away from the practice of religion altogether.[3]

In a letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated April 21, 1866, Manning said: "My chief fear is Fenianism, which is Mazzinianism, deceiving Catholics in Ireland as it did in Poland." In another letter he wrote: "I am having Missions held in all the large parishes in London, which I shall attend myself. But the name Fenianism drives the Irish mad. All that can be done is to induce them to come

[1] See Dr. Ward's articles in the *Dublin Review*, 1864-5.

[2] Third volume on Ecclesiastical subjects, with a Preface.

[3] Fenians, as a matter of fact, could not be brought to believe that Fenianism was a sin, and therefore never confessed it.

to the sacraments. But the Fenians and Irish-Americans do all in their power to keep them away. The Fenians, indeed, would sooner turn upon priests than Protestants."

In a letter of Manning's to a friend, dated 27th January 1866, there is the following passage on Fenians :—" I wish I had time to-day to write on Fenianism. I believe it to be far graver than we think. The majority of the Irish sympathise in the cause, and are Fenians, less its folly and its violence." [1]

The question of the reunion of Christendom had, like the question of allowing or prohibiting Catholics to go to the Universities, its beginnings in the last year of Wiseman's rule; but as the case was conducted and concluded by Manning as Archbishop, it is, as a matter of convenience and order, treated as a whole in this chapter.

Cardinal Wiseman always displayed a warm and hopeful interest in the movements of Anglicanism. The Oxford movement, and its great and growing results in bringing so many zealous men to the Church, had inspired him with a too enthusiastic hope of the conversion of England. At an early period he had instituted public prayers for that pur-

1 *8th February* 1867.

MY DEAR LORD—When writing to your Grace on yesterday, I forgot to say that the Fenian movement appears to have ceased in Ireland. For some weeks there has not been a word about it, and I think the accounts latterly published in the American papers about Stephens and his associates, have convinced the followers of the head centre that the whole business was a mere swindle got up for the purpose of extracting money from the credulity of poor servants and tradesmen. Perhaps some of the Fenian spirit may be still fostered in the manufacturing towns of England and Scotland, but as far as Ireland is concerned, I think we shall hear no more about it. The Government appears to be of this opinion, for I have heard that they are determined to let loose the political prisoners now detained in Dublin, and to send them to America.

I have heard that Father Lavelle has been writing to your Grace on the subject of Fenianism. He did a great deal of mischief by encouraging that movement in the beginning, but he managed to keep out of the clutches of the law. It appears to me that it would not be safe to correspond with so reckless a gentleman, or to notice him at all. If there be any stir on the part of the Irish in Glasgow, or in any other town in Scotland in favour of Fenianism, it is probably due to the letters of F. Lavelle.—Wishing your Grace every happiness, I remain with great respect, your devoted servant,

✠ PAUL CARD. CULLEN.

pose. He had encouraged Father Spencer in his laborious crusade for a universal prayer to be offered up by Catholics and non-Catholics alike for the unity of Christendom. With such hopes in his heart, Wiseman was much moved when Ambrose de Lisle, the most zealous and most hopeful of Catholics, communicated to him a fact which exceeded his most sanguine hopes—namely, that nearly two hundred clergymen of the Anglican Church had resolved to address a letter to the Holy See on the subject of the reunion of Christendom, founded on the profession of one and the same Catholic faith. These clergymen belonged to an "Association" (established in 1857) "for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom." Of this association Mr. de Lisle and several other Catholics were active members, contributing articles or letters in the *Union Review* to promote the cause of the reunion of Christendom. The co-operation of Catholics in this work led the bishops to take cognisance of the *Review* and Association in a letter addressed to the Holy Office in April 1864. The answer of the Holy Office, addressed to the English bishops, condemned the theory that Christendom or the Christian Church consists of three parts —the Roman, the Greek, and the Anglican—as heretical, and prohibited Catholics from taking part in the association or showing it favour. The publication in England of the condemnation was the immediate occasion of the letter to the Holy Office written by the promoters of the Association, who conceived that their views had been misunderstood or misinterpreted. Before taking the important step of addressing the Holy See, they desired a personal interview with Cardinal Wiseman. A deputation of some of the leading clergymen and promoters of the Association, attended by Mr. de Lisle, went to York Place. In an autobiographical Note Cardinal Manning recorded the fate which overtook the deputation as follows:—

> In the last days of the Cardinal, Lisle Phillipps came to him with certain Anglicans asking an interview. Canon Morris came to me in alarm at Bayswater; and we both prevailed on the Cardinal to ask for a written statement instead. He answered it in writing. The Unionists had written to the Holy

Office. 'The answer[1] came, when the Cardinal could not publish it. Therefore it was my first act. Dr. Littledale affirmed I had obtained it by misrepresentation. The Bishop of Birmingham published a pamphlet, stating that he had obtained it in the name of the bishops while the Cardinal was yet living; and that I had no hand in it. Dr. Littledale, with his uniform untruthfulness, continued to repeat his statement. I published the answer with a pastoral.[2]

The difference between Wiseman's treatment of the question of reunion and Manning's was not so much a difference of principle as of temperament. Wiseman's heart was touched, his warm imagination fired by the fact that for the first time since the Reformation a large number of clergymen of the Church of England were inspired by God's grace with an active desire for reunion with Rome. He did not stop to count or contrast their numbers or weight with the multitudes of the Anglican clergy who stood aloof from the movement, or condemned it, or scouted the bare notion of an approach to Rome; he took little or no heed that the supporters or friends of the reunion movement did not count among their number a single bishop, not even an archdeacon; for him it sufficed —sufficed, at least, to excite his sympathy, his hopefulness, his trust—that these men, in sincerity of heart, with nothing to gain, everything to lose as far as the world was concerned, came to him as the Pope's representative in England with a petition for advice and aid to bring about the desire of their heart, as far as they could compass it—the reunion of England and Rome.

Deeply as he desired such a reunion, Manning had no belief in the movement, no great trust in its advocates, no hope of its success. The propositions which these

[1] The answer of the Holy See to the letter signed by 198 Anglican clergymen was dated 8th November 1865, nine months after Wiseman's death.

[2] There is obviously some confusion in the Note as to the facts and dates. The answer which the Bishop of Birmingham obtained, and in which, as he stated, Manning had no hand, was not the answer of the Holy Office to the letter of the Anglican clergymen, which was not written until after the Cardinal's death; but the answer of the Holy Office to the bishops condemning the A.P.U.C., dated in September 1864.

men put forward involved grave theological difficulties. Were there not dangers lurking behind the reunion movement? The gravest of all dangers, it seemed to him, was the danger of treating with heresy, as proposed, on equal terms. Truth, as he maintained with great force in his Pastoral Letter on Reunion, was the first consideration; unity was a consequence.

Archbishop Manning, afraid of the mischief which might be wrought among Catholics by "the anticipations of inconsiderate hope," hastened in his Pastoral Letter to show what little practical importance attached to the Unionist movement. For to those who were hoping so much from it, he showed—

> That the Church of England represents only one-half of the English people, and that the Anglican school represents only a portion of the Church of England, and that the Anglo-Catholic movement represents only a section of the Anglican school, and that the Unionist movement represents only a fraction of that section. Two hundred clergymen are a small proportion upon some seventeen thousand; and supposing many to agree with them who did not sign the letter to Rome, and many more to wish well to them, the whole is hardly an appreciable quantity upon the Church of England, and an inappreciable quantity upon the English people.[1]

Cardinal Wiseman's last act of friendliness to the Unionists, from whose action he hoped and expected so much, was to promise them that he would forward, with some kind, explanatory remarks, their letter to Cardinal Patrizi, Prefect of the Sacred Office. But Cardinal Wiseman died before he could fulfil his promise. In their difficulty the Unionists consulted Mgr. Talbot, some of whom were personally known to him. They informed him that hitherto Cardinal Wiseman had presented their communications to the Holy See, and asked Mgr. Talbot whether he would undertake a like kindly office. After consulting the Pope, Mgr. Talbot agreed to present the following letter, signed by 198 Anglican clergymen, to Cardinal Patrizi, Prefect of the Holy Office:—

[1] *The Reunion of Christendom: a Pastoral Letter.* Epiphany 1866.

Address from Anglican Clergy to Cardinal Patrizi.

To the Most Eminent and Most Reverend Father in Christ, and Lord C. Cardinal Patrizi, Prefect of the Sacred Office.

Most Eminent Lord—We the undersigned deans, canons, parish priests, and other priests of the Anglo-Catholic Church, earnestly desiring the visible reunion, according to the will of our Lord, of the several parts of the Christian family, have read with great regret your Eminence's letter "To all the English Bishops."

In that letter, our Society, instituted to promote the reunion of all Christendom, is charged with affirming in its prospectus that "the three Communions, the Roman Catholic, the Eastern, and the Anglican, have an equal claim to call themselves Catholic."

On that question our prospectus gave no opinion whatever. What we said treated of the question of *fact*, not of *right*. We merely affirmed that the Anglican Church claimed the name Catholic, as is abundantly plain to all, both from the Liturgy and the Articles of Religion.

Moreover, as to the intention of our Society, that letter asserts our especial aim to be "that the three Communions named, each in its integrity, and each maintaining still its own opinions, may coalesce into one."

Far from us and from our Society be such an aim as this; from which were to be anticipated, not ecclesiastical unity, but merely a discord of brethren in personal conflict under one roof. What we beseech Almighty God to grant, and desire with all our hearts, is simply that œcumenical intercommunion which existed before the separation of East and West, founded and consolidated on the profession of one and the same Catholic faith.

Moreover, the Society aforesaid should all the less excite your jealousy that it abstains from action, and simply prays, in the words of Christ our Lord, "May there be one Fold and one Shepherd." This alone finds place in our hearts' desire, and this is the principle and the yearning we express to your Eminence with the utmost earnestness, with sincere heart and voice unfeigned.

As to the journal entitled *The Union Review*, the connection between it and the Society is purely accidental, and we are therefore in no way pledged to its *dicta*. In that little work various writers put forth indeed their own opinions, but only to the further elucidation of the truth of the Catholic faith by developing them. That such a mode of contributing papers should not be in use in Rome, where the controversies of the day are seldom under discussion, is hardly to be wondered at; but in England, where almost every question becomes public property, none results in successful conviction without free discussion.

To hasten this event we have now laboured during many years. We have effected improvements beyond what could be hoped for, where the faith of the flock, or divine worship, or clerical discipline may have been imperfect; and, not to be deemed forgetful of others, we have cultivated a feeling of good will towards the venerable Church of Rome, that has for a long time caused some to mistrust us.

We humbly profess ourselves your Eminence's servants, devoted to Catholic unity.

(This address was signed by 198 clergy of the Church of England.)

On receiving the above letter Mgr. Talbot at once communicated with Manning, and sought his advice as to what kind of letter the Holy Office ought to write in reply. In a letter, dated Vatican, 10th July 1865, Mgr. Talbot wrote as follows :—

Apropos to the conversion of England, I am desired to ask you a question. You remember the letter of the Holy Office to the English bishops about the Association of Unity. Well, 198 dignitaries and ministers of the Anglican Church have written an answer to it, which they have sent to Cardinal Patrizi, in which they say that the Holy Office has misunderstood them, as they do not believe that there are three Churches *de jure*, but only that they exist *de facto*, and, therefore, their association is intended to reunite them. As the Holy Father has desired the Holy Office to answer them, we wish to know what your opinion is about the whole affair, and whether you think any good will be derived by a dogmatic but paternal letter being written to them.

Cardinal Wiseman had promised to present their letter to Rome, but when he died they consulted me about it, and after speaking to the Holy Father, I wrote to them to say that I would present it if they sent it to me. What I wish you to let me know is what kind of a letter you think the Holy Office ought to write, as it is almost pledged to send an answer. I think some good may come out of this affair.

Archbishop Manning attached great importance to the way in which the answer of the Holy Office to the Unionists was to be drafted. Not only its substance required grave consideration, but its tone and terms needed delicate and careful handling. An official answer ought to give no encouragement to false hopes, or lay the foundation of

future complications. In form, too, reticence ought to be observed. For instance, if in courtesy the title of *reverendissimi* were given to Anglican clergymen, it might be looked upon as a recognition by the Holy Office of their Orders. Such details, however, were reserved until Manning's arrival in Rome, when the answer of the Holy Office to the Unionists was to be submitted to his consideration. In the meantime Manning indicated the broad lines to be observed in dealing with the A.P.U.C. in the following passages of a letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated 8 York Place, 18th July 1865 :—

1. I feel assured that a letter from the Holy See, full of *charity* and full of dogmatic truths, will be most powerful upon not only the Unionists, but upon public opinion in England. It is a new fact, a new crisis, for Englishmen, above all clergy, to be seeking the Holy Father. It is like the Holy Father's letters to the North and South in America, and cannot be too closely held. In this aspect I have always encouraged not the Union but the movement, which they have disguised.

2. But it is vital that the dogmatic part should be most explicit.

They have been in no sense misunderstood. The Holy Office most truly appreciated their position and their statements.

Their present answer is proof enough. They say that they do not believe that there are three Churches *de jure*, but only *de facto*.

But this denies (1) the exclusive unity of the Catholic and Roman Church, and (2) its exclusive infallibility, and (3) the universal duty and necessity of submission to it.

These three points they do not hold. They hold that the three are all alike *de facto* Churches. By *de jure* they do not mean "Divine right," which the Anglican and Greek Churches have forfeited, and against which they are sinning.

Under the disguise of this theory lies hid the old assumption of the *divisibility* of the Church, and its consequent loss of *perfection* only. And this assumes also the suspension of infallibility, and, therefore, of the perpetual Divine assistance of the Holy Spirit.

You know all three as well as I do, but I write it because I know that these *de facto* and *de jure* theologians do not hold it.

Mr. de Lisle wrote to me the other day saying that there are I know not how many who desire to be reconciled to the Pope. I had rather hear of one who will submit to the infallible voice of the Church. This is the one point which they do not hold or see.

But a letter of the Holy Father will be the surest way under God to open their eyes, and it will be a text for us to preach

about. It will be a part of the Holy Father's mission to the English people, which is visible in this Pontificate.

In reply to the above letter, Mgr. Talbot, under date Castel Gondolfo, August 2, 1865, wrote as follows:—

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP— . . . I translated all you say about A.P.U.C. into Italian for Cardinal Monaco, and he read the translation to the Pope. Both the Holy Father and Monaco have adopted your view, and they will write an answer accordingly. The Pope was much pleased by the lucid manner in which you placed the question before him, and he takes great interest in it, as he hopes that some conversions may come out of it. So do I, but I think that there are many persons in England who think they are Catholics because they hold Catholic doctrines, whereas they know very well that the most ultra-Puseyite, until he has made his abjuration, is no more a Catholic than the most bigoted Evangelical. I am afraid that Mr. de Lisle encourages the error.

A passage or two here and there from subsequent letters will suffice to show that the business of coming to Rome to receive the pallium did not interfere with Archbishop Manning's interest in the affairs of A.P.U.C. In a letter, dated 10th August 1865, he wrote:—

As to the A.P.U.C., I will bring more matter with me. Meanwhile, I will only say that it is part of a system which is deceiving many Catholics, and will give us much trouble if we do not cut down to the bone.

In reply, Mgr. Talbot informed Archbishop Manning that the Pope seemed to take great interest in the affairs of the A.P.U.C., adding that "a letter is being prepared which, of course, will be submitted to you for your advice and observations when you come."

In revising the answer to the A.P.U.C., Archbishop Manning, on his arrival in Rome, gave oral advice, and left written observations for the guidance of the Holy Office.

Soon after Archbiship Manning's return to England, in a letter dated Vatican, 11th November 1865, Mgr. Talbot informed him that

At last the letter to the A.P.U.C. is completed. I think it will do. It will be sent to you. It is not exactly what I

should have wished, but it will do good if it is published. At any rate, it will commit all those who have signed the letter to the Holy Office.

On 1st December 1865, Mgr. Talbot sent the following report to Manning :—

Last week I placed into the hands of Mr. Oldknow the letter of the Holy Office to the A.P.U.C. By this time Mr. Lee has received it. Copies of it will be sent to your Grace, and all the English bishops. I think you will be satisfied with it *now*, but it has cost me a great deal of trouble and anxiety. As the members of the A.P.U.C. draw a distinction between Cardinal Patrizi and the Pope, they ought to know that the letter comes from the Congregation of the Holy Office, of which the Pope himself is Prefect, and Cardinal Patrizi is only the secretary. Greater publicity given to the letter the better, especially since the *Eirenicon* of Dr. Pusey and his letter to the *Weekly Register*. The letter could not come at a more seasonable moment. I am glad that you intend to hold your Diocesan Synod soon, and intend to condemn the A.P.U.C.[1]

---

[1] The Rev. Dr. Lee, one of the founders of the A.P.U.C., writes to me thus :—

"The reunion movement, having several undoubted historical precedents, was very generally and earnestly taken up on the Anglican side of the wall of separation, finding supporters in all ranks of the clergy. The Address to the Holy Father was signed by nearly two hundred of these ; and from information given by Monsignor Talbot, I know that the authorities at Rome were considerably impressed by it, regarding it as the natural and logical outcome of the Oxford Movement. I likewise learnt that while influence was brought to bear against it by the late Bishop Ullathorne and Dr. Manning, several influential prelates at Rome took the opposite side.

"I ventured to remark to Monsignor Talbot that the Anglican position would have been far less defensible had successors been at once appointed to the ancient English sees—deeds never done. There would have been no greater difficulty in continuing the old lines of authority by bishops than by priests ; while such grave public acts would have made clear and definite the policy of the Holy See before the Church and the world.

"The fact that such a step was not taken under Elizabeth : and that an unusual and irregular policy, in which arch-priests, with special jurisdiction, was subsequently adopted, gave force in controversy to the Anglican plea—a force which has never failed.

"It is to be deeply regretted that the policy indicated in the formal reply to the Anglican clergy, in which their official titles were ignored, and their arguments and assertions gravely misunderstood, tended most directly to damp the hopes of the Anglican Corporate Reunionists, and to hinder their practical labours. At the present day, the movement is less effective and powerful than ever—to the loss both of faith and hope—while this fact

The following important postscript was attached to the above letter:—

Since I wrote the above I have just received the printed copies of the letter of the Holy Office. I think you will admire it. It contains all your ideas on the subject, as they made your instructions their rule. You had better not publish the copy which I send you *officiously* until you receive it *officially* from Propaganda, but I have thought that you would like to have a copy before the rest, as Propaganda is so long before it sends anything.

Certainly this is a most important moment. The bishops ought to do something. Pusey's *Eirenicon*, and his letter with Newman's to the *Weekly Register*, are important facts. Pray send me Pusey's *Eirenicon* by the earliest opportunity, as I want to take it to the Holy Office.

Archbishop Manning was not altogether satisfied with this much revised and amended letter of the Holy Office, as appears from the following passage in a letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated 8 York Place, 11th December 1865:—

I write a few lines to thank you for your last letter, and the Union letter, which is very solid and dignified, as far as it goes. I had hoped for more, but it will do. I intend to reprint and send it to the priests, with a letter upon it.

In apology for the "Union letter," of which Manning complained, Mgr. Talbot wrote, "It is difficult, almost impossible, to make Italians understand the Anglican mind and view of things."

Rough proofs of his Pastoral Letter were sent to Bishop Ullathorne and Bishop Grant. Dr. Ullathorne thought some things *sharp*. Dr. Grant and Father Coffin did not think so.

Archbishop Manning, wishing, as he wrote to Mgr. Talbot (27th January 1866) that "we may all go and keep together," said:—"I have struck out every word I can find likely to sound sharp. Canon Morris and Mr Anderdon

obtains a disastrous and considerable influence over the religious thought of England. In 1857 we argued for reunion on a dogmatic basis; now, others plead for co-operation upon pleas which would render all doctrine baseless, useless, and worthless.

"Monsignor Agostino, the late Patriarch of Venice, expressed as much to one of his diocesan officials, my friend Archdeacon Zanetti of Murano."

trying to hinder me. I hope it is strong but I do not wish it to be sharp." [1]

In another letter, dated 3rd Feb. 1866, Manning wrote—

I am just going to-day to receive Mr. Lane Fox out of the thick of the Union, who will come soon to Rome, and tell you that instead of being a corporate body they are in complete dissolution, one more shaken than another, and kept back only by the intimidation or influence of a few men, some really good, others no great things.

In the Appendix of his Pastoral Letter, entitled the *Reunion of Christendom*, Archbishop Manning printed the two letters of the Holy Office on the A.P.U.C. The first, dated 16th of September 1864, to the English Bishops; the second, dated 8th of November 1865, to the one hundred and ninety-eight Clergymen of the Church of England.

In the text of his Pastoral Letter the Archbishop gives a short summary of the answer of the Holy Office as follows :—

1. That the unity of the Church is absolute and indivisible, and that the Church has never lost its unity, nor for so much as a moment of time ever can.

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

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

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

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

6. That whosoever is separated from the one and only Catholic Church, howsoever well he may believe himself to live,

---

[1] In the same letter Manning wrote :—"Your letter enclosing that of the Holy Father has just come. I cannot tell you what a strength and consolation it is to me in the midst of such a life as this to hear his words spoken to me, and to have his blessing." Then the archbishop concludes with the following remark :—"In one of your letters you said of somebody we know (Pope Pius IX.) that he is not a saint. Do you know that I have an idea that he is, and that the *miserie umane* we see, were in St. Vincent Ferrier."—See Mgr. Talbot's letter to Archbishop Manning, dated Vatican, 26th December 1865.

by the one sin of separation from the Unity of Christ is in the state of wrath.

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

It ought, perhaps, to be observed by way of explanation that the letter of the Holy Office does not apply to non-Catholics generally; but in a particular instance is addressed to a certain number of Anglican clergymen who, whilst professing belief in all the doctrines of the Catholic and Roman Church, hesitated or declined to become Catholics.

The following eloquent passages from Archbishop Manning's first Pastoral Letter throw side lights on his character, as showing that his sympathies were with the whole mass of the people of England separated from the Church, rather than with the narrow section—to which be himself once belonged—which was intellectually nearer to the Church:—

> That an Association to promote the reunion of England with the Catholic and Roman Church should exist, and that nearly two hundred clergymen of the Church of England, describing themselves as "Deans, Canons, Parish Priests, and other Priests" of the Church of England, should address the Cardinal Secretary of the Holy Office, expressing this desire, are facts new in our history since the separation of England from Catholic unity. We do not regard this as a merely intellectual or natural event. We gladly recognise in it an influence and an impulse of supernatural grace. It is a wonderful reaction from the days within living memory when fidelity to the Church of England was measured by repulsion from the Church of Rome. It is as wonderful an evidence of the flow in the stream which has carried the minds of men onward for these thirty years nearer and nearer to the frontiers of the Catholic faith. It is a movement against the wind and tide of English tradition and of English prejudice; a supernatural movement like the attraction which drew those who were once farthest from the kingdom of heaven to the side of our Lord. A change has visibly passed over England. Thirty years ago its attitude towards the Catholic Church was either intense hostility or stagnant ignorance. It is not so now. There is still much hostility and much ignorance. But the hostility is more civilised, and the ignorance is breached on all sides.[1]

---

[1] *The Reunion of Christendom: A Pastoral Letter to the Clergy*, p. 148.

In the following passage Archbishop Manning opens out the fulness of his heart towards the millions of his fellow-countrymen, "who are as sheep without a shepherd, wandering to and fro in 'the cloudy and dark day'":—

One soul, as St. Charles was wont to say, is diocese enough for a bishop; and a mere remnant stretching out their hands towards unity have a right to all our care. At the same time we must not forget that our mission is not only to a section or to a fraction who may be approaching nearer to us, but to the whole mass of the English people. If the handful who have come so near have a claim upon our sympathy, much more have the millions who are as sheep without a shepherd, wandering to and fro in "the cloudy and dark day." Moreover, we owe an especial duty to the class of the English people in which descends the mid-stream of traditional hostility to the Catholic Church—that is, the middle class of educated and industrious men, the heart of English national life,—vigorous, calm, intelligent, and benevolent, though darkened by inherited prejudices, and narrowed by anti-Catholic faults. To this class above all we have a mission of charity—that is, to preach the truth in patience, and to wait till they will listen. From circumstances of birth and education, from historical contacts, and approximations of opinion, from social and political neighbourhood, and from manifold bonds of kindred, the Anglican system is more nearly related to the Catholic Church than the Baptist, Independent, Wesleyan, and other Nonconformist bodies. And yet to the Catholic Church the millions who are in separation from the Established Church are an object of the profoundest sympathy and charity. They are souls for whom Christ died, robbed of their inheritance by the Anglican separation, from which they by legitimate process have separated in turn. Their state of privation is all the less culpable, as they have been born into a diminished inheritance of truth, with a greater difficulty of rising to it again. They are, moreover, marked by a multitude of high qualities of zeal, devotion to duty, conscientious fidelity to what they believe. If they are rougher in their language against the Catholic Church, they are more generous and candid adversaries; more vehement but less bitter, and altogether free from the littleness of personality and petty faults which sometimes stain the controversy of those who are intellectually nearer to the truth. For such men it is our duty to cherish a warm charity and a true respect, and not disproportionately to waste upon those who stand nearer to us the time and the sympathy which is their due. The time is come

that the Catholic Church should speak, face to face, calmly and uncontroversially to the millions of the English people who lie on the other side of the Establishment.[1]

In the declining days of Wiseman's life a matter of far graver import, and affecting far more deeply than the Reunion of Christendom movement, the intellectual life and interests of Catholics was raised in the question whether Catholics were to be allowed to go, or to be prohibited by ecclesiastical authority from going, to Oxford or Cambridge. With his large hopefulness and his trust in men carefully trained in Catholic colleges, Cardinal Wiseman, in the first instance and for a considerable period gave his tacit sanction to their obtaining the advantages of University education at Oxford and Cambridge. No one knew better than he did how grievous was the loss suffered by English Catholics from the want of University education. They were everywhere placed at a disadvantage in the race of life. Their intellectual inferiority as a necessary result of the lack of higher training was a reproach to the Catholic Church. It was more and worse: it was a danger to Faith; for in the higher walks of literature, in philosophy, in science Catholics occupied a lower intellectual ground. In arguments with adversaries of the Faith possessed of the advantages of University education they were often worsted. In their controversial writings against unbelief or Agnosticism Catholics were apt to fall into blunders, which exposed not only themselves but their Faith to ridicule. The result for the most part was that they held their peace; and for want of University training let the argument against Christianity go by default.

In all the spheres of higher active life English Catholics suffered under like disadvantages. Cardinal Wiseman was too much in touch with the laity not to feel the deepest sympathy with their desire to be allowed to enjoy the like intellectual advantages possessed by their fellow-countrymen. That Catholics, in that day of abounding grace, when so many of the noblest of the sons of Oxford were returning to the

[1] *The Reunion of Christendom: A Pastoral Letter to the Clergy*, p. 151.

Church, should be trained once more in the Universities raised by their forefathers, was to Cardinal Wiseman like the beginning of the fulfilment of the desire or dream of his heart. The proposal to found a hall or college at Oxford, under exclusively Catholic management, enlisted at first Cardinal Wiseman's warmest sympathy. To found a Catholic hall governed by tutors or teachers trained at Stonyhurst or Ushaw, or perhaps for the most part by Oxford men familiar with the ways and habits and traditions of the University; where the voice and influence of Newman might have again been heard and felt in Oxford, not only in training Catholic undergraduates, but in explaining the Catholic faith to Anglicans, or in defending before the graduates of the University, in the early days of danger, the first principles of revealed religion: to have attempted such a work would have been a large and bold experiment. Whether under the circumstances of time and place the renewed influence and activity of Newman as head of a Catholic college at Oxford would have succeeded even in part in arresting the rising forces of unbelief is now mere idle speculation, as the experiment was never put to the test of trial.

Dr. Manning was opposed to the attendance of Catholics at Oxford and Cambridge, either in a college of their own or otherwise. He was even more opposed to a Catholic Hall than to the matriculation of Catholics in other colleges.

He brought arguments to bear on Wiseman, which eventually induced him to forego his hopes of a Catholic college or hall at Oxford. Manning declared his belief that instead of un-Protestantising the University, the University would de-Catholicise the Catholic hall; and further, he urged that the only effectual way of preserving the faith, was to prohibit parents from sending their sons to Oxford and Cambridge. The plan which Manning suggested was that the question of Catholics going to the Universities should be brought before the next meeting of the bishops in Low Week, 1864, and that if any difference of opinion should arise, the question might be referred to the Holy See for decision.

Up to this time there had been no authoritative prohibi-

tion of Catholics going to Oxford, no public discouragement even. When in accordance with the provisions of an Act of Parliament the University admitted them to matriculation, Catholics eagerly availed themselves of the opportunity of enjoying a University education. At the meeting of the bishops in Low Week, which, in the absence of Dr. Goss, Bishop of Liverpool, and of Dr. Hogarth, passed off very amicably, as Dr. Manning reported to Mgr. Talbot, a decision was arrived at, prohibiting the establishment of Catholic colleges at the Universities. Trusting to Dr. Manning's assurance that a Catholic University was about to be founded, it was agreed that parents should be discouraged from sending their sons to Oxford and Cambridge.[1] Many of the bishops, however, were opposed, considering all the circumstances, to an absolute prohibition. On the other hand, when the question of higher education came under discussion, the bishops unanimously declared that the establishment of a Catholic University was impracticable.

With his knowledge of the world and of human nature Manning saw clearly that to prohibit Catholics from going to Oxford and Cambridge, and not to provide them with a University of their own as a substitute, would in the nature of things render the prohibition nugatory.[2] He expressed his disagreement with the bishops' decision that a Catholic

[1] This advice on the part of the bishops was in no small measure due to the persistent pressure brought to bear on them by Dr. Manning, and by the influence he exerted over Wiseman's mind during the last year or two of the Cardinal's life. Many of the bishops were known to be in favour of Catholics going to Oxford and Cambridge; unless as a necessary alternative a Catholic University was founded.

[2] Dr. Manning's prevision has been fully realised. For his failure in establishing a Catholic University, as he afterwards attempted at Kensington, under the Rectorship of Mgr. Capel, rendered nugatory, as he had anticipated, the advice of the bishops against the attendance of Catholics at the Universities. At this day, in default of a Catholic University, there are between sixty and eighty Catholics at Oxford and Cambridge. And, what Dr. Manning did not anticipate, but what experience has shown, the frequentation of Catholics, well trained in their own Colleges, of the Universities has not turned to their detriment, morally or spiritually, or lessened their fidelity to the Church; but, on the contrary, has to no small extent quickened their zeal in defence of religion, whilst the advantages of University training have placed them on an intellectual level with their non-Catholic fellow-countrymen.

University was impracticable in the following passage of a letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated Bayswater, 22nd April 1864:—

The bishops decided against the Protestant Universities in all ways; but that a Catholic University is not possible. To this I cannot agree. And I trust that they will be encouraged to attempt, or to let others attempt, something to meet the needs of our laity. It will not do to prohibit, and to provide nothing. Many will go to Oxford and Cambridge; and the precedent will be set, and all hope of anything higher will be lost. I am convinced that we shall have a very unsound school of thought and principle among our laymen, of which the *Rambler* is a type.

Communications were made by Dr. Manning, Dr. Ward, and other opponents of Catholic education at Oxford, to Propaganda. It was urged that no time ought to be lost in prohibiting the attendance of Catholics at the Universities. Some were already matriculated, others were preparing; an evil precedent was being set. In March 1864 Propaganda had written to the bishops desiring that the meeting in Low Week, 1865, should discuss the proposed colleges in Oxford and Cambridge; but on 13th October 1864, Propaganda, giving ear to the urgent appeals of Dr. Manning and his followers, wrote to Cardinal Wiseman to consider whether an extra meeting of the bishops could not be held on the subject. Poor Cardinal Wiseman, who had not much love of the ordinary annual meeting of the bishops, dreaded the calling together of an extra meeting; especially on such a difficult and vexed question. He was worn out and weakened by a fatal malady, mentally and bodily; but under no circumstances and at no time did he ever hesitate to obey the voice of Rome. On 7th of November, Propaganda ordered the meeting of the bishops to be held on 13th December 1864, just two months before Cardinal Wiseman's death. Nine days before the meeting was held a series of far-reaching questions were drawn up by Dr. Manning in regard to Oxford: its system of education, its moral training, its religious or spiritual tendency, and the influence which such an education would be likely to have on Catholics. These questions in a Circular bearing Cardinal Wiseman's signature,

were privately addressed to almost every Oxford convert, with the sole exception of Dr. Newman.

In one of several Memoranda or autobiographical Notes on the Oxford University question, the more important of which I shall presently recite, Cardinal Manning made the following statement:—"The controversy became grave, and the Bishop of Birmingham and J. H. N. were involved (see Letters and Pamphlet)." [1]

The Pamphlet with letters referred to, as giving evidence of the way in which the Bishop of Birmingham and Dr. Newman were involved in the Oxford controversy, was a pamphlet entitled, "Facts and Documents Relating to the Mission and Contemplated Oratory at Oxford." The documents were the letters which passed between the Bishop of Birmingham and Dr. Newman; and the Bishop of Birmingham and Cardinal Barnabò, Prefect of Propaganda.

It will suffice for the purpose to give a brief summary of the facts, and a few extracts from the more important letters. In 1864, the site of the old poor-house at Oxford, near Worcester College, came into the market: it was a desirable position, and extended over five acres. Finally Father Newman, in September 1864, purchased the five acres for £8500. Ill-sounding rumours as to Newman's intentions in purchasing land at Oxford were set on foot, and as time went on took form and shape of a hostile character. In August 1866, in a letter from Switzerland to Dr. Ullathorne, Newman gave the following explanations:—

> When I first thought of purchasing Mr. Smith's five acres, it was with no intention at all of having in consequence any part myself in any work at Oxford of any kind. I entertained the idea of purchasing it, because I hoped to re-sell it to bishops or laity, taking on myself the immediate responsibility of the purchase. Whether it was to be used at once, or some time afterwards, whether for an academical college, or for an Oratory, or for both, or for a monastic house, or for an enclosed nunnery, or for training-schools, or for a church and mission, or for several of these, kept for the future. It did not come before me that I was to have a personal part in any plan.

[1] The pamphlet, written by Dr. Ullathorne, was privately circulated among the bishops and others.

In the pamphlet Dr. Ullathorne made the following comments :—

At that time [1864], and for a considerable period afterwards, the question was still under discussion, both in England and in Rome, whether it would be expedient or not to establish a Catholic hall at Oxford ; and it is essential to the understanding of the correspondence to be quoted, that it be carefully synchronised with the questions that were open and under consideration at the period when the letters here produced were written.

In his correspondence with Cardinal Barnabò, Dr. Ullathorne more than once expressed himself as unfavourable to the plan of establishing Catholic halls in the national Universities.

In his pamphlet, Dr. Ullathorne gave the following account of the Bishops' Meeting, held 13th December 1864 :—

The Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda referred the question to the bishops, who discussed the whole subject in a meeting, held 13th December 1864. Nine days prior to that meeting the late Cardinal Wiseman had issued a series of questions privately addressed to a number of Oxford converts, to obtain their lights on the subjects, and several of the papers so elicited were read at the meeting. But it is to be observed that Dr. Newman was passed over on this occasion, that neither then, nor at any other time was he ever invited to express his opinions on the subject of Oxford education, as respecting Catholics. In the joint-letter addressed from the meeting to Propaganda, the bishops expressed their unanimous agreement against establishing Catholic colleges at the Universities, and on the duty of discouraging Catholics from sending their sons to Oxford or Cambridge for education ; but *plurimi*, the letter said, were of opinion that the circumstances of the moment suggested the gravest deliberation before issuing any absolute prohibition. Nothing was at this time promulgated on the subject, nor until after the meeting held in Birmingham on the 23rd of March 1865. Nevertheless, the reports that got abroad respecting what passed in, and with reference to the meeting of December 1864, had the effect of altogether arresting the project of an Oxford Oratory and church for a time.

Dr. Newman bought the land on the 20th of September 1864. On the day following, at an interview with the bishop, Dr. Newman asked him what he would think of an oratory at Oxford, to which the bishop replied that he would not only

accept the proposal, but would transfer the mission to the Oratory. And in the course of conversation the bishop remarked that there were still persons who entertained the idea of a Catholic hall at Oxford, and others of a university, which, if realised, would naturally facilitate a prohibition of entering Protestant colleges. Two days after this conversation Dr. Newman wrote to the bishop as follows:—

"MY DEAR LORD—Will you let me tell you the object with which I have been contemplating an Oratory at Oxford, and again the effect upon my mind of the remarks which you made to me the other day?

"1. I consider that there is considerable danger to the souls of Catholic youth who go to the Protestant colleges in Oxford.

"2. I consider there is comparatively little danger in their going to a Catholic college there.

"3. The former of these is the actual state of the case.

"4. When I thought of our going to Oxford, it was with a view of meeting this actually existing danger.

"5. If that danger ceased, I should not feel any special reason for our going there.

"Now you have told me that it is not unlikely that this danger *will* cease, *i.e.* that Catholic youth will be *prohibited* from going to Oxford, for your lordship said, to my surprise, that the idea of a Catholic university in England, which I thought not feasible, was still in contemplation. Before this great design, the notion of Catholic youth being on any footing at Oxford shrinks into nothing. But moreover, such a second-best notion not only fades away before so large a scheme, but it becomes absolutely illicit and impossible. When I was in Dublin, I did my best (as you reminded me) in getting a prohibition against Irish Catholics going to the English universities, for I thought that the new Catholic university in Dublin would have no fair chance of success without such a prohibition; and now, in like manner, your lordship has informed me that, as is natural, if an English Catholic university is founded, Catholic youths will be forbidden to go to Oxford, Cambridge, London, Trinity College, Dublin, Edinburgh, etc.

"If then the present danger to young English Catholics is only temporary, Oxford has no stronger claims upon me than any other mission of 100 souls, etc."

On the 25th of September the bishop replied to the above letter intimating that he was in a position that did not allow him to give any sanction to any clerical co-operation in any

scheme that would imply ecclesiastical sanction of the education of Catholics in a Protestant university.

To this letter Dr. Newman replied on the 26th of September as follows:—

"MY DEAR LORD—We thank your lordship very much for your most candid and instructive letter, and I hope in what I shall say in answer to it, I shall show that I understand its full drift, and shall meet your wishes; as regards then the Oxford matter I will say:—

"1. That we have no intention at present to do more than accept your lordship's offer to put into our hands the Oxford mission.

"2. That we do so with a view to the *future* foundation of an Oratory there; and for the same reason we buy the ground.

"3. That we have no intention in any way to co-operate with the University, or with the colleges of Oxford, whether by taking lodgers, or private pupils, or in any other way.

"4. That we propose to confine ourselves to the spiritual duties of the mission, taking the care of the present Catholics there, and doing our best to increase their numbers.

"5. That neither now, nor in time to come, will we take part in any Catholic college there, or sell our ground for that purpose, without your lordship's knowing our intention, so that you may write to Propaganda on the point if you so wish.

"6. That we feel the kindness of your offer to write for us to Propaganda, but we will not avail ourselves of it—nor write ourselves—for this simple reason, that if we do, we shall give Propaganda the impression that we are contemplating something more than the performance of spiritual duties at Oxford.

"7. That we contemplate, as our first step, to build a church on such a site as we can best provide for it.

"This is all that strikes me to say. I have put it down in a formal shape, that you may more easily see if I have left out anything which it might be desirable to say."

At this period, October 1864, Dr. Newman prepared the following Circular with the view of making the project of the Oxford church and Oratory known, and of soliciting subscriptions, and the bishop furnished a commendatory letter.

"CHURCH OF THE ORATORY, OXFORD.

"Dr. Newman, having been entrusted by his diocesan with the mission of Oxford, has it in contemplation with the blessing

of God, to proceed to the establishment there of a church and house of the Oratory.

"Some such establishment has been for some time required in behalf of Catholic youth, whom the University, according to the provision of a recent Act of Parliament, admits to matriculation.

"It need scarcely be insisted on that a measure like this on the part of the University, however equitable in itself, and however kind and liberal in its character, is nevertheless fraught with spiritual danger to the parties who are the subjects of it, unless the inexperience of their age and the temptations of the place are met by some corresponding safeguard of special religious aid and superintendence.

"Priests of the Oratory may attempt, it is conceived, without presumption, to supply this imperative need; considering that, after the example of its founder, St. Philip Neri, it has ever made the care of the young men its primary object, and that its English congregation in particular, by virtue of the Apostolic Letters constituting it, is sent to those classes of society above others, to which the members of an academical body necessarily belong.

"Moreover, educated, as many of the English fathers have been themselves at Oxford and Cambridge, they bring to the work an intimate acquaintance with the routine and habits of university life, which furnishes a reasonable hope of their being able to set about it without giving cause of offence to the authorities of the place,—a hope which they indulge the more readily, because the peaceable discharge of its own special duties has been in every country the historical characteristic of the Oratory.

"In pursuance of their object, they have procured a site in an eligible part of Oxford, and they propose at once to collect funds for the erection of a church; and they venture to solicit all who take an interest in it, for contributions upon a scale adequate to the occasion, contributions large enough and numerous enough for carrying out an important work in a manner worthy of the Catholic name, worthy of the most beautiful city, and one of the great and ancient universities of England."

On this Circular Bishop Ullathorne made the following comments:—

"Although nothing in this Circular contemplated other than spiritual duties at Oxford, and although the spiritual danger to which Catholic youth is there exposed was plainly expressed, yet when the bishop read it in the manuscript, he was under the impression that it would be construed as favourable to the education of Catholics at Oxford. He therefore asked Dr. Newman to withhold its publication, which he not only with the

utmost readiness consented to do, but he spontaneously offered a copy to be read, if deemed expedient, at the approaching meeting of the bishops. And in consequence of exaggerated rumours having reached Cardinal Wiseman as to its contents, it was read there, and the bishops were unanimous in thinking that its publication would be inexpedient. It was a time of many rumours.[1] The invitation which Cardinal Wiseman gave to a number of Oxford men—clerical and lay—to express their opinions on the Oxford education question, whilst Dr. Newman was passed over, tended to increase these reports, and left the impression on Dr. Newman's mind also that confidence was not placed in him. In consequence of this state of things, Dr. Newman resolved to relinquish the idea of establishing a church and Oratory at Oxford, and to re-sell the land. This intention was intimated to the bishop in a letter dated December 28th."

Seeing that there was no prospect of establishing a Catholic University in England, and seeing, moreover, that Catholics at Oxford University were on the increase, the Bishop of Birmingham re-opened the question, and expressed to Dr. Newman the hope and wish that he would take up the work anew of building a church and founding an Oratory in Oxford. A petition, dated 11th June 1866, was addressed by the bishop to the Pope through Propaganda.

In the Rescript of Propaganda, dated 18th December 1866, granting the petition, there was a special instruction directed to the bishop to discountenance Newman's taking up his residence at Oxford in the contemplated Oratory. By a strange error of judgment, Dr. Ullathorne, in giving a copy of the Rescript to Newman, suppressed the clause containing the special instruction. Yet, apart from the special instruction to the bishop, the Rescript implied a certain hesitation and apprehension in the mind of the Sacred Congregation. Dr. Newman felt this thoroughly, and asked the bishop what he thought of it, and what he would advise. He replied that doubtless the petition was substantially granted, and would not have been granted unless intended to be acted upon. He added, however, "Yet, were I in your place, I do not think I would act upon it; for new opposition and new troubles may arise

[1] It was indeed a time of many rumours—a veritable plague of tongues whispering in secret evil things, especially to the detriment of Father Newman.

that may be very harassing. But suppose you wait until I go to Rome, when I should like to enter into explanations with the authorities; and we shall then see our way more clearly."

The Bishop of Birmingham's explanations were forestalled. Others more quick of foot went to Rome. Mgr. Talbot, too, was warned afresh by Manning of the dangers of "English Catholicism," of "the old jealousy of Rome," of "the desire of independence." Cardinal Wiseman's "inertness of will" was again bewailed. In truth Bishop Ullathorne's petition to Propaganda for the founding of an Oratory at Oxford had provoked the opponents alike of Catholic education at Oxford and of Dr. Newman to redouble their efforts. Propaganda was besieged afresh with informal petitions, letters, denunciations, and direful predictions of the evils which would overtake Catholicism in England if Newman were permitted to open an Oratory at Oxford or Catholics to frequent the University. The natural result followed. The mind of Propaganda was aroused and alarmed at the alleged dangerous tendencies of English Catholicism, and deeply prejudiced against Dr. Newman.

In the meantime a Circular,[1] to which the bishop added a letter requesting subscriptions for an Oratory in Oxford, was issued: and whilst yet in private circulation, the sums promised or given amounted to £5000. But the whole undertaking was suddenly stopped by a letter from the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda. It declared that the presence of Father Newman in Oxford would serve as a pretext for sending Catholic youths to a Protestant university, and enjoined the bishop to take heed lest Father Newman should do anything which might in any way favour the presence of Catholics at the University of Oxford.

Dr. Ullathorne had evidently overrated his influence at

[1] In a letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated Feb. 1, 1867, Manning wrote as follows:—"Dr. Newman has put out his Circular for the Church in Oxford saying that it is with the approval of Propaganda. It will be certainly taken as approving the sending of Catholics to the University. There is not a word in Dr. Newman's Circular or in the Bishop's letter to imply the reverse. Dr. Newman is preparing Mr. John Townsley's son for Oxford, and my belief is that many of the boys at Edgbaston will go there. We are slipping sideways into the whole mischief.

Propaganda, as well as with his fellow-bishops in England. The opponents of Newman and of the projected Oratory at Oxford were bolder than the Bishop of Birmingham in their action, clearer and firmer in their convictions; penetrated to the marrow of their bones with the conviction that Newman's presence at Oxford would have a disastrous effect on the future of Catholicism in England, they made it their business and their duty to oppose him early and late, not only in England, but in Rome. They may not have been very wise, may not have taken broad and generous views of Newman's work and influence; but in their opposition or hostility to him they were actuated by the belief, that he was what they called him a minimizer of the Catholic faith; and therefore, in the transition state of the Church in England at that period, his influence at Oxford or elsewhere was an evil to be resisted at every hazard. It is idle to suggest suppression of such facts; it is worse, it would be especially unfair in such a biography as this, for without the knowledge of the motives which governed his conduct, it would be impossible to account for the grave variances which separated Manning from John Henry Newman. A governing motive does not of necessity exclude lesser motives, or even personal feelings or prejudices.

Whilst the controversy was raging about Catholics going to Oxford and Cambridge, Manning, as was natural, was in frequent communication with Mgr. Talbot. Some of the letters show the extent and character of the dangers which he apprehended, as well as the suspicions he entertained, of J. H. Newman. In a letter dated Bayswater, 29th August 1864, Dr. Manning wrote to Mgr. Talbot as follows:—

> . . . You will have seen in the *W. Register* of October 15 a contradiction of the rumour about Newman's opening a hall in Oxford.
>
> This I believe for the present, because Dr. Ullathorne would not consent as things stand. But I believe that neither of them are opposed to the thing in itself. I hope you will read the article in the last *Dublin Review* upon this question.[1]

---

[1] The writer of the article in the *Dublin Review* was Dr. Ward, the most extreme and persistent opponent of Dr. Newman and of Catholic education at Oxford and Cambridge.

Every week, ever since you went, some new evidence of the growth of an English party appears. The Anglicans have already perceived it, and used it in the *Christian Remembrancer*, in the *Union*, and in the *Quarterly*. The old jealousy of Rome, and desire of 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.

While men sleep the enemy is sowing tares, and certain men *alte positi* seem *alte dormire*; but, as you will see from the Cardinal's last letter to the Propaganda, he has roused up. The amount of unpopularity and odium thrown on every one who speaks out for Rome, the Temporal Power, the Roman Congregations, etc., is very great, and many who really hold right principles are silent through cowardice. The Cisalpine Club is dead, but we shall have an English Catholicism in its place. Nothing can exceed the lukewarmness with which Rome and its present trials are treated. The English newspapers have sunk even to the bone, and that in good people.

In a letter of Manning's after he had become archbishop, dated 8 York Place, 26th June 1866, is the following passage:—

I have written nothing about Dr. Ullathorne's reopening the question of Dr. Newman and Oxford. But I am certain it will bring back the University question, and encourage the Catholics to send their sons to Oxford.

If Propaganda sanctions it, I trust they will couple it with a renewed and stronger declaration against the Protestant Universities. I think Propaganda can hardly know the effects of Dr. Newman's going to Oxford. The English national spirit is spreading among Catholics, and we shall have dangers.

In a later letter on the University question, dated 23rd March 1867, Archbishop Manning wrote to Mgr. Talbot as follows:—

You may depend on me. I have not a temptation to swerve from the line I have taken, or to compromise. I have convictions so complete and so well tried upon the matters now in contest among us, that I should cease to speak or act at all sooner than speak or act otherwise than I have hitherto. This applies at once to the University question. The Bishop of Birmingham and I are in correspondence. You may assure those who ought to know that I will neither allow any compromise nor any dissension. . . .

After alluding to Dr. Newman's going to Oxford as a consent to young Catholics going there, Manning says

Thursday last a lady came with her son for my advice how to send him to Oxford. The time that has been lost has spread this evil. Happily as yet not more than six or seven are there; but many are training up to go, and unless we speak in time will go.

What you say of Lady A. K. and of two men here is a sample of the opinions which will overspread the next generation unless we are prompt and explicit. We shall not have Cisalpinism again; but we shall have Anglo-Catholicism and nominal Catholicism acclimatised to English society. But as yet the majority of our lay families are sound, and only need to know what is the mind and advice of the Holy See. But that has hardly reached them on this and other subjects.

The following letter is on the same subject:—

8 YORK PLACE, 3*rd May* 1867.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—Your letter came on Tuesday just as the bishops were to meet.

We had three days of kind and united conference. We were perfectly united on the subject of the Protestant Universities, as follows:—

1. That the former declaration has not been made sufficiently known.

2. That the tendency to send youth to Oxford has increased.

3. That, though none have *apostatised*, two have suffered harm.

4. That we ought EACH to publish a Pastoral to our flocks against sending to the Protestant Universities.

5. That we ought to lay on our clergy the OBLIGATION to *hinder* our youth going to the Universities by all means in their power.

6. That we pray the Holy See to enjoin us to act in this sense.

If the Holy See will speak clearly and strongly, as above, we shall carry it through.

A prohibition on the *clergy* must come first. *They* have not yet done their duty in dissuading the laity. Some have even advised them to send their sons to Oxford.

With this we can begin; and my belief is that it will suffice.

But we must act at once, for the *evil is spreading*.

Two or three passages from another letter, referring to the Bishop of Birmingham and to Father Newman, will suffice

to show how strongly Archbishop Manning felt on the Oxford question, and on Newman in connection with it. In a letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated York Place, 25th September 1867, he wrote as follows:—

> The Bishop of Birmingham is, I fear, likely to be to me what he was to the Cardinal, in the main at least. He is evidently sore at the Oxford affair, in which he has been chiefly, almost only to blame.
>
> The theological contention about Father Ryder I suspect also irritates him. I know that he is murmuring against Ward and, I believe, myself. And this I have no doubt goes to Rome, and Cardinal de Luca is the receiver of such things. . . .
>
> Newman has just put out a circular privately to his friends, saying that he is not going to found an Oratory in Oxford, because he cannot go there in person. But ends, *I hear*, by saying that *hereafter perhaps some change may come.* What?[1]
>
> I have not seen it, and the bishop communicates nothing to me.

In the series of autobiographical Notes from which I have already so often quoted in detail or followed in outline, there is a Note dated 15th November 1888, in which Cardinal Manning has put on record his account of the Oxford question and some of its results.

The Note is as follows:—

> I will endeavour to put on record the narrative of the movement about higher studies, the University College at Kensington and its disastrous issue.
>
> Just before the Cardinal's death the subject of our young men going to Oxford was started. It came chiefly from Mr. Ffoulkes who said to me, "Give me a Catholic college in Oxford, and I will unprotestantise the University." Like Dr. Colenso and the Zulus, Oxford has uncatholicised him. The whole school, of whom I have spoken as "Literary Vanities,"[2] were all for it. The Cardinal by instinct was opposed to it. He put out certain questions which were sent to the bishops and others for their opinions. I have never doubted that the Bishop of

---

[1] In another letter, dated 5th October 1867, Manning said, "The effect of Dr. Newman's Circular is to imply that Rome is undecided and influenced by some transient personal cause. Are we never to come to an end of this? Do not use this. You shall have a copy and judge for yourself."

[2] "The School of Literary Vanities," is spoken of in an autobiographical Note on the Vatican Council, p. 457

Birmingham was in favour of Oxford. At that time the Cardinal died, and the work fell upon me. I laid it before the Holy See; and the answer was, that no Catholic parents could *salva conscientia* send their sons to Oxford; and that no Catholic college there could be permitted.

This was about 1866. After this all religious tests at Oxford were abolished. Some thought that this would induce the Holy See to give another decision. I believed *a fortiori* the reverse. The bishops discussed it in Low Week 1867. There were in favour of Oxford, Clifton and Plymouth. The others actively or passively against. The Holy See was again consulted. The answer was still more strongly negative: with an injunction to us to raise the studies of our colleges that the plea of insufficiency might be taken away.

In truth, nobody cared for higher studies. Certain Catholic parents wished to get their sons into English society, and to have latch-keys to Grosvenor Square. Nevertheless a great noise was made about the need of higher studies.

Therefore in Low Week 1868, I brought on the subject of creating a Board of Examiners in obedience to the Letter of Propaganda.

Nearly a whole day was spent in vain, and at 5 P.M. I withdrew the subject.

That night I drew up a minute which is in our *Acta* for 1868, and brought it on next day. To my surprise it was at once adopted.

The scheme was to create a *personal* university, not a local: a Board of Examiners who should universally test and reward the best students in our existing colleges. This was and always has been my belief as to the way of proceeding.

A conference of three days was held at Bayswater: certain bishops and the heads of colleges were present. Much useful matter was written and printed, and the subject was launched; but nothing done. Then came the Vatican Council, and all stood over till the 4th Provincial Council of Westminster in 1873.

At the head of this interesting autobiographical Note stands the following direction:—"At the other end of this book is a short summary of the variance between Newman and myself. This is perhaps the proper place to take it in."

Accordingly it will form the subject, together with the correspondence between himself, Father Newman, and Canon Oakeley referred to as evidence, of the next chapter.

CHAPTER XIV

ARCHBISHOP MANNING'S RELATIONS WITH J. H. NEWMAN

1864–69

THE first point which has to be established beyond doubt or question is, What were the actual relations between Archbishop Manning and John Henry Newman about the time —a turning-point in both their lives—that Newman wrote his *Apologia* and Manning was made Archbishop of Westminster? That an alienation of some sort existed is apparent from the fact that, through the mediation of Canon Oakeley, Archbishop Manning in 1867 sought an explanation of its cause. When the facts have been fully ascertained, an attempt must be made, as a necessary consequence, to account for an estrangement which to-day every one will see calls for an explanation. Facts, which may be briefly or bluntly told, are not only difficult, but often almost impossible to be accounted for, unless antecedent circumstances—acts done out of sight, or words spoken in whispers, unheard of the world—are known and related. Such antecedent circumstances in all their bearings, I am afraid, must be rehearsed before we can understand aright or fully how it came to pass that John Henry Newman mistrusted Manning personally, or how Archbishop Manning treated Newman as an unsound or disloyal Catholic.

The relations between two such men as Manning and Newman are of too delicate a character to be paraphrased. No words but their own could escape the charge of rudeness. No charges of a character so grave but such as came

direct out of their own mouth, would be listened to without offence, or accepted without hesitation as beyond doubt or question. What is wanted to-day is the simple truth concerning an almost life-long antagonism. For the simple truth will do what all the comments, subterfuges, and glosses have failed to accomplish—account for the governing motive of Cardinal Manning's persistent opposition to Newman.

I will give here at once two or three such passages from the correspondence as will establish the facts of the case beyond cavil or contradiction. It may seem abrupt or rude, but abruptness is often only another word for delicacy. The following brief extracts are taken from two of Newman's letters, one addressed to Canon Oakeley, the other to Archbishop Manning himself; and from a letter of Manning to Newman.

The whole correspondence follows below in due order:—

THE ORATORY, BIRMINGHAM, 28*th July* 1867.

MY DEAR OAKELEY—I will answer you as frankly as you write to me. The only and the serious cause of any distance which may exist between the Archbishop and myself is the difficulty I have in implicitly confiding in him. And I feel the want of confidence in him especially in matters which concern myself. . . .—Ever yours affectionately in Christ,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

The following are two or three passages from a letter of Newman's addressed to Archbishop Manning;—

REDNALL, 10*th Aug.* 1867.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP— . . . You are quite right in thinking that the feeling, of which, alas! I cannot rid myself in my secret heart, . . . has nothing to do with the circumstance that you may be taking a line in ecclesiastical matters which does not approve itself to my judgment.

Certainly not; but you must kindly bear with me, though I seem rude to you, when I give you the real interpretation of it. I say frankly then, and as a duty of friendship, that it is a distressing mistrust, which now for four years past I have been unable in prudence to dismiss from my mind, and which is but my own share of a general feeling (though men are slow to express it, especially to your immediate friends) that you are

difficult to understand. I wish I could get myself to believe that the fault was my own, and that your words, your bearing, and your implications ought, though they have not served, to prepare me for your acts. . . .

No explanations offered by you at present in such a meeting [*a meeting proposed by Archbishop Manning*] could go to the root of the difficulty, as I have suggested it. . . .

It is only as time goes on that new deeds can reverse the old. There is no short cut to a restoration of confidence when confidence has been seriously damaged. . . .—Yours affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

Archbishop Manning, on his part, was equally explicit. Challenged by Dr. Newman's unvarnished declaration of a want of confidence in him, the Archbishop, laying aside his habitual reserve and love—for peace sake—of evading a difficulty, in a letter to Newman, dated 14th August 1867, replied as follows:—

I have felt in you exactly what you felt in me, and that feeling I share also, as you say, with others. I cannot put my meaning into more precise and delicate words than by using your own. I have felt you difficult to understand, and that your words have not prepared me for your acts.

This I know to be a feeling respecting you, as you find it respecting myself.

Now, I feel with you that the root of the difficulty is a mutual mistrust, and as you say, this is hard to cure.

This mutual mistrust, to speak the plain truth, as I must do if I speak at all, was never cured. Newman could not bring himself to believe in the sincerity of Manning's professions of friendship, inasmuch as his acts did not correspond with his words.

Manning, on his side, refused to act upon Newman's test of sincerity by reversing, as time went on, his old line of persistent, if unavowed, opposition to Newman.

The correspondence, far from removing, only deepened the alienation, for the root of the difficulty—personal mistrust—remained to the end No attempt was ever hereafter made on either side to restore lost confidence. They never wrote or spoke again in terms of intimacy. Letters, indeed, passed between them of courtesy or congratulation,

as when Manning was made cardinal in 1875, or when, four years later, Pope Leo XIII., as a stamp and mark of approval on his life's work, bestowed on Newman the dignity of Cardinal. Such public professions of friendliness do not count for much, or at any rate are no substitute for the confidence of intimate relations. I am not unmindful in this regard, too, of the words spoken by Cardinal Manning at the dirge of Cardinal Newman at the Oratory in London on the 20th of August 1890. Such words, however, like an epitaph, must not be too closely scrutinised.

It was not, then, as has been too often believed, or, perhaps, sometimes pretended, a mere matter of temperament, a difference of character, a divergence on ecclesiastical matters, which led to an estrangement that perhaps forms one of the most marked and painful incidents in Cardinal Manning's career. The real motives of his opposition to Newman, of his abiding mistrust, have yet to be fully accounted for. In the meanwhile, it is necessary briefly to review antecedent or surrounding circumstances. Archbishop Manning was not alone in his opposition. Neither was he the first, either in the order of time, or of authority. For Cardinal Wiseman preceded him, unfortunately, in giving ear to attacks on Newman. The following letter gives a clear explanation of circumstances antecedent to the line of action taken up by Manning in opposition to Newman:—

ARUNDEL, 28*th April* 1894.

DEAR MR. PURCELL— . . . As for the attacks on Cardinal Newman, it is quite true they did not begin with Manning. He found them in York Place, but he ought not to have adopted them, for he knew that Newman had not come into the Church to be a bad Catholic.

These are the facts:—When Newman was converted, he put himself in the hands of Dr. Wiseman, who directed Newman's studies, and that was very necessary, for Newman was learned—and he was very learned—in the Fathers. In those days there was a good deal of Gallicanism in England, not to say Jansenism, and the English College in Rome was anything but Roman. Dr. Wiseman himself, in the *Dublin Review*, in order to conciliate Protestants in relation to the desired and expected Hierarchy, saw that the Pope would have less authority here if we had

Ordinaries. He saw other things of the same kind, and my belief is that in those days even he was more Gallican than Roman. Well to return:—Dr. Wiseman put Gallican books in the hands of Newman and the converts at Maryvale, and Newman, who was not then, and was never after a theologian, took the opinions set before him in perfect good faith, believing them to be true Catholic doctrine. Some time afterwards he edited one or two numbers of the *Rambler*, and did what is called "put his foot into it," and Rome was told of it. When he heard that what he had said was disapproved of, he gave up the *Rambler*, purely out of obedience, for he was not a Gallican really. In those days the censorious and the detractors were in the habit of saying that Dr. Wiseman was jealous of Dr. Newman, and that jealousy and dread of a greater understanding was at the bottom of the troubles. The secret of York Place was kept as well as it could be, but it could not escape observation on the part of those who knew the men on both sides. Newman did not change his Oxford habits: he saw all who would call upon him, and among these some were old friends, and others new friends; and the misfortune was that they left him with the impression that he agreed with them, and they with him, hence many misunderstandings. At Oxford, he never liked Ward's ways and works, and it was not easy to change the habits of many years; and Ward on his part thought Newman too slow in his movements, and therefore in the wrong. There was this difficulty in the way of a cordial sympathy, and beside that, an inveterate distrust of Manning, apparently shared by Oakeley, the simplest of men.—I am, my dear Mr. Purcell, most truly yours,

DAVID LEWIS.

York Place was for years the centre from which aspersions, more or less open, were directed against Newman's orthodoxy. Dr. Ward of the *Dublin Review* was the most active and audacious of these assailants. But he had not a free hand or he would have been more outspoken still. In reply to Mgr. Talbot's advice as to the necessity of restraining, at the moment,[1] Ward's attacks on Newman, Archbishop Manning wrote as follows:—

[1] Mgr. Talbot alarmed, as was Manning himself, at the Address of loyalty presented to Newman by the Catholic laity of England, deprecated at the moment any further attacks by Dr. Ward in the following passage of a letter to Manning dated Vatican, April 19, 1866:—"I think you are prudent in not allowing Dr. Ward to write strongly against Newman. Although the spirit of Newman's letter is most offensive, yet I do not think there is anything to be laid hold of.

You may rest satisfied that nothing is published by Ward, which does not pass under the censure of three competent ecclesiastics, and I mostly see every critical article.

For those aspersions, then, on Newman which did appear in the *Dublin Review*—and they were fierce and frequent—Archbishop Manning was responsible, since they were published under his tacit sanction. But, of course, the way in which Newman was attacked in conversation and correspondence was infinitely worse than what was published in the Archbishop's *Review.*

On the very day of his consecration, when he had not only invited Newman to be present at the function, but had spoken of him, to Ward's horror, with sympathy, Archbishop Manning was once more warned in the following words of the dangers of conciliation, to which at certain moments of weakness, Archbishop Manning was, according to Ward,[1] but too prone:—

> Of course there is a very dangerous extreme to be avoided. But is it not also dangerous to speak of J. H. N. with *simple* sympathy? If it is true (and I for one have no doubt at all) that he is exercising a most powerful influence in favour of what is *in fact* (though he doesn't think so):—(1) Disloyalty to the Vicar of Christ, and (2) Worldliness—is not harm done by conveying the impression that there is no cause for distrust?

Dr. Ward begged Archbishop Manning to turn over in his mind during his absence in France the fact of Dr. Newman's disloyalty to the Pope, and worldliness. He likewise supplied out of his wanton storehouse of unpublished aspersions on Newman's orthodoxy further matter for Manning's meditation. The following passage reads like one of Dr. Ward's jokes—for he was not afraid of joking even with Manning—"But unfortunately (as I think) Newman has slighted you in some degree; and this leads

[1] Mr. Ward on more occasions than one said, in speaking of Manning, "Manning is never so strong in the right line as when he is attacked by the *Times* or the *Saturday Review.* But unfortunately, when he is belauded by the *Times*, he betrays weakness, goes in for conciliation all round, and holds up the silver side of the shield. We ought, therefore," he added with a laugh, "to pray that Manning may be attacked every morning by the *Times.*"

you possibly to magnify the Christian duty of forgiveness, while not adequately pondering on the Christian duty of protest. Excuse my impudence which is incurable."

Father Coffin, Archbishop Manning's friend and confessor, afterwards Bishop of Southwark, was among the busiest in impugning Newman's religious opinions; and so were two or three of the Fathers of the London Oratory. The then Bishop of Newport, Dr. Brown, whether with or without Archbishop Manning's knowledge, delated an article of Newman's in the *Rambler* to Propaganda. Count Torre Diaz,[1] a personal friend and through thick and thin a supporter of Manning, was another of these utterers of the base coin of secret calumny.[2] But he, like the rest of the fraternity, had an implicit belief in their charges against Newman's orthodoxy. These and other known and unknown whisperers carried their complaints and charges to York Place. From York Place, through the agency of Mgr. Talbot, they passed in due course to the Vatican. For years, Newman did not know who his accusers were, or what he was accused of. The vital question however is, Did Archbishop Manning believe in these charges against Dr. Newman? Did he share in Ward's belief that Newman was a disloyal and worldly Catholic? Still more: Did he lend the authority of his name to this charge? If so, need we inquire further for Archbishop Manning's real and governing motive in his opposition to John Henry Newman?

There would have been no difficulty in answering this question at once, had it not been for Manning's professions of friendship for Newman. Can friendship exist apart from friendly acts? Is it compatible with acts of hostility? It

[1] Zuluetta, Count Torre Diaz, a Spaniard, was educated at Oxford, and, under the influence of Newman and the Tractarian Movement, was converted.

[2] One of the base coins which passed into currency among this narrow clique, though not bearing the stamp of the perfervid Spaniard, but that of another, was this:—"Newman's conversion is the greatest calamity which has befallen the Catholic Church in our day." In reply came the famous retort, attributed at the time to Canon Macmullen, "No, the greatest calamity to the Church in our day was the death of a woman" (Mrs. Manning). On this retort reaching Manning's ear, he made a remark about it to Canon Macmullen, who with his wonted readiness of repartee replied, "I pity the man who repeated it to your Grace."

would almost seem so, for in a curious correspondence on friendship with Mr. Gladstone, at the time of his pamphlet on Vaticanism, Archbishop Manning spoke of "friendship as distinct from its expression." He said, "During the twelve years in which we never met, my friendship for you was not overcast. . . . In the midst of our strong opposition I still believed your friendship to be as unchanged as my own."

Mr. Gladstone retorted that in his unchanged friendship, then, Manning had made against him "insidious and painful charges that he had suppressed his opinions on the Vatican Council until he had no longer the Roman Catholic vote to gain or lose." Mr. Gladstone also thought it strange that "during the twelve years of unchanged friendship Manning had charged him with doing the work of Antichrist in regard to the temporal power of the Pope." "In regard to the Vatican Decree," he added, "I could do no more."[1]

Is it not possible, therefore, that, if he could preserve an unchanged friendship for Mr. Gladstone, whilst denouncing him as doing the work of Antichrist, Manning might not also, even whilst accusing Newman in private of being an unsound or disloyal Catholic, have retained for him the friendship which he professed?

If this proposition be accepted, it will get rid of one of the difficulties.

Again, it must be borne in mind that, second only to his belief in the Infallibility of the Pope, if I may be allowed to compare small things with great, was Manning's belief in the duty of keeping up at every hazard the appearance of unity of opinion among Catholics. Had he felt constrained in conscience to warn the Vatican directly or indirectly of the unsoundness of Newman's religious opinions, Archbishop Manning, on the other hand, would have been keenly alive to the necessity, at the same time, of not allowing it to be supposed in public that there was any divergence between himself and Dr Newman.

It was not so much a matter of personal feeling, indeed, as a matter of prudence or of policy which induced Archbishop Manning at this juncture to desire to have his relations

[1] See correspondence between Manning and Mr. Gladstone, I p. 477-479.

with Newman placed on a good footing. It was a time of danger. Catholic feeling in England was aroused.

The latent opposition to Newman, which had long existed, proceeding, as an intimate friend of the late Cardinal Newman has observed, "from almost unseen sources," was made public in a most uncouth and offensive form in some anonymous attacks which were published on 6th April 1867 in the Roman letter of the *Weekly Register*. This anonymous attack appeared almost simultaneously with the Rescript from Propaganda putting a stop to Newman's founding an Oratory at Oxford. "These offensive remarks in the newspaper," as Bishop Ullathorne declared in the concluding passages of his pamphlet on the Mission and contemplated Oratory at Oxford, "however calumnious and replete with error, had yet an obvious connection with the transactions here recorded. And," he added, "other painful incidents were occurring at the same period, and it became a matter of justice as well as prudence to reveal to Newman that instruction (*to the bishop*) respecting his residence in Oxford. For the new embarrassments in which he was placed, and the measures he might be led to adopt for counteracting them, absolutely required that he should know the whole mind of Propaganda as to his relations with Oxford." [1]

This public attack made upon Father Newman by the Roman correspondent of a Catholic paper roused the hearts of the Catholics of England. Their love and veneration for him were manifested by the eager and spontaneous response given to Mr. Monsell's (the late Lord Emly) appeal. A meeting of representative Catholic laymen was held without loss of a day at the Stafford Club, and the following Address was presented to Dr. Newman.[2]

[1] No failure could have been more signal or more absurd than Dr. Ullathorne's clumsy attempt at diplomacy, in concealing from Newman, who had a natural shrinking from diplomatic arts and subterfuges, the special instruction sent by Propaganda in relation to his residence at Oxford.

[2] In kindly forwarding these documents to me, Lord Emly took occasion in the following letter to rebut a recent statement that the Address was toned down to get signatures:—

"TERVOE, LIMERICK, 6*th Dec.* 1893.

"DEAR MR. PURCELL— . . . The strength of the language of the Address

To the Very Rev. John Henry Newman.

We, the undersigned, have been deeply pained at some anonymous attacks which have been made upon you. They may be of little importance in themselves, but we feel that every blow that touches you inflicts a wound upon the Catholic Church in this country. We hope, therefore, that you will not think it presumptuous in us to express our gratitude for all we owe you, and to assure you how heartily we appreciate the services which, under God, you have been the means of rendering to our holy religion.

Signed { The Lord Edward Fitzalan Howard, Deputy Earl Marshal; The Earl of Denbigh, etc.

Stafford Club, 6*th April* 1867.

Newman's answer to this Address was most sympathetic and touching:—

Answer to Address.

The Oratory, Birmingham, 12*th April* 1867.

My dear Monsell—I acknowledge without delay the high honour done me in the Memorial addressed to me by so many Catholic noblemen and gentlemen, which you have been the medium of conveying to me. The attacks of opponents are never hard to bear when the person who is the subject of them is conscious to himself that they are undeserved, but in the present instance I have small cause indeed for pain or regret at

---

is a sufficient answer to the assertion that it was toned down to get signatures. It was signed by about 200 laymen, and so far as I recollect no distinguished name was absent from it. The attacks you mentioned on Cardinal Newman and his friends as national, worldly, and anti-Roman, are precisely of the same character as those made at the same time by Louis Veuillot and the *Univers* on the best French Catholics, including Dupanloup and Lacordaire. Some of these scurrilous attacks have, with doubtful good taste, been published in Veuillot's posthumous letters. Cardinal Newman's devotion to the Sacred College is a conclusive answer to such calumnies.—I am very sincerely yours,

Emly."

Lord Emly had apparently forgotten the absence of Ward's name. Asking me on the occasion whether I was going to sign the Address, Mr. Ward said, "Well, I cannot, because Mr. Monsell says 'every blow that touches Newman wounds the Church.' If the Pope were to forbid Newman's going to Oxford that would be a blow to Newman, but it would not wound the Church; quite the contrary." Mr. Ward for once forgot his logic in not perceiving the distinction between a scurrilous attack published in a newspaper and a prohibition on the part of Propaganda to Newman's residence at Oxford.

their occurrence, since they have at once elicited in my behalf the warm feelings of so many dear friends who know me well, and of so many others, whose good opinion is the more impartial for the very reason that I am not personally known to them. Of such men, whether friends or strangers to me, I would a hundred times rather receive the generous sympathy than have escaped the misrepresentations which are the occasion of their showing it.

I rely on you, my dear Monsell, who from long intimacy understand me so well, to make clear to them my deep and lasting gratitude in fuller terms than it is possible, within the limits of a formal acknowledgment, to express it.—I am ever your affectionate friend, JOHN H. NEWMAN.

The Right Hon. Wm. Monsell, M.P.

Mgr. Patterson, now Bishop of Emmaus, with characteristic ardour, wrote an indignant letter to the papers on the base and calumnious attacks made upon Father Newman. In recognition of this prompt protest the latter wrote as follows:—

THE ORATORY, BIRMINGHAM, 15*th April* 1867.

MY DEAR PATTERSON—I thank you for your friendly letter in the papers; it is just like you. If any one complains of my "silence" about the University question it is simply because my opinion has never been asked by any one in authority. Oxford men younger than myself had been consulted, and, as I am told, their letters sent to Rome; but I, who certainly have as great a claim as any one to have an opinion, have not been allowed to give one. Their friends and others have written to me. I have never disguised what my view of the difficulty was, and all I had to say about it. Those letters often say all I have thought, often they answer some particular question asked of me with a particular view in the questions, but whether my answers have been partial or full, I am quite sure they have been consistent with each other, and if any one of them taken by itself was liable to misrepresentation (which I do not suspect), they have to answer for such unavoidable results who have never thought it worth while to ask what I really and fully had to say.

It was a part of the same incomprehensible neglect that, when Cardinal Reisach was here last summer,[1] not a hint of any kind

[1] In a letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated York Place, August 1866, Manning said, "Cardinal Reisach has just left: he has seen and *understands* all that is going on in England."

was given me that he might like to hear my opinion on the matter which had brought him here, an omission the more strange because he was not only brought as near to me as Oscott without my knowing it, but he was taken to see the very ground I had purchased at Oxford, being lionised over it, as I understand, by Father Coffin, who had no claim whatever to represent the owner of that ground, against whose teaching he is in the practice of protesting.

And now, when people, after in a marked way omitting to ascertain my opinion, demand of me my *intentions* on going to Oxford, they are, to use a common phrase, adding "insult to injury."—Yours affectionately, JOHN H. NEWMAN.

Archbishop Manning wrote also to Dr. Newman on the attacks made upon him by the Roman correspondent of the *Weekly Register* as follows:—

8 YORK PLACE, W., 17*th April* 1867.

MY DEAR NEWMAN—Patterson has, I believe, told you that I was aware of his letter to the papers on the subject of the *Weekly Register*, and that the use of my name was intended to convey my feeling on this painful affair.

My first prompting, as I wrote to the Bishop of Birmingham, was to write to you; but I refrained perhaps without sufficient cause.

I write now, after what has passed with Patterson, because I feel it more in accordance with all that has ever passed between us to assure you that whatsoever gives you pain is to me a source of very real regret.—Believe me, my dear Newman, yours affectionately, HENRY E. MANNING.

On the publication of the Address to Father Newman Archbishop Manning hastens to write a word of warning to Mgr. Talbot as follows:—

8 YORK PLACE, W., 13*th April*, 1867.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—You will see in the *Tablet* an Address to Dr. Newman signed by most of our chief laymen.

The excessive and personal letter in the *W. Register* has caused it.

1. The Address carefully omits all reference to Oxford.

2. It is signed also by men most opposed to our youth going there, *e.g.* Lord Petre.

3. But it will be used, and by some it is intended, as a means of pushing onward Dr. N.'s going to Oxford, and ultimately

the University scheme. I only wish you to be guarded against supposing the Address to prove that *the signers are in favour of the Oxford scheme.* Do not let Propaganda alarm itself. If it will only be *firm* and *clear* we shall get through all this and more.

But if it yield I cannot answer for the future.

It will be necessary to take care that no such letters from Rome be sent to our papers. Can you do anything?[1]—Always affectionately yours. ✠ H. E. M.

In reply Mgr. Talbot wrote denouncing the Address as another manifestation of the absence of Catholic instincts in the English Laity; of their insubordination and disloyalty to the Holy See, and of a dangerous spirit to be put down with a firm hand.

8 York Place, W.,
Easter Monday, 22nd April 1867.

My dear Mgr. Talbot— . . . This Address of the laity is as you say a revelation of the absence of Catholic instinct, and the presence of a spirit dangerous to many.

1. It was got up by Mr. Monsell, always in favour of a College in Oxford, and Mr. F. Ward, whose son is there after preparing with *Walford!*

2. In the first draft the *Oxford University question* was expressed. Many refused to sign.

3. It was then amended to "Oxford *Mission.*" They refused still.

4. It was then reduced to its present terms, and so got them, not without objection.

5. As it stands it implies that in Dr. Newman's writings there is nothing open to censure, and that to touch him is to wound the Catholic Church.

But if Rome should touch him?

The whole movement is directed and sustained by those who wish young Catholics to go to Oxford.

The Bishop of Birmingham, I must suppose unconsciously, has been used by them. It is a great crisis of danger to him. Only do not let him alarm Propaganda by the names and number of these lay signatures.

---

[1] The attacks on Newman, published by an anonymous Roman correspondent of a Catholic paper were, though different in form, identical in substance with the charges made in the correspondence between Mgr. Talbot and Manning. Mgr. Talbot was naturally anxious that his name should not be mentioned in connection with the newspaper affair. In reply Manning wrote that he had guarded against any such allusion.

Many have declared to me that they are as strong against Oxford as I am.

The moment this point is raised the Address will go to pieces.

I have taken care to clear you of all relation to Mr. Martin, and you may rely upon my not wavering. The affair is full of pain, but even this will work for good.

Pray place me at the feet of His Holiness, and offer my thanks for providing me a home so near to his own side, and by the Apostles.

Once more thanking you, believe me, always affectionately yours,

✠ H. E. M.

This Address of Catholic laymen and Newman's answer, coupled with a general outburst of indignation at the calumnious charges of the anonymous "Roman correspondent," had a wholesome, deterring effect, as was intended, on those who had made it their business in newspaper letters or articles in Reviews to belittle the good name and fame, as a Catholic, of the illustrious Oratorian.

Archbishop Manning was accused, and not by Dr. Ward only, of bending before the storm. Mgr. Talbot reproached him with remaining neutral out of fear of Newman, instead of resisting the insubordinate movement of the laity. It was even hinted in the following letter that Pope Pius IX. would regret Cardinal Wiseman:—

VATICAN, 25*th April*, 1867.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP—I cannot help writing to you again about the address of the English laity. Although I am the first to condemn the correspondent of the *Weekly Register* for touching on such a delicate matter, 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, and if a check be not placed on the laity of England they will be the rulers of the Catholic Church in England instead of the Holy See and the Episcopate.

It is perfectly *true* that a cloud has been hanging over Dr. Newman in Rome ever since the Bishop of Newport delated him to Rome for heresy in his article in the *Rambler* on consulting the laity on matters of faith. None of his writings since have removed that cloud. Every one of them has created a controversy, and the spirit of them has never been approved of in Rome. Now, that a set of laymen with Mr. Monsell at their head should have the audacity to say that a blow that touches

Dr. Newman is a wound inflicted on the Catholic Church in England, is an insult offered to the Holy See, to your Grace and all who have opposed his Oxford scheme, in consequence of his having quietly encouraged young men going to the University, by means of his school, and by preparing two men, a fact which he does not deny.

But I think that even his going to Oxford, which will induce many of the young Catholic nobility and aristocracy to follow, is of a minor importance to the attitude assumed by the Stafford Club and the laity of England.

They are beginning now to show the cloven foot, which I have seen the existence of for a long time. 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, and Mr. Monsell is the most dangerous man amongst them.

What is the province of the laity? To hunt, to shoot, to entertain? These matters they understand, but to meddle with ecclesiastical matters they have no right at all, and this affair of Newman is a matter purely ecclesiastical.

There is, however, one layman an exception to all rule, because he is really a theologian. I mean Dr. Ward. His letter is admirable, and he has attacked the Address of the laity in its most vulnerable point.

I was much pained to see the name of Lord Petre amongst those who subscribed their names. No doubt he did not fully see the bearings of the Address, because I am told that he has the highest regard for ecclesiastical authority.

Dr. Newman is the most dangerous man in England, and you will see that he will make use of the laity against your Grace. You must not be afraid of him. It will require much prudence, but you must be firm, as the Holy Father still places his confidence in you; but if you yield and do not fight the battle of the Holy See against the detestable spirit growing up in England, he will begin to regret Cardinal Wiseman, who knew how to keep the laity in order. I tell you all this in confidence, because I already begin to hear some whisperings which might become serious. I am your friend and defend you every day, but you know Bò as well as I do, and how ready he is to throw the blame of everything on others. Dr. Brown by means of his gossiping has done a great deal of mischief here, but his value is known in high quarters.

Dr. Ullathorne has been the cause of the whole mischief. If he had only obeyed the letter of Propaganda and communicated to Dr. Newman the inhibition placed to his going to Oxford,

he could not have sent forth a Circular saying that the whole Oxford project had the approbation of the Holy See.

Of course your suffragans are frightened by the Address of the laity. You will find yourself much in the position of Dr. Milner. I hope the clergy will not adopt the Rev. Mr. Waterworth's suggestion of getting up an Address to Dr. Newman. That would make matters worse. Adieu.—Believe me affectionately yours,

GEO. TALBOT.

P.S.—I have done all I could for Dr. Tate and Mr. Consitt.

Manning replied to these reproaches in the following careful letter:—

8 YORK PLACE, *3rd May* 1867.

MY DEAR TALBOT—I have not been influenced by fear or by neutrality, but by the following motives. I believe—

1. That my first duty and work is to restore unity and concord among the bishops; and that this is vital, and above all other things necessary.

2. That to get the bishops to act unanimously, as above stated, is a double gain.

3. That the only way to counteract the unsound opinions now rising among us is to keep the English bishops perfectly united.

4. That it would be fatal if the Stafford Club laymen could divide us, and get an Episcopal leader.

5. That towards Dr. Newman my strongest course is to act in perfect union with the bishops, so that what I do, they do.

6. That to this end the greatest prudence and circumspection is necessary. A word or act of mine towards Dr. Newman might divide the bishops and throw some on his side.

7. That the chief aim of the Anglicans has been to set Dr. Newman and myself in conflict. For five years papers, reviews, pamphlets without number, have endeavoured to do so.

8. That a conflict between him and me would be as great a scandal to the Church in England, and as great a victory to the Anglicans as could be.

For all these reasons I am glad that Cardinal Bò lays on me the responsibility of the permission given to Dr. Newman to go to Oxford, and says that I did it "to serve an old friend." This has given me untold strength here at this time.

I would ask you to make the substance of this letter known where alone I feel anxious to be understood. I have acted upon the above line with the clearest and most evident reasons. And I believe you will see when we meet that I should have

acted unwisely in any other way. We shall have a trying time, but if *the bishops are united* nothing can hurt us.

Dr. Ullathorne has printed a statement of the Oxford affair, and sent a copy to Dr. Neve for Propaganda. *Mind you see it.* It is fatal to Dr. Ullathorne's prudence, and to Dr. Newman's going to Oxford.

F. Ryder of the Edgbaston Oratory has published an attack on Ward's book on Encyclicals.[1] Dr. Newman sent it to Ward with a letter *adopting* it, and saying that he was glad to leave behind him young men to maintain these principles.[2]

This is opportune, but very sad.—Always affectionately yours, H. E. M.

Would you oblige me by asking F. Brunengo to read over Ward's book on Encyclicals, and mark any doubtful passages. I will do so too, and compare in Rome. *I must know with certainty what to state.*

A variance, so prolonged and so abiding, between two such men as Manning and Newman, imperatively calls for an explanation—the fuller, the clearer, the more candid, the better. Divergence in opinion as to the question of the Temporal Power, or the Oxford question, or the Infallibility, does not go far enough or deep enough to account for Manning's profound mistrust, from beginning to end, of Newman as a Catholic. The causes which excited this mistrust, the reasons which justified it, at least to his own heart and mind, are clearly and fully stated by Manning

[1] Dr. Ward's book on Papal Encyclicals—a republication of his *Dublin Review* Articles—contained the most exaggerated views as to the extent of Papal Infallibility. The writer denounced all those who refused to accept his extravagant interpretation of the Pope's Infallibility as bad or unsound Catholics. Father Ryder, now Superior of the Birmingham Oratory, exposed, with singular ability, Dr. Ward's errors, showing his statements to be contrary to the principles of Catholic Theology. Of F. Ryder's second Pamphlet Manning said, "It is a great evil; the more so because it is not his own sole act. It must, I think, be examined at last in Rome."

[2] With the substance of Father Ryder's pamphlet Newman agreed heartily. He looked upon it as a protest on the part of a number of young Catholics who had a right to an opinion on the momentous questions raised in regard to Papal Encyclicals, and who felt keenly that Ward was desirous to rule views of doctrine to be vital which the Church did not call or consider vital. Manning was right: Newman certainly did rejoice in believing, as he said, "that now that my own time is drawing to an end, the new generation will not forget the spirit of the old maxim in which I have ever wished to speak and act myself, *In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus charitas.*

himself. This justifying evidence exists in his letters to Mgr. Talbot. To suppress such evidence would not be an act of charity or of prudence, but, on the contrary, an act of injustice, of irreparable injury, for without such evidence men would impute, as they have too often done already, Manning's opposition to Newman and his influence to lower causes, to ignoble human motives.

Hence, in justice to Manning, I am bound to produce letters containing his deliberate judgment on Newman as a Catholic; or as identifying him in sympathy and action with an anti-Papal party in England. It is comparatively of little or no moment whether or no Manning's judgment was correct, whether his suspicions were justified or not, the point at issue is, whether Archbishop Manning acted in good faith on that judgment, on those suspicions; and consequently that his opposition was, if not wholly, mainly based on mistrust of Newman's religious opinions.

About a year before Manning's attempt to enter upon friendly relations with Newman, Dr. Ward of the *Dublin Review* placed in the Archbishop's hands the subjoined letter, which in the judgment of one or both convicted Newman, under his own signature, of the sin of minimizing Catholic doctrine. In answer to one of Dr. Ward's dolorous lamentations on the wide divergence in matters of vital concern affecting religion which separated them, Father Newman wrote as follows:—

THE ORATORY, BIRMINGHAM,
18*th February* 1866.

MY DEAR WARD—I thank you very much for the present of your volume, and for your kind letter, but far more, of course, for your prayers. I do not feel our differences to be such a trouble as you do; for such differences always have been, always will be, in the Church; and Christians would have ceased to have spiritual and intellectual life if such differences did not exist. It is part of their militant state. No human power can hinder it; nor, if it attempted it, could do more than make a solitude and call it peace And thus thinking that man cannot hinder it, however much he try, I have no great anxiety or trouble. Man cannot, and God will not. He means such differences to be an exercise of charity. Of course I wish as much as possible to agree with all my friends; but if, in spite

of my utmost efforts, they go beyond me or come short of me, I can't help it, and take it easy.

As to writing a volume on the Pope's infallibility, it never so much as entered into my thought. I am a controversialist, not a theologian, and I should have nothing to say about it. I have ever thought it likely to be true, never thought it certain I think, too, its definition inexpedient and unlikely; but I should have no difficulty in accepting it were it made. And I don't think my reason will ever go forward or backward in the matter.

If I wrote another pamphlet about Pusey, I should be obliged to have a few sentences to the effect that the Pope's infallibility was not a point of faith—that would be all.—Ever yours affectionately in Christ,

JOHN H. NEWMAN,
Of the Oratory.

W. G. Ward, Esq.

This generous protest in favour of spiritual and intellectual life in the Church against Ward's loud and intolerant dogmatism, served as a text, as it were, to the following letter to Mgr. Talbot, in which Archbishop Manning pronounces judgment on Newman's religious opinions.

Without specific reference to Newman's letter to Dr. Ward, Archbishop Manning, within a week, wrote as follows:—

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO MGR. TALBOT.

8 YORK PLACE, 25*th Feb.* 1866.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT— . . . What you write about Dr. Newman is true.[1] Whether he knows it or not, he has become

---

[1] In a letter dated Vatican, Feb. 20, 1866, Mgr. Talbot had written about Newman as follows:—" . . . I have read Newman's letter to Pusey. The patristic argument is admirable and unanswerable, but there is nothing new in it. The introduction and some other passages are detestable. His sarcastic remarks about you have given pain to many who have written to me about them. They are most uncatholic and unchristian. I am afraid that the *Home and Foreign Review* and the old school of Catholics will rally round Newman in opposition to you and Rome. Stand firm, do not yield a bit in the line you have taken. The Oratory (London) will support you, Ward, and many others, and what is better still, you will have the Holy See on your side. It is simply absurd in Dr. Newman to quote Lingard, Rock, and Tierney as authorities. Lingard has used expressions in his *History* which one can hardly understand how a Catholic could use them. The Pope refused to make Dr. Rock a prelate; and every one knows what kind of Catholic Tierney was. . . . I repeat myself, continue to stand forward as the advocate of Roman views in England. Your rule ought to be the *Bullarium*

the centre of those who hold low views about the Holy See, are anti-Roman, cold and silent, to say no more, about the Temporal Power, national, English, critical of Catholic devotions, and always on the lower side. I see no danger of a Cisalpine Club rising again, but I see much danger of an English Catholicism, of which Newman is the highest type. It is the old Anglican, patristic, literary, Oxford tone transplanted into the Church. It takes the line of deprecating exaggerations, foreign devotions, Ultramontanism, anti-national sympathies. In one word, it is worldly Catholicism, and it will have the worldly on its side, and will deceive many.

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. Between us and them there is a far greater distance than between them and Dr. Pusey's book. I know that the Anglicans look on the *Apologia* as a plea for remaining as they are. What makes this more anxious is that there is the same school growing up in France. I hear that there is a party who think Cardinal Patrizi's letters "hard,"[1] and who are talking of "Bossuet" and "a General Council," like Dr. Pusey; also Patterson tells me that Dr. Döllinger is writing against the prerogatives of the Holy See.

Now all these things portend storms, and we shall have them in England. But I have no fear. So long as I know that I have only repeated the words of the Holy See I have no anxiety.

I have not failed to see what you notice in Dr. Newman's pamphlet towards myself, but I do not talk of it, and shall never notice it. The thing which will save us from low views about

---

Romanum, and not the opinions of Dr. Rock. *Sentire cum Petro* is always the safest side. As I have promised I shall stand by you. . . . You will have battles to fight, because every Englishman is naturally anti-Roman. To be Roman is to an Englishman an effort. Dr. Newman is more English than the English. His spirit must be crushed."

In another letter to Manning Mgr. Talbot wrote as follows:—"I have not as yet received your *Letter to Dr. Pusey*, but I have read the extracts in the papers, which have greatly pleased me; and I find that they are written in a much more Catholic tone than Newman's writings. I was speaking about your 'Letter' to Father Cardelli, who has seen it, and expressed himself much pleased with it. Newman's work none here can understand. Poor man, by living almost ever since he has been a Catholic surrounded by a set of inferior men who idolise him, I do not think he has ever acquired the Catholic instincts. I have reason to suppose that secretly he has always sympathised with the *Rambler* school."

[1] The Letters of Cardinal Patrizi referred to were those written from Propaganda, in condemnation of the movement for the reunion of Christendom.

the Mother of God and the Vicar of our Lord is the million Irish in England, and the sympathy of the Catholics in Ireland. These two things are with any one who speaks up to the highest note on these two great truths. I am thankful to know that they have no sympathy for the watered, literary, worldly Catholicism of certain Englishmen. It will spread somewhat among the English priests, and will find no little favour among English Jesuits; but the religious of every Order instinctively feel that it is not the mind of the Church. I have, therefore, no great anxiety. It will need much prudence to avoid splits and contradictions among ourselves. But I think we shall do it. Compared with Milner's days, ours are Ultramontane. Even our Anglicanising Catholics are higher than Milner's colleagues. And, lastly, the bishops are really united and at peace. I do not believe we have the least danger of dissension. I have had full and confidential communication with most of them, and I doubt if there be a single point of difference among us, certainly not one which cannot be safely yielded for the greater gain of peace.

I think, therefore, I can assure you that I have no cause for anxiety. I will keep you fully informed, and you will take care that things are correctly known and understood where you are. . . . —Affectionately yours, H. E. M.

This indictment was a virtual adoption by Archbishop Manning of Ward's charge against Newman (1) of "disloyalty to the Vicar of Christ, and (2) of worldliness." This letter is the keynote to Archbishop Manning's opposition to Newman. It sprang, as his correspondence throughout with Mgr. Talbot shows, from a profound and rooted conviction that Dr. Newman's religious opinions were unsound and dangerous, were anti-Roman and anti-Papal.

Such a conviction—or prejudice, to call it by its right name, and prejudices once rooted in his mind were not easily eradicated — explains the motives of Archbishop Manning's line of action in consistently opposing John Henry Newman at Rome during the Pontificate of Pope Pius IX.

This explanation, however, rests on the hypothesis that Archbishop Manning's true mind in regard to Newman was expressed in his private correspondence with Mgr. Talbot—virtually with the Vatican. The professions of friendship, on the other hand, uttered either in public, or in the apologetic correspondence with Newman, which

follows below, need not be taken as expressing Archbishop Manning's inner mind so much, as making use of forms of courtesy and friendliness which he considered incumbent under the circumstances.

Another question arises, Why, having such a profound mistrust, did Manning, as Archbishop of Westminster, seek to enter into friendly relations and co-operation with Newman?

I have already given Canon Oakeley's evidence of the golden opinions which the Archbishop was winning by his conciliatory manners and moderation. He had succeeded in conciliating the good-will of many of the bishops he had so long opposed and mistrusted. His first work, as he explained in one of his letters already recited, was to bring about unity among the bishops. In pursuance of his mission of bringing about conciliation and good-will, what more natural than his attempt to conciliate the good-will of Dr. Newman, the illustrious Oratorian, whose influence over the hearts and minds of English Catholics had more than once been publicly attested. His standing aloof the Archbishop felt as something like a public reproach.

Adventitious circumstances quickened his desire to be on good terms with Newman. Only two or three years before, the English world had been literally taken by storm by the publication of that most incomparable of books, the *Apologia pro Vitâ Suâ*, in which the author laid bare to the public eye, with transparent candour, the motives which had governed his conduct during the whole period of the Oxford Movement which ended in his becoming a Catholic. Since his conversion he had been living for more than twenty years under a cloud. He had been misunderstood by his fellow-countrymen, misrepresented, suspected. He was treated as if he were dead, or lost to the world, or out of his mind. The *Apologia*, in its transparent truthfulness, worked a transformation as complete as it was sudden in England's judgment of Newman's life. He became one of the most revered of men, honoured and beloved by his fellow-countrymen. This high opinion he never forfeited. The influence of his name and character opened to English

Catholics a new life. They were listened to with respect when they spoke; their writings were read with attention or curiosity. The *Apologia*, by its effects on the public mind, was the inauguration of Catholic literature in England.[1]

In justice to Archbishop Manning, it is but fair to state that the *Apologia*, far from making a favourable impression on his mind, only increased his dread of Newman's influence. It was the work of a "minimiser" of Catholic doctrine; and one of its effects, as expressed in a letter to Mgr. Talbot, "Is to make Anglicans remain where they are."[2]

Another circumstance which wisely induced Archbishop Manning to seek to be on good public footing with Newman was the expression of reverence and gratitude on the part of the laity in their Address to him, just three months before the following correspondence between Manning and Newman was opened.

I now proceed to lay before my readers, without note or comment, the letters from which in the commencement of this chapter some extracts were made that passed between Archbishop Manning and Dr. Newman.

Canon Oakeley, an intimate friend and disciple of Dr. Newman's, was sought out by Archbishop Manning as an intermediary to open up the following correspondence:—

[1] To this fact Manning bore witness in a letter to Mgr. Talbot, in which he said, "Longman will publish anything for us. And through him our books for the first time have broken into all parts of the country. Longman is an old school friend of mine, and came to me lately, plainly showing that he is very much pleased. This is next to getting hold of the *Times*."

[2] In another letter to Mgr. Talbot, Manning spoke of the *Apologia* as "The Kingsley affair, about which Canon Oakeley and Dr. Maguire were making fools of themselves." When the Third Part of the *Apologia* first appeared, Manning, in a letter to Cardinal Wiseman, who was deeply interested in the work, said, "I have just read Newman's Third Part. It is singularly interesting; it is like listening to the voice of one from the dead." On the other hand, the fact that in the *Apologia* Newman referred in the kindest terms and by name to all his more intimate friends, Anglican or Catholic, new or old, while the name of Manning from the first page to the last was never once mentioned in the *Apologia*, may, whether he knew it or not, to borrow his own favourite phrase of limitation, have prejudiced to some extent Manning's judgment of the famous work.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN CANON OAKELEY, ARCHBISHOP MANNING, AND DR. NEWMAN [1]

1867-1869

ST. JOHN'S CHURCH, DUNCAN TERRACE,
ISLINGTON, N., 6*th July* 1867.

MY DEAR NEWMAN—The Archbishop has more than once expressed to me his great regret that there should exist between himself and you what he feels to be a state of personal alienation, and his earnest desire of doing anything in his power to remove it.

I have ventured to say, on my part, that the case was hardly one, as I feared, to be met by mutual explanation, inasmuch as there was, I conceive, no personal quarrel nor breach of charity on either side, but only the absence of those cordial and intimate relations which depend on similarity of character, antecedents, personal views, and the like, and which no mediation can bring about.

I think, however, that you ought to know both what the Archbishop feels and what I have said, in order that I may not be the occasion, through any misrepresentation, of hindering what is abstractedly so much to be desired, and what I should be so happy to promote.

I have not told the Archbishop that I have written to you.—Ever yours affectionately, F. OAKELEY.

THE ORATORY, BIRMINGHAM, 28*th July* 1867.

MY DEAR OAKELEY—I will answer you as frankly as you write to me. The only and the serious cause of any distance which may exist between the Archbishop and myself, is the difficulty I have in implicitly confiding in him. And I feel this want of confidence in him especially in matters which concern myself. I have felt it, and, as I think, on sure grounds, for four years past. But I cannot state those grounds for various reasons:—first, because they lie in a number of occurrences which are cogent mainly in their combination; secondly, because they lie in communications which have been made to me confidentially.

---

[1] The correspondence was arranged and numbered, as for publication, by Cardinal Manning. In a letter to the Bishop of Birmingham, dated November 1, 1869, Archbishop Manning speaks of making public Dr. Newman's letters. See "Supplementary Correspondence," p. 66.

In a letter, No. 13 of the series, dated the Oratory, Birmingham, 2nd September 1867, Dr. Newman said: "I write this (letter to Archbishop Manning) as a protest and an appeal to posterity."

Such grounds, it may be objected, are not capable of being met, and I ought not to expect others to accept them; it is true; I will appeal then, in my justification, to the general sentiment of Catholics in the matter. Mr. Martin[1] testified to that sentiment, when, on presuming last April to write on the subject of obstacles at Rome to my going to Oxford, he found it necessary to assure his readers that the Archbishop had nothing to do with the matters to which he referred. And, when an address was, in consequence of his allegations, sent to me from the laity, certain distinguished laymen testified to the same sentiment, when they declined to sign it on the simple ground that to do so would seem to be taking part against the Archbishop.

This being the general feeling of Catholics in England and at Rome, the best means which the Archbishop could take to set the world and me right, and to show that he had nothing to do with barring me from Oxford, would be to effect the removal of any remaining difficulty which lies in the way of my undertaking the mission. In saying this, I do not mean to imply (what would be untrue) that it would be any personal gratification to myself to have such difficulty removed; but that such an act on his part would be going the way to remove an impression about him, which everyone seems to share, and no one seems even to question.—Ever yours affectionately in Christ,

JOHN H. NEWMAN,
Of the Oratory.

THE ORATORY, BIRMINGHAM, 31*st July* 1867.

MY DEAR OAKELEY—I have no objection to your using my letter. However, I don't expect, any more than you, that any good will come of it. The Archbishop will answer, "I have literally taken *no part* in the Oxford Oratory matter. My action has been confined to the question of education."

If by "his action" he means what he has said or written to Rome, his assertion is quite intelligible and credible. But if by "his action" he means to assert that the action of York Place has been simply withheld either way, nothing is more opposed to fact. The question is, whether his house has not been a centre from which a powerful antagonism has been carried on against me; whether persons about the Archbishop have not said strong things against me both here and at Rome; and whether, instead of showing dissatisfaction publicly of acts which were public, he has not allowed the world to identify

[1] Mr. Martin, the Roman correspondent of the *W. Register*, was the author of the scurrilous attack on Father Newman.

the acts of his *entourage* with himself. No one dreams of accusing me of thwarting him—indeed, the idea would be absurd, for I have not the power. The world accuses him without provocation of thwarting me; and the *prima facie* proof of this is, (1) that his *entourage* acts with violence against me. (2) That, instead of taking any step to prevent them, he contents himself with denying his having done anything against me himself, and with deeply lamenting that there should be a distance between us.

The world thinks, and I think, that he has virtually interfered in the Oxford Oratory matter—and the world and I have to be convinced to the contrary, or we shall continue to think so.—Ever yours affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN,
Of the Oratory.

8 YORK PLACE, W., *7th Aug.* 1867.

MY DEAR NEWMAN—The Bishop of Birmingham, in a letter which reached me last night, gives me a short account of his conversation with you, and mentions that I had not written as Patterson told you I had intended to do.

In fact, I did write a few words, expressing my great regret at the letter written by Mr. Martin in the *Weekly Register*. But I did not send it, partly because I knew that the Bishop of Birmingham had already made known to you what I had written to him on the subject, and partly because I doubted whether it would be acceptable to you. I have the letter by me now.

This was all I intended at that time.

But it would give me a great consolation to know from you anything in which you have thought me to be wanting towards you. I have seen that something has come between us, and that representations contrary to truth have been made to you—perhaps to both of us; and I sensibly felt that the separation of an old friendship was both painful and evil, and that the use publicly made of our supposed variance, both by Catholics and by Protestants, was adverse to that which we count more precious than any private friendship.

It would, therefore, give me a real happiness to enter with you into the openest and fullest explanation of all my acts and thoughts towards you.

I shall be ready to do so by letter if you will, but it would be far easier to both of us, overfull as our time is, to do so by word.

I should be most happy to come to the bishop or to Oscott for a day, and to spend a morning with you, as I did the last time we ever spoke, as in old days, together, during the last Synod at Oscott.

I do not believe that among your old friends there is any one who has remained more unchanged in all the kind regards which have so long united us. If our lines have differed, I cannot suppose that either you or I would invest that fact with any personal feeling. If misunderstandings have come between us, I feel it in every way a duty to endeavour to clear them away.—Believe me always, my dear Newman, yours affectionately,

H. E. MANNING.

REDNALL, 10*th August* 1867.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP—My memory differs from yours as to the subject of that letter of mine to Patterson last spring, which he felt it his duty to show you. It did not relate to Mr. Martin, but to Cardinal Reisach.

You are quite right in thinking that the feeling, of which (alas!) I cannot rid myself in my secret heart, though I do not give public expression to it, towards one whose friendship has so long been a comfort to me, has nothing to do with the circumstance, that you may be taking a line in ecclesiastical matters which does not approve itself to my judgment.

Certainly not; but you must kindly bear with me, though I seem rude to you, when I give you the real interpretation of it. I say frankly, then, and as a duty of friendship, that it is a distressing mistrust, which now for four years past I have been unable in prudence to dismiss from my mind, and which is but my own share of a general feeling (though men are slow to express it, especially to your immediate friends), that you are difficult to understand. I wish I could get myself to believe that the fault was my own, and that your words, your bearing, and your implications, ought, though they have not served, to prepare me for your acts.

I cannot help thinking that having said this, I have made a suggestion, which, if followed out, may eventually serve better the purposes you propose in our meeting just now, than anything I could say to you in any conversation, thereby secured, however extended.

On the other hand, as regards, not me, but yourself, no explanations offered by you at present in such meeting could go to the root of the difficulty, as I have suggested it. I should rejoice, indeed, if it were so easy to set matters right. It is only as time goes on that new deeds can reverse the old. There is no short cut to a restoration of confidence, when confidence has been seriously damaged.

Most welcome would the day be to me, when, after such a preparation for it as I have suggested, a free conversation

might serve to seal and cement that confidence, which had already been laid anew.

But such a day, from what I know both of myself and of you, cannot dawn upon us merely by the wishing; and the attempt to realise it now would be premature, throwing back the prospect of it.

That God may bless you and guide you in all things, as my own sun goes down, is, my dear Archbishop, the constant prayer of yours affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

8 YORK PLACE, W., 14*th Aug.* 1867.

MY DEAR NEWMAN—I thank you for your letter of this morning, and all the more because of its frankness. The affection I have borne to you, and the value I put on your friendship, make me reply with the same sincerity.

I have felt in you exactly what you have felt in me; and that feeling I share also, as you say, with others. I cannot put my meaning into more precise and delicate words than by using your own. I have felt you difficult to understand, and that your words have not prepared me for your acts.

This I know to be a feeling respecting you, as you find it respecting myself.

Now I feel with you that the root of the difficulty is a mutual mistrust; and, as you say, this is hard to cure.

I send you a letter written to Oakeley, who has kindly shown me yours to him; and I leave it with this and my last, as the record of my readiness at any time, either in writing or by word, to explain anything you may desire.

If you have by you, which is not likely, a letter from me, in 1854 I think, written in Rome, in which I quoted the Capitulum for None, *Justum deduxit Dominus*, etc., you will know what my feeling was and is towards you. I say my feeling, because, as you know, our thoughts are more dependent upon events.

That God may bless you, and make the evening of your life happier and more useful even than its beginning, is my sincere prayer,—Believe me, my dear Newman, yours affectionately,

HENRY E. MANNING.

8 YORK PLACE, W., 14*th Aug.* 1867.

MY DEAR OAKELEY—1. Many thanks for sending me your correspondence with Newman. Whatever comes of it, you will have the reward of the peacemakers.

I must go further back than he does to find the first event which shook our confidence in each other.

(1) About 1862 the *Rambler*, with neither kindness nor courtesy, attacked a pamphlet of mine on the Temporal Power.

It was stated by a person, closely connected with the *Rambler*, that Newman had seen the article before publication, or was cognizant of it, and that it expressed his mind. It was believed also that a letter of his formed part of it.

This became extensively known, and was the first cause of the constant contrast of his name and mine, in private and public, on the subject of the Temporal Power.

About the same time the Academia began, and Newman wrote to me to say that if the Cardinal gave a discourse on the Temporal Power, he should take off his name.

You are well aware how, for four years, not only Catholics, but Protestant reviews and newspapers have used his name to condemn me. This was not caused by me.

(2) In the first No. of the *Dublin Review* I spoke against Catholics going to Oxford.

Immediately Mr. Renouf, in a pamphlet addressed to Newman, attacked me, though not by name; yet all the world knew that I was the writer of the article.

From that time all the world, Catholic and Protestant, justly or not I cannot say, has used his name against me on the Oxford question.

(3) In his letter to Dr. Pusey he introduced my name as one of those with whom he did not agree. Ward and Faber he represented as excessive; of me he said nothing, because of an accidental reason.

The impression made by this is that he classed me with them.

And thereby placed us in opposition.

Whether rightly or wrongly all the world, both Catholic and Protestant, has this belief. And the *Quarterly Review*, *Frazer's Magazine*, *Blackwood's Magazine*, and the *Union Review*, as well as a multitude of papers at the time and since, have so used it.

Here again I was not the cause.

Three times in print and twice by name I have been set out as an object of expressed or implied censure by his friends or by himself.

On no occasion have I so much as referred to him mentally in any publication, except once.

In my letter to Pusey I defended myself from a charge which had been brought against us both. And believing that a passage in the *Apologia* was open to misunderstanding, and knowing that it had been most unfairly used in a Protestant review, I tried to cover both him and myself. If he had done this for me I should have felt it to be an act of friendship. It was so intended on my part.

These three public causes have for the last five years created a belief that we were opposed to each other. As he says, all the world knows it, speaks of it, and writes in public of it. But the facts given above will at least account for much of this result.

I am not aware of any act on my part of a like kind.

2. Next as to the Oxford question.

What I have already written will show that on the Oxford University question my line was known before Newman's, and that the attack began against me.

I am therefore wholly free from all responsibility for the raising of this opposition.

As to the question of the Oratory in Oxford, Newman will know that when it was proposed in the Cardinal's time it was given up on the ground that it would have the effect of encouraging young Catholics to go to Oxford.

This fact Newman will remember in connection with the circular which the Bishop of Birmingham requested him not to publish. I never knew the facts until after the event, and had no part in them.

But since I have been here I have had part in the question, and my part has been uniform and open.

I have opposed the sending young Catholics to Oxford as before.

I have also expressed my regret that the subject of the Oratory in Oxford should be renewed, and that on the reason given by Newman in one of his letters to the Bishop of Birmingham, and communicated by his desire, on the former occasion, to some one of the cardinals in Rome—namely, that his going there would attract young Catholics to the University.

Nevertheless I stated that, as the subject had been again proposed to him, I thought he would have cause to complain if the permission to go to Oxford were refused; but that the permission ought to be accompanied by a renewal of the declaration against our youth frequenting the University.

As to the personal restraint of Newman's going to Oxford, I never heard or imagined such a thing until the Rescript had been for at least two months in England.

I had answered the Holy See, always supposing that Newman would go if the Oratory went.

And I know from Cardinal Barnabò that the decision as to the Oratory was given upon my answer; and that he believed and believes that answer to have been given against my own judgment, "out of regard to an old friend." This he has stated to two other persons as well as myself, adding: "Aliquid humani passus est."

This is the whole of my part in the matter. I am, however, conscious that if it had been the affair of anybody else I should have opposed it altogether.

My friendship for Newman, and my great reluctance to oppose any of his wishes, has kept me silent, except in the only letter written by command from Rome. The Bishop of Birmingham has seen the letter.

As to my *entourage*, I do not know whom it means, except F. Vaughan and Ward. They will be able to say what part I have had in their acts. F. Vaughan, to whom I thought myself at liberty to show the letters yesterday, said at once, that all he had said or done had been not only without my direction but without my knowledge.

It may be said that I did not restrain them. I could not restrain what I did not know.

And I ought not to restrain what they have full freedom to do in matters of public interest to the Church. The facts in the beginning of this letter are in point.

Newman will see that we are both liable to be mixed up, both consciously and unconsciously, by those about us.

As to Mr. Martin's reference to me, the same facts in the beginning of this letter are enough to show that to Newman's own friends here and in Rome, of which I have evidence, is to be ascribed the public belief of an opposition, not on one side only, but on both.

This is a matter of private and public mischief, and nothing shall be wanting on my part to remove it. — Believe me, always affectionately yours, H. E. MANNING.

THE ORATORY, BIRMINGHAM, 18*th August* 1867.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP—I thank you for your letter. As your remarks on my conduct in past years are addressed to Canon Oakeley, I also have written to him, and I have asked him to send my letter to you.—Yours affectionately.

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

THE ORATORY, 18*th August* 1867.

MY DEAR OAKELEY—Will you be so good as to forward to the Archbishop these remarks on the letter which he has addressed to you about me.

I do not quite see the drift of his reference to certain acts or imputed acts of mine in former years, unless it be in order to show that I have been underhand in my conduct to him. That I should have taken or expressed a view of ecclesiastical matters different from his cannot have hurt him, as indeed he

said himself in a late letter to me. Certainly, I should not have complained of a parallel divergence on the part of anyone from myself, unless indeed the person accompanied his dissent from me with saying that I had compromised the faith, was disobedient, was a bad Catholic, a heretic at least materially, or in some way or other was morally wrong, and to be shunned and shut up. I am quite sure that neither I, nor anyone of my friends, acquaintance, or well-wishers have said this of the Archbishop. And, did I know of their doing so, I should not defend them on the ground of their right to have an opinion of their own, and to speak their minds, if they chose. To suffer such things seems to me inconsistent with the character of a peacemaker. But to come to the questions :—

1. His question about the *Rambler* article on his pamphlet upon the Temporal Power.—As a good deal is implied in and depends on this point I will go into it at length. (1) I have never heard the report he mentions before now, I have no recollection of having seen such an article before publication. My impression is, that, after July 1859, when I ceased to be editor of the *Rambler*, I did not see any article in proof or MS. but one, and that one I plucked. I was all along in a state almost of hostility to Simpson, and I think I wrote my papers on "Ancient Saints," which I had begun as editor, only on the condition and understanding that he was not to succeed me as editor. Whether he, or anyone else, introduced into any article in the magazine any words from any private letter of mine, I cannot tell ; but certainly with no leave direct or indirect from me. So far my memory. (2) I have now actually referred to the article he speaks of. It is in the number for November 1861, vol. vi. page 106. On looking through it, I have no recollection of having read it before. I have not a dream who is the author. I see nothing in it which I recognise as mine. As, from June to December 1861, I was anxiously indisposed, and moving about a great deal, it is very unlikely I should have been engaged in any aggressive acts against Dr. Manning. So much for the magazine itself. (3) And now I have looked through my memoranda about the *Rambler* in those years, 1859-1862. The article being published in November, if I saw it in proof, it must have been in the previous month, October. In that month I find I wrote three letters to two persons intimately connected with the *Rambler*. I quote here passages from them ; after reading them, the Archbishop may decide whether I was on such terms with its conductors, as to make it possible I could be answerable for anything which at that time appeared in its pages.

2nd October 1861.—To A. "Some months ago, in consequence of information which C. gave me, I expressed my deliberate opinion about the *Rambler*. I thought it was in a false position, which it never could get out of, and was sure to be stopped, or to come to an end, in one way or other. Accordingly, I said that it would be best for the proprietors to stop it themselves, and at once . . . I have had no reason up to this day to change this view of the matter. This may seem a hard answer in your great perplexity, but I do not see how to speak otherwise, consistently with my own feeling expressed by letter to C. last June."

4th October, 1861.—To A. "The reason why C. did not tell you what I wrote to him some months since probably was, because it was mixed up with some very strong opinions I expressed about articles in the *Rambler*, which, I believe, were yours. I thought that the *Rambler* had lost its position among Catholics, and was in a false position. If, however, it does go on . . . anyone, like myself, who thinks such a course unsuitable, cannot judge what is necessary for it in that false position, and what is not necessary. This only I can say, that if [so and so is done by its conductors], this is a strong evidence how false that position is, the grave scandal which it would involve being some kind of measure of the unsuitableness of continuing the publication. . . . My own judgment is that it will be mending evil with evil, and place you in a position still more seriously false, and opening the way to positions falser still. . . ."

5th October.—To B. "I am not well enough to undertake what you propose, if I saw my way ever so clearly to approve of the steps which the proprietors of the *Rambler* have taken of late. . . . I think they are in a false position; but, as this is a matter which concerns them specially, I do not say much about it here."

I have been led to look back at my memoranda before this date, viz. from May 1859, when I resolved to retire after the July number from the editorship; and I find the following notices all in the same strain:—

5th July 1859.—To C. "I wrote that I would not go on with the 'Ancient Saints.' I was glad he was going to Longman, for that implied secularising the *Rambler*. Had I continued, I should have stopped the theological correspondence.

22nd July 1859.—To A. "The printer has written to me that the proofs of the *Rambler* have been sent to me by your direction. I do not feel I can accept your kind wish about them, and have thought best not to read a line of them."

26th October 1859.—To A. "If the new article on Toleration

appears in the *Rambler* without a *bonâ fide* revision, I must ask you to be so good as not to publish mine on St. Chrysostom ['Ancient Saints']. I write to you as if you were sub-editor, which, from your letter just received, I suppose you are, though I am surprised to find it is so."

For the *Weekly Register*, 16*th November* 1859.—"We are requested to state that the reference to Dr. Newman as editor of the *Rambler*, etc. etc. . . . is founded on a misconception, as Dr. Newman has no part in conducting or superintending that able periodical."

20*th June* 1860.—To C. "Another chief condition was, that there should be a responsible editor. I have the greatest opinion of A., but I deliberately thought him unfitted for the office. . . . Knowing the difficulties of the magazine, I waived for the moment both conditions, and wrote an article for November 1859. What happened I do not like to repeat, lest I should seem unkind . . . I could not let any writing of mine appear together with a theological article which had had no revision . . . I wrote to him to say that I could not let my name any longer be associated with the magazine while its arrangements were so incomplete . . . I am exceedingly desirous of the success of the *Rambler*, and to contribute to it as far as I can; but I cannot undertake to be theological censor, nor can I give my name to it, unless it had a responsible editor, and the countenance of such theologians as I have mentioned above. . . ."

7*th June* 1861.—To C. "I said that the article on —— went out of its way to attack St. Pius V. etc. . . . that there were covert allusions to the present state of things, and such mere allusions were irritating . . . I said, too, that . . . the Temporal Power, being a large subject, required a large book . . . that I had a smattering of theology, history, and metaphysics, and knew nothing thoroughly."

30*th June* 1861.—To C. "Answered, that, looking at the matter simply as one of expedience, to go against authorities was to be in a false position, that I thought authorities wanted the *Rambler* stopped."

5*th July* 1861. To C. "I wrote a strong answer . . . I said I thought the *Rambler* had transgressed upon grounds which were under the direct jurisdiction of ecclesiastical authority; that I thought A. incorrigible; that I despaired of him; that the good sense of the public would be with the ecclesiastical authorities, if they came down upon the *Rambler*. I said that no good could come of a periodical with which A. was connected. I said the common-sense of the public would say, 'Serve him right,' if the *Rambler* was censured."

So much on the first question from its importance. What evidence has the Archbishop to put against the above for his statement that I revised and supplied matter for a critique in the *Rambler* upon him in November 1861?

2. The Academia and the Temporal Power.—I certainly said privately to Dr. Manning — to no one else — that, if the Cardinal *inaugurated* the Academia with an address upon the Temporal Power, I did not wish to belong to it. And for this reason, viz., because (at that time when the Pope and the bishops had not spoken so emphatically on the subject as they had done since) I thought it was beginning the new society with a party question, and I suspected the Academia was a party project. But what has all this to do with Dr. Manning?

3. Renouf's Pamphlet.—That Renouf asked me my leave to address a pamphlet to me, I am not at all sure, though I think he did not. However, I should have given him leave if he had asked it. But that would not make me answerable for all that he said in it, especially as I did not see it before publication. I rather think it advocated a Catholic College at Oxford; if so, it said more than I have ever said or thought myself on the matter.

Nor do I see any harm, nor should I have seen any harm, in his criticising any article of Dr Manning's in the *Dublin*, if he did it temperately. When there is a difference of opinion among Catholics, I consider that party is in fault, if there be fault on either side, who is the *first* to publish on either side of the question. I have felt much of late years, though I have said little about it, the great injustice of those who put out strongly their own views, and then accuse others as wanting in peace and charity, who, on this provocation, feel bound to show that there is another opinion on the point, and that there are good Catholics who hold it.

4. My letter to Dr. Pusey.—I was simply obliged to allude in it to the Archbishop, as I did, for I said in my letters that "the only two English writers he quoted were both of them converts, younger in age than myself." This would not have been said correctly unless I also referred to the Archbishop, and explained why I did not think it right to enter into controversy about him with Dr. Pusey.

And now having, I trust, said enough to show him that he has misunderstood those matters in which he thinks I have been unfriendly to him, and assuring you, that, whenever my opinion has been asked on any matter (which has not been often) I have tried to answer with the greatest frankness, in order that I might be understood with the greatest ease, and that, if I have not spoken out more, it has been because, as soon

as ever I attempted to speak, I was told I was only to speak on one side.—I am, my dear Oakeley, affectionately yours,

JOHN H. NEWMAN,
Of the Oratory.

The Very Reverend F. Canon Oakeley.

8 YORK PLACE, W., *24th August* 1867.

MY DEAR NEWMAN—I have to thank you for your letter to me, and for that to Oakeley, which reached me this week in Essex.

In my letter to Oakeley I did not state that you were cognisant of the article in the *Rambler*, or of Renouf's pamphlet; nor did I complain of the criticisms made by the *Rambler* or by Mr. Renouf on me.

Your letter to Oakeley had stated, most truly, that an opposition is supposed to exist between us.

I gave the reasons which, in my belief, have caused that supposition, and I have noted them as they arose in the last five years.

The belief that you were cognisant of the article in the *Rambler* was, as you state, unfounded. Nevertheless it existed; and it gave rise to the supposition that we were opposed on the subject.

The same supposition was caused, in a like way, by Mr. Renouf's pamphlet, and by the letter to Dr. Pusey.

I did not complain of this, but stated it simply as fact, and as explanation of another fact, which unhappily is not doubtful, namely, that Protestants and Catholics have supposed us to be in opposition.

My statement was only to show certain evident and public causes of that supposition.

I write this merely to preclude any misunderstanding of my letter to Oakeley.—Believe me, my dear Newman, yours affectionately,

H. E. MANNING.

THE ORATORY, BIRMINGHAM, *26th August* 1867.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP—It is a great satisfaction to me to find, from the clear statement contained in your letter of yesterday, that, when you said in your former letter that the critique in the *Rambler* was "the first event which shook *our* confidence in *each other*," and that my connection with that critique "became extensively *known*," you did not mean by those expressions at all to imply that *you yourself* shared in that utterly unfounded belief or "knowledge."

This leads me to think that my own long letter to you has not been without effect on you.

It also encourages me to anticipate, that, did the nature of the case admit of it, which it does not, I should be successful also in proving to you that the "extensive" belief, which you assert, had as little existence as the pretended fact to which you say it related; that it was really nothing more than a portion of the endemic gossip of London, which happily never reaches Birmingham or is widely effective.—I am, my dear Archbishop, yours affectionately in Christ,

JOHN H. NEWMAN,
Of the Oratory.

The Archbishop of Westminster.

BARTON FIELDS, CANTERBURY, 29*th August* 1867.

MY DEAR NEWMAN—It would be equally a satisfaction to me if your letter to Oakeley had cleared away what I wrote to him.

I cannot, however, say that it has done more than affect one point in my letter to him, and that point was not affirmed by me, as the cause of the common belief of our being opposed to each other; but as a reason why the old confidence of friendship, which I had felt towards you, was, for the first time, shaken.

It was believed, rightly or wrongly, that you were in some way cognisant of the article in the *Rambler*.

I am as little open to gossip as you are; the grounds of that belief seemed solid to me.

I did share that belief. Subsequent events seemed to me to confirm it.

Your letter takes away the credibility of that belief, and I am very glad to receive it; but the fact that such belief existed at that time, and that it had the effect I state, I feel to be unaffected by your letter.

In this one personal question the letter you were so good as to write to Oakeley has had effect with me; I wish I could say more. I feel deliberately convinced that the supposed opposition, which you say all the world believes to exist between us, was caused by the events enumerated in my letter to Oakeley.

It is a satisfaction to me to be assured by you that you were not participator in the first act which gave rise to the belief of opposition between us.

But they who caused it were publicly believed to be in communication with you; and you have been thought responsible for their acts, as you have thought me responsible for the acts of those about me.

Whether you had any cognisance of their acts or not, the public effect of their acts was the same. And to this alone I directed what I wrote to Oakeley.

Nevertheless, it is a satisfaction to me to be assured by you upon the one point above referred to.

I doubt if among your friends there are many to be found who have more truly and warmly desired than I have to see you prosper, and enlarge your power and means of serving the Church. These are not words, but I do not think this the time to go into any other subject.—Believe me, my dear Newman, always affectionately yours, H. E. MANNING.

The Very Rev. J. H. Newman, D.D.

THE ORATORY, BIRMINGHAM, *2nd September* 1867.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP—I do not think your new conclusion will bear examination better than your old one.

Your own misapprehension about my relations with the *Rambler* did go to explain your present bearing towards me, if retaliation be an explanation; but it does nothing in the way of proving that other men, that men in general, shared the misapprehension of York Place.

And, even though men did believe in my complicity with the *Rambler*, still you would have to prove that they also shared your feeling about the *Rambler's* attribute of hostility to you, an hostility which you consider so pronounced and pointed, that in matter of fact their present belief that you are thwarting me grew out of their then belief that I was thwarting you.

It avails not, therefore, to assure me of your deliberate conviction of all this. For my own part, I consider the world judges of the present by the present, and not by the past.

I write this as a protest and an appeal to posterity.

Meanwhile, I purpose to say seven masses for your intention amid the difficulties and anxieties of your ecclesiastical duties.—I am, my dear Archbishop, affectionately yours,

JOHN H. NEWMAN,
Of the Oratory.

The Archbishop of Westminster.

8 YORK PLACE, W., *4th September* 1867.

MY DEAR NEWMAN—I am much obliged by your kind intention of saying mass for me, and I shall have great pleasure in saying one every month for your intention during the next year.

I have more confidence in this than in anything else to bring about what we desire.—Believe me, my dear Newman, yours affectionately, HENRY E. MANNING.

The Very Rev. Dr. Newman.

THE ORATORY, BIRMINGHAM, 14*th October* 1867.

MY DEAR OAKELEY—Renouf has been here, and I took the opportunity of asking him about that pamphlet of his, of which the Archbishop in his late letter to you spoke as controverting his views on education, and as, though Renouf's ostensibly, really proceeding from me.

Renouf assures me, as I expected, that I had nothing to do with the pamphlet whatever, that he did not tell me that he was writing or had written it, and that he did not ask my leave to dedicate it to me.

Will you kindly send this letter on to the Archbishop, as a supplement to what I was able from myself to say on the matter on the spur of the moment.—Yours affectionately in Christ,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

In a letter to Mgr. Talbot, 14th September 1867, Manning said:—

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.

In a subsequent letter, dated 9th October 1867, Manning wrote:—

I have lately had two correspondences—one with Dr. Newman, the other with the Bishop of Birmingham; neither satisfactory. But I have no anxiety about it; nor need you have any.

No further reference is made to this correspondence in Manning's letters to Mgr. Talbot.

In an autobiographical Note Cardinal Manning, referring to the vindictive attacks made by Mr. Ffoulkes on himself and on the Holy See in regard to the prohibition of a Catholic college at Oxford, wrote as follows:—"After some years of scandalous writings, Mr. Ffoulkes returned to be a Protestant incumbent, as he is at this time."

Perhaps the most vindictive of these scandalous writings was Mr. Ffoulkes' *Second Letter*, in which he cast reckless imputations on Archbishop Manning, and sought to stir up ill-blood on every side. On this "Second Letter" Father Ryder of the Birmingham Oratory, in a letter dated The

Oratory, Edgbaston, 29th October 1869, wrote to a friend as follows:—

I have not seen Ffoulkes' *Second Letter* beyond the very copious extracts given in the *Guardian*. I have no wish to see more of it. I will not trust myself to say what I feel about the attempt to lug in Father Newman. The worst stab in my opinion ever dealt to Father Newman was by Ffoulkes in one of his papers in the *Union Magazine*, and now he *uses* him in order to make his fall splendid.

I am authorised to say this much, that the story about the letter is a melodramatic misstatement. I believe that Father Newman was treated abominably; but I am not at liberty to enter into any details.

Of course the account of Manning's action in the matter is simply ridiculous. I do not think such an idea is contemplated even by Ffoulkes. . . .

Mr. Ffoulkes' action was the exciting cause of the following supplementary letters, written two years after the first correspondence had been brought to a close:—

Supplementary Correspondence, 1869.

To the Bishop of Birmingham.

8 York Place, W., 1*st November* 1869.

My dear Lord—I am sorry to trouble you again so soon on the subject of my last letter; but, as I leave England on Friday, my days and my hours are few, and I shall need to take some step before I go.

Until to-day I have not been able to decide what it is my duty to do in respect to the accusation made on me by Mr. Ffoulkes in pp. 62, 63 of his *Second Letter*, paragraph 3, "Whether," etc.

The accusation therein contained touches me not only personally but officially, and not me only but the Holy See. It must cause scandal; and it is grievously injurious to the Catholic Church. For these reasons I feel it to be my duty to require the production of the pamphlet there referred to.

The chief consideration which has made me slow is the same which has hitherto so long made me silent. I have thought it better to bear any amount of unjust accusation than to make public the letters of Dr. Newman, and many facts relating to these unhappy misunderstandings.

I feel that now duty to the Catholic Church and to religion

requires the exposure of these vindictive imputations. But I am anxious to do so in any way which will involve the least pain to Dr. Newman.

I shall be much obliged if you will give me any advice or suggestions how that can be effected, and how I can obtain a copy of the pamphlet or statement referred to. You will, I feel sure, excuse my troubling you on a subject of such great moment.—Believe me, my dear Lord, your affectionate servant in Christ,

HENRY E. MANNING.

TO THE BISHOP OF BIRMINGHAM.

8 YORK PLACE, W., *2nd November* 1869.

MY DEAR LORD — I am much obliged by your letter of yesterday, enclosing Dr. Newman's statement.

It gives me much satisfaction to be able to separate him from the subject.

My question, however, was not whether such a report was believed by him or by you, but whether you had ever heard it. Your letter does not answer this question, and I have a reason for asking it again, which reason I will state.

I remember telling you that I was in the English College when Cardinal Wiseman received a letter from Dr. Newman on the subject of the article in the *Rambler*. It was no statement or explanation, but a request to know what passages were objected to.

The impression now created in my mind is that this fact is the foundation of the report I conveyed to you in my letter on Sunday, and that it must in some way have originated with yourself.

As I feel that I owe it to myself, and still more to the peace and fair name of the Catholic Church, to bring this matter to a complete and final exposure, I would ask you kindly to tell me whether you have heard the report contained in my letter of Sunday from any other sources; and, I would add, whether the fact I mention above can have been in any way the occasion of it.—Believe me, my dear Lord, your obedient servant in Christ,

HENRY E. MANNING.

TO THE BISHOP OF BIRMINGHAM.

8 YORK PLACE, W., *3rd November* 1869.

MY DEAR LORD—I am much obliged by your last letter.

It was in this country that I stated to you that the Cardinal had received a letter from Dr Newman while we were in the English College.

I did so when you were saying that the Cardinal had failed to communicate to Dr. Newman any result of his endeavour to remove the effect of the Bishop of Newport's delation of the article in the *Rambler*. I stated also that the Cardinal fell ill almost at the time he received the letter, and that so far as I remember I never heard him again speak of it.

During that time I wrote to Dr. Newman asking in what way I could be of use. He may perhaps still have the letter.

I endeavoured more than once to remove from Cardinal Barnabò's mind the impression left by the Bishop of Newport.

This is all I know on the subject.

Mgr. Searle tells me that no letter or statement, so far as he knows, on this subject exists among the papers left by the Cardinal. Mgr. Searle has gone over them all. I have never done so, and do not know what they contain.

My belief has long been that some persons have come between Dr. Newman and myself. I have borne this so long as it was only a private pain. But it has become a public danger to our peace, and to the fair name of the Catholic religion; and my purpose is to pursue it till I find the authors who write anonymously, and the pamphlet referred to.

I believe that I have ascertained this latter point.

I am sorry to trouble you with so unpleasing a matter, but we both have at heart the peace of the Church, and the correction of mischievous error, or of still more mischievous falsehood. —Believe me, my dear Lord, yours affectionately in Christ,

HENRY E. MANNING.

TO VERY REV. DR. NEWMAN.

8 YORK PLACE, W., *2nd November* 1869.

MY DEAR NEWMAN — The Bishop of Birmingham has forwarded to me the paper you wrote on the subject of my letter to him.

Mr. Ffoulkes's pamphlet has done this good, that we shall let the light in upon the misunderstandings of these last years.

It is my intention to obtain a copy of the pamphlet referred to by Mr. Ffoulkes at page 63 of his Letter, and to take any steps it may make necessary.

I feel that I have no right to ask you to assist me in obtaining the pamphlet, and Mr. Ffoulkes may be in error in supposing that you know the author, and may know how to obtain a copy for me.

If you are not unwilling to do so, you would confer on me a real and kind service.

On Friday I hope to leave England, and as return is always

uncertain, and may, at best, be distant, I leave with you the assurance that the friendship of so many years, though of late unhappily clouded, is still dear to me.—Believe me always, my dear Newman, yours affectionately, HENRY E. MANNING.

THE ORATORY, 3*rd November* 1869.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP—Thank you for your kind letter.

I can only repeat what I said when you last heard from me, I do not know whether I am on my head or my heels when I have active relations with you. In spite of my friendly feelings, this is the judgment of my intellect.—Yours affectionately in Christ, JOHN H. NEWMAN.

Of the above letter Cardinal Manning said in an autobiographical Note—"His last was in terms which made a reply hardly fitting on my part. For years we never wrote and never met."

After the year 1869, owing to poor Mgr. Talbot's removal from the Vatican to an asylum at Passy, there is no further direct nor contemporary evidence recorded of Manning's opinion in regard to John Henry Newman. Mgr. Talbot had no successor capable of interpreting at the Vatican Manning's judgment on men and things Catholic in England.

In the following autobiographical Note, written in the year 1887, Cardinal Manning gives his own version of the relations which had subsisted between himself and Newman, from the date of their first acquaintance at Oxford in 1830 to the year 1879, when Newman was made Cardinal by Pope Leo XIII. But the main purpose of this Note is to give a summary of what Cardinal Manning designated his "variance" with Newman:—

CARDINAL MANNING'S SUMMARY OF HIS VARIANCE WITH NEWMAN, AN AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL NOTE, 1887

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN

"MY first acquaintance with Newman was about 1829 at Oxford. It grew into intimacy during the long vacation of 1829, or 1830, probably the latter.[1]

[1] In 1829 Manning spent the long vacation at Trent Park with Robert Bevan and his sister.

"I stayed up to read for my examination, and I remember once dining with him after evening service on Sunday in Oriel.

"After that I saw little of him till I had taken my degree. I resided as fellow of Merton in 1832, and then saw him oftener.[1]

"In 1833 I went into Sussex, and only came back to Oxford from time to time.

"Once I remember going to see him at Littlemore. And he walked back, I think, with me towards Oxford. After that we corresponded, but not much. I undertook to translate Justin Martyr for the *Library of the Fathers*, and did much of it; but I went abroad ill, and Wilson took my place.[2]

"After that I sent references for the tract on 'Tradition.' This was the only contact I had with the *Tracts for the Times*, with which I agreed in the main, but not always nor in all things, especially Isaac Williams' 'Reserve' and Pusey's 'Sin after Baptism.'

"When I was 'select preacher' I saw Newman at times.

"In 1844 or 1845 he wrote telling me of his belief that the Catholic Church is the true Church, and the Church of England no part of it. He then became Catholic, and we did not meet again till I became Catholic in April 1851, and went to Edgbaston and stayed a day or two with him.

"I remember his saying to me, 'It will be well for you to go to Rome, for if the Cardinal's life dropped you would not be known.'

"I went that year. In 1852 we met at the First Provincial Council of Westminster at Oscott. In 1854, when he was to be consecrated bishop, I wrote full of sincere joy. But it was unhappily defeated. We met again in 1859. I was at Oscott at the Third Provincial Council of Westminster, and I then obtained the Bishop of Birmingham's consent that I should ask the Cardinal to renew the intention of consecrating him. The Cardinal authorised me

[1] In 1832 Manning was up in Oxford qualifying for Orders, and in a letter to his brother-in-law, John Anderdon, said that he had not met Newman once. After a lapse of fifty years and more it is not surprising that Cardinal Manning's memory was at fault.

[2] Manning went to Rome in the winter of 1838.

to renew the subject at Rome. I went there that winter and opened the matter to Cardinal Barnabò, then Prefect of Propaganda. As soon as I began he said, 'The Bishop of Newport has just denounced an article of Dr. Newman's in the *Rambler* as inconsistent with the Infallibility of the Church.'

"Cardinal Wiseman tried to get this removed, but without effect, and the consecration could not be proceeded with. This brings me down to 1860.

"At this time the subject of the Temporal Power became a foremost public controversy in Europe and in England.

"I both preached and printed about it—ill enough no doubt—but following the line of the Holy See. An article appeared against me in the *Rambler*, then edited by Newman.[1] The internal evidence led others as well as myself to believe it to be his.

"Simpson, Capes, Renouf, and Acton were intimate with Newman as I believe—some more, some less. At this time the Academia of the Catholic Religion was founded in London. The Cardinal was to give the Inaugural Address. I had prevailed on Newman with some difficulty to give his name to the Academia. He wrote to me to say that if the Cardinal should speak of the Temporal Power in his Address as he had spoken of it before, he [Newman] would take his name off the Academia.[2]

[1] In July 1859, Father Newman ceased to be editor of the *Rambler*, see his letter to Canon Oakeley, *supra* p. 335.

[2] The following is the letter which Father Newman wrote on that occasion to Dr. Manning:—

Confidential. THE ORATORY, BIRMINGHAM, 21*st June* 1861.

MY DEAR MANNING—I find the Cardinal Archbishop (for Cardinal Antonelli is out of my field of sight) is taking strong measures on the question of the Temporal Power.

You will not, I know, fancy that I am capable of writing anything in the shape of a threat; but I am obliged to write this, else you will say, when the event took place, "You *should* have given me a hint beforehand; *why didn't* you tell me?"

I ought then to say what I am resolved on, but this is for you, not for the Cardinal.

Should his Eminence put out any matter bearing on the same question in the same way in his *Inaugural Address on the* 29*th*, I certainly will not remain a member of the Academia.—Ever yours affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN, *Of the Oratory.*

"From that day a divergence began between us. Soon after came the controversy between Ward and Father Ryder. Newman accepted Father Ryder's statement on the minor censures in a letter to Ward which is in the collection.

"About the same time came the contention about Catholic youth going to Oxford. The Bishop of Birmingham invited Newman to found an Oratory in Oxford. It was believed that both the bishop and Newman were in favour of our youth going to Oxford. Much opposition was raised. The late Cardinal opposed the scheme. And in 1865 the duty of continuing that opposition fell officially on me.

"I was and am convinced that no Catholic parents ought to send their sons to the National Universities; that no Catholic can be there without danger to faith and morals; and that to engraft ourselves on the un-Catholic and anti-Catholic intellectual culture of England would have two effects—the one that the Catholic Church would abandon all future effort to form its own university, and the other, that our higher laity would be like the laity in France, Catholic in name, but indifferent, lax, and liberalistic.

"I was compelled therefore to oppose this scheme. Newman did not disclaim approval of this scheme. The opposition, therefore, included his going to Oxford, as the effect of it would be powerfully to attract our Catholic youth.

"This caused a still further divergence, as will be seen from his letters and mine, and from those of the Bishop of Birmingham and Oakeley in the "Collection."[1]

"The Bishop of Birmingham printed a pamphlet to assure the bishops that he did not promote the Oxford scheme. It obviously proved that he did. The Bishop of Northampton called it to me, 'The Bishop of Birmingham's general confession.'

"From that time our divergence was increased.

"When I was nominated to the See of Westminster, I wrote to Newman saying, 'Your name comes among the first

[1] The Bishop of Birmingham's letters and pamphlet were given in the last chapter; the other letters referred to as proving "a still further divergence" are given *supra* pp. 327-346.

of those friends whom I desire to have with me on the day of consecration.' He answered in a letter in the collection saying that he would come, 'if he might take it as a pledge on my part that I would not again endeavour to have him consecrated as bishop; that if the Pope offered it, he should refuse it.'

"This fact is of importance. It proves that he knew what I had done. It refutes the notion that I had hindered his being prominent in the Church. I had endeavoured to effect it. This letter is in the 'Collection.'

"Then followed a painful correspondence in which we mutually taxed each other with opposition. The letters are in the 'Collection.' His last was in terms which made a reply hardly fitting on my part.

"For years we never wrote and never met.

"Then came his letter to Dr. Pusey, in which he twice, if not three times names me.

"Then came the Vatican Council and his letter to the Bishop of Birmingham, on which I need not comment.[1]

"Then followed his 'Letter to the Duke of Norfolk.'

"During these years three subjects were uppermost: (1) The Temporal Power; (2) The Oxford Question; and (3) The Infallibility.

[1] Newman's letter, written in confidence to his bishop, and made public without his consent or that of the Bishop of Birmingham, led to a misrepresentation of his views which Father Newman corrected in the following letter to the editor of the *Standard*:—

THE ORATORY, 15*th March* 1870.

SIR—I am led to send you these few lines in consequence of the introduction of my name in yesterday's *Standard* into your report of the "Progress of the Œcumenical Council." I thank you for the courteous terms in which you have on various occasions, as on the present, spoken of me; but I am bound to disavow what you have yesterday imputed to me, viz., that I have "written to my bishop at Rome, Dr. Ullathorne, stigmatising the promoters of Papal Infallibility as an insolent, aggressive faction."

That I deeply deplore the policy, the spirit, the measures of various persons, lay and ecclesiastical, who are urging the definition of that theological opinion, I have neither intention nor wish to deny; just the contrary. But, on the other hand, I have a firm belief, and have had all along, that a Greater Power than that of any man or set of men will overrule the deliberations of the Council to the determination of Catholic and Apostolic truth, and that what its Fathers eventually proclaim with one voice will be the Word of God.—I am, Sir, your obedient Servant, JOHN H. NEWMAN.

"On all these Newman was not in accordance with the Holy See.

"I am nobody, but I spoke as the Holy See spoke.

"But almost every newspaper in England abused and ridiculed me. My name was never mentioned, but his was brought in to condemn me; his name was never mentioned, but mine was brought in to despite me.

"If only we had stood side by side and spoken the same thing, the dissension, division, and ill-will which we have had would never have been, and the unity of Catholic truth would have been irresistible.

"But it was not to be so.

"There is one only person who has kept Dr. Newman back from the highest office—himself. He is the sole cause.

"During all this time I can declare that I have cherished the old friendship between us. I should have never been in Birmingham without going to Edgbaston, if the Bishop of Birmingham had not advised me not to go. I can truly say through all these years I have never had a feeling of offence or of resentment against Newman. I began with a great admiration, a true affection, a warm friendship.

"I always regarded him as so far above me in gifts and culture of every kind that I never had a temptation to rivalry or jealousy.

"We diverged on public duties. My line was not my own. It is that of the bishops in 1862-1867, of the Holy See, and of the Vatican Council. It is also the line which is unpopular in England, and in the public opinion of all countries.

"That Newman has a morbid sensitiveness is well known. His relations with Faber, the late Cardinal, Father Coffin, the London Oratory, underwent the same change as his relations to me. I never referred to him in print except with affection and respect as a friend. If I have been opposed to him, it has only been that I must oppose either him or the Holy See."[1]

[1] The concluding paragraph of this Note referring to Newman's elevation to the Cardinalate in 1879 appears in its proper place in Chapter XX. p. 570.

Cardinal Manning in the above version of his relations with Newman, points out, it will be noted, that on one occasion he opened the matter of Newman's consecration as bishop to Cardinal Barnabò, Prefect of Propaganda, who immediately objected, that an article of Dr. Newman's in the *Rambler* had just been delated to the Holy Office by the Bishop of Newport as inconsistent with the infallibility of the Church. "This fact," Cardinal Manning declares, "is of importance. . . . It refutes the notion that I had hindered his (Newman's) being prominent in the Church. I had endeavoured to effect it." This evidence of Cardinal Manning's desire to see Newman prominent in the Church would be entitled to greater weight were it not for the concluding paragraph in the "Summary," in which, speaking of his opposition to Newman, Cardinal Manning says, "If I have been opposed to him, it has only been that I must oppose either him or the Holy See." For it should scarcely seem to be in keeping with Manning's known character, as writ large in his own handwriting in letters to Mgr. Talbot, to desire to see any one prominent in the Church who was opposed to the Holy See. His contemporary letters at all events betray no such desire.[1]

My duty, however, is happily limited to laying before the public all such facts, documents, and letters hitherto unpublished, as throw light on a much disputed point or part in Cardinal Manning's career and character; and, having furnished adequate materials for judgment, to leave readers to form their own conclusions as to the real relations between Cardinal Manning and Cardinal Newman.

[1] See *passim* correspondence between Manning and Mgr. Talbot, 1858-1869.

CHAPTER XV

WORK ECCLESIASTICAL, LITERARY, AND POLITICAL

1865–1869

Soon after Cardinal Wiseman's death, his friends, grateful for his eminent services in the cause of religion, held a preliminary meeting at Lord Petre's house, and resolved unanimously that the most fitting Memorial to the first Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster would be to build a cathedral. A committee was formed to carry out this purpose. The plan of building a cathedral at Westminster was warmly espoused by the Catholics of England. It appealed to the imagination, for men knew how ardently Cardinal Wiseman had desired to see a grand Gothic church in the heart of London.

A large meeting was held at Willis's Rooms. Manning, as Archbishop-elect, was invited to preside. He made an eloquent speech, and promised to promote to the best of his power the building of a Cathedral, as determined on by the Cardinal's friends, to the memory of his lamented and great predecessor. The rest of his speech was devoted to the question of the children of the Catholic poor—whom he estimated at 20,000 in number—destitute, uncared for, untaught, running wild in the streets, without knowledge of the faith, a prey to apostasy or to immorality. It was a powerful and touching appeal. The work of saving these children was his first duty, the first duty of the Catholics of London.

At the close of the Archbishop's speech the late Sir

Charles Clifford pointed out that the meeting had been called for the purpose of collecting funds to build a cathedral at Westminster as a Memorial to Cardinal Wiseman, and that the question of providing for the children of the Catholic poor in London was beside the plan and purpose of the meeting. The crowded assembly of representative Catholics from all parts of England was very enthusiastic and unanimous, and the largest sum of money ever collected on one occasion by the Catholics of England, £16,000, was given or promised before the close of the meeting at Willis's Rooms. Sir Charles Clifford and the late Earl of Gainsborough were appointed treasurers. Archbishop Manning expressed great hopes to his friends that the two works would go on simultaneously, for they appealed to two different classes of people, those who wished for a cathedral at Westminster and those whose chief concern was to provide for the 20,000 Catholic children in London, deserted or neglected by their parents.

Archbishop Manning's mind turned naturally not to the past, but to the future. A memorial church to Cardinal Wiseman belonged to the past, but the saving of Catholic children from Protestant workhouses or reformatories, where their faith would be lost, belonged to the present and the future, and he made this saving work the primary end and aim of his labours.

As no effective steps were taken to promote the building of the cathedral, it was thought advisable to call upon the trustees to resign their trust. The Earl of Gainsborough assented, and after some resistance and delay, Sir Charles Clifford eventually followed his example. All the money collected for the Wiseman Memorial was handed over in trust to the Archbishop of Westminster. The large sums subscribed enabled Archbishop Manning, however, to purchase in 1867 a site in Westminster for the cathedral.[1] He was satisfied with purchasing land for the cathedral, but

[1] In a letter, dated 6th September 1867, Manning wrote to Mgr. Talbot as follows:—"I have bought the Jesuits' land in Westminster for the Cathedral. I was glad to indemnify them for the money they had spent there. It is sufficient for a fine church 480 feet long by 86 wide.

left the work of building to his successor. For immediate use, however, he laid in 1867 the foundation-stone of the present pro-cathedral at Kensington. It was at this church that Manning, as archbishop and as cardinal, constantly officiated and delivered those impressive sermons which drew together Sunday after Sunday large crowds of non-Catholics, many of whom year after year he received into the Church.

In an autobiographical Note, No. 44 in his Journal, dated 1878-82, Cardinal Manning wrote on the Cathedral and the children of the Catholic poor as follows:—

I do not know that it is worth while writing about the Diocese. One idea has governed me. I believe, in fact, I learned it from Carlyle. I mean that mechanism without dynamics is dead. I have all through the last thirty, especially the last sixteen, years, kept this in mind. St. Bede says of St. Gregory I.: "*Alii quidem Pontifices construendis ornandisque auro vel argento ecclesiis operam dabant, hic autem totus erga animarum lucra vacabat.*" (Hist. Eccl. Lib. 11-41.) I always felt this. When Cardinal Wiseman's friends met at Lord Petre's and resolved to build a cathedral as a memorial of him, I assented; but when I was appointed by Pius IX., and presided before consecration at a meeting in Willis's Rooms for that purpose, I said that I accepted it with all my heart, but that first I must gather in the poor children. I hope I have kept my word, for I bought the land which the builders of Νεφελοκοκκυγία never thought of; and some thousands are given and others left for the building. But could I leave 20,000 children without education, and drain my friends and my flock to pile up stones and bricks? The work of the poor children may be said to be done. We have nearly doubled the number in schools, and there is schoolroom for all; and about 8000 have been saved from apostasy and from the streets. . . . My successor may begin to build a cathedral. I have often said the Cardinal's death bought the land; perhaps mine will begin the building.[1]

Piling up bricks and stones was not to Archbishop Manning's taste. To him the building of a grand cathedral at Westminster seemed like erecting a triumphal arch before the victory was gained. And who was justified even in speaking of victory or triumph whilst 20,000 children of the Catholic poor were unprovided with schools, reformatories,

[1] On this occasion, at any rate, Cardinal Manning spoke with the voice of a veritable prophet.

refuges, or orphanages. It was perhaps natural in Cardinal Wiseman, who had borne the heat and burden of the day; who had lifted up the Church in England from the catacombs, as it were, in which it had taken refuge under the penal laws, and even after their severity had been relaxed; and who had restored to England its ancient hierarchy, to look at the close of a laborious and successful life not only for rest and repose, but to long for an outward and visible sign of the triumphs which the Church under his rule had achieved.

But to his successor, quivering to the finger-tips with restless energy, equipped for the battle against apathy and indifference, against vice and ignorance in the slums of Rotherhithe and Whitechapel, and of Drury Lane, and in the *hinterland* of lordly Westminster,—where the cathedral was to have been but is not,[1]—and last, though not least, against drunkenness, the besetting sin of too many of his Irish children, to hanker after a grand cathedral, to delight in rubrics and ceremonial, in Gothic mitres and vestments and altar-vessels, seemed almost like child's-play. At any rate, such things seemed to him waste of time, energy, and money. The plan of a cathedral was shelved; Gothic vestments and vessels were relegated to the lumber-room; and Gothic architecture, together with the Pugins and their traditions, was exiled from the diocese of Westminster. Cardinal Manning was fond of repeating what he described as a saying of Savanarola: "In the catacombs the candlesticks were of wood, but the priests were golden. Now the candlesticks are of gold,"—but Manning artistically omitted the concluding clause.[2]

[1] On the Feast of the Apostles SS. Peter and Paul, 29th June 1895, in the presence of a vast assemblage of the Catholics of England, his Eminence Cardinal Vaughan, assisted by his Eminence Cardinal Logue, Archbishop of Armagh, attended by many Prelates, and surrounded by the Clergy, secular and regular, laid the Foundation stone of Westminster Cathedral, originally projected in 1865 as a Memorial to Cardinal Wiseman, on the Cathedral site, Ashley Place, Westminster.

[2] The words attributed by Cardinal Manning to Savanarola are to be found in the acts of the Council of Trebon, near Mainz, and are there described as a saying of St. Boniface. The Council of Trebon, *Concilium* Treboniense was held Anno Domini 895, and that makes the saying some 600 years old when Savanarola used the words of St. Boniface.

Archbishop Manning girded up his loins to the great work of his life—the saving from sin, ignorance, and unfaith the children of the Catholic poor in London. It is too early to record here the singular successes which he achieved by his patience, organising skill, and love-inspired labours. We are contemplating him now in the early beginnings of his noble mission of faith and charity. He never drew back his hand from the plough. He turned the soil and sowed the good seed. He tended unto the end with loving care and watchful anxiety the growth of what he had planted. By God's mercy he lived to reap the harvest and garner the fruits of the greatest work of his laborious and labour-loving life.

Though in the beginning many bitterly resented Manning's abandonment of the memorial to Cardinal Wiseman, yet in the end all recognised in this, as in other instances, the practical sagacity and far-reaching foresight of the Archbishop of Westminster. Though indifferent to the building of a cathedral, Archbishop Manning was zealous in the work of multiplying missions and building small churches, so that religion might be brought home to the door, as it were, of the hovels of the poor. To every mission a school of some sort was to be attached, which by degrees might be enlarged and made more efficient. Sometimes a large parish was split up into many missions, occasionally perhaps not very wisely, for complaints were raised that the central organisation was disturbed and weakened, and that the multiplication of small missions increased the chronic poverty which hampered the work of the old-established parishes, most of which were already in debt.

Perhaps in one sense the most successful of Archbishop Manning's undertakings was the establishment in 1866 of the Westminster Diocesan Education Fund. At that time the existing schools were not large enough or numerous enough to educate more than half, if even that, of the children of the Catholic poor in London. It was not in Manning's nature to be content with ineffectual desires, or to seek in a half-hearted way to carry out his designs. What he desired and had determined on, he carried out in

a thorough and business-like fashion. To provide, both in extent and efficiency, a thorough system of Catholic education for the Catholic poor in London, money was needed. No mere driblets would be of the slightest use. No large sums even, produced by spasmodic efforts, would avail for the establishment and support of efficient schools. What was needed was a permanent and regular fund. To establish such a fund for the education of the children of the poor Archbishop Manning called together a public meeting. In his appeal for support he stated that there were 20,000 Catholic children uneducated and uncared for in the streets of London. Some experienced priests, among them Canon Oakeley, objected to this statement as exaggerated. In a letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated 8 York Place, 18th May 1866, Archbishop Manning wrote as follows :—

"On 14th June we are to have a public meeting to form a Diocesan Fund for the poor children. It is strange I cannot get some men to believe in their existence. Oakeley throws cold water on everything, and knows less of the state of London than almost any man, and after having said that all our Catholic children are in school, now admits that there are 12,000 without education.[1] I am sure there are 20,000, but I will work with 12,000, which is sad and bad enough."

A large Catholic meeting was held on 14th June at St. James' Hall to establish the Westminster Diocesan Fund. The results in donations and subscriptions were most satisfactory. In a letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated 14th June 1866, Manning gave the following interesting account of the Meeting :—

The papers will have given you my last Pastoral and the circular about the children.

To-day we had the meeting. It was the best we have ever had. The support given me surpasses all my hopes. Before we went to the meeting, every post brought in contributions. Donations about £2200 ; subscriptions £2300 a year.

In the meeting we had £1200 more, making nearly £6000 to form a Diocesan Fund for the poor children. Lord Petre, Lord E. Howard, Lord Stafford, Sir R. Gerard, Hope Scott, and many more have helped me very largely. The meeting was

---

[1] Mgr. Talbot echoed, after his wont, Manning's complaint against Oakeley. "Poor man, he is half blind, and knows far less of London even than I do."

excellent: the speeches very strong and sensible, and I never saw greater vigour and satisfaction. The effect upon the diocese, and upon public opinion will be very good. Read the *Times* of the 12th on my Pastoral.

But I look on this as only a beginning. And thank God for it. I know your heart will be in the work. And I should be glad that the Holy Father should know that the "Benediction and Indulgence" which His Holiness graciously gave me last October were distributed throughout the St. James' Hall, and have borne a great fruit.—Affectionately yours, ✠ H. E. MANNING.

To this letter Mgr. Talbot replied as follows:—

VATICAN, 22*nd June* 1866.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP—I have just received your kind letter of 14th June.

1. I am delighted to hear that your meeting for the poor children was a complete success. I was not surprised, as English Catholics manifest their sympathy for philanthropic good works more than any other objects. There is not much of the supernatural in their zeal, but nevertheless you are very wise in making use of this feeling for the greater glory of God and the salvation of souls. Myself I have always taken the greatest interest in the poor of London, but always in order to save their souls, not merely to make them more respectable members of society, which is the Protestant view of such matters, with which I am sorry to think many Catholics sympathise. It is putting this world before the next. I do not see much enthusiasm ever got up for anything purely spiritual, or for the high interests of the Holy See as one sees in France, Belgium, Spain, Ireland, and other Catholic countries. Nevertheless, I am delighted that you have got the money, as you will make good use of it, and make it an instrument for saving souls. . . .

2. To-day Dr. Cullen was made cardinal. He seems to be very happy. I am glad for his sake as he is a very good man, and also for Ireland. I have worked for this for some years, and I am delighted that it is at last accomplished. Dr. Cullen is a thorough Roman in every sense of the word. He really has the high interests of the Holy See at heart, which is not very common out of Rome. . . .

The Pope said to me the other day that you were the man of Providence, so that it would be a sad misfortune if you shortened your days by overwork. You ought to adopt the rule of the late Archbishop of Baltimore, never to do yourself what a priest can do for you.—Yours affectionately, GEO. TALBOT.

P.S. 23rd June.—I have just read your speech and interpreted it to the Pope. It is admirable. The *Times* has rendered you a great service, because the English venerate more the opinion of the *Times*, than an Encyclical from the Vicar of Christ. G. T.

The success of the "Westminster Diocesan Education Fund" was a striking testimony to Archbishop Manning's organising powers, as well as of the singular influence he possessed in awakening the generosity and munificence of the Catholic community. One chief reason was that everyone was convinced that the urgent appeals which he made to the Catholic public were on behalf of the pressing needs of the diocese—works of essential necessity for the support or preservation of the faith, or of the moral or material wellbeing of those under his spiritual rule. For instance, without the Westminster Diocesan Fund, supported by yearly subscriptions and gifts and bequests, it would have been impossible to prevent thousands and thousands of Catholic children from being merged in the practical heathendom of the London poor. Men, moreover, had implicit belief in the wise and business-like administration of funds entrusted to his charge.

No fund could have been better administered or have produced more successful results. By its aid poor schools have been improved in every mission, and new Industrial and poor-law schools have been established, as well as reformatories and orphanages. The responsible and arduous office of masters and pupil-teachers was recognised by the administrators of the fund in giving gratuities as a reward and encouragement. In every direction, by the aid of this masterful fund at the disposal of the Archbishop, the faith of the children of the Catholic poor was safeguarded and secured.

A work which, as affecting the secular clergy, perhaps lay nearest to Archbishop Manning's heart, was the establishment in London of a Diocesan Seminary, in which, according to the Decrees of the Council of Trent, the clergy could be trained under the bishop's eye. I have already shown how deeply concerned Manning was in the formation of seminaries in every diocese in England. In placing the Oblates of St. Charles in the Seminary of St. Edmund's,

Ware, Manning had hoped that under their direction it would have been brought, as it were, under his own supervision and control. When, however, by the removal of the Oblates from St. Edmund's, his plan was defeated, Manning was urgent, in season and out of season, in Rome as in England, in insisting on the enforcement of the Tridentine decrees in regard to diocesan seminaries.

In a letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated 8th April 1868, Manning wrote saying:—

I wish Cardinal Barnabò would write me a letter commanding me to begin a true Tridentine Seminary. If he would do so, I would do it at once.

In reply Mgr. Talbot wrote as follows:—

VATICAN, 17*th April* 1868.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP—Many thanks for your letter dated on Easter Monday. I am glad that you have been able to do so much good in London during Lent, and that so many souls have been brought to the Church. I am also very glad to hear that you have the intention of erecting a seminary at Hammersmith, as the future of the church in England depends greatly on ecclesiastical education. I did not ask Propaganda, as yet, to *order* you to erect a seminary as it has already done so several times to all the bishops, and you may depend upon it that there is very little sympathy in England among Catholics for the wishes of the Holy See, unless it suits their purpose. It is merely breath thrown away. The blessing of the Holy Father will help you, and that I will obtain for you. If you begin your seminary saying that you are commanded to do so by the Pope, the English character is so naturally opposed to the authority of Rome, and Roman interference, that you will have little sympathy, but if you begin it of yourself with the blessing of the Pope, they will probably take it up. This was the advice given me even by Dr. Errington, when I tried to interest the English Catholics in the Collegio Pio. He said to me "If you say that the Pope wishes them to support it, they will do nothing, but if you say that it will be useful in educating more students they may take it up."—Believe me, sincerely yours, GEO. TALBOT.

In April 1869, the old convent of Benedictine nuns at Hammersmith was transformed into a diocesan seminary, and such of the ecclesiastical students as were ready to commence their Theology, were transferred from the

Seminary of St. Edmund's to Hammersmith.[1] In writing to Mgr. Talbot, Manning said that as he intended to direct the Seminary at Hammersmith himself, he had appointed Dr. Weathers president, because he would in all ways carry out the views and wishes, and follow the line prescribed by his archbishop. "I have appointed," he said, "Dr. Weathers president for the same reason that I appointed Canon O'Neal vicar-general. It will gratify the clergy, smooth over difficulties, and lessen opposition on the part of the clergy when they learn, for I have not yet told them, of the removal of the Seminary from St. Edmund's to Hammersmith." [2]

Cardinal Manning has left a brief Note on the subject of the Seminary at Hammersmith. Speaking, in 1879 of the chief works of the last fourteen years, he wrote as follows:—

> The building of two-thirds of the Seminary for £18,000, which is paid. The last third I hope to begin and, please God, to finish.

To this Note the following passage was subsequently added:—

> Now completed, except the chapel. The whole cost £32,000, of which about £27,000 is paid.[3]

---

[1] Five or six years later it was found that the old building afforded inadequate accommodation, and Manning had once more to appeal to the generosity of the Catholic laity for funds to enable him to build a new Seminary on the site of the old convent at Hammersmith. The prompt and munificent response to his appeal, amounting within a few weeks to £10,000, enabled Cardinal Manning to lay the foundation-stone on the 7th of July 1876 the Feast of the Translation of St. Thomas of Canterbury. The following is a passage of the eloquent and touching sermon he delivered on the occasion:—
"I feel confident that my people, my flock, will not fail me in this last effort. We have done many works together hitherto. I may say that not one appeal I have ever made has fallen to the ground. I no sooner made known the need of the diocese than some three or four persons immediately put into my hands an amount which warranted my going on. I do not call upon my poor to help me in this. They have enough to do with the education of their children."
In this Appeal the Archbishop said, in reference to the building of the new Seminary at Hammersmith, "It is also the last work to which I can hope to lay my hand. If I can leave this behind me, I shall feel that the work of my life is done."

[2] In another letter to Mgr. Talbot Manning said: "It will facilitate matters here to make Dr. Weathers Domestic Prelate to the Pope. Please draw up a *supplica*."

[3] In 1884 the chapel was built. The whole cost of the Seminary at Hammersmith was estimated at about £37,000.

In a Note written ten years later, dated 11th March, 1889, which refers to his three chief works—the Congregation of the Oblates, the Westminster Diocesan Fund, and St. Thomas's Seminary—Cardinal Manning wrote as follows:—

When I began to work as a priest, the first work was the Congregation of the Oblates, and of this the first result was St. Charles's College. The congregation has about twelve schools, with about 1300 children and two colleges, a lesser, St. Michael's and a greater, St. Charles's.

Then as soon as I had my present office, the Westminster Diocesan Fund was formed with its annual meeting; and the work of the poor children, 14,200 have passed through our hands: 3000 are always in education in our twenty-two diocesan schools and orphanages.

Then finally came St. Thomas's Seminary.—I hope I have not withdrawn my hand from the plough. But certainly it is our Lord who has kept it there, as it was He that put it there at the outset.

There was another work commenced in 1863 in which Dr. Manning was interested—the establishment of a College for Foreign Missions at Mill Hill by Father Vaughan, now Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster. In the first instance, Manning was much opposed to such a large and adventurous undertaking. He could, besides, ill spare the aid and co-operation of Father Vaughan in the work of establishing the College and Seminary of St. Charles. Moreover, the Superior of the Oblates was far from sanguine as to the success of a work involving such large expenditure of time, labour, and money. When, however, the College of the Foreign Missions was successfully established, Archbishop Manning wanted to "annex" it, and often afterwards expressed his regret that so thin a line of connection existed between the College of St. Joseph at Mill Hill and the congregation of St. Charles at Bayswater. This, at any rate, for a time was a sore point with the Archbishop.

In reply to some remonstrances from Mgr. Talbot on behalf of the proposed College for Foreign Missions, Dr. Manning wrote the following letter:—

BAYSWATER, *27th September* 1863.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—I omitted in my last letter to ask you to do all that can be done to further the work of the Foreign Missions, on which Father Vaughan will soon come to Rome.

We have committed to him the work of raising funds for a college; and we trust to have men first for our own house of studies, and then for such a college in a reasonable time.

I have always had a great interest in the Foreign Missions, and have often regretted and wondered that nothing should be done for them by Catholics in England. I felt thus all the more because in old days I had a large and active part in what is attempted elsewhere. I should count it a great grace if the Oblates may realise this work. . . . I had written thus far before your last letter arrived this morning.

You will see that I cordially approve of the work of the Foreign Missions. If I have seemed slow to express myself, it is because all that I have and am is already given to a work, which must take precedence in vital importance. I cannot deviate from it, and I had relied on Father Vaughan to take it up after me and with me, and to have concentrated his energy on our own house of studies and the formation of our own men. We have been only six years in existence; our congregation is not yet confirmed. I am afraid of trying to run before we can walk. It is no easy thing to form a community; very easy to lose its spirit and its unity.

Everything in my power for the Foreign Missions shall be done; but if we relax our work or are distracted from it, we cannot succeed. This is what has made me slow to undertake it. It is a great loss to me to give all Father Vaughan's efforts away in the work in which I need him so much. . . . Yours affectionately, H. E. MANNING.

In another letter Dr. Manning observed, that it is easier to found twenty missions than to establish in permanent efficiency one Community.

None of all the ecclesiastical works which had engaged Manning's attention interested him more deeply than that of establishing or reconstructing seminaries and colleges. His first attempt in this direction, made in 1857, was to reorganise St. Edmund's College, Ware, by introducing his Oblates into the Seminary. Defeated by the action of Bishop Grant and Dr. Errington and the Chapter of West-

minster in this project, Manning with the wonted tenacity of his character, sought to accomplish his ends by other means and in another direction. The first step, soon after the removal of the Oblates from St. Edmund's, was to establish on a small scale a Community house or College in Rome, where the Oblates of St. Charles might finish their studies for the priesthood. This College was placed under the charge of Father O'Callaghan, one of the Oblates removed from St. Edmund's. Having obtained a footing in Rome for his new house, on the ground that in the English College they were unable to observe their Rule or be faithful to the spirit of St. Charles, Manning bided his time and waited for an opportunity of developing his plans. The opportunity came at last. Soon after he was nominated Archbishop of Westminster he set to work. The whole story of reorganising the English College in Rome—the famous College to which many of the candidates for the priesthood in England were sent by the bishops to finish their ecclesiastical training—and of placing it under the management of the Oblates of St. Charles from the Congregation at Bayswater, is clearly told in the letters which passed in the year 1867 between Manning and Mgr. Talbot on the subject. I cannot do better, or in a fashion more brief, than let the two chief actors tell their own story. In one of his letters to Mgr. Talbot, the Archbishop explained as follows the motives which made it imperative on him to improve ecclesiastical education:—

I cannot tell you the dearth of men above the average, or out of the line of routine in this diocese, indeed in England generally. Good, zealous, faithful, unworldly as our priests are, their formation has not lifted them above the old level. We are rapidly coming in contact with public opinion and with society in such a way as to make a new race of men absolutely necessary.

In another letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated 8 York Place, 18th December 1866, Manning wrote as follows:—

What you tell me of the English College is not new to me. I am afraid all you say is true: and I see no cure but the complete remodelling of it. It is a sad thing that our noblest

College should be so little appreciated. One way to improve it would be that the Pope should retain the best students for the College by a Pontifical act. I am looking forward to our meeting; for it is impossible to write fully. . . .—Believe me always affectionately yours, ✠ H. E. M.

Within a few weeks Manning, in a letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated 8 York Place, 19th January 1867, took another step towards developing his plan for reorganising the English College in Rome. After observing that "there remains the greatest work of all for which as yet I have done nothing; nor can, until the funds are divided with Southwark,—I mean ecclesiastical education and a seminary, without which we shall never have a secular clergy that can hold its place," Manning goes on as follows:—

And this brings me to the College in Rome. Why not draw up a scheme for its reorganisation and lay it by the Pope's command before the English bishops in Rome next June?[1] Would not the Sulpicians take it? And can it be used for professors, and not missionaries only? I do not know a man to name for it in England. I say the Sulpicians, because they would not look for subjects; and I hardly know any other Order which would not; and some I know certainly would. . . .—Believe me, affectionately yours, ✠ H. E. M.

To this proposal for the reconstruction of the English College in Rome, Mgr. Talbot, not as yet fully aware of Manning's prejudice against the Jesuits, innocently suggested placing it under the direction of the Society of Jesus.

The English College in Rome had been originally founded by the Jesuits, but on their suppression in 1773, it was placed under the protection of the Pope. Of this famous College for the education of ecclesiastical students from England, Wiseman, who afterwards became its rector, was the most distinguished pupil.

The Pope as protector naturally and as a matter of course, when a vacancy occurred in the rectorship, consulted

[1] It is characteristic of Manning's confidence in Pope Pius IX. to assume that His Holiness would be willing, not only to approve of the scheme for the reorganisation of the English College in Rome, but to issue a command that the proposal should be laid before the English bishops.

the English bishops as to the choice of a successor. In the year 1867, when Manning proposed to reorganise the College, Dr. Neve, appointed on the recommendation of the English bishops, was rector. In the meantime Mgr. Talbot, the Pope's private chamberlain, had become Pro-Protector of the English College. No one, therefore, under the Pope himself, was in a better position than Mgr. Talbot to forward Manning's views and plans.

On receiving Mgr. Talbot's letter about the English College and the Jesuits, Manning developed his ideas more fully on the subject, and while expressing his great liking for the Jesuits, did not think the change suggested by Mgr Talbot expedient, but threw out hints in regard to the sort of rulers required for the good government of the English College. The letter is as follows:—

8 York Place, W., 8*th February* 1867.

My dear Mgr. Talbot— . . . Now for the English College.

I have a great *penchant* for the body you name. They have been in Rome my friends, teachers, and directors. But I should see with anxiety for the secular clergy in England the change we speak of. The reaction upon us here would be unfavourable, and would weaken not strengthen us.

Most especially being as we are without proper seminaries.

I believe that of all the bishops there is only one more friendly to that body than myself; and most would be very strong in their feeling.

Moreover, what is wanted is *three good rulers* like F. O'Callaghan. The qualities needed are to be found, I believe, in England. I will gladly give any man in this diocese if there be one fit. But the real difficulty is their bad *tradition.* If there were a system like the discipline of S. Chiara introduced, the rector, even a common man, would be able to work it. Now the rector is too weak to resist the tradition of liberty and laxity. The mixture of men from so many colleges will always make confusion, till a strong discipline is introduced.

If the Holy Father would do this, and if need be close and reopen it like the Accademia, it might be done. The Apollinare would afford an example of discipline.

We have a fatal notion that Englishmen must be treated *altogether* differently. *Somewhat* perhaps, but in *the main* the same discipline ought to be imposed.—Believe me, always affectionately yours, ✠ H. E. M.

Manning's plans and aims were too far-reaching and intricate to be prudently committed to writing, especially as Mgr. Talbot had shown in his reply that he had not grasped the extent or method of the suggested reorganisation of the English College. Since it was impossible, as Manning said, to write fully on the subject, the discussion was suspended until Manning, who was going to Rome for the celebration of the centenary of St. Peter, was able to explain fully to Mgr. Talbot the precise mode and manner in which the English College in Rome was to be remodelled.

All the English bishops were in Rome for the centenary, but Mgr. Talbot thought it more expedient, for reasons stated in a subsequent letter,[1] to modify, with Manning's consent, the original scheme, and instead of consulting the bishops on the reorganisation of the English College, to carry it behind their backs, as it were, by a *coup d'état.* After their departure in July, Mgr. Talbot in the following letter reported to Manning that the work of reorganising the English College had already been satisfactorily arranged :—

VATICAN, 23*rd July* 1867.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP—. . . You have heard by this time. that Dr. Neve has resigned his post of rector of the English College, and the Pope has named O'Callaghan in his place. I think this a great compliment to the Oblates of St. Charles, although it may cause some murmuring in England.

For the present he will not take possession, as I wish to give Dr. Neve all the time he requires to settle his affairs, and I think that it is better that Father O'Callaghan should start at the commencement of the scholastic year, or rather at the end of October, when the English College returns to Rome.

In the meantime, you will be able to look out for some one to supply his place at St. Nicola. Besides, as the Holy Father said the other day, the young men there are so good that they do not require much to keep them in order.

For the first year O'Callaghan must go on quietly, seeing that the rules and regulations are kept, and studying the characters of the young men. Later on when he has gained a footing, I hope for better things.—Believe me, my dear Archbishop, affectionately yours, GEO. TALBOT.

---

[1] See letter dated 27th September 1867, p. 371.

In another letter, dated 31st August 1867, Mgr. Talbot wrote as follows:—

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP—I have received no answer to my letter in which I informed your Grace that Dr. Neve had, of his own accord, resigned the rectorship of the English College, and that the Holy Father had named Father O'Callaghan his successor. . . . As O'Callaghan is now rector, of course you will take up your quarters in the English College, and we shall be able to do something for the improvement of it. I am aware that the removal of O'Callaghan from St. Nicola, in Arcione, has caused some inconvenience to the Oblates of St. Charles, but, as the Pope said, "They are so good that there is no danger of their getting into mischief." The inconvenience is only for the moment. In a few years you will have plenty of men to dispose of; and it will be for you a great distinction to have the first English ecclesiastical college.

In a letter dated Vatican, 9th September 1867, Mgr. Talbot wrote as follows:—

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP— . . . I attribute your not having written to me to many reasons. *As for the nomination of O'Callaghan I tell every one that you had nothing to do with it, which is quite true. I purposely did not write to you about it, in order that I might say so.*—Adieu. Believe me, affectionately yours,

GEO. TALBOT.

In reply to Mgr. Talbot's allusions, in the letter of 31st August, to his silence Manning wrote as follows:—

8 YORK PLACE, 6*th Sept.* 1867.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—I ought to have written sooner, but I have been very much engaged.

I waited also to see how the change at the English College would be taken.

Little has been said to me, but I find that it has startled some of the bishops, as Newport, Clifton, and, I think, Shrewsbury and Nottingham. But I have heard little except from those who rejoice in Father O'Callaghan's appointment. His removal is a great loss to us; but we all feel that the Holy Father's will and the good of the English College ought to be above all.

Dr. Neve has never written to me; and I have therefore made no communication to the bishops.—Always affectionately yours,

✠ H. E. M.

In the meantime typhus fever had broken out in the small Community house, and the Oblates were sent back to Bayswater. Mgr. Talbot wrote to Manning deprecating the giving up the house in Rome, and advising the return of the Oblates in November. The Pope, he said, had expressed his surprise and sorrow at their closing the house, saying they ought to return after the place had been disinfected. Then Mgr. Talbot added, as a further reason—

Besides, if you give up your house in Rome it would be a great triumph for your enemies. I believe that the permanency and success of your Institute in England depends upon your house in Rome, as it will be its great support whenever Almighty God may take you to a better world.

It is true that the nomination of O'Callaghan to the English College will give great moral importance to the Oblates, as is evident from the feeling it has created in England, but I think both Colleges are of the greatest importance, and that in Rome they will help one another.

8 YORK PLACE, 14*th Sept.* 1867.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—Your letter is just come. Many thanks for it.

Pray assure the Holy Father that the thought of giving up our house in Rome has never crossed me. We have been making provision to send an Oblate to be head under Father O'Callaghan's direction. . . .

As to the English College, the bishops have not spoken further. If any write to you, a full and weighed letter on the whole subject of the English College as a *Pontifical College* would be very important. It is thought to belong to England, not to belong to Rome *for* England.—Always affectionately yours, H. E. MANNING.

Mgr. Talbot began to feel uneasy, as the following letter shows, at the opposition manifested by many of the bishops and clergy to the placing of the English College in Rome under the direction of the Oblates:—

VATICAN, 17*th Sept.* 1867.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP— . . . I hear that some dissatisfaction has been expressed in London about O'Callaghan's appointment, on the grounds of his not having been a student of the English College, and his being an Oblate. I cannot conceive anything more narrow than both objections.

I cannot conceive what benefit it is to the College to have a rector full of the old traditions, or what objection there can be to an Oblate, if he is a good man with ecclesiastical spirit.

One thing is certain. All agree that the state of the English College was not satisfactory, and no one denies that O'Callaghan is a very good man, and fit for the post.

After all the Pope named him, and I know no one who sees through characters better than the Holy Father himself. He saw through Dr. Neve long before I did, and could not conceive why he had been proposed by the English bishops.

A little opposition is a good thing. It is a good sign, as in England they have always the knack to oppose good men. If a nullity or a jolly fellow had been named he would have met with universal approbation. O'Callaghan is gone to Loretto and the Adriatic for a fortnight to prepare him for his new career.—Adieu. Believe me, affectionately yours, GEO. TALBOT.

Monsignor Talbot's description of the man who would have been universally approved of as Rector by the bishops and clergy of England is manifestly something like a calumny, though not uttered in malice,[1] on Archbishop Manning's colleagues in the Episcopate. There is no doubt that many of the bishops, mindful of the attempt made ten years previously to place St. Edmund's Seminary under the direction of the Oblates, resented the nomination, without their knowledge or consent, of an Oblate as Rector of the English College in Rome. The following letter shows Mgr. Talbot's reasons for not communicating to the bishops the contemplated changes in the English College :—

VATICAN, 27*th Sept.* 1867.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP—. . . I am told that some of the English bishops are not pleased with the way in which O'Callaghan has been named Rector of the English College. A *coup d'état* was absolutely necessary. If I had written to your Grace requesting you to *interpellare* the English bishops about a fit person, they would have recommended some respectable old priest whom they want to get rid of; and if they proposed him, it would be difficult to reject him, as was the case with Dr. Neve, of whom Dr. Clifford had become tired. If I had asked you to name one yourself, all the odium would have fallen on your shoulders, whereas it has fallen on mine. More I see of

[1] Mgr. Talbot's bark was worse than his bite. It was like that of a faithful watchdog carefully trained to bark at his master's "enemies."

O'Callaghan, more am I convinced that he is the right man in the right place. He is quite well, and will take the reins of the College when the students return from Monte Porzio. Dr. Neve is awfully sulky, but he really has no hardship to complain of. He has brought it all on himself.—Believe me, yours affectionately,

GEO. TALBOT.

Bent on pursuing a policy of conciliation towards his fellow-bishops—the re-opening of an era of peace and good-will, as he had described it—Manning was placed in a difficult position. Knowing that the obnoxious nomination was attributed to him, he carefully abstained from committing himself in any way, and did not even communicate to the bishops the appointment of Father O'Callaghan as Rector of the English College in Rome. On finding, however, that silence only increased "the amount of murmuring," and that Mgr. Talbot's chivalrous act of taking the odium on his own shoulders did not find general credence, Archbishop Manning wrote an urgent letter to his friend in need at the Vatican, begging him to write an official letter announcing the nomination of Father O'Callaghan; or, better still, induce the Pope to direct Propaganda to send a formal announcement. Archbishop Manning's letter is as follows:—

8 YORK PLACE, W., 25*th September* 1867.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—Though I wrote to-day, I write again to suggest that a letter should be written to me either by you or through Propaganda, officially notifying the change at the English College, and giving, in so far as is thought right, in general the motives of the change.

I will then print it and send it to the bishops.

What I find they complain of is chiefly the *manner* in which it has been done.

Of course they do not like—

1. The appointment of an Irish name.
2. Of an Oblate.

But they complain—

1. That they never heard of it.
2. That it must have been decided while they were in Rome but that it was kept from them.

I have told them that this is incorrect.

3. That no notice was given to them.
4. That Dr. Neve's resignation was not spontaneous.

Also some one has written, saying that Dr. Neve had from you the statement "that the change was intentionally so made that the bishops should not know of it."

I said that I was sure that you had said that, as the Pope intended to act of his own power, it was thought best to do so without raising any discussion.

I think a calm and full letter, entering into the needs and state of the English College, will be of MUCH USE.

It would be far better if the Holy Father saw fit to direct Mgr. Capalti to write in Latin. You would then be covered by the highest authority. I have a strong wish for this, and a strong conviction that the advice is good.—Always affectionately yours,

✠ H. E. M.

In reply to this appeal Mgr. Talbot wrote two letters, one private, the other official. The private letter is as follows:—

VATICAN, 3*rd October* 1867.

MY DEAR DR. MANNING—By this post I send you an official letter announcing to you the nomination of Father O'Callaghan as Rector to the English College. If you remember, immediately he was nominated I wrote to your Grace a friendly letter telling you so, in order that you might with your usual prudence communicate the fact to your suffragans. As, however, you wish to have an official letter from me, I have sent it to you by this post. It will reach you in time, because Dr. Neve does not resign his government of the College for ten days.

Failing to obtain, as Manning had suggested, a formal announcement of O'Callaghan's nomination from Propaganda, Mgr. Talbot wrote the following official letter:—

VATICAN, 1*st October* 1867.

MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP—As I have received information from various quarters that some of the English bishops are displeased at the manner in which Father O'Callaghan has been nominated Rector of the English College, I write to your Grace begging you to communicate my letter to their lordships.

In the first place, I must say I am much grieved if I have offended them, as I never intended to do anything that might give them offence, and I am very sorry if I have given them the slightest pain.

The plain history of the appointment is as follows:—For several years so many complaints from various quarters, even from bishops have reached my ears about the internal discipline of the English College, that I wrote to Dr. Neve a friendly

letter to say that I wished to speak to him upon the subject. His answer to me was that he wished me to dismiss him at once for incompetency, and that he only asked for a fortnight to make up his accounts.

As it was the third occasion on which he had expressed his desire to leave the College, I replied that in justice to himself I could not think of acting in this manner, but that if he wished to resign, he had a good opportunity for doing so to the Pope himself, as he had already asked for an audience to present one of the students.

After his audience, Dr. Neve wrote to me to say that he had given in his resignation to the Holy Father, and that His Holiness had answered that he would not accept it until he had spoken to me on the subject.

When I saw the Holy Father, he told me that Dr. Neve had made a full confession of his incompetency to govern the College, and asked me whether I thought he ought to accept his resignation. I replied in the affirmative. He then asked me whom in Rome he could name as his successor, and I suggested Father O'Callaghan as the only English priest in Rome fit for the post. Instantly he approved of the choice, and I asked him to authorise me to send the *biglietto*, which he accordingly did.

I therefore called on Dr. Neve, and told him that the Holy Father had accepted his resignation, and had named Father O'Callaghan in his stead. Dr. Neve received the announcement very well, and said that Father O'Callaghan would do very well, much better than himself.

The reason why I proposed Father O'Callaghan to the Holy Father was simply because he is an excellent priest, and is highly esteemed by His Holiness. For eighteen years he has lived in St. Edmund's College, and therefore fully understands college life. His government of the Oblates at S. Nicola has been a complete success. He speaks Italian very fairly, and is very popular with all the authorities here. He is young and active, and I feel convinced will be most attentive to all the commissions given him by the bishops.

Besides, I have so long been tormented with complaints about the English College, even from England, that if I am to remain Pro-Protector, I felt I ought to have some one as rector in whom I have full confidence.

As a report has got abroad that all this was planned whilst the bishops were in Rome, I must declare that the report is void of foundation, and that all took place as I mentioned above.

One thing I regret not having done, namely, not writing officially to the bishops to notify the appointment to them, but

I do not remember this having been done on other occasions, and Dr. Neve told me that he intended to write to them all himself.

If in any other way I have given offence to their lordships, it is entirely unintentional on my part, as I should regret very much having done so.—Believe me, my dear Lord Archbishop, your Grace's obedient and faithful servant,

GEORGE TALBOT.

In accordance with strict official forms, Mgr. Talbot notified to Archbishop Manning Father O'Callaghan's nomination in the following letter:—

VATICAN, *3rd October* 1867.

MY LORD ARCHBISHOP—I write to inform your Grace that in consequence of the resignation of Dr. Neve, His Holiness has named the Very Rev. Henry O'Callaghan his successor as Rector of the English College in Rome. I request your Grace to communicate the official notice to their lordships your suffragan bishops, as shortly he will enter upon the government of the College.—I have the honour to be your Grace's obedient humble servant,

GEORGE TALBOT,
Delegate-Protector of the English College.

The reply of Archbishop Manning was as follows:—

8 YORK PLACE, *5th October* 1867.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—Your two letters are come. That to the bishops will be copied and sent round at once. It is very straightforward and strong.

The amount of murmuring here is endless—not on this subject only—but on everything. I add, in strict confidence, that the centre of it is at Birmingham. Everything runs to this point—the Oxford question, Newman, Ward, the *Dublin Review*, English College, you, me, everything. The restless nature of that mind is reproducing what harassed the last years of the Cardinal.[1]—Always affectionately yours, ✠ H. E. M.

In spite of opposition Manning gained the day. His Oblates, whom ten years previously he had failed to impose on St. Edmund's Seminary, were now established in the English College in Rome.[2]

[1] The restless nature alluded to was that of Dr. Ullathorne, the Bishop of Birmingham.

[2] As a matter of fact, Father O'Callaghan was Rector only in name. The English College was carried on under the directions of Archbishop Manning himself, with the assistance of Mgr. Talbot.

In his turn Mgr. Talbot took up in reply the parable against poor Dr. Ullathorne, the Bishop of Birmingham, as follows:—

A correspondent has written to ask me whether the reason why I accepted Dr. Neve's resignation was because he was a *Newmanite*. The idea never crossed through my mind. My only reason was because I was put out by the complaints made of the internal discipline of the English College. I hear, however, that Birmingham is the focus of all these reports. Dr. Ullathorne has never forgiven me for the part I took in the Oxford question.

In the following letters Mgr. Talbot sent cheerful reports to the Archbishop, seasoned with abuse of Dr. Neve:—

13*th November* 1867.

You will be glad to hear that already there is visible improvement in the English College. A change was absolutely necessary. . . . Dr. Neve is going about Rome[1] grumbling as usual, and attributes motives which do not exist.

In reply, Manning said jocosely, "Never mind the arch-grumbler, but do not send him to H..v.n."

26*th November* 1867.

The English College is going on very well. Every day I am finding out things about Dr. Neve which show his complete incompetency for so important a work. The Holy Father has made O'Callaghan Doctor, as it is necessary that the Rector should have that title.

Archbishop Manning replied as follows:—

I am rejoiced about the English College. This is our hope. Make some men fit to be professors, vicar-generals, and bishops, and we may get seminaries here. I would not send a mere missionary to fill up the English College.

Then, in condoling with Mgr. Talbot about grumblers and the want of high appreciation among English Catholics, Manning added—

This I meet every day. We have also among us some ill-tempers who sow discord and discontent in everything. But it will do no harm at last. It is only hard to bear patiently.

In the following letter Mgr. Talbot reported:—

[1] In compensation for his removal from the English College, and as a mark of confidence, the English bishops appointed Dr. Neve their agent in Rome.

28*th February* 1868.

The English College is going on very well, and Dr. O'Callaghan is gaining ground. Four of the English Bishops tell me that they are very glad to hear of the improvements in the English College. I find now that only three of them were really offended—Newport, Clifton, and Birmingham; the rest did not care about it, as they were convinced of the incapacity of Dr. Neve. The putting a stop to the plays was a good move. The students took it very well, but O'Callaghan made up for it in other ways. He pulls very well with his two Vice-Rectors, and there is peace and good humour in the College. Now that it is in so satisfactory a state, I hope that more of the converts will come to the Collegio Pio.[1] If later there is a general move in England, and many Anglican clergymen become Catholics, it will be a great godsend for them to have such a place to go to.

"The putting down of the vulgar and mischievous acting of plays" in the English College was at all events a veritable godsend to an austere prelate like Archbishop Manning, who, dating from his Anglican days, had a holy horror of the stage and of every form and fashion of acting. In the following passage of a letter, dated 4th March 1868, Manning thanks Mgr. Talbot for his firmness:—

I am most thankful about the English College, and that you had the firmness to put down the vulgar and mischievous acting of plays. This will begin a new spirit.

These last words, spoken in joy of heart by Manning, bring to a close the story of the setting-up the Oblates in the English College in Rome.[2]

In default of a Catholic University, and in the view of preventing Catholics from frequenting the national Universities, Manning's fertile brain conceived the idea of establishing a lay Academy in Rome. In a letter to Cardinal Wiseman, dated 28 Via del Tritone, 19th January 1864, Manning described his plan as follows:—

[1] The Collegio Pio was an inner department of the English College, a kind of superior seminary. It had but a shadowy existence, and, on Mgr. Talbot's leaving Rome, was closed for want of funds.

[2] Almost all the passages recited from Mgr. Talbot's letters were scored in red ink by Cardinal Manning as giving the history of the nomination of Father O'Callaghan.

MY DEAR CARDINAL— . . . As an appendix to n y last letter about an University, why should not some priest open here in Rome an Academia for young Englishmen till we have an University ? *i.e.* for the richer, *e.g.* Welds, Blundells, etc. Such a place would be very well liked here.

It would make our youths good Catholics.

They would have many advantages of study.

They would enter the English society on more than *equal terms* here, and would fix relations which could not be as well formed in England. The English would seek them here instead of being sought by them as in London.

They might have a long vacation from July 1 to Nov. 1, so as to avoid the heat.

I cannot but think that this would be a practicable plan. If the five or six youths who are now thinking of going to Oxford were to unite, there would be money enough to take the Palazzo Poli, or some such place. And my impression is that the Catholic families would rejoice at the idea.

And I think the Holy Father would like to have the young lay English about him.

Of course this would only be feasible for the richer; but they are those for whom the social argument for Oxford and Cambridge is thought to be strongest.

Let me know what you think about this, and whether to broach it.[1] . . .—Believe me, my dear Lord Cardinal, your very affectionate servant, H. E. MANNING.

Manning's acute mind must have been singularly blinded by his prejudices against Oxford and Cambridge, or perhaps still more, by the idea of a Catholic hall under Newman, to have suggested such an exotic plan as practicable, or for a moment to have imagined that English Catholic families would prefer, for the education of their sons, a new lay College in Rome to the ancient Universities of England. Another point, which was the basis of the plan, is still more startling as coming from so strict and severe a disciplinarian as Manning. It was proposed that the

[1] The following passage in the above letter is not without interest :—

"This will start to you on St. Agnes's day. I shall try to make a visit there for you. We shall not have such a St. Agnes as you tell of in *Fabiola*, no first harbinger of spring, but a most resolute and intense cold. Old Triton is shaggy with icicles, and looks as if he had lumbago, sciatica, and all forms of rheumatism in the small of his back. The photographers were at him on Monday morning."

young Englishmen attending the College should not only be allowed but encouraged to enter the English society in Rome; that is to say, attend its receptions, balls, dinner-parties, and to frequent with their English acquaintances, almost as a matter of course, the opera house or the theatres. What effects would such a laxity of discipline, utterly unknown in the English Universities, have on the studies of the students, or on their character and conduct? Such a question does not seem to have disturbed Manning's mind.

In a subsequent letter to Cardinal Wiseman, Manning said—

> Edmund Stonor will speak about the idea of a Catholic Academia in Rome for laymen. I have told him that it is just the work for him, and I think he likes the idea. He is well suited for it, and the English Catholics would trust him.

That was a perfectly accurate statement. Mgr. Stonor, now his Grace the Archbishop of Trebizond, enjoyed at that time, as he does to this day, the esteem and confidence of the Catholics of England. His independence of character, sound judgment, and courage did good service to the Catholic laity of England — and especially to Father Newman, venerated and beloved of all men, Catholics and non-Catholics alike — at a time when adverse criticisms and charges, preferred against them in private, had made such headway in Rome.

Mgr. Stonor, true to his independent character, did not at once accept all the statements made to him, but with wonted foresight made it his business to consult the leading Catholic laity in England as to their views in regard to the proposed College in Rome, and to obtain the opinion of priests most experienced in the work of education. This independent inquiry led to a conclusion adverse to Manning's proposal. Among those whom Mgr. Stonor consulted was Canon Oakeley. At the suggestion of Mgr. Stonor, Canon Oakeley explained his views in the following letter:—

> St. John's, Islington, 12*th Feb.* 1864.
>
> Dear Monsignore Stonor—When I met you at the Cardinal's the other evening, you were so good as to ask my

opinion upon a suggestion which you told me had been made at Rome for the education of the higher classes of the English Catholic laity. The suggestion, if I understood you correctly, is as follows :—to establish a College at Rome under the direction of an English priest, and with the assistance of others who are acquainted with the system of our Universities as well as of competent foreign professors. I understood you to say that a vacation would be allowed of equal length with that which prevails at Oxford and Cambridge, in order to give the students the opportunity of rejoining their friends in England for a considerable portion of the year. You told me also, I think, that considerable liberty would, according to the plan suggested, be allowed to the students even when at College with the view of enabling them to mix freely with the best Roman society. You mentioned it as a principal recommendation of this plan, that it would be likely to obviate the dangers which might result from sending Catholics to the Universities in this country, by giving the rising generation of our aristocracy the advantage of imbibing the faith and spirit of the Church at their fountain head.

As you are so good as to think my opinion on the subject worth having, it is due to you that I should give it fully and freely, and after reviewing the proposition in all its bearings more deliberately than I was able to do during the brief conversation in which you described it to me.

The proposition seemed to admit of being regarded in two points of view. First, as to its probable success; and, secondly, as to its abstract desirableness.

With regard to the former of these questions you, who live in the midst of the Catholic aristocracy and can ascertain its opinions and feelings without danger of mistake, must be a far better judge than a priest of retired habits like myself. From the little I have heard on the subject, whether from parents themselves, or from those well acquainted with them, I should be surprised to hear that they were favourable to the suggestion, as compared with the plan of sending young men to the English Universities. For I have always understood that the association with Protestants of their own age and rank which the plan you mention would not only preclude, but is meant to preclude, was one of the principal reasons for which the English Universities are preferred. I am not inquiring whether this reason be good or bad, but merely saying that it exists, and that as far as it does so, it will, as I imagine, operate against the suggestion in question.

Next—as to the plan itself. I entertain very strongly the

opinion that whatever advantages Rome possesses for the education of priests, our English laity, especially of the higher classes, ought to be educated in this country. I think, indeed, that the probability of their exercising a beneficial influence upon the mind of the country depends mainly upon their spending within its boundaries the most important period of their education and early training. I confess, too, that I should not anticipate any great advantages in an educational point of view from such a plan as you say has been suggested; nor can I think that when its real character has been sifted, it will be felt that we should be conferring any benefit upon a foreign city, and least of all upon a city with the strict views of education which prevail at Rome, by introducing into it a College under such very lax regulations of discipline as those which would admit of the students mixing as freely with the society of the place as I understood was proposed as part of the plan in question. It is true that this is a consideration for the Roman authorities rather than for us; but if they look favourably upon the suggestion, I cannot but think that it must be because they are not as yet aware of the full bearing of the case. At any rate, my own feeling is that if we are to make a new experiment in the line of education, we ought to advance upon the discipline of Oxford and Cambridge, and not to fall below it. Still it may be said, What are we to do to meet a want which is coming to be very extensively felt in the higher classes of Catholic society? . . .

P.S.—You will, of course, make any use of this letter which may seem to you desirable.—Believe me, dear Monsignore Stonor, yours very faithfully, FREDERICK OAKELEY.

The Hon. and Very Rev. Monsignore Stonor.

Canon Oakeley suggested, as the best solution to the difficulty of providing for the higher education of English Catholics, the establishment of a Catholic hall at Oxford under the direction of the Jesuits.

Such a proposal was naturally resented by Manning; but his own scheme of a lay College in Rome was nipped in the bud by the cold breath of adverse criticism.

If, during his Anglican life, in the prime of his manhood, it was difficult to keep count of Archdeacon Manning's varied labours in every direction, it is even a still more arduous task to follow or chronicle the almost infinite

variety of works large and small in which he was engaged as a Catholic. Founding churches and missions, colleges and seminaries, elementary and industrial schools, reformatory and poor-law schools certified by the Government, and homes and orphanages, did not fill up the time or exhaust the almost inexhaustible energies of the Archbishop of Westminster. He was ever on the alert. Whatever work his quick eye detected his quicker hand carried out. He imparted by force of example some of his restless activity to those about him. He kept his Reverend and Very Reverend secretaries on their office-stools from morning to night without pity or remorse. Living for work himself, and loving it, he taught them to love work not mainly out of obedience or sense of duty, but for its own sake.[1]

Archbishop's House, Westminster, if not, as from its sombre and gloomy aspect it often seemed to the casual observer, a Workhouse, was at any rate a house of work. Following the example of his illustrious predecessor, who, in 1858, had secured from the Tory Government—mainly by the public action of the Catholic laity, under the leadership of Mr. Langdale—an official position with rank and pay for Catholic chaplains to the army and navy, Manning set to work to obtain like spiritual rights as those already granted to Catholic soldiers and sailors for the Catholic inmates of prisons and workhouses. He differed, however, from the mode of action which had succeeded in obtaining official recognition of the principle that Catholics, whether in the

[1] The Right Rev. Canon Johnson is a living embodiment of Manning's principle of loving work for its own sake. Knowing that his friend and secretary had for a long spell of years taken no holiday, Cardinal Manning, five years before his death, insisted on Canon Johnson's going away forthwith on a proper vacation. The following morning, accordingly, the reluctant Canon started on his journey, but on arriving at the station he remembered that some intricate business required immediate attention. On coming down to dinner Cardinal Manning found his secretary happy and smiling in his accustomed seat, and shaking his finger at him said, "I did not know, Canon Johnson, that you were such an obstinate man. Then, adding with a smile, "You are more self-willed even than I am."

In 1866 Dr. Johnson was appointed secretary. In a letter to Mgr. Talbot Manning wrote as follows:—"I have taken Dr. Johnson as secretary. He is very efficient and has much ecclesiastical knowledge. I mean to have another training up under him."

army or navy, or in prisons and workhouses, were entitled to equal rights and privileges to those enjoyed under similar circumstances by their Protestant fellow-countrymen.

Archbishop Manning deprecated public meetings at the Stafford Club or elsewhere, or the presentation of Catholic petitions to Parliament, or deputations of laymen to ministers in support of Catholic rights or interests. He feared lest such public action on the part of Catholics might excite anti-Catholic bigotry and provoke a counter agitation. For the removal of Catholic grievances he relied on his personal influence with ministers, notably with Mr. Gladstone, with whom at this period he had renewed friendly relations. One of the results of the Archbishop's line of action was that the Catholic laity abstained from public action in furtherance of Catholic interests. No meetings were held except for religious or charitable objects. The exclusive guidance of Catholic public affairs rested in the hands of the Archbishop.

But no responsibility was too heavy for Manning. He gladly dispensed with aid or advice. No work was beyond his strength or activity. He possessed, moreover, the gift of persuasiveness, or the art of conciliation, in the highest degree. He brought this power to bear on Ministers. The Prison Ministers Act was passed, enabling the Governor to appoint and pay a Catholic chaplain; and an Act giving permission to the Boards of Guardians to transfer Catholic children from the workhouse schools, where they were brought up as Protestants, to Catholic schools. The vice of this legislation was that it was permissive only, and not compulsory. The result was that relief to Catholic prisoners and to the children in workhouses was in too many instances refused or delayed for years. Four or five years after the passing of the Prison Ministers Act, in twenty-five out of thirty-five prisons the Act had not been put in force. The Boards of Guardians were far more difficult to deal with than the prison authorities. It needed all Archbishop Manning's firmness and moderation to make an impression on their stolid bigotry. After many conferences, letters, and appeals to their sense of justice, and to the

duty of economy—for the children educated in Catholic schools cost much less than in the workhouse schools—the majority of the Boards of Guardians at last, after a long and tedious conflict of many years, consented to transfer Catholic children to certified Catholic schools.

But before Manning had taken up the responsible office of Archbishop, works of another order engaged his attention and stimulated his zeal. In the year 1861 Cardinal Wiseman established a learned society after the pattern of the Roman Academy of Letters, called the Academia of the Catholic Religion.[1] In a letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated Bayswater, 4th June 1861, Manning wrote as follows:—

> You will be glad to hear that the Academia is flourishing well. I have invited more than sixty of our best men; two only have hesitated, but neither refused. We shall hold our first meeting on the Feast of St. Peter and St. Paul at the Cardinal's House. He will give an Inaugural Address, putting it under the patronage of the Patrons of the Holy See.
>
> I hope before long to be able to report the cessation of the *Rambler*. We shall probably make some public demonstration about it.

The business of the Academia is during the session to assemble once a month, when its members read papers on divinity, philosophy, history, and like subjects, treated from a Catholic standpoint. Men of eminence in theology, science, or literature, belonging to the Roman Academia or other learned societies in Rome were enrolled as honorary members. In its early days, after the reading of the papers a conversation followed, in which members discussed and criticised the papers read. At times the discussion was lively. Sharp criticisms were heard, and serious differences of opinion arose, and Archbishop Manning, perhaps too morbidly sensitive as to differences or disputes among Catholics, put a stop as president to the practice of discus-

[1] To the readers of the severe strictures contained in Manning's letters to Mgr. Talbot on the *Rambler* and its chief writers, Sir John Acton and Mr. Simpson, and the anathemas uttered against Father Newman for his alleged support of the obnoxious *Review*, it may seem somewhat curious that Sir John Acton and Mr. Simpson were invited to become members of the Academia, and that the former was even appointed one of the censors.

sion. What the Academia gained in unanimity of opinion it lost in attractiveness. The attendance fell off, and the art of criticism was lost or merged in an eulogistic vote of thanks to the reader of the paper, both proposer and seconder being named by the president. Three volumes of *Essays and Reviews by various Writers*, edited by Archbishop Manning, were published, 1865-74.

Another responsibility of a literary kind which Manning took upon his not even yet overburdened shoulders, was the proprietorship of the *Dublin Review*, which in 1862 Cardinal Wiseman transferred to him. In a letter dated St. Mary of the Angels, Bayswater, 8th September 1862, Dr. Manning wrote as follows:—

My dear Lord Cardinal—May I ask your Eminence to write me a note stating that you transfer the *Dublin Review* to me. It will enable me more firmly to take the necessary steps.

I am to see Duffy on Wednesday.—Believe me always, your very affectionate servant, H. E. Manning.

P.S.—Our Lady has brought us a covey of converts. Some excellent ones.

After offering the editorship to one or two who declined the arduous task, it was offered by Manning to Dr. Ward, who accepted it. The *Review*, however, was placed under strict ecclesiastical censorship; and for further security Manning reserved to himself the right of supreme supervision. Mr. Ward told me on one occasion that after articles of his had passed successfully through the ordeal of the ecclesiastical censors, Manning would at times come down upon him on the sudden and suppress as inopportune an article already in type. On the *Dublin Review* passing into the hands of Dr. Manning in 1862, Cardinal Wiseman ceased to have any authority over the Catholic Quarterly, which, with the aid of Mr. Quin and O'Connell, he had established in 1836, or any connection with it. In an article on the death of Cardinal Wiseman, entitled "Memorial," in the April number, 1865, of the *Dublin Review*, Dr. Manning wrote as follows:—

In the last two years since it (the *Dublin Review*) passed into other hands, the declining health of our lamented Cardinal com-

pelled him to postpone again and again the kind and encouraging promises he made to us of contributions from his pen. No line written by him has therefore appeared in it; and though most kindly watched and approved by him, this *Review* has had no other relation to, or dependence on our most eminent pastor.

In the first number of the new series, July 1863, Dr. Manning inaugurated the fresh start of his Quarterly Review by an able and interesting article entitled, "The Work and Wants of the Catholic Church in England." In the course of this article Dr. Manning expressed with force and clearness his views on the Oxford University question, and opposed with vigour the education of Catholics at the National Universities.

Manning imposed on Dr. Ward, the new editor of the *Dublin Review*, the most conciliatory of programmes.

One of the main objects which Dr. Manning had in view in acquiring possession of the *Dublin Review* was to have at his disposal a ready organ in the press to defend the Temporal Power of the Pope—a subject then uppermost in his thoughts. He wished, also, by means of the *Dublin Review*, to set right or rebuke those Catholics, priests and laymen, who did not fall in with his views about the Temporal Power—"The conflict about the Temporal Power was one of the chief events of this time," as Cardinal Manning has recorded in a Note, "in which some of our priests and laymen first went wrong."

The editor of the *Dublin Review* fulfilled both these ends to perfection after his own style. The series of articles on the Temporal Power of the Pope first brought Dr. Ward into note among Catholics; for his work as Teacher of Dogmatic Theology at St. Edmund's was unknown beyond the walls of the College. His extreme views about the Temporal Power soon provoked opposition; his dogmatic assumption of authority, and his intolerant denunciations of all those Catholics who would not accept his extravagant theories on the extent and nature of Papal infallibility, as well as about the Temporal Power, were bitterly resented. Not his extreme views about what he called "the civil

princedom of the Pope," nor his still more extravagant and absurd theories extending the infallibility of the Pope to every Encyclical letter, and even to letters addressed to individuals, excited the indignation of the majority of English Catholics half so much as the unbecoming attacks in the *Dublin Review* on Father Newman, in which the illustrious Oratorian was denounced as a minimiser of Catholic doctrines. That such intemperate and offensive articles were not suppressed, even if only as inopportune, excited not a little surprise and wide-spread regret. But the possession of the *Dublin Review* did not suffice for Archbishop Manning's purposes. It was only a Quarterly organ. The *Month*, edited with singular ability by the late Father Coleridge, S.J., had a far wider influence and did much to keep in check and counteract Archbishop Manning's *Review*. The *Tablet* was a perpetual thorn in his side, as the following letter to Mgr. Talbot shows:—

8 York Place, *4th March* 1866.

My dear Mgr. Talbot—Many thanks for your last letter. The assurances contained in it are very acceptable to me, for I have much on my hands, and I know that if I am to do my work I shall have much to go through. All I desire is to be understood and truly represented, and the reliance I have in your uprightness and friendliness, together with the consciousness that every word and act of mine is covered by the express declarations of the Holy See, is my peace.

I will now say a string of things and then return to this point.[1] . . .

What you say of the *Tablet* is most true. In one of his letters Dr. Cullen said that one chief difficulty in uniting the English and Irish bishops is the *Tablet*. It has been again attacking the Archbishop of Cashel; and it has been covertly writing against me. The articles in the penultimate and antepenultimate Nos. on the mode of conducting Catholic affairs are directed against my *supposed* line. Mr. Wallis, Ryley, Swift, and one or two more of the Stafford Club, assume to deal with

---

[1] In the above letter Manning said:—"I have paid £55 to your account in Pall Mall. The £5 are for you; for I have put you to expense by telegrams, and I beg you to let me know any expense for printing the Pastoral. I much wish that it should be printed, as I can receive any corrections or directions as to the line to take." . . .

Catholic questions, and to know better than anyone when public meetings are to be held, deputations sent to Government, etc.; and, if crossed, out come attacks in the *Tablet*. They are writing up Dr. Newman in a way so marked as to show their intention; and they are helping the formation of an *English* party which will again divide the English and Irish Catholics, and the English Catholics among themselves. The Redemptorists are writing from Ireland to F. Coffin to remonstrate. Finally, the party, without any communication to the Bishop of Southwark or to me, at once sent in a Deputation of thirty to Lord Derby to beg him not to oppose the Oaths Bill. He said that if the Catholics would pledge themselves to his amendments he would pledge his party not to oppose. His amendments were, to introduce (1) the Act of Settlement which binds the Crown to Protestantism, and (2) the Royal Supremacy. They came away in exultation, and sent Sir G. Bowyer and Mr. Langdale to me. I and the Bishop of S. answered that we could give no judgment (1) without seeing the wording of the Oath, (2) without consultation with the bishops, (3) that we could in no way recognise the principle of Lord Derby's two amendments. Meanwhile this most imprudent Deputation has done more to rouse opposition to the Oaths Bill as a *Catholic* measure than anything else could.[1] Now I shall bring this before the bishops in Low Week. The Bishop of Southwark and I are acting in the most perfect agreement. But the unpopularity will fall on me. And you must be prepared for it on this and on the subject of the Jesuits.[2] Oakeley is thick with them and "Grumbler." But he is much changed for the better—and other subjects in which I have published and applied laws of positive necessity, *e.g.* as to mixed marriages, which the dear Cardinal in his last years shrunk

---

[1] In a subsequent letter Manning referred to the passing without opposition or excitement of the Oaths Bill—a measure of Catholic relief, for it superseded the obnoxious oath imposed on Catholics—as evidence of the ground which Catholics were gaining in England.

[2] The unlucky Jesuits were a fertile subject of discussion between Manning and Mgr. Talbot. Manning especially resented the fact that the chief Catholic laymen found sympathy and support from the Jesuits in their independent political action. Mgr. Talbot shared this resentment to the full, and was angry at the unpopularity provoked by Manning's opposition to the Jesuits, as the following extract from a letter about this date shows:—"When I was in London I did not speak to you about Father Gallwey and the Jesuits. They are exercising in London a most pernicious influence which ought to be counteracted. All the chief Catholic laymen, bound hand and foot, have fallen into their hands. Poor Father Gallwey is an ambitious man. The motto of the Jesuits ought to be changed from *ad majorem Dei gloriam* to *ad majorem Societatis gloriam*."

from. But I have the full and firm support of all whose judgment is of real weight.

You speak truly of the acts of the Holy Father towards England, and the little response.[1] I have been trying to get the St. Peter's pence in my mission. *Half the Missions* have not even *answered* my circular and official letter.

Nevertheless we are a hundred years in advance of Milner's days. We have only a feeble *lay* democracy, and a Stafford instead of a Cisalpine Club. I have no fear; but we shall have difficult and dangerous times, for our *good* men are so little alive to the principles which are at stake that they are carried away, and everything Roman is thought extravagant and Italian. And in this I grieve to think that Dr. N. has thrown all his weight the wrong way. The Home and Foreign School and the Union are both using his name. I send you a book of Ward's on the authority of Encyclicals. It is ably done and is the sole and only book we have on the subject. This it is that has brought on him the charge of extravagance. But I am confident that in Rome it will not be thought so. It is necessary that you should know the truth about him, for he has done a service beyond any other in this line. . . .

P.S.—Politics look dark. I never knew Government and Parliament so confused since William IV. If things go peacefully it will be a great crisis for us. If there is any rising in Ireland we may easily have a dangerous reaction against Catholics in England. I hope you are well.—Always affectionately yours,

✠ H. E. M.

The *Tablet* was foredoomed. In publicly attacking Archbishop Cullen, in covertly writing against Manning's mode of conducting Catholic affairs, and in writing up Dr. Newman, the *Tablet* had written its own death warrant, as the event shows.

A few passages from some of Archbishop Manning's letters will suffice to indicate his relations with the *Tablet*. In a letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated 13th Feb. 1886, is the following passage:—

The *Tablet* is one of Dr. Cullen's difficulties, and it does not like me. But I am trying to get Wallis out of his narrow

---

[1] Mgr. Talbot had written saying, "The Pope has established the Hierarchy, placing Cardinal Wiseman at its head, removed Dr. Errington, and made you Archbishop, and yet the Catholics of England show no gratitude for these three gifts."

Toryism, at least as regards Catholic questions. In the rest he may be as he likes.

P.S.—At the Oratory they gave £50 for St. Thomas. I am longing to hear what the Holy Father said.

Another, in a letter dated Whitmonday 1866, is as follows:—

Dr. Cullen and I are acting in complete good understanding, and are therefore equally detested by the *Tablet*.[1]

In a letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated The Oratory, St. Philip's Day 1866, Archbishop Manning wrote as follows:—

We have a knot of hot-headed party-men, who will do nothing except as a party move. This is at the bottom of the attack in the *Tablet* on the Hospital in Great Ormond Street, and its silence on the things about which you chiefly care. It is nurturing an English, national, secular spirit. Its chief object of attack is Archbishop Cullen of Dublin, and before long I shall be the next. I write this in strict confidence, that you may understand it and not tease about it.

In another letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated 18th May 1866, Manning wrote—"Do not be frightened at the *Tablet*. It is all going wrong, but will do no real harm." Again, under date 27th November 1866—"I have much to tell you, but it must wait. We have had a very critical and unpleasant affair with Mr. Wallis of the *Tablet*."

After a futile attempt to combine existing Catholic papers under independent lay direction into one great organ placed under supreme ecclesiastical control, negotiations were opened up to purchase the *Tablet*, which, owing to adventitious circumstances, had been greatly reduced in circulation as well as in public influence.

Mr. Wallis, Manning's ancient opponent, was not loath to be quit of his responsibility; and thus it came to pass

[1] In the above letter Manning avowed that he and Dr. Cullen and the Bishop of Southwark were of like mind in regarding the overthrow of the Whigs then in office as a calamity to Ireland. It was, perhaps, not unnatural for the *Tablet*, a paper representing Catholic Tories, to resent such a close alliance between Cardinal Cullen and Archbishop Manning to keep the Whigs in office.

that the *Tablet*, which for well-nigh fifty years had been under independent lay management, passed, in 1868, into ecclesiastical hands. Archbishop Manning, who was keenly alive to the influence of the press, Catholic and non-Catholic, had now practically in his possession two organs, the *Dublin Review* and the *Tablet*, on which he could implicitly rely to represent his principles and advocate his views in Rome as well as in England.

In politics—but his politics in the main were ecclesiastic—Manning's mind was as busy and his hand as active as in every other department of work. In those days he was an uncompromising upholder of the Temporal Power of the Pope, and an unflinching opponent of the Revolution alike in Italy and in Ireland.

In the interests of the Temporal Power and of Ireland Archbishop Manning gave his tacit support to the Whigs, who were in office in 1866, as the following letter to Mgr. Talbot shows:—

THE ORATORY, *St. Philip's Day*, 1866.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT— . . . Next as to politics. I think it well that you should know—

1. That Dr. Cullen writes, saying that the overthrow of the present Government would be a calamity to Ireland.

2. That he used his influence to prevent their overthrow.

3. That Bishop Grant and I are fully of the same mind though we did nothing.

4. That so long as these men are in office they are very unlikely to meddle with Italy again. I have said to two of the Cabinet that if they do, Ireland will rise against them at once. One of these repeated what I said to the others.

5. That if they were out of office, and therefore irresponsible, they certainly would agitate the question as a cry against the Conservatives.

I have no party politics either way, but would oppose both parties, or support either when they act justly to the Holy See and to our poor.—Always yours affectionately, ✠ H. E. M

In a letter dated 30th April 1866, Manning wrote as follows:—

The papers will tell you our politics. The crisis is most favourable to us. The Irish members saved the Government on

Saturday, and the Government will honestly do all it can for us. Be sure of one thing. If they went out, we should have the Italian and anti-Roman cry up in an hour. Being in they will not risk losing the Irish votes and setting Ireland on fire. They will also do for Ireland what no Government has yet ventured to propose. To-night they have a Tenant-Right Bill. I have not a doubt of their giving us all their help for the poor and prisoners. Nothing can be more frank and fair than their way of dealing with us. There is a notable change in Parliament and public opinion, of which the Oaths Bill is a signal proof.

In another letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated Whitsunday 1866, Manning said:—

Now I could write a good deal about politics, but I never like to put it into the post. Everything here towards Italy and Ireland is improved. There is no will to run the old muck again unless the Opposition comes in. Then it will all rise again. The Tories will do the one and the mischievous Liberals the other. Dr. Cullen and I are acting in complete good understanding.

Archbishop Manning took the Irish Catholic Members in hand and invited them to his Tuesday evening Receptions. Writing under date 13th February 1866, he said:—

They are all coming next Tuesday. I shall try all I can to keep up relations with them and with Archbishop Cullen, to whom I have again written fully.

Mgr. Talbot had strongly urged upon Manning the policy of bringing the English, Scotch, and Irish bishops into line. Such combined and common action would have no little political influence. Cardinal Wiseman had attempted it, but failed, owing to the unwillingness of the Irish bishops.

In reply, Manning wrote under date 3rd February 1866:—

I shall be most glad of help in drawing the bishops of England, Scotland, and Ireland together. It *can* be done, and *must*; and when done it will put us on a new level. I am glad to hear that Dr. Cullen is to be made cardinal. It is most due.

In a letter to Manning Mgr. Talbot said:—

The Irish bishops were afraid of Cardinal Wiseman, and they are suspicious of you; but you had better go over to Ireland and make the attempt.

In a letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated 19th January 1866, Manning wrote as follows:—

Yesterday brought me a letter from Dr. Cullen, saying that he is ready to endeavour to form a union with the English bishops, and that he has spoken to several of the Irish bishops, who are most willing. It is difficult, but I think it can be done. The Bishop of Down and Connor has asked me to come and preach at Belfast this summer; and if prudent I will go. But things are very uneasy. The Fenianism is far more grave than the Government says. And all care must be taken not to have another Belfast row.[1]

The following letter shows what an acute observer Manning was of public events, and how quick in drawing far-reaching deductions. The readiness with which the Disestablishment of the Irish Church was accepted by public opinion in England, and the unsparing vigour of the attack made upon it by the leading newspapers, seems to have taken Manning by surprise. In his Anglican days he had shown himself not unwilling to throw overboard the sister Church in Ireland, or to cripple it badly, in order to stave off attack on the English Establishment; and partly, perhaps, on account of the extreme and ugly character of its Protestantism. In his letter to Mgr. Talbot, Manning gives a brief but acute forecast of the moral effect which Disestablishment—"the heaviest blow the Reformation and the Royal Supremacy have ever received"—would have on Protestantism everywhere, and the consequences which would accrue to the Catholic Church lifted as a consequence to political and social equality.

The following letter was written during the debate in the House of Commons on Mr. Gladstone's Resolution against the Established Church in Ireland:—

[1] A year or two after Cardinal Cullen invited Archbishop Manning to pay him a visit in Dublin. Owing to his condemnation of Fenianism, Manning was very unpopular among the Irish in London and other English towns. For some nights in 1868 the churches and chapels had to be guarded by special constables against the Fenians, who had threatened to burn them. Hence Archbishop Manning, knowing that he was as unpopular among the extreme Nationalist party ir Ireland as he was in London, did not deem it prudent to go to Ireland.

8 York Place, W., *2nd April* 1868.

My dear Mgr. Talbot—I have been intending to write, but I have been unusually hard worked this Lent. We have had four grand missions with very great fruit.

But my object in writing is to call your attention to what is passing in respect to Ireland. In the last six months the change of mind in England is sudden and decisive beyond all example. The Ecclesiastical Titles Act is dead, and will be swept away. The Irish Church is doomed. This is the heaviest blow the Reformation and the Royal Supremacy have ever received. The moral effect of it upon the Catholic Church in these countries cannot be estimated. It weakens Protestantism everywhere and lifts the Catholic Church to social and political equality. This must loosen the hold of the Church of England indefinitely. I could not have believed the rapidity with which it has sunk, or with which the Catholic Church has risen in public opinion. You will read the debate now going on. I could not have believed it possible that the Irish Establishment should have been so utterly without defenders. It is given up, and the Disestablishment only a question of time. The Church in England will last yet as an Establishment, but as an antagonist to the Catholic Church it is already gone. Spiritually and intellectually the fight is over. I do not mean that it will change rapidly into Catholic doctrine, but that it is discredited as a Teacher or Guide. In doctrine, in discipline, in authority, in unity, in logical coherence, in moral influence over public opinion, it has been losing every day. Its own people and its own newspapers have written it down. Public opinion has no respect for it. It is tolerated: not trusted or obeyed. The *Times*, *Star*, *Telegraph*, *Pall Mall*, have damaged it in the last year more than for twenty years before. On the other hand, the Catholic Church has been gaining upon Parliament and public opinion openly and sensibly. When you come to England you will *feel* what I say.[1]
—Always affectionately yours, ✠ H. E. M.

---

[1] In connection with the above statements as to the growth of public feeling in England towards the Catholic Church, the following passage from a letter of an earlier date, 14th March 1867, is not without special interest:—"The change of public feeling towards the Church is very marked. I never remember anything at all like it. The Anglicans and even Dissenters are so shaken and alarmed that they are tolerant of us. But all this makes it ten times our duty to be explicit and uncompromising."

Archbishop Manning, perhaps, did not sufficiently consider that a large number of those who supported the Disestablishment of the Protestant Church in Ireland belonged to the irreligious party which is everywhere opposed to the Catholic principle of the union of Church and State.

Gladstone carried his Irish Church Resolution by 328 against 272, majority 56. This is an immense moral victory.

Secular politics merely touched the fringe of Manning's mind, whereas such an ecclesiastical work as the defence of the Temporal Power of the Pope moved every fibre of his heart. In December 1866 he wrote to Mgr. Talbot:—

All our eyes and hearts are in Rome. Somehow my confidence has been rising continually. It is wonderful what a change has come over England about the Holy Father. It is the chief subject, and, except the *Times* and *Standard* which are vile, even the political papers wish him well.

In a previous letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated 3rd January 1866, Manning said:—

I do not like writing on politics because I mistrust the post; but I could say many things in the same sense as your letter from this side of the question. I believe our Government is not disposed to meddle in Italy, if it can help it. I have told Gladstone and Charles Villiers that if they do the Catholics of England and Ireland would at once oppose them; and I have proposed to Archbishop Cullen to make an alliance to this effect. *Milner's Life* shows the importance of union between the Irish and English Catholics.

In a letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated 8th September 1866, Manning wrote:—

We have already fixed Rosary Sunday for a day of intercession for the Holy Father. All the bishops most earnestly write. I shall issue a Pastoral; and I hope all will. Last Tuesday, at the opening of St. Michael's, Hereford, I preached on this subject. The *Times* published a large part of what I said, but omitted all that related to Rome and the State. This has brought the *Telegraph* on me, very civilly, but misrepresenting me. I shall write a letter to it. My arguments are—(1) that the Pope is by Divine dispensation subject to none, and the supreme director of all. (2) That for the exercise of the office Divine Providence has given to the Pontiffs for 1500 years Rome and the Patrimony, and that this has been often usurped but cannot be taken away. They omitted all No. 2 but other papers have reported it. I mention this that you may be on your guard, and not be misled by the English papers. They are all alive, notice everything, and though they oppose they are

much changed. I think we shall make a great day on Rosary Sunday. On Thursday I have to preach at Leeds, and I shall, I think, go on with the subject.

In another letter:—

My belief is that you will not stir from Rome. The *Pall Mall* and the *Saturday Review* are writing in their way in favour of the Temporal Power. The subject has gained immensely. Thanks for the Allocution. . . . It is all in to-day's *Times*. Rosary Sunday was like Easter Day for communions for the Holy Father. It was like a jubilee or a mission amongst the people.

In the following letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated 2nd October 1866, Manning again expressed the hopeful opinion that the people of England were moving against the Revolution as they had done at the end of the last century:—

We are politically in a curious *calm* and crisis, and I am convinced that the English people are turning against Revolution as they did seventy years ago, and so far do not wish the overthrow of the Pope. You will see in the *W. R.* the sort of duel I have had with the papers on the Temporal Power. It is still going on, both in London and in the country. Yesterday all but the *Times* printed the Pastoral, and to-day the *Times* has a leader, civil and weak. Next Sunday will give a new text. The Scottish bishops unite with us, and it has excited great attention, and the tone of all the papers with only one or two exceptions is visibly calmed. The *Pall Mall Gazette* had an *excellent* article. I believe what you say to be true, and that there is no disposition in Europe to subvert the Holy Father except in the Revolution. But that still remains to be met.

In a subsequent letter, dated 18th November, Manning reaffirmed this opinion in still stronger terms:—

. . . In truth I have little else in my head except Rome, and about that I hardly like to write, for I can hardly depend on what I have; all I can say is that there is in England a perceptible reaction and recognition of the fitness of securing to the Holy Father his perfect freedom. I saw Lord Stanley about protecting the British property in Rome. He promised to do so.

The following passage from a letter to Mgr. Talbot, dated 19th January 1867, regarding the Roman people and the Italian Government will be read with interest:—

As to Rome it is clearly supernatural. My belief is that the Roman people have no desire for taxes, conscription, and war; and that their religious instincts are in favour of the government of the Holy Father, if only the secret societies can be kept out, and the material industries and interests of the people can be kept up to the level of the rest of Italy. I hope that the religious negotiations may have a good issue. Any rupture would be dangerous. It seems as if the Italians had greatly moderated. Whether this is so or not I cannot of course know. When their Parliament begins to talk we shall see. But I have thought every year there was a great subsiding of the anti-Roman fury. But this, too, is supernatural. The chief mischief-makers are the English papers.

A few more extracts from Manning's letters to Mgr. Talbot will suffice:—

May 1867.—You will be glad to know that the Address to the Holy Father has been most promptly and universally signed by the laity, and it will show the Protestants that the Barons of England are true Papists.

25*th September* 1867.—We are watching you with great anxiety. But I feel confident no harm will fall on Rome.

6*th November* 1867.—It seems to me that two good things have come: the infidel Revolution has thrown off its mask, and the Catholic world has made itself felt.

30*th November* 1867.—We are all praying for you that God may protect Rome; and I believe He will. It has been a *palpable* Providence which has saved it. And even the English begin to see in it something greater than Louis Napoleon.

17*th January* 1868.—As to the Government I think they are careful to do nothing against Rome. I have had full conversation with one of their chiefs, and I know through the French embassy enough to assure me that they are on their guard. The storm of Revolution has swung round upon our own house, and they have learned a lesson.

Archbishop Manning was far too shrewd an observer not to know the importance, if he could not enlist the active support of such a statesman as Mr. Gladstone in favour of the Temporal Power of the Pope, of disarming his opposition. He had found by experience, as he mentioned on one occasion, that to argue with Mr. Gladstone served no purpose

other than to provoke his logical faculties to discover counter arguments. But Manning trusted in the power of persuasion and of personal influence. Learning that Mr. Gladstone was about visiting Rome, Archbishop Manning wrote as follows to Mgr. Talbot:—

Gladstone is coming to Rome in October. *Show him all the kindness you can.* I am anxious about him. He has been driven and goaded into extremes, and may become very dangerous. But for a long time he has been *silent about Rome* and the Temporal Power. And he has been helping us. He stayed till two or three in the morning to support our clause for the Workhouse Children at my request, and would have spoken if there had been need.

Another letter in praise of Mr. Gladstone followed:—

You are beforehand with me. I was going to write, and say that Gladstone is to be in Rome next month. I do not hear of Lord Granville, etc., coming. I have had *strong* battle with Gladstone. He promises to avoid bad company, and I believe he will. I also promised to write to Cardinal Antonelli. Gladstone is *much* softened. He fully holds that the Holy Father must be *independent.* But his head is full of schemes. I think he will do nothing *hostile.* Towards us in England and towards Ireland he is the most just and fargoing of all our public men. Be kind to him. He is very susceptible of any kindness, and his *sympathies* and *respect* religiously are all with us.

In another letter, dated 2nd October 1866, Manning wrote:—

Lady Herbert will write to you about Gladstone. I am satisfied that he sincerely wishes to find a position he can take up in the House of Commons about Rome, and that he desires to do no violence to the Roman Government.

But he is embarrassed without and within.

He does not come as an enemy, and may be made friendly, or he might become on his return most dangerous. The Liberals in England will be very jealous of him on this subject.

Pray ensure his meeting Giovanni, Patrizi, and Duca Salviati, and the Borghese.

These urgent directions to Mgr. Talbot to show special kindness to Mr. Gladstone during his visit to Rome, were prompted not only by Manning's personal regard for Mr.

Gladstone, but by a wise desire to prevent the English statesman from developing into a dangerous opponent to the Pope's Temporal Power.

Besides Mr. Gladstone, there was another ex-Cabinet Minister, Lord Clarendon, recently relieved from the cares of office by the overthrow of the Whig Government, seeking rest and relaxation in the august City of the Popes. Archbishop Manning had serious misgivings as to the political designs of Lord Clarendon, imputing to him, as the following letter to Mgr. Talbot shows, a scheme on the part of the Whigs to recover their lost hold on the priests and people of Ireland :—

Private. 8 York Place, W., 19*th January* 1868.

My dear Mgr. Talbot—I write one line, too late I fear, to put you on your guard lest Lord Clarendon should be urging the endowment of the Catholic Clergy in Ireland.

This is done with the avowed intention of gaining a hold over them. It would absolutely separate them from their flocks. And I fear there is a strong party forming to try to carry it.

If any colour or countenance could be extorted, or stolen from the Holy See in its favour, we should be paralysed here.

We are in a great crisis, but I am hopeful.—Always affectionately yours, ✠ H. E. M.

P.S.—I suspect that some expressions of yours have been written home by Lord Clarendon. He is one to whom you may apply your warning *Cavete ab hominibus.*

It is somewhat curious to note that whilst for Mr. Gladstone, Manning had prescribed a soothing treatment of kindness and care during his visit to Rome, and had laid Lord Clarendon under a ban as a man to be shunned and thwarted, it was not Mr. Gladstone who, in the hour of Rome's direst need during the Vatican Council, stood boldly up as the friend of Manning and the Pope, but Lord Clarendon. Mgr. Talbot, likewise, had not a good word to say for Lord Clarendon, as the following passage from a letter dated Vatican, 21st January 1868, shows :—

My dear Archbishop—I regret very much you cannot at present come to Rome, as two most important questions are

about to come on shortly at Propaganda—the question of higher Education or the Catholic University in England, and the question of Scotland. Regarding both questions I agree with your Grace. I shall therefore occupy myself about both. . . . Regarding Scotland, I see the absolute necessity of creating a hierarchy, notwithstanding the protest of Lord Clarendon, who has somehow got to hear of the project. He had the impertinence to speak against it to the Pope; but I do not think His Holiness is inclined to listen to him; and at Propaganda they say that the reason for which he is opposed to it shows that the hierarchy will do great good in Scotland.

With the shrewdness of a born diplomatist, mistrustful of Mr. Gladstone as liable to be goaded into dangerous courses, and suspicious of the designs of the Whigs in opposition, as his letter to Mgr. Talbot testifies, Archbishop Manning hastened to make overtures to Mr. Disraeli and the Tories. There was one special bond of union between the great ecclesiastical diplomatist and the Tory statesman. Both alike regarded with equal condemnation the disloyal and seditious designs of the extreme faction of the Nationalist Party in Ireland. Availing himself of a favourable opportunity of approaching Mr. Disraeli, whom he had recently met for the first time, Archbishop Manning sent a copy of his *Pastoral Letter* on Fenianism to the Tory statesman. In reply Mr. Disraeli wrote the following letter:—

Private.

GROSVENOR GATE, 26*th April* 1867.

MY DEAR LORD—I am honoured and gratified by the receipt of your Grace's Pastoral, which I shall read, especially on the subject you mention, of Fenianism, with still greater interest, since I have had the pleasure of becoming acquainted with the writer.—Believe me, with great consideration, your faithful servant,

B. DISRAELI.

After this first interchange of courtesies Archbishop Manning had from time to time frequent conferences and correspondences with Mr. Disraeli and other Tory statesmen, as will be related in a subsequent chapter. This was more especially the case after his second break with Mr. Gladstone, consequent on the latter's attacks on the Vatican Council.

Although Manning condemned Fenianism and all its works, open or secret, his heart deeply sympathised, as his outspoken *Letter to Lord Grey* in 1868 bears touching witness, with the sufferings of the people of Ireland and their Agrarian troubles, borne with such heroic and Christian patience, at all events, before the birth of the ill-boding Land League. In a letter, dated 1868, Manning wrote to Mgr. Talbot, saying, "I hope you have received my *Letter to Lord Grey:* strange to say it has not been attacked in the English papers, even Dr. MacHale, the Archbishop of Tuam, seems to be contented with it."

In connection with this *Letter to Lord Grey*, it is pleasant to be able to revive the memory of a name so familiar in the early years of Manning's life as that of his brother-in-law John Anderdon—mentor, friend, and constant correspondent. To John Anderdon, Manning wrote as follows:—

8 York Place, W., 2*nd April* 1868.

My dear John—I am glad you liked my *Letter*. I never wrote anything with a firmer conviction of its truth and justice.

It seems as if a light had fallen suddenly upon men's minds. I never thought to live to see what is passing now. My belief is that if Ireland were like Canada or Australia these kingdoms might yet be united. The main cause of all division, conflict, and animosity is the Irish Establishment.

Give my love to Maria and your children.—Believe me, always your affectionate brother. ✠ Henry E. Manning.

Several years ago I remember Cardinal Manning speaking with justifiable pride as to how, in his *Letter to Earl Grey* on the Land question, he had anticipated many of the reforms which had since been carried out by the Legislature. In this *Letter* Archbishop Manning appealed in eloquent terms to the good feeling and generosity of the people of England; deprecated the hostile way in which the Irish race and the Irish faith were too often regarded and denounced as fatal to peace and concord. He said, "We have outgrown not only our swaddling clothes and the years of our childhood: we have become an empire of many races and of many religions;

and the worst enemy of our civil and religious peace could devise no surer policy of discord, and no more fatal device of ruin than the attempt to keep alive the ascendency of race over race, or religion over religion; of church over church. A policy of absolute equality in religion is alone imperial, and, I will add, if the empire is to hold together is alone possible." He explained to Lord Grey, and to the people of England, to whom his *Letter* was virtually addressed, that whatever may be thought and said about the Land question by politicians in England, in Ireland, it meant starvation to the peasantry.

The following passage is of personal interest:—

I am day by day in contact with an impoverished race, driven from home by the Land question. I see it daily in the destitution of my flock. The religious inequality does indeed keenly wound and excite the Irish people. Peace and good-will can never reign in Ireland until every stigma is effaced from the Catholic Church and faith, and the galling injustice of religious inequality shall have been redressed. This, indeed, is true. But the "Land Question" as we call it by a somewhat heartless euphemism, means hunger, thirst, nakedness, notice to quit, labour spent in vain, the toil of years seized upon, the breaking up of homes, the miseries, sickness, death of parents, children, wives; the despair and wildness which spring up in the hearts of the poor when legal force, like a sharp harrow, goes over the most sensitive and vital rights of mankind.[1]

"This *Letter to Lord Grey* at all events," Cardinal Manning remarked, "bears witness to my sympathy with the sorrows and sufferings of the Irish people."

There was a still earlier expression of lively sympathy with the sufferings of the people of Ireland; for as far back as the year 1847, Archdeacon Manning published a letter in the *English Churchman*, dated 27th March 1847, under the title, "What one Work of Mercy can I do this Lent?" It was the terrible famine year in Ireland. In spite of the utmost exertions on the part of the Government in sending relief, in establishing public works in Ireland, in spite of private munificence—over a million sterling was subscribed in England—the people of Ireland were decimated by famine

[1] *Miscellanies*: "Ireland. A Letter to Lord Grey, 1868," p. 254.

and fever, or by emigration to more fruitful lands where they might earn a less precarious existence on a less barren soil. The Catholic people of Ireland bore with heroic resignation and submission to the Divine Will the horrors of that terrible famine.

In his pleasant home under the Sussex Downs Archdeacon Manning's heart was touched with sympathy for the suffering people in Ireland. In a devotional spirit he called upon his friends in the penitential season of Lent to do, each according to his power, an act of mercy; and out of his substance to give aid to a famine-stricken people. He denounced feasting and luxurious living; monstrous and wicked waste in too many households; "while thousands of our fellow-citizens in Ireland are dying on sea-weed." The famine year in Ireland was the year as I have already related, in which Archdeacon Manning was brought face to face with death, a year in which his faith in the Anglican Church was beginning to fade out of his mind.

Turning from the memories of the past to the business of the moment, Cardinal Manning said, "beyond that 'Letter to Lord Grey on the Land question in Ireland,' and an article before the late elections in the *Dublin Review*, 'How shall Catholics Vote?' I have not printed a letter or a line on the Irish question—on Home Rule. Is there any need to go beyond those printed documents in the 'Life'?"

As in the natural order, gnats and gadflies—all the more irritating because of their insignificance—sting the flesh of man, so in the moral order his soul is vexed at times, even to the verge of wrath and rage, by the petty troubles of life. Manning was visited by such minor vexations, all the more hard to bear because of their parochial character or origin. These troubles cannot be altogether passed over, as they affected the ecclesiastical interests of the diocese over which he was set; but they may be dismissed in a few words. The most vexatious and prolonged dispute of this kind was about the hospital in Great Ormond Street, and with Sir George Bowyer, the founder of the Church of St. John of Jerusalem and of the convent. The trustees of the

hospital held it independently of the church and convent, and refused to allow Sir George Bowyer to interfere with the management of the hospital, or to have control over the nuns who attended the wards. As founder of the church and convent he claimed the right to exercise authority, and place the nuns of his foundation in the hospital. The dispute was carried to Propaganda and extended over a prolonged period. It created a great deal of bad blood and a vast amount of letter-writing. The correspondence between Manning and Mgr. Talbot was full of this hot and unhappy squabble. Manning complained that Sir George Bowyer had not only spoken against Cardinal Wiseman—for the dispute began in the Cardinal's time—and against himself in the most unmeasured terms, but had written angry letters in the papers, and had held public meetings in Liverpool and Birmingham whilst the Appeal was still pending in Rome. Bowyer was loud-mouthed in his denunciations of Manning; and carried his abuse even into the smoking-room of the Reform Club, much to the amusement of Mr. John Bright and others.

Next in its annoyance to Archbishop Manning, was the dispute about the Italian church, and the opposition of one or two of the Italian priests who were at its head and carried complaints to Rome against Archbishop Manning. Their resistance to, or evasions of, the rules of discipline prescribed by the Archbishop, after vexatious discussions and delays, finally ended in the removal of the offenders. Besides insubordinate priests here and there, Manning had to deal with nuns who questioned or resisted authority, as, for instance, the sisters of that day of Nazareth House, Hammersmith.

In these and other troubles of a like vexatious kind Manning found in Mgr. Talbot a ready friend. He was able to justify Manning's ways at Propaganda and rebut the charges and complaints which, with mischievous misrepresentations, were brought to Cardinal Barnabò.[1]

[1] On receiving from Manning a warning not to allow Sir George Bowyer, who intended going to Rome, to mislead a certain personage, Mgr. Talbot wrote in reply:—"You may depend upon it that if Bowyer comes to Rome, I shall defend you against his follies, because he is quite a madman. I am very sorry that I did so much for him in past years."

Manning found relief from these petty diocesan squabbles in the spiritual consolations afforded to him by the zeal and piety of the faithful in the diocese. He reported to Mgr. Talbot that "On Rosary Sunday, the Day of Supplication for the Pope, there was a magnificent demonstration of fealty towards the Holy Father. Our churches were so crowded that there was no space to form a procession. At the Oratory there were 700 communicants. It was like Easter Day."

Manning's Pastoral Letter on Rosary Sunday brought generous gifts and offerings to the Pope, from the savings of the humble as well as from the munificence of the wealthy. In a letter to Mgr. Talbot Manning wrote—"Lay at the feet of the Holy Father the earnings of a humble Catholic (£500) which Father Vaughan will hand to you."[1]

In another letter to Mgr. Talbot, Manning said, "I have just received into the Church four of Mr. Liddell's curates, two of them possess materials for the making of excellent priests." Besides those whom he received into the Church, there were others who came to him in their doubts and difficulties for counsel, help, and kindness; and their excellent dispositions and aspirations were to Manning hearty compensation for many of the minor troubles he was often exposed to from time to time in the management of the diocese. The following letter is a sample of many:—

[1] The following somewhat eccentric letter to the Archbishop accompanied the generous offering:—

Guy Fawks Day, 1866.

May it please your Eminence—While listening to your very admirable Pastoral on Rosary Sunday, I, an old humble Catholic, felt inspired—"moved by the spirit," as the Quakers call it—to make an offering (in secret) to my heavenly father, and through your Grace's hands to our Holy Father, Christ's vicar on earth, of these my savings, £500. Much for me, yet but a drop in the ocean to Him. I request your Grace therefore to transmit, as you best know how, safe, the amount enclosed immediately to His Holiness, with this SOLE condition, that NOT ONE FARTHING be spent on armaments or aught connected with war, bloodshed, and rapine, and all its miseries. No: God forbid the vicar of Christ should use the sword. Please to enforce this proviso. That his predecessors have used it may be the reason of the heavy afflictions the Church has suffered from time to time.

Begging with all humility the prayers of His Holiness and your own—am, your Eminence's very humble servant, N. J. S.

To the most Reverend Archbishop of Westminster.

STOKE RECTORY, GRANTHAM, 12*th Nov.* 1868.

MY DEAR FATHER—For so I must call you, even without any fair claim to it, by reason of your great kindness and tender consideration towards me. I am unwilling to allow a longer time to elapse without expressing my thanks to you for your affection and sympathy. My interview with you did me so much good, that—although I am still tossed and carried about with various doubts and difficulties, and God only knows how it will all end—I shall ever be grateful to you for your help. And this gratitude will be increased if I may be allowed to write you now and then, and come and see you, should circumstances admit of my doing so. I was ill in bed yesterday, and so have not had much time for reading or transcribing my difficulties, which you kindly said I might send to you. But I read last night the first part of your *England and Christendom* with deep interest. May our blessed Lord lead me into His truth, whatever it be, and give me courage to take that step if His hand points that way! I shall need many prayers, much faith, much courage. I should have to give up everything: want, instead of plenty will stare me in the face, and this for my wife and children, by my own act. Of course I know this has nothing to do with it; but it adds to my misery. My convictions are Catholic, my sympathies are Catholic; but history staggers me? May I ask for your prayers, my dear father? I cannot write more to-day.

With every expression of respect and gratitude.—I am yours, CECIL EDWARD FISHER.

Manning, likewise, had the happy faculty or gift of turning his mind from cares and annoyances to the consideration of subjects of high intellectual or spiritual interest, such as formed the staple of the correspondence which passed between him and Mr. Gladstone. The following letter from Mr. Gladstone,[1] Cardinal Manning considered would suffice as a sample:—

11 CARLTON HOUSE TERRACE, S.W.,
16*th November* 1869.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP—I have no difficulty in answering you; the state of my speculative mind, so to speak, is not the

[1] In placing this letter in my hands Cardinal Manning said, "This letter of Gladstone's—mine is of no importance—is the best illustration I can offer of our frequent intellectual controversies. Moreover it throws light upon our relations from as far back as 1836. It was an answer to a letter of mine in which I expressed a fear that he was developing into a Rationalist."

portion of me that I have most difficulty in exhibiting, and I do it in the familiarity of ancient and unextinguished friendship.

When I said that there had always been in me a turn towards rationalising, I did not mean to use the term in its technical sense, but only meant it had always been my habit and desire to give to religious doctrine a home in my understanding, so that the whole mind might embrace it, and not merely the emotional part of it.

It was in the year 1830, I think, that I began to be powerfully acted upon by the writings of Bishop Butler (one of my four great teachers), and I then wrote a paper on his chapter concerning Mediation, the matter of which I still view with interest in no way abated. The tendency to rationalise in this sense has continued, and I wish to encourage it, believing it to be truly Evangelical, Apostolical, and Catholic.

My first recollection of difference from you was in 1835 or 1836, about a question at 67 Lincoln's Inn Fields, where I had been (with Lord Cholmondeley) to support the bishops, and you to vote against them. My second went deeper, and left a strong mark in my memory. You sent me (I think) a proof sheet of a Sermon about the working of the Holy Spirit in the Church, and the Infallibility of the Church. I thought it by much too absolute, and argued this, more or less, in reply. You kept to your text, and it was what I should call further exaggeration of that already over-absolute proposition, which you embodied in a paper as your immediate vindication for joining the Church of Rome. I saw that paper in 1851, but never had a copy. It seemed to me that in it, you broke altogether away from the teaching of history and experience, respecting the methods of God in dealing with his Church. But I am becoming aggressive.

I remember well, though not so accurately as you, the scenes at the time of the Gorham Judgment. Suddenly plunged into a vortex of complicated controversies on the relations of Church and State, I was a good deal tossed about; and in 1850, family cares and sorrows wrought me (for I was a kind of spoilt child of Providence) into an unusual susceptibility. But to sum up all in a few words: (1) I view the judgment itself as I did then. (2) I hold firmly by the doctrine of the Supremacy of the Crown, as I then worked it out for myself. (3) I overestimated the *scope* of the judgment. The Bishop of St. David's is right when he says, such a judgment could not rule anything except the case it decided and, through the Courts, any case in precise correspondence with it. (4) Soon after that judgment the Church of England recovered its corporate capacity, and its voice; a great change which you or I had never anticipated. Then, and before,

she lost the most brilliant of her children, that she might have cause to know the meaning of the words, "Not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit." All her gloss was rubbed away. Those who have adhered to her, have done it without illusions. In the Edinburgh Discourse to which you refer, I said something about the necessity and difficulty and value of a philosophy of religion, and the master-hope, the master-passion of my soul is to be permitted, when my present work (which cannot last very long) is done, to gather up from off the battle-field of politics all that may remain of my being, and to be permitted by the Divine mercy to dedicate any residue of life to some morsels of that work. I profoundly believe in a reconcilation between Christianity and the conditions of modern thought, modern life, and modern society. While I see that in the common idea and tradition of the time, even in this country, and yet more on the Continent, they are farther than ever from being reconciled.

In 1839, Lord Macaulay covered me with not ill-natured, yet unqualified and glittering ridicule, because in my imperfect way I had professed my loyal allegiance to two principles which in religion, at least, he appeared to regard as incompatible; freedom and authority. After some thirty years of the blasts of life, I remain rooted as much as before, in regard for authority, and even more than before in the value I set upon freedom. It has pleased God, at a heavy cost, to give it the place of a foundation-stone in the being of man, the most wonderful of His known works. The difficulty of training and rearing it aright, I feel; but under no inducement whatever, could I, without treason to duty, consent, whether in religion or secular affairs, to its being trodden under foot. And hence, while my creed is what it was, and perhaps even more sacramental, I regard with misgivings, which approach to horror, what may be called sacerdotalism. In this sacerdotalism I recognise a double danger; first, that many elect and tender souls may forego one of the great prerogatives and duties of their nature; secondly, that the just reaction from their excess, co-operating with other causes less legitimate, may yet more estrange the general mass of humanity from God, and from religion.

Lastly, I did not recommend Dr. Temple as a bishop because the Church of England retained him, any more than you would choose Mr. Ffoulkes on a similar ground; but because of his combinations of mind and life for the office, together with the futility or insufficiency of any charge which was (to my knowledge) advanced against him.

And now my dear friend, what a flood of egotism you have unwittingly brought down on your devoted head! I must

recognise the terms of your letter as most kind and considerate; I do not feel equally certain about my reply. Pardon it, as you have pardoned much before.—Believe me, affectionately yours,

W. E. GLADSTONE.

In the league, offensive and defensive, between Manning and himself, Mgr. Talbot had fulfilled his part of the bargain with the utmost zeal. Was it possible that in the over-eagerness of his expectations, or judging only by results, he thought that Manning on his part had been lukewarm in promoting as he had undertaken to do the building of the church of St. Thomas in Rome? Mgr. Talbot's letters were full of complaints about the English laity and their indifference to high spiritual ideas.

He wrote, "They prefer building twenty petty Gothic churches in the green lanes near a gentleman's country house to contributing to a national church like St. Thomas's in Rome." In a letter, dated 10th February 1866, Mgr. Talbot wrote as follows:—

VATICAN, 10*th Feb.* 1866.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP—. . . The great event of the season in Rome has been the Pope's laying the first stone of the Church of St. Thomas. I never saw such excitement amongst the English. Lord Northesk and Lord Sinclair begged for tickets. Lord Northesk was so impressed that he has promised me a contribution. Lord Sinclair is a descendant in direct line from one of the murderers of St. Thomas. The Pope's Homily was beautiful, but it will lose much in the report, because it is the manner with which he delivers his discourses that impresses people. He strongly exhorted the English to complete the work they had commenced. There is a long account published officially in the *Giornale di Roma*, and the *Osservatore Romano* has quoted lengthily from your sermon. The whole thing was a complete success. The Pope himself was delighted. He said so to me several times, and has said so to every one he has seen during the last week. All the English visitors also were immensely pleased. If the Catholics in England have any feeling for Rome or the Pope it ought to make a sensation there also. Cardinal Antonelli gave me last night a hundred dollars, he was so pleased with the whole affair, as he looks upon it as a work of principle which is so difficult to make the English understand. They are so stupid that they cannot see that a work like this places them on an equality with other European nations, and only forms part of the Pope's

policy to raise the position of the Church in England in the face of the world. But it is like everything else that he has done. He gave them a hierarchy with a Cardinal, removed Dr. Errington, and made you Archbishop, and he has met with no gratitude. I never heard an Englishman thank him for any one of these three things.—Adieu. Believe me, affectionately yours,

GEO. TALBOT.

In another letter Mgr. Talbot said: "The Pope has just given me £100, and would take no refusal, saying 'every kick sends the ass on.'"

At last, in October 1867, Mgr. Talbot wrote almost broken-hearted announcing his "intention of giving up the building of St. Thomas's Church. There were no funds coming in." In reply, Manning wrote, 8th October 1867:

. . . But now about St. Thomas's Church. I beg you not to think for a moment of throwing up the work; *suspend* building when you have spent all you have, but call it only suspension. It will go on again, and I hope you will come to England next year and collect for it: many reasons urge this. We are praying for you all.

The next day Manning wrote again as follows:—

8 YORK PLACE, W., 9*th October* 1867.

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT—I wrote yesterday, but your letter of the 5th, just come, needs a few words.

Do not be cast down or pained, though there is much to cause it.

You have acted uprightly and for the true service of the Church. It is your lot and mine to have to cross the wills of people and to suffer: and to suffer when we have done all we can in prudence and charity, though very trying, is of no moment. Indeed it is a consolation.

You are right about Birmingham. It is the centre of murmur and whispering. I have lately had two correspondences, one with Dr. N. and the other with the Bishop—neither satisfactory. But I have no anxiety about it, nor need you have any.

Yesterday I wrote the very words you have written about St. Thomas's Church. Do not waver for a moment. It may be a long and slow and discouraging work, but it will be done. If I know how to help you I will; but I am burdened beyond measure.

Once more, do not be troubled. Few men have acted with a more single heart than you have, and this is felt even at Birmingham.—Believe me always affectionately yours,

✢ H. E. M.

It was but cold comfort for Mgr. Talbot that Manning, too, was disappointed in many from whom he had hoped better things; or that he was "burdened beyond measure." Manning's part in the compact for mutual help was heavier by far than Mgr. Talbot's. Mgr. Talbot's "wonder-working" method of dropping a word in season on Manning's behalf in the Vatican or at Propaganda required only a careful watching for opportunities, whereas Manning's task involved extracting some thousands of pounds from the Catholic laity, already overburdened with claims at home. Mgr. Talbot resumed the building of St. Thomas's; but, in a letter dated 21st January 1868, he wrote to Manning saying: "The Church of St. Thomas is going on slowly, but I am so disgusted with the disgraceful way of acting on the part of English Catholics ever since the idea was mooted, and their utter contempt for ecclesiastical authority, from the Pope downwards, that for the future I do not intend to pay the slightest attention to those who come to Rome." There were further letters showing growing discontent at the way in which the work of promoting the building of the Church of St. Thomas in Rome—his share of the compact with Manning — was neglected in England. Manning, quick enough to perceive that there was something amiss with his friend at the Vatican, wrote the following sympathetic words:—

8 York Place, 27*th April* 1868.

My dear Mgr. Talbot—I thank you much for your last letter, and I feel very heartily with you in what you wrote. If I were to tell you all the disappointments we have here in persons of whom we might have looked for better things, you would know how I can feel with you and for you.

I also see in your letter another point which is not expressed. But we will talk of all this, and we will endeavour to make an effort for St. Thomas's Church together, and I will gladly postpone any step for the Cathedral. This I can do all the more easily because we wish at once to begin the Seminary.

In another letter, dated Easter Monday 1868, Manning made a direct appeal to Mgr. Talbot for an openhearted explanation of the cause of offence, in the following affectionate terms:—

And now tell me *cuore aperto*, Have you been in any way disappointed with anything on my part? I have an instinct of it. We have been too near together, and our union is too important for that which is nearer our heart than anything personal, to allow of any want of perfect and cordial sympathy between us. On my part, I may say there are few in whom I trust more than in yourself, or regard with more tried regard.

Wishing you a happy Easter.—Believe me, my dear Mgr Talbot, yours affectionately, ✠ H. E. M.

The result was satisfactory, for, in reply, Mgr. Talbot wrote: "When I come to England in the summer we must put our heads together for the improvement of the English College and the building of the Church of St. Thomas." The reconciliation was complete, for Mgr. Talbot was as fervent as of old, as will appear in the following Chapter, in promoting Manning's nomination to one of the sub-commissions to assist in the preparation for the coming Council.

CHAPTER XVI

THE VATICAN COUNCIL

1869–1870

To have been a member of an Œcumenical Council is a rare distinction which cannot but affect the imagination even of the most unimaginative of men. In such a historic assemblage the Past lives again. The fathers of a General Council —from the Council of Jerusalem to the Vatican Council —have, as Assessors, assisted the Popes in appeasing feuds and controversies which from age to age disturb the Church; in condemning heresies, and in defining dogmas contained in the Apostolic Deposit. To no Churchman, even the dullest of the dull, could such a historic event as the meeting of a General Council in the nineteenth century—the first since the Council of Trent—be a matter of unconcern. To Archbishop Manning it was the event of his life. It not only in itself made life worth living, but life, at such an epoch, the greatest of human blessings. To be a father of the Vatican Council; to take a foremost part in discussing the dogma of Papal Infallibility; to hear with his own ears the final Decree promulgated; the final anathema pronounced, was to Manning a supreme, almost an unearthly joy. At such a moment it naturally would not occur to a man of a nature so self-centred that he was merely a unit in an assemblage so vast. It would seem to him rather as if the Vatican Council were personified in himself; as if his were the supreme vote which defined the dogma of Papal Infallibility. Such moments, like the intensest joys of the human heart, do not, cannot last. They leave, however, an

indelible stamp on the memory. The Vatican Council was the reward and crown of his life: was the visible fulfilment of the visions of his heart: the infallible consecration of the principle of authority which, even as an Anglican, he had venerated and sought after as the goal of his hope and faith.

For years Archbishop Manning had made the question of Papal Infallibility his own. He was identified, whether for good or evil, with the mysterious dogma, by the popular mind of England. He had preached about it; had worked for it; and in tones and terms of infallible certitude had predicted its definition. The anti-Catholic papers made light of his arguments, and laughed his predictions to scorn. Men of science and learning, the "superior people" of the day, accounted it unto him as foolishness; but, as he himself said, the event proved that the fools were on the side of Divine Wisdom. His critics, learned or unlearned, were no match for Archbishop Manning, for he knew what he was talking about, and they did not. In their ignorance of Catholic doctrine they fell into all sorts of absurd blunders about the meaning of the Pope's infallibility. They did not know or had forgotten that the Christian Church had always, from the beginning, exercised an infallible authority in deciding matters of faith and morals. It was no new idea; no new principle; no new encroachment, as was believed by too many honestly, if heedlessly on civil allegiance. If even statesmen of eminence and honour were for a time misled by the strange infatuation that Papal Infallibility interfered with the loyalty of English Catholics, can we wonder much at the random or reckless conclusions arrived at by lesser or more unreflecting critics? Now happily—for Time is the great teacher—all the world with a grain of common sense in its composition knows that the only question before the Vatican Council was, Where does infallibility in the Church reside—in the head or in the body? In the Church dispersed throughout the world, or assembled in a General Council; or in the Pope speaking *ex cathedrâ*, and defining as universal Teacher questions of faith or morals?

Before the definition pronounced by the Vatican Council the all but universal belief of Catholics—for Gallicanism had died out, or, at most like an exhausted fire burned low in its ashes—was, that the normal seat of infallibility is the Pope as universal Teacher defining *ex cathedrâ* questions of Faith and Morals. Since the Vatican Decree Papal Infallibility is accepted throughout the Catholic world as a dogma of faith.

I do not for a moment deny or wish to conceal the fact that the Vatican Decree introduced a far-reaching change if not in doctrine, in practice. It was not without reason that the opponents of the Papacy—the Civil Powers, the anti-Christian Party, the Revolution took alarm. For the Definition of Papal Infallibility placed a powerful and ready weapon of defence, or, if needs be of offence, in the hands of the Church. In these days of quick action or quicker thought, the assembling of an Œcumenical Council is a slow process, a clumsy movement or method of defence in the face of an active enemy. Wars or the rumours of wars, revolutions or the fears of revolution, which to-day is the normal state of European society, might retard or prevent altogether the meeting of a General Council; or, if assembled, it might be broken up by the action of a hostile State or by the outbreaks of an irreligious Revolution. By such methods, either arising from the natural course of events, as international wars must be accounted to-day, or designedly contrived by the subterranean action of its enemies, the Church, deprived of its spiritual weapons, would be paralysed in its action in the hour perhaps of gravest danger to Christian society. In a day of prolific error, new heresies might arise; a new code of morals be introduced subversive of Christian ethics, calling for rapid and formal condemnation by the Church. In these days of complicated action and rapid development and quick decision, the authority of a General Council, compared to that of an infallible Pope, is as unwieldy and as slow in its movements as the wooden ship of Nelson's day to an ironclad in our own. A strong factor in promoting the Vatican Decree was a common fear that the principle of authority, assailed on

every side, was so weakened and whittled down as to endanger the existence of Christian society in Europe. The most efficacious remedy for this growing evil was, it seemed to the Vatican Council, to concentrate the supreme authority of the Church in the person of the Pope—the highest representatives of moral power in the Christian world.

Archbishop Manning, at any rate, was one of the most active advocates of the Definition on the special ground that the consolidation of authority was essential in the interests of society. I do not know whether in so many words he declared of Councils, as he did of chapters, that they were an obselete institution; but his arguments in favour of Papal Infallibility conveyed that impression. A few years ago Canon Moufang of Mayence, the learned theologian at the Vatican Council of Bishop Ketteler, a well-known leader of the Inopportunist or Opposition party, related to me the effect produced in a conversation at Rome by Manning's startling description of European society. Manning, he said, scouted the idea that animated most of the German and Austrian and Hungarian bishops that the Definition was inopportune. What could be more opportune, he argued, more essential, more necessary than the consolidation of authority, in the face of the Revolution, political and religious, which was working in the dark and in the day for the subversion of all authority, human and divine. To-morrow, he urged, there might be wars and revolutions shaking society to its foundations. In such an upheaval of the social fabric; in such an attack upon the Divine order and organ of society what more "opportune" than to concentrate all the powers of the Church in the Pope? With all Europe in a state of war and revolution of what use, asked the Archbishop, would a General Council be? The triumphant enemies of the Church and of society would not be such fools as to allow it to meet. They could not gag a Pope, unless, indeed, by cutting his throat. But we should elect, even in the catacombs as the early Christians did, another martyr in defence of Christian society. "Archbishop Manning," exclaimed Canon Moufang, "by his vehement and vivid forecasts of the evils which threatened us,

made my hair stand on end. But," he added, "there was a great deal of force in his arguments. Our opposition to the opportuneness of the Definition was confined more or less to historical or theoretical objections; we gave little or no thought to the practical view of things, which Manning insisted upon; to the coming events in the political order—wars and revolutions, which he predicted with such terrible earnestness. We were, perhaps, more of theologians; he more of an ecclesiastical statesman."

Manning was indeed well fitted as an ecclesiastical statesman of no mean order to take part in such a General Council as that of the Vatican. The art of persuasion, natural and acquired, diplomatic skill, quickness of apprehension were ready instruments in his hands to remove obstacles, turn aside opposition, or to win men to his side. Indeed, at the Vatican Council as elsewhere, Manning was ever persuaded by a consciousness beyond the province of reasoning, as he on more than one occasion avowed, that his side was the side of God. His absolute belief in the doctrine of Papal Infallibility as a manifestation of the Divine Will made Archbishop Manning the most uncompromising champion, inside the Council and out, of the Definition of the dogma. On one memorable occasion his tenacity of purpose stood him in good stead. The discussion of Infallibility had been ruled out of order in the Council; for, what was afterwards a question which absorbed every other, had not yet found its place in the *Schema de Ecclesiâ*. In a conversation speaking on this turning-point in the history of the Vatican Council, Cardinal Manning said, "After a long discussion there were at last only two bishops, I and another, who persisted in presenting petitions for the Definition, or in other ways urging the question of Infallibility. We were adjured to obey the will of the Council; we were rebuked for wilful and obstinate obstruction. I do not know what might not have happened had not a cardinal of eminence come to our support; then several Italian and some French bishops. The Council was adjourned; and at the next sitting the party of two was found to be fast growing in influence and numbers until it became

the party of the majority—the victorious party. It was on that occasion, I think," added Cardinal Manning, "That I received from the Opposition the most glorious of titles, *Diabolus Concilii*."

Looked at merely from a human standpoint the Vatican Council was a noble field of action for Manning. What finer opportunity for the exercise of his special gifts and talents. He was moving, speaking, working, in the presence of representative men of the highest order from every country and clime; of every race, tribe, and tongue in the Christian world—men of many nations but of one Faith. Among the fathers of the Vatican Council there were profounder theologians and more original thinkers: men of far wider learning, of more subtle thought; yet among the names of the few known outside the Council—known far and wide—was Manning's name. At the centre of the Christian world on a historic occasion he was one of the best known Fathers of a Council which filled the public eye; agitated the minds or vexed the spirits of statesmen, and affected the policy of kings and cabinets. Still more, his words and work remain for ever associated with an event which will be recorded in history as the chief, the most memorable landmark of the 19th century.

Had Archdeacon Manning, on the other hand, remained an Anglican, with an Anglican Churchman's belief and habits of mind, and instincts of moderation, backed by such influential friends as Sidney Herbert and Mr. Gladstone, there is little or no doubt that, like his friend and fellow-dignitary W. Ker Hamilton, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, he, too, would have been rewarded with a mitre for his fidelity to the Church of England in her day of sorest need. It is even possible that with his finer tact and spirit of moderation he might have succeeded, where his brother-in-law, Bishop Wilberforce, failed; and attained—at any rate had, instead of Disraeli, Mr. Gladstone been in office—to the throne of Canterbury, which fell so unexpectedly to the lot of Tait, the most fortunate of schoolmasters. What then? Manning, as Archbishop of Canterbury would have only been a somewhat larger and more spiritual-minded Tait, a far

more impressive and ornate preacher, a graceful, if perhaps somewhat too frequent, speaker in the House of Lords—a very Whig of the Whigs on the Episcopal Bench; a benevolent and eloquent philanthropist following the footsteps of Lord Shaftesbury; an ever-welcome guest at Exeter Hall to advocate, as in his younger days, the distribution of Bibles among the benighted "Romanists" in "sensual France and in Spain sterile in Christianity"; a judicious and mild-spoken advocate of Temperance; a lofty scorner of Home Rule and Parnellism or anti-Parnellism; and, as would have become a station so high, and so holy a calling, a denouncer of Socialism and Romanism—the twin evils of the day, foes alike to Christian society and to the Reformed Church raised by the hand of God, as he had declared in his Archidiaconal days to be "the regenerator of a dissolving Christendom, the centre of a new Catholic world."

There are other possibilities of lesser import—possibilities scarcely worth considering, except as a striking point of contrast—whether, in such a supposititious case, as in that of Archbishop Tait, the palace of Addington or of Lambeth would have been made glad by the voices of the children of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

But how small a man, in comparison with what he was, would Manning not have been as Archbishop of Canterbury. He would indeed have been revered for his piety and personal holiness; universally respected for his kindness and charity to the afflicted and poor; admired in society for grace of speech and manner; popular at the Athenæum Club for his pleasant ways and agreeable talk; but to the larger world beyond the narrow limits of Anglicanism, outside the range of ecclesiastical literature in England, he would have been unknown. Or perhaps have obtained an ephemeral fame in his day as a graceful speaker in the House of Lords, in the pulpit, or on the platform; or as a popular writer on social topics in Reviews or Magazines. Or, perchance, on the Episcopal Bench, he might have raised again, as in his 5th of November sermon, 1843, a stately protest against the pretensions or assumptions of the Papacy; and have denounced, to the delight of

the *Rock* or *Record*, as blasphemous, the power conferred, in 1870, upon the Pope of Rome by a mock or mutilated Council. In missing the Catholic Faith and the Vatican Council and the Cardinal's Hat, Manning would have missed an European reputation.

But the rising dignitary of the Anglican Church rose superior to the temptations of ambition, and for conscience' sake forewent the chance of winning an Anglican mitre at Canterbury or Durham or York. Obeying the Divine call henceforth he devoted himself heart and soul as a Catholic to the service of the Holy Roman Church, to the work and will of God.

Archbishop Manning was one of the five hundred and twenty bishops assembled in Rome in 1868 for the celebration of the Centenary of St. Peter. On that occasion he took a solemn vow to promote to the best of his power the Definition of Papal Infallibility. In 1881 Cardinal Manning related the circumstances in the following words:—

> On the eve of St. Peter's Day I and the Bishop of Ratisbon were assisting at the throne of the Pope at the first Vespers of St. Peter; we then made the vow drawn up by P. Liberatore, an Italian Jesuit, to do all in our power to obtain the Definition of Papal Infallibility. We undertook to recite every day certain prayers in Latin contained in a little book still in my possession. The formula of the vow with my signature is bound up in my copy of *Petri Privilegium*.

This vow expressed Manning's mind and the desire of his heart. Henceforth, the end and aim of all his energies and labours was to secure the Definition of Papal Infallibility. For though the question of Papal Infallibility was not spoken of at the meeting of the bishops in 1868, nor even in the Bull convoking the Council, yet every one knew, friend and foe alike, that, as it was the subject uppermost in men's minds, it would find or force its way into the Vatican Council. And so it did, to the exclusion of every other topic. Even if the Pope did not originally intend its introduction, his hands were forced by the widespread desire and demand for a definite settlement of the question. Petitions to this effect were addressed to Rome

from many a diocese. Archbishop Manning and the Bishop of Ratisbon were both active. Two petitions were presented to the Pope from Westminster: one by the Chapter, the other by the fathers of the London Oratory. Before the meeting of the Council there were two years' grace: two years given for preparation, for defence, for attack, for the mustering of forces from the ends of the earth; two years for the battle of pastorals, of pamphlets, of polemical articles in the *Augsburg Gazette*, the *Civiltà Cattolica*, the *Univers*, the *Tablet*; two years, also, for prayer and meditation, too much forgotten, may-be, by the Hotspurs and Ruperts on either side.

The Bishop of Orleans was the first to begin the battle. No sooner had the Pope announced his intention to the bishops, assembled at Rome for the Centenary of St. Peter's, of convoking an Œcumenical Council, than Mgr. Dupanloup hurried back to France to proclaim the coming event in a Pastoral letter. Archbishop Manning was not far behind, for, under the title "The Centenary of St. Peter and the General Council," he too published a Pastoral letter to the clergy. But these were merely preliminary skirmishes.

In a letter to Manning, dated Vatican, 23rd July 1867, Mgr. Talbot said:—

> I am anxious to see your Pastoral about your visit to Rome. You have read no doubt Mgr. Dupanloup's. He slipped away in a hurry on purpose to be the first to announce the Œcumenical Council to the French people. I look forward to the Council as being the greatest event during the present Pontificate.

In another letter, dated 9th September 1867, Mgr. Talbot wrote as follows:—

> I hope you will be able to come here after Christmas, as it will be the moment when the matter for the General Council will be prepared, and most probably you would be placed on one of the Sub-Commissions which have already been named. As yet there are four: Dogma, under the presidency of Cardinal Bilio; Canon Law, under Cardinal Caterini; Politico-theological politics, under Reisach; the Regulars are under Bizzani.

Then Mgr. Talbot added as a piece of news,—

Dr. Newman has written one of his letters to Barnabò. I do not think he will like Bò's answer.

On the 13th September 1868 the Bull of Indiction was issued by Pope Pius IX., formally con oking an Œcumenical Council to meet at Rome on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, 8th November 1869. Men of learning and eminence were invited to attend the Vatican Council as consultors and theologians. The bishops were instructed to appoint theologians. On matters connected with the Council Mgr. Talbot kept Manning well informed. In a letter, dated Vatican, 30th September 1868, he wrote as follows:—

I have had several conversations with the Holy Father about the Œcumenical Council, and also with Cardinals Antonelli, Barnabò, de Luca, Patrizi, and Caterini. Already the Brief to the schismatic bishops has appeared, as you no doubt have already seen in the papers. In a few days the Brief to the Protestants will appear also. It would have been published before, only that some modifications will be made owing to your observations on it.

I think that Dr. Newman will be invited to come to Rome next winter in order to be named consultor,[1] so that the sooner you name your theologians in union with the other bishops the better.

The following letter is on the same subject:—

VATICAN, 20*th October* 1868.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP—I write to your Grace to say that as soon as I received your last note I told the Holy Father that you had sent two names for English consultors for the Œcumenical Council, Provost Platt and Professor Gillow of Ushaw. I also went to Cardinal Caterini to tell him so, but he told me

[1] Mgr. Talbot was either misinformed, or Pope Pius IX. subsequently revoked his intention, for Dr. Newman was not specially invited to the Council. He would have been elected by the English bishops as their consultor had they not been informed at the time of the election that he would be specially invited by the Pope. The Bishop of Orleans wanted Newman to go to the Council as his theologian; but, under the circumstances, Dr. Newman considered it would be an impropriety, and might be regarded as an affront to the Pope.

that the Holy Father had desired Cardinal Barnabò to occupy himself about the consultors from England, America, and the East.

Accordingly I went to Cardinal Bò. and gave him the names; but he said that it was not enough, as he had written you an official letter, to which he wished to have an official answer in order to refer it to the Pope. He said also that you ought to mention the qualifications of the theologians, so that the Pope may approve of them, and because it would never do if they could not write Latin, or in other ways be able to write *voti* fit to be submitted to the Congregations.

I must say that when one looks all over England it appears that there are few theologians up to the mark, and capable to stand by the Roman and German consultors. But you will do your best.—Adieu, and believe me sincerely yours,

GEO. TALBOT.

Informed of the Pope's reported intention of naming Dr. Newman one of the consultors to the Council, Bishop Grant wrote the following letter:—

ARUNDEL, 30*th September* 1868.

MY LORD ARCHBISHOP—Your Grace will not be displeased, I trust, if I venture to ask you to defer the circular to the bishops about selecting theologians for the Council until the reply of the Bishops of Liverpool, Nottingham, and Plymouth arrive, as you are not obliged to issue it until then. The Bishop of Liverpool would, however, vote for Dr. Newman if he saw others doing so, and my idea would therefore be to wait until your Grace hears from Talbot about Dr. Newman. If his Holiness designs to invite him separately the votes will naturally take another turn.

2. In any case I hope your Grace will start with *List No.* 2 without any preface, as your present letter will be interpreted as a direct effort on your own part to exclude the Regulars of *List No.* 1.

What would your Grace say of Dr. Waterworth, the translator of the Council of Trent and editor of the *Faith of Catholics.* He has standing, and is a man of ability, rather junior to Cardinal Wiseman in Rome.

My petition therefore is to wait till Talbot writes.

2. Also till all the bishops reply.

3. I will alter my candidate, so as to endeavour to lead to a good result.

You could then send round and say: "If no one has an

absolute majority, will your lordships allow the Bishops of Birmingham, of Clifton, of Southwark, and the Archbishop, meeting at Birmingham, October 15, and as many others as can come, to settle, October 16, about the theologians and the question of the Regulars?"—Yours affectionately,

THOMAS GRANT.

The year of the Vatican Council 1869-70 witnessed the fiercest ecclesiastical conflict since the Council of Trent. The opposing forces stood under arms. The polemics of the newspapers, as befitted the temper of the age, preceded the battle of the Pastorals. The *Civiltà Cattolica*, the organ of the Jesuits, was the first to throw down the gauntlet. It was picked up defiantly by the *Augsburg Gazette*, the organ of Dr. Döllinger's Party. On this opening conflict a few words will suffice.

In the month of March 1869 the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of Augsburg published five articles under the title "The Council and the *Civiltà*." It was a fierce attack on the impending Council in reply to a French correspondence which had appeared in February in the *Civiltà Cattolica* of Rome, advocating the cause of Papal Infallibility. The *Augsburg Gazette* denounced the Council "as one chiefly called for the purpose of satisfying the darling wishes of the Jesuits and of that portion of the Curia which is led by them." Under the title "The Œcumenical Council and the Rights of the State," the Civil Power is warned not to be lulled to sleep by the arts of the Ultramontane Party; the Governments of Europe are admonished not to permit the Catholic conscience to be misled and new elements of discord to be introduced among the nations. The laity are reminded, and especially Princes, that they belong to the Church; that the first Councils were convoked by Emperors, and that States have in manifold ways a power of guidance. The summoning of a General Council by Pius IX. without consulting the Catholic Governments was declared by the *Augsburg Gazette* to be an assault on the privileges of the Civil Power.[1]

The party of Dr. Döllinger and of Professor Friedrich and their allies strove hard in every direction to excite the

[1] *Angemeine Zeitung*, 8th May 1869.

jealousy of the States against the Council; and the articles published in the *Augsburg Gazette* had that object in view. So prominent an advocate of Papal Infallibility as Archbishop Manning did not escape attack. Declaring that "the whole plan of campaign is to settle the new dogma at one sitting as by the stroke of a magician's wand," the *Augsburg Gazette* went on to say that "Archbishop Manning, who, with the glowing zeal of a new convert, has embraced the theory of infallibility, a short time ago had undertaken to give the impulse to these proceedings."[1] In another article it is said: "The English bishops will follow Manning; the Irish will follow Cullen, imposed and set over them by Rome."[2]

In the summer appeared Monseigneur Maret's work, *La Concile Générale et la Paix Religieuse;* it excited no small sensation. It was paraded and praised by the opponents of the Vatican. It was followed by an anonymous letter against the Definition of Papal Infallibility. Then came the Address of the German Bishops assembled at Fulda, which indicated that they considered the Definition as uncalled for and inopportune. Archbishop Manning was not slow in coming forward as champion of Papal Infallibility. He published a pastoral letter, entitled *The Œcumenical Council and the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff*, in which with signal ability and force he defended the doctrine not only against its open and direct opponents, but against, what he considered, the feeble and half-hearted fashion of professing belief in the dogma itself, whilst arguing against the opportuneness of the Definition. Fixing his mind on the essential point that the doctrine was true, he did not look to the right or to the left, or forecast possible consequences; but maintained as an absolute duty not to evade the Truth or go behind it, but to define it as an article of Faith. His clear conception and uncompromising spirit and thoroughness imparted a force and directness to Manning's defence of Papal Infallibility which was not without effect on the judgment of his own countrymen. This uncompromising statement provoked

[1] *Allgemeine Zeitung*, 13th March 1869.
[2] *Ibid.*, 14th March 1869.

a collision between himself and the Bishop of Orleans. In his Pastoral letter Monseigneur Dupanloup accused Manning of a grave theological error in declaring the Pope to be infallible *apart* from the Church. The Archbishop of Westminster answered that Monseigneur Dupanloup, not understanding English, had been misled by a faulty translation. The French bishop retorted, "the translation was done by your friend and henchman, M. Veuillot, in the *Univers*," and reiterated the charge of theological error. Archbishop Manning dropped the controversy; being at the time in the Council he objected to carry on the discussion.[1]

Cardinal Manning gave a graphic account of his journey to Rome in order to take part in the Vatican Council in the following Note:—

I started in November for the Council. Passing through Paris, I saw both Thiers and Guizot. Thiers said, "I am looking with great anxiety to your Council. It may do much good and much harm. Do not make *notre vie trop dure*—do not condemn the principles of '89. They are in the very marrow of all Frenchmen." He spoke much of the Temporal Power, which he had always supported. I said: "*Mais, M. Thiers, vous êtes effectivement croyant.*" He said, "*En Dieu.*" After this I saw Guizot, who spoke of the Temporal Power as the centre of European order. He said: "I am awaiting your Council with great anxiety. It is the last great moral power and may restore the peace of Europe." I saw also Père Gratry who was wild about the Infallibility. His was a beautiful mind like a child's, but with the clearness of a mathematician. His French is, I have always thought, like Pascal's. But he had no theology. This, Père Petitot, his Superior at the Oratory, had told me, and it was true. At Chambèny I fell in with Mgr. de la Bouillerie, Bishop of Carcassonne; and at Florence with Monseigneur Mermillod. We travelled to Rome together. At the station at Florence we found papers containing telegrams of Monseigneur Dupanloup's Pastoral against Infallibility, and we heard that he had been at Munich with Döllinger, and at Malines with Archbishop Deschamps trying to form an Opposition. In his Pastoral he attacked me by name. When I got to Rome I tried to

[1] In an appendix to his pastoral, Mgr. Dupanloup published the incriminated passages in Manning's letter in English and in M. Veuillot's translation.

correct some of his errors about myself; but he refused He had attacked me for saying that the Pope *apart* from the bishops is infallible, maintaining that this separates the head from the body. I have answered this in the last pastoral in *Petri Privilegium.* The word *seorsum* is common in theologians. He would not retract and, being in the Council, I would not enter into controversy.

The first business of the Vatican Council was to elect the four Deputations, the most important was the *Deputatio de Fide.* The two sides, the Infallabilists and the Inopportunists made their separate lists. The Deputations consisted of twenty members each. The bishops of each nation elected one of themselves as a representative. The English bishops did not elect Archbishop Manning but Bishop Grant. This was one of Manning's first trials. The Irish did not put him into their list; nor the American bishops. The Italian bishops, however, put him into their list. Archbishop Manning's chief work at the Vatican Council was not so much that of a theologian as of an ecclesiastical statesman and diplomatist. He had free access, as he has put on record, to the Pope during the Council, but Pope Pius IX. himself was not a profound theologian, and wisely left the discussion of nice or knotty theological difficulties to the great theologians of the Council. They were not confined to one side only. The Inopportunists boasted as many great names in their ranks as the Infallibilists, as in popular terms the two parties were described. Perhaps it is not too much to say that it was outside the Council that the chief work was done, so far as the influencing of opinion among the Fathers of the Council was concerned. Influence was acquired, and votes won not so much in the Council itself as in the extra-Conciliar meetings held on both sides; in private discussions between members of the Opposition and Infallibilist parties; in the great social assemblages, at which the rival parties were entertained by great ladies of either side; or in those still more favoured entertainments in which, on neutral ground as it were, grand ladies or ladies of the diplomatic world welcomed the rival Fathers of the Council and their friends and supporters.

The day of woman's influence in statecraft or church-craft is surely not yet over. It did not expire with the courts of the kings of France. Its form may be altered; its spirit remains. In Rome during the Vatican Council, as in party politics at home, women took sides. Even the big hall of the Council was too narrow to confine within its own walls all the arguments for or against the fiercely contested Definition—was too grave, perhaps, or solemn for the lighter play of attack or defence. The ample discussions overflowed beyond the walls of the Vatican and were gathered up and popularised in extra-Conciliar meetings, or in those brilliant assemblages where woman with her grace and wit played no undistinguished part. Great ladies canvassed or cajoled on this side or that; or with delicate diplomatic skill brought together such of the grave Fathers of the Council as might be open to argument, or persuasion; or be ready with Italian ease and grace for the congenial work of compromise. The most uncompromising Fathers of the Council, like Archbishop Manning, for instance, did not disdain these lighter assemblages, for on such neutral ground they saw a fine opportunity of winning converts to their sterner views. The influence of these great dames were apparently more than otherwise on the side of the Opposition; for M. Louis Veuillot held them up to public scorn and ridicule as *commères* (gossips) *du Concile.*

But the sterner, fiercer work of denunciation or misrepresentation was rightly left to the rougher hands of men. And rough work, it cannot be denied, was done on either side. Imputations were freely cast abroad to the right and the left. Uncharitable inferences were rashly drawn. Surmises or suspicions were set down, on the one side or the other, as facts, as indisputable as proofs in Holy Writ. It was no day to pick or choose weapons of offence. The contest was too vital; the differences too great and fargoing not to touch to the quick the hearts of men. Passions were aroused; for not even from an Œcumenical Council are human weaknesses excluded. If its final results be the work of Divine illumination the instruments made use of are only human,—sometimes, perhaps, very human.

Of all the Fathers of the Vatican Council the one who attained to the highest influence — I don't mean inside but outside the Council—was Monseigneur Dupanloup, the famous Bishop of Orleans. His voluminous correspondence was the wonder, the talk of the Council. It excited rage and scorn in the one party; in the other boundless enthusiasm. Not content with writing to churchmen and chapters, to party politicians and newspapers, Mgr. Dupanloup appealed to chancelleries and cabinets, to statesmen, and kings. As Cardinal Manning once remarked: "I do not know, I cannot even guess the number of secretaries employed by Mgr. Dupanloup; but I know that day by day, week by week, bales of baneful literature—letters, pamphlets, circulars, appeals—were despatched to every centre of intrigue in Europe—notably to Paris and Munich."

Untiring as was the energy displayed by the Bishop of Orleans; profound as was his belief that under the circumstances of the day, at an epoch when infidelity was so rampant, the Definition of Papal Infallibility would bring about evils untold—such evils, for instance, as wrung from his heart the passionate exclamation, "I shed tears of blood at the thought of the number of souls which will be lost"; fierce as were his invectives against the extravagant claims of the extreme Party represented in France by M. Veuillot and the *Univers;* yet, if not in fierceness of invective, in energy and earnestness, Archbishop Manning was second only to the Bishop of Orleans.

On his part, Archbishop Manning regarded with like intensity the rejection of Papal Infallibility as fraught with untold ills and evils. It would add a new triumph to the enemies of the Papacy; impart a new strength to the Revolution. It would paralyse the arm of the Church in the face of the foe, give to its enemies a new weapon in the day of battle. And was not the enemy already in the gate? The rejection of Infallibility would destroy the principle of Authority and shake Christian society to its base. The evils depicted by Mgr. Dupanloup, Manning regarded as imaginary, or at any rate as exaggerated out of all proportion, to suit the purposes of the Opposition. In Manning's view they were mere flea-

bites, at all events compared to the deathblow which was the real meaning of the attack aimed, whether Mgr. Dupanloup and his friends knew it or not, at the supreme Authority of the Pope. What was the policy of the Inopportunists, Manning often asked, with the vehemence begotten of indignation, but a policy of intrigue, of compromise, or of cowardly connivance with the world, of co-operation even with the arch-enemies of the Pope.

Such was the line of argument Archbishop Manning pursued with the friends and supporters of the Opposition whom by choice he singled out in those extra-Counciliar meetings and assemblages held during the eventful months when the Vatican Decree was trembling in the balance. The lobbies of the House of Commons are not half, not a tenth part, so favourable for the work of persuasion and of canvassing as were the crowded *salons* presided over, not merely by the fair partizans on either side, but by neutral ladies. Votes changed sides with an ease and rapidity which at home would be the envy of our whips and wire-pullers.

If Archbishop Manning's field of action was more limited than that of the Bishop of Orleans; if it was not open to the Archbishop of Westminster to appeal to the disaffected, as he would call them, or the worldly-minded wherever they might be found on two continents, as did the Bishop of Orleans; yet in his narrower range Archbishop Manning's tongue was as busy as Mgr. Dupanloup's pen. What finer field than Rome, the centre of action and of interest in the crowded and eventful days of the Vatican Council, for the display of Archbishop Manning's special talents. The occasion was one which called for the exercise of diplomatic skill of the highest order. Consider who were they whose votes had to be won if the Definition of Papal Infallibility were to be brought to a successful issue? Many of these grave Fathers of the Vatican Council, whose reason had been unreached, whose hearts had been unmoved by the elaborate harangues, by the passionate appeals of the most learned and profound theologians on the Infallibilist side, could now only be induced to review their opinions and change sides by the most subtle arts of persuasion. What tact, what delicacy

had to be shown in approaching such grave and reverend Fathers. It was not as with a commoner electorate of a lower order, whose votes, as in the House of Commons, are at times to be won by false promises, false hopes; by fear or by favour. The votes of the Fathers of the Council could only be gained by appeals to reason, or to conscience, or to the sense of responsibility. What was at issue was not a question of principle but of policy. The Fathers of the Council, speaking broadly, were of one mind as to the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. What divided them in the main was the wisdom or unwisdom—the opportuneness—as they called it, of the Definition under the circumstances of the day; in the temper of men's minds inside and outside of the Church. Such a state of things naturally afforded room for the work of diplomacy; fittingly gave play to the arts of persuasion.

Archbishop Manning's skill was recognised on both sides. His grace of manner, his earnest and persuasive speech, his thorough belief in the absolute necessity of the Definition, added weight to his words. By natural bent, as by policy, he avoided argumentation and its pugnacity. He relied on clear and concise statements of his case. He dwelt on the terrible responsibility of leaving so vital a question as the Infallible authority of the Pope unsettled. He drew pictures of evil days to come; of terrors which threatened society; of Revolution going down to the roots of things, which made the hair of others besides the theologian of the Bishop of Mayence stand on end. It was said at the time outside the Council, half in jest, half in earnest, that "There was no better hand than Manning's in drawing the long bow." It may be said with greater truth, that he was a past-master in the art of persuasion; the Prince of Diplomatists. Nature, it would almost seem, had intended Manning for a "Parliamentary Whip"; but accident, or rather the Will of God, had made him a Bishop and a Father of the Vatican Council.

His restless energy was a marvel to the easy-going Roman. A summer's day in Rome brought to him no *siesta*. He was ever awake and on the alert. He pursued

his half-made converts to the bitter end, drove them into a corner, and carried them captive one by one. Some of the older cardinals of the Council on either side looked askance at his novel method of canvassing for votes, and deprecated what they called his "perpetual intriguing." They did not understand the man or his methods; nor the terrible earnestness of his belief, of his hopes or fears, nor the zeal which consumed his soul.

There was another Party outside the Council, headed by Dr. Döllinger and Professor Fredrich, powerful by its organisation and by its intimate relations with the anti-Papal press, especially of Germany, which displayed no little ferocity against the Vatican Council and against the Papal Infallibility. These were the men who distorted historical facts; who fabricated fables to the dishonour of the Papacy; who filled, week after week, the irreligious or anti-Catholic press with the most extravagant misrepresentations of what had occurred in the Council. But heat and passion are not altogether unpardonable sins, and were, it must be confessed, not confined to one side only. But what was almost unpardonable—as a sin against the principle of civil and religious liberty—was the cowardly attempt to bring about an intervention on the part of the leading States of Europe hostile to the rights and liberties of the Vatican Council. Dr. Döllinger, who was a *persona grata* to the King of Bavaria, suggested to King Louis II. that a coalition should be formed of the various States whose Catholic subjects would be deprived, as he pretended, of their civil liberties by the setting up of the Pope's Infallibility, a dogma incompatible with their Civil Allegiance. Bavaria was to take the first step, and to propose to the English Government to issue in due form and order an invitation to France, Prussia, Austria, Bavaria, and Belgium to make a common stand against the Vatican Council; and to present to the Sovereign Pontiff, through their respective Representatives at the Holy See, a common declaration that the Definition of Papal Infallibility was against public policy; and that the promulgation of any such dogma by the Council would be prohibited by International enactments.

This nefarious attempt was frustrated in the main by the diplomatic skill and foresight of Archbishop Manning. Early in the sittings of the Council it came to his knowledge, as Cardinal Manning himself told me, that copies of the *schemata*—or what in parliamentary phrase are called bills—to be presented to the Council, either purloined, or acquired by bribery or corruption, were in the hands of Dr. Döllinger's party. The substance of these documents was published in the *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*. Their meaning was wilfully distorted; a false interpretation put upon the proceedings of the Council, in the view of exciting the jealousy of the Civil Power and provoking opposition on the part of the leading States. To counteract the mischievous effects of these and other misrepresentations, both as to the actual proceedings of the Council and as to the real meaning and object of Papal Infallibility, Archbishop Manning sought an interview with Pope Pius IX., and begged to be released from the oath of secrecy in order to furnish Mr. Odo Russell, the diplomatic agent of the English Government at the Vatican, with a true report of the proceedings of the Council.

Mr. Odo Russell had been for twelve years the British diplomatic resident at the Vatican; and both before, during, and after the meeting of the Council was in constant and intimate communication with Archbishop Manning. Although not a Catholic, Mr. Odo Russell was, like Mr. David Urquhart, an ardent supporter of Papal Infallibility, and declared to his colleagues the ambassadors or ministers assembled at Rome, as well as to Archbishop Manning, that "its definition by the Council is necessary to the very existence of the Pope's future authority." From his mother, who was a Catholic, he had acquired a more intimate knowledge of Catholicism than falls to the lot of most Protestant statesmen or diplomatists. His letters to Manning are full of diplomatic gossip, as it would be called in our careless days, but in the pregnant day of the Vatican Council such information was rare and invaluable. His weekly reports to Manning tell all about the doings at the Council; the misdoings of the Opposition; the boastings of the Inter-

national Committee; the machinations of Dr. Döllinger's party; the intrigues of the Bavarian Government; the threats and intimidations of M. Daru, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs; and the confident predictions of the ministers and ambassadors in Rome of the impending collapse of the Vatican Council and the triumphant success of the Opposition party, inside and out of the Council.

To facilitate communication, Archbishop Manning and Mr. Odo Russell used to meet during the session of the Council every Saturday—a day on which the Vatican Fathers kept holiday—and take long walks outside the walls of Rome. Manning gave his weekly report of the work of the Council to Mr. Odo Russell for the enlightenment and guidance of Lord Clarendon, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs; and Mr. Odo Russell on his part communicated to Archbishop Manning the latest intrigues of the party of Dr. Döllinger, the most active leader of which in Rome was Lord Acton; the manœuvres of the Bavarian Government; and the active relations of the diplomatists with the Opposition.

Archbishop Manning had positive knowledge that Lord Acton was in constant communication with Mr. Gladstone, supplying him with information hostile to the Council, "poisoning his mind," as Archbishop Manning phrased it, against Papal Infallibility and the Pope's friends and supporters. Lord Acton, a friend and disciple of Dr. Döllinger, had great influence with the German bishops, who for the most part belonged to the Opposition, and was also on confidential terms with Monseigneur Darboy, Archbishop of Paris, and with the Bishop of Orleans, and had not a little to do with bringing into closer union the Bishops of France and Germany. He was active also in furnishing the Opposition bishops at the Council with the views of Dr. Döllinger and Professor Friedrich and their hostile historical criticisms of the Papacy. Lord Acton, as Manning knew well, did more than any other man, except the Bishop of Orleans, in exciting public feeling, especially in Germany and England, against the Vatican Council.

On one occasion, speaking of Lord Acton's action in

stirring up the German papers and people against the Vatican Council, Cardinal Manning said :—

I found out that Acton was the correspondent of the *Augsburger Gazette*, which was weekly attacking and defaming the Council in an amusing way. Odo Russell asked me whether I thought the Definition would be made. I said, "Certain." He asked, "Is there no way in which it can be prevented?" I said, "Certainly. Cut our throats." In less than a week this came back in the *Augsburger Gazette*. Odo Russell assured me that he had told this to no one but Acton.

On another occasion Cardinal Manning said :—

On one Saturday afternoon, our *Sabbatina*, as we used to call them, I was walking with Odo Russell when Acton joined us. I made a sign to my companion to change the conversation. On discovering that we were silent as mice on the subject of the Council, Acton in disgust left "the pair of conspirators."

The communications which passed between Archbishop Manning and Mr. Odo Russell were attended by results of the most practical character and of the highest value. Without Odo Russell's aid and timely information all Manning's diplomatic skill would have been of no avail in averting from the Vatican Council the fatal catastrophe of diplomatic intervention. Had Dr. Döllinger's plan or plot succeeded, and the Powers of Europe taken common action against the Pope and the Council, the moral influence of the Opposition would have become almost irresistible, and the united action of the majority of the Fathers of the Council have been broken or so weakened as to have rendered them helpless to resist the final demand, insisted upon by the Opposition, of proroguing the Council. But Mr. Odo Russell, by the aid of Archbishop Manning was enabled to supply the Foreign Office with a full and accurate report of the proceedings of the Council and the real meaning and true extent of Papal Infallibility. And what, as the result proved, was of still more importance, to refute by means of Mr. Odo Russell's reports to Lord Clarendon, the gross misrepresentations both as to the action of the Council and the Civil effects of the Definition, which Manning knew had been supplied to Mr. Gladstone by Lord Acton.

On the occasion of the presentation by Prince Hohenlohe,[1] the President of the Bavarian Ministry, of a formal proposal that the English Government should invite the Powers of Europe to intervene at the Vatican for the protection of the civil and religious liberty of their Catholic subjects, there was a prolonged and hot discussion in the Cabinet. In giving this information Cardinal Manning said, "I am telling you facts which I could not publish myself, but they may fitly appear in the *Life*. I hope," he added, "I am not betraying a Cabinet secret. The prime minister, Mr. Gladstone, supported the Bavarian proposal on the grounds and by the arguments supplied to him by Acton; but Lord Clarendon, better informed by Odo Russell, exposed one by one the fallacious statements and wilful distortions of fact. Finally, after a hot discussion, Mr. Gladstone was defeated in the Cabinet, the Bavarian proposal was rejected, and the Vatican Council was left in peace to do God's work. Had the Council been prorogued according to the designs of the Opposition, owing to events—the Franco-German War, the seizure of Rome, the persecution of Catholics in Germany by Prince Bismarck—it would have been prorogued *sine die*. The Council, with the Pope a prisoner in the Vatican, could not have met again, and the Pope's Infallibility would have been undefined even to this day." Then he added with more than wonted earnestness, "It was by the Divine Will that the designs of His enemies were frustrated."

If this be so, it is not too much to say that Archbishop Manning and Mr. Odo Russell were the human instruments in God's hands.

The part which Mr. Odo Russell played in frustrating by Archbishop Manning's effective aid the diplomatic intrigues directed against the Vatican Council invests his personality with special interest. The Reports which he sent to Lord Clarendon, his chief at the Foreign Office, were entombed in its pigeon-holes; but his notes and letters to Archbishop Manning—and they are numerous—give life and local colour to the dry bones and dull details of a

[1] Prince Hohenlohe, the President of the Bavarian Ministry at the time of the Vatican Council, is now the Chancellor of the German Empire.

forgotten controversy, which in its fierce day shook the hearts of men, ruffled the smooth surface of diplomacy, and agitated the chancelleries and cabinets of Europe. Unfortunately Manning's share in the correspondence is nowhere to be found. Lady Ampthill, the widow of Mr., afterwards Lord, Odo Russell (created Lord Ampthill in 1881), bears witness to the great store set by her husband on these lost letters, but after anxious search and inquiry she has failed to discover any trace of them.

A few letters selected from Mr. Odo Russell's voluminous correspondence suffice to show the nature and importance of the correspondence.

Letters from Mr. Odo Russell to Archbishop Manning on the Vatican Council, 1869-70.

Mr. Odo Russell's first letter gives the glad news that he is to return to Rome for the Vatican Council.

Private. Athenæum Club, Pall Mall, S.W.,
31*st August* 1869.

Dear Dr. Manning—I have called on you several times, not only to pay you my respects, but also from interested motives. Her Majesty's Government have been kind and amiable, and have allowed me to return to Rome and remain there "as long as the Œcumenical Council lasts." May it last as long as that of Trent!!!

To be allowed to *report* the diplomatic history of the Council of the Vatican is a privilege and happiness I little dreamt was awaiting me in my career, and I envy myself and pity my colleagues.

Of course I am making the most of my leisure and reading all I can before I begin to write, and the favour I came to ask your Grace was to advise me as to what I ought to read in particular to strengthen myself for the task.

You know that my earnest wish is to do justice to all parties, and for that I require knowledge.

If your Grace should ever think of the name of any work, book, pamphlet, speech, etc. etc. that could be useful to me, and would put it on a scrap of paper and the scrap of paper into an envelope addressed to me at the Foreign Office, Downing Street:—

Or, Knowsley Park, Prescot, for the next ten days;
Or, Lathom House, Ormskirk, until the 20th September;—
Or, to this club, I should be grateful, *la di là dell' immaginazione.*

We spent our summer at Frascati in the Villa Conti, and left with deep regret, but now we hope to remain in England until the end of October.

H.M. the Queen was pleased to ask us to Osborne, and took immense interest in all I had to say about the Pope, the Council, and Rome in general.

My mother often asks me how she could manage to know your Grace? And I tell her that she is too much devoted to Bossuet, Fénélon, and Fleuri to find favour in your eyes,—the day of the Gallicans is over?

The Dowager Lady Salisbury, also, tells me often that she would be happy to find means of renewing your acquaintance.

The diplomatic habit of reporting makes me indiscreet.—Believe me, dear Dr. Manning, your Grace's faithful servant,

ODO RUSSELL.

Sunday night, 23/1/70.

MY DEAR LORD—I have tried in vain to get the Opposition petition, which is not printed, but I heard to-night at the Austrian embassy that Cardinal Rauscher had sent it up to the Pope to-day under cover to Monsignor Pacca. It was to have been presented to his Holiness by four archbishops, but each of them declared that three would be sufficient!

The Petition is composed of five documents signed by different nationalities, the German one had forty-seven signatures, of the other ones I know nothing positive.—Ever, my dear lord, yours sincerely,

ODO RUSSELL.

Friday evening.

MY DEAR LORD—I have to send off a messenger on Sunday, and fear, to my great regret, that I shall not be able to call to-morrow at 3 p.m. Next week, however, I shall hope to pay my respects to your Grace.

The publication in the *Augsburg Gazette* of the *Schema de Ecclesia* has been of the greatest use to the Opposition, who are founding their demand for moral support from foreign governments on it, and foreign governments alarmed at the dogmatisation of the Syllabus, are preparing to advise the Pope. The French Government especially seem determined to oppose the majority in the Council, and flatter themselves that they can easily prevent the definition of the Infallibility by sundry threats conveyed through the Archbishop of Algiers and M. de Banneville.

The Opposition are certainly gaining daily in strength and enlisting foreign support and public sympathy, and will be very powerful in another ten days or so. Have you read the manifesto of the French Opposition in the *Moniteur Universel* of the 14th inst.? Many articles of the kind will appear in the press. I still think the majority can carry the Definition if they do not put it off much longer.

Next week I hope to have the honour of hearing your Grace's opinion on the deeply interesting situation of affairs.—Ever my dear lord, yours sincerely, ODO RUSSELL.

Sunday night.

MY DEAR LORD—I have received the letter for Lord Petre and the documents, for which I am exceedingly obliged and grateful.

The Opposition say they have 34 French bishops, 47 German, and 20 Italian,—they now expect about 150 signatures. Cardinals Bonnechose and Mathieu have *not* signed,—Cardinal Rauscher has, as well as Archbishop Darboy.

The International Committee, who met in Cardinal Rauscher's house almost every afternoon, are now full of hope and even confidence, but I have not yet obtained a copy of their petition, which was drawn up by Cardinal Rauscher and Monsignor Strossmayer.

On Saturday next they expect to receive a new dogmatic *schema* which they intend to demolish—never mind what it is. Bishop Ullathorne has joined the ranks of the Opposition.—Ever my dear lord, yours sincerely, ODO RUSSELL.

Monday.

MY DEAR LORD—The International Committee of the Opposition have decided in their last meeting to send a deputation, headed by Cardinal Schwarzenberg Rauscher and Archbishop Darboy to the Pope to present their petition against Infallibility in a day or two. They say that if the matter is pressed in the Council they will all speak against time until the Council is prorogued *sine die*. Monsieur Darboy announces an important speech on Wednesday with which he intends to open the sitting. Bishop Hefele has joined the International Committee.—Ever, my dear lord, yours sincerely, ODO RUSSELL.

Sunday.

MY DEAR LORD—To-morrow, Monday, at 3 p.m., will suit me perfectly,—many thanks.

Diplomacy and the International are going to ask for *delay!*

I read Monsieur Dupanloup's letter differently, page 32, there is a sentence beginning "*Ah les luttes necessaires*," etc., which looked to me like prospective submission.—Ever my dear lord, yours sincerely,

ODO RUSSELL.

PALACE CHIGI, *Monday night.*

MY DEAR LORD—According to a diplomatic report, Banneville has received a despatch for communication to Cardinal Antonelli saying that the French Government wash their hands of the consequences of the definition of the Pope's Infallibility, but foreshadow that the Concordat, and the relations of Church and State may suffer from it in France. I have not seen the despatch myself, nor do I know whether it has been communicated to Cardinal Antonelli, but my colleagues tell me that the Council will not venture on definition after the speeches of Ketteler, McHale, Yussuf, Schwarzenberg, Darboy, Simon, etc., and that the Court of Rome will hesitate before a rupture with France and Germany, so that the definition of the Infallibility will be put off *sine die*, and good excuses for doing so will now be found and put forward, and great are the rejoicings of the Opposition in and out of the Council at their coming triumph.

By holding to my old conviction that the Definition is necessary to the very existence of the Pope's future authority I make myself supremely ridiculous, and have been much laughed at, and yet I cannot get myself to believe that the power of Rome is on the eve of being broken and weakened for ever, by a handful of bishops and diplomatists!—Ever, my dear lord, yours sincerely,

ODO RUSSELL.

Sunday.

MY DEAR LORD—My Prussian and Bavarian colleagues tell me that the strength of the Opposition has now been unexpectedly proved by an offer of compromise on the part of the Infallibilist majority. Your Grace, Mgr. Spalding and Mgr. Deschamps are named as the authors of it. The dogma will not be defined if the Opposition will vote their faith in it as it has existed for 1800 years, etc.

I expressed surprise and doubt because I could not see that compromise was yet necessary.

They say that Mgr. Lavigerie of Algiers has gone to Paris to propose this compromise to the Emperor, because the powerful support the French Embassy is lending to the Opposition has tended to increase their numbers by more than 100; that they have 180 signatures to their *Fallibility* petition, and expect

100 more, and that with their silent sympathisers they will make up 300 votes.

The support of the French Embassy is giving the Opposition strength and courage, and is an important feature in the contest, and has decided wavering bishops to join the Opposition, I am told.

The Queen's Messenger leaves to-morrow afternoon, if your Grace has anything to add to my information.—Ever, my dear Lord, yours sincerely, ODO RUSSELL.

Easter Sunday, 17th April.

MY DEAR LORD—I scarcely hoped to find your Grace at home yesterday, but I tried, not having been able all the week to find the free moment I wanted to call.

The triumph of the Opposition at having had 83 votes, the expected arrival of Banneville, the Daru Note, the threatened State interference, and last but not least the eternal Dawkins' case, for now H.M. Government demand explanations to meet Mr. Crawfurd's question in the House after Easter, etc. etc., have fully occupied my time.

I now have a messenger to send off, and in the course of next week I shall hope to pay you my respects, when Mr. Childers has left Rome.

The new Daru Note will defeat its own object, I think.—Ever yours sincerely, ODO RUSSELL.

MY DEAR LORD—I have been shown a document—a *mezzo termine*, which I am told is to be substituted for the postulatum resp. Infallibility, and which is attributed to your grace, Bishop Spalding, and Archbishop Martin of Paderborn. The Opposition says it is quite inadmissible and must be rejected.

An Oriental Patriarch is said to have been personally reprimanded by the Pope for a speech in Council advocating decentralisation in the Church. A question is to be asked in Council by the Opposition about it.—Ever, my dear lord, yours sincerely, ODO RUSSELL.

Sunday night.

MY DEAR LORD—Many thanks for your letter, which I will make use of in writing home to-morrow.

The Opposition reckon on 128 votes against Infallibility, that is 43 Austrian, Hungarian, and Germans, 29 French, 40 Anglo-Americans, 4 Portuguese, 7 Italians, and 5 English (?).

My wife would be very happy to see you any afternoon from 3 to 7 P.M. and very grateful for a visit.—Ever, my dear lord, yours sincerely, ODO RUSSELL.

Thursday.

MY DEAR LORD—Government has been beaten in the House of Commons, and a majority voted an inquiry into Conventual Institutions, and the vote would be very difficult to reverse now, I imagine.

The temper of the House must be very hostile to Rome, and I conclude that the deplorable affair of the three ladies will produce a good deal of indignation when Miss Dawkins' friends bring the matter forward.

Here the universal indignation is very trying, and I have passed anxious days.

The ladies have made it all as public as possible, and the "correspondents" are in great request.

As Miss Dawkins has not gone, I conclude that she is to be allowed to remain.

Council news is very interesting just now, and the Opposition are flushed with their triumph, and ready to take advantage of it.

I will call on Saturday at 3.—Ever, my dear lord, yours sincerely,

ODO RUSSELL.

Friday.

MY DEAR LORD—I must give up the pleasure of calling to-morrow for our *Sabbatina*, having a messenger to attend to who goes Monday evening.

My Opposition friends reckon with certainty on 150 votes against *la grosse question*, and are elated at Cardinals Bilio and Morechini, and Riario Sforza of Naples having joined the ranks of the *Fallibiliarians!* (*?*)

They intend to fight vigorously, and are sure of immense concessions and alterations in the *schema*, which they say has merely been *made stronger* to facilitate concessions to the minority.

I shall endeavour to call on your Grace in the course of next week.—Ever, my dear lord, yours sincerely,

ODO RUSSELL.

Thursday night.

MY DEAR LORD—Monsieur Darboy, who now takes the credit of the Minority vote to himself, was going to Cardinal Bilio to dictate his terms. He tells us that, with the *juxta modums*, and those who did not attend, he is sure of 140 *non placets!* At the French-German International he has recommended a solemn protest to be laid on the table of the Council

after the 140 have voted—to declare that, without moral unanimity, they do not feel bound, etc. etc.

I saw my colleagues, who all agree that the triumph of victory is at fever heat among the eighty-eight. They hope for more Oriental votes also, but I don't know on what grounds.

Two bishops left, Breslau and Budveits, I think. None left to-night.

The death of the bishop of Würzburg has alarmed many, and there may be a limited departure on Saturday, but everything is being done to prevent it.

The excitement of Haynald is most curious to analyse.

I find the same date and ornament at the back of Bishop Kenrick's pamphlet, printed at Naples, that there is on Dentu's *Dernière Heure du Concile.*

The whole edition was distributed yesterday and to-day. Villa Graziola has sent the list of the eighty-eight to be published in the newspapers.—Ever, my dear lord, yours faithfully,

In great haste. ODO RUSSELL.

Thursday.

MY DEAR LORD—Flushed with their success my friends have determined to remain and to win over forty of the *juxta modums*, so as to ensure at least 120 *non placets* at the public Session. Mgr. Ketteler and some others announce concessions in their sense, which will enable them to give their *placet*; but they declare they cannot otherwise recede from their present standpoint.

Villa Graziola has sent a "bulletin" to the press announcing a great victory—a moral Sadowa.

The general excitement is deeply interesting.—Believe me, my dear lord, yours sincerely, ODO RUSSELL.

Sunday night.

MY DEAR LORD—You may like to know that the French, Hungarian, and German Opposition have resolved to vote against the new Definition, which they have unanimously declared to be unacceptable.

They reckon on ninety votes, about, and seem very much pleased with themselves.—Ever, my dear lord, yours faithfully,

I have sent your letter. ODO RUSSELL.

Tuesday.

MY DEAR LORD—My friends have settled, notwithstanding what they call their triumph of yesterday, that, if they cannot command eighty votes to-morrow, they will abstain from attend-

ing the public Session, where they would have only fifteen men courageous enough to say "No." I reckon now with certainty on a unanimous *placet.*

The loss of Cardinal Guidi has been a severe blow.

I shall call to-morrow at 5 P.M.—Believe me, my dear lord, yours, ODO RUSSELL.

Archbishop Manning and Mr. Odo Russell were both busy in writing about the Council to members of the English Cabinet. Manning's letter is as follows:—

ROME, 6*th April* 1870.

MY DEAR GLADSTONE—I thank you much for writing at such a time of pressure. . . .

In your last letter you speak of what is passing here: and in the House I believe you have used nearly the same words.

Let me speak freely. I know that Acton corresponds either with you, or with those who are in contact with you. I believe with both.

You will of course sympathise with him rather than with me. But I pray you to see that you are hearing only one side, and that from a partisan of the most hostile animus.

For the sake of us all, for your own sake, for your future, for the peace of our country, do not allow yourself to be warped, or impelled into words or acts hostile to the Council. If you desire to do good to Ireland, and therefore to the empire, do not render it impossible by touching a religious question.

The French Ministry, with great imprudence, or at least some members of it, have attempted, and may attempt again to put a pressure on the Council.

I feel it to be a duty to say that in such an event we are prepared for the course we shall have to take. The question will be reduced to the simplest terms, and our next step is inevitable. I wish to say this beforehand. The repeated efforts of the Opposition here to invoke the interference of the Civil Governments are well known to us. No such interference will have a shadow's weight on the Council; but it will impose upon us duties not free from many dangers, but to be done at the cost of all things. I believe that you would wish me to be perfectly open on such a subject.

The fears which move me to write may be groundless, and then I hope you will excuse my having so written. But there are great things at stake, and we are both responsible.—Believe me, always affectionately yours, H. E. MANNING.

The Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P.

Thursday, 8th April 1879.

MY DEAR LORD—I shall be faithful to the *Sabbatina* this week, and be with your Grace as soon after three as possible.

Work seems increasing just now, and I shall be glad when the warm weather drives our countrymen to the north and gives more leisure for reflection. While your Grace was writing to Mr. Gladstone I was writing to Lord Clarendon in the same sense and on the same subject, but with what success I know not.

I shall be grateful for a conversation on this grave matter on Saturday at 3 p.m.—Ever my dear lord, yours faithfully,

ODO RUSSELL.

Tuesday night.

MY DEAR LORD—Many thanks for your very kind visit—I greatly regret I was out. After a busy morning I had gone out for air and exercise and missed your letter, which I am very sorry for.

Monseignor Dupanloup told me that he was collecting signatures to a petition for prorogation, to which he expects a favourable reply, because he sees no difficulty in keeping up the present discussion all summer if necessary. Both he and Bishop Strossmayer say that the prolongation of the present discussion and indefinite postponement of the Definition serve to prove the strength of the opposition to the world.

Lord Acton has spoken in a similar sense since his return to England and has been listened to. Mgr. Dupanloup has a letter from Mr. Gladstone which he is showing his friends, but I cannot learn to whom this letter has been written. To Dr. Döllinger I suppose? My wife writes that I am thought to be *all wrong* in the Cabinet and Lord Acton the true prophet. He has assured them at home that the Opposition will obtain such concessions from the majority in the wording of the Definition (if they allow one to be voted at all), that the final result will be a great theological triumph of the Liberal Catholics over the Ultramontanes, and the *Jesuits* are as good as defeated. This is good news at home.

My colleagues here expect similar successes, and tell me that the majority, seeing that they cannot carry the Definition they hoped for, are now ready to accept any the Opposition will agree to, *i.e.* Infallibility and water, if I may so express it. "Above all the Pope fears *a scandal*, and wishes to save appearances if possible," they say, in their despatches.—Ever my dear lord, yours sincerely,

ODO RUSSELL.

Monday night.

MY DEAR LORD—Only a line to say that I have just returned from a large party at Mrs. Stone's, where I found the whole of the British and foreign community up in arms about the banishment of the three ladies, and wanting to bombard Civita Vecchia, etc. etc. etc., so that secrecy is now impossible.—I pity the poor ladies.—Ever my dear lord, yours sincerely,

ODO RUSSELL.

Sunday night.

MY DEAR LORD—Mr. Gladstone telegraphs to me that he has only been able to defeat the motion on higher education in Ireland by making it a vote of confidence, but he regrets that he has not been able to reverse the vote on the Conventual enquiry. —This message is clearly intended for your Grace.—Ever my dear lord, yours sincerely,

ODO RUSSELL.

Saturday night.

MY DEAR LORD—The *Conservatore* of Florence has published the petition we were talking about to-day, so I hope your Grace will be at liberty to let me have a copy for Gladstone.

Cardinal Schwarzenberg's speech of yesterday was written by Bishop Strossmayer, we are told.

The Opposition petition will not be published until it has been presented to His Holiness.

The position of parties will then become clearer to the public, who will take part in the struggle in and out of the Council.— Ever, my dear lord, yours sincerely,

ODO RUSSELL.

Friday night.

MY DEAR LORD—The International determined this evening to send up a deputation at once to the Pope, composed of Darboy, Rivet of Dijon, and three others, to ask,—

1st, for the suppression of the interpolated sentence in the 3rd chapter, respecting the *plenitude* of Pontifical Power; and 2nd, the addition in the Definition formula of Infallibility of the words *consensus ecclesiarum.*

In the event of a refusal on the part of His Holiness, the Opposition will vote *non placet, en masse,* and although seven Opposition bishops have left since Wednesday, they expect to be over one hundred *non placets* at the public Session on Tuesday next.

I have not been able to ascertain the Pope's answer to the Deputation.

I shall call at 5.30 P.M. to-morrow.—Ever, my dear lord, yours sincerely, ODO RUSSELL.

Sunday evening.

MY DEAR LORD—I went to the station this evening. About 20 bishops left—3 Bavarian, 4 French, 1 Dalmatian, and I spoke to Melchor of Cologne, Ketteler, Haynald, and Dupanloup; the others I did not know.

To-morrow morning about 20 more leave; the rest to-morrow night.

Melchor would not sign the collective Address or Protest, but drew up one of his own. Haynald thought the move a mistake, but was obliged to follow the rest; he thought a *non placet* vote more effective; but many would not vote although they would sign.

Not one will attend to-morrow, and the result will be unanimity. Evidently all feared to have to sign a confession of Faith they had been told would be presented to them to-morrow.

I thought your Grace would like to know these facts to-night. —Ever, my dear lord, yours sincerely, ODO RUSSELL.

ROME, *Sunday.*

MY DEAR LORD—Darboy was ill and could not attend the International, so that Dupanloup had it all his own way, and the whole Opposition, for *reasons unexplained*, have decided NOT to attend to-morrow, at the suggestion of the Bishop of Orleans!

A unanimous vote is therefore certain to-morrow!!! They are deliberating at present about an Address or Declaration to be signed by the opposition, but it is not yet adopted.

Most of them leave to-morrow, and some few think of going to-night; none will venture to appear or vote to-morrow; and the world will again be surprised by the triumph of Wednesday last, and the vote of Monday next to-morrow.

How curious the history of the last few days has been!

Cardinal Rauscher was going at 12 to-day to the Pope.

I need not ask your Grace to keep all my scraps of information as secret as I shall always keep yours. Otherwise, my usefulness would cease next winter I apprehend.—Believe me, etc.

ODO RUSSELL.

The Definition of the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff.

In the above letters Mr. Odo Russell has given, if a brief, a graphic account of the hopes and fears, the movements and counter-movements, the confident predictions and boastings on the one side and the other of the opposing Parties in the Vatican Council, and of their final struggle for mastery. The Minority disputed every inch of ground, fought for dear life, or what was dearer to them than life, more sacred, the Spiritual welfare and Temporal peace of the peoples entrusted to their Pastoral care, jeopardised as they believed by the proposed Definition. They had learning on their side, and eloquence and authority, and a high repute for religious zeal. Darboy and Dupanloup, Strossmayer and Haynald, Ketteler and Hefele and Deschamps, were no insignificant or unknown names. And a name greater by far than theirs, though of his own will outside of the Council, was on their side and in sympathy with them—John Henry Newman. Newman had declined to accompany the Bishop of Orleans as his theologian, on the special ground that Pope Pius IX. had of set purpose omitted to call him as consultor to the Vatican Council.

The majority of the German and Austrian and Hungarian and French bishops contended, not without reason, that they were more competent judges of the mind and temper of European society than Italian bishops and bishops of South America or Orientals could pretend to be, but whose pliant and unreasoning votes swamped theirs at the Vatican Council. But, as the event proved, the bishops of France and Germany, of Austria and Hungary, were in the wrong. "They were wise," as Cardinal Manning has recorded, if boastfully not without justification, "and we were fools. But, strange to say, it has turned out that the wise men were always blundering, and the fools always right."

Scant justice, it seems to me, was accorded by its opponents to the Opposition, for the great good it achieved in the Council; the real services it rendered to the Church.

It proved to the world, as nothing else could have done, the independence of the Bishops; their freedom of speech; their fearless, if pungent criticism. In the unrestrained exercise of their right they subjected the doctrine of Papal Infallibility to searching criticism, raised objections theological and historical, fatal, as they conceived, to its Definition by the Church. In a word, they spoke out their mind before the Council, in the face, as it were, of the Pope.

His Holiness' Opposition, like Her Majesty's Opposition in Parliament, fulfilled also a wise and salutary office in putting out of court the extravagant theories as to the conditions and extent of Papal Infallibility entertained by the extreme Party, more influential, perhaps, outside the Council than in it. Archbishop Manning, who was inclined to the extreme views put forward by Dr. Ward in the *Dublin Review*, and by M. Veuillot in the *Univers*, soon learnt at the Council the wisdom and necessity of moderation. Neither can it with justice be alleged that too much time was consumed by the Opposition in discussing so grave a dogma, and in pointing out the dangers, political, social, and religious, which might ensue, owing to the circumstances and temper of the time, from the Definition of Papal Infallibility. It was only in March, the third month of the Council, that the question was introduced into the *Schema de Ecclesiâ*, and in July, having barely lasted four months, the discussion was closed. Time was a vital factor in hurrying on a decision. It was known to both sides that war between France and Germany was imminent. It was known to the Papal Party that war would inevitably break up the Council; and that, if the Definition was not carried without further delay, it must needs be postponed *sine die*. It was this knowledge, and the hope that it inspired, which stimulated the Opposition to postpone by every art or artifice in their power the final decision. Opposing bishops openly avowed their determination to speak against time. The temper of the majority of the Council was not unnaturally raised to fever-heat. The tactics of the Opposition were denounced as wilful obstruction. And factious opposition in the Vatican Council as in

our own Parliament had to be defeated by the stern process of the closure.

The excitement on the occasion can be better imagined than described. Human passions are not confined to politicians and parliaments. Churchmen and Councils are swayed with like feelings; with passions, in truth, far deeper and more intense, since religion stirs the hearts of men with far greater force and fury even than politics. There was hope and fear, joy and rage, triumph and disappointment on the one side or the other in the Vatican Council on the final day of battle.

On Wednesday, 13th July 1870, Pope Pius IX. *proprio motu*, defined the dogma of the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff in the following terms:—

Itaque Nos, traditione a fidei Christianæ exordio perceptæ fideliter inhærendo, ad Dei Salvatoris nostri gloriam, religionis Catholicæ exaltationem et Christianorum populorum salutem, sacro approbante Concilio, docemus et divinitus revelatum dogma esse definimus: Romanum Pontificem, cum ex cathedrâ loquitur, id est, cum omnium Christianorum pastoris et doctoris munere fungens pro supremâ suâ Apostolicâ autoritate doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universâ ecclesiâ tenendam definit, per assistentiam divinam, ipsi in beato Petro promissam, eâ infallibilitate pollere quâ divinus Redemptor ecclesiam suam in definiendâ doctrinâ de fide vel moribus instructam esse voluit: ideoque ejusmodi Romani Pontificis definitiones ex sese, non autem ex consensu Ecclesiæ irreformabiles esse.

Si quis autem huic nostræ definitioni contradicere, quod Deus avertat; anathema sit.

The Day was lost. The Opposition acknowledged their defeat. Procrastination, their last hope, their only chance, availed no more. The last weapon in their hands was broken. They were divided, too, in their counsels as to whether they should take part in the final act of the exciting drama, and record their *non placet* on the day when the Vatican Council was called upon to ratify or reject the Pope's Decree defining Papal Infallibility; or abstain altogether from voting, and content themselves with sign-

ing a Protest. The more cautious and wiser course was adopted. The Opposition bishops dissolved their Union. The International Committee was deserted. There was a sudden dispersion of the tribes. Mr. Odo Russell, like a recording angel, bore witness to their hurried departure, and communicated to Archbishop Manning the glad tidings of the flight of the enemy.

The ultimate hour of the Vatican Council is come. On Monday the 18th of July 1870 it held its fourth and last public Session. The excitement was intense. The moral as well as the material atmosphere was charged with electricity. Men to whom the Faith of the Church was as breath to their nostrils, stood in that hour trembling on the verge of future events, they knew not what—revolt, schism, apostacy, perhaps the fall, if not of nations and peoples, as the prophets of ill had predicted, of individuals, bishops, priests, and even whole communities. The thunder-storm, the lightnings from Heaven which burst over the Vatican, as the Council received and ratified the Papal Decree was but a pale reflex or faint whisper of the moral storm which agitated the hearts of men, and shook for a time from their balance the minds of but too many. The more subdued the excitement, the more intense. The white-mitred Fathers of the Council, as they took part in the last scene of the moving drama, were subdued into silence by a feeling akin to awe. Manning was, perhaps, the most silent; but, as an eye-witness related, his face was flushed with excitement and transfigured with an indescribable look of triumph at the unanimity with which the Council, in obedience to the Divine Will, ratified, as he had predicted, the dogma of Papal Infallibility. The *placets* recorded were 533; there were only two *non placets*, but a large number of the Opposition bishops had either already left Rome, or abstained from voting. On the day after the Definition—Tuesday, 19th of July—War was declared between France and Germany. And War, the great proroguer of Councils, prorogued the Vatican Council for an indefinite period.

Archbishop Manning's predictions were fulfilled. War and Revolution and the Italian annexation of Rome have

rendered the meeting of the Vatican Council impossible even unto this day.

The Inopportunist bishops of France and Germany, the leaders of the Opposition, without entering into any pre-concerted scheme of future action, each went his way to his own home and diocese. If War dissolved the Vatican Council, it dissolved also any chance of combination between the leading bishops of the Opposition. But the Council had accomplished its chief work. None of the evils feared or foretold took place. Every bishop in the Catholic world, however inopportune he may have held, during the Council, the Definition to be, submitted to the Infallible ruling of the Church. A very small and insignificant number of priests and laymen in Germany apostatised and set up the Sect of "Old Catholics." Elsewhere, a few individuals, unhappily, fell away from the Church; but all the rest of the Catholic world, true to their Faith, accepted, without reserve, the dogma of Papal Infallibility.

Petrus loquitur: causa finita est.

Cardinal Manning's "Reminiscences of the Vatican Council" are almost purely of a personal character. In "The True Story of the Vatican Council," which appeared originally in the *Nineteenth Century*, he had unravelled, whilst the controversy was fresh in the minds of men, the knotty points in dispute, and with consummate skill disentangled the unbroken thread of Truth from the confused web of fiction. In his Reminiscences of 1887 he was well advised not to dwell again on controversial points or theological difficulties. He hinted, indeed, or half promised, that he might on some future day, in his Autobiographical Notes, write the inner history of the Vatican Council.

In a conversation on this subject, Cardinal Manning indicated, at any rate in part, the line he might have taken. He said, "Until I had attended one myself, I had never understood aright the history of the Councils. Now all that was obscure or perplexing or disedifying in the Œcumenical Councils of the Past is accounted for to my mind. I now understand how Councils were delayed or broken

up or intimidated; how it came to pass that Emperors and Kings were encouraged to browbeat Popes or Papal Legates. I can put my finger, by the light of the present, on the culprits of the Past. I can understand their motives, and the means they made use of to attain their ends. Nothing is too base for the partisan spirit. I understand now the confusion which prevailed and the misunderstandings that darkened the minds of men in too many a Council. The calumnies of yesterday were not one whit worse than those of to-day. Cowardice in weak and well-meaning men is but too common in every Age, and so are bribery and corruption, fraud and falsehood. But in every Age Truth prevails in the end, for God knows how to defeat the designs of His enemies.

In the following Reminiscences of the Vatican Council, Cardinal Manning lays his finger on the intrigues which he witnessed, or the partisan spirit which he deprecates as the worst of evils:—

The public history of the Council I have given in "The True Story." The private history is known to few. Ratisbon, Carcessone, Malines, Paderborn and I began meeting in order to watch and to counteract the French and the German bishops who were united in an International Committee. We met at my rooms, and Ratisbon's and Paderborn's rooms, and finally at the Villa Caserta. One day the Opposition came and half filled the room. We had to adjourn. In the end we drew up the *postulatum* asking that the Definition should be proposed to the Council. The whole is told in "The True Story." I remember our anxiety while the signatures were coming in, hindered and delayed by intrigue and misrepresentation. And finally when the *postulatum* came before the *deputatio de postulatis*. It was a Sunday morning. We met in the Vatican. Out of 25 all but two or three voted to recommend to the Holy Father that the Definition should be proposed to the Council. This was the first great step in advance. The International Committee met often, and we met weekly to watch and counteract. When they went to Pius IX. we went also. It was a running fight.

The first act of the Council was to elect the four Deputations of 24 each. The two Sides made their lists. The Bishops of each nation met and chose one of themselves as a representative.

The English bishops met at the College and elected Bishop Grant for the list of the *deputatio de fide*. The American bishops were told that as I was on the *suprema*, I ought not to be on two Deputations. The Italian bishops met and put me into their list. One said, *Primo, Manning*. The Council voted, and I was elected on the *deputatio de fide*.

An incessant storm of newspapers beat upon the Council. The lies and fables were endless. To correct them in some measure Pius IX. released a bishop of the Italian, Spanish, French, German, and English tongues from the oath of secrecy. I used to see Odo Russell often, and walk with him every Saturday. I kept him well informed, and he wrote to Lord Clarendon. Lord Acton was writing to Gladstone. Odo Russell gave me all information as to the diplomatists, and the International Committee. From him I received J. H. N.'s letter to the Bishop of Birmingham, and information as to Lord Acton and Gladstone. All this enabled me to judge and act in defeating what I have palliated as far as I could in "The True Story," but it was a plain conspiracy to make Pius IX. the Honorius of the nineteenth century. On the secret history of the *deputatio de fide* see a Latin memorandum by the Bishop of Ratisbon, of which no use must be made while Cardinal Bilio lives, nor after his death in any way to dim the great name of one whom I love much. I have said in another place, how humbly before the Conclave he spoke of his own weakness of character. In the *deputatio de fide* he was overborne by Malines and Paderborn, and had a fear of French Bishops, who beset him in private. Ratisbon has given the history. Perhaps some day I may also give it in these Notes. The whole story of the Council, down to the Definition and the War, is in "The True Story."

The history of the Infallibility in England ought to be written. Of those who ought to have defended it not one spoke. Two of them spoke erroneously, F. Waterworth and F. O'Farrell in Dublin. A third said "he did not know what harm the Definition would do. One of our bishops wrote erroneously. The laity were averse and impatient. They would not read. The priests were almost everywhere sound and in earnest. One day I was standing in the Aula outside the Council with some of the bishops. Monseigneur Dupanloup came up to me in a formal and towering way, and drew a letter out of his breast pocket, and presented it to me. It was from F. O'Farrell imploring me to read the *Defensio Cleri Gallicani* of Bossuet. What was the good man made of? It seemed to me that our laity were cowed and scared by the political and Protestant newspapers. The

Tablet did good service in *The Vatican*.[1] It was no time for "rose water."

The Opposition bishops were damaged by the support of Döllinger and Friedrich, and in some of them the same spirit of supercilious science, with contempt of others, showed itself. Their Parliamentary whipping, and canvassing, and boasting, and defiance, and I must add intrigue, to sway Pius IX., and to bring the pressure of the Civil Powers upon the Pope and the Council, were well known to me. I knew Acton to be their servant. All this was known to me in Rome, at the time, and I have the record and proof of it in a series of letters from Odo Russell, then in Rome, with whom I had close communication.

Cardinal Manning in a Note, dated September 18, 1887, refers to Mr. Odo Russell's letters in the following terms:—

I have also read over Odo Russell's letters to me before, in, and after the Vatican Council. When the Opposition in Rome began filling the newspapers and the Governments of Europe with misleading or false information, I asked Pius IX. to release me from the oath of secrecy that I might give to Odo Russell whatsoever information I thought it advisable our Cabinet should know. This caused a close intimacy by letter and meeting. We used to walk together every Saturday afternoon, which he called our *Sabbatina*, and I gave him full and detailed information, which he wrote home to Lord Clarendon, then Foreign Secretary. From Odo Russell I had also full and detailed information of the acts and intentions of the Opposition, which enabled me to keep Pius IX. fully aware. Before the Council met, that is in November 1869, Odo Russell had clearly thought out the question of the Definition. His mother being Catholic, he had an intellectual conception of the Catholic Faith, and maintained most strongly the absolute need of defining the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff. He said to me, "If you do not define it, the doctrinal Authority of the Pope will be weakened in all the world, and a tendency to National churches will follow."

In the following Note, Cardinal Manning gives a short summary of his speech in the Council; and records Cardinal Bilio's appreciation of it:—

In the Vatican Council I only spoke twice, once to explain a charge made in the *deputatio de fide* on the "unanimous consent

[1] *The Vatican* was a supplement to the *Tablet* newspaper.

of the Fathers," and a second time on a general discussion of the Infallibility. It had been said that the Definition would hinder conversions, that the public opinion of England especially was vehement against it. This I answered:

1. By showing how the Infallibility of the Head follows logically upon the Infallibility of the body; and that the Anglicans reject the former because they reject the latter; that Gallicanism hinders conversion by its illogical absurdity; that in the day in which I saw the Infallibility of the body, I saw, *a fortiori*, the Infallibility of the head.

2. By proving with copious quotations from the *Times*, *Pall Mall*, and *Standard* that the public intelligence of non-Catholics clearly perceived this; that they twitted and ridiculed those who professed to believe the one and not the other as logically confused; that they still more assailed those who professed to believe it, but refused to define it; that they declared the Ultramontanes to be alone consistent, frank, and straightforward.

I wrote the whole by myself; and afterwards read it over to the then Bishop of Beverley, and to P. Liberatore. They made no change in it. I had no knowledge of its length, which was 1 hour 50 min. Before I got up I was nervous; but once up perfectly calm. I saw dear old Cardinal De Angelis look in despair at the Cardinals next to him, as if he thought I should never end. But the bishops never moved till I had done. Cardinal Monaco, who was at the greatest distance, told me that he heard every word. The *Standard* Correspondent said that I had not rolled out my Latin in the grand Oxford pronunciation. True enough, for no living man would have understood a word. Cardinal Bilio told me since that the two speeches he liked best were Cardinal Cullen's and mine. This was perhaps a friend's kindness, but we both meant business, not declamation. And the Archbishop St. Louis, in his *Oratio habenda non habita*, said: *Magna animi voluptate audivi Reverendissimum West^m. nuper in hoc cœtu perorantem, et dubius hos quid plus mirari, viri eloquentiam aut ardentissimum ejus animum in promovenda et quasi imperanda novæ definitione. Lucidus rerum ordo, delectus verborum prorsus felix, gratia eloquii singularis, summaque auctoritas et animi candor, quæ in eloquenti splendebant, me quasi coegerunt in vocem erumpere: Talis eum scio, utinam noster esses. Eum tamen dum audirem mihi in mentem venit, quod de Anglis in Hibernia considentibus olim dici consuevit, eos nempe ipsis Hibernis Hiberniores esse. Reverendissimus Præsul est certe magis Catholicus quam quotquot hujusque Catholicorum noverim. Nullum dubium de Pontificis infallibilitate personali, separata et absoluta, aut ipse habet aut aliis ut habeant permittere vult. Eam doctrinam esse fidei asserit; eamque a Concilio Vaticano definiri*

non tam postulat quam praedicit; more forsan prophetarum istorum qui eventus a se predicti dant operam ut fiant. Sec. VII.

No doubt.

During the Council the Italian papers attacked me incessantly. They gave me the noblest of titles, "Il Diavolo del Concilio." They must have had spies everywhere. They knew when I went to the Pope, how often, and whom I took with me; and said that I went when I liked and took whom I liked. It was true. On the day of the Definition I came from St. Peter's at about 1 o'clock, and found on my table a box containing the portrait of St. Charles with the inscription sent to me by the *Civiltà Cattolica* fathers. A week before it came, the whole, together with the Inscription, was in the Italian papers. I thought it one more lie, but it came true. Pomponi's Book has the whole story.

At the Centenary of St. Peter, when Pius IX. announced the Council of the Vatican, Baron Hübner, the Austrian ambassador, told me, that he was full of alarm that the unity of the Episcopate would be broken; the dissensions brought into conflict, and the authority of the Church diminished, with much more of the same sort, which to an old diplomatist in the natural order must have seemed likely to happen. I said all I thought in direct opposition. After the Council we met again in Rome. He said: "I was wrong and you were right. I could not have hoped for such a result."

Going home, I saw Montalembert, already in his last illness. He at once declared his submission to the Vatican Council like a true Catholic. Our parting was very touching and affectionate. His widow afterwards told me how he spoke of it. He was a noble, chivalrous soul, with a gift of eloquence above his fellows.

On all these four points 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," the "leaders of Catholic thought," the "independent and manly characters who redeem the Catholic Church from servility and meanness." But the Church decided against them; one was censured and submitted, another would not submit and is excommunicate, a third has happily passed without note, and is in full peace with the Truth and the Holy See.

But we, the ignorants, the fools, the flatterers, the empty pates, were right after all. An Œcumenical Council justified us, and the Catholic Church believes and teaches what we said; and we said it because the Church taught us.

I do not know that anything has ever taught me more the

emptiness and sham of worldly reputation than this period of fourteen years. I have seen a "Mutual Admiration Society" label itself and its members at extravagant prices, and the world take them at their fictitious values. They puffed each other, and blew upon their opponents. They were the "men of culture," the "scientific historians." They abused, diminished, ridiculed, ran down, sneered at everyone who opposed them. They deceived many: the world believed in them. They were wise, and we were fools. But strange to say, it has turned out that the wise men were always blundering, and the fools were always right. At last the wise men have had to hold their tongues and, in a way not glorious to them, to submit and to be silent.

In truth, the main characteristic of these men was vanity—intellectual and literary. They had the inflation of German professors, and the ruthless talk of undergraduates.

The Vatican Council was fatal to them. They foresaw this, and therefore by a conspiracy in every country tried to discredit it beforehand. During the whole course they ridiculed and maligned it. When it was suspended they tried to evade it, to explain it away, to slip out of its reach.

It was all in vain. The literary vanities were pricked and collapsed, and in a little while will be forgotten. Both charity and prudence taught us silence. On my return from the Council I wrote a Pastoral which recorded all I thought was necessary. This done, I never named Council or Definition or Infallibility. The Day was won and the Truth was safe, like it was after the Council of Nicea. We had no need to talk about it.

At the time of the Vatican Council, Manning, at the age of sixty-three, was in the full vigour of life. His intellectual powers had reached their highest development. External circumstances were all in his favour. His zeal for the cause of Papal Infallibility was known to the counsellors of the Pope, to the leaders of the Party, before he entered the Council. In Rome, during the Council, he soon made for himself a foremost position as one of the most active advocates of the Definition. His earnestness, his thoroughness, commanded the respect even of the opponents of the scheme; though on the other hand his pertinacious advocacy excited the rage of the inveterate or infidel antagonists of the Papacy. His tact and diplo-

matic skill were admitted by all. Untiring energy, dogged perseverance, and an absolute belief in the sacredness of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, marked him out as foremost among his fellows.

In his almost single-handed struggle for the supercession of Dr. Errington as Cardinal Wiseman's successor, Manning had likewise displayed infinite skill, and, if I may so speak, rare audacity. His work was crowned with singular success. But the field of action in that day was of a narrower range. The removal of Dr. Errington affected only the interest of the Church in England. In that struggle there was an undercurrent that partook perhaps in some ways of a personal character. But the struggle in the cause of Papal Infallibility was purely impersonal. The field of action was world-wide, for it affected the welfare, the rule and order of the Universal Church. In his work in promoting the Definition, every impulse of Manning's heart, every energy of his soul, every quality of his mind were called into play and stimulated to the utmost. Heaven and earth were alike witnesses to the intensity of his faith in Papal Infallibility. His vivid belief in the Supernatural and his practical sagacity as an ecclesiastical statesman combined to render him a not unworthy champion of so noble a cause, a not insignificant actor in a world-wide drama affecting the Temporal and Spiritual interests of men and of nations.

The Vatican Council was the index-hand which marked the culminating point in Cardinal Manning's career.

CHAPTER XVII

THE FALL OF THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE — THE COMMUNE AND ITS CRIMES — "VATICANISM" — MANNING'S RELATIONS WITH MR. GLADSTONE

1870–1875

THE Temporal Power of the Popes, which had rested, as against the Revolution, on the support and filial allegiance of Catholic nations, fell with the fall of Napoleon the Third. The French army of Occupation had been withdrawn from Rome ostensibly to aid in the defence of the Empire against the victorious Prussians, but really in the secret hope of enlisting the armed support of the Revolutionary party in Italy. The King of Piedmont had no intention, however, of aiding his brother Revolutionist in distress.[1] The astute Italian had his own game to play. Napoleon's misfortune was Victor Emmanuel's opportunity. In violation of International law, of right and of justice, he invaded, like a thief in the night, the States of the Church, forced an entrance into Rome, and overthrew the most ancient and legitimate monarchy in Europe. Pope Pius IX., yielding to *force majeure*, withdrew his army from the gates of the besieged city as soon as a breach had been made in the walls of Porta Pia.

In the Vatican Council, the Sovereign Pontiff as Head

[1] The freebooter, Garibaldi, however, with two or three thousand of his Red-shirted followers made an attempt on the Swiss frontier to support France against Prussia. It was more of a demonstration consisting of movements and counter-movements than an attempt to come to close quarters with the Germans. Garibaldi soon deemed it expedient to get out of harm's way by crossing the Italian frontier.

of the Church had gained a great moral victory over the enemies of Religion and the Revolution; but in the annexation of Rome and the States of the Church, in the overthrow of the Temporal Power of the Pope, the cosmopolitan Revolution achieved at last its sinister and long-premeditated aim. The terrible war between Germany and France served as an opportunity, and gave a free hand to Victor Emmanuel—to the Revolution wearing a crown. Europe, apart from those governments and nations, which gave their countenance or support to the Revolution in its attacks on the Papacy, absorbed by the hopes and fears of the war, tamely acquiesced in the misdeeds of the King of Piedmont. Archbishop Manning's ancient ally at the Vatican Council, Mr. Odo Russell, reported that he could not get the diplomatic world to care about the *New* Roman question, for that the Franco-Prussian war absorbed all other interests.

Archbishop Manning, who for ten years had defended against all comers the Temporal Power, was foremost now in denouncing the invasion of Rome. In an indignant Essay on this deed of ill, which was published in the *Supplement* to the *Tablet*, 8th October 1870, he arraigned the invaders of Rome as public malefactors, and stigmatised their forcible seizure of the City of the Popes as a crime against public morality. This was the first but by no means his last protest. He preached in the same year a sermon on "Rome the Capital of Christendom." In the following year the Archbishop of Westminster delivered three Pastoral letters to the clergy of the diocese in defence of the rights, temporal and spiritual, of the Holy See. These letters were republished in a volume under the title, *Petri Privilegium.* Archbishop Manning showed no loss of heart or hope in the day of disaster. He had an implicit belief that the evil designs and deeds of the enemies of God and of the Holy See would be speedily frustrated, to the confusion of Kings, and States, and peoples, who had either laid sacrilegious hands on the Patrimony of Peter, or in their apathy or little faith had acquiesced in the evil deed. His spirit was buoyed by the confident hope that the loss of the Temporal Power was merely for a brief space of

time, and that as the Papacy in its chequered career had often lost its Temporal Power, but had always recovered it, so it would be now once again. As if he saw in a vision what he foretold, Archbishop Manning predicted in terms of absolute assurance that the Temporal Power would be restored as surely as day follows night, and that the world would witness once more the Pope in his ancient See and seat, vested, as King of Rome, in all the ancient plenitude of his Temporal Sovereignty.

Manning, in truth, did not put his trust in kings and princes, still less in carnal weapons. He deprecated the enrolment — at least in his private communications to Mgr. Talbot—of the Papal army. In a letter, dated 3rd January 1866, he wrote as follows:—

MY DEAR MGR. TALBOT. . . . I did not misunderstand about the Holy Father and de Merode. What you write is what I then saw. I always *sympathised* in the heroism of the Lamoricière policy; but my *head* always went against its prudence. The present state is much more to my mind. The strength of the Holy See is to be unarmed. I do not like writing on politics because I mistrust the post; but I could say many things in the same sense as your letter from this side of the question. I believe our Government is not disposed to meddle in Italy, if it can help it. I have told Gladstone and Charles Villiers that if they do, the Catholics of England and Ireland would at once oppose them; and I have proposed to Cardinal Cullen to make an alliance to this effect. Milner's *Life* shows the importance of union between the Irish and English Catholics. . . .

Let me hear often. *Buon capo d'anno*, always affectionately yours, ✠ H. E. MANNING.

The seizure of Rome by Victor Emmanuel's troops caused no little apprehension as to the Pope's safety or liberty of action. An English war vessel was placed at His Holiness' disposal. The English Government offered him hospitality on English territory. Baron Arnim, on the other hand, strongly urged the Pope to accept an asylum in Prussia offered by King William. Pope Pius IX. was implored by some of his friends and counsellors to leave Rome, shaking its desecrated dust from off his feet, and as Pope in exile preach a new crusade against the infidel invaders. Wiser

and bolder men were opposed to such a course, and strongly advised Pius IX. to remain at all hazards in the City of the Popes. "The problem before the Catholic world," as Mr. Odo Russell wrote to Archbishop Manning, "will then lie between the loss of the Temporal Power and its consequences, or the Papacy in exile and its hopes." Cardinal Antonelli with his wonted courage and sagacity adopted the more heroic course, refused compromise in any shape or form, and contended that the Pope, even as a prisoner in the Vatican, would occupy a better and more dignified position than he would as an exile dependent on the goodwill of foreign Potentates.

The following letters of Mr. Odo Russell reflect the anxiety and apprehension felt by Archbishop Manning, both in regard to the liberty of the Pope and the safety of ecclesiastical property belonging to British subjects in the hands of the spoilers of Rome:—

Private. *Friday*, 12*th August* 1870.

Alas! it is but too true, my twelve happy years at Rome have come to an end, and I am called to the F. O. for the present.

From one to six I am at the F. O., but will come to the Athenæum at 2.30, and wait for your Grace there, if that is convenient. If convenient, pray do not answer, and I shall be there.—Ever, my dear lord, yours gratefully,

In haste for post. ODO RUSSELL.

FOREIGN OFFICE, 19*th Sept.* '70.

MY DEAR LORD—The enclosed letter is very important and must call forth some reply from our German Opposition friends. I have not a doubt that the writer will find himself isolated, if not censured, with four or five bishops at most, perhaps less. Our press, I imagine, has proclaimed the fall of the empire and of the Temporal Power too soon, but as nobody agrees with me I dare say I am mistaken. A great man of the Press asked me to-day whether I seriously believed that any more Popes would be elected by the Church!!!

The Pope knows best, but I wish I could understand why he has selected to remain in Rome. Probably because possession is nine points of the law. Still I do not understand it.—Sincerely yours, ODO RUSSELL.

THE ATHENÆUM,
Tuesday evening, 20*th Sept.* '70.

MY DEAR LORD—Since I saw your Grace we have heard from Florence that the Italian troops have been ordered to occupy Rome, by force if necessary, and that great pressure had been put on the Pope to leave Rome, but without effect.—Ever my dear lord, yours sincerely, ODO RUSSELL.

THE ATHENÆUM,
Monday evening, 27*th Sept.* '70.

MY DEAR LORD—I did my best to meet your Grace to-day at 5.30, but found it impossible to leave the F. O. before 7 P.M., to my great regret.

I hear from Rome that Baron Arnim offered the Pope an asylum in Germany—Fulda I think—and strongly pressed His Holiness to accept, which confirms the impression we were under, when last we met here, about Bismarck's policy.

Things look bad, I fear, at Rome. To-morrow I hope to meet Mr. Gladstone at dinner at Count Bernstorff's.—Sincerely yours, ODO RUSSELL.

FOREIGN OFFICE, 28*th Sept.* '70.

MY DEAR LORD—My letters from Rome tell me that the Pope has appointed three cardinals to settle administrative questions with Cadorna, and has ordered all the public departments to continue their respective functions. From this I conclude that His Holiness will not really think of leaving Rome himself for the present.

From Florence I hear that public pressure will be so great when the Italian Parliament meets next month that the transfer of the Capital from Florence to Rome will become inevitable.—Sincerely yours, ODO RUSSELL.

AUDLEY SQUARE, 1*st Oct.* '70.

MY DEAR LORD—I have seen Cardinal Antonelli's last Circular to the Diplomatic Body, dated on the 20th or 21st of Sept., after the siege of Rome, and it is as vigorous as all the protests he has ever issued—I feel sure he will never give in, and his language to Jervoise proves it from beginning to end—as well as his total rejection of the *modus vivendi* proposed to him. Not so the Pope, who, after the occupation of Rome, appears to have told some diplomatists that he was beginning to think it was God's will that the Temporal dominion should cease.

If His Holiness returns to his Italian policy of 1848,

Cardinal Antonelli's position will become untenable, and the Di Pietro, Silvestri, De Luca school will soon be in power, and a *modus vivendi* established. The problem before the Catholic world will then lie between the loss of the Temporal Power and its consequences, or the Papacy in exile and its hopes. In both cases the struggle will be beneficial to the Church.—Sincerely yours,

ODO RUSSELL.

FOREIGN OFFICE, 12*th Oct.* '70.

MY DEAR LORD—I have written to Walmer about Marchese Patrizi, and will let you know the answer. Lord Granville has the gout, I hear.

Your letter to Rome shall be forwarded by bag. Jervoise writes that there is a great battle between those who wish to keep the Pope and those who wish him to go, and he cannot yet judge who will succeed.—Ever, my dear lord, yours,

ODO RUSSELL.

FOREIGN OFFICE, 17*th Oct.* '70.

MY DEAR LORD—I am deeply shocked at the sad news you give me of Cardinal Antonelli; may he recover and live to deal with the difficult questions before him! His loss would be irreparable at this moment to the Pope.

I trust that you may get better news to-morrow.

Your letters have been consigned to the messenger and the care of Jervoise.

Lord Granville desires me to tell your Grace that he will have great pleasure in seeing Marchese Patrizi as soon as the gout permits his coming up to London.—In great haste, yours sincerely,

ODO RUSSELL.

FOREIGN OFFICE, 20*th Oct.* '70.

MY DEAR LORD—I am so happy to hear that Cardinal Antonelli is out of danger. Your last accounts of him quite upset me.

On inquiry, I am told that the salute of the Flag was ordered at the Admiralty, not here.

I shall report what you tell me of Severn, but pray let Mr. Gladstone know all these things; he is in town for the Cabinet. Lord Granville has come up, but has not had time to receive me yet. Has he written to appoint Marchese Patrizi at any particular time?

I am powerless in all these matters; but, as there is a Cabinet, and that Mr. Gladstone will be responsible for the Roman policy of the Government, which I have not yet been made acquainted

with, the moment is favourable to urge upon him to submit his views to the Cabinet at once.

I am finally settled and much nearer than I was to York Place —namely, in Lady Salisbury's (now Derby) house at 17 Upper Grosvenor Street, W.—Sincerely yours, ODO RUSSELL.

FOREIGN OFFICE, 29*th Oct.* '70.

MY DEAR LORD—Jervoise writes that he has received and safely delivered the letters your Grace entrusted to my care. He also tells me that Lord Acton is in Rome.

I cannot get my friends to listen to or care about the *new* Roman question which has been called forth by late events. The Franco-Prussian war absorbs all other interests, but the consequences of the former will be more important in the course of centuries than of the latter.

I have not seen Mr. Gladstone for an age.—Sincerely yours

ODO RUSSELL.

FOREIGN OFFICE, 5*th Nov.* '70.

MY DEAR LORD—Your letter missed me, for I go to the country while the weather is still fine as often as I can, and I regret exceedingly not having been able to wait on you in consequence, but I will come as soon as I can find an hour of leisure. At present I am serving three masters, who all lay claim to my time—the F. O., my wife and children, and my mother!

Jervoise is in communication with the Colleges at Rome to obtain a correct list of all that may be called property of British subjects. The invaders seem to want to claim everything, although they deny it at present.

Cardinal Antonelli was told that *The Defence* would have to go to Naples for safe anchorage, but could be brought back whenever he wished it, for which he expressed his thanks, but said he did not expect the Pope would require *The Defence.* His Eminence assured Jervoise that Baron Arnim pressed him in the strongest terms to accept Prussian hospitality, and to decline British. . . . The Nuncio, Mgr. Chigi, saw Prinz William at Versailles, and seemed satisfied with the warm expressions of sympathy of His Majesty.

I feel quite confident now that the Pope will not leave Rome. The Italian Government have managed that rather cleverly.

Lord Acton, I hear, has left Rome for Florence, Vienna, Hungary, and Munich.—Sincerely yours, ODO RUSSELL.

17 UPPER GROSVENOR STREET, W., *Thursday.*

MY DEAR LORD—I have carried some despatches in my pocket ever since Saturday last, intending to show them to your

Grace, but both our Under-Secretaries are away, and the F. O. takes up all the day now that I am alone.

The despatches were, one from Jervoise, enclosing copy of his letter to Dr. Kirby, asking for a list of the ecclesiastical establishments belonging to British subjects in Rome that may some day need protection, and the other a despatch from Sir A. Paget, in answer to a letter from Sir G. Bowyer on the same subject, and conveying the assurances of Visconti Venosta that Church property would be respected by the Italian authorities in Rome. I shall call to pay your Grace my respects as soon as I can find a moment of leisure.

Arthur[1] tells me that he had the honour of meeting you among the *Atheists*, and I am beginning to wish to belong to the forty of the future Academy.—Sincerely yours,

In haste. ODO RUSSELL.

After the Franco-German war, and the siege of Paris, and its capitulation, in January 1871, came the horrors and atrocities of the Commune. A second "Reign of Terror" prevailed in the unholy and unfortunate city of the Revolution. Monseigneur Darboy, the Archbishop of Paris, and the venerable Curé of the Madeleine, among others, were seized by the impious and bloodstained Communards, and held as hostages. The Commune declared that if the troops at Versailles succeeded in forcing their way into Paris, the hostages would be shot in cold blood.

Archbishop Manning was most energetic in using every means in his power to deliver the Archbishop of Paris—his ancient opponent at the Vatican Council—from the hands of his bloodthirsty goalers. In the following Note (No. 40), dated 13th December 1882, Cardinal Manning has recorded the steps he took to save the life of Mgr. Darboy:—

When the Archbishop was cast into prison, I was asked to write to Bismarck and urge him to interfere to save him. I did so, and he telegraphed to the General commanding at St. Denis, instructing him to communicate with the Commune. He did so without success. Bismarck's letter is somewhere among my

---

[1] "Arthur" referred to by Mr. Odo Russell was his brother Mr. Arthur Russell. He was one of the members of the Metaphysical Society of which Archbishop Manning, together with believers and unbelievers, was also a member. See Chapter xviii. p. 515.

papers. After this I tried to get Gladstone and Lord Granville to intervene. They wrote to Lord Lyons, but nothing came of it. Then I was acting for the Lord Mayor's Fund and corresponding with the Committee in Paris of which the Archbishop was president till he was seized. Through Mr. Norcott I wrote to the Archbishop in prison, and his answer, in pencil, on the back of my letter, is also among my papers. Mr. Norcott went to the heads of the Commune, and tried to save him. They called him a priest-ridden Englishman. He said "I am a Protestant Irishman, but I revere this venerable prelate and hate the violence done to him." They said, "we will give up the Archbishop if Thiers will give up Blanqui." They wrote a paper which is also among mine, to that effect. Mr. Norcott went to Thiers, but he would not give up Blanqui. Most of those who signed the paper were afterwards shot.

I was preaching at Moorfields one Sunday night, and had spoken of the Archbishop, saying that he might be no longer living. I went into the sacristy for Benediction, and a note came from Lord Granville to tell me that he had been put to death.

The cold-blooded murder of the Archbishop of Paris at the second siege, within a year, of that ill-fated city by the Commune, revived discussion as to the line that Mgr. Darboy had taken at the Vatican Council, and the venerable martyr was claimed by the anti-Papal Press as a disbeliever in the Pope's Infallibility. To rebut this charge Archbishop Manning wrote to the *Times* as follows:—

I am able to attest that the resistance of the Archbishop of Paris to the Definition, did not touch the Truth of the doctrine, but the expediency of defining that Truth. I make this statement, not on hearsay, but on personal conference with him in Rome.

Cardinal Manning has, also, recorded how deeply moved Pope Pius IX. was on hearing of the death of the Archbishop of Paris, at the hands of the enemies of God and man. The Pope exclaimed in his emotion:—"He has washed away his defects in his own blood, and has put on the martyr's robe."

Sympathy with the French people suffering from the effects of two such disasters as the war with Germany and the Civil War enkindled by the Commune, was widespread in England. The Relief Fund inaugurated at the Mansion

House was almost a national movement. Archbishop Manning was invited to join the Committee at the Mansion House, and soon created a most favourable impression on all those with whom he was brought into contact by his business aptitude, his readiness of resource, and his unfailing tact. It was his first appearance at the Mansion House in one of those philanthropic movements in which he afterwards took a foremost part. Hitherto he had been known only to the bulk of his countrymen as an ecclesiastical leader, champion of causes like the Temporal Power of the Pope, or of Papal Infallibility, with which they had no sympathy, or it would be, perhaps, more correct to say, against which they entertained for the most part an insuperable aversion. Manning gradually became known to the public in a new character. As a philanthropist, as a Social reformer, as a ready platform speaker, he gained the esteem and confidence of men; and his aid in Social movements and on public platforms was after a time in constant requisition; until in the end the presence and fellowship in Social reforms of a Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, was welcomed even at Exeter Hall. An opportune occasion favoured Archbishop Manning's introduction into the social and public life of his fellow countrymen. As the Archbishop of Paris was President of the Committee in Paris, which was in correspondence with the Mansion House Relief Fund, it seemed to the Lord Mayor but right and proper, and in many ways convenient, that Archbishop Manning should be a member of the Mansion House Committee. Manning made good use of his opportunities in rendering ready and resourceful service. As a friend of Mgr. Darboy he put himself into personal communication with his fellow-Archbishop, and helped by his more intimate knowledge, to make matters of detail work smoothly. The Archbishop of Westminster invited, and with signal success, collections to be made in all the churches of the diocese, in aid of the Mansion House Relief Fund. When the Archbishop of Paris was shot by order of the Commune, Manning in the name of the Mansion House Committee, conveyed to the ecclesiastical authorities in Paris, a message of condolence

and sympathy at the tragic death of the Archbishop. At the closing of the Relief Fund, Archbishop Manning's special services were gratefully recognised by the Lord Mayor and the Committee.

No Social, philanthropic, or charitable meeting has since been held at the Mansion House without Cardinal Manning's presence, aid, or advice, up to the very last years of his life.

But the time had not yet come for Manning to develop into the public philanthropist, into the platform speaker, into the active Social Reformer. That side of his character was still undeveloped, awaiting events and circumstances to call it into play and to give a new turn to his career and a new manifestation of his powers, which was to form the basis of his popularity among the people at large at the latter period of his active and fruitful life.

But, as in the days of the Vatican Council, he had still an unpopular cause to represent before the eyes of the English people; still to defend with all his ancient ardour the cause of the Papacy,—the Temporal Power in ruins, the Infallibility, issuing triumphant indeed from the Vatican Council, but assailed on every side and by every weapon, fair or foul,—had to see his ancient friends, like Mr. Gladstone, turn against him and rend him in their rage. The day of peace had not yet dawned, the enfeebling times and tones of popularity were still beyond the light of the sun.

Manning, the undaunted champion of Papal Infallibility and of the Vatican Council, stood in sore need of the shield of Ajax. Blows, fierce and furious, were directed against the Papacy and its counsellors and defenders, as vengeful, if not more so, on the morrow of their triumph as in the day of battle. The rattling fire of the daily press, at home and abroad, was succeeded by the big guns brought into play. The Vatican Council and Papal Infallibility were assailed and misrepresented in Germany by Professor Friedrich in two ponderous volumes,[1] by the venomous attacks of an anonymous writer, "Pomponio Leto," in Italy, and in England, alas, by Mr. Gladstone in a series of vehement, not to say vindictive tracts, treatises, and articles. How deeply

[1] *Documenta ad illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum*, 2 vols. 1873.

wounded Archbishop Manning was by these attacks on the Council and Papacy by a friend whom he had long revered and trusted, was shown by the fact that in his indignation he imputed to Mr. Gladstone as the real motive of his attack the rejection by the bishops of Ireland, in 1873, of his Irish University Bill;[1] and, as a further reason, that he had no longer the Irish vote to win or loose.

At the time of writing his famous, or, in one sense, infamous pamphlet, *The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance*, Mr. Gladstone was in a dangerous mood. He had been defeated in Parliament by the Irish vote dictated by the Irish bishops; he had resigned office in consequence: on the refusal of Disraeli to take over the Government, Mr. Gladstone had returned to office; early in January 1874, he had dissolved Parliament, and, defeated at the general election, had retired from public life. He

[1] Cardinal Cullen was in the habit of taking counsel with Archbishop Manning and of asking his advice and guidance, especially as to the line of action which ought to be pursued towards Mr. Gladstone in regard to his hostility to the Temporal Power, to the Vatican Council, and to his policy on Catholic University Education in Ireland. The following letter, addressed by Cardinal Cullen to Manning, is clear evidence that Mr. Gladstone's Irish Bill of 1873 was utterly condemned by the bishops and priests of Ireland. Archbishop Manning, until the Irish bishops spoke out, thought Mr. Gladstone's Bill might be accepted—and told him so—as a settlement of the dispute.

DUBLIN, *27th February*, 1873.

MY DEAR LORD—I write one line to say that our bishops met to-day and will meet again to-morrow. All are sadly disappointed with Mr. Gladstone's Bill, and speak against it much more strongly than I did in my letters to your Grace. The Bishop of Limerick was the only one who attempted to defend the Bill. In the end we agreed to send a petition to Parliament against everything in the Bill that sanctions mixed education, and against the way in which the endowments are distributed, and we called on Parliament to make the favourable parts of the Bill of some practical utility by putting us on a footing of equality with Protestants who retain Trinity College, with the Presbyterians who have Belfast Queen's College, and with the Non-sectarian party which gets great advantages in the New University.

If we did less than we have done, the people here would be indignant with us, and our enemies would proclaim that we had changed our past decisions, and approved of the mixed system.

I will send a copy of the petition to your Grace as soon as I can get one.

Wishing you every happiness, I remain your faithful servant,

✠ PAUL CARD. CULLEN.

Most Rev. Dr. Manning.

had ample leisure, and no small cause, to nurse his wrath. He was not unmindful, moreover, that besides being turned out of office by the ungrateful Irish Vote, he had been overruled in the Cabinet during the sitting of the Vatican Council on the question of Civil intervention at Rome, mainly by the joint action of Archbishop Manning and Mr. Odo Russell in furnishing authentic information to Lord Clarendon, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs. Besides personal incentives to action, Mr. Gladstone throughout his active life had always taken lively interest in ecclesiastical controversies, and had studied with a zeal which might often be described as intense, the deepest religious questions of the day. Such an act as the Definition of Papal Infallibility was in itself more than sufficient to excite his animosity, and once aroused, with time on his hands, his opposition was not slow in taking form and expressing itself with force almost at times bounding on frenzy, and, as Manning complained at the time, "with an indulgence of unchastened language rarely to be equalled." Besides, Mr. Gladstone was a friend of Dr. Döllinger's, and shared his views—the views, that is to say of his later days—on the Papacy. The great leader of English Liberalism, ecclesiastical as well as political, was likewise in intimate communication during the contest at the Vatican Council with Lord Acton, and shared to the full his opposition to the Vatican decrees. Archbishop Manning declared indeed that the arguments in Mr. Gladstone's Tracts on Vaticanism, were based on Dr. Döllinger's historical misrepresentations of the Papacy; and that the heat which he displayed, and the personal animosity, were provoked or inspired by "the malicious misrepresentations of Lord Acton."

On Saturday, 5th November 1874, Manning received by post Mr. Gladstone's incendiary pamphlet, denouncing the assumptions of the Papacy and the Decrees of the Vatican Council as incompatible with the Civil allegiance of Catholics. It was the thirty-first anniversary, if I may note a curious coincidence, of the notorious 5th of November sermon, in which Archdeacon Manning in 1843 had denounced with a like vehemence and a like "indulgence of

unchastened language," the assumptions of the Popes as incompatible with the rights of the Crown and the liberties of the Realm of England.

Mr. Gladstone, in his "Expostulation" with the Catholics of the British Empire on the decrees of the Vatican Council, wrote as follows:—

> England is entitled to ask and to know in what way the obedience required by the Pope and Council of the Vatican is to be reconciled with the integrity of Civil allegiance?

On reading these words Manning at once recognised the right of the English people, speaking by its legitimate authorities, to learn from him what he believed and what he taught. In his reply to Mr. Gladstone's "Expostulation," Archbishop Manning wrote as follows:—

> But in recognising this right I am compelled to decline to answer before any other tribunal, or to any other interrogator. If, therefore, I take the occasion of any such interrogation, I do not address myself to those who make it, but to the justice and the good sense of the Christian people of this country.

Archbishop Manning, with his quick insight into the temper of the times and the anti-Catholic feeling excited by the Press in this and other countries, recognised at once the immense mischief which would be done by Mr. Gladstone's elaborate argument as to the impossibility for Catholics, since the Vatican Council, to be loyal except at the cost of their fidelity to the Council, or faithful to the Council except at the cost of their loyalty. Before a formal reply could be prepared to refute them, Mr. Gladstone's charges would have sunk into the hearts and minds of tens and hundreds of thousands. Archbishop Manning therefore lost not a day in publishing a brief but distinct and clear statement of the meaning and effect of the Vatican Decrees in the following letter to *The Times*:—

TO THE EDITOR OF *THE TIMES*.

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE, WESTMINSTER,
7th November 1874.

SIR—The gravity of the subject on which I address you, affecting, as it must, every Catholic in the British Empire, will,

I hope, obtain from your courtesy the publication of this letter.

This morning I received a copy of a pamphlet, entitled *The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance.* I find in it a direct appeal to myself, both for the office I hold, and for the writings I have published. I gladly acknowledge the duty that lies upon me for both those reasons. I am bound by the office I bear not to suffer a day to pass without repelling from the Catholics of this country the lightest imputation upon their loyalty; and, for my teaching, I am ready to show that the principles I have ever taught are beyond impeachment upon that score.

It is true, indeed, that in page 57 of the pamphlet Mr. Gladstone expresses his belief "that many of his Roman Catholic friends and fellow-countrymen are, to say the least of it, as good citizens as himself." But as the whole pamphlet is an elaborate argument to prove that the teaching of the Vatican Council renders it impossible for them to be so, I cannot accept this grateful acknowledgment, which implies that they are good citizens because they are at variance with the Catholic Church.

I should be wanting in duty to the Catholics of this country and to myself if I did not give a prompt contradiction to this statement, and if I did not with equal promptness affirm that the loyalty of our civil allegiance is, not in spite of the teaching of the Catholic Church, but because of it.

The sum of the argument in the pamphlet just published to the world is this:—That by the Vatican decrees such a change has been made in the relations of Catholics to the Civil Power of States, that it is no longer possible for them to render the same undivided Civil allegiance as it was possible for Catholics to render before the promulgation of those Decrees.

In answer to this it is for the present sufficient to affirm—

1. That the Vatican Decrees have in no jot or tittle changed either the obligations or the conditions of Civil allegiance.

2. That the Civil allegiance of Catholics is as undivided as that of all Christians, and of all men who recognise a divine or natural moral law.

3. That the Civil allegiance of no man is unlimited; and therefore the Civil allegiance of all men who believe in God, or are governed by conscience, is in that sense divided.

4. In this sense, and in no other, can it be said with truth that the Civil allegiance of Catholics is divided. The Civil allegiance of every Christian man in England is limited by conscience and the Law of God; and the Civil allegiance of Catholics is limited neither less nor more.

The public peace of the British Empire has been consolidated in the last half century by the elimination of religious conflicts and inequalities from our laws. The empire of Germany might have been equally peaceful and stable if its statesmen had not been tempted in an evil hour to rake up the old fires of religious disunion. The hand of one man, more than any other, threw this torch of discord into the German Empire. The history of Germany will record the name of Dr. Ignatius von Döllinger as the author of this national evil. I lament, not only to read the name, but to trace the arguments of Dr. von Döllinger in the pamphlet before me. May God preserve these kingdoms from the public and private calamities which are visibly impending over Germany. The author of the pamphlet, in his first line, assures us that his "purpose is not polemical but pacific." I am sorry that so good an intention should have so widely erred in the selection of the means.

But my purpose is neither to criticise nor to controvert. My desire and my duty, as an Englishman, as a Catholic, and as a pastor, is to claim for my flock and for myself a Civil allegiance as pure, as true, and as loyal as is rendered by the distinguished author of the pamphlet, or by any subject of the British Empire.
—Your obedient servant, H. E. MANNING.

On seeing Archbishop Manning's Letter in *The Times* on Monday morning, the enterprising correspondent of *The New York Herald* called at Archbishop's House, and asked Manning to write a Letter of similar character to *The New York Herald.* The Letter is as follows:—

TO THE EDITOR OF *THE NEW YORK HERALD.*

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE, WESTMINSTER.
10*th November* 1874.

DEAR SIR—In answer to your question as to my statement about the Vatican Council, I reply as follows:—

I asserted that the Vatican Decrees have not changed by a jot or a tittle the obligations or conditions of the Civil obedience of Catholics towards the Civil Powers. The whole of Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet hangs on the contrary assertion; and falls with it. In proof of my assertion I add—

1. That the Infallibility of the Pope was a doctrine of Divine Faith before the Vatican Council was held. In the second and third parts of a book called *Petri Privilegium* (Longmans, 1871), I have given more than sufficient evidence of this assertion.

2. That the Vatican Council simply declared an old truth, and made no new dogma.

3. That the position of Catholics therefore in respect to Civil allegiance, since the Vatican Council, is precisely what it was before it.

4. That the Civil Powers of the Christian world have hitherto stood in peaceful relation with an infallible Church, and that relation has been often recognised and declared by the Church in its Councils. The Vatican Council had, therefore, no new matter to treat in this point.

5. That the Vatican Council has made no Decree whatever on the subject of the Civil Powers, nor on Civil allegiance.

This subject was not so much as proposed. The Civil obedience of Catholics rests upon the natural law, and the revealed Law of God. Society is founded in nature, and subjects are bound in all things lawful to obey their rulers. Society, when Christian, has higher sanctions, and subjects are bound to obey rulers for conscience' sake, and because the Powers that be are ordained of God. Of all these things the Vatican Decrees can have changed nothing because they have touched nothing. Mr. Gladstone's whole argument hangs upon an erroneous assertion, into which I can only suppose he has been misled by his misplaced trust in Dr. Döllinger and some of his friends.

On public and private grounds I deeply lament this act of imprudence, and, but for my belief in Mr. Gladstone's sincerity, I should say this act of injustice. I lament it, as an act out of all harmony and proportion to a great statesman's life, and as the first event that has overcast a friendship of forty-five years. His whole public life has hitherto consolidated the Christian and Civil peace of these kingdoms. This act, unless the good providence of God and the good sense of Englishmen avert it, may wreck more than the work of Mr. Gladstone's public career, and at the end of a long life may tarnish a great name.
—Your obedient servant, H. E. MANNING.

The correspondent of the *New York Herald* telegraphed both of the above letters to America, and Manning had the satisfaction of knowing that his refutation of Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet was circulated all over America, with the result that when it did reach that country its force was broken and its charges discounted.

In February 1875, Mr. Gladstone published a second pamphlet on the Vatican Decrees, in the appendix to which

he stated that Archbishop Manning had made an astonishing error in describing, in his letter to the *New York Herald*, the publication of *The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance*, as the first event which had overcast a friendship of forty-five years. This statement gave rise to the following correspondence, in which Archbishop Manning incidentally gave a definition of friendship which seems to have somewhat surprised Mr. Gladstone:—

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE, WESTMINSTER, W.S.,
24th February 1875.

MY DEAR GLADSTONE—I have to thank you for the copy of your pamphlet which reached me to-day.

My attention has been called to the last paragraph in the appendix, which would seem to me to need explanation.

You say that I am in error in stating that your former pamphlet is the first act which has overcast our friendship.

If you refer to my act in 1851 in submitting to the Catholic Church, by which we were separated for some twelve years, I can understand it. I have already stated this fact in a letter which was published some years ago.

If you refer to any other act either on your part or mine I am not conscious of it, and would desire to know what it may be.

My act in 1851 may have overcast your friendship for me. It did not overcast my friendship for you, as I think the last years have shown.

You will not, I hope, think me over sensitive in asking for this explanation—Believe me, yours affectionately,

✠ H. E. M.

11 CARLTON HOUSE TERRACE, S.W.,
25th February 1875.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP MANNING—As far as your question is concerned, *rem acu titigisti*. It did, I confess, seem to me an astonishing error to state in public that a friendship had not been overcast for forty-five years until now, which your letter declares has been suspended as to all action for twelve. I doubt not you failed to perceive that your inaccurate assertion operated to sustain the insidious and painful charges made against me that I had suppressed my opinions on the Vatican Council until I had no longer the Roman Catholic vote to gain or lose.

I wondered, too, at your forgetting that during the forty-five years I had been charged by you with doing the work of Antichrist in regard to the Temporal Power of the Pope. In regard to the Vatican Decrees I could do no worse.

Of this I had written an explanation, but I could not prevail upon myself to make it the subject of public discussion; I struck it out, and substituted the present undoubtedly rather enigmatical protest.

In this explanation I said, and now repeat, I am quite sure you did not see the effect of your statement upon my honour; also that the charge about Antichrist had given and could give no offence as between men in earnest; indeed, I believe I retorted it.

Our differences, my dear archbishop, are indeed profound. We refer them, I suppose, in humble silence to a Higher Power. We have both also, I firmly believe, cherished as well as we could the recollections of the Past. They probably restrained your pen when you lately wrote, they have certainly and greatly restrained mine. You assured me once of your prayers at all and at the most solemn time. I received that assurance with gratitude and still cherish it. As and when they move upwards there is a meeting point for those whom a chasm separates below.—I remain always, affectionately yours,

W. E. GLADSTONE.

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE, WESTMINSTER, S.W.,
25th February 1875.

MY DEAR GLADSTONE—I have read your reply to my note with a full sense of the feelings under which you wrote it.

You are more likely to have forgotten the inclosed letter than I can be.

It was full in my mind when I wrote the words which seem to you to be seriously inaccurate. To me they are in no way inaccurate, so far as friendship is distinct from its expression. During the twelve years in which we never met my friendship towards you was not overcast. It was my act that separated us. What I express in the inclosed letter was the state of my mind until the publication of your pamphlet. It is not for me to say whether your friendship for me was already changed or ought to have been changed. In the midst of our strong oppositions I still believed it to be as unchanged as my own.

After your "Expostulation" I could no longer so believe, and with great reluctance believed otherwise. But let this find its level as all human things must. My present point is to ask you

to make clear what you say is now enigmatical. Do not allow what you do not intend to be conceived. Our friendship has indeed been strained to any degree you will fix, by public opposition for conscience sake, but never by private acts or words unworthy of either you and myself.

I think I am even bound to ask that this may be made clear beyond all mistake. It is for you to say how you would wish to do so: for I cannot doubt that you will be even readier to do this act of justice to a friendship, which may be of the past, than I can be to ask it.—Believe me, yours affectionately,

✠ H. E. M.

Speaking of this correspondence in after-years, Cardinal Manning said:—"From the way in which Mr. Gladstone alluded to the overcasting of our friendship, people might have thought that I had picked his pocket, or committed some act of a like kind. In the end he sent me the proof sheets of the second edition of his pamphlet to make what correction I thought fit." [1]

In 1875 Archbishop Manning published his reply [2] to Mr. Gladstone's attacks on the Vatican Council and on the Civil effects of the Definition of Papal Infallibility. In his *Vatican Decrees* Mr. Gladstone's critic stated, that he thought it his duty to wait before publishing his reply, on the ground that he was certain that two things would follow; the one, that far better answers than he could make would be promptly made; the other, that certain nominal Catholics, who, upon other occasions had done the same, would write letters to the newspapers. He then goes on as follows:—

Both events have come to pass. The Bishops of Birmingham, Clifton, and Salford have abundantly pointed out the mistakes into which Mr. Gladstone has fallen on the subject of the Vatican Council; and have fully vindicated the loyalty of Catholics.

The handful of nominal Catholics have done their work; and

---

[1] Acting on Mr. Gladstone's suggestion, Manning sent a correction to be inserted in the second Edition of the Pamphlet, which Mr. Gladstone accepted, striking out "the beginning and ending for the convenience of the printers."

[2] *The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance*, by Henry Edward, Archbishop of Westminster, 1875.

those who hoped to find or make a division among Catholics have been disappointed. It is now seen that those who reject the Vatican Council may be told on our fingers, and the Catholic Church has openly passed sentence on them.[1]

It will be noticed, perhaps, with surprise that though he speaks of Bishop Ullathorne's, Bishop Clifford's, and Bishop Vaughan's answers to Mr. Gladstone, Archbishop Manning in his pamphlet makes no allusion to Father Newman's magnificent *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*, in which he triumphantly vindicated not only the loyalty of English Catholics, impugned by Mr. Gladstone, but the spiritual authority of the Church in defining articles of Faith.[2] The opening passages of Dr. Newman's *Letter*, in which he refers to the extravagances of an extreme Party as stretching principles till they were close upon snapping, and as stating truths in the most paradoxical form: men who, having set the house on fire call upon him to put out the flames, may perhaps have given offence to Archbishop Manning, whose relations with Newman were already more than strained.

Archbishop Manning's pamphlet was very effective and especially able in its exposition of Catholic doctrine. With singular clearness he pointed out the effect of the Vatican Decrees in regard to Civil allegiance, which Mr. Gladstone has so egregiously misunderstood. Archbishop Manning summed up the argument as follows:—

> My first answer to the charge that the Vatican Council has made it impossible for Catholics to render a loyal Civil allegiance, is that the Vatican Council has not touched our Civil allegiance at all; that the laws which govern our Civil allegiance are as old as the revelation of Christianity, and are regulated by the Divine constitution of the Church and the immutable duties of natural morality. We were bound by all these obligations before the Vatican Council existed. They are of Divine institution, and are beyond all change, being in themselves unchangeable. I have

---

[1] *The Vatican Decrees*, etc., p. 7.

[2] Father Newman's *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk* in reply to Mr. Gladstone's Vatican Pamphlets was fiercely attacked by "the extreme faction" in the *Dublin Review* and elsewhere. Newman was denounced as "a minimiser," was accused of writing in a spirit of opposition to the Pope.

shown, I hope, that in the conflicts of the Civil Powers with the Church, the causes have arisen, not from acts of the Church, but from such acts as the Constitutions of Clarendon, the Claim of Investitures, the creation of royal Courts of final Appeal, and the like; that these invasions of the spiritual domain ever have been from the attempts of Governments to subject the Church to their own jurisdiction; and now more than ever, from an universal and simultaneous conspiracy against it. A leader of this conspiracy said the other day, "The net is now drawn so close about the Church of Rome that if it escape this time I will believe it to be Divine." If God grant him life, I have hope of his conversion. For, that the Church of Rome will escape out of the net is certain, and that for two reasons: first, for the same reason why its Divine Head rose again from the grave—"it was not possible that He should be holden by it;"[1] and next, because the Civil Governments, that are now conspiring against it, are preparing for their own dissolution. Finally, I have given the true and evident reason why, when some six hundred bishops from the ends of the Church were gathered together, they defined the Infallibility of their Head—*Visum est Spiritui Sancto et nobis.*

In the "Conclusion" Mr. Gladstone is rebuked for his "signal act of rashness," for his "unchastened language," for his levity in "playing the part of canonist and theologian." It can be easily conceived with what reluctance Archbishop Manning made such charges against one who had been a friend of old and intimate standing. The pamphlet concludes as follows:—

Conclusion

And now there only remains for me the hardest and saddest part of the task, which has not been sought by me, but has been forced upon me. A few months ago I could not have believed that I should have ever written these pages. I have never written any with more pain, and none of them have cost me so much as that which I am about to write.

Thus far I have endeavoured to confine myself to the subject-matter of Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet; but before I end, I feel bound by an imperative duty to lay before him, in behalf of his Catholic fellow-countrymen, the nature of the act which he has done.

[1] Acts ii. 24.

He has not only invited, but instigated Catholics to rise against the Divine authority of the Catholic Church. He has endeavoured to create divisions among them. If Mr. Gladstone does not believe the authority of the Catholic Church to be Divine, he knows that they do.

If he thinks such a rising to be "moral and mental freedom," he knows that they believe it to be what his own litany calls "schism, heresy, and deadly sin." If he believes religious separations to be lawful, he knows that they believe them to be violations of the Divine law. I am compelled therefore to say that this is at least an act of signal rashness.

No man has watched Mr. Gladstone's career as a statesman with a more generous and disinterested good-will than I have. No one has more gladly appreciated his gifts; no one has more equitably, interpreted certain acts of his political life, nor has hailed his successes with greater joy. But when he casts off the character of a statesman, for which he has shown so great capacity, to play the canonist and theologian, for which he has here shown so little, and that with the intent of sowing discord and animosities among six millions of his fellow-countrymen—and, I must moreover add, with an indulgence of unchastened language rarely to be equalled—I feel bound to say that he has been betrayed into an act for which I can find no adequate excuse. I must tell him that if he would incline the Catholics of the empire to accept the ministries of his compassion, he must first purify his style both of writing and of thinking. Catholics are not to be convinced or persuaded by such phrases as "the present perilous pontificate," "the papal chair, its aiders and abettors," "the great hierarchic power and those who have egged it on," "the present degradation of the episcopal order," "the subserviency or pliability of the Council," "hideous mummies," "head-quarters," "the follies of Ecclesiastical power," "foreign arrogance," "the myrmidons of the Apostolic Chamber," "the foreign influence of a caste." I transcribe these words from his pages with repugnance; not, indeed, for our sake against whom they are levelled, but for the statesman who has thought them fitting. Mr. Gladstone can do many things; but he cannot do all things. He has a strong hand; but there is a bow which he cannot bend. He has here tried his hand at a task for which, without something more than mere literary knowledge, even his varied gifts will not suffice. This Expostulation is, as I have already said, an act out of all harmony and proportion with a great statesman's life.

I have written these words with a painful constraint; but, cost what it may, duty must be done, and I believe it to be my

duty to record this judgment, in behalf of the Catholics of this country, on an act unjust in itself, and therefore not only barren of all good result, but charged with grave public dangers.

But, I cannot break off with a note so cheerless. If this Expostulation has cast down many hopes both of a public and a private kind, we cannot altogether regret its publication. If such mistrusts and misconceptions existed in the minds of our fellow-subjects, the sooner and the more openly they were made public the better. We are not content to be tolerated as suspect or dangerous persons, or to be set at large upon good behaviour. We thank Mr. Gladstone for gaining us the hearing which we have had before the public justice of our country; and we are confident that his impeachment will be withdrawn. His own mind is too large, too just, and too upright to refuse to acknowledge an error, when he sees that he has been misled. It is also too clear and too accurate not to perceive that such is now the fact. I see in this the augury of a happier and more peaceful future than if this momentary conflict had never arisen. We shall understand each other better. Our civil and religious peace at home will be firmer by this trial.

If the great German Empire shall only learn in time, thirteen millions of contented Catholic subjects, reconciled as they still may be by a return of just laws, will give a support to its unity which nothing can shake.

If Italy shall only come to see that the "Roman question" is, and for ever will be, a source of weakness, contention, and danger to its welfare; and, seeing this, shall solve it peacefully, as Italy alone can do, by undoing its un-Catholic and therefore un-Italian policy, then its unity and independence will be secured by the spontaneous co-operation of a united people, gathered around the centre of all its Christian glories. Such a solution would then be consecrated by the highest sanctions of its faith. If wise counsels prevail, and wise friends of Italy shall gain its ear, it may be again what once it was, the foremost people in the Christian world.

And, lastly, for ourselves, our world-wide empire cannot turn back upon its path without disintegration. It is bound together, not by material force, but by the moral bond of just laws and the glad consent of a free people. But justice and freedom cannot be put asunder. They flow from one source; they can be kept pure only by the same stream. They have come down to us from our Christianity. Divided as we are, we are a Christian people still. By religious conflict our Christianity will waste away as a moth fretting a garment. By religious peace, all that is true, and wise, and just, and Christian, will be per-

petually multiplied, binding indissolubly in one all men and all races of our imperial commonwealth.

Mr. Gladstone's Tracts on Vaticanism had stirred up suspicions; had excited bad blood which at one moment, almost seemed to threaten the revival of a "No Popery" outcry. His passion was contagious, and might have worked mischief had not the good sense and good feeling of the English people repudiated such appeals to an obsolete fanaticism. But the occasion was one to call for prudence. Archbishop Manning recognised the call. The definition of Papal Infallibility had been a great victory. To Manning, owing to the part which he had played at the Vatican Council, it seemed almost like a personal triumph. An outbreak of fanaticism in England would dim the lustre of the victory—hand over its fruits to the spoiler. It was bad enough that Prince Bismarck, tempted more indeed by political motives than by religious animosity, had lit up the fires of persecution in Germany by the infamous Falk Laws—the origin and occasion of the prolonged *Kultur-Kampf*. There was another reason for the manifestation of prudence. F. Newman in his *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk* had just rebuked, with a touch of indignation, the folly of extreme and extravagant claims and theories which had bred all the mischief, and had given to Mr. Gladstone a handle to his weapon. No rebuke, no persuasion, no power on earth could still Manning's tongue or stay his hand in the heat of the battle; but after battle and victory, no man was more prudent, or showed greater moderation, or a more conciliatory spirit.

But such moderation is too often apt to be mistaken. It was so in regard to Manning's pamphlet. Mgr. Nardi,[1] a devoted and distinguished supporter of the cause of the Papacy, and some other of his more ardent friends and fellow-

[1] An intimate friend of Mgr. Nardi writes as follows:—"Nardi was one of the most remarkable men of his time; of talent and genius unsurpassed. Pius IX. made him Cardinal *in petto*. Nardi felt deeply that it was never proclaimed. Nevertheless no vexation made him swerve one iota from his devotion to the cause to which he had devoted his life. He was almost the only writer on Pius IX.'s side of power enough for the intruded Government to be afraid of him."

workers in Rome during the time of the Vatican Council threatened to attack it publicly because "it savoured of conciliation." On a former occasion, when Archbishop Manning thought it wise to show a conciliatory, or at least a quiescent spirit in regard to the action and attitude of Mr. Monsell and the Catholic laity, in presenting to Father Newman an Address of confidence and affection, he was taxed by Mgr. Talbot with betraying, out of fear of Newman's popularity, indifference or neutrality.

Mgr. Talbot's name has been so long familiar to the readers of these pages as to make it almost unseeming to pass by its disappearance without alluding to the sad malady which cut short his active career and deprived Manning of an influential friend and interpreter at the Vatican. Mgr. Talbot's reason gave way, and he was removed to an asylum at Passy, a suburb of Paris. Pope Pius IX. had a warm affection for his chamberlain, friend, and constant companion, and would not allow his rooms, which were near the Pope's own, to be disturbed, in the hope that he might recover from his malady. But the hope was not realised. Though he had lucid intervals, Mgr. Talbot never fully recovered his reason, and died in the year 1886, at Passy. In all Manning's Diaries, Journals and Reminiscences, there is no record or mention of Mgr. Talbot's illness and death. His letters, extending over a long series of years, which, together with Manning's own to him, have been such a fruitful source of information, especially in regard to Manning's intimate relations with the Vatican, suddenly came to an end in 1868. Henceforth Mgr. Talbot's name disappears, sinks out of sight as a stone cast into the waters.

Father O'Callaghan, an Oblate of St. Charles, and Rector of the English College in Rome,—as Mgr. Talbot's successor, though without his personal influence with the Pope, in interpreting Manning's views or wishes, or in reporting from the Vatican the more important opinions or sayings of the Pope,—gave an account in the following letter of the judgment recorded in Rome on Newman's reply to Mr Gladstone's indictments, and on Manning's pamphlet:—

ROME, 16*th February* 1875.

MY DEAR LORD—The Holy Father said to me this morning that he understood you were afraid that he was going to condemn Fr. Newman, but that he had no such intention, though he would wish that some friend might let Newman know that there were some objectionable passages in his pamphlet. 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.[1] To all this I gave respectful assent.

You will be glad to hear that the Holy Father looked exceedingly well in spite of the very cold weather we have had for the last fortnight. I understand he is quite satisfied with your pamphlet—though Nardi and some others seemed to think it savoured of conciliation—Nardi announced twice in the *Voce della Verità* that he intended to notice it, and I feared—and asked him if he intended to attack it. Finally, he neither inserted my manuscript copy of the abstract of the 4th chapter,—the fruit of much consumption of midnight oil,—nor gave the promised review, finding evidently from the fact that the *Osservatore*, having printed all in three successive numbers, that you were quite safe in what you had said—I bought at your expense several copies of the respective *Osservatores*, and carefully marked the important passages for the benefit of Nardi and Co.

As signs of the times, I may mention that the Italian Government have announced that they will allow 15,000 lire per annum for the Theological School of the Collegio Romano. Also they profess willingness to sanction the *Scuole Paterne*, a Catholic Lyceum sort of arrangement.

On the other hand, you may have seen the circular of Vigliani, Minister of Grace and Justice, in which, besides warning Lenten preachers and the clergy generally to mind what they say, the Holy Father is pretty plainly warned to be careful about his discourses, and those who print them.— Believe me yours affectionately.

H. O'CALLAGHAN.

As the result of these effective vindications of Catholic

[1] Neither Archbishop Manning, nor Father O'Callaghan communicated at the time or later to Dr. Newman or his friends the estimate which Pope Pius IX. had formed of the *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*. Far less was Cardinal Newman ever informed of the statement made by Pius IX., "that the notion of Newman's opposition to the Pope was completely dispelled" by the pamphlet. One of Cardinal Newman's most intimate and trusted friends, on seeing the above letter to Archbishop Manning, wrote to me as follows:—"Cardinal Newman would have been most deeply touched and gratified had he known what Pope Pius IX. had said of him; but he never heard of it to the day of his death.'

loyalty, it is but fair to state that Mr. Gladstone, if somewhat more tardily than his Catholic friends expected, withdrew in a final Tract his charges against them of divided allegiance. His inexhaustible energies were soon afterwards diverted from attacks on the Vatican Council to still fiercer attacks on the "Unspeakable Turk." The irresponsible position he enjoyed in his retirement from public life gave him full liberty and a free hand to carry on his agitation against "Bulgarian atrocities." His crusade against Vaticanism, as he feelingly complained, by alienating the Irish Vote, had impaired his power of giving effectual aid in Parliament to "Holy Russia in her crusade against the great Antichristian State." In a conversation at the time on the effect of his pamphlets against the Vatican Council and its decrees, Mr. Gladstone said:—"To-day I have not a friend in Ireland. I alienated all my Protestant friends by disestablishing their Church, and by my pamphlets all my Catholic friends except one, and he is a bishop who, though venturing to correspond with me, is afraid lest his name should become known.[1] With few exceptions," Mr. Gladstone added, "my Catholic friends in England stand aloof from me. Even Lady Georgiana Fullerton has ceased her wonted visits to this house."[2] Expressing his profound regret that "The Great Church of the West" was supporting against the civilising power of Russia the barbarous and Antichristian Turk, Mr. Gladstone said: "I would furbish up my Italian, and write to the Pope, did I know any one who would present my letter to His Holiness. I once knew and corresponded with eight Cardinals, and now I only

[1] The Bishop was Dr. Moriarty; as he is long since dead, his name may now be mentioned.

[2] Mr. Gladstone at that time was living in Harley Street. He had invited to one of his "famous Thursday breakfasts" his old friend, the late Canon Oakeley, but on intimating his desire to accept the invitation, Cardinal Manning replied, "I should regard it as a personal affront were any of my priests to visit Mr. Gladstone." I was sorry for having mentioned this fact, as Mr. Gladstone was visibly affected—for a moment there was almost a vindictive glare in his eye—that Manning should have considered Oakeley's visit as a personal affront. Canon Oakeley, on his side thought it bad policy on the part of the Cardinal, and not in keeping with his wonted diplomacy, to leave Mr. Gladstone to the exclusive influence of Lord Acton.

know one—Manning. Poor Manning," he added, despondingly, "how changed; he is now writing in the *Pall Mall Gazette* in support of Disraeli and the Antichristian State: of the Jew and the Turk.[1]

If pity was the predominant feeling in Mr. Gladstone's mind because "poor Manning" was giving his moral support to the Antichristian State; indignation filled the heart of Archbishop Manning on account of Mr. Gladstone's "insolent and slanderous accusation of the Holy Father." The following letter breathes defiance and distrust of Mr. Gladstone:—

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE, WESTMINSTER, S.W.,
18*th June* 1875.

DEAR MRS. BISHOP—I thank you for sending the enclosed, and for the purpose in view.

The chief points to note are—

1. The strange contrast between the assertion of Mr. Gladstone, Prince Bismarck, and the Old Catholics as to the Vatican Decree and Civil allegiance, on the one hand, and that of the Catholic Church, from the Pope downwards, on the other.

Surely we know our own religion, and are not all falsifiers.

2. Mr. Gladstone's incredible want of knowledge and inexcusable accusation of the English Catholics, as guilty "of the blackest fraud in history" to obtain the repeal of the Penal Laws.

If you have not seen the exposure of this "scientific history" in the *Spectator*, pray get it, and do not let M. Cherbuliez write till he has read it.

3. The unjustifiable attempt to create division among his Catholic fellow-countrymen.

4. The strange virulence and vulgarity of language.

5. The mistranslations in which Dr. Newman and F. Coleridge caught him.

These are a few of the main points which ought to be brought out.—Believe me, always yours faithfully,

HENRY E., C.-Archbishop of Westminster.

In the following letter to his sister Cardinal Manning's

[1] The late Mr. Phillipps de Lisle, an intimate friend of Mr. Gladstone's, was referred by Cardinal Manning for an exposition of his views on Russia and Turkey, to a leading article in the *Pall Mall Gazette*. Mr. de Lisle, in a letter dated September 1876, said that the source of Mr. Gladstone's information was in the following passage of a letter of Cardinal Manning's:—

MY DEAR MR. DE LISLE—. . . . If you will read the Leading Article of the *Pall Mall Gazette* of yesterday (5th Sept.), you will see my estimate of the Servian War.—Yours very faithfully, H. E., Card.-Archbishop.

feelings towards Mr. Gladstone find a truer and kinder expression :—

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE, WESTMINSTER, S.W.,
14*th February* 1875.

MY DEAR CAROLINE—Your last letter I have kept by me intending to write, but I have been very hard worked. By this post I send you some of the results. You will, I am sure, be sorry for the occasion which forced me to write, for you know how much I valued Mr. Gladstone's friendship, and how little I ever thought that I should ever have to write publicly against him. However, all these things are ordered for higher ends than we see, though I can see some of them.

I was glad to read what you said of Frederick. I am sure that he is as upright and true in his belief as a man can be. And it gives me joy to hear that he gives so largely to the poor, for they are the friends of our Divine Lord, and he takes it as done to Himself. . . .

Well, to go to a better world ought to be our hope and prayer.

I hope you are well.—Believe me always your affectionate brother, H. E., C.A.

In a letter of two or three weeks earlier date, is the following passage :—

MY DEAR MR. DE LISLE—I think Mr. Gladstone's intervention and pamphlet to come at this crisis a simple disaster. It will heat men's passions and blind their understanding as he did about Neapolitan prisons and Garibaldi.—Believe me always, with kind regards to all, yours very faithfully, H. E., Card.-Archbishop.

Cardinal Manning gives an account of his relations with Mr. Gladstone in the following autobiographical Notes, dated September 1887 :—

MY RELATIONS AND CORRESPONDENCE WITH MR. GLADSTONE FROM 1835 TO 1887.

I have just read over my letters to Gladstone from the year 1835 to 1851. Then my submission to the Catholic Church suspended all communication by letter or meeting until about 1861. In that year I was walking with William Monsell (Lord Emly) in Downing Street, and I came upon Gladstone walking with some one whom I forget. We shook hands warmly, and he said "I shall be glad to see you." When I went home, I wrote saying, "You said so-and-so. Was it a mere form of speech, or did you mean it?" For I have always felt that I

had no right to expect a continuance of relations when I had myself dissolved the basis on which they rested. He answered that "he meant it," and his letter is in the series dated 12th March 1861. After this our correspondence and meetings were renewed until 1873. And our letters were, I think, more in number, and more important than in the first period, for then we were in early life, and afterwards we were in the stress of responsibility.

In 1873 he published his ill-starred *Vaticanism* and his unpardonable article upon Pius IX. From that day we parted again. I have never again entered his house nor he mine. Our letters were very few, and simply official until the beginning of last year. Since then we have written oftener, and on the old terms. But we have only met twice in these fourteen years, once at a garden party at Chiswick, and once in a sculptor's studio.

Now I explain his conduct in this way.

We parted in 1851 precisely on the difference between the act of faith founded on Scripture and tradition, and the act of faith founded on the perpetual office of the Holy Ghost in the Catholic Church, by which it is infallible.

The Vatican Council did more than define its own infallibility. It defined the Infallibility of its Head.

This revived the old antagonism of 1851 in the most acute and challenging form.

Into this he threw himself. But I do not think this would have become a lasting alienation if two events had not followed.

The one, that during the Council he was in close correspondence with Lord Acton, then in Rome, and in full sympathy with the Bishops in opposition in the Council. They professed to believe the doctrine, but to oppose the Definition. He opposed the doctrine root and branch, and thought that they were going to do his work. When this broke down he must have felt it, for he had committed himself by open opposition, and I believe I can say, in the Cabinet. Lord Clarendon, better informed by Odo Russell, whose letters I have preserved, always opposed him, and in the end was justified.

I do not think that this would have lasted long, but for the influence and character of Lord Acton.

Gladstone's geese were always swans. His friendship always blinds him. Time was when I had the benefit of his illusions. When this turned, Acton was the man made to his hand. He was a Catholic, learned in literature, of a German industry cold, self-confident, supercilious towards opponents, a disciple of Döllinger, and predisposed against me. He was a client of Newman's, whom he used to call "our awful chief." He knew what I thought of the *Rambler*, the *Home and Foreign Review*, the

Academy, I think, it called itself. He knew what I had written on the Temporal Power, on the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff. This was precisely the mind that would most surely and speedily sharpen, and sour, and stimulate Gladstone's mind. Then his whole conduct in Rome during the Council was an active and canvassing opposition to the majority of the Council. He was the *mediastinus* between the French and German bishops, always busy with tongue and pen.

Now all this poisoned Gladstone; and the part I took in the Council pointed his irritation upon me. His slighting and even contemptuous mention of my name would never have been written if Lord Acton had not inspired him with his own animosity. And he never would so far have forgotten our renewed relations from 1861 to 1873, as to publish in print that his friendship had ceased when I became a Catholic. I could only believe that political expediency made him wish to break with me, or that I had been misled into believing his renewed relations to be friendly.

Our correspondence from 1835 to 1851 traces the course of his mind and my own starting from our common outset, namely his book on Church and State, to the time when he saw his theory to be impossible, and I saw it to be false.

My last letter of any account to him at Naples foretells his present lot.

I forsook all things for faith, he has forsaken his whole political past for Ireland. He is as isolated now as I was then.

And this makes me turn to him. We are at last and at least agreed in this.

18*th September* 1887.

When I submitted to the Church in April 1851 I did not withdraw from my old friends, but I felt that they were all released from any relations of our former friendship. I had dissolved the foundations of our friendship, and the change was made not by them but by me. Nevertheless, I let them know that in my friendship for them there was no change, but that I should never by word or deed seek them, as I did not know what they might wish, but that if they sought me they would find me unchanged, except only in my Faith, and glad to renew, so far as possible, our old friendship. I thought this course considerate, just, and prudent. There may have been a mixture of human pride in it, for I could not place myself where my friendship might be declined; nor act as if my submission to the Catholic Church was a thing to be ashamed of.

When Gladstone therefore in 1873 publicly declared that our friendship had ceased, I was, as I think, justly displeased, for I had never sought him or his friendship.

CHAPTER XVIII

MR. FORSTER'S EDUCATION BILL—UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, KENSINGTON—BISHOPS AND REGULARS

1871-1874

To pick up the dropped threads of domestic affairs was Archbishop Manning's first business and duty on his return from Rome. The year 1870 was memorable for the revolution in the national education of England as well as for the Vatican Council. Mr. Forster's Bill, by establishing School Boards and setting up schools in which secular teaching was divorced from religion, introduced the godless principle into the National system of education. It was Mr. Forster's intention and purpose that the Board schools, paid for out of the rates, should, as he expressly declared in Parliament and in the preamble of the Bill of 1870, "supplement and complete" the religious and voluntary system. But, in spite of good intentions, an evil principle works out its own ends. In the hands of Mr. Forster's successors it did so without scruple or remorse. Experience has proved that the Secularists, represented to-day by Mr. Acland, have turned the School Boards into instruments of oppression, with the view of superseding or destroying schools in which religion, if not made the basis of education, at all events is recognised as essential to moral training.[1]

Owing to the absence of Archbishop Manning with the other bishops from England, and to the absorbing interest excited by the meeting of the Council, no organised attempt

[1] This statement in regard to Mr. Acland was made before the overthrow of the late Government.

was made by Catholics, in Parliament or in the country, to resist the introduction of the godless principle into the National system of education. No effort even was made to obtain the exemption of Catholic schools from the operation of so fatal a law as that of 1870. A meeting was indeed held by the English bishops, presided over by Archbishop Manning, at the English College in Rome, to consider Mr. Forster's bill. Mr. Forster said some years later to a Catholic friend, "What fools you Catholics were not to claim exemption; for your schools were obviously outside the scope of the School Board system. The Jews were better advised or more on the alert, for they obtained what you did not even ask for."

In a letter to Mr. Gladstone on matters affecting the Council, Archbishop Manning did allude on one occasion to the Education Bill, and in the following words expressed a fear lest Catholics in England should be compelled, as they were in America, to set up schools of their own:—

ROME, *6th April* 1870.

As to the education I do not like to trouble you, being at a distance.

One thing only is evident. No compulsory education can be just unless the faith and conscience of the people be respected.

From what you write I fear that we shall be compelled, as in America, to form our own schools. I am afraid that a small but persistent school are prevailing against the sense of the great majority of the English people. But I write now for another purpose. . . .

In his communications to Mr. Gladstone, Manning appears to have conveyed the impression of goodwill towards, rather than opposition to, the Government in respect to the Education Bill of 1870. In a letter on the subject, Mr Gladstone wrote as follows:—

BALMORAL, *27th September* 1871.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP—I expect to be in London either on the 21st of October, or, and rather probably, a few days earlier, and to remain until after the Lord Mayor's Day. I should like much to have a conference with you on the subject of English education. All you say would lead me to believe that you and the Government are on the same lines with respect to this important matter. . . . Affectionately yours, W. E. GLADSTONE

Before he went to Rome to attend the Council Dr. Manning had assented to Mr. Forster's Education Bill and had surrendered the right, obtained in the days of the Vicars-Apostolic, of a Catholic Inspector of Schools. Some of the bishops were displeased at Archbishop Manning's giving up the Catholic Inspector. When he was asked to show the exact terms which he had employed in the Act of Surrender, made without the assent of the other bishops, Archbishop Manning replied, "I do not recollect the exact words: I kept no copy: I gave my letter to Lord Ripon."

No doubt the letter is in the custody of Mr. Acland.

In 1871 Lord Edward Howard had collected £40,000 and more for poor schools; but the Archbishop of Westminster insisted on the money being given to those schools only which had accepted the Government's terms, thus compelling hundreds of schools to come under a yoke which their managers hoped to escape.

In 1872 Archbishop Manning began to have misgivings as to the policy of acquiescing in the new system of National education. He wrote and spoke on the duty of maintaining religion as the basis of popular education, and published a Pastoral Letter on "National Education and Parental Rights." But it was too late; it was like shutting the stable door after the steed had been stolen. One or two leading Catholics and one Catholic newspaper, more far-seeing than the archbishop, or giving their mind more deeply than he did, at the time, to the principles involved in Mr. Forster's Bill, did their utmost, almost single-handed, to avert the mischief. But in vain; the initial error was irreparable. Among the priests, Mr. Formby, the most outspoken of men, denounced Manning's concessions to the Civil Power in the matter of education in language too strong for quotation.[1]

[1] Here is a sample, with many judicious omissions, of Mr. Formby's criticisms. Speaking of an article of Manning's on education in the *Nineteenth Century*, Mr. Formby, in an unpublished letter, dated "The Priory, Hinckley," said: "Anything more simply anti-Christian I have never read . . . His first act . . . is to open the gate of the citadel and to let the enemy have free ingress. He concedes that the Civil Power has the right to be the schoolmaster of its subjects. But to concede this right is the denial of the

In later years, Cardinal Manning made strenuous and successful efforts to counteract the evil effects of the School-board system. By immense exertions, and in the most self-sacrificing spirit, the Catholics of England were enabled to set up voluntary schools all over the country, and to maintain them in a high order of efficiency. In secular instruction they were not inferior to board schools built and supported out of the rates; and though religion did not form the basis of education, as was the case in all Catholic Schools before Mr. Forster's Bill, yet religious instruction and prayer by priests before or after school hours imparted a Christian character to the schools, which was utterly wanting under the board-school system.

The great and critical question of establishing "a College for Higher Studies," adjourned by the preoccupations of the Vatican Council, was resumed after the normal peace and quiet, if it can be so called, of the Catholic world was restored, and the minds of men were enabled to return to their ordinary occupations or pursuits. Manning's mind, ever on the move, ever disturbed by the dread of evil days to come, was haunted, it might almost be said, by a perpetual fear lest a Catholic hall or College, more or less under Newman's influence, should be set up at Oxford. Still more disturbing, perhaps, was the fear of the Jesuits. To promote higher studies was their special work and mission. They had ample means at their command. They were a well organised and powerful body. Their staff of teachers and professors, already trained and at work at Stonyhurst, might be easily recruited as occasion required from centres of the highest literary attainments and of scientific research. Already their influence over the more educated Catholic laity of England was firmly established. Such influence was recognised and bewailed, as we have seen, in the correspondence between Manning and Mgr. Talbot. A University under the control of the Jesuits

Parental right under the first law of creation, and the right of the Sacerdotal order to be freely chosen by the parents as those in whom they have confidence, and of their joint autonomy."

would, however, be as repugnant, though for different reasons, to Manning's mind as a Catholic hall at Oxford.

That the Jesuits were apt to succeed, he knew of old That they had failed in their attempts to establish Grammar Schools in London for the middle classes was wholly and solely due to the Episcopal ban which he placed upon their work. But a College for higher studies, the nucleus of a future University, outside London, would escape from his jurisdiction. Other bishops did not share his prejudice against the Society of Jesus. Moreover, he was well aware that Father Weld, the Provincial in England, had been contemplating and preparing for the establishment of a College of higher studies, either at Richmond or at Reading. No time, therefore, was to be lost if Manning hoped to checkmate the Jesuits.

Hence at the Fourth Provincial Synod of Westminster, held in 1873, at St. Edmund's College,—the first and last over which Archbishop Manning presided,—disciplinary regulations were laid down against the frequentation of non-Catholic Universities; and a decree was made on the subject of the education of the laity. Manning announced his intention, which was approved of by the Synod, to form a body of examiners, and to proceed to the forming of Colleges of higher studies. It was resolved to found a College in London under the management and control of the bishops. An objection was raised on the part of the laity, that it was contrary to the character and spirit of the ancient Universities to be simply Episcopal institutions. It was contended that independence was essential to the freedom of action and to the literary spirit. The aim of Universities was to foster initiative among the laity, acting in harmony with ecclesiastical authorities. Some of the other colleges, notably Stonyhurst, were likewise opposed to a University-college in London under the exclusive control and management of the Bishops, which practically meant under the control of the Archbishop of Westminster. At a meeting of the Bishops, held in the following year at Birmingham, the subject of management was again discussed, and it was resolved, on the proposal of the Bishop of Birmingham, to

establish a Senate representing all the dioceses, colleges, and the laity. With somewhat of reluctance and foreboding Manning assented to the proposed scheme. He predicted, however, that the scheme would not work, and his prediction came true. The Senate met once, but was never invited to meet again, except to present a formal report on studies and finance. A joint Pastoral Letter, signed by all the bishops, was read in every church. It was proposed to raise £25,000 to found the University College at Kensington. Men of scientific eminence—Professor Barff, Dr. Mivart, Mr. Seager, in his Oxford days assistant professor of Hebrew under Dr. Pusey, and Mr. Paley—were appointed professors. Mr. Paley gave up his position as private tutor at Cambridge, to support Archbishop Manning's scheme, and to serve under the rectorship of Mgr. Capel. Manning in the beginning was elated at the prospects of success foreshadowed by the accession of such men as professors to his Kensington College. His initial mistake was in the choice of the Rector. Mgr. Capel, though popular at the time and active in the work of education, had no qualifications for so responsible an office. He had enjoyed no University education; had no claims to be regarded in any sense as a representative of higher studies. It was said at the time, by way of accounting for the strange appointment, that Manning made him Rector of the University College at Kensington with the view of pacifying him; for, by his opposition and ostentatious rivalry for influence over the higher classes, Mgr. Capel was already a thorn in the Archbishop's side.

A second error, fatal to the pretentious scheme, was the refusal of co-operation offered by the Jesuits. Some of their best men, who had been trained under Professor Barff, were willing to work under him. But Archbishop Manning absolutely declined the aid and presence of the Jesuits at the College for Higher Studies at Kensington. Over its gates, if in letters invisible to the unheeding crowd, was written—"No Jesuits need apply." Their exclusion was fatal to the foredoomed scheme. The obvious result was that English Catholics refused to send their sons

to a College under the exclusive control, as they believed, of Archbishop Manning, and under the management of Mgr. Capel as rector. The co-operation of the other bishops was looked upon as little more than nominal. The Senate, composed of priests, secular and regular, and of representative laymen, if it looked well on paper, was in reality a farce. Its first meeting at Archbishop's House was practically its last. It committed the error of believing itself to be an independent body. That error was fatal to its existence. For it was not in Archbishop Manning's mind to allow the Senate, consisting of "laymen, priests, and regulars," to take an independent line of action. Since it would not work as he had intended it to work, "it was necessary," as he declared, "to let it die." The Senate, happier in its mode of death than Manning's ill-fated college, was stifled metaphorically, like Desdemona, by a secret pillow; whereas the College, morally and financially bankrupt, came to an end under the public eye in scandal and disaster. In precipitate haste the college was opened in October 1874, and all that Archbishop Manning and Mgr. Capel could achieve by their joint efforts was to scrape together sixteen students; even some of this handful were but ill-prepared to enter upon higher studies.

Manning's futile attempt to found a Catholic University under the rectorship of Mgr. Capel was, it must be confessed, both in conception and execution opposed to the wishes as well as to the highest interests of the Catholic laity. Had they really been consulted on the subject, had a representative meeting of those interested in University education been called, and a free expression of opinion been invited by Archbishop Manning, the all but unanimous decision would have been that a Catholic University in England without the co-operation of Newman must needs in the nature of things have little or no chance of success. It was like leaving Hamlet out of the Play. The exclusion of the most revered leader of Catholic thought, incomparable for his experience in University teaching and for his personal influence over the minds of men: the refusal to

permit the most learned of the Religious Orders, he Society of Jesus, to participate in the work of higher education: and the nomination of Mgr. Capel as Rector, were like the handwriting on the wall.

The reason why Archbishop Manning did not consult those for whose benefit he attempted to found his University-college at Kensington, and without whose active co-operation it was foredoomed to failure, was simply because he knew only too well that the Catholics of England did not share, nor understand even, his prejudices in regard either to Newman or to the Jesuits. Rather than avow or explain in public the motives of his opposition, Archbishop Manning preferred to run the risk of failure. His confidence in himself, and in his power to induce Catholic parents to send their sons to his University-college, filled him with such an implicit assurance of success as to make him deaf to words of warning, and impatient of remonstrance or opposition.

Such a line of action in a man of Manning's practical sagacity would have been utterly unaccountable did we not know that his mistrust of Newman and of the Jesuits, though for widely different reasons, had become almost a second nature.

There can be little or no doubt that had Newman been invited by the Catholics of England and by the bishops to lay the foundations of a future Catholic University, he would not have refused to make the attempt.

The opportunity was lost—was thrown away. Twenty years and more have since elapsed. Men are gone and things have changed. Such an opportune time for founding a Catholic University in England is not likely to recur again in our generation, even if the lost opportunity has not brought as a consequence, as Cardinal Manning predicted at the time, a postponement of any College for higher studies to an indefinite future.

It was thought at the time, even by some good Catholics who did not really understand his character, that Newman had assumed an attitude of hostility, or at least stood wilfully aloof from Catholic life and work. Indeed it was

imputed to him by more or less hostile critics that, like Achilles, "he was sulking in his tent." Even some of his friends were pained and perplexed at an apparent estrangement and isolation which, at the time, they were unable to account for. One of his most intimate friends, Father Whitty, S.J., troubled at heart at his isolation, wrote to him on the subject and elicited from Newman the following touching reply, which by a simple statement of facts explains why it was that he had done, according to his own estimation, so little for God and the Church in England during a long twenty years following his conversion :—

THE ORATORY, BIRMINGHAM,
19*th March* 1865.

MY DEAR FATHER WHITTY—I thank you very much for your most kind letter; and thank you heartily for your prayers, which I value very much. It is very kind in you to be anxious about me, but, thank God, you have no need. Of course it is a constant source of sadness to me that I have done so little for Him during a long twenty years; but then I think, and with some comfort, that I have ever tried to act as *others* told me, and if I have not done more it has been because I have not been put to do more, or have been stopped when I attempted more.

The Cardinal brought me from Littlemore to Oscott; he sent me to Rome; he stationed and left me in Birmingham. When the Holy Father wished me to begin the Dublin Catholic University I did so at once. When the Synod of Oscott gave me to do the new translation of Scripture I began it without a word. When the Cardinal asked me to interfere in the matter of the *Rambler* I took on myself, to my sore disgust, a great trouble and trial. Lastly, when my Bishop, *proprio motu*, asked me to undertake the mission of Oxford, I at once committed myself to a very expensive purchase of land and began, as he wished me, to collect money for a church. In all these matters I think (in spite of many incidental mistakes) I should, on the whole, have done a work, had I been allowed or aided to go on with them; but it has been God's Blessed Will that I should have been stopped.

If I could get out of my mind the notion, that I *could* do something and am *not* doing it, nothing could be happier, more peaceful, or more to my taste, than the life I lead.

Though I have left the notice of the Catechism to the end of the letter, be sure I value it in itself and as coming from you.

The Pope will be very glad to hear the author of it.—Ever yours affectionately,[1] JOHN H. NEWMAN.

The Rev. Fr. Whitty.

Father Whitty took an early opportunity of placing John Henry Newman's letter in Manning's hands, with the view and in the hope of inducing the Archbishop to avail himself of the great Oratorian's active services in the cause of God and religion. But Newman's letter to Father Whitty, manifesting such humility; such touching faith in God; such sadness of heart at not having rendered greater services of which he felt capable to the Catholic cause, had no effect on Manning. At all events it produced no change in treatment; for a year or two later, when an opportunity presented itself of enlisting Newman's special and splendid abilities in founding a Catholic University, rather than invite his aid, co-operation, or even advice, Archbishop Manning risked almost inevitable failure. Newman's letter, though buried in oblivion from the day it was placed in Manning's hands, bears witness now from the grave, as it were, to Newman's willingness to have undertaken, if he had been called upon, any work, however arduous or even alien to his temperament. In a work so congenial to his talents and tastes, so near and dear to his heart as laying the foundations of a Catholic University in England, it is more than probable that Newman, with his unrivalled powers and gifts, would have succeeded, where, from the nature of things, Manning and Mgr. Capel were doomed to failure.

In the following Note, dated 1887, Cardinal Manning sums up in a somewhat scanty fashion the disastrous history of the college:—

Mgr. Capel had already shown intelligence and energy in

---

[1] An old and intimate friend of Newman's, on reading his letter to Father Whitty, wrote, under date 17th November 1893, as follows:—"I was very glad to read Cardinal Newman's letter. It is a clear and truthful explanation of matters that pained and puzzled his friends. It has been a revelation to me. . . . At the time good people suspected Cardinal Newman of many wrong things, and all the while he was simply doing what he was told to do."

education. He had made a beginning in Kensington, and I thought him capable of beginning the college. I suggested his name to the bishops. The Bishop of Salford concurring, he was appointed.

A Senate was formed of the bishops, the heads of colleges, and of Orders having colleges, with two laymen from each diocese. At the first meeting of the senate at my house, I explained our purpose, and invited the members of the senate to tell us what they desired. As soon as I had stated the subject, Mr. Hardman rose and said that they should better discuss the subject in the absence of the bishops. Dr. West and others took the same line. I thought it best not to oppose this, and we all withdrew; but I saw at once that the effect would be to surrender the whole treatment and guidance of the question to laymen, priests, and regulars. I made up my mind that our scheme would not work, and that it was necessary to let it die.

I incurred much odium for not calling the senate more than once again. But how could I? The senate, in its second meeting, appointed committees on study and finance. They reported, and we followed their report. But it met no more.

But here begins the series of troubles.

The college was opened in 1875. Mgr. Capel asked to have full liberty in forming it. He fixed the stipends of Mr. Barff and Mr. Mivart at £600 a year, Mr. Paley at £400, Mr. Gordon Thompson at £300, Father Clarke at £200, and this at a time when the outgoing exceeded the income. All expense was profuse. He rendered no balance-sheet till 1877. Financially the College was ruined. I carried it on for two years at a loss of £4000 to myself. Finally it was necessary to obtain Mgr. Capel's resignation. The college had lost all confidence and was evil spoken of. He resigned, and then claimed money of the bishops as advanced by him to the college. His counsel and the Solicitor-General gave opinion that Mgr. Capel was our agent, and that we were bound by his acts. My counsel did not deny this, but advised us to defend ourselves on the ground that he had kept no proper accounts, and that no Court would pass the books which he produced as authorities and admitted accounts.

But I had no doubt that he had spent money of his own in the work, and I therefore was resolved that he should never have the power of accusing the Episcopate and myself. I was resolved also not to call upon my colleagues to help in this, and to obtain from Mgr. Capel a legal discharge for them and for myself of all claims. This done, I gave him £4000.[1] I

[1] See Mr. Harting's papers and my MS. and papers in Mr. Harting's hands.

believed that he had wasted his own money with ours, and I was resolved to take from him the power of accusing the bishops of England. What I gave him fulfils, I believe, every duty of justice, equity, and honour, and I could not rest so long as he could lay to our charge anything at variance with these three high obligations. I feel that we are not in his debt, and that he has wrecked our only united work; the highest work next to the formation of the priesthood. I am responsible in chief for its proposal, not for the founding of the college, which I always thought premature. I yielded to my colleagues, who thought that people would understand nothing that was not *in concreto*. I did not and do not think this, but it was a move in the way I desired to take, and I assented. It has cost me £10,000, but I am content if only I can keep our youth within the intellectual unity of Catholic education. In all this trial our Lord has helped me almost palpably, and I must believe that some good will arise. One thing is certain; it has struck spurs into all our flanks, and we are straining upward in our studies. The time is not come, I believe, for any united effort. We must improve the studies of our existing colleges until our youth outgrow them and demand a college of their own.

I am responsible for selecting Mgr. Capel. Others were of the same mind, but I was the first. My reasons were (1) his intelligence and energy; (2) his material beginnings of a school at Kensington, which I proposed to him to convert to a higher purpose, taking youths after seventeen, instead of boys up to that age. He consented. The bishops stipulated that he should give up his school and take this work only. He never did so. He evaded, and carried on the school, and involved himself deep in debt for it, and drew plans for a college of £50,000, and started a company to get the money; and as he stated to Lord Petre, the University College was as Leah, and the school as Rachel, to him. All this would have wrecked our work. But there were other causes. The college was both suspected and mistrusted for reckless irregularity and for immorality. The Duke of Norfolk and Lord Petre told me that they could no longer advise any Catholic parent to send their sons. Lord Petre's son had been culpably exposed to danger. The bishops were informed on all sides of these evils. They appointed a committee of themselves. It reported that Mgr. Capel must resign. The accounts were then examined. There were no accounts, no ledgers, no books. After long delays new books, newly written up, were produced, and a claim of £6000 advanced against the college. Mgr. Capel would not produce his book of money received. The bank account gave

only a partial evidence. In the end I forgave him a debt of £1000, and gave him £3000. He could have proved nothing against us. But he received £4000. Afterwards he was bankrupt for £28,000 on his school, and then gave out in word and in print, in private and in public, in England and in Rome, and in newspapers, that he had been ruined by the University College undertaking—that is, he claimed £6000, he received £4000. He professed to lose £2000, which assuredly he did not lose, and was bankrupt for £28,000 on his own reckless speculations. The proof of all this is to be found in the archives of this house—that is, (1) in the audit of the Vicar-General and Mr. Harting; (2) in Mr. Harting's printed statement; (3) in Mr. ——'s printed opinion; (4) in several MS. statements drawn up by me at the time.

This was a heavy cross, a grave scandal, a grave hindrance to the work of Catholic education, and a postponement of any College for Higher Studies to an indefinite future.

Afterwards, I continued the University College as a private diocesan work in Cromwell Road, F. Clarke and the professors uniting generously and zealously.

Lastly, being convinced that our only course is to improve the studies in our existing colleges, I determined to unite the University College to St. Charles' College as a higher department.

For the whole of Mgr. Capel's case, see the documents in two of the red boxes and in Canon Johnson's custody. The Vicar-General and F. Fenton[1] know them all. Canon Macmullen, F. Butler, F. Pennington, and F. Knox know the whole case.

Archbishop Manning acted wisely in not calling on his fellow-bishops to bear a share in the heavy losses incurred. If they were legally liable, he was morally responsible for the ill-considered and precipitate scheme. Moreover, the bishops would have disputed Mgr. Capel's claims in a court of law. In the course of such an action the whole story of mismanagement would have come out: the original causes of failure—Manning's mistakes in the selection of London as the site of a Catholic university, and of Mgr. Capel as its rector; the reasons for rejecting the co-operation of the Jesuits; the farce of nominating a Senate of laymen and others without power to act; and the final folly of

[1] Now the Right Rev. Mgr. Fenton, a canon of the Chapter of Westminster.

opening a University college without students to fill it. Such a public disclosure of folly and failure; the scandal of Archbishop Manning and his suffragan bishops squabbling about money in a Law Court with Mgr. Capel, the bankrupt Rector of a pretentious College, was wisely and cheaply averted by the payment of £10,000.

It must be confessed that Archbishop Manning's failures are in the main to be attributed to the desire which possessed him to concentrate authority and power in his own hands. He was jealous of any interference in his schemes. For this reason he refused the co-operation of the Jesuits and religious Orders in his University scheme; for this reason he brushed aside the Senate of laymen; for this reason he selected London as the site of the future Catholic University of England, since outside his own diocese his authority would not have been supreme and unchallenged. Manning never understood early or late the wisdom of co-operation: never valued the virtue of competition. His idea was concentration of authority; one mind to conceive, one hand to execute. This narrowness of mind was his chief intellectual defect. It led by degrees to the isolation of his life. It was the origin and cause of the two most conspicuous failures in Cardinal Manning's career—the Kensington University College, and his Seminary at Hammersmith.

At the fourth Provincial Synod of Westminster, besides the disastrous scheme of establishing a University College at Kensington, a difficulty of another kind occupied the attention of the bishops. Archbishop Manning felt keenly the difficulty of adjusting his Episcopal authority with the rights of the religious Orders. His jurisdiction was at times confronted or challenged by the special privileges or exemptions from Episcopal supervision enjoyed by the Regulars. This was especially the case in regard to the Jesuits. The Society of Jesus was not under the rule of the bishop of the diocese in which they worked. It was under the direct authority of the Father-General in Rome. Only when the charge of a parish was imposed by the Bishop on the Jesuits, did they fall, as far as the adminis-

tration of the parish or mission was concerned, under his jurisdiction. Frictions arose, perhaps under the circumstances, not unnaturally. Jesuits, for instance, claimed exemption from attendance at Diocesan Synods. Archbishop Manning disputed their claim. The matter was referred to Rome, and decided in Manning's favour. One of the privileges conferred on the Society, and enjoyed ever since its foundation, was the right to establish schools as a part of their ordinary work in any part of a diocese where they had a House. This right Archbishop Manning disputed, and during the whole period of his Episcopate he never allowed the Jesuits to establish a College or Grammar school in the diocese of Westminster. They had to work outside of London in the fulfilment of their special vocation as teachers. They had a Novitiate at Roehampton, in the diocese of Southwark, and a College of higher studies at Beaumont, near Old Windsor, and later on in Wimbledon. The fourth Provincial Synod was invited by Archbishop Manning to frame a Decree regulating the relations between the religious Orders and the bishops.

The Regulars at the Synod maintained their rights and privileges and protested against the encroachments attempted or favoured by some of the bishops. The Jesuits denounced the pleas for interference, suggested by the Archbishop of Westminster, with the rights of the Regulars, as dangerous innovations, contrary to the spirit of the Church and hostile to the maintenance of friendly relations between the Religious Orders and the Bishops. There was a prolonged and warm discussion. Father George Porter's trenchant remarks and the vigorous speech delivered by Father Gallwey made a strong impression; many of the bishops showed themselves opposed to Manning. The Synod passed no Decree.[1]

In a Note dated 1887, Cardinal Manning said :—

[1] The prolongation of the Provincial Synod was the reason given to the Archbishop of Armagh by Archbishop Manning for not being able to fulfil his promise of preaching at Armagh on the occasion of opening the cathedral. Manning, in truth, needed rest and quiet, for he had been somewhat put out at the opposition he had encountered at the Synod. Archbishop Manning was, perhaps, somewhat too intolerant of opposition.

In that Council the first seeds of the contests of the Bishops and Regulars were sown in Gallwey's unseemly speech and Father G. Porter's theory that *The Sincere Christian* and the *Catechismus ad Parochos* are the books for the secular clergy. He did not say, but this means, that all that is higher is not for them.

In the following Note about the same date, Cardinal Manning relates how the contest between the Bishops and the Regulars, the seeds of which were sown in the Provincial Synod of 1873, bore fruit in 1877 :—

My part in the contest of Bishops and Regulars was (1) That in Low Week of 1877 I proposed to avoid all local and personal contention—to draw up one complete statement, lay it before the Holy See, and ask for a Constitution, analogous to the "Apostolicum Ministerium," to regulate under the Hierarchy the questions which were in existence also before it was founded. This was unanimously adopted. (2) I went to Rome, then came the election of Leo XIII. I asked him to proceed by way of a Constitution as it was not a conflict, but a legislative matter affecting the divine order of the Church and the whole Church on earth. This he promised to do. (3) Then, at Cardinal Bilio's suggestion, I asked for a special Commission of cardinals. This also he granted. These three points were my chief part in the affair ; save only that I went to Rome again—in all three times —and urged the matter with the Cardinals and the Holy Father till they wished me out of Rome. I went gladly, sick of the heat and of the intrigues.

Cardinal Manning, sick of the heat of Rome, and even still more of the moral heat engendered by the stubborn opposition of the Jesuits defending their ancient rights and privileges against the claims of the bishops, wisely left the management of this difficult and delicate business to the Bishop of Salford. Scarcely less tolerant of the summer heats of Rome than Manning himself, Bishop Vaughan was more tolerant of opposition ; took it more good-humouredly, fretted less, if indeed he fretted at all. One great point in dispute was the Jesuit College in Manchester. The Bishop of Salford demanded that it should be closed, as he had announced his intention of opening there a diocesan college of his own. Pope Pius IX. asked the bishop whether it was not unreasonable, since he had been told that the

Jesuits had no objection to his opening a college at Salford. On explaining that Manchester and Salford was one city like Rome and the Trastavere, and that the Jesuits wished to confine him, as it were, to the Trastavere, the Pope understood the point at once, and henceforward in joke called the Bishop of Salford the "Bishop of Trastavere."

The conflict between the bishops and the Jesuits raged, it is not too much to say, for two years in Rome. The Cardinals of the Propaganda thought they had discovered an easy solution when they found out that the three chief disputants, Father Weld, the Provincial of the Jesuits, Bishop Clifford, and Bishop Vaughan were cousins. "Go into another room," they exclaimed; "nothing can be easier than for three cousins to settle the dispute offhand by coming to a friendly compromise." But Englishmen in thorough earnest are as much averse to compromise as Italians are addicted to it on every occasion or under any pretext. The Roman cardinals could only shrug their shoulders, half in amusement, half in despair. They had enjoyed after their fashion a large experience of English bishops from the days of Bishop Errington downwards. Manning was described by them as "*Il diplomatico*," Clifford as "*Il avvocato*," and Vaughan, after his recent intractability, as "*Il diavolo*." The Roman cardinals, however, did not escape altogether scot-free. It was retorted upon them "That talking with Cardinals in Rome was like talking to owls at noonday."

Speaking of his two years' conflict in Rome with the Regulars, Cardinal Manning in the following Note says:—

> For two years I was assailed by the *Standard*, *Daily Chronicle*, and Society papers with a mendacious and insolent animosity, which pointed to personal malice. It became so personal and brutal that at one time many of the clergy thought of presenting to me an Address of indignation. I thought it best to wait till Leo XIII. had spoken. The *Romanos Pontifices* wiped out the lies. I prepared an answer which I leave in this book.

The long contention between the Bishops and Regulars, which a Constitution framed by Pope Benedict XIV. in

1753 had failed to appease, was brought to a satisfactory conclusion by the Bull of Pope Leo XIII. The ancient privilege possessed by the Jesuits of establishing schools without seeking permission of the bishop of the diocese in which they were carrying on their normal work of education was abolished. Cardinal Manning had gained the victory, and maintained to the end of his life the right of refusing permission to the Society of Jesus to open schools within the diocese of Westminster. The Jesuits, with their wonted wisdom, though it deprived them of an important privilege, regard the Bull *Romanos Pontifices* with satisfaction, for, by removing a constant source of friction, it has placed, as they say, the relations between the Bishops and the Regulars on an intelligible basis. In most dioceses it has led to a good understanding and a cordial co-operation between the Bishops and the Society of Jesus.

The following is the document which Cardinal Manning alluded to in the above Note. It was prepared beforehand as an answer to an Address which some of his friends among the clergy had suggested. The suggestion, however, was not carried out. But Cardinal Manning's answer is too full of personal matters to be omitted. It is in substance an autobiographical Note.

Written in 1881 *when some of my Clergy wished to address me on the malicious attacks of the Newspapers in* 1879, 1880, 1881:—

YOUR brotherly love constrains me to do what the public attacks of twenty years have failed to do. I mean to lay open to you many things in my mind and life which would otherwise have come out only when I am gone.

During the last twenty years I have had my share and perhaps more than the usual share of public attacks. My assailants have been of two kinds. The larger part by far, both in number and weight, have been my non-Catholic fellow-countrymen, who have assaulted me in a manly and chivalrous way, which, when they hit hardest, has always commanded my respect, and has never kindled my indignation. Of the lesser kind in every sense, I can say none of these things; and as of them I can say no good, I will say nothing.

When a man is nearing his seventy-fourth year he may well

look upon his life as over. I truly do so. My work, such as it has been, is done. What remains to me is to begin nothing new, to make less imperfect if I can that which I have attempted, and to rejoice in the many and multiplying works of my brethren. I may, therefore, look back for a moment over a long life.

Two years only are wanting to make up half a century since I began to work according to the light that God had given me. And in looking back I can see how God shaped all my ways towards the fulness of faith. In 1833 I had no knowledge of the Catholic Church, or faith, or priesthood, except such vague, perverse, and inadequate conceptions as the Anglican tradition has preserved. In 1837, by the study of the Fathers and certain Catholic authors, I had reached to a truer knowledge of the office of the priesthood and of the priestly life. I believed at that time without a doubt that my ordination was valid. In 1837 the hand of God changed my whole life and state, and I believed that he thereby had set me apart for His service as a priest.

With a deliberate choice I then resolved to live or die in the state in which He then had placed me. From this resolution I have never swerved in word or will. Through the next thirteen years the light of faith gradually but slowly expanded in my reason. A friend who knew me well, himself in the end a Catholic, used to say, "You have been slow to go on, but I never knew you go back." The truth of these words may be seen in eight volumes, of little worth indeed, except that they mark every step of the way, in which I never either went back or even turned aside. I remember in the outset of that time making two resolutions, the one never to write anonymously, believing it to be a great danger to charity, truth, and justice. Wherever I have been compelled to put no name to my writing, as in newspapers, I have always let it be known that I was the writer. The other resolution was never to write polemically. Polemics only destroy, they build up nothing. To write constructively leaves something at least behind, if it be only a stone in the structure, or a grain in the field of Truth. In looking back over the period from 1837 to 1851, I have the consolation of knowing that if I built up little of truth, I pulled nothing down. During the whole of that period it was my lot to contend for unpopular truth against popular error. My first public act was a protest in 1837 against the Erastianism of the Ecclesiastical Commission, and my last, in 1850, against the supremacy of the Crown in spiritual matters. If in those days I had sought popularity or the world I should have done none of those things. But I had vowed my whole life to the search and service of Truth, and wheresoever it led me there I went.

In 1850 the supremacy of Rome re-entered England in its fulness. I had just before protested against the supremacy of the Crown. I was called upon to take part in this conflict. The one supremacy I could not defend, the other I could not oppose. I felt that God called me to choose the master whom I would serve. And I resigned my office and benefice. The next step you know. In the month of June 1851, my illustrious predecessor and friend, with the full and explicit sanction of Pius IX., willed to ordain me to the priesthood, promising me that I should have as much time after ordination for retirement and study as I might have had before it. In the autumn of that year I went to Rome. Pius IX. sent for me and bade me to enter the Accademia Ecclesiastica. I resided there between three and four years. It is not necessary that I should dwell on the fourteen years from 1851 to 1865. I have lived among you in friendship and brotherhood; an unprofitable servant indeed, but with no other desire than to be a priest and a pastor of souls. But the years, now nearly sixteen, from 1865 to 1881, need a few words. Not only contrary to all personal merit, but to all human probability, and, as Pius IX. with his own lips told me, without human influence, or rather deliberately against it, he laid on me the burden I still bear. From that day I have been in the midst of you. I saw you labouring like good soldiers in the midst of your people. You shared their poverty and their hard life. Your example was a call and a law constraining me to share your life and your labours as you shared those of my flock. I felt that you were my first charge; that my duty was to live in the midst of you; that on any day and at any hour I ought to be at your side; that at any day or hour you ought to be able to find me. How far I have fulfilled these intentions, you, not I, must judge. But it is not for me to speak of myself. I will only say that if in the last thirty years or in the last sixteen years I had sought either popularity or the world, I should not have lived the life I have lived till now. It has still been my lot to defend unpopular truth against popular opinion. No subjects are less pleasing to English ears than the Temporal Power of the Pope; the duty of refusing all contact with the heterodox intellectual education of England from the lowest to the highest form; the extent of Pontifical censures; the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff; the Vatican Council. In these five primary controversies which were flagrant from 1860 to 1870, it was my lot to bear a part, and that on the unpopular side. Through those years an honour, altogether undeserved, fell to me—the united attack of newspapers and correspondents. Finally, and for some inscrutable reason, the same befel in the Conclave of 1878. It will probably go

down to history that I divided the Sacred College by vehement debates, that I opposed the election of Leo XIII., and that I counselled the holding of the Conclave in Malta. It little matters that the reverse of all these three, now historic fables, is fact and truth. All the waters of the sea will not wash out the tradition of error. Nevertheless, I have thought it not without a due motive that I should leave in your custody, under my own hand, this relation of facts and dates, which to men of honest minds will be enough to sweep away the fables and fictions of sensational tattlers. *Si hominibus placerem non essem servus Jesu Christi.*

Bear with me, reverend and dear brethren, in speaking so long of myself. I have hitherto thought it an indignity to notice the persistent detraction of anonymous malevolence. But your brotherly affection opens both my lips and my heart. It is the first time, and so far as I can foresee or can command, it will be the last. When a man is nearly half way between seventy and eighty years of age, it is time to think of rest. It is more than towards evening, for the long shadows of evening have already fallen upon me, and the night is at hand. The tale of life is full, and every year is a gift of God; something added to the measure already filled in mercy, in patience, and for an end not seen as yet. God metes out to each his lot. Some live a life withdrawn from the eyes of men. They are out of the stir and the stream of human wills and human actions, which are the trial, the danger, the burden of our life in the world. To others God appoints a life of continual activity in public duties, and innumerable relations with men and events. The former lot has not been mine. From the latter I have never been able to escape. It cannot be that in a life so active, so public, and so various for more than forty years, I have not acted rashly, hastily, unwisely. But I have endeavoured "to have a conscience without offence towards God and towards men." In these thirty years, and above all in the last sixteen, you must have much to forgive. There is only one thing of which I feel that I can say I am innocent. I have never consciously or intentionally wronged any one. What I may unconsciously and unintentionally have done, I dare not say. I ask forgiveness of God and of you; and I thank you from my heart for the words of affection which have drawn all this from me.

This interesting and characteristic review of his acts and motives, whether as an Anglican or a Catholic, which Cardinal Manning had intended to serve as an answer to an Address, had it, as he had expected, been presented to

him, of the Clergy of Westminster, was never published or made known to them. Instead of leaving it to their custody for publication at the time, as he had intended, he left this document—a veritable *apologia pro vitâ suâ*—among his papers for after publication, as a testimony and a self-justification.

Archbishop Manning's keen desire to keep abreast with the foremost thought of the day, as far as the limitation of his faculties permitted, was evinced by his becoming a member of the Metaphysical Society. In this Society Agnostics, as eminent in science as Professor Huxley, Professor Tyndall, and Sir Fitzjames Stephens, as famous in letters as Mr. John Morley and Mr. Leslie Stephen, or atheists like Professor W. K. Clifford, discussed and disputed, or denied the first principles on which Manning, in the "Papers" which he read, took his stand. The result was that, however clear and logical his arguments or deductions were from the premisses which he took for granted, he was merely beating the air, for his opponents did not care to follow or refute his statements. What they called in question was his assumption of first principles, which he did not even attempt to prove. Propositions which he looked upon as self-evident they regarded as devoid of foundation. Archbishop Manning was not a keen and subtle metaphysician like Father Dalgairns, or a philosophical thinker like Dr. Ward, two of his Catholic colleagues in the Metaphysical Society. His earnestness, his eager desire to bring conviction home to his hearers, the absolute and transparent conviction of his soul in the truths which he presented, compelled respect. But in such an assemblage of philosophical and original thinkers, by whom no principle was taken for granted, Manning, whether he knew it or not, was out of his depth. On one occasion, one of his oracular statements was somewhat rudely called in question by Professor Clifford. Manning, at the time, not knowing he was in error, declined to withdraw the statement; but at the next session he made an ample apology, and acknowledged that he found on reference that he had misunderstood the drift of the quotation he had made. It

was a pathetic spectacle to note the ill-disguised amazement with which Manning listened to the ruthless and cold-blooded denials of what to him were self-evident and eternal Truths. He had not imagination sufficient to enter into the feelings or position of his Agnostic opponents, nor grasp of mind nor depth of thought to enable him to perceive the subtilties of their argument, nor the ultimate dividing lines which rendered intellectual agreement impossible. Cardinal Manning in his attendances at these discussions in the Metaphysical Society was not so effective as a witness to the Truth as he was edifying as a moral martyr.

The following are the papers read by Manning at the Metaphysical Society :—

1871.
Jan. 11. Archbishop Manning: "What is the Relation of the Will to Thought."
1872.
May 14. Archbishop Manning: "That Legitimate Authority is an Evidence of Truth."
June 10. Archbishop Manning: "A Diagnosis and Prescription."
1877.
Feb. 13. Cardinal Manning: "The Soul before and after Death."
1879.
Nov. 25. Cardinal Manning: "What is Philosophy?"

The Metaphysical Society was founded in 1869 by Mr. James Knowles, now editor of the *Nineteenth Century*. The meetings were held once a month at the Grosvenor Hotel. The Papers to be read at the meetings were previously circulated among the members, and the reading was followed by a full and free discussion of the subject treated of. The first meeting was held on 2nd June 1869, and the first Paper read was that by Mr. R. H. Hutton, the editor of the *Spectator*, "On Mr. Herbert Spencer's Theory of the Gradual Transformation of Utilitarian into Intuitive Morality by Hereditary Descent." The last Paper was read 11th May 1880, when the Metaphysical Society, after a brilliant career. died of natural exhaustion. The Society included among its members, besides Agnostics eminent in science and letters, the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of Gloucester;

and such Broad Churchmen as Dean Stanley and F. D. Maurice; a High Churchman, too, as pronounced as Dean Church of St. Paul's; Dr. James Martineau, a Unitarian, and the Positivist, Mr. Frederic Harrison. It contained also among its members statesmen as famous as Mr. Gladstone, Lord Selborne, and the Duke of Argyll; men as eminent in the science of medicine as Sir William Gull and Dr. Andrew Clarke. Tennyson, the poet, was a member, and so were Mr. Ruskin, Mr. J. A. Froude, and Mr. Arthur Russell, brother of Mr. Odo Russell, and many others.

Of the five Catholic members Cardinal Manning read four Papers, Father Dalgairns three, Dr. Ward three, Professor Mivart three, and Dr. Gasquet one. Archbishop Manning sent to Mr. Gladstone—it was in the days before the Vatican Council had caused a rupture in their friendship—his Paper read at the Metaphysical Society, "That Legitimate Authority is an Evidence of Truth." In reply Mr. Gladstone wrote the following letter:—

It was an act of self-privation on my part not to go to your meeting and discussion on Authority at the Metaphysical Society: but my brain will not now stand that kind of exertion. I venture, however, to observe that I do not find your printed Paper clear on the relations between "testimony" and "authority"; a remark which I hazard with hesitation because, in general, I think that one of the strongest points of your writings is their admirable clearness.—Believe me, affectionately yours,

W. E. GLADSTONE.

There was no limit to Archbishop Manning's activities—at least no man perceived it, if there were one—in this the most active period of his busy life. He frequented the House of Commons, had interviews with leading politicians, discussed public affairs of Catholic interest with ministers or statesmen. During the interruption of his friendship with Mr. Gladstone, Manning had entered into friendly relations with Mr. Disraeli.

A strong inducement for Archbishop Manning to seek the political friendship and support of Mr. Disraeli was the way in which the Tory statesman defended in Parliament on the one hand the Temporal Power of the Pope as the most

ancient and legitimate monarchy in Europe, and on the other with deep political insight ascribed the successes of the Revolution to the subterranean work of the Secret Societies with which Europe was honeycombed.

In 1868 Disraeli's scheme for conferring a Charter on the Catholic University of Dublin, and through it a great and long-expected boon on the Catholics of Ireland, excited warm and widespread discussion. It was fiercely assailed by the Whigs and even by the Irish Catholic members. It was a critical measure, on which the fate of the Tory Government depended. In the height of this agitation Mr. Disraeli invited Archbishop Manning to an interview.

Archbishop Manning and Mr. Disraeli were on such terms of mutual confidence that Manning was consulted before Mr. Disraeli introduced his Bill to confer a charter on the Catholic University of Dublin. Over this business Archbishop Manning got into trouble with Mr. Disraeli. After having read a draft of the measure and approving of its chief provisions, Manning, perhaps with over-confidence, had undertaken to secure Catholic support for the Bill. This undertaking had been given without a full understanding with the Irish bishops. Mr. Disraeli on his side apparently attributed to Archbishop Manning the possession of far greater influence over Irish bishops and Members of Parliament than he in reality enjoyed. The result was that when the negotiations were opened up with the Irish bishops they instantly broke down. Far from supporting, they opposed Mr. Disraeli's Bill, and at their bidding the Irish Catholic members voted against it, with the result that the Tory Government was defeated. This result was attributed at the time to Archbishop Manning's non-observance of his undertaking.

Some years later the subject again came under discussion in the manner described in the following letter, written by Pope Hennessey, to Lord Mayo, who at the time of Mr. Disraeli's Catholic University Bill was, as Lord Naas, Chief Secretary for Ireland:—

19*th May* 1870.

MY DEAR LORD—I find myself obliged to write to you in

consequence of a rather unpleasant incident, referring back to the period of your Irish administration, in regard to which Archbishop Manning has appealed to me. The circumstances are these. About a fortnight or three weeks ago, the Duke of Norfolk and Sir Charles Clifford waited on Mr. Disraeli in regard to the pending motion of Mr. Newdegate about our convents, Mr. Disraeli said, as I am informed, that it was impossible for him to give any help to Catholics in matters affecting their political interests; that, when in office, he had made certain propositions; and that on the score of those propositions certain Catholic leaders had given him an undertaking of support; but that undertaking had not been observed, but had been betrayed; in consequence that he had felt impelled to place his resignation in the hands of Her Majesty, and would have done so, but that superior considerations of policy intervened; that he had however been obliged to banish your lordship to Calcutta; and, in fine, that he no longer possessed the confidence of the Party in Catholic questions. The Duke and Sir Charles withdrew, but he followed them to the head of the stairs and said it was to Archbishop Manning he particularly referred, and that he wished what he had said to be communicated to his Grace.

Accordingly, the Archbishop, who is attending the Council, was at once informed of what had passed. . . . Very soon after the negotiation touching the grant of a charter to the Irish Catholic University proved unsuccessful, a rumour spread in London that Mr. Disraeli attributed its failure to the Archbishop, and that he had even said that Dr. Manning had "stabbed him in the back." The phrase in due course reached the Archbishop's ear, but without any such sanction of authority as would, he thought, warrant him in directly charging Mr. Disraeli with the use of it. However, it affected him very much, and as I happened at the time to be well aware of his opinions and conduct in the matter, and had also the honour of being known to your lordship, then charged with the conduct of the transaction, he asked me to speak to you, and to ask you to mention the matter to Mr. Disraeli. I accordingly did so. It was at a period not long subsequent to the publication of your correspondence with Archbishop Leahy. That correspondence told its own story. Any one who read it might safely swear that Archbishop Manning had nothing to do with it. From various sources I happened to know exactly how the case stood, and I had to tell your lordship that the Irish bishops charged with the negotiation had simply set his Grace aside and dealt with the question, as a question exclusively Irish, after their own fashion, with a result never to be forgotten. . . . .—Yours faithfully, J. Pope Hennessey.

Manning, who was attending the Vatican Council, wrote to Mr. Disraeli the following letter of explanation :—

ROME, *7th May* 1870.

MY DEAR SIR—I have to-day received a letter from England which conveys to me a statement made by you to certain Catholic gentlemen respecting the negotiations on the subject of the Charter for the Catholic University in Dublin, in which negotiations you were so good as to admit me to confer with you.

The same statement I had already heard from Lord Denbigh, to whom you had made it about two years ago.

I requested Lord Denbigh to give you a full and correct statement of the facts, from which you would see that you had been led into an erroneous judgment.

Shortly after I met Mr. Cory, then I believe your private Secretary, at the house of Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens, and requested him also to state to you that the negotiations in question were entirely taken out of my hands by the bishops who corresponded with you; and in a sense at variance with my judgment and advice.

Mr. Cashel Hoey, who is well known to Lord Mayo's brother, Mr. Bourke, was witness of the whole negotiation and can give evidence to show that you have been entirely misled in your impressions as to my part in the transactions.

If I had been left free to act, Mr. Cashel Hoey's judgment as well as my own is that the negotiation would have been successful. And we have never ceased to regret the failure of my efforts.

I refer you to Mr. Hoey, and thereby with this letter place within your reach a full rectification of the erroneous judgment you have been led to form and to express.—I remain, my dear sir, yours faithfully, ✠ HENRY E. MANNING.

The Right Hon. Benjamin Disraeli, M.P.

In an autobiographical Note, numbered 41, Cardinal Manning has given the following interesting account of this interview :—

In 1868, Disraeli asked me to come to him on the subject of the Catholic University in Ireland. I saw him several times. He gave me the printed scheme before he laid it before the Cabinet. It gave a Charter without money; I was convinced that the Charter once given would bring money in due time. I did all I could to induce Cardinal Cullen and the Irish bishops

to accept it. I think the Cardinal was not unwilling. The bishops deputed three—the Archbishop of Cashel, Leahy, and two others, to come over. They fell under Monsell's influence, who, I always thought, wished only his own Party to settle the question. The bishops were advised to ask money also; and in a correspondence not conciliatory.

I then ceased to touch the question, or to communicate with Disraeli. I was in this strait. Either I must tell Disraeli that I differed from them; or I must be silent. The former would have been used against them. The latter only affected myself. I was therefore silent. Monsell and others in the House of Commons attacked the Government as to giving money, which it did not. The scheme was defeated. And Disraeli, believing me to be a party to this opposition, which I then deplored and do still, told the Duke of Norfolk and Lord Denbigh and others that I had "stabbed him in the back." I never had an opportunity of telling him these facts till 1879. He said that he did not remember the "stabbing," and had heard the truth before. If the Charter had been given the Catholic University would have been stronger and more independent at this day.

I may here anticipate and say that I was again placed in the same difficulty in 1873 with Gladstone's Irish University scheme. He, Lord Hartington, and Lord Granville asked my opinion. I thought the scheme just admissible, and advised Cardinal Cullen to get rid of the subject by accepting it. But the scheme was made impossible by changes in the House of Commons, and it fell. Gladstone said that he had no complaint to make against me for the failure. But McCullogh Torrens told me that everybody ascribed to that fact Gladstone's insane Vaticanism, and attacks on me. I do not, because when he and the Government fell, I saw him the same night, and he said, "You find me without disappointment and without resentment." I saw him many times before his Pamphlet, which is ascribed to two causes: the influence of Lord Acton, who poisoned his mind against the Council and against me; and a calculated policy of breaking with me for the sake of political expediency.

It is curious that the same subject should have involved me in collision with both Disraeli and Gladstone; and the one should have have written *Lothair*, and the other *Rome's New Fashions in Religion*. Disraeli kept his head, but not his temper: Gladstone lost both.

On the return of Mr. Gladstone to Office, after the General Election in the autumn of 1868, on the Irish Church Disestablishment question, the Ecclesiastical Titles

Act was referred to a Committee of the House of Commons. Before this Committee Archbishop Manning was examined for three hours. His evidence proved many inconveniences and some absurd results caused by the Act. The Act had long been a dead letter; its remaining on the Statute Book, as Manning stated in evidence, was an inconvenience as well as an anomaly. The evidence given before this Committee was not without effective results, for in 1871 the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill—Lord John Russell's abortive progeny—was repealed.

One of the last political communications which passed, before the estrangement of 1874, between Archbishop Manning and Mr. Gladstone, was the following note, with an extract of a passage from a despatch of Sir A. Paget, accredited to the Court of the Quirinal:—

Private.

10 DOWNING STREET, WHITEHALL, 10*th August* 1872.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP MANNING—I send you herewith an extract from a despatch of Sir Augustus Paget recently received, which, it appeared to me, might properly be placed in your hands.—Affectionately yours, W. E. GLADSTONE.

EXTRACT FROM SIR A. PAGET'S LETTER OF JULY 26, 1872.

Although Chevalier Visconti Venosta has again renewed his declaration that the property of foreign ecclesiastical establishments will be respected in the intended law for the suppression of the religious Corporations in Rome, I cannot conceal from your lordship that a policy of moderation and conciliation in dealing with the "Convent question, whether national or foreign," has become tenfold more difficult for the Government to carry out by reason of the attitude of increased provocation and irritation which has latterly been pursued by the clerical Party. Not a day passes but some fresh insult is levelled at the Italian Monarchy and Government by the chiefs and press of that Party; they openly proclaim that they recognise neither the laws nor the institutions in this country; and they are not at the trouble to conceal that the subversion of the existing order of things, either by foreign intervention or other means, is the desire which they have most at heart.

Failures did not daunt Archbishop Manning's spirit or shake his confidence in himself. He was unconscious to a large extent, perhaps altogether, that he had failed through any faults or shortcomings of his own. "Some one had blundered," and brought trials upon him. He had consolation even amidst the mistakes and disasters which ruined the Kensington College in the conviction that—"In all this trial our Lord has helped me almost palpably." This elasticity of mind enabled him to turn without hesitation or delay to new works, to embrace new opportunities. Cardinal Manning was too much of a diplomatist to waste time or thought about the loss of Mr. Gladstone's friendship, and of the political influence which such an intimacy conferred. The axiom that there are as good fish in the sea as ever came out of it, was an inspiration to his mind. There were other statesmen in England besides Mr. Gladstone whose political friendship might be cultivated with advantage. In 1877 Mr. Disraeli, who had been long and consistently supported by a small but active party of English Catholics, was in office. Though by nature Manning was a Whig and a believer in the "Sovereign people," yet he was a diplomatist, and, having broken a second time with Mr. Gladstone, soon entered into friendly relations with Mr. Disraeli. Mr. Disraeli had spoken in Parliament in support of the Temporal Power of the Pope; had denounced the Secret Societies, with which Italy was honeycombed, as the agents of the Revolution, and, in striking contrast to Mr. Gladstone, had disdained to fraternise with Garibaldi. The Tory leader was a supporter of the principle of religious education against irreligious Liberalism, he had offered a Charter to the Catholic University of Dublin. On account of these and other political principles he was supported by the Catholic Tories of England, in those days of inaction, a small minority. In his correspondence of an earlier date with Mgr. Talbot, it will be remembered how Manning was wont to denounce Catholic Tories and the Stafford Club men as sacrificing Catholic interests to Party politics and by public meetings and speeches alienating the support and goodwill of such friends, forsooth, of the Catholic cause

as Mr Gladstone and the Whigs. That was in the days before Mr. Gladstone's friends had made a breach in the walls of Rome. In 1877 the tables were turned. Mr. Gladstone and the Whigs were in disgrace. The *quondam* friend of the Catholic cause was denounced as doing the work of anti-Christ in Rome and at the Vatican Council. Hence in the year 1877, Cardinal Manning sought the support of the Catholic Tories, and cultivated the friendship of Mr. Disraeli.

The only Irish Catholic Tory in Parliament, Pope Hennessey, was the ambassador on the occasion between the Prime Minister, Mr. Disraeli, and Cardinal Manning, as is recorded in the following autobiographical Note, dated 1882:—

In 1877, Disraeli was in office. Pope Hennessey came to me and asked whether I would put in writing anything as to the Roman question for the Cabinet. I did so and he gave it to Lord Derby, then Foreign Secretary. (See his note.) It was laid before the Cabinet. I gave a copy of it to M. Gavard. He sent it to Paris, that is, M. d'Harcourt, French Ambassador here sent it to Duc Decazes in Paris, and he to Courcelles in Rome; with an account of a conversation with me in which he put his interpretation on my words, and his ideas into my mouth. Courcelles went about Rome with it. Cardinal Franchi wrote to me, and I wrote fully to the Holy Father through him. Then the matter dropped. I got the Note back by M. Gavard from the French Foreign Department, and in Rome I found from Baron Baude, Courcelles' successor, the mare's nest he had made. This is the matter travestied in the *Opinione* of 28th March 1877. *Red Book*, vol. iii.

In the Note laid before the English Cabinet, I said:—

1. That the Pope would cede nothing.
2. That he would not invoke armed Intervention.
3. That no restoration of the Temporal Power is possible except *mediante populi Italici voluntate.*
4. That fear of armed Intervention made Italy dependent on Germany and embittered Italy against the Holy See.
5. That if this fear were taken away there would be hope of a settlement.

All these things seem to be acknowledged now. Then our *intransigente* thought them heresy. The Note is among my papers.

The Note on the Roman Question by Cardinal Manning, which was laid before the Cabinet for Mr. Disraeli's information, is as follows :—

1. The Holy Father is bound by oath never to cede Rome and the States of the Church.

2. No transaction or compromise on this is possible.

3. He can never sanction the principle of Non-intervention.

4. But he would be the last to invoke warfare into Italy.

5. It is the fear of such armed intervention on the part of France that throws the Italian Government upon Berlin for protection.

6. Berlin gladly keeps alive this fear to make Italy dependent, so as to have Italy in the rear of Austria and France as a perpetual menace.

7. If Italy were relieved of the fear of armed intervention it would reunite with France and form alliance with Austria.

8. The union of these three Powers would render the solution of the religious Question in Italy comparatively easy.

9. Italy alone can solve the Roman question: and if Italy be content with the solution, which would satisfy the conscience of the Catholic Church, no non-Catholic power can have any pretext to interfere.

10. I believe that the Revolutionary party in Italy is confined to about three millions, and that twenty-three millions would gladly reconcile themselves to their old traditions.

11. The present parliament is elected by the suffrages of not more than a hundredth-part of the Italian people. It does not represent them.

12. Many of the leading statesmen of Italy desire a reconciliation with the Holy See as the only way to consolidate the independence of Italy.

13. If they can obtain this reconciliation they would obtain the support of all that is sound and conservative in the electoral Body, one-half of which now abstains from voting because of the violation of the rights of the Holy See.

14. But no initiative can be taken by the Holy See.

In 1882 Cardinal Manning made the following comment on his Memorandum of 1875 :—

18*th June* 1882.

1. The foregoing memorandum was written at the request of Sir J. Pope Hennessey for Mr. Disraeli and Lord Derby in 1875.

2. It was read in a Cabinet Council.

3. M. d'Harcourt, French Ambassador, had a copy and lent it to Duc Decazes at Paris.

4. Then to M. de Courcelles in Rome.

5. M. de Courcelles misrepresented it all over Rome as a "Conciliazione."

6. I had no copy. This was copied in the *Ministère des Affaires Etrangères* at Paris, by the request of M. Gavard, then at the Embassy in London.

H. E., Card.-Archbishop.

It is significant to note with what facility Cardinal Manning transferred his polite attentions to Mr. Disraeli. The Tory leader had now the benefit of those private communications and suggestions—as to the policy which ought to be pursued towards Catholics: towards the Pope, the victim of the Revolution: towards Ireland, infected on the one hand with Fenianism; on the other, denied a Catholic University,—which in other days were addressed to Mr. Gladstone. Cardinal Manning had frequent appointments with Mr. Disraeli and with Lord Derby, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, frequent interviews with Lord Carnarvon and Mr. Ritchie. He made as favourable an impression on the Conservative statesmen as he had made on Mr. Gladstone and Lord Clarendon. As in his archidiaconal days he had sent his Charges to peers and commoners and men eminent in art or letters, so now Cardinal Manning sent his Pastoral Letters to Mr. Disraeli, to Lord Carnarvon, and even to Lord Brougham, and to other leading men in Parliament and in the country.

Lord Brougham in acknowledgment wrote a flattering letter. The letter, though he was a peer, bore his customary signature *Harry Brougham.*

Cardinal Manning, in a conference with Lord Carnarvon, gave his advice—as he had done in former days to Mr. Gladstone—as to the best way of securing for the Tory Government the Catholic vote in England and Ireland

In the following letter Lord Carnarvon gave Cardinal Manning the satisfaction of knowing that his views had been brought before the Prime Minister:—

Private.

16 Bruton Street, 17*th November* 1876.

My dear Lord Cardinal—I took an early opportunity of letting the Prime Minister and Lord Derby know all that you said to me a short time since with regard to the contingencies of a future Election. I know that you do not desire any answer, and that you are satisfied to have your view of the position laid before the Government. This is now the case.

Since you left England the Eastern horizon has grown very cloudy, but I still indulge the hope that where there is a general, if not an universal, disclination to fight, some escape from war may be found.—Believe me, yours very truly,

Carnarvon.

The following letters show Cardinal Manning's friendly relations with Lord Beaconsfield.

2 Whitehall Gardens, S.W., 9*th April* 1877.

Dear Lord Cardinal—It was most courteous and considerate in you sending to me an authentic copy of the Allocution of His Holiness, which I shall read with interest and attention.—Believe me, very faithfully yours,

Beaconsfield.

10 Downing Street, 11*th July* 1879.

My dear Lord Cardinal—I send you the promised *precis*, which will, I hope, assist your Eminence in your communication with the Propaganda, and show that Her Majesty's Government is not liable to the charges brought against them—Ever faithfully yours, Beaconsfield.

His Eminence, Cardinal Manning.

Hughenden Manor, 31*st December* 1879.

My dear Lord Cardinal—Your kind wishes to me for the New Year touch me much, and I reciprocate them with a perfect cordiality. In the dark and disturbing days on which we have fallen, so fierce with faction even among the most responsible, the voice of patriotism from one so eminent as yourself, will animate the faltering, and add courage even to the brave.—Believe me, with deep regard, yours, Beaconsfield.

The following letter, of earlier date, is from Lord Derby:—

23 St. James's Square, S.W., 28*th March* 1877.

My dear Lord Cardinal—I am much obliged to you for

your letter, and for the copy of your communication to the *Daily News* enclosed in it.

Permit me also to thank you for your friendly remarks on the policy pursued by the Government in regard to Eastern affairs.—Believe me, very faithfully yours, DERBY.

Cardinal Manning acted well and wisely in fostering intercourse and communication with English statesmen, be they Whigs or Tories. It was of advantage to the Church in England that in his person it was brought into contact with English life, not indeed matters of religion, but in things political. It was a breaking down of that adamantine wall of separation which, built up in the first instance by religious bigotry, and perpetuated in no small degree by Catholic reserve or apathy, had so long divided the Catholics of England from their fellow-countrymen, not only in social, but in public life. The revolution which Newman's genius and character had already wrought in the intellectual and literary world, Manning was now effecting in official and political life. Statesmen and politicians were slowly learning that the Catholic Church was a moral power in the world, a factor which had to be considered and dealt with in politics. The cordial alliance which had existed between England and the Holy See early in the century, in the time of the Napoleonic wars, had strangely faded out of the national memory. The spread and triumph of the Manchester school and of materialism had done its evil work in England. The school of Cobden worshipped wealth and its increase. Its idols were the factory and the cotton-loom. It believed in Free Trade as the sole agent for the regeneration of society, the herald of a new millennium of universal peace and good-will among men. Tennyson, with a poet's insight into the nature of things, exposed this imposture of Cobden and his school in a poem, from which the following vigorous lines are taken:—

> Last week came one to our county town
> To preach our poor little army down.
>
> . . . . .
>
> Whose ear is stuft with his cotton, and rings
> Even in dreams to the chink of his pence—
> This huckster put down war!

The gospel of universal peace was flouted by terrible wars in Europe from 1854 to 1871. And from the loins of materialism have sprung the socialism and anarchy of our day. In the last quarter of the century it came like a new revelation to politicians and statesmen, that society could not be regenerated, or even restrained, by mere brute force; that booted apostles had never yet changed the hearts of men. It dawned on men's minds that the Papacy was a power to be reckoned with: that its moral influence was of moment to the world in stemming the onsweep of Socialism and of the Cosmopolitan Revolution. It is beginning to be understood in Europe, especially by the German Emperor, that in the counter-revolution arms alone will be little or no avail without the aid of moral Power, and of its highest representative, the Papacy.

Like causes were at work in emancipating English Catholics from the ancient dominion of Whiggery. Men discovered that Liberalism was identified with the Revolutionary movement abroad, with the Irreligious movement at home—the secularisation of the State, of Society, and of National Education.

It was the force of events rather than political inclinations or principles which led Cardinal Manning after his rupture with Mr. Gladstone to approach and associate with Tory statesmen. This change had a good effect in Rome; for Roman cardinals could not understand Manning's association or intimacy with Mr. Gladstone, notorious for his active co-operation with the revolutionary Propaganda in Italy from its seed-time in the days of Mazzini and of Poerio to the gathering in of the harvest of evil in the days of Cavour, Garibaldi, and Victor Emmanuel.

Manning was recognised in the political life of England, and especially by its leaders, Whig or Tory, as a representative of the moral power of the Church. To the official world he made known with equal tact and firmness the rights of the Catholic community, and the principles on which these rights rested. By his able interpretation of Catholic views and principles, public needs and interests, the Catholic Church in England was brought out of ob-

scurity into the light of day, into the fulness of public life. To banish the mystery which attaches to the unknown, the bigotry which is begotten of ignorance, was one of Manning's highest achievements as Archbishop of Westminster. Owing in no small measure to his judgment, prudence, and practical sagacity, he obtained a hold on public opinion in England, a footing in public life, rarely or never since the Reformation accorded to a Catholic. He was a Catholic Churchman of the most uncompromising principles; and yet a true Englishman. He loved the Church of Rome, and he loved England. The bitter hostility against England too often displayed by the Catholic bishops of Ireland had led the popular mind, in the days before English Catholics were really known, to identify Catholicism with hatred of England. In his private intercourse with statesmen and politicians, at public meetings in the furtherance of social and philanthropic objects, Manning had long lived down this evil tradition. The people of England were almost persuaded at last to believe in Cardinal Manning's own saying, "The better a Catholic, the better an Englishman."

The bishops of Ireland and the American bishops set great store by Manning's intimacy with Mr. Gladstone. If it was misunderstood or misliked at Rome, it was regarded by the Irish and the American bishops as a singular privilege. Indeed, they ascribed to Archbishop Manning's relations with Mr. Gladstone a far greater political importance than they possessed. It is amusing to observe with what eagerness on various occasions Cardinal Cullen consulted Manning as to how Mr. Gladstone was to be treated; what line of action or argument was best adapted to move him. When, for instance, the Catholic University Bill was rejected by the Irish bishops as destructive of the religious principles which they had always professed, Manning was consulted as to the form and wording of the petition to Mr. Gladstone to withdraw and recast his Bill. Again, on the occasion of a public meeting in Ireland against the Italian annexation of Rome, Cardinal Cullen wrote to Archbishop Manning, asking whether it would be expedient to denounce

Mr. Gladstone by name as an enemy of the Temporal Power, or whether it would have a mischievous effect on him to identify him in public as the author of a virulent article in the *Edinburgh Review*. When finally Archbishop Manning broke with Mr. Gladstone and entered into friendly relations with Mr. Disraeli, Cardinal Cullen was too thoroughgoing a Whig to approve of the change; not sufficient of a diplomatist to understand Archbishop Manning's motives.

It is well, moreover, to bear in mind that by the instincts of his nature Manning was prompted, apart from considerations of policy, to enter into friendly relations with public men. He had no doubt in his own mind, or hesitancy, as to his fitness or ability to advise statesmen, to solve the most difficult of questions, or to unravel the tangled knots of doubtful policy.[1] It was a supreme satisfaction to him to confer with Cabinet Ministers on questions of the day; to drink of the waters of political wisdom at the fountain-head; to stand, as it were, at the sources and well-springs of public life and action. If he was not himself a Cabinet Minister, as was the ambition or dream of his early days, to consort and consult with Cabinet Ministers was a consolation for the sacrifice he had made, and an indication of the "what might have been" had he not been called to the sanctity of a higher life.

His early intimacy with Mr. Gladstone and Sidney Herbert naturally and properly led Archbishop Manning when he occupied, like Mr. Gladstone himself, a position of responsibility, to confer with his friends on public matters either at Downing Street or elsewhere, and to attend on occasions the debates in the House of Commons. The suggestion once thrown out by Lord Salisbury that Cardinal Manning should be called to the House of Lords as a life-

[1] Without consulting the Irish Bishops, Manning assured Mr. Gladstone that his Irish University Bill (of 1873) might be accepted as a final settlement of a vexed question. To Mr. Gladstone's astonishment and vexation, the Bill, when produced, was rejected by the Irish Bishops as incompatible with Catholic teaching. Of Cardinal Manning it might, perhaps, be said in the words of Shakespeare—

"Turn him to any course of policy,
The Gordian knot of it he will unloose
Familiar as his garter."

Peer, was only in keeping with the fitness of things, and with the natural aptitude for public life which he had always evinced.

On one occasion only Archbishop Manning's tact had apparently forsaken him. It was when the late Mr. William Gladstone, who was Manning's godson, made his maiden speech in the presence of his illustrious father. Archbishop Manning appeared in the House of Commons, not in the Distinguished Strangers' Gallery, but behind the august chair of the Speaker. No sooner was the maiden speech concluded than Archbishop Manning beckoned to his godson, and, taking him by the hand in the full view of the House, warmly congratulated him on his success. Such a public demonstration of intimacy was only too apt to give offence, for even in those days Mr. Gladstone had before his eyes the fear of the Nonconformist conscience.

Not long afterwards Archbishop Manning made ample amends for the indiscretion he may have committed in too public a demonstration of his relationship to Mr. Gladstone's eldest son. In 1869, a correspondent, Mr. Davidson, pointed out to Archbishop Manning that the *Standard* stated that some kind of understanding about the Disestablishment of the Irish Church had existed between Mr. Gladstone and the Archbishop of Westminster. In reply, Manning wrote to his correspondent the following vigorous letter:—

I beg to thank you for calling my attention to the paragraph in which an attempt is made to calumniate Mr. Gladstone by the fact that his eldest son is my godson. This is a mean artifice which can only damage those who use it. The fact is so. Mr. Hope-Scott and I stood sponsors to the eldest son of Mr. Gladstone about 1840. Mr. Hope-Scott and Mr. Gladstone were at Eton and Oxford together, and have been friends during a long life. My friendship with Mr. Gladstone began when we were at Oxford about 1830. We had the same private tutor, and were in many ways brought together. From that time till the year 1851 our friendship continued close and intimate. In 1851 the intercourse of our friendship was suspended by the act demanded of me by my conscience in submitting to the Catholic Church. We ceased to correspond, and for more than twelve years we never met. In the last years public and official

duties have renewed our communications. I have been compelled to communicate with many public men in successive governments, and among others with Mr. Gladstone; with this only difference—of the others most were either strangers or but slightly known—Mr. Gladstone was and is the man whose friendship has been to me one of the most cherished and valued of my life. To found on this an insinuation for raising the No-Popery cry, or suspicion of Mr. Gladstone's fidelity to his own religious convictions, is as unmanly, base, and false as the Florence telegram,[1] in which the same political party, for the same political ends, united Mr. Gladstone's name with mine last summer. The indignation you express at this new trick will, I am sure, be shared by every honourable man in the country. I cannot conclude this letter without adding that a friendship of thirty-eight years, close and intimate till 1851 in no common degree, enables me to bear witness that a mind of greater integrity or of more transparent truth, less capable of being swayed by faction and party, and more protected from all such baseness even by the fault of indignant impatience of insincerity and selfishness in public affairs, than Mr. Gladstone's I have never known. The allegation that the policy of justice to the Irish people by removing the scandal of the Established Church has been inspired either by a mere desire to overthrow the Government, or by friendship with me, is imposture; and imposture is the mark of a feeble and failing cause.

---

[1] The Florence telegram was a statement that Pope Pius IX. had asked Archbishop Manning to thank Mr. Gladstone for the line he had taken in regard to the Protestant Church in Ireland.

CHAPTER XIX

THE SECOND ENGLISH CARDINAL SINCE THE REFORMATION

ROME would not have acted in accordance with her traditional wisdom had she longer delayed to confer upon Archbishop Manning the dignity of the Cardinalate. It was bestowed on him by Pope Pius IX. in recognition of his services at the Vatican Council; in recognition of his zeal for religion; of his steadfast faith; of his loyalty and allegiance to the Holy See; in reward of his defence of the rights and privileges, temporal and spiritual, of the Papacy. If not Archbishop Manning himself, his more intimate friends and supporters were surprised and disappointed that the Red Hat had not been given to him at an earlier period. The years 1870-71-72-73-74 had passed, and yet there were no tidings of the Cardinal's Hat. Had Archbishop Manning's claims been forgotten at the Vatican? or had they encountered opposition at the College of Cardinals? Mgr. Talbot, in almost his last letter to Manning in 1868, speaking of the nomination of a large number of Cardinals in view of the coming Council, said, "Your turn is not yet, but it will come soon."

Manning's *amicus curiæ*, it was recalled in sorrow, was no longer at the Vatican to whisper into the ear of Pope Pius IX. an opportune reminder of apparently forgotten services. Father O'Callaghan, at best, was but a sorry substitute for Mgr Talbot, the Pope's late private Chamberlain and constant companion. But, in truth, Pope Pius IX. stood in need of no reminder. He had not forgotten Archbishop Manning; he had proposed, in the first or second year after

the Council, his name for election to the Sacred College. But the cardinals, acting within their right, declined to elect him. Three years later, after the death of Cardinal Barnabò, Prefect of Propaganda—no friend of Manning's—the Pope again proposed him. It is the custom of the College of Cardinals to elect unanimously a candidate proposed for the second time, since they regard it as an expression of the Pope's deliberate wish and determination. Accordingly, at the Consistory held on the 15th of March 1875, Archbishop Manning was admitted by an unanimous vote into the College of Cardinals.

On 5th March 1875, accompanied by his nephew, Father Manning, one of the Oblates of St. Charles, the Archbishop of Westminster travelled in haste to Rome, where he arrived on the 10th, and took up his residence at the English College, the rector of which, Father O'Callaghan, was an Oblate.

On the afternoon of the 15th March, the following document, by Cardinal Antonelli, the Secretary of State, containing the official announcement to Henry Edward Manning, Archbishop of Westminster, of his elevation to the dignity of Cardinal, was presented by a high official of the Papal Court to his Eminence at the English College:—

From the Office of the Secretary of State.

15th March 1875.

In the Secret Consistory of this morning, our Lord, His Holiness, deigned to promote to the sublime dignity of Cardinal Mgr. Henry Edward Manning, Archbishop of Westminster.

This gracious, sovereign consideration is hereby brought to the notice of your Eminence, according to rule and regulation.

G. CARD. ANTONELLI.

To Mgr. Henry Edward Manning, Archbishop of Westminster.

A large number of his fellow-countrymen in Rome, non-Catholics as well as Catholics, had assembled at the English College to offer their congratulations, or to do homage to the new Cardinal. Cardinal Manning, in reply to the congratulations of his friends, spoke a few appropriate words as follows:—

I do not affect to think lightly of the great dignity conferred upon me without any merit of mine. It is truly an honour to be associated with the Sacred Council immediately around the Vicar of our Lord, and to share his lot in good and evil. Indeed, I would rather this dignity fell upon me as it does, in the time of danger than in the time of safety. It is, as it were, being told off to the "forlorn hope" in the sight of the world, but it is a "forlorn hope" which is certain of victory. I feel that your presence this day is a representation of England, especially of those in England who have preserved unbroken the tradition of the Faith, and that your kindness to me proceeds from love to England, and I feel assured that on returning to our country I shall meet with the same kindness and affection.

On taking possession of St. Gregory the Great, on the Cælian Hill, Cardinal Manning spoke as follows:—

I can find no precedent for this day's meeting. Never before has any one of my race and nation received possession of this Church of St. Gregory for his title. Never, hereafter, shall any other Englishman, in all human probability, at least, obtain as cardinal this same title.[1] Other Englishmen, worthier far than I am of such a dignity, will doubtless receive the same rank and office which I bear, but it is most unlikely that any one of them will find at the time of his creation the title of the Church of St. Gregory vacant. . . . From this very Cælian hill went forth in holy mission, in days long past, the first Archbishop of Canterbury. The names of the first Bishop of Rochester, that of the first Bishop of London, and that of the first Archbishop of York, are inscribed on the walls of these cloisters.

On 16th March the new Cardinal took the oath in the throne-room of the Vatican. In Cardinal Manning's face, as he repeated the pregnant words of the oath, there was an expression of intense and solemn earnestness, akin to that which passed over his countenance when, on his deathbed, he followed in mind, but attempted in vain to utter in words, his last profession of faith. To him the forms of the Church, the form of an oath of allegiance, or of a Profession of Faith, in life or in death, were ever-living

[1] Cardinal Manning unfortunately, on this as on some other occasions, was unmindful of the wise saying of Artemus Ward, "Never prophesy unless you know." For his successor, Archbishop Vaughan, on being created Cardinal, received possession of this very Church of St. Gregory for his title.

realities. The Supernatural underlying every religious form was as visible as the most vivid of realities in life to his spiritual eye. The Profession of Faith as a Cardinal was inspired and informed with the determination of his soul, to do battle, in the days to come, as a soldier of Christ; as a councillor and servant of the Pope to the end. In his dying Profession of Faith, when there were, alas! no more days to come for him, there was a like earnestness, but more pathetic in expression, as of one who should say, I have fought the good fight, and now nothing more remains for me to do upon earth, but to render up my soul into the hands of the Lord.

With the exception of the imposition of the Cardinal's Hat, the final ceremonies of investiture were carried out at a public Consistory held on Easter Monday the 29th of March.

Pope Pius IX. had high hopes and expectations of the coming conversion of England to the faith of its forefathers. Mgr. Talbot had fostered such hopes by his sanguine predictions of the wonders to be worked by Manning, as successor to Cardinal Wiseman, in bringing back his countrymen to the fold of Peter. Manning himself, however, had too much practical sagacity to indulge in such a day-dream. He had a more intimate acquaintance with the state of English society and popular feeling, and of the hostile influence of the Anglican Church than was possessed by Pius IX. The hopes of Cardinal Manning were more limited and rational. In returning to England as Cardinal his aim was not so much the conversion of England as to make the Catholic Church better known to the masses of the people, to present its doctrines and devotions in their true light, to disarm prejudice, to conciliate the goodwill of the people of England. It was not in Manning's nature to be a new Peter the Hermit, and preach a crusade against Protestantism, or to meet half-way the friendly advances of High Church Anglicans. He had already shown more than repugnance to the Reunion movement; he mistrusted Anglicanism in every shape and form. Anglicans for the most part, especially those most attracted towards Rome, most mistrusted and misliked Cardinal Manning. To him

the entering into relations with Anglicans, except as individuals seeking instruction, seemed like a parleying with the enemy in the gate. Cardinal Wiseman, the Hon. and Rev. George Spencer, and Pope Pius IX. were enthusiasts for the conversion of England. In their enthusiasm, without too closely scrutinising the motives of men, they welcomed every approach; every indication of a desire for reunion with Rome, as a sign of hope, as a promise of a rich harvest of souls in the future. Under Cardinal Wiseman's rule public prayers were offered up, not merely at stated times and in a somewhat formal fashion, but with fervour and frequency, for the conversion of England. Cardinal Manning somewhat discountenanced the practice. His primary object was not the conversion of England, but the conciliation of the English people.

To Pope Pius IX. it was a singular satisfaction to be able to assign to Cardinal Manning as his titular church the Church of St. Andrew and St. Gregory on the Cælian Hill. St. Gregory the Great had lived in the monastery attached to the church, and from this famous monastery had sent forth St. Augustine of Canterbury to preach the Gospel to the heathen Saxons of England; and Manning, St. Gregory's successor, went forth, in the hope of Pope Pius IX., to bring England back once more to the unity of the Faith.

On his return to England, early in April, his first work as cardinal was appropriate to the mission entrusted to him by Pope Pius IX.; for it was the dedication to St. Thomas of Canterbury of a new church in the ancient See and Seat founded by St. Augustine in carrying out his mission to England. The sermon, which the new Cardinal preached on the 13th of April at the opening of the Church of St. Thomas at Canterbury, was marked by the simplicity, reserve, and good taste he was wont to maintain on such occasions. He was especially on his guard against provoking in any way a like outburst to that excited in England by Cardinal Wiseman's message or challenge of public attention. It seemed well to Cardinal Manning in his prudence to display to the people of England the silver side of the shield. Conciliation was at that time the ruling

idea. He even came to look upon public prayers for the conversion of England as a possible stone of offence. The Catholic laity of England were not wanting in zeal or generosity; or in gratitude to the Pope for the dignity which he had conferred on Archbishop Manning. Wiseman, when as cardinal he was sent by Pope Pius IX. to restore the hierarchy to England, received from the papal bounty a sum of £400 *per annum* to maintain the dignity of his office. It was known that such support, given under exceptional circumstances, was not to be renewed in the present instance. Hence the Duke of Norfolk, and several other friends of the new cardinal, determined to make a private subscription in order to present a sum sufficient to enable Cardinal Manning to maintain the dignity of his office. It is not a matter of choice or personal preference; a cardinal is bound by his oath to maintain the dignity of his position. The sum of £6500, as an offering on the part of the laity, was presented to Cardinal Manning by the Duke of Norfolk. The gift was acknowledged in the following letter addressed by Cardinal Manning to the Duke of Norfolk:—

The private and delicate way in which this valuable and, as I will show, timely expression of your kindness has been conceived and made, seems to prescribe to me the same way of thanking you. And first, I thank you that what you have so kindly done has been done, not by public appeal, but by a private letter. Any publicity would have caused me no little pain. Some two or three years ago, in a circular letter, I told you that I have no shame in begging for the spiritual need of the diocese, or for the cathedral, but that I could not beg for anything which seemed to confer a personal benefit on myself. I hope there was no pride in this; if there be, I hope it may be forgiven. But in the work of true friendship which you have now fulfilled towards me, I say at once that anything beyond a private communication, eliciting with equal privacy an unconstrained spontaneous offering of free will, would have caused me great regret. Knowing that when others have been called to the office I now bear, their flocks and friends have united to relieve them of the very heavy charges which were thereby imposed on them, I did not doubt but that I also might be relieved of those first and sudden expenses. But it did not enter into my thoughts that you would extend your considerate care to the

increased charges to which I may be exposed. This your kind and generous foresight has done; but I did not think that any of you were fully aware of the importance of the service you were rendering to me and to the metropolitan See of Westminster. Your delicate kindness justifies me in saying what has hitherto been known to very few.

The old London Vicariate possessed a mensal fund sufficient for the needs of the bishop. On the erection of the Archbishopric of Westminster many new and heavy charges were thrown upon my predecessor. For these, his private means, and the annual provision attaching to him as cardinal, with the mensal fund, sufficed. When I was called upon to fill his place the provision as cardinal ceased; the mensal fund was divided with the diocese of Southwark; the charges, public and private, upon the archbishop remained undivided; and, if I had not possessed a very narrow income of my own, the mensal fund would not have sufficed by some hundreds every year. With the little I possessed, the See has never failed, year by year, to meet its expenses. But, without my private means,—and they have yearly become less in the work of the diocese, to which they will be altogether left,—the income of the See would not have sufficed. Your generous kindness has, for the first time in the ten years I have held the See, placed it in a condition to meet its inevitable annual costs. My successor will be in some measure where my predecessor was. The See will once more possess a mensal fund equal to the charges from which the archbishop cannot in any way exempt himself. The public and permanent benefit rendered to the diocese will, I hope, add to the satisfaction which I know you feel, in doing me this private and personal act of friendship.

Of what you have so generously brought to me, so much as will defray the present and future costs of receiving the office laid upon me will be set aside. The rest will be invested as a permanent endowment of the metropolitan See of Westminster, and as a record, which will remain in the archives, of your generous kindness to myself.

Manning's elevation to the dignity of cardinal was well received in England. He was known as a man who had made his mark in the world. He was zealous in religion; an indefatigable worker; his time and services were devoted, not to the worship of Mammon, not to society, but to the poor and outcast. In the popular mind his conduct contrasted favourably with that of the prelates of the Estab-

lished Church. He was better known by far than any one of them. It was ten years since the death of Cardinal Wiseman; for ten years Manning had worked—and his heart and soul were in his work—as Archbishop of Westminster. Why had he not been made a cardinal? Men wondered, as they will do about the concerns of others, what was the reason why his services were not recognised by Rome? Was it because he was a convert? When he was made cardinal there was a general expression in the country of satisfaction. The English people felt a just pride that the merits of a distinguished Englishman were so suitably recognised. The glory of a Roman cardinal appealed to the popular imagination. It seemed in the fitness of things that the successor of Cardinal Wiseman should likewise be a cardinal. Ten years spent in hard work in the diocese of Westminster, chiefly on behalf of the poor, and of the children of the Catholic poor, outcasts in the streets or captives in workhouse schools, had endeared Cardinal Manning to the masses of his flock. Even they who had stood aloof from him in the beginning, or had even mistrusted him, were now of one mind in regarding him, though different in his mode and method of rule, different in character of mind and disposition, as a not unworthy successor to Wiseman, and rejoiced in his elevation to the dignity of cardinal.

Of the letters of congratulation which Manning received on his elevation to the cardinalate, the following are the most important, or of most interest.[1]

Newman sent, in the following letter, a few kindly words of congratulation:—

[1] It is the Roman custom for every newly created cardinal to address a letter to every member of the Sacred College, expressing his profound gratitude for the honour bestowed upon him. Each of the members of the Sacred College in reply writes to every cardinal created in the same Consistory a letter, though couched in the most eulogistic terms, of a merely formal and general character. Copies of the same letter are sent to each newly created cardinal. Among the letters of congratulation sent by the members of the Sacred College to Cardinal Manning was one from Cardinal Pecci, now the illustrious Pontiff Leo XIII. It is, however, of no personal interest, for it contains no allusion or reference to Manning's history or character, or to the Diocese of Westminster, or even to England! It is a formal letter in general terms addressed to each of the cardinals created at the same date.

THE ORATORY, *Easter Eve*, 1875.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—I beg you to accept the congratulations of myself and this house on your recent promotion. It must be a great gratification to you to receive this mark of the confidence placed in you by the Sovereign Pontiff. And it must be a source of true pleasure to your brother and his family and to your other relations and friends.

And as regards the Protestant world, it is striking to observe the contrast between the circumstances under which you return invested with this special dignity, and the feelings which were excited in England twenty-five years ago on occasion of the like elevation of your predecessor, Cardinal Wiseman.

That the temporal honours, to which you have attained, may be the token and earnest of those which come from God alone, is the sincere prayer of yours affectionately, JOHN H. NEWMAN.

The late Dowager Duchess of Norfolk, the mother of the present Duke, wrote the following warm-hearted letter:—

ARUNDEL CASTLE, ARUNDEL, 17*th March* 1875.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—You will receive congratulations from many faithful and admiring friends, and from devoted and affectionate hearts; but I think there are few who have rejoiced with a keener and more personal joy than I have done, or who will have felt more strongly how good it is to see honour done to you who will do so much honour to your great dignity.

My son is away, but you will let my other children lay their congratulations at your feet.—Believe me, your Eminence's faithful servant, M. NORFOLK.

The Rev. W. H. Anderdon, S.J., Cardinal Manning's nephew, wrote as follows:—

ST. BEUNO'S, ST. ASAPH, N. WALES, 6*th April* 1875.

MY DEAR UNCLE—I need not say that I have watched the course of your Eminence's great and well-merited elevation with deep interest; and now, on your return to England, beg to offer you my heartfelt congratulations. If increased responsibility has also its graver aspect, that is only what I remember your saying strongly at Moorfields, on occasion of your receiving the Pallium.

Father Rector, I know, intends to solicit the honour of your Eminence's presence amongst us here on your return from opening the church at Chester. I hope that an engagement in Dublin, to plead the cause of the nuns of St. Dorothea in Venice, on whose circular I see your Eminence's name, will not prevent

my being present then.—Believe me, my dear uncle, your Eminence's affectionate servant in Christ, W. H. ANDERDON.

The following letter is from the Rev. Dr. Russell, President of Maynooth College:—

ST. PATRICK'S COLLEGE, MAYNOOTH, 4*th April* 1875.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—I have waited your Eminence's return to England, being unwilling to intrude upon the engrossing occupations of your visit to Rome with my congratulations on your elevation to the cardinalate. Even as it is, I do not venture to offer to your Eminence a mere congratulation of ceremony; but I think that you will permit me to assure you of my sincere and fervent prayer that your new office may be a source of happiness here and hereafter to yourself, and of profit to the Church, to whose highest Council you have been called; and that it may please God to grant you many years of distinctive faithfulness as a Prince of the Church. I shall offer the Holy Sacrifice to-morrow with this humble and earnest petition. . . .

Begging your Eminence's blessing, and reverently saluting the Sacred Purple, I have the honour to remain, my dear Lord Cardinal, your Eminence's humble and affectionately devoted servant, C. W. RUSSELL.

Canon Pope of Dublin wrote as follows in most enthusiastic terms, predicting that Cardinal Manning would bring England back to the unity of the Faith:—

CHURCH OF ST. ANDREW, 48 WESTLAND ROW,
DUBLIN, 6*th April* 1875.

YOUR EMINENCE—Immediately on your Eminence's arrival in England I desire to convey the expression of my respects, reverence, and congratulations on your Eminence's elevation to the dignity of the cardinalate. I regret that distance will deprive me of the honour of doing so in person, and of waiting on you at your Eminence's levèe.

The names of Henry, Edward, Westminster, San. Gregorio, Thomas à Becket, and Canterbury, Oxford, Rome, and England, all entwined in the person of Cardinal Manning, are replete with significance. They inspire the cheering hope that in the order of God's providence your Eminence is one day destined to lead back England, the beloved one, to the bosom of Holy Church, and replace in the Spouse's breast the once most blooming flower of the garden of religion, *Fasciculus myrrhæ dilectus meus mihi, inter ubera mea commorabitur!*

Accept of my congratulations, which I imagine will not be the less grateful because presented by an Irish priest.—Your Eminence's humble servant, THOMAS CANON POPE.

Lord Odo Russell,[1] whilst declaring it was not Roman etiquette to congratulate a cardinal, managed to convey his feelings of satisfaction to Cardinal Manning in the following letter :—

Private. BRITISH EMBASSY, BERLIN, *Easter Sunday*, 1875.

MY LORD CARDINAL—It is contrary to Roman etiquette, if I remember right, to congratulate, so I will not do so in words, but Your Eminence will understand, I feel sure, what I must wish to say after the many acts of kindness I have received at your hands. My attempts to see Your Eminence during the sad summer we spent in London all failed. Next time we come home on leave I hope for better luck.

Without entering into the questions now raging in Europe, I would venture to remind Your Eminence of the calm and peaceful manner in which we discussed them under the pines and cypresses of Villa Ludovesi, and along the ancient walls of dear old Rome. The Governments of Europe were then indifferent to the subject, which now is uppermost in their minds—the contrast is curious and instructive when one compares the attitude or standpoint of the Bishops of the Opposition then and now—but it has not taken me by surprise. Your Eminence correctly foretold what was coming, and I never doubted but that it would be so.

How much I should like to resume those walks from Via Tritone at 3 P.M., and talk quietly over the struggle that is coming !

Lady Odo desires me to present her best remembrances to Your Eminence. — Believe me, my Lord Cardinal, Your Eminence's faithful servant, ODO RUSSELL.

In many respects the most interesting and important of the letters of congratulation addressed to Cardinal Manning was that of Sir George Jessel, Master of the Rolls. He bears witness in his official capacity, as entrusted by the Government of England with the duty of superintending the national publications connected with its history, to the important aid rendered by Cardinal Manning to the cause

[1] On the accession of his eldest brother to the dukedom of Bedford in 1872, by a patent of precedence the style and precedence of a duke's younger sons was granted to Lords Arthur and Odo Russell.

of historical literature by obtaining for their literary agent admission to the archives of the Vatican. It was an invaluable and, in those days, an unique privilege. The literary representative of the Master of the Rolls was the only person admitted into the archives, the only one privileged to inspect the important documents in the Vatican Library. And he attributed, in a letter to the Master of the Rolls, his admission in the first instance, and the privileges he subsequently enjoyed in collecting materials for the history of England, to the influence of Cardinal Manning. Such active steps in opening up the Vatican Library to an English scholar speaks well for the Cardinal's interest in promoting historical research, and shows the extent of his personal influence. Under the enlightened rule of Pope Leo XIII. the secrets of the Vatican Library have been opened up to the world, the now unburied treasures contained in the archives are the delight of every scholar in Europe, who comes, no matter what country, creed, or party he belongs to, to the Vatican to inspect and study the records of the Past.

The letter of Sir George Jessel, Master of the Rolls, is as follows:—

ROLLS HOUSE, 23*rd April* 1875.

DEAR CARDINAL MANNING—In the first place allow me to offer you my sincere congratulations on your elevation to the cardinalate, and to wish you many years of health to enjoy your new dignity. I believe there are few Englishmen, whatever their religious opinions, who will not esteem it a high compliment to their country that you have been called to fill so exalted a station.

It is very gratifying to me to find that, notwithstanding your Eminence must have had so many important subjects to occupy your attention in Rome, you remembered my application to you respecting our historical researches in the Vatican. Our literary agent in Rome, the Rev. Joseph Stevenson, has written to tell me how much we are indebted to your Eminence for your judicious and powerful interposition in our behalf. Many of the privileges and helps he now enjoys in collecting materials for the history of this country he attributes entirely to your kind and energetic recommendation.

It was only this morning that I received a letter from Mr. Stevenson saying, "I am the only one who has admission to the archives. Several English have tried, French and Germans innumerable, but all have failed. My admission in the first

instance, and my recent increased advantages, are all owing to the influence of Cardinal Manning."

Not only, therefore, on my personal behalf, but in my official capacity as Master of the Rolls, and entrusted by the Government of this country with the duty of selecting and superintending the national publications connected with its history, I am very desirous of expressing to you my warmest thanks for the aid you have given me in advancing the cause of historical literature in this country. I may, I hope, always count on your good offices if it should be at any future time necessary to apply to you for any similar purpose. My great wish is to assist the researches of scholars and historians, without consideration of creed or party, and I am sure we cordially agree in that respect, judging not only from the important aid you have already rendered us as to the important documents in the Vatican Library, but from the interest which you as a scholar must feel in whatever tends to further the progress of historical inquiry.—I have the honour to remain, yours very truly, G. JESSEL.

What a contrast, as Newman pointed out in his letter of congratulation, was the friendly reception accorded by England to Manning as Cardinal to that outburst of fanatical fury which twenty-five years before had assailed Cardinal Wiseman. England was proud that one of her own distinguished sons had been raised to so high an Office, and was of one accord in doing honour to Cardinal Manning.

The Master of the Rolls, in his letter to Cardinal Manning, expressed in one sentence the general feeling of the country on the occasion:—"I believe there are few Englishmen, whatever their religious opinions, who will not esteem it a high compliment to their country that you have been called to fill so exalted a station."

The elevation to the dignity of Cardinal made no difference in Manning's zeal for work. His labours were not abated by one jot or tittle. He preached as often as ever, and to more crowded congregations; for strangers were attracted by the presence in London of a Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church. Besides his reply to Mr. Gladstone, *The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance*, Cardinal Manning published in 1875 *The Internal Mission of the Holy Ghost*, and a sermon which he preached at the Church of St. Aloysius, Oxford, entitled "*Dominus*

illuminatio mea," among many others,[1] which show no falling off either in number or in substance from those he delivered in the early years of his Cardinalate.

Cardinal Manning in 1875 even descended, almost for the first time, into the arena of public controversy by a correspondence with Lord Redesdale, published in the *Daily Telegraph*, on the well-worn topic of Communion in both kinds.

In the *Guardian* there was another controversy between Cardinal Manning, who wrote under the pseudonym *Catholicus*, and Dr. Davidson. Dr. Davidson accused Cardinal Manning of having advanced a heretical proposition in his sermon on "The Sacred Heart." Cardinal Manning defended his position. Dr. Davidson brought forward further arguments; and Cardinal Manning, in an autobiographical Note, explains "That being away from home and my books, I asked Dr. Ward to take up the defence. But Dr. Ward adopted an apologetic line, saying, in reply to Dr. Davidson's charges, 'Cardinal Manning must have meant this; or have intended to say that,' giving away the whole case. Fortunately," adds Cardinal Manning, "Dr. Roux came in and supplied Dr. Ward with evidence from the Fathers in support of my proposition. Many laymen, and even priests, ill-instructed in theology, believe to this day that Dr. Davidson was right and I in the wrong."

In 1876 Cardinal Manning paid a short and somewhat unsatisfactory visit to Rome,[2] which he did not revisit till a few weeks before the death of Pope Pius IX. As Cardinal Manning's activities were, after a while and in the main, centred on work at home, ecclesiastical and social, Cardinal Manning was not slow in discerning that he could render greater service to the Church and society as philanthropist and social reformer than he could achieve as ecclesiastical reformer in Rome, working in opposition to the policy of the Ruling Cardinals.

[1] Other sermons or writings published by Cardinal Manning about this date are—*The Love of Jesus to Penitents*, and the *Glories of the Sacred Heart*, 1876. *The Independence of the Holy See*, and the *True Story of the Vatican Council*, 1877.

[2] See Cardinal Manning's "Reflections on Rome and the Ruling Cardinals," Chapter XXI.

CHAPTER XX

DEATH OF PIUS IX—THE CONCLAVE—ELECTION OF POPE LEO XII.—CARDINAL MANNING AND CARDINAL NEWMAN

1878-79

By the death of Pope Pius IX. Cardinal Manning lost a steadfast friend and patron. For a quarter of a century and more Rome had been to him a second home. Pope Pius, as far back as 1848, had noticed, as Mgr. Talbot, who was with him at the time, has recorded, how Archdeacon Manning knelt down in the Piazza di Spagna as the Papal carriage approached. The incident of a dignitary of the Anglican Church doing homage in public made a lasting impression on the susceptible mind of Pius IX. When Manning returned to Rome as priest in 1851 the Pope showed paternal kindness by making inquiries as to the pecuniary circumstances of the convert, apparently aware of the deprivations suffered by many clergymen of the Anglican Church on becoming Catholics. The striking contrast between the characters of the two men was not without its effect. Pius IX. was effusive in manner and expression, spoke out his mind freely in the varying moods that passed over him, was good-humoured and jovial. Manning was reserved and self-restrained and austere. But he threw off his habitual reserve in the presence of the Pope, and without in any way or for a moment forgetting a becoming and reverential deference, entered pleasantly into the humours of the hour. It was naturally gratifying to Pius IX. to find his own views on Papal authority, on the rights and privileges of the Holy See, not only reciprocated, but even

at times anticipated in enunciation, by the late learned dignitary of the Anglican Church. As time went on, Manning's footing at the Vatican became firmly established. In regard to the Definition of Infallibility and to the policy of the Vatican Council the Sovereign Pontiff was of one mind with his disciple. At the time of the Council his intimacy with the Pope was at its closest. It might, indeed, be said that Cardinal Manning carried in his pocket a latch-key, as it were, to the Vatican.[1]

To Manning a new Pope meant, in the nature of things, a Rome that was not the Rome of old, an unfamiliar Vatican, or at any rate a Vatican without the privilege of a private entrance; a Papal throne no longer filled by a friend of well-nigh thirty years, but by a stranger. A new Pope meant new surroundings, special friends of his own, intimate counsellors, of whom Cardinal Manning was not one. With his wonted tact and good sense he put a fair face upon his troubles of heart. Not even the closest of his friends knew anything of his misgivings as to his relations with the new Pope. Cardinal Manning has, however, left a record of the causes which had made him a stranger at Rome during the first four years of the Pontificate of Leo XIII. In a Note, which has the special advantage of having been written on the spot and at the time of the events it records, Cardinal Manning gave an account of his relations with Pius IX., and a description of the death of the Pope on 7th February 1878. On the 18th of February, in Conclave, when Cardinal Manning, Father Butler, and Newman, the Cardinal's body-servant, were shut up in the Vatican, the following Note was written:—

THE CONCLAVE, 18TH FEBRUARY 1878—
AN AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Cardinal Simeoni wrote to me in August last proposing to me

---

[1] "I had access," Cardinal Manning once remarked, "by a private passage into the Pope's apartments. On one occasion, I remember the surprise shown by Cardinals and Ambassadors—they had not seen me go in—as I passed out into the Antechamber where they were awaiting an audience of his Holiness."

to come to Rome to receive the Hat in the Consistory of September. In answer I promised to come for the Consistory of December.[1] The illness of the Holy Father postponed the Consistory till the 31st, on which day I received the Hat from his hands.

During these days I may note down the events of the last four months, at least in outline.

I left London on November 5th, was two days at Dover, and reached Paris on the 8th. I had, as I thought, a slight cold, but it turned to an attack of bronchitis and, I believe, gout. I became in two days so ill that I could not travel, and in two days more I could hardly walk across the room. I remember saying, "I do not think this is my last illness, but it is one of the last." I was kept by it five weeks in Paris. During that time the accounts of the Holy Father's illness became so grave that I made up my mind as soon as I could travel to come here. I had, under the advice of a physician, decided to go back to England, but letters from F. O'Callaghan, Cardinal Howard, Mgr. Stonor, and a message from Cardinal Simeoni decided me. I left Paris on the 10th of December, and reached Rome on the 22nd.

The next day, Sunday, I went to the Vatican, and saw the Holy Father. He was in the library, but in bed propped up. He received me with great affection. His countenance was natural and bright, but his voice was weak, and his feebleness was evident. Nevertheless, through the whole of January he made visible progress in strength. I saw him always twice, sometimes three, or even four times a week, and having to bring to him Mr. Eastham's two pictures, F. Richard's psalter, and the new edition of Challoner, I saw him alone often. We were all hoping that if no new illness came on he might last long. But on Wednesday, 6th February I went with some Peter's Pence, and a paper which I wished him to sign. Before I went in I first went to Monseigneur Vanutelli, who told me that the Holy Father was unwell, and that he had signed a paper that morning, giving his blessing to some children who had offered their communions for him on the Purification, the anniversary of his first communion, but that the signature and words were illegible, as I saw. I therefore decided not to ask for his signature. But I went to see him. I found him in bed in his bed-room. Very

---

[1] In 1865 Archbishop Manning was called to Rome to receive the Pallium at the Consistory of September, but wrote postponing his visit till December. On Mgr. Talbot's representations that such delay would give offence to the Pope, Manning consented to come to Rome in its empty season.

weak, and visibly changed. I asked for a blessing for a sick person, which he gave with the sign of the Cross. He then asked for the attendants to lift him, and I went out. That night he had a fit of shivering. Cardinal Simeoni said to him: "You will be better to-morrow." He answered, "*tutt' al contrario.*" Next day, 7th February I intended to go and see how he was, but wishing to see the Cardinal Vicar, I sent at half-past nine to ask if he would be at home that morning. The servant came back with the answer that the Cardinal Vicar was just going to the Vatican, and that "*il Papa stava per spirare.*" I went at once. On reaching the Antecamera, I found many of the Cardinals already there. It was at once evident that the end was near. I went into his bed-room, and found him somewhat raised in his bed, breathing with difficulty. He was motionless, and his face calm and grand. I knelt down and kissed his hand. He said, "*Addio, carissimo!*" Cardinal Bilio, who was standing by, gave my name. He said "*Sicuro,*" with an emphasis meaning that he had recognised me. These were his last words to me. I then went out, but waited through the day, and went into the room four or five times, and saw the gradual approach of the end. Once I saw him lift the crucifix to his lips, and then drop his hand on the bed. At last, about 5.30, I went in and saw that the end was come. The room quickly filled, and the change came, just at Ave Maria, a quarter to six. It was a majestic death, surrounded by filial love and veneration. I never saw so many men in tears. The Camerlingo then took possession of the Vatican: and the Sacred College met in the Hall of the Consistory the next day at 10 o'clock A.M. Since that day the Sacred College has met every morning. The *Novendiales* began with the Lying-in-state and the masses in St. Peter's, and closed by the masses in the Sistine Chapel. On the evening of Saturday the 9th, the body was carried from his apartments by the private way into the Chapel of the Blessed Sacrament in St. Peter's, the Sacred College following. It was a majestic and solemn sight. The Holy Father was vested in pontificals with a gold mitre, and lay upon a cloth of red and gold lama. The whole procession, seen by torchlight down the stairs, was grand and beautiful. Still more grand and beautiful was the burial or *tumulazione* on the night of the 13th. We went down into the chapel of the Blessed Sacrament and kissed the feet. I laid my pectoral cross on the left foot as a pledge of fidelity and a prayer for perseverance in all I have learned from Pius IX. We then went across St. Peter's to the Chapel of the Choir. The procession then went to the Confession of St. Peter, and the bier was lowered to the ground before it, as if to receive the blessing of

St. Peter on his successor. Then it entered the chapel, and the office was said, and the *Gesta Pii IX.* were read over the body; which was placed in the coffin, and a cloth was laid over the face by the Maggior Duomo: and the coffin closed. The Sacred College then retired, and the coffin was carried and deposited in the *loculus* over the side door of the choir. This was our last function, and our last assistance rendered to Pius IX.

We entered the Conclave, Monday, 18th February at 4 o'clock. The Pope was elected at 12.20 to-day, 20th February 1878.

Two days ago came the tidings of Cardinal Franchi's illness, yesterday of his death about midnight on Wednesday.

He had been four months Cardinal Secretary of State, the honourable and legitimate end of his life.

Pius IX. died on 7th February: from that day till we entered the Conclave the Sacred College sat day by day in the Vatican. On the Wednesday in that week, 13th February, Cardinal Monaco said to me, that he thought we ought to confer together as to whom we should propose in the election. It was then fixed that we should meet at Cardinal Bartolini's rooms on Friday evening, 15th. There were present Cardinal Bartolini, Franchi, Bilio, Monaco, Nina, and myself.

Cardinal Bartolini proposed Cardinal Pecci's name, in which we all concurred as the first name.

He then said for the second there were Cardinals Franchi, Bilio, and Monaco. Monaco at once said that he was impossible on account of youth, and want of self-control. Bilio said that if elected he would absolutely refuse, for reasons *cognosciate ed occulte.* He said that his character was weak, that Pius IX. had told him so, and that he knew it; that he could not stand up against opposition, and that therefore he would never consent to the election. He then proposed Cardinal ————. Franchi and Monaco objected, that ———— was habitually strained and uncertain in his judgments, as they knew by being on Congregations with him. Bilio said that he held it necessary in the present conflict of the Church that the next Pope should be a foreigner, and then suggested myself. I then said that in my judgment, as they already knew, the next Pontiff must be Italian in blood and speech, and one who knows and loves Italy, and is known and loved by Italians.

That the election of a foreigner might lose Italy to the Holy See through political causes, as England was lost in the sixteenth century. That the reconciliation of Italy with the Holy See is vital not only to Italy, but to the Catholic world.

That therefore this preliminary bar excluded all foreigners.

When they pressed that I had been so domesticated in Rome as not to be a foreigner, I said that though I knew their language, I knew it well enough to know that I do not know it well enough to be responsible for government; that I never knew a foreigner know England, and that I believed no foreigner would know Rome sufficiently for such an office. Bilio said that proved too much, that there had been foreign Popes. I said: But that was when Christendom was one, and all Christian persons Catholic, and Europe united, and the Latin tongue universal, and Nationalities only arising, and Catholic unity dominant over all.

We then agreed on Cardinal Pecci, and undertook to speak to other Cardinals. I undertook the foreign Cardinals with Cardinal Howard, and most of them were invited to vote for Cardinal Pecci. I record this with a sadder interest at this moment when Cardinal Franchi is gone.

In a Note of a later date, in repudiation of most offensive statements in Bishop Wilberforce's *Diary*, imputing to Manning abject servility in lying prostrate at "the Pope's feet and in refusing to rise," and adulation by flattering the vanity of Pope Pius IX. in regard to Papal Infallibility, Cardinal Manning wrote as follows:—

I speak the truth in Christ and lie not, my conscience also bearing witness in the Holy Ghost, that neither in Pius IX. nor in me were there such thoughts and motives as poor Samuel Wilberforce had the heart to conceive.

For twenty years I defended the Temporal Power, and asserted the Infallibility of the Head of the Church. This, of course, was flattery, adulation, obsequiousness, and servility. Five hundred bishops affirmed the Temporal Power in 1867, and seven hundred the Infallibility in 1870. Nevertheless in me, it was flattering the vanity of Pius IX. In truth, a knot of intellectual vanities in and out of the Catholic Church staked their reputation against the Temporal Power and the Infallibility, and when they were refuted by the Catholic Church they could not contain themselves. Such were Samuel Wilberforce, and I grieve to add Gladstone. It is most true that I have been always united with every utterance of Pius IX. And so was Ward. Was this flattery?

In his last illness, when I was sitting by his bedside, Pius IX. said: "The first time I ever saw you was in 1848 kneeling in the Piazza di Spagna." For nearly thirty years we had known each other. I must not call it friendship, for that implies

equality. But Pius IX. treated me as a son. When in 1851 I lost friends and brethren for conscience sake, he received me with a generous affection, which never failed, and a confidence which was never shaken. Between him and me there was no room for flattery. I was no *assentator*. In the matters of my duty I was absolutely of his mind by free and full conviction of my reason. And when upon his deathbed he said to me, "*Addio, carissimo*," it was the close of a mutual and affectionate confidence founded upon a rectitude of heart on both sides, unintelligible to those who could think, speak, and still more, write such base mendacities as Samuel Wilberforce wrote and his son has published.

In offering so touching and heartfelt a tribute to the memory of Pius IX., Cardinal Manning discharged a filial duty of affection, whilst at the same time recording a silent protest in his Diary against the contemptible aspersions of his brother-in-law, Bishop Wilberforce.

In his private Notes and Records of the Conclave, and of the Election of Pope Pius IX.'s successor, there is not even a passing allusion to the personality of Pope Leo XIII., or to his qualifications for the high Office to which he was called by the Conclave. It was but natural in Cardinal Manning, and not unpleasing, that in his private Records he should not waste a word on Pope Pius's successor. In fact, the new Pope was a stranger to him. Cardinal Pecci, as Bishop of Perugia, seldom left his diocese; made but short visits to Rome.[1] On his return to England, after the death of Pius IX., Cardinal Manning in reply to an Address from his clergy, spoke of his personal relations with Pius IX. as follows:—

You will forgive me if I seem to imply too much that is personal to myself in what I add. I say it now, because it is the first and will perhaps be the last time I may ever so speak. During the last twenty-five years I have had the happiness, and as I account it the blessing, of being admitted by Pius IX. to an intimacy which had no cause but his paternal kindness. . . . Never at any time, such was his undeserved goodness, had I the sorrow of hearing from him a word of disapproval, nor did any cause of displeasure ever lessen or overcast his paternal affection.

[1] Pope Pius IX. did not appreciate Cardinal Pecci. Cardinal Manning, not unnaturally, shared the Pope's opinions.

During those long years, while his health and vigour of life lasted, I had sometimes the privilege, and sometimes the duty of speaking with him on matters of great anxiety. But in the last five weeks of his protracted life no subjects of such a kind ever passed. I had the happiness of sitting by the side of his sick-bed to console his last days. No subject of his manifold and great anxieties was ever spoken of; no business, however slight, was ever introduced. I felt that the sick-bed of Pius IX. was sacred, and that all affairs and interests of his great Office belonged to those whose direct responsibility it was to treat them; that I had the happiness of conversing with him only on such thoughts and things as were consoling and cheerful and free from all anxious thought. More than once in those five weeks I was able, as I hope, to bring before him some momentary solace; and I thank God that my lot was so ordered that I stood beside the Pontiff, whom we have so revered and loved, in the last days and in the last moments of his great and glorious life.

During the Pontiff's lifetime, at the opening of the Church of St. Dominic at Newcastle, Cardinal Manning, in his enthusiasm, professed his belief

> . . . That when the history of the Pontificate of Pius IX. shall be written, it will be found to have been one of the most resplendent, majestic, and powerful—one that has reached over the whole extent of the Church with greater power than that of any other Pope in the whole succession.

Had he been alive at the time, Bishop Wilberforce might, perhaps, with some reason, have objected to an eulogy so premature and unlimited.

On the death of Pius IX., Manning's ancient influence at the Vatican passed away. One of the first indications of this change was that the representations of Newman's friends were listened to with interest and favour by Pope Leo XIII. It would be mere affectation to ignore the fact that the general opinion entertained by the Catholic laity of England, shared, too, by some of the bishops and many of the clergy, was that Newman's ostracism under the Pontificate of Pius IX. was due to Manning's adverse influence. It is unnecessary to dwell on this topic since Manning's relations with Newman have been already described. These relations were still further strained by a painful incident

in 1879, caused, as appears from the correspondence given below, by an error of judgment on the part of Cardinal Manning.

In the summer of 1878, not six months after Pope Leo XIII.'s accession to the Pontifical throne, Newman's friends were taking active steps to bring his unrivalled services to religion and the Catholic Church in England under the special attention of the new Pope. It was their strong desire to obtain from the Holy See a conspicuous recognition of Newman's labours and writings, both before and since his conversion; of his unique influence in awakening in the minds of Englishmen a recognition of the Catholic Church, and in leading, directly and indirectly, such numbers to the Catholic Faith

One serious difficulty had to be faced. It was not easy to explain to Pope Leo XIII. why Father Newman had been so ostentatiously neglected during the Pontificate of Pius IX. Why his genius, his singular piety, his self-effacement, on the one hand, and on the other, his splendid services in defence of the Church and of the Papacy had been so strangely passed over without any recognition or mark of confidence on the part of the Holy See. It was time that the mystery should be unravelled; the unexplained mistrust of Father Newman be accounted for. It was time that the most illustrious Catholic of our generation, held in the deepest veneration by non-Catholics as well as by Catholics should be cleared of unjust suspicion; that the wrong done to him should, at last, be righted.

The Duke of Norfolk was the natural representative of the Catholic laity of England. He had been a pupil and was an intimate friend of Father Newman. It was the last opportunity for obtaining an act of reparation.[1] The Duke of Norfolk happily did not lack the moral courage necessary for initiating under the circumstances so difficult a task. Accompanied by the Marquis of Ripon he sought an interview with Cardinal Manning, and expressed to His Eminence the desire so widely and deeply felt by the

[1] In speaking of Rome's delay, Cardinal Newman on one occasion said to me, "Not a word of blame or reproach in regard to the acts of the Holy See."

Catholic laity of England that Father Newman should be raised to the dignity of Cardinal.

On hearing this proposal Cardinal Manning bent his head and remained silent for some moments. Recovering his self-possession he rose to the occasion. With great alacrity he offered to embody in a letter of his own to Cardinal Nina the substance of the statements drawn up or indicated by the Duke of Norfolk and Lord Ripon, together with the various reasons which they had brought forward in support of their petition.

The following Letter embodying the reasons urged by the Duke of Norfolk and the Marquis of Ripon for Newman's being made a Cardinal, was addressed by Cardinal Manning to Cardinal Nina:—

CARDINAL MANNING'S LETTER TO CARDINAL NINA

The Duke of Norfolk and the Marquis of Ripon have represented to me on their part and on the part of Lord Petre, a strong desire, which is shared, as they state, by many of the Catholics of this country, that the Holy See should manifest by some public and conspicuous act its sense of the singular and unequalled services rendered by Dr. Newman to the Catholic faith and to the Catholic Church in England.

He was the chief agent in the intellectual movement which in 1833 stirred the University of Oxford towards the Catholic Faith. The fact of his submission to the Church has alone done more to awaken the minds of Englishmen to the Catholic religion than that of any other man. Many both directly and indirectly have been brought by his example to the Catholic Church. His writings both before and after his conversion have powerfully contributed to the rise and extension of the Catholic literature in England, and wherever the English tongue is spoken.

The veneration for his powers, his learning, and his life of singular piety and integrity is almost as deeply felt by the non-Catholic population of this country as by the members of the Catholic Church.

In the rise and revival of Catholic Faith in England there is no one whose name will stand out in history with so great a prominence.

Nevertheless he has continued for thirty years without any token or mark of the confidence of the Holy See; and this

apparent passing over of his great merits has been noted both among Catholics and non-Catholics as implying division among the faithful in England, and some unexplained mistrust of Dr. Newman. It is obviously not only most desirable that this should be corrected, but obviously right that Dr. Newman should be cleared of any unjust suspicion.

He is now in his seventy-eighth year and his life cannot be long. The opportunity in which the Holy See could render this testimony of confidence to the singular merits and services of Dr. Newman is, therefore, brief.

Such an act of the Supreme Authority of the Holy See would have, it is believed, a powerful effect in demonstrating the unity of the Faith in England, and in adding force to the impulse already given by Dr. Newman by his life, writings, and influence to the return of many to the Catholic Church.

Some years ago Pius IX. designed that Dr. Newman should receive Episcopal consecration, as Rector of the Catholic University in Ireland. This design was not then executed, and when subsequently revived Dr. Newman expressed his firm resolution to refuse such a proposal.

There remains, therefore, only one mark of the confidence of the Holy See to so distinguished a priest. And no greater gratification to the Catholics of England could be given than by the elevation of Dr. Newman into the Sacred College.

I have felt it to be a duty, very grateful to myself, to convey to your Eminence this expression of the desires of the distinguished Catholic laymen in whose names I write, and of those whom they represent.

Correspondence between Cardinal Manning, Cardinal Newman, the Bishop of Birmingham, and Others

In a letter, dated Arundel Castle, 2nd August 1878, the Duke of Norfolk, in returning to Cardinal Manning the draft of the above Letter, acknowledged that it gave an admirable summary of the views expressed by Lord Ripon and himself. The Duke of Norfolk, moreover, thought it advisable that Cardinal Howard, who was going to Rome, should be told by Cardinal Manning of the matter discussed at the late interview, so that if it were spoken of to him at Rome he might not be taken unawares.

Lord Petre's letter is as follows:—

FELIX HALL, KELVEDON, *7th August* 18[illegible]8.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—I return the draft, having underlined in pencil the particular passages to which I cannot subscribe.[1] I am, my dear Lord, with great respect, yours faithfully, PETRE.

His Eminence The Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster.

Early in December, Cardinal Howard, to whom Cardinal Manning had entrusted his Letter containing the reasons which induced English Catholic laymen to hope that Father Newman would be made Cardinal, not having arrived in Rome, the Duke of Norfolk sought a private audience with Pope Leo XIII. At this audience the Duke of Norfolk submitted to his Holiness the reasons why the Catholic laity of England were so desirous that Newman's unrivalled services should receive fitting recognition and reward from the Holy See. The Pope naturally made particular inquiries as to what Cardinal Manning thought of the proposal. Such a request coming from laymen seemed to his Holiness out of the usual course. Nevertheless he was willing to consider it. That was a step gained; and the first step, especially in a matter so delicate under the circumstances, is always the most difficult.

In a letter dated *Ambassade d'Angleterre*, Paris, 12th December 1878, the Duke of Norfolk urged Cardinal Manning, as his first letter was now out of date owing to Cardinal Howard's delay on his journey, to write again to Rome and to reiterate what he had said before.

After giving an account of his private audience with Leo XIII., the Duke of Norfolk added, that the Pope seemed to think that the request to make Father Newman a Cardinal coming from laymen, a high-reaching one, but seemed willing to consider it. The Duke of Norfolk added, that the Pope asked particularly what Cardinal Manning thought of the matter.

The Duke of Norfolk's statements, giving an account of

[1] The passages in the draft Letter which Lord Petre objected to out of regard to Cardinal Manning's possible susceptibilities, were those in which 1. Newman's services were spoken of as *unrivalled;* and 2. there is *no one* whose name will stand out in history *with so great a prominence.*

the strange way in which Newman had been so long neglected and mistrusted, made a strong impression on Pope Leo XIII. The presentation, at last, of Cardinal Manning's Letter by Cardinal Howard served to confirm the favourable impression, and to supply what may have been wanting in regularity in the Duke of Norfolk's request. At the end of January a letter was written by Cardinal Nina to Cardinal Manning, to the effect that Pope Leo XIII. had "intimated his desire to raise Dr. Newman to the rank of Cardinal." This letter was forwarded by Cardinal Manning to Dr. Ullathorne, Newman's bishop, and a rough copy sent at the same time to Dr. Newman at the Oratory.

In the following letter to Cardinal Manning, Dr. Ullathorne gives a full and touching account of the profound impression made on Dr. Newman by the kindness and great mark of confidence shown to him by the Sovereign Pontiff:—

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE, OSCOTT,
BIRMINGHAM, *3rd February* 1879.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—Your kind letter, enclosing that of Cardinal Nina, gave me very great gratification. As I could not with any prudence go to Birmingham, I wrote and asked Dr. Newman if he could come to Oscott. But he was in bed suffering from severe cold, and much pulled down. I, therefore, took advantage of a clause in Cardinal Nina's letter, and asked him to send a Father in his intimate confidence whom he might consult in a grave matter of importance, to whom I could communicate in secrecy the Holy Father's message. Father Pope was sent, and with him I went into the subject, and sent the documents with a paper in which I had written my own reflections.

Dr. Newman contrived to come himself to-day, although quite feeble. He is profoundly and tenderly impressed with the goodness of the Holy Father towards him, and spoke to me with great humility of what he conceived to be his disqualifications, especially at his age, for so great a position, and of his necessity to the Birmingham Oratory, which still requires his care.

I represented to him, as I had already done through Father Pope, that I felt confident that the one intention of the Holy Father was to confer upon him this signal proof of his confidence, and to give him an exalted position in the Church in token of the great services he had rendered to her cause, and that I

felt confident also that his Holiness would not require his leaving the Oratory and taking a new position at his great age. But that if he would leave it to me, I would undertake to explain all to your Eminence, who would make the due explanations to Cardinal Nina.

Dr. Newman has far too humble and delicate a mind to dream of thinking or saying anything which would look like hinting at any kind of terms with the Sovereign Pontiff. He has expressed himself in a Latin letter addressed to me, which I could send to your Eminence, and which you could place in the hands of Cardinal Nina.

I think, however, that I ought to express my own sense of what Dr. Newman's dispositions are, and that it will be expected of me. As I have already said, Dr. Newman is most profoundly touched and moved by this very great mark of consideration on the part of the Sovereign Pontiff, and I am thoroughly confident that nothing stands in the way of his most grateful acceptance except what he tells me greatly distresses him, namely, the having to leave the Oratory at a critical period of its existence, and when it is just beginning to develop in new members, and the impossibility of his beginning a new life at his advanced age.

I cannot, however, but think myself that this is not the Holy Father's intention, and that His Holiness would consider his presence in England of importance, where he has been so much in communication with those who are in search of the Truth.

I have also said to Dr. Newman himself that I am confident that the noble Catholics of England would not leave him without the proper means for maintaining his dignity in a suitable manner.

Although expecting me to make the official communication, Dr. Newman will write to you himself.—I remain, my dear Lord Cardinal, your faithful and affectionate servant,

✠ WILLIAM BERNARD,
Bishop of Birmingham.

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE, OSCOTT,
BIRMINGHAM, *4th February* 1879.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—I had no time to write you a more private letter after seeing Dr. Newman yesterday. He is very much aged, and softened with age and the trials he has had, especially by the loss of his two brethren, St. John and Caswall; he can never refer to these losses without weeping and becoming speechless for the time. He is very much affected by the Pope's kindness, would, I know, like to receive the great honour

offered him, but feels the whole difficulty at his age of changing his life, or having to leave the Oratory, which I am sure he could not do. If the Holy Father thinks well to confer on him the dignity, leaving him where he is, I know how immensely he would be gratified, and you will know how generally the conferring on him the Cardinalate will be applauded. . . .

My dear Lord Cardinal, faithfully and affectionately yours,

✠ W. B. ULLATHORNE.

THE ORATORY, *5th February* 1879.

DEAR CARDINAL MANNING—Thank you for sending me your rough copy.

I could not be so ungracious whether to the Holy Father, or to the friends at home who have interested themselves in this matter, as to decline what was so kindly proposed, provided that it did not involve unfaithfulness to St. Philip.—Yours affectionately, JOHN H. NEWMAN.

On Saturday, 15th February, Cardinal Manning, bearing Newman's answer to Cardinal Nina, started for Rome. He passed through Paris, where he remained a day or two. From the following correspondence it appears that Cardinal Manning, from the perusal of the letters to Cardinal Nina, to himself, and to the Bishop of Birmingham, had fully persuaded himself that Newman had declined to accept the dignity of Cardinal. Such a belief, however, was by no means shared either by the Bishop of Birmingham or the Duke of Norfolk.

By a strange error of judgment, almost unaccountable in one so distinguished for his prudence and sense of propriety, Cardinal Manning, as appears from Newman's letter to the Duke of Norfolk, not only divulged the fact that the dignity of Cardinal had been offered, but, putting his own interpretation on the letter to Cardinal Nina, unfortunately, before even the Letter had reached its destination in Rome, allowed the statement to be made public that Newman had refused the Pope's offer. Unquestionably, Cardinal Manning had deceived himself as to the true meaning of Newman's letter to Cardinal Nina; but did his best on reaching Rome to repair his error.[1]

[1] Of this journey to Rome, Cardinal Manning has left no records or notes.

In the meantime the following statement appeared in the *Times* of Tuesday, 18th February 1879:—"Pope Leo XIII. has intimated his desire to raise Dr. Newman to the rank of Cardinal, but with expressions of deep respect for the Holy See, Dr. Newman has excused himself from accepting the purple."

On reading this statement, Father Newman wrote the following letter to the Duke of Norfolk:—

THE ORATORY, 20*th February* 1879.

MY DEAR DUKE—I have heard from various quarters of the affectionate interest you have taken in the application to Rome about me, and I write to thank you and to express my great pleasure at it.

As to the statement of my refusing a cardinal's Hat, which is in the papers, you must not believe it—for this reason:

Of course, it implies that an offer has been made me, and I have sent an answer to it. Now I have ever understood that it is a point of propriety and honour to consider such communications *sacred*. The statement, therefore, cannot come from me. Nor could it come from Rome, for it was made public before my answer got to Rome.

It could only come, then, from some one who not only read my letter, but, instead of leaving to *the Pope* to interpret it, took upon himself to put an interpretation upon it, and published that interpretation to the world.

A private letter, addressed to Roman Authorities, is interpreted on its way and published in the English papers. How is it possible that anyone can have done this?

And besides, I am quite sure that, if so high an honour was offered me, I should not answer it by a blunt refusal.—Yours affectionately, JOHN H. NEWMAN.

The Duke of Norfolk, not having the remotest suspicion that Cardinal Manning was the author of the report in the papers, forwarded to him Newman's letter.

In a letter dated 22nd February 1879 the Duke of Norfolk explained to Cardinal Manning that since the proposed offer to Father Newman was known everywhere it would be idle to look upon the matter as secret; and, therefore, he had, with the concurrence of Lord Petre and Lord Ripon, moved at the half-yearly meeting of the Catholic

Union the Resolutions published in the *Times*. He was confirmed in this view on hearing that the Bishop of Salford had sent a message to the Editor of the *Tablet* to insert a notice of the matter. The Duke of Norfolk, under the natural apprehension that the Pope might be surprised at the publication of his intention of making Newman a Cardinal, begged Cardinal Manning to explain to His Holiness that the whole affair had been made public in a way no one was able to account for. The Duke of Norfolk then added that he had just received a letter from Father Newman, which he hoped Cardinal Manning would bring to the notice of the Pope, as it was clear that Father Newman did not mean the Pope to interpret his letter in the way in which it had been interpreted by the Papers. The Duke feared that the Pope might think the interpretation put by the papers on Newman's letter to Cardinal Nina the right interpretation, and, *if it were not contradicted*, might abide by that interpretation.

In concluding his letter the Duke of Norfolk stated that as he was the one who had brought the matter before the Pope in a personal communication, he begged Cardinal Manning to thank the Pope for his condescension in vouchsafing to consider the proposal.

In another letter, dated 23rd February 1879, the Duke of Norfolk declared that neither he nor his friends nor Father Newman had abused the Pope's confidence by spreading the false report, and inquired of Cardinal Manning who had told him that Father Newman had declined. The Duke added that it was probable the report in the Papers might have come from the same source.

In this letter the Duke of Norfolk expressed a fear that the Pope might think his confidence had been abused. There was also the further danger that many in Rome would not appreciate the delicacy and importance of the matter, or understand how much mischief would be done if it could be suggested that the honour was never meant to be really conferred.

The news that Father Newman had positively declined the dignity offered to him by the Pope was a fruitful topic

of discussion in all the Papers. Surmises of the most contradictory character, some of them very far-reaching, were made as to the motives which induced Dr. Newman to refuse the high dignity of Cardinal. Had conditions, it was asked, been imposed which made acceptance impossible? No one stopped to inquire who was the author of the report. It was accepted as true by the *Tablet*, which was supposed to have official or semi-official relations with Cardinal Manning.

An article in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, headed "*Dr. Newman*," and a paragraph in the *Guardian*, as if they possessed some peculiar significance, were carefully preserved by Cardinal Manning among the collection of letters on Newman's elevation to the Cardinalate.

The paragraph from the *Guardian* is as follows:—

> The *Times* of Tuesday stated that Leo XIII. had "intimated his desire to raise Dr. Newman to the rank of Cardinal, and that with expressions of deep respect for the Holy See, Dr. Newman has excused himself from accepting the purple." We have written elsewhere on the supposition that Dr. Newman had positively declined the dignity offered him, but we have since had reason to doubt whether this be really the case, and whether Dr. Newman's reply may not have been of a kind which would leave it open to the Pope either to insist on or withdraw his offer, as might appear best, after considering Dr. Newman's answer. If this proves to be so, it is certainly a pity that any premature report of the nature of his reply,—especially one so conceived as to force in any degree the Pope's hand,—should have been made public. The true interpretation of replies to such offers as this is frequently a very delicate matter, and to put one out of many possible senses publicly upon it, may render it very difficult to attach the proper significance to the other senses of which it admits.
>
> The suggestions contained in the above paragraph convey the real interpretation of Dr. Newman's letter to Cardinal Nina. This information, in terms so clear and concise, supplied to the *Guardian*, obviously either by Dr. Newman, or by some one in his confidence, coupled with the expression of regret as to the premature report of the nature of the reply to Cardinal Nina, had an instantaneous effect in casting

doubt on the apparently authoritative statement which had appeared in the *Times*.

The article in the *Pall Mall Gazette* was sent to Cardinal Manning by a friend and adviser who, like Dr. Ward, looked upon Newman as disloyal to the Church and the Papacy, and who regarded his elevation to the dignity of Cardinal as a reversal of the temper and policy which for thirty years had been dominant at the Vatican. It seemed to the extreme faction of English Catholics, of whom Dr. Ward was most conspicuous by character and ability, like conferring the stamp of Papal approval upon the writings of one whose religious views and opinions they so thoroughly mistrusted, and had so persistently misrepresented.[1]

The concluding passages of the following article in the *Pall Mall Gazette* were underlined and profusely scored and marked in the margin by crosses and other devices by Dr. Ward, or another of a like stamp, in the view of again impressing on Cardinal Manning's mind the mischief which would ensue if Newman were made a Cardinal.

Dr. Newman.

The announcement that Leo XIII. has "intimated his desire" to make Dr. Newman a Cardinal will give great displeasure to the Ultramontane section of English Catholics. For many years they have done their best to forget, and to make others forget, Dr. Newman's existence; and though they have not succeeded in the latter enterprise, they have at all events been able to cheer themselves with the thought that their efforts were thoroughly approved at Rome.[2] . . . Hereafter the persistency with which

---

[1] See Dr. Ward's letter, dated 8th June 1865, to Archbishop Manning. Also Dr. Ward's articles *passim* in the *Dublin Review*.

[2] In the following passage (quoted from the above article) the *Pall Mall Gazette* gives a signal illustration of the curious fashion in which the editor of the *Dublin Review* sought to belittle Father Newman:—"The feeling of the English Ultramontanes towards the most illustrious of living Catholics could not have been better shown than in an article on 'Catholicism and Culture' which appeared in the first number of the new series of the *Dublin Review*. The writer of that article undertook to reckon up the English Catholics who had made for themselves a name in letters. The list was not a long one, and the Reviewer frankly owned that it was not. It must have been a great tempta-

the most influential section of Catholics have endeavoured to thrust Dr. Newman into obscurity will be regarded as one of the strangest facts in the theological and literary history of the century. It is not a case of a prophet being without honour in his father's house. The Anglican Church had that excuse, the Roman Church had not. Dr. Newman in the vigour of his age had sacrificed all that he most valued, save conscience, to the deliberate pursuit of what he believed to be truth, and those to whom he brought support of such unapproached value might have been expected to show some sense of their own gain. What faculty of appreciating even their own real interest they have really displayed is known to every one. Later converts have been raised to the highest places in the Church; men who might have been glad to recognise in themselves the hundredth part of one of Dr. Newman's gifts have become influential and famous; while Dr. Newman has remained at Edgbaston the same solitary thinker that he was at Oriel or Littlemore. Now, when he is nearly eighty, the long-delayed recognition comes to him, and we will venture to hope will yet be thrust upon him even against his will. At his age, indeed, Dr. Newman could hardly hope to take part in the deliberations or help to shape the policy of the Sacred College. *But the fact of his elevation would be on record, and would make it impossible for the most unscrupulous partisan to say that the Pope's intention had been misrepresented.*[1] *As it is, the Ultramontane faction will have persuaded themselves before the year is out that the whole story was an invention of the English papers.* Indeed, the offer which has just been made by Leo XIII. is of a kind which it is hardly open to a man to refuse. It demands personal sacrifices—sacrifices which to Dr. Newman would be especially great, and it demands them in the cause of principles for which he has all his life contended. *Dr. Newman's elevation to the Cardinalate would mark almost more than any other single act the divergence of Leo XIII.'s policy from that of Pius IX. All that is most alien from the temper which for the last thirty years has been dominant at the Vatican is summed up in Dr. Newman's name; and when the head of the Church seeks by one conspicuous step to mark that this temper*

---

tion to him to have included in it the man who, as regards the substance of his writings, stands on the same level with Pascal and Bossuet, while, as regards their form, he has shown a mastery of the varied resources of the English tongue which gives him an equal pre-eminence in the literature of his own country. But the *Dublin Reviewer* rose superior to the temptation, and had the magnificent courage to omit Dr. Newman's name."

[1] The passages marked by italics were not so marked by the writer of the article.

dominates there no longer, it is surely not for the man without whom that step cannot be taken to withhold his co-operation. There is yet time, probably, for Dr. Newman to reconsider his answer; and, however little he may himself care for the stamp of official approval on his work, he ought not to put out of sight the many on whom that work may exercise greater influence if it comes to them with that stamp affixed.

How exceedingly much Cardinal Newman did "care for the stamp of official approval on his work" was shown by the letters which he wrote on the occasion to his intimate friends. In one letter he expressed the gratitude which filled his heart at the marvellous manner in which the misrepresentations, that for a long series of years had clouded his life and work, had been for ever dissipated. His letters to Lord Emly and Mr. David Lewis of Arundel, and to many others, bear witness to Cardinal Newman's joy and gratitude at the stamp of approval conferred on his life and work by Pope Leo XIII.

Referring to the authoritative statements which appeared, first in the *Times*, and afterwards in all the other Papers, Catholic as well as non-Catholic, Mr. Lewis said, "I abstained from writing to Father Newman, but after the false report had been contradicted, I received in answer to mine a letter from Cardinal Newman, which was simply joyous; full of gratitude for the kindness and condescension of the Pope, and for the loving-kindliness of his friends."

As soon as Newman's letter to the Duke of Norfolk had reached Cardinal Manning in Rome, he hastened to explain how his interpretation of Newman's letter to Cardinal Nina differed from Newman's own interpretation. Cardinal Nina, after listening to Cardinal Manning's explanations, drily remarked, that the author was usually a better interpreter than another of his own words.

With Pope Leo XIII. there was no difficulty. With sympathetic insight he fully entered into Newman's feelings, and highly appreciated the delicacy he had shown in his letter to Cardinal Nina. Without hesitation or delay Pope Leo conferred on Father Newman the dignity of Cardinal, and gladly gave him the privilege he desired of remaining

in England with his brethren at the Oratory. Cardinal Manning was authorised to communicate the Pope's intention to the Bishop of Birmingham.

When the news reached Cardinal Newman, he was much moved by the Pope's kindness and condescension, and said to his brothers of the Oratory, "The cloud is lifted from me for ever."

On receiving Cardinal Manning's letter, the Bishop of Birmingham wrote in reply as follows:—

St. Mary's College, Oscott,
Birmingham, *4th March* 1879.

My dear Lord Cardinal—Your letter, following your telegram, was extremely welcome to Dr. Newman. He wrote to me: "You may fancy how I am overcome by the Pope's goodness." He also said to his own brethren: "The cloud is lifted from me for ever." He accepts with the greatest gratitude the honour and dignity which the Holy Father designs for him, and I am sure that if he can take the journey he will come to Rome. He is still suffering from severe cold, but is wonderfully consoled by the Pope's kindness.

The whole press of England has been engaged on the subject, and the general disposition is to look upon Dr. Newman not merely as a Catholic but as a great Englishman, and to regard the intention of the Pope as an honour to England.

Your communications came happily in time to stop the general conclusion that Dr. Newman had declined, upon which the comic papers have founded their illustrations.

I have considered it prudent, now that all is public, to deny, and cause it to be denied, that Dr. Newman has or did decline. . . . I remain, my dear Lord Cardinal, your faithful and affectionate servant, ✠ W. B. Ullathorne.

In the first of the following letters to Cardinal Manning, Dr. Newman expressed his gratitude at being allowed by His Holiness in his condescending goodness to remain at the Oratory; and in the second, thinking that the impression which existed some fortnight since, that he had declined it, might still prevail, signified his readiness to accept without any delay the high dignity of Cardinal as soon as the Pope had made known his intention of conferring it.

THE ORATORY,
BIRMINGHAM, *4th March* 1879.

DEAR CARDINAL MANNING—I hardly should have thought it became me, since no letter has been addressed to me, to write to anyone at Rome myself, on the gracious message of the Holy Father about me.

Since, however, the Bishop of Birmingham recommends me to do so, I hereby beg to say that with much gratitude and with true devotion to His Holiness, I am made acquainted with and accept the permission he proposes to me in his condescending goodness to keep place within the walls of my Oratory at Birmingham.—I am, sincerely yours, kissing the Sacred Purple,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

THE ORATORY, *5th March* 1879.

DEAR CARDINAL MANNING—Wishing to guard against all possible mistake I trouble you with this second letter.

As soon as the Holy Father condescends to make it known to me that he means to confer on me the high dignity of Cardinal, I shall write to Rome to signify my obedience and glad acceptance of the honour without any delay.

I write this thinking that the impression which existed some fortnight since, that I had declined it, may still prevail.—Yours very sincerely, JOHN H. NEWMAN.

P.S.—This second letter is occasioned by something which has come to my knowledge since my letter of yesterday.

The following letter of explanation was addressed by Cardinal Manning to Dr. Newman:—

ENGLISH COLLEGE,
ROME, *8th March* 1879.

MY DEAR NEWMAN—Your second letter has just reached me. Mine will have been received before this, and you will know that I have not a second time failed to understand your intention. The letter written by you to the Bishop of Birmingham in answer to Cardinal Nina's letter was sent by the Bishop to me with a letter of his own.

I fully believed that, for the reasons given in your letter, you declined what might be offered.

But the Bishop expressed his hope that you might under a change of conditions accept it.

This confirmed my belief that as it stood you declined it.

And your letter to me of a day or two later still further confirmed my belief.

I started for Rome taking with me the Bishop's letter, not knowing what might be done here.

In passing through Paris I wrote to the Duke of Norfolk in the sense I have written above.

I never doubted this impression, received from your letters and the Bishop's, till I received from the Duke a copy of a letter of yours to him, in which you said that you had not intended to refuse what had been proposed.

The moment I read this, I went to the Vatican, and told the Holy Father, and asked his permission to write to the Duke, and to the Bishop of Birmingham.

And to shorten still further the suspense I telegraphed to both.

I write this because if I misunderstood your intention it was by an error which I repaired the instant I knew it.—Believe me always, yours affectionately,

H. E. Cardinal-Archbishop.

In a letter, dated Norfolk House, St. James Square, 15th March 1879, whilst regretting the terms, if meant to apply to Cardinal Manning, made use of by Cardinal Newman, the Duke of Norfolk repeated his statement that he should not have put the interpretation which Cardinal Manning did, on the letter to Cardinal Nina, but should have read it as clearly meaning that it was left to Cardinal Manning to explain to the authorities in Rome that Newman's real reason for declining was one which they could easily remove, but was one which he could not himself explain in so many words. To Cardinal Manning's energetic intervention the Duke of Norfolk attributed the happy result of the main issue, and trusted the private point would be settled.

In the subsequent months a few notes, kindly in character, were interchanged. In one of them Cardinal Manning offered to Newman, on his returning from Rome, the hospitality of Archbishop's House, Westminster, which Cardinal Newman declined because he was engaged to the Duke of Norfolk.

Cardinal Manning and the Bishops of England presented on the 16th of May a warmly expressed Address of congratulation, to which Cardinal Newman, in a letter dated

Leghorn, 5th June 1879, replied in most kindly and grateful terms. In his letter, Cardinal Newman spoke of some of the Bishops who, almost as soon as he was received into the Church up to the present time, had allowed him to feel sure that they were personally attached to him. He also spoke of having known Cardinal Manning even in his early College days.

In a Note, dated 15th November 1888, Cardinal Manning makes the following reference to the circumstances attending Newman's being made Cardinal:—

When the Duke of Norfolk and Lord Ripon asked me to lay before the Holy See their desire that Newman should be made cardinal, I at once undertook to do so, and wrote the letter of which a copy is with the other correspondence. The Duke of Norfolk and Lord Ripon and Lord Petre all saw the letter, and approved of it. Lord Petre said that I had even said too much. Cardinal Howard told me that at first there was no disposition to do so, but that my letter worked a change.

I fully believed that Newman declined to accept the cardinalate for the reasons given in his letter to Cardinal Nina. The moment I knew that he did not so intend his words to be taken, I went to the Pope and obtained his leave to telegraph and write to the Duke of Norfolk and to the Bishop of Birmingham. On this, also, there is a letter of explanation in the Correspondence.

In the same Correspondence will be found the letter from Propaganda calling on me to invite Newman to correct certain things in his "Letter to the Duke of Norfolk," and my answer deprecating any such act.

The grateful duty is imposed on Cardinal Newman's future biographer of bringing out in their full light and force all the kindly feeling, the gratitude and tenderness manifested by the large-hearted Oratorian in so many ways on the occasion of his being elevated to the dignity of Cardinal. What was most precious in his eyes was the stamp of approbation which the act of the Pope had set upon the work of his life. It was "the lifting of the cloud." In his magnanimity, he never, even to his brethren of the Oratory, alluded to the past. Indeed, on one occasion in connection with a Biographical sketch, which I was writing of him, Cardinal Newman said

to me, in allusion to the Party which had so long opposed him in England and in Rome, "Let bygones be bygones"; and then he added with a smile, "besides, they have all come round to my side now."

After the interchange of kindly courtesies on his elevation to the Cardinalate, there were no further active relations between Cardinal Manning and Cardinal Newman. During Cardinal Newman's stay at Norfolk House in the summer of 1880, when he received the affectionate homage of English Catholics, Cardinal Manning was absent in Rome. They never met as Cardinals except twice: once in June 1883, when, for the purpose of giving a sitting for his portrait to Millais, Cardinal Newman had come to town for four or five days; and before leaving—he was staying at the London Oratory—paid a visit to Cardinal Manning.[1] The second occasion was a return visit made at Birmingham by Cardinal Manning in 1884.[2]

[1] On his return from London, Cardinal Newman said to one of the Fathers of the Oratory, "What do you think Cardinal Manning did to me? He kissed me!"

[2] Before he was made Cardinal, Newman for a long period of years had never met Cardinal Manning, except on one occasion by accident at the porch of the London Oratory, after the Requiem of the Dowager Duchess of Norfolk. There was, however, no time or opportunity for conversation. The only words which passed were those addressed to Father Newman by Cardinal Manning, as follows:—"I congratulate you on getting so well through the 'Absolutions.'"

CHAPTER XXI

REFLECTIONS ON ROME AND THE RULING CARDINALS—THE CASE OF MGR. CAPEL AND THE HOLY OFFICE

1876—1883

THE year after he was made Cardinal, Manning went to Rome in high hopes and with joy of heart. He came now, not as a mere archbishop permitted once in three years to visit Rome and render an account of his diocese. This time he came as a Cardinal, one of the chosen councillors of the Holy See, in the hope of being able to shape the policy of the Sacred College and to serve the Universal Church at the seat of government and the centre of the Catholic world.

It was a position of privilege and power which Cardinal Manning rated at the highest. He was not unmindful—scarcely could be—of the influence which he had obtained during the Vatican Council; of the friends he had made among the ruling Cardinals, of the triumphs he had helped to achieve. Pius IX., his friend and patron, who eleven years ago had made him Archbishop and now Cardinal, still sat in the Chair of Peter.

On reaching Rome he found, to his dismay, things all at sixes and sevens. The Sacred College were not of one mind. Seven or eight of the men he remembered in full vigour in the days of the Vatican Council were partially or wholly useless. Cardinal Antonelli was dead. The political and ecclesiastical Rome of his memory was broken up. Rome in that day of trial stood in sore need, as Cardinal Manning knew but too well, of a great ecclesiastical statesman.

The question who was to be Cardinal Antonelli's successor was uppermost in every man's mind. It was discussed everywhere: in the College of Cardinals, in the Pope's Ante-Camera, in the recesses of the Vatican itself, by those cardinals who had free access to the Pope's apartments. The rare qualifications needed in the successor of so great a diplomatist and statesman as Antonelli were set before the Pope in the most precise terms.

Of all the Pope's advisers no one was more urgent than Cardinal Manning in insisting upon the absolute necessity—in the interests of the Church, for the sake of the Temporal Power, for the safeguarding of the liberty and spiritual rights of the Papacy—of finding a great ecclesiastical statesman as successor to Cardinal Antonelli. Carried away by his zeal, and relying upon the latitude in offering advice allowed to him by Pius IX., Cardinal Manning criticised very freely the qualifications of the few available candidates for the office of Secretary of State. He even hinted at the stagnation in the Sacred College; its want of a common understanding, of prevision, of resourcefulness. Finally, at the conclusion of his interview with Pope Pius IX., Cardinal Manning in sorrow of heart lamented that, at a moment when a great ecclesiastical statesman was most needed, the Holy See was most wanting in its councillors and men of action.

Soon after this interview Cardinal Manning complained to an intimate friend that "Pope Pius IX. was growing old and garrulous, and not to be trusted with a secret." What was the secret which the Pope betrayed? Did Pope Pius IX., yielding to his love of a practical joke, introduce Cardinal Manning to a rival and astounded Cardinal as "Antonelli il secondo." It was not till the succeeding year, 1877, that Cardinal Nina—the astounded cardinal—was appointed Secretary of State.

In the Rome of 1876, where, in the olden days his busy brain and hand had ever been at work, morning, noon, and night, Cardinal Manning felt himself to be "a looker-on and a bystander, *tota die otiosus*." A bystander all the day idle. A looker-on merely, at the source and centre of all

the movements and activities of the Catholic world. What a change must have come over the face of things in Rome, as far at least as Cardinal Manning himself was concerned! What a contrast to the position he held in the days of the Vatican Council!

In truth no one seemed "to know Joseph," nor to be ready as in the days of old to listen to his advice, or to accept his suggestions. Moreover, though he did not allude to the fact, his ancient friend at the Vatican, poor Mgr. Talbot, afflicted with a mental malady, was no more in Rome.[1]

Seeing how things were drifting from bad to worse, with no hand to stay the evil; no master-mind to discover and apply a remedy, what wonder that Cardinal Manning, after a brief sojourn of three weeks, left Rome, "Sorrowful of heart," as he said, "even unto death."

In this state of despondency, due in part to illness and inactivity, he retired to Genoa, where he put down, as his wont was, the impressions uppermost in his mind in the following reflections:—

Genoa, 8th December 1876.—The three weeks I spent in Rome, from November 14 to December 6, have left on me, I hope, a lasting impression.

1. First, I was really ill, which always does me good.
2. Next, I had one of my usual attacks, which produce extreme depression of strength and of mind. I always feel as if I could never get up again, and as if life were over, at least all active thought and work. I feel like the old men I see set aside with full power still remaining to perceive that I have lived my life. This I know to be morbid, and I say so all the time, but then it is like a nightmare which we know to be unreal, and yet cannot throw off.
3. Next, I had nothing to do. The extreme demand on me at home had suddenly ceased, and in Rome I was a looker-on and a bystander.
4. Then Cardinal Antonelli's death and the hopeless state of

---

[1] Pope Pius IX. was much attached to Mgr. Talbot, his intimate and constant attendant, and, in the hope of his recovery and return to Rome, would not allow his rooms, which were close to the Pope's own, to be disturbed or occupied.

the Cardinal Vicar broke up the political and ecclesiastical Rome of my memory.

5. Still more the state of the Sacred College. At least seven or eight of the men I remember in full vigour are partially or wholly useless. They still nominally hold their office.
6. The number of effective Cardinals in Rome is reduced to seven or eight.
7. There seems to be a lack of young men of promise. The middle-aged men have grown too old to enter upon new offices. At this moment the Holy See seems to me reduced very low in its counsellors and men of action.
8. I seemed to see stagnation. Six years have passed over the Holy See since 1870, and its organisation has been dying out year after year.
9. I seemed also to see that there is no common counsel, no common understanding, no preparation, no provision, no readiness for alternatives. All this may exist unknown to me, but hardly unknown to those who spoke with me in the same sense.
10. I find some looking for miracles, (2) some for inaction, and (3) some for action. Therefore there is no unity of mind.
11. The inactive unite with the first class in doing nothing, letting everything get worse, and in speaking against them who would act as *conciliatori*.
12. But there is work to be done *ab intra*, and more than will ever be done; and work to be done *ab extra*, which is not conciliation, but hostility. Still the "white cockades" will neither do it nor see it.
13. The Holy See, the Faith and its traditions are immutable; but the world is not immutable, and it is the changes of the world that constitute our trials and conflicts.
14. Are we to shut ourselves in like Noe and wait? or are we to act upon the world, as all the Pontiffs from St. Leo the Great?
15. If the world has fallen off and become corrupt, how is it to be recovered? By leaving it in its corruption till it returns by itself to soundness? Surely this is contrary to the parable of the lost sheep, to the life of our Lord, to faith, and to natural reason.
16. Confidence in God and action for God are inseparable.
17. This Ecclesiastical Quietism seems to me to be condemned in Madame Guyon.
18. The Mancini laws, if carried out, will leave dioceses and

parishes without bishop or priest! Are the people to be left till the old are dead and the young have grown up without the sacraments?

19. If this be right, I am so wrong that I can only hold my peace.

20. All this darkness, confusion, depression, with inactivity and illness, made me understand the *Tristis est anima mea usque ad mortem.*

21. It seems to me all that remains is this:—(1) The closest unity and conformity to the Word made Flesh through the Blessed Sacrament, and in His Vicar upon earth. (2) The guarding of the election of his successor. *Etiam cum dispendio vitæ ita mori verum est martyrium et beatitudo eterna.*

After this unhappy visit to Rome in 1876, when Cardinal Manning found himself "a bystander and looker-on"; when his advice was not listened to; when even his friend and patron Pope Pius IX. made light of his warnings, Cardinal Manning did not return again till 1878, to find Pius IX. on his death-bed. In 1883 Cardinal Manning made his last visit to the Eternal City. Leo XIII. had been Pope for four years. During these four years great changes had taken place in regard to Cardinal Manning's relations with the Holy See. He was no longer on the same footing at the Vatican as under the Pontificate of Pius IX. He no longer enjoyed a like exclusive influence in the management and control at Rome of English Catholic affairs. Men were no longer made or marred by his *ipse dixit.* Other voices were listened to; other statements taken into consideration. The most signal manifestation of the change which had taken place at the Vatican was the prompt elevation of John Henry Newman to the dignity of Cardinal, in recognition of his unrivalled services to religion in England, and as a public reversal of the policy prompted by adverse influences, which had so long been pursued towards the illustrious Oratorian. No one in Rome imputed unworthy or personal motives to Cardinal Manning in his opposition to Newman; but, whilst recognising his good faith, it was considered that he had greatly erred in judgment and prudence.

Under such circumstances his reluctance to present himself at the Vatican is easily accounted for, especially as he was under the impression that an absence of four years and the industrious misrepresentations of many people had created strong prejudice against him. Happily his apprehensions were unfounded. No one had misrepresented him. No prejudice had been created because, like many a man invested with power and influence, he had committed now and again an error of judgment. Cardinal Manning was surprised and gratified at the frank and cordial manner in which he was received and treated by Pope Leo XIII.

The following reflections and recollections bear witness that Cardinal Manning was not a stranger, as he had feared, at the Vatican under the new Pontiff:—

Florence, 4th December 1883.—On October 16 I left London, reached Rome October 31, and left it to-day. The illnesses of last spring have made me so liable to cold, and to go down so fast and so low, that I have been afraid of being ill in Rome. I do not know why, but it is not easy to get well in Rome; and the monotony of my life there always depresses me. It is real imprisonment not to be able to walk about.[1] It would soon make an end of me.

I went to Rome with no anticipations of satisfaction. An absence of four years, and the industrious misrepresentation of many people, had, as I know, created strong prejudice against me. I am told that it was intentional that I was not consulted about Ireland, or our Government, and that the bishops were invited to write severally on the Oxford question. For the last two years I have been silent; and I did not look for what has happened.

Whether the Holy Father had any perception of this I do not know; but if he had, he could not have done more to undo it. He desired me to come every Wednesday, so that in five weeks I had six audiences of more than one hour each. There is no subject on which he did not speak or allow me to speak. There was only one on which I resolved not to speak unless he began,[2] and as he had directed Cardinal Bilio as Secretary of the Holy Office to treat with me, there was no need. We spoke fully of the "Letter on History" to the three Cardinals, on the religious state of England, three times; on the relations with

[1] It is not the custom for Cardinals in Rome to appear in the streets on foot.

[2] The Case of Monsignor Capel. See below, p. 581.

Russia, Austria, Berlin, France very fully; on the two notes of his own Pontificate, the intellectual, and the diplomatic; and most fully on Ireland and on our Government. I do not think I could have had a more complete admission into the knowledge which for the last two years seemed to be withheld.

This brought me into full communication with the Cardinal Secretary. And all that I cared to know I have come to know.

The history of the Errington Mission I take to be this :—

1. The Holy Father wished for recognition by the English Government, and at least a *persona officiosa.*
2. Certain of our friends made this known to our Government.
3. Mr. Errington was in the confidence of Government and of Cardinal M'Cabe.
4. And he was nothing loath to be a diplomatist.
5. The Cardinal Secretary and perhaps the Holy Father thought that they had got at last full information about Ireland.
6. And that it was a shoe-horn for a *persona officiosa.*
7. This suited Mr. Errington.
8. But not the Opposition, nor public opinion in England.
9. Nor the Government when they were attacked.
10. They then threw over Mr. Errington, and finally, with great indignity, Gladstone declared that they had no desire for relations with Rome.
11. This gave no pleasure in Rome, but just displeasure.
12. Propaganda and the Segretariatos were at sixes and sevens. Then came out the Parnell Letter before Propaganda could send it to the bishops.
13. Propaganda wished Mr. Errington at Jericho, and the Holy Father wished it too. "Tell him not to come again."
14. But he did come, and set up at the Tempietto as *en permanence.*
15. He went to Propaganda and to the Cardinal Secretary; whether to the Holy Father I do not know, but do not believe it.
16. Cardinal Secretary said to me on Wednesday, *Signor Errington non è venuto più.*
17. I considered it my duty to say, Mr. Errington represents the English Government, but he does not represent Ireland.
18. I suggested to Cardinal Secretary to call the Irish bishops to Rome in groups like the American. He took the suggestion, and told me to say this to the Pope. He

had just come out, and I was just going in. I did so. The Pope said, *Ottima idea.* I then said, (1) this would give the *Carta geografica* of Ireland; (2) it would be pleasing to Ireland as a sign of confidence; and (3) it would be acceptable to our Government. The Holy Father said, *Lo accetto*, and he has since spoken of it fully with Cardinal Secretary and Mgr. Jacobini, and again with me, and said they would do it in this next Spring.

In talking about Ireland in my first audience I said that the preservation of the Imperial Unity is vital to the three kingdoms, and to Ireland above all. The Holy Father seemed to be relieved, as if he expected Home Rule from me. I added, under this condition there is no domestic administration which Ireland ought not to have.

In many letters I said, *Amministrazione domestica, ma Parlamento no: sarebbe preludio di conflitto e di separazione.*

The Holy Father promised that he would address a letter to the English Episcopate on the subject of Christian education in the sense of which we have been working; and would so word it as to appeal to the English people as a Christian people, calling on them to strengthen what remains of the old tradition of St. Augustine. I drew up a paper which he read; and he desired me to send him another.

The Oxford question we very fully discussed, and the Holy Father read my report of the Low Week meetings. On Sunday night he told me that I might be at rest about it, and gave me to understand that he would decide as before, no *regresso*, and as the bishops almost unanimously desire.

It is clear to me that an attempt has been made to make them believe me to be despotic and that the Episcopate is not free in opinion and action. This bubble also is burst.

I have also had the fullest opportunity of seeing and conferring with the American bishops. They have gained the good-will and confidence of Propaganda, and they have been placed exactly on our footing as to rectors and parishes, but with consultors and not canons.

They have still to treat the judicial procedure.

I urged that every case of appeal ought to be to the Archbishop and not *per saltum;* that every case of fact should be tried *twice on the spot.* This I think is settled. In the case of an archdiocese those of fact would be tried by the senior suffragan, or a neighbouring archbishop as Apostolic Delegate.

Genoa, 5th December 1883.—I remember in 1876, on my way home, writing from this very house in Genoa. I wrote two

letters, one I have, and another letter to Cardinal Franchi urging him to select young and vigorous men for Cardinals and Bishops in Italy. I named Alimonda, the Provost here. I had been profoundly impressed with the unprepared state of Rome. It was divided into *miracolisti* who looked for a Divine intervention, *conciliatori* who were for giving way, and a still larger class of good and faithful, but old and inefficient men, who had never been beyond the walls of Rome. It was a time of stagnation, or, as Cardinal Franchi called it, *la politica d'inerzia.*

This time I find a new state. The *miracolisti* are gone. The Abstentionists are in the ascendant, but they cannot last long; and some of their leaders know as well as we do that the policy is false. The subject is openly discussed, as in the *Rassegna* by Rolli and by Facometti. Also Cardinals and Prelates speak openly about it. And I find them recognising a merited chastisement in their present state. They see too that the Past can never come back; that the Temporal Power may come back but under new conditions; that the old dynastic world is dying out, and a new world of the peoples is coming in; that the Christendom of Europe is widening out into the Christendom of the East and West and South of the world. I found a humbler and a larger mind in many. All this gives me hope and confidence. But I believe that the end is not yet come. Everybody told me that the monarchy is weaker. Any shock in France would bring it down, and regionalism or a republic would come up. In the transition the Church would be persecuted, and probably driven out of Rome as in 1848. But, spoiled and cast off, the Church would be purer and stronger. It may be that all this spoliation is a Providential preparation for the advent of the Commune, or of the times of the peoples. A rich Church would fare ill in the face of a Commune; and it would be out of sympathy with the peoples, and unable to win their good-will.

I remember saying that at each return to Italy I find the people more like their former state, less excited, suspicious, and hostile to the Church. I find it so this time more than ever. I do not believe that the people of Italy have in them a Revolution like the people of France in the last century. They have gained what they wished; the Church is poor; and they have no wrongs to avenge. If the French Revolution does not again poison and stir up Italy, I have much hope for it.

Nice, 9th December, 1883.—In the first audience with the Holy Father we spoke long about his Letter to the three Cardinals on history. I told him it had made an impression in England; that our papers had written largely about it, that

our histories were mistrusted as partial and dissembling; that his Canon about hiding nothing and writing sincere history would gain much confidence in England. I said, *Se l' Evangelista non ha celato il peccato e la caduta del Giuda, perchè dobbiamo noi celare il peccato di vescovi ed altri personaggi?* The Holy Father took this up as a text and spoke long and fully in the same sense. But this means a new historical dispensation (see Symonds's *Rinascimento*, etc.). I then said that such a history would separate the human element from the divine in the Christian world, and would show the divine organisation and life of the Church as in the beginning; for God created the Church, and the Church created the Christian world of nations and kingdoms which are departing from the Faith and destroying themselves. He took up and continued the same.

He then said that he intended to call to Rome from each country one or two men versed in their own history; and he bid me select and recommend some for England.

The Case of Mgr. Capel and the Holy Office

One of the causes which led to Cardinal Manning's reluctant visit to Rome in 1883 was the case of Mgr. Capel, which was then under consideration at the Holy Office. Mgr. Capel had made for himself many friends in Rome. Plausible in manner, adroit in discovering the weak side in the character of those whom he sought to influence, and audacious in the charges which he insinuated against Cardinal Manning, Mgr. Capel had succeeded in making some of the Cardinals and influential personages in Rome believe that he was the victim of false charges—charges only too readily and eagerly accepted by Cardinal Manning. Mgr. Capel had been suspended from his office as priest in the Diocese of Westminster; and had appealed to Rome against the sentence pronounced by the Cardinal Archbishop.

The Holy Office investigated the case against Mgr. Capel and heard all he had to say in his defence. Cardinal Bilio, Secretary of the Holy Office, appears to have listened too readily to the statements made in defence, that Cardinal Manning, jealous of Mgr. Capel's influence as a preacher, of his success in the work of winning converts

to the Church, of his social popularity, had acted towards him under the influence of prejudice and passion.

Cardinal Manning, naturally indignant at such calumnious insinuations, and still more so by far at the report that Mgr. Capel was to be restored to his office, intimated in a private letter to Cardinal Bilio, the Secretary of the Holy Office, that if such an attempt were made he must find a new Archbishop for Westminster. That Cardinal Manning would have resigned his See, if a priest suspended for grave moral offences had been sent back to the diocese, is beyond doubt or question.

Cardinal Manning has left on record the following statement in a Note, dated February 1887 :—

The Holy Father directed Cardinal Bilio as Secretary of the Holy Office to confer with me on the Decree of January last on Mgr. Capel's case.

Therefore on Sundays, November 18, 25, and December 2, I had full conversations.

In the first he defended the Decree of September 1882 as juridically necessary, and the treating Mgr. Capel as acquitted as consequently just.

But he said that they all believed him to be guilty ; and that he was not *dimisso ex capite innocentis*.[1] He tried to say that the Decree of January was not a Decree till the formalities and the terms made it effective.

I then said that its three heads are founded : (1) upon error ; (2) upon falsehood ; and (3) upon the incredible.

I denied absolutely the accusation against my clergy, and showed the falsehood of the documents.

He then said that it seemed that I had been impelled by "passion." I said when I see an ———— priest in the midst of souls purchased by the passion of our Lord upon the Cross I acknowledge that I am *appassionato*. This changed his tone. And as I left he excused himself for having used the word. Nevertheless on the two following Sundays he repeated the same, more strongly.

On November 28 he told me that the Decree of January he had never seen, that he was not then Secretary, that Cardinal Panebianco was too ill to attend. It had therefore been the

[1] Cardinal Bilio maintained that according to law Mgr. Capel must be dismissed from the court, not on the ground of his innocence, but because the process in London, against which Mgr. Capel appealed, was null for grave omission of the legal forms.

work of Salua and Laurenzi, that the Cardinal had probably only heard a verbal statement and desired a letter to be written, that the Holy Father had certainly never heard or read it. It bore no signature, and was sent to me by Cardinal Simeoni incorporated in a letter of his own. Cardinal Bilio said that it was *troppo dura.* I said *dura* is not the word, *è l' opera di una mano subordinata e meno educata.* He did not deny this. I then said this is not the way to write to a Bishop, still less to a Cardinal. I have never so written to the humblest priest in my diocese. The Bishops complain justly of this way of addressing them.

On the following Wednesday I was in the Ante-camera. He came out from the Holy Father and said that I should have a Letter, that he had read my answers of February, and that the answer on the spiritual head was *Vittoriosamente*, etc.

On Sunday, December 2, we went over the same ground. He admitted still more the impropriety of the Letter, and said I should have a letter about it.

But I look for a censure of the *manner* and an implied re-assertion of the matter. I urged the impossibility of judging *ex parte* statements in the absence of witnesses.

He answered with warmth and so did I. I said it is the way to commit essential injustice.

He began again about "passion." I said I have never had to accuse myself in confession of passion in all these years. I have been censured by many for being slow and unduly forbearing by those who on the spot have known and seen everything.

I am censured for passion by those afar off who have no knowledge but Mgr. Capel's *ex parte* statements. Cardinal Bilio once said to the Bishop of Ratisbon and to me, *Non ita sunt tractandæ res Ecclesiæ.* I have now to say it to him.

These three conversations have more profoundly convinced me of the incapacity of the Holy Office in such cases, and the essential injustice of its procedures and its secrecy.

I left with him :—

1. A copy of the Decree of January.
2. My answer of February.
3. My Letter to the Holy Father in May.
4. A Letter pointing out what I asked of Holy Office.
5. A private letter to himself in which I reminded him that any attempt to send Mgr. Capel back to England would need my removal from the See of Westminster.

He again and again said "*ritorno in Inghilterra impossibile.*"

I also told the same to Cardinals Simeoni, Monaco, Nina, and Howard.

I have exhausted my duty, as I told Cardinal Bilio. I shall now do no more till they compel me.

I resolved not to speak to the Holy Father unless he began the subject.

He did not, but by deputing Cardinal Bilio gave me to understand that he wished not to treat it in person.

He said last year to Bishop Coffin, "These are personal things, I am obliged to leave them to Holy Office." He would have said the same to me. It would have been out of time in the midst of his great anxieties to have forced mine upon him.

And I had greater things to speak of for England than a personal and private cross.

If need be I can write to Holy Father at any moment. Any importunity would be put down to passion.

I have ascertained—

1. That my answer of February was received by the Holy Office in February and no answer given to me.

2. That the Assessor said he had never seen it in May to F. Butler.

3. That my letter to the Holy Father on May 28 must have been given to Laurenzi, for in June my answer was before the Holy Office.

4. And yet no answer was given. Ten months and not a word.

I look for a re-assertion. Their pride will not let them say after all that the earth moves.

But there will be no correction of all this. Therefore the Italians are in Rome, and divine Providence will correct it, "but so as by fire."

February 6, 1887.—The correction came. The Pope commanded Cardinal Bilio to write to me, and ordered the return of the Letter from the Westminster Archives. I sent it back, but kept a copy.

And now at last poor Capel is suspended *a divinis* by the Holy Office.

They might have saved him.

In all its processes the Holy Office requires as indispensable strict proof legally offered. Cardinal Bilio, the Prefect of Propaganda, raised an objection on account of the non-observance of the proper legal formalities by Cardinal Manning in his process against Mgr. Capel.

The effect of the suspension pronounced by the Holy Office was to deprive Mgr. Capel throughout the Catholic world

of the right of officiating as a priest.[1] The sentence never repealed, is in force to this day. Such a Decree, moreover, proved that Cardinal Manning was in the right, and had just and ample cause for the measures he was compelled by his duty as Archbishop to take against Mgr. Capel.

Cardinal Manning's visit to Rome in 1883 was the last of the twenty-two visits he paid to the Eternal city. The first was in 1838—the year after his wife's death—when the mind of the Evangelical Rector of Lavington was still unawakened by Catholic ideas or impressions, still unmoved by the glories of the Church in the City of the Popes. The second was in 1848 when Pope Pius IX. was edified at the sight of the Protestant Archdeacon of Chichester kneeling for the Papal Blessing in the streets of Rome. The third visit was when Manning came as a newly ordained priest to study theology at the threshold of the Apostles. Each of the twenty-two visits had its own special significance, its own gift, its hope and promise, its triumph, its blessing; or maybe, as in all things human, its disappointment or sorrow or humiliation. The end of this long series of visits to the Eternal City was come at last. The Vatican, which had known him so long, was to know him no longer. For five-and-forty years he had known and visited Rome; but he was to visit it no more during the last nine years of his long and busy life.

A man's last act be it what it may, his last farewell, has always something pathetic about it. But I can hardly conceive anything of its kind more pathetic than Cardinal Manning's last farewell to the Eternal City—the City of the Popes, especially of Pope Pius IX.—which he had known so long and loved so well.

His farewell to Rome in 1883 was the close of by far the most important, the most interesting period of Cardinal Manning's career. His active relations with Rome for twenty-five years—from 1858 to 1883—with the curious episodes, struggles, correspondences, and disclosures which

[1] For some years after suspension by Cardinal Manning, Mgr. Capel officiated as priest in America; but suspension *a divinis* by the Holy Office is universal.

form part of these relations, stamp his career with its peculiar distinction. It is not what he spoke or wrote which, though graceful in diction, was wanting in originality and depth, that people care about or remember, or what history will have to record, but what he did. His life from beginning to end was a life of action. It was his work as an ecclesiastical statesman, inspired by a vivid belief in the Supernatural and devoted to the sacred Cause of the Papacy, which was the foundation of his fame and the source of the unique interest which attaches to his career and character.

Everything else, in comparison, is of lesser moment, of lower public concern. When his career as an ecclesiastical statesman came to a close, fortunately for himself, for his fellow-countrymen, for his own people, and for England, his unexhausted energies did not run to waste, nor his unresting spirit fret itself to shreds and tatters in a state of enforced quietude. A career as Philanthropist, as a Reformer of abuses, as a fellow-worker with men of every creed and calling in the relief of distress, of misfortune, and of poverty, was still open to him. How he pursued his benevolent purposes, and with what results, is told in the following chapter.

CHAPTER XXII

PHILANTHROPIST, POLITICIAN, AND SOCIAL REFORMER

1871-1890

PHILANTHROPIST

CARDINAL MANNING was well endowed by mental and moral qualities for the noble duties of a philanthropist. He was quick of eye, tender of heart. For the sufferings of the poor and the sick, for the toiling masses, under-fed and ill-housed, he had not merely a sentimental, but a practical sympathy. To relieve distress, to lighten the burden of poverty and its hardships, he trusted not to eleemosynary methods alone; but, tracing the causes of the evil to the root, sought to discover an effectual remedy capable, if not of removing altogether, of mitigating the sorrows and sufferings of the poor and the unemployed thrown out of work by illness, by bad seasons, or by stagnation in trade. As rector of a rural village in Sussex, he had been acquainted with the hardships and sufferings, in that day but too common, in the lives and in the homes of shepherds and agricultural labourers; and had learnt at Lavington early in life his first lesson in practical sympathy. As Archbishop of Westminster, however, he was brought face to face with poverty of a widely different type, on an immeasurably vaster scale, of a far deeper intensity. He saw under his very eyes a huge mass of suffering humanity, hopeless, helpless, and almost dumb. An inarticulate cry of despair went up to heaven day by day, night after night, from the slums of Westminster—his own diocese; from the

courts and purlieus and alleys of the East End; from the holes and corners, garrets and hovels in the centre of the big city to its furthermost ends. Archbishop Manning felt painfully the contrast between his position in early days at Lavington—where he was known and revered; where his counsel and aid were gratefully accepted; where it was alike his right and duty to act—and his position, at all events at first, as a Catholic bishop in London. In London he was unknown to the mass of the people, to the suffering poor, to the outcasts of society, to the toiling masses. As a Catholic bishop he was looked upon in those days of ignorance or suspicion as an alien—almost as an enemy. Moved by the instincts of his nature, called by his duty as bishop—for he knew that vast numbers of the suffering poor in London, of the outcasts, of the criminals, belonged by birth and baptism to his own household of the Faith—he made up his mind to take public action against the joint evil of pauperism and crime, the curse of modern civilisation. Words were of no avail; for speaking in his own pulpit was like to one crying in the wilderness, his words did not touch even the fringe of the evil, did not reach the ears of those responsible for the well-being of the community, nor of those philanthropists like-minded with himself, whose co-operation he stood most in need of, and desired most.

The opportunity happily came which introduced Archbishop Manning into public life and action as a philanthropist. I have already elsewhere related how he was invited by the Lord Mayor to join the Committee of the Mansion House French Relief Fund during the Franco-German War in 1870-1871, what special services he rendered, and how cordially he co-operated with his colleagues on the Committee. This was the opportune occasion of his first attendance at the Mansion House—the centre of every social and philanthropic movement in the country. It was the beginning of his public career as a fellow-worker with his countrymen in the active duties of social life.

Hitherto Archbishop Manning had been known only as the advocate of an unpopular Cause—a zealous controversialist, a defender of the Papacy, a prominent member of the

Vatican Council. His new career, on the other hand, as a philanthropist gave full play to his powers of organisation and administration; brought him into close contact with leaders of the philanthropic and social movements of the country, like Lord Shaftesbury and other active and benevolent men. The conciliatory attitude displayed by Archbishop Manning, his tact and earnestness of purpose, won the esteem and confidence even of those who, unaccustomed to the presence in their midst of a Catholic priest or bishop, were, perhaps, at first disposed out of religious bigotry to resent such co-operation. But the Archbishop's prudence, his singleness of mind and oneness of heart with his non-Catholic fellow-workers in the cause of philanthropy or charity, had such happy results that henceforth his presence was welcomed and his aid eagerly sought for in every social or charitable movement. As time went on no public meeting at the Mansion House was held for Social or Charitable purposes without Cardinal Manning's presence and active co-operation.

In the year following his presence on the Committee of the Mansion House for the relief of the starving poor in Paris during the siege, Archbishop Manning presided over the International Prison Congress. Since in those days Catholics in England were not accustomed to see their priests or bishops take an active part in meetings which were not exclusively religious — indeed his Irish people in London were somewhat jealous of the public fellowship of their Archbishop with Protestants and Dissenters — Manning thought it expedient to give the following explanation :—

> When I was called upon to preside over this Meeting, I felt it my duty to do so as neutrally as possible. That is to say, holding a profound conviction that on all these occasions which laid on my conscience a public duty, I am bound to be as outspoken, I may say as explicit and determined in expressing what I believe, as my office requires; so on all other occasions, when I am not bound to make these declarations or to bear these testimonies, I desire to identify myself with the majority of those whom I love and respect. But outside the circle and the pale of that one subject, I know of no other relating to our political, our social, our industrial welfare, in which it is not in my power

to work with the same energy and the same entire devotion of heart and feeling as any other man in England.

To account for this apparent apology for an English Catholic's fulfilling his public duty as a citizen, it is perhaps necessary to explain that extreme Irish politicians in London found fault then, and long afterwards, with Archbishop Manning for that he was only too ready to lend a helping hand to every public movement but the Irish movement. They remembered, too, against him that, fulfilling his duty as Bishop, he had condemned Fenianism as a secret society excommunicated by the Holy See. Manning was rightly careful in not increasing his unpopularity among a certain section of the Irish poor under his spiritual rule, by expounding for their benefit the Christian duty of citizenship. In the same year, Archbishop Manning attended and spoke at several meetings at the Mansion House in promotion of "Hospital Sunday"; his appeals on behalf of the sick and suffering poor in London were perhaps the most effective and touching of the speeches delivered. An annual Collection for "Hospital Sunday" was ordered in the diocese of Westminster.

One of the incidental effects of Manning's public action was to make, in his own person as its Head, the Catholic Church better known to the people of England. By his own example he made it clear to the public eye that English Catholics were not an exclusive set of men, self-centred, or intent only on their own religious interests, or out of touch with popular wants or feelings, or with the intellectual movements of the day—alien, in a word, to the public life of England. Manning, indeed, did not change—for there was no need—the hearts and minds of English Catholics, for they were always amongst the most loyal subjects of the Queen, always good citizens and true to their country. However, he did them a great service in breaking down the prejudice against Catholicism, which still lingered, like an evil tradition, in the hearts and minds of men; still rested like a stain upon the popular imagination. By his own mode of action, he bore public testimony on their behalf;

and by the influence of his personality he made it clear to the mind of England that, apart from religious faith, in all matters of public concern, or in every movement to promote the well-being or happiness of their common country, English Catholics were of one mind and one heart with the rest of their fellow-countrymen.

Cardinal Manning treasured to the end of his days as a memorial of his first public work at the Mansion House, the bronze Medal presented to him at the close of "The Mansion House French Relief Fund" by its President. The following letter accompanied the gift:—

The Mansion House French Relief Fund.

MANSION HOUSE, 21*st November* 1871.

MY LORD—I am directed by the late Lord Mayor, Mr. Alderman Dakin, as President of the French Relief Fund, to present you with the accompanying Bronze Medal, the Gift of the City of Paris (through M. Leon Say, Prefect of the Seine), to you as a Member of the late Committee, and am, my Lord, yours truly, JOSEPH GIBBS, *Hon. Secy.*

To the Most Rev. Archbishop Manning,
8 York Place, Portman Square, W.

The crown of all Cardinal Manning's labours as a philanthropist was the foundation of the League of the Cross. It was, in the main, the work of his own hands. He was the heart and soul of the League, the leader of the noble crusade against the crime and sorrow of drunkenness. As Archbishop of Westminster he had to recognise the painful fact of the immense "leakage" which was going on in the Catholic Church in England. The frequentation of the Sacraments at the seasons or periods appointed by the Church under pain of excommunication, was out of all fair proportion to the Catholic population in London, as indicated by the Baptismal registers and other like sources of information. In like manner, had at that day a proper proportion of baptised Catholics attended mass on Sundays, or even half of them, the Churches would not have been

large enough to have held them all. The pessimists after their kind cried out aloud, "A leak, a leak, the Church is sinking!" Archbishop Manning, who was by nature the reverse of a pessimist, as his sanguine views about the Anglican Church, up almost to the last, bore witness, in reply to the clamour about religious deterioration compared with the state of things twenty years earlier, said:—There can be no leakage where there is no vessel. The vessel of the Church in England dates only from the restoration of the Hierarchy. In every vessel there must needs be leakage, more or less.

Manning, however, was far too shrewd a man not to perceive that the "leakage," or falling away of Catholics, if not from faith, from religious observances, not only in London but in the big cities of England and Scotland, far exceeded normal or natural proportions. It was borne home on his mind and heart that the chief accounting cause of these sad defections was the vice of drunkenness which, like a wild beast over its prey, raged and ravaged among the poorer members of his flock, to the ruin both of body and soul. To the vice of drunkenness, which at that day was so prevalent among them, he rightly imputed far more than half of their poverty and misery, and nearly all their crime and neglect of religion and its duties. To such a man as Manning the manifestation of such a vice with all its evil consequences, religious and social, was like a clarion-call to battle. With wonted prudence, he surveyed the battle-field; reconnoitered the enemy's camp, its approaches and its defences; made tentative moves in advance. To see with his own eye the horrors he had heard of, accompanied by a single priest Archbishop Manning penetrated into one of the slums abutting on Drury Lane. The sight which he witnessed filled his heart with an infinite pity for the victims of the vice, but with an equally infinite horror of the crime of drunkenness.[1] Counting the cost to himself and to others of an unrelenting warfare against the crime of drunkenness

[1] It was on one of these visits that an Irish apple-woman at the corner of the court threw herself on her knees and cried out, "God bless your Iminence;" adding, "but the Divil take your cook."

in all its forms and degrees, without a moment's hesitation, Archbishop Manning donned the armour of a crusader against the enemy of God and man, which he never took off to the last hour of his life.

Cardinal Manning, I know, has been accused even by bishops and priests of lack of judgment and moderation in the conduct of this crusade. It was imputed to him that in his unmeasured denunciations of the habit of drinking something stronger, brighter, and better, maybe, for many than mere water—an innocent practice in itself—he was laying a new burden on the consciences of men.[1] It was even alleged that he was at fault in his moral Theology.

If Cardinal Manning in theory or language was intemperate at times in his advocacy of Temperance, or if discretion on occasions took French leave of judgment, or if in the matter of Total Abstinence he looked at only one side of the question, and was intolerant of any view opposed to his own will, What then? Such mistakes or exaggerations do not count for much in comparison with attaining the end he had in view. A fault under certain circumstances is sometimes a virtue, as was Nelson's putting the telescope to his blind eye at the battle of Copenhagen. Manning's eye, maybe, was wilfully blind to the warning signals of timid friends or cautious advisers. Yet he won the battle against the vice of drunkenness, so far, at any rate, as is given to a man, who was not a worker of miracles, to change the hearts of men, for he carried captive from the camp of the enemy thousands or tens of thousands; and enrolled in the course of time hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children in the army of the League of the Cross. What though the apostle of Temperance was accounted a fanatic! What great philanthropic or social Reform has ever been carried without a touch of fanaticism, which is only enthusiasm gone mad for a while.

Cardinal Manning had in him all the stuff to make a successful philanthropist; tenacity of purpose, an un-

[1] It was said at the time in jest, that Cardinal Manning encouraged the practice of Divorce, by putting asunder the legitimate union between brandy and soda.

bending will, a horror of evil, not only in its consequences, but in itself. Even his faults added new strength to his action. His mind once made up, and not on this question alone, he listened to no counsellor. He refused even to look at the other side of the shield presented to his view. If men, however wise or benevolent, differed from him in judgment, so much the worse for them and their counsel. Persuaded in his own mind that his view of a question was the right view, there was no room or standing-place for doubt or hesitation. Whatever may be said against such a frame or temper of mind in a legislator or law-giver, it was an immense aid as far as it went, whether wise or no, to the active work of a philanthropist or reformer. Such absolute certitude, and such reliance on his own judgment imparted directness and force to his action. Against such an opponent, protected, like Ajax, by a seven-fold shield, not material but moral, composed of self-confidence, self-will, obstinacy, horror of sin, sympathy with its victims, indifference to hurt, contempt of blame, there was no fighting. In his crusade against drunkenness, the Giant, Cardinal Manning possessed the strength of Goliath and the dexterity of David. The tongue in his head was a weapon as effective as the stone in David's sling.

In a very brief autobiographical Note, Cardinal Manning gives the following account of the origin and success of the League of the Cross :—

As to the League of the Cross I have said so much that I have nothing to say. It began in a meeting in the school of the Italian Church. It has now over thirty branches in London, and nearly twenty in England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland. Its four festivals, St. Patrick, Whit-Monday Procession to the Crystal Palace, and Father Mathew's Birthday, have been like the four Solemnities of the Church.

Though not mentioned in the above brief Note, Father Nugent, now the Right Rev. Mgr. Nugent,[1] together with a few faithful adherents to Teetotalism, who had received the

[1] In one of his later speeches on Total Abstinence, Cardinal Manning described Father Nugent as "the second Father Mathew in the nineteenth century."

pledge from Father Mathew and kept it, took an active part with Archbishop Manning in founding the total abstinence League of the Cross. Manning brought to bear all his powers of organisation in promoting the efficiency of the League. He presided at monthly meetings at Archbishop's House. He attended public meetings too numerous to recount; he appealed to thousands and tens of thousands on various occasions and in different places. He spoke at open-air meetings to thousands of working men in Hyde Park, on Tower Hill, in Trafalgar Square. The Catholic Archbishop in supporting the Temperance movement was warmly welcomed at Exeter Hall as a fellow-worker, and was invited to preside over a meeting called together for the purpose of forming a new Temperance Association. In his speech he alluded to Father Mathew as follows:—

The last act of Father Mathew was to receive the pledge from those who stood round his death-bed. I desire no better end for my reverend brethren around me, no better end for myself.

One of the most ingenious devices for checking drunkenness among a section of his own flock, was the "Truce of St. Patrick," to which was attached an Indulgence, under the usual conditions, to all those who pledged themselves to abstain during three days, the feast of St. Patrick, its eve and the day following, from intoxicating drink. Manning appealed to Mgr. Talbot to obtain from Pope Pius IX. a special Indulgence for all who faithfully observed "The Truce of St. Patrick." It was a most judicious arrangement, for it appealed to the two strongest feelings in the Irish heart, Religion and Nationality. It was a signal success. Order and sobriety took the place of the customary orgies which had so long disgraced the Festival, and had brought into public disrepute the Catholic faith and the Irish name. The public-houses during the Truce of St. Patrick were religiously shunned. The police-courts were empty. The great gain, which promised well for future success, was the gradual formation of habits of self-restraint. The practice was extended by a pledge taken by men and women not to enter a public-

house on Saturdays and Sundays throughout the year; though the Archbishop in a Pastoral Letter exhorted his people to take such a pledge, it was not attended by anything approaching to the success of the Truce of St. Patrick.

In the year 1872, the League of the Cross was fairly launched. Archbishop Manning himself took the "pledge," provoked thereto at a meeting of working men in Southwark. On saying that his doctors would not allow him to take the pledge, a working man at the end of the hall cried out, "Never mind the doctors, come and see what good it has done us in our homes." Besides the League of the Cross, the Archbishop gave his support to the "permissive prohibition" policy of the United Kingdom Alliance, and spoke more than once at its meetings in Manchester. He joined hands with Sir Wilfrid Lawson, and warmly supported his legislative attempts to control the liquor traffic. At a public meeting in St. James's Hall, Archbishop Manning, speaking in support of Sir Wilfrid Lawson's Permissive Bill, came in for a fair share of Sir Wilfrid's unpopularity. Manning was just as much at home at open-air meetings as in crowded halls. His earnestness and enthusiasm and quiet humour laid hold of the attention of his hearers; and his pathos at times touched the hearts of crowded meetings of working men on Clerkenwell Green, at London Fields, and on Tower Hill. He seemed to enjoy his rough and rude surroundings. As a platform speaker he was never dull. The ringing applause gave him additional animation; he was put out by no interruption; irritated by no angry words; he had always a ready retort at hand, or a good-humoured suggestion.

Then, his ascetic appearance was in his favour. The absence of stateliness and formality, his kindly manner and homely phrase endeared him to the motley crowds of men rough in manner, but quick of perception, to whose hearts he appealed, not without success. But where is the need, if even it were possible, to chronicle the speeches innumerable, delivered on platforms so various, by this indefatigable apostle of Total Abstention. As time went on, Cardinal Manning, far from losing his first fervours, redoubled his

efforts and unceasing labours. His pleadings, his taking illustrations, his fierce denunciations of the Demon, drink, were almost as familiar in Manchester and Liverpool and other large cities as in London. He never spared himself; his autumn holidays for years were spent in the North of England in carrying on his crusade against drunkenness. In company with Bishop Hedley of Newport and Menevia, he went from town to town on what Cardinal Manning used to call his "walking and talking tours." This fruitful work among the sturdy men of the North was his great delight, and its successful result, its own reward.

One of the greatest trials of increasing age and infirmities was the necessity of giving up this active work in his autumnal holiday some six or seven years before his death.

What, perhaps, most excited public attention in London and impressed the popular mind most was the annual procession of the League of the Cross on Whit-Monday to the Crystal Palace. The first of these public demonstrations of the League at the Crystal Palace was inaugurated by Archbishop Manning on the 24th of August 1874. He presided over a crowded meeting in the Opera Theatre, and in the evening addressed the immense crowds assembled in the gardens, in a powerful and touching speech, which excited enthusiastic applause on every side. Many men burst out into sobs at the Archbishop's vivid picture of the desolation of heart and home caused by the terrible vice of drunkenness. At the annual recurrence of these public demonstrations of the League of the Cross at the Crystal Palace the members, marshalled by their "officers" and accompanied by banners and brass bands, were in the habit of assembling at the Thames Embankment. In emulation of "General" Booth and the Salvation Army, Cardinal Manning gratified the dramatic instincts of his Irish sons by bestowing on their leaders military titles, if not of "general," of "major" or "captain"; and by creating them his "Body-guards" and adorning them with a red sash as uniform. The march past the Cardinal at the Crystal Palace, and the beating of drums, and the marshalling of the soldiers of the League of the Cross by the Cardinal "Guards," excited enthusiasm and

attracted public attention. Besides the enrolled members of the League, numbering many thousands, their friends and sympathisers in still greater numbers attended these demonstrations; and, coupled with the ordinary Whit-Monday holiday-makers and sight-seers, filled the Crystal Palace with such enormous crowds as were never gathered together on any other occasion.[1]

In the course of time, the zealous apostle of Total Abstinence was rewarded by the results of his crusade. Magistrates in the police courts bore public testimony to the improvement that had taken place. Their time was no longer taken up by trying on the days following St. Patrick's Day, and other great Feasts, cases of drunkenness, disorder, and faction fights. Women maddened by drink no longer unsexed themselves. The police reported that whole districts, especially the courts and alleys where, owing to the state of drunkenness and riot, it was unsafe for strangers and even for a single constable to enter, were now to a large extent reformed by the Temperance movement. It was not merely a temporary but an abiding reform.

The daily papers, which had so fiercely attacked Cardinal Manning for his manly defence of the Vatican Council and for his outspoken support of the Temporal Power, were the first, with characteristic justice and generosity, to recognise and do honour to Cardinal Manning. The *Standard*, in 1874, paid the following just tribute to Archbishop Manning and the League of the Cross:—

> The League has been formed mainly by the untiring exertions of that great apostle of Temperance, Archbishop Manning, who has never ceased to strive for the cause, not only of temperance, but of total abstinence. That he has been to a great extent successful may be judged by the fact that the League now numbers many scores of thousands throughout the United Kingdom, and that in London alone their 28,000 members

[1] Cardinal Manning proposed to the managers that no alcoholic liquors should be sold at the Crystal Palace on the occasion of the visit of the League of the Cross. Their answer was, "On no other occasion are our profits so large on the sale of liquors." No doubt, it was not the Leaguers themselves but their friends who drank to the prosperity of the League.

shows that the Association has done good work amongst the humbler classes of the Catholic population of the metropolis. Very many of these have now taken the pledge, and have kept it most firmly. Thus habits of temperance become, as it were, inoculated and habitual. Of the value of such a League, no man who has seen the evils arising from intoxication can doubt. Yesterday the proceedings were of a semi-religious character, for there was a large meeting held in the Opera Theatre at which Archbishop Manning presided. After five o'clock the Archbishop addressed a crowded meeting in the gardens, where he urged, with a homely eloquence that at times was real pathos, the evils of intemperance both mental and bodily. Certainly the cause of Abstinence has never found a more able advocate, and we wish his Grace every success.

Another leading paper at a later date wrote as follows :—

Who can tell to what an extent the Cardinal's advocacy of the teetotal movement has aided him in winning over the minds of the masses? He knows that excessive drinking is a most destructive vice, he knows that temperance is a most praiseworthy virtue, and he knows, too, that teetotalers as a class are increasing in numbers, and the benefits to be derived to religion from that increase. Of course there are some that rail at all this, and treat such a course of conduct with objections; but they are, as a rule, men who understand very little of the masses, and are greatly ignorant of what must be done to win them. They may accuse the energetic Cardinal who, to serve his flock and his Church, does not hesitate to deprive himself of any enjoyment or rest, so long as he may succeed in bringing over the former to his way of thinking. But while they are laughing, he is working, and with what success let any one who knows London and its people well attempt to estimate.

What was especially trying to the eager temper of the apostle of Total Abstinence, was the opinion entertained by many of the clergy and some of the bishops that, in his denunciations of intoxicating drink, Cardinal Manning not only exceeded sometimes the bounds of discretion and prudence, but advanced statements which seemed to many not in strict accord with theological teaching. As long as the opposition to his views and to the line he had taken in the Temperance movement was kept out of the papers, it might be ignored or borne in patience. But patience gave

way to irritation and resentment when his conduct was publicly impugned by the Bishop of Nottingham, Dr. ——, in a protest under the signature "Senex"; when for weeks the *Tablet* was filled with letters on the one side calling in question the views and line of action of the Cardinal Archbishop, and on the other defending his conduct and teaching. Cardinal Manning, who could ill brook opposition to his will, and still less criticism of his conduct or teaching, especially by members of his own clergy or by a brother bishop, was even more painfully affected by the publicity given to the quarrel. His pet policy was to keep up appearances of unity among Catholics by suppressing or keeping out of sight differences of opinion—not on matters of faith, but on questions of policy or conduct.

This amiable weakness, this aversion to the spirit of criticism among Catholics, from the nature of things too often defeating its own ends, was rudely affronted by a public controversy in the Catholic papers—worse than all since the subject of the controversy was himself—the conduct and teaching of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster.

This humiliation Cardinal Manning, in the spirit of a martyr, offered up as an act of self-sacrifice in the cause of Temperance. Traces, however, of natural human feeling are disclosed in the following letter (1888) to a priest who in the *Tablet* had defended the conduct and line of the Cardinal:—

I thank you much for your letter, and more for your letter in the *Tablet* of last week. The letters of last week were in a majority good; what this week, like to-morrow, may bring forth, I cannot tell. But do not be out of heart. If we were ever on God's side in a battle, it is now, when we are using, *i.e.* giving up our Christian liberty for the salvation of souls. If others think to save more souls by using their liberty to drink wine, let us wait for the Last Day. I have borne years of reproval and shame in this matter, and I often say, "I am a fool for Christ's sake." Why should you or I be afraid. *Si hominibus placerem, non essem servus Jesu Christi.* I am so deliberately, maturely, and calmly certain of every reason and principle involved in what we are doing, that I look on this *Tablet* work as part of our gain. I had heard before, but I will not believe it,

that "Senex" is one of my colleagues. Lest it should not be so, I will not write in the *Tablet;* lest it should be, I hope next month to have many opportunities of saying what is necessary; and we must not complain. And now, do not fear. When I began, only two priests in London helped me. Now there are about forty. And the young ones from St. Thomas's have for years been attending our meetings, and almost all are doing something. Everything is going onward. God forbid that we, Catholic priests, should be left behind in self-denial for the love of souls by those who are not in the Unity of the Truth. "I will provoke you to jealousy by that which is not a nation; by a foolish nation I will anger you." This is a sharp rebuke. Write on and work on, and may God be with you.

One of the indirect consequences of Cardinal Manning's noble work in the cause of Temperance was the gradual winning of the affections of his Irish people in London. His untiring labours, his patience and perseverance soon convinced them of his sincerity and zeal on their behalf. For the cause of Temperance was practically the Irish cause in London. He did not in his sermons rebuke them; it was the vice of drunkenness he denounced, not its victims. In simple words he appealed to their hearts; and their hearts were touched by his paternal sympathy. It was a sight, once seen not lightly forgotten, to watch the eager faces, flushed with emotion, of those masses of men and women listening to the pathetic words of the ascetic Cardinal, as he described the sorrows of drunkenness and its sin. Preaching on St. Patrick's Day in the Church of St. Patrick's, Soho, with what tenderness of heart did he not adjure the sons of St. Patrick in the name of religion and of Ireland; for the honour of God and the salvation of their souls; for the sake of their children and their homes; for the love and good name of Ireland, to take the pledge and keep it. The hearts of this warm-hearted and sensitive race were won by the respect and affection with which Cardinal Manning always spoke of Ireland, the sympathy he showed for its sorrows and sufferings. Ireland was the "martyr-nation," the "Apostle of the Faith" in every English-speaking land.

It was not only the Irish in London who looked upon

him as their father and benefactor. In Ireland itself, after the work of the League of the Cross had borne fruits in reclaiming such multitudes from lives of squalor, misery, and vice, the name of Cardinal Manning was held in reverence; he was spoken of in terms of gratitude and affection, and regarded as the friend and benefactor of the Irish race.

In everything human, in every movement or reform evil will at times be found and abuses creep in. And such was the case in the League of the Cross and its organisation. The "Cardinal's Guards" here and there presumed too much at times on the kind way in which Cardinal Manning was in the habit of treating them, and the familiar intercourse, at least in his latter years, which he permitted. These leaders of the League, his Body-guard as they called themselves, were in the habit of attending at Archbishop's House, Westminster, once a week, and reporting on the progress of the League. At times some of these "Captains" of the League so far forgot themselves as to comment adversely on the conduct of the priests in regard to the League. In "this mission" the leaders of the League were treated with scant respect; in "that" cold water was thrown on their efforts. Too many priests, it was reported, persistently declined to become total Abstainers; others were opposed to the movement altogether, or declared that in some ways it did more harm than good; and many others averred that total Abstinence was not needed in their missions. These reports were conveyed to Cardinal Manning, and in some instances grossly exaggerated statements were made. Some of these "captains" had unhappily the ear of the Cardinal.

The consequence was that a few of them gave themselves airs; regarded themselves, as total Abstainers, in a position of moral superiority to priests who were not; boasted of their intimacy with Cardinal Manning, of their weekly tea-meetings at Archbishop's House, and looked upon themselves as possessed of greater authority and importance in the diocese, and more closely concerned in the well-doing of missions, than priests who were not total

Abstainers and in their lives had never spoken to the Cardinal Archbishop.

On one occasion, at a Temperance meeting held in a school-room, one of these "Body-guards," more impudent than his fellows, ascending the platform announced that he had just been commissioned by the Cardinal Archbishop to give his blessing to the meeting. Suiting the action to the word this "captain" of the Body-guard in the presence of the parish priest and of others pronounced in due form the Episcopal blessing. Some of the priests put on their hats and left the room.

Such an incident in itself, and other acts of a like kind, would have been beneath notice did they not indicate the sort of influence exercised by some of the leaders of the League of the Cross as well as the confidence placed in their "weekly reports." The tenour of these "reports," adverse to the priests in the matter of total Abstinence, accounts in no small measure for the contrast between the priests and the people which Cardinal Manning draws in the following Note:—

I think it was St. Guy of Tours who said in the Arian times that the ears of the faithful were purer than the lips of the priests. In the total Abstinence movement the aspiration of our people has been higher than that of the clergy. The chief discouragement has come from priests. Every bishop knows the scandals and sorrows he has in priests, not only in drunkards, but in those who are never seen to be drunk but are lowered in mind and soul by suspected and unsuspected drink. And yet some will not move. I have deliberately made myself "a fool for Christ's sake" in this matter, and set my face as a flint. When I thought in Paris that I might never come back in 1877, one of my happiest thoughts was that "we had saved many poor drunkards." I hope whosoever comes after me will have the courage to face the criticism and the ridicule of not the fools only, but the half-hearted wise. Our poor men are an example and a rebuke to us. They founded and have maintained the League of the Cross: we have only led it.

In spite of incidental mistakes; errors of judgment or faults of temper; too ready a reliance on reports or hearsay evidence; and occasionally erroneous estimates of men and

things, the League of the Cross is the crown of Cardinal Manning's life, and the most lasting memorial to his work as a philanthropist.

Among a series of Notes, autobiographical and otherwise written in the year 1890—the year in which all his journals and diaries were brought to their close—is the following Note on the League of the Cross:—

There is no doubt that fastidiousness, fear of ridicule and dislike, keep the middle class away from the League of the Cross. The fine gentleman heresy, the high life below stairs, and the free living of the middle class have kept educated and half educated laymen and priests from joining.

For years I stood almost alone. Father Police, Father Crescibelli, Father Lockhart, and Father Richardson helped me. Gradually here and there a parish priest, driven by the drunkenness of his people, began to move. The Marists, the Palottini, the Oblates of Tower Hill came in. Then many of the clergy, then the Dominicans and Oblates of St. Charles, and now every large mission in the diocese has its branch or its equivalent. Year by year at the Crystal Palace we have about eighty priests, and they are nearly the same as those who give the parochial missions.

It is long since we have had any case of intemperance in a priest of the diocese. And this I ascribe largely to the League of the Cross. It has created a Vigilance Society which watches and knows a great deal. But it never finds fault with anybody. The number of total Abstainers among the priests is a minority even of the presidents, but the men do not make any criticism. They would, if a priest were known to be intemperate; but they do not complain that he is not a total Abstainer. There are in London and Southwark about forty-two or forty-three branches, and, I am told, about 1400 men "Guards" and many hundreds of boy "Guards." The number of the people we do not yet know. There is no doubt that a large number who never show themselves have taken the pledge. The number at the Crystal Palace may not all be pledged, but a great part of the 20,000 certainly are, especially young women, and thousands of children. The League has taken hold of the people, especially the working men. It was this that gave me a hold in the Strike of last year, not only of my own men but also of the Englishmen, who were as two to one. I pray God that my successor will humbly and with his whole heart go into the midst of the people as I have tried to do—and will give to the League of the Cross a warm and encouraging countenance.

Politician

In politics, Cardinal Manning was guided more by his feelings and sympathies or personal predilections than by a clear and definitive view or understanding of political principles. In his youth and early manhood he looked upon Democracy and Dissent as fraught with dangers to society, and as hostile to the principles of law and order alike in Church and State. Though he regarded with favour the first Reform Bill of 1831, yet he preferred the tyranny of despotism to the licentiousness of democracy. During the whole of his Anglican life, Manning's politics were ruled by his regard for the interests of the Established Church, to which he was profoundly attached. Catholic Emancipation, the Abolition of Tests, the Commutation of Tithes, were repugnant to him as measures hostile to the Church. He opposed Lord John Russell and the Whigs because they treated the Established Church as if it were, what in fact they believed it to be, a department of the State for the management of the religious concerns of the nation. Lord John Russell's ecclesiastical appointments,[1] his nomination of bishops like Dr. Hampden, his repeated attempts to oust the Church from the management of its schools and to secularise National education, filled the cup of Manning's wrath against the Whigs. In despair, he turned to Sir Robert Peel and the Tories in the hope of serving, in the matter of tithes, the interests of the Established Church. The old Whig doctrine of the "sovereignty of the people," however, survived, and was rooted in Manning's mind alike as Anglican and Catholic.

In his copious Diary, 1844-47, there is no allusion to such secular topics as the repeal of the Corn Laws or the

[1] Speaking on one occasion of her brother's leaving the Anglican Church his sister, Mrs. Austen, remarked with no little warmth, "Do you think we did not all resent with as much sorrow and indignation as dear Henry himself the miserable state of the Church in that evil day? It was all due to Lord John Russell's wretched Ecclesiastical appointments."

On the other hand, in a letter to Mgr. Talbot, Manning at a later period said, "I had often met Lord John Russell at public meetings, and we were to the end always on friendly terms."

Manchester school of politics. In truth, the Archdeacon of Chichester's politics were limited to the narrow range of Anglican interests. He was not, as indeed he himself declared, a politician, but a churchman; and as an Anglican churchman he devoted all his thoughts, his whole time, and all the energies of his mind, as his large correspondence shows, to ecclesiastical causes. Outside of Anglican interests politics had no charm for him. He had no concern for the political claims of Dissent; no understanding of, far less sympathy with, the political rights of Catholics in England or Ireland. He was indeed in favour of the endowment of Maynooth, mainly on the ground that the principle of concurrent endowment would safeguard the temporalities of the Anglican Church and serve as a bulwark against the assaults of Dissenters and the irreligious party. The Archdeacon of Chichester was even ready to throw overboard the Established Church in Ireland as a mere Irish question not worth considering in comparison with Anglican interests. His only fear was that an endowed Catholic Church in Ireland would so strengthen the position of English Catholics as to shift the balance of power and impose upon statesmen the duty of reorganising the defences of the Established Church in England.[1]

Ecclesiastical politics, perhaps from the nature of things, are too often apt to beget or breed narrowness of view. At all events Archdeacon Manning's policy was arraigned at the time as wanting in broad sympathies and devoid of a clearly defined principle. The compromise offered by concurrent endowments was fiercely denounced as a betrayal of the common Protestantism of England and Ireland. Archdeacon Manning was not in the position, or perhaps even in the mood, to declare publicly that he did not believe in Irish Protestantism, though he still did, to a certain extent, in Anglicanism.

Manning's political preferences, apart from ecclesiastical questions, were in no small measure inspired or shaped by his intimacy with Mr. Gladstone and Sidney Herbert, who were of one mind with him in ecclesiastical politics. He might,

[1] See Correspondence with Mr. Gladstone, Vol. I.

broadly speaking, be classed as a Liberal of Mr. Gladstone's school. Like the great statesman, Manning, for instance, was as much opposed to O'Connell and the Repeal of the Union as he was in his Catholic days to Mr. Parnell and Home Rule, until, in the closing years of his life, Cardinal Manning was converted, like his master, to Home Rule proclivities.

In his Catholic life, Manning's politics embraced a far wider field than was open to him as an Anglican. All the concerns of the Catholic world, as far as they touched upon religious interests, came within his purview. Except, perhaps, during his undergraduate days,[1] Manning was opposed to the Revolution and its irreligious principles, whether in Italy and France or in Ireland and Poland. It was as the defender of the Temporal Power of the Pope, as has already been fully related, that Archbishop Manning became first known to the English world. It is worthy of note, as an illustration of his political views, that he based the defence of the Pope's Temporal Power mainly on the ground that it was necessary for the freedom and independence of the Church. Archbishop Manning, perhaps, rather ostentatiously waived aside the argument, or at all events assigned it to a subordinate position in his line of defence, that the sovereignty of the States of the Church was the most ancient and legitimate monarchy in Europe; that the Pope as king was guilty of no such act of tyranny, of no dereliction of public duty as alone would warrant his subjects in resisting his authority, or in rising in rebellion, or give them a right to invoke or accept armed intervention against the legitimate authority of their king. The Revolution has no right, known to the Law of Nations, to release the subjects of a legitimate king from their oath of allegiance and fealty. This principle applies not only to the Pope's Temporal Power or sovereignty, but to the sovereign powers, the hereditary and inherent rights of every legitimate king. The "sovereignty of the people" was an awkward doctrine for a defender of the Temporal Power to admit. It was a

[1] On the outbreak of the Polish Revolution in 1830, in a letter to John Anderdon, Manning, in his enthusiasm, put down in big letters the words: "Huzza for Poland."

concession to the Revolutionary theory that kings, whether Popes or no, were subject to removal from the throne at the vote of the majority—the will of the people. The theory of numbers, invented by the Revolution, took the place, in the mind of the Revolutionary party in Europe, of the Law of Nations. It was on this theory that the overthrow of the Papal throne was justified by the statesmen of Europe, and, notably, by Mr. Gladstone.[1]

For the House of France, for the Italian and Spanish Bourbons, Cardinal Manning had no political sympathy. The Bourbons, indeed, had provoked the fate which has befallen them. Exiles to-day from every throne in Europe, they are expiating the misdeeds of the Past. It was the misrule of the Kings of France, their absolutism and abuse of power, their hostility to the Church, their licentious conduct, reckless luxury and extravagance, and their guilty indifference to the welfare, moral and material, of the people, which precipitated the first French Revolution and did much to provoke its horrors.

In domestic politics Archbishop Manning took no active part. He professed a benevolent neutrality between the two Parties in the State. Yet he strongly objected to English Catholics giving their support to the Tory party. When the Tories were in power, and Catholics urged him to co-operate with them in endeavouring to obtain from the Government the consideration or support of some measure of Catholic interest, Archbishop Manning's almost invariable reply, softened, indeed, by a playful smile, was "A plague o' both your houses. I have no faith in either Party." But when the Whigs were in office he was always ready to give Mr. Gladstone a helping hand, or supply him, on critical occasions, with information as to the views and wishes of Catholics in England.[2]

[1] In his correspondence with Archbishop Manning on the Temporal Power of the Pope, Mr. Gladstone contended that no one had a right, even, as alleged, for the benefit of the Catholic world, to coerce the people of the States of the Church to retain against their will the Pope as king. It was a violation of the principle of modern society—the sovereignty of the people.

[2] On one of these occasions Mr. Gladstone said, "I am much obliged by your information respecting the political views of R. C.'s in England."

I remember on one occasion an animated discussion on politics between W. G. Ward and Archbishop Manning. Ward in his blunt fashion taxed the Archbishop with taking sides with the Irreligious party—the Whigs, whereas in his Anglican days he had given his support to the Tories. Manning retorted, "Quite the contrary; I attacked the Tories at Oxford." "Oh," replied Mr. Ward, laughing, "you mean at the Union; that counts for nothing," and sought to pursue the argument. But the Archbishop of Westminster, irritated at being catechised on his political principles, broke off the discussion abruptly, saying, "I do not support either Whigs or Tories; I trust neither party."

Archbishop Manning always warmly sympathised with the sufferings of Ireland, and bore public witness on many an occasion to the fidelity of the Irish people in holding fast, through bitter and prolonged persecution, to the Faith. He spoke, and from his heart, of the esteem and love he felt for the "martyr-nation" which had set so glorious an example to the nations of the world of fidelity to the Faith. Out of regard to Catholic interests he zealously supported Mr. Gladstone in the disestablishment of the Protestant Church in Ireland. To Archbishop Manning the Protestant establishment was a badge of conquest: it kept "alive the ascendency of race over race, of religion over religion, of Church over Church." His heart, in sympathy with the Irish race, was overjoyed at the final overthrow of Protestant ascendency in Catholic Ireland. Perhaps, the reason of his opposition to the scheme proposed under Lord Derby's Government in 1866, of concurrent endowment, was the fear that such a measure might have saved the Irish Church from disestablishment.

In his letter to Earl Grey in 1868, Archbishop Manning spoke a good word in season on behalf of the agrarian troubles from which Ireland suffered. He suggested such reforms in the land laws as might relieve the tenants from the hardships they had to endure, and remove, by a just modification in the laws, the sense of rankling injustice

which exposed the peasantry of Ireland to the arts and wiles of agrarian agitators. For were there no land question there would be no Fenianism.

However much he sympathised with the suffering and toiling peasantry of Ireland, half-starved and living, in that day, in wretched mud-cabins, Archbishop Manning had no sympathy with Irish politics. He had a holy horror of Fenianism. In the presence of Catholic Irishmen he did not shrink from denouncing Fenians as bad Catholics. At a Catholic meeting at Birmingham in 1867 he said: "Show me an Irishman who has lost the Faith and I will show you a Fenian."

Archbishop Manning shared to the full Cardinal Cullen's judgment on the Nationalist or Revolutionary movement in Ireland. Cardinal Cullen said:—

> For thirty years I have studied the Revolution on the Continent; and for nearly thirty years I have watched the Nationalist movement in Ireland. It is tainted at its sources with the Revolutionary spirit. If ever an attempt is made to abridge the rights and liberties of the Catholic Church in Ireland, it will not be by the English Government, nor by a "No Popery" cry in England, but by the revolutionary and irreligious Nationalists of Ireland.

Except with Cardinal Cullen, whom he met in Rome, Cardinal Manning was not in touch with the Irish bishops or with the Nationalist politicians, at any rate, until the closing years of his life. For, as late as the year 1885, Cardinal Manning denounced Home Rule as disastrous for Ireland and as destructive of the unity of the empire.

As time went on and the Italian Government, seated in Rome, grew in strength and popularity; and the Catholic States of Europe, either tamely acquiesced in, or openly approved of, the new order of things, Cardinal Manning's political views as to the Temporal Power underwent a change. The sanguine belief which he had held so long and proclaimed so strenuously in the early restoration of the Papal sovereignty, either by the diplomatic intervention of Europe, or by the will of the Italian people—at last for-

sook his heart. The struggle seemed to him hopeless. In the meanwhile, things were growing from bad to worse in Italy. A revolutionary Government, hostile to religion, had established itself in Rome. Church property was confiscated. Catholic colleges and schools were closed Monks were driven into exile. Without let or hindrance the Italian Parliament had introduced laws, anti-Christian in character. A godless generation was growing up without religion, without faith. Of this state of things Cardinal Manning took what he called a practical view. The loss of faith, the loss of religion among the rising generation of the people of Italy, he accounted as a greater evil than the loss of the Temporal Power of the Pope. According to his wont, Cardinal Manning looked at the question from one point of view only—the point which struck him most forcibly at the time. His heart was appalled at the loss of faith which, owing to the suppression by the Italian Government of Catholic schools and Catholic training, was spreading so rapidly among the rising generation. The remedy which suggested itself to his mind was a political remedy—the creation of a Catholic party in the Italian Chamber, like to that in the German Reichsrath. But the prior question did not occur to him. Did the elements exist in Italy for the formation of such a party? In Germany the Catholics who formed the Centre party were active, zealous, accustomed to public action. They had been trained in their *Vereine* or unions to act in concert. They were inspired with ardour on behalf of the rights and liberties of the Church, and still more for the independence of the Holy See. But in Italy, apart from the irreligious and revolutionary party, instead of ardour there was apathy, instead of an active determination to defend religion and the Papacy, a profound indifference as far at least as public action was concerned. Otherwise, the majority of good Catholics in Italy would not have so tamely acquiesced in the overthrow of the Temporal Power of the Pope, and in the violation of the rights and liberties of the Church. Deluded by the outward seeming of resemblance between the state and position of German Catholics and the Catholics of Italy, Cardinal

Manning, in the impatience of his zeal, proposed a remedy which those who knew Italy far better than he did—the Pope and the ruling Cardinals—knew to be fallacious and worthless. A new fire must needs be enkindled in the hearts of the people before such an attempt is made with any prospect of success. To create a Catholic political party in Italy, persecution may, perhaps, quicken a zeal which had died out in prosperity.

It was not in Cardinal Manning's nature to stand idly by whilst, at the centre of the Catholic world, where he had once played so prominent a part, things were drifting, as he conceived, from bad to worse. Since the ruling cardinals in Rome[1] paid no heed to his counsels or warnings, Cardinal Manning ventured to propose to Pope Leo XIII. a reversal of the policy of his predecessor; a withdrawal of the Decree prohibiting Catholics in Italy from taking part in parliamentary elections, or from becoming candidates. By such a change of policy Cardinal Manning suggested to the Pope that a Catholic party, like the Centre party in the German Reichsrath, might be formed in the Italian Parliament, strong enough by unity of action to counterpoise in a measure the irreligious and revolutionary element in the Chamber, and to influence legislation in the future. Pope Leo XIII., further, was urged to put his trust, not in Kings and States, but in the people. A united appeal, at the command of the Pope, made by the bishops and clergy to the people of Italy to elect members as representatives of the Church, of the Papal cause, would alike promote Catholic interests and strike a blow at Revolutionary principles.

A fatal objection to Cardinal Manning's suggestion raised at the Vatican was this—a change of policy meant a change of principle, meant a compromise. The Holy See, according to such a suggestion, was to make terms with the Revolution; to recognise, and by recognising sanction, the continued usurpation of the Papal Sovereignty by the Italian King, and to order or permit the Catholics of Italy to take the

[1] See Cardinal Manning's "Reflections on Rome and the Ruling Cardinals," Chapter XXI. p. 572.

oath of allegiance to the usurper of the Temporal Power of the Pope.

What, it was asked, would be the result of such an act of weakness in Italy? What its moral effect in Europe? To the Italians it would seem that the Pope had abjured his principles, had abdicated his sovereignty. In Europe his reconciliation with the Revolution would be a triumph to the revolutionary party in every land; add fresh force everywhere to revolutionary principles. The Catholics of Italy would follow or be tempted to follow, not the Pope's precept, but his example. Instead of, as heretofore, tacitly acquiescing in the accomplished work of the Revolution, they would openly avow their adherence to the unity of Italy, established on the ruins of the Temporal Power. It could hardly be expected of them to be more loyal to a "lost cause" than the Pope himself.

And what was the compensation offered for such a compromise of principle by Cardinal Manning's "practical view of things," the right of good Catholics in Italy to take part in the election of Catholics like themselves as members in the Italian Chamber of Deputies. No doubt, the majority of Italians are good Catholics, faithful in the observance of their religious duties. Outside of the sanctuary, however, they are but indifferent citizens, ignorant or careless of their public duties. They may devoutly tell their beads day by day; but they fold their hands and leave the Church and its public interests with placid confidence to the keeping and mercy of God.

Of what avail, of what practical use would such a compensation have been? These good people, Cardinal Manning was plainly told, would not bestir themselves, would not offend their friends, vex their kith and kin by taking part to an effective extent in a contested election. They had hitherto abstained, by Papal direction, from electing or seeking to become deputies, on the ground that as deputies they would have to take an oath of allegiance to the King of Italy. If such an oath were now to be sanctioned, such

a sanction would naturally be interpreted as a recognition on the part of the Pope of the sovereign rights of the Italian King. If Pope and King were reconciled, why should good Catholics become the King's opponents or enemies?

Under such circumstances, the appearance of a weak Catholic party in the Chamber of Deputies would only expose the nakedness of the land as regards the political strength of good Catholics. A Pope, standing upon his rights as Sovereign Pontiff, only yielding under protest to *force majeure*, occupies a well-defined position of strength and honour alike, even in the eyes of a hostile world. But a Pope who abjures his principles and makes terms with the Revolution, would assuredly become a scandal to staunch and faithful Catholics, a source of weakness to the timid, and a laughing-stock in Europe. Cardinal Manning had put trust in the report that Pope Leo XIII., as Cardinal Pecci, was in favour of a policy of conciliation towards the Revolutionary Government of Italy; and was bitterly disappointed on finding how deeply the Pope resented the proposed compromise. The only Cardinal who was said to have shared to the end Cardinal Manning's views, was Cardinal Capecilatro, the Archbishop of Capua, an Oratorian. At the time of his last visit to Rome in 1883 Cardinal Manning stated that there were three Cardinals—Cardinals Czacki, Schiaffino, and Alemonda, who were of one mind with him in regard to the Pope's prohibition of Catholics voting at the parliamentary elections. Cardinal Schiaffino even said that Pope Leo XIII. was afraid of the *freddezza* of the *intransigeant* Cardinals. But such an imputation is not consistent with the known character of Pope Leo XIII., who is in the habit of going his own way and of listening to no one.

After this change of front in regard to the Temporal Power, strained relations took the place of former friendly feelings between the ruling Cardinals and Cardinal Manning. The Jesuits in Rome regarded the former champion of the Temporal Power of the Pope as a renegade to his principles.

In confirmation of his altered relations with Rome, Cardinal Manning told me, in 1886, that the chief editor of a well-known and influential paper, conducted by the Jesuits, wrote to him saying: "I am directed henceforth not to mention the name of Cardinal Manning with praise."

"Yes," added Cardinal Manning, not without a touch of bitterness, "they look upon me in Rome as *un Italianissimo*." Then he went on to explain his view of the Temporal Power as follows: "To restore the Temporal Power of the Pope by foreign intervention, by force of arms, would blot out in blood the Catholic faith in Italy. There can be no restoration until God changes the minds and hearts of the people. But we have no right or reason to look for such a miracle in Italy in our generation."

No doubt, Cardinal Manning's natural intolerance of a losing cause helped not a little to perturb his judgment. His hope or desire was to be the leader, at any rate, by way of suggestion or advice, of a new crusade—the creation of a Catholic Party in the Italian Chamber and in the country. Were the ruling Cardinals, the leaders of the Jesuits in Rome, and others of a like mind, to devote all the time, thought, and energy, now devoted to a "lost cause," to the new crusade, Cardinal Manning was confident that the anti-Catholic spirit and the anti-Christian legislation of the Revolutionary government of Italy would, in the course of no considerable time, be arrested, modified, or altogether defeated. Following a truce between Pope and King, a new epoch of peace and prosperity would be opened up for Italy alike in Church and State. Such was the Utopian idea—*une idée fixe*—which in his old age took possession of Cardinal Manning's mind. To the remonstrances, rebukes even of intimate and influential friends and advisers he turned a deaf ear. On being reminded that he was turning his back on the principles which, for the last twenty years, he had held in defence of the Temporal Power of the Pope, his enigmatical reply was: "I am beginning to feel my feet in the Italian question."

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE, WESTMINSTER, S.W.,
24*th May* 1889.

MY DEAR CHILD—Many thanks for your letter just come, but it is grievous reading.

The people of Italy are being lost, as the English people have been lost, by the same policy and the same blindness affecting the line of Catholic perfection. It is like the Peculiar People, refusing medicines.

The Catholic people of Italy have died out, a new generation have risen up, acclimatised to the Revolution, and powerfully attracted by the open careers of public life.

The Catholics are no longer in public life. They are, like ours, under the penal laws, exiled from all experience, training, and education in political and public life.

The whole power, and all the forces of the State—legislative, executive, military, financial, are all in the hands of the anti-Christian or the lukewarm men of the day.

Moreover, Italy has been taught by the dread of intervention, armed or diplomatic, to hang upon Berlin for safety. And this is the work of Catholics, ultra-Catholics.

Perhaps it is permitted by our Divine Master for the expiation of sin, and the purgation of Italy, so as by fire.

I hope you are well. Let me hear more if you can.—Always yours affectionately, H. E., C.A.

Love to Kenneth.

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE, WESTMINSTER, S.W.,
9*th June* 1889.

MY DEAR CHILD—Thank you for your letter and for *Tostie Conciliazione.*

Find out and let me know how it is regarded at the Vatican. Do not fail in this.

Now as to your friends of Alta Italia.

It is well known in Rome that I have always regarded the *ne eletti ne eletori* as a policy of abdication. In 1878 I induced Margotti to come to Rome to confer upon it. At first he agreed with me, afterwards he was bound to his old line.

The difficulty now is that the decision of the Holy See, which at first was *non expedire*, is now *non licere*, and until this is withdrawn there is nothing to be done.

I need not go into the question. I feel so profoundly convinced that the Italian people are being lost that I must suppose myself to be incapable of judging if I am wrong.

The Italians of Catholic education are dying out. Half the generation is already gone. The rising generation have "never known Joseph." And they are kept back from all paths of public life and service. We see the effect of this in our young Catholic men, even now, when all paths are open. Multitudes are being lost every year in Italy.

I am reluctant to weary the Holy Father. He knows my mind already. So does Mgr. Jacobini of the Propaganda.

I hope you are well.—Always yours affectionately in Christ,

H. E., C.-Archbishop.

In an autobiographical Note, dated 19th April 1889, after giving an account of how the people of England were lost to the Faith: after denouncing "the Spanish policy, the political conspiracy, the reign of James II., as having lost us the heart and trust of Englishmen," Cardinal Manning wrote of the policy pursued in Italy as follows:—

And so I fear it will be in Italy. The abdication of natural duty called abstention, is not the mind of the Holy See, but of him that letteth, and will let until he be broken out of the way. *Quousque Domine?*

The change in Cardinal Manning's political views in regard to the Temporal Power was followed, not long afterwards, by his conversion to Home Rule. In an interview with Pope Leo XIII. in the year 1883, Cardinal Manning, as has been already recorded, described Home Rule as disastrous alike for England and Ireland. Two years later in still more decided terms he denounced in a letter addressed to the Pope, the demand of the Irish Nationalists for a parliament in Dublin as synonymous with separation, as fatal to the interests of both countries.

On the introduction of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill in 1886, Cardinal Manning expressed his cordial concurrence with the provisions it made for granting to the Irish people the fullest right to manage their own local or domestic concerns, but he regarded as a fatal objection to the Bill the transference of the Irish members from Westminster to a parliament in Dublin. In his pleasant and

friendly way he told the Irish Catholic members that he could not spare one of them from the parliament of the United Kingdom; naturally he did not tell them, as he had told the Pope, that a parliament in Dublin meant separation from England. The Irish members were delighted with his sympathy, and readily interpreted his fervent expressions of good-will towards them and their cause, as meaning what they meant, an independent parliament and executive government in Dublin. In his frequent visits to the House of Commons before the infirmities of age and of illness debarred his presence, Cardinal Manning was always received in the lobbies with marks of respect by men of all parties, but was most at home and most welcome with the Irish and Radical members.

In the year 1886, the year of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill, speaking in reference to his biography, Cardinal Manning said, "Is there any necessity, in stating my views on the Irish question, to go beyond what I have written and published? I have only spoken in public about Ireland on two occasions; once in a "Letter to Lord Grey in 1868," and secondly, in an article in the *Dublin Review*, under the title "How shall Catholics vote at the coming Parliamentary Elections?"[1]

It must be remembered in this connection that Cardinal Manning was in the habit of drawing a distinction between views and principles which he had avowed in public, and views or sympathies which he entertained in private. *Littera scripta manet.* But unavowed views might, owing to the course of events, undergo modification or change; or be altogether dropped. Cardinal Manning's sympathies with the sufferings and wants, aims and aspirations of the Irish people had been for many years rooted in his heart, and grew ever stronger as life was drawing to its close. But, as he said, except upon two occasions he had held himself entirely aloof from Irish politics.

It was only in 1887 that Cardinal Manning avowed himself a Home Ruler. How it came about, briefly told, was as follows:—Since Mr. Gladstone's violent pamphlets

[1] The elections of 1885.

against the Vatican Council no communication was held between him and Cardinal Manning; no correspondence passed in all the intervening years save one or two notes of a formal character. They met once at Chiswick and, shaking hands, Cardinal Manning passed on without a word. In 1887, kindly inquiries, friendly messages, and mutual explanations passed between them through the instrumentality of a third person. The final result of these friendly communications was that Cardinal Manning wrote a letter, which he read to me, to Mr. Gladstone. After recounting that for nigh upon eighty years they had ascended together the steps of life, Cardinal Manning said, "In the beginning of our career we were of one heart and one mind in defending the interests of the Anglican Church. And now at the close of our career we are again of one mind and one purpose; for second to you only, I am the greatest Home Ruler in England."

The reconciliation between the great statesman and the great ecclesiastic, alienated for so many years, was immediate and complete. They resumed correspondence once more on the old footing of affectionate intimacy. This I can vouch for on personal knowledge, for Cardinal Manning at the time showed me the letters, in evidence of the happy issue of my mediation.

In an autobiographical Note, dated 18th September 1887, referring to his correspondence with Mr. Gladstone from 1835 to 1851, Cardinal Manning made the following contrast between himself and Mr. Gladstone:—

> I forsook all things for faith. He has forsaken his whole political past for Ireland. He is as isolated now as I was then. And this makes one turn to him. We are at last and at least agreed in this.

His conversion to Home Rule, in Mr. Gladstone's sense, had yet to be professed in public. Cardinal Manning availed himself gladly of an opportune opening for a public profession of Home Rule sympathies. Shortly after his reconciliation with Mr. Gladstone a vigorous article appeared in the *Times* condemning Archbishop Croke and

Archbishop Walsh for their Home Rule principles or proceedings. Without the loss of a day, Cardinal Manning wrote a letter to the *Times* in which he espoused the views and defended the proceedings of the two Prelates, who, if not now, since the Papal condemnation, were at that day, perhaps, the most advanced defenders of the Home Rule League and its immoral methods of action.

By this identification of himself with the two Episcopal leaders of the Home Rule party, Cardinal Manning had publicly qualified himself as a Home Ruler. The Nationalist newspapers and speakers expressed in the most fervent terms their admiration and gratitude for the chivalry displayed by Cardinal Manning in coming to the rescue in his letter to the *Times* of Archbishops Croke and Walsh.

No inconsiderable difficulties were experienced by Cardinal Manning in explaining to critical friends his views as to Home Rule. To one or two personages, entitled by their intimacy or position to question him, he gave a most satisfactory account, and left them under the impression that his views as to Home Rule and its limitations were in full accord with their own.

One of his distinguished critics, whom indeed Cardinal Manning had invited to Archbishop's House for the express purpose of explaining his Home Rule principles, was so satisfied as to exclaim, "If that is all you mean by Home Rule, then you and I are of one mind. Indeed, your principles are these held by Mr. Balfour himself."

Irish Nationalists, members of parliament, and the majority of Irish bishops, judging from the sympathetic language he made use of in conversation, looked upon Cardinal Manning as a real Home Ruler like themselves. In his letters, however, to the Irish members, whilst expressing the deepest sympathy for Ireland and sanguine hopes of the future, he was on his guard, by introducing limitations, against committing himself to their view of Home Rule, as the following passage of a letter to Mr. W. O'Brien, M.P., shows :—

The day of restitution has nearly come. I hope to see the daybreak, and I hope you will see the noontide when the people of Ireland will be re-admitted, so far as is possible, to the possession of their own soil, and shall be admitted, so far as possible, to the making and administration of their own local laws, while they shall still share in the legislation which governs and consolidates the Empire.

Again, in a letter dated St. Patrick's Day 1891, to Mr. Justin M'Carthy, the mild leader of the largest section of the Home Rule party, Cardinal Manning said, "I see Ireland rising and reorganising itself, after a passing obscuration, upon the old and only lines which have unfolded its noble life throughout the world."

The fear so widely felt in the North of Ireland, that if the Revolutionary party succeeded in forcing Home Rule on the minority, the Protestants of Ulster would suffer persecution at the hands of the Catholics, Cardinal Manning repudiated as an ignoble suspicion. Catholic Ireland, the "martyr nation," he contended, had never persecuted their Protestant neighbours in the matter of religion. "The children of martyrs are not persecutors."

The warm-hearted people of Ireland were deeply moved by such words of sympathy, expressed with such delicate regard to their national feelings and aspirations. Though an Englishman, and for a long time regarded with suspicion, in the latter portion of his life he was beloved not only by the Irish in England and in his own diocese, but by the people of Ireland. Cardinal Manning, unlike his brother bishops in Ireland, and one of his own suffragan bishops, was no militant Home Ruler. In spite of his boast that "he was second to Mr. Gladstone only as a Home Ruler in England," the Archbishop of Westminster wisely bore in mind that he had no call to play the part of a politician. He observed, at all events in public, a benevolent attitude between Home Rulers and anti-Home Rulers. In truth, at heart, Cardinal Manning was an Englishman first, and then, if the Irish chose to accept him as such—as they did for the sake of his benevolent good-will—a Home Ruler under limitations.

In the winter of 1886, after the utter rout of Mr. Gladstone and the Home Rule party at the General Election, Mr. Parnell renewed the agrarian agitation in Ireland on an extended scale. His lieutenants, Mr. Dillon and Mr. O'Brien, started the "Plan of Campaign" and "boycotting," which led to such disastrous results. Intimidation and terrorism were but too effective weapons of the Home Rule League. Bishops gave their sanction and support to the "Plan of Campaign" and to "boycotting." Priests acted as chairmen of the committees and as treasurers of the funds of the "Plan of Campaign." The Holy See in its wisdom sent a Papal delegate, Mgr. Persico (now Cardinal) on a special mission to Ireland to inquire into the moral aspects of the League and its methods of action.

Cardinal Manning, as the correspondence between himself and Mgr. Persico shows, was in a state of no little alarm at the effect such an inquiry might produce in Ireland. The Home Rule agitators were inflaming by their wild harangues the hearts of the excited peasantry. The dictum of O'Connell was repeated—"We take our theology from Rome, but our politics we prefer of home manufacture."

It was asked by the professional agitators at public meetings at which priests acted as chairmen, "What can a 'foreign potentate' know of Irish politics? How can an Italian delegate pretend even to understand boycotting and the Plan of Campaign? We don't want 'foreign intervention.' Our bishops understand Ireland and its wants; Rome does not. We will follow and obey only our own Bishops."

Cardinal Manning, who was in constant communication with the Papal Delegate, strongly urged upon Mgr. Persico the policy of governing Ireland through the Bishops, and not over their heads, nor from outside.

Regarding from the standpoint of an ecclesiastical statesman the Papal inquiry into the state of things in Ireland, and judging it from its political rather than its religious side, Cardinal Manning proposed an alternative policy to that adopted by Pope Leo XIII. The plan suggested to

Mgr. Persico for the consideration of the Holy See was as follows:—The Irish Bishops were to be called to Rome in batches of three or four, and after having been thoroughly enlightened as to the views of the Holy See in regard to the practices and principles of boycotting and the Plan of Campaign, were to be sent back to Ireland with precise instructions to act in obedience to the canons of public morality as taught by the Church. When the whole episcopate had undergone such a process of enlightenment, they were, as if *ex motu proprio*, to issue a joint pastoral letter to the priests and people of Ireland, explaining what was morally amiss in boycotting and the Plan of Campaign.

The reasons offered by Cardinal Manning, and which Mgr. Persico was urged to impress in his Report upon Pope Leo XIII. were, that the priests and people had implicit confidence in their bishops, "There is one power in Ireland that can govern the Irish people, that is the Irish Bishops, and there is one power on earth that can govern the Irish Bishops, and that is the Pope. But this must be with, by, and through the Episcopate, and not from outside."

Mgr. Persico seems to have agreed to these views, and to have acted in accordance with suggestions coming from so high an authority. Cardinal Manning was also at pains to impress upon the Papal Delegate the necessity of caution, so that nothing might be mentioned in the Report—as for instance, the opinions entertained by some of the other bishops, as to his political action—of a nature to shake the confidence of the Holy See in Archbishop Walsh. If such a thing were to happen, and especially if a Papal Rescript were to be issued over the heads of the Irish Bishops, Cardinal Manning declared that he could not say what might happen in Ireland, owing to the excited state of feeling prevailing among the people.

During the mission of the Papal Delegate in Ireland, Cardinal Manning was in frequent communication with Archbishop Walsh. In the beginning, the Archbishop of Dublin reported favourably of Mgr. Persico, describing him

as very fair and favourable. But at a later period, Archbishop Walsh expressed alarm, and, among other grievances, was much annoyed at the recall, on the ground, as he believed, of his friendly relations with the Home Rule party, of Father Gualdi, the secretary of the Papal Delegate. During the mission of Mgr. Persico, Cardinal Manning's advice was freely given and gratefully accepted by some of the Irish Bishops.

Mgr. Persico, moreover, was strongly urged to use his influence at Rome to prevent the establishment of diplomatic relations with England. The reception accorded to Mgr. Ruffo Scilla as special Envoy to the Queen on the occasion of Her Majesty's Jubilee, filled Cardinal Manning's mind with grave apprehension. He besought Mgr. Persico to lay stress on the mistrust which would be excited in Ireland by the appointment of a Papal Nuncio to the Court of St. James's. The bishops, priests, and people of Ireland would look upon it as a device of the English Government to control, or to interfere with, the appointment of Irish Bishops. Such a suspicion would produce not only political, but grave spiritual evils.

The promulgation of the Papal Rescript, condemning boycotting and the Plan of Campaign as grave offences against the moral law, took Mgr. Persico as much by surprise as it did Cardinal Manning; for both he and the Papal Delegate confidently expected that, in accordance with their joint suggestions, the condemnation of the immoral methods of the League would have been pronounced not directly by the Holy See, but by the Irish Episcopate.

The disrespectful way in which the Papal Rescript was denounced at public meetings by the leaders of the Home Rule party, was ample justification of the direct action of the Holy See. The assertion that the Catholics of Ireland would submit to condemnation at the hands of their own bishops, but objected to the direct exercise of Papal authority, seemed too much like a plea in favour of national Churches—a system of semi-rebellion always condemned by the Holy See—not to call for prompt and vigorous action. The Papal Rescript nipped the evil in the bud. And its

successful results showed once more, that the Catholics of Ireland are sound at heart, and far more attached to the Holy See, and obedient to its Decrees, than were their political leaders.

Cardinal Manning did not meet the Papal Delegate during his stay in England, after his mission in Ireland was practically concluded; for though he was invited to come to Archbishop's House, Westminster, Mgr. Persico thought it expedient for many reasons to decline the invitation.[1]

Three years later, in 1890, Cardinal Manning thought it necessary for his own justification to explain in his Journal, the reasons for the line of action he had taken in 1887—which was disapproved of in Rome at the time—in regard to what he called the "Intervention of the Holy See in Ireland."

The Decree of Pope Leo XIII. on the Plan of Campaign. An autobiographical Note, 1890.

After setting forth that the *Infallible Magisterium Romani Pontificis* extends over politics, Cardinal Manning says:—

But is there in this no limit? Now, as there is no action which is not either good or bad in the agent, so there is nothing indifferent in the action of the Commonwealth. It is therefore undeniable that the Pontiffs were morally within their right in the Crusades, the Armada, and in the Condemnation of Boycotting and the Plan of Campaign, let alone the Parnell Testimonial. But it is one thing to be morally right, or not morally wrong, and another altogether to be within natural and supernatural prudence. I have been always unable to think certain of these acts to be prudent. It is easy to be wise after the event. But the event seems to have pronounced against them. The Decree of Leo XIII. was absolutely true, just, and

[1] During his mission to Ireland an active correspondence was carried on between Mgr., now Cardinal, Persico and Cardinal Manning, on the one hand, and, on the other, between Cardinal Manning and Archbishop Walsh of Dublin. The policy of Pope Leo XIII. in sending a Papal Delegate to Ireland was freely discussed. Such an interference with Irish politics was regarded as an imprudence, and the mission of Mgr. Persico bewailed as a mistake but too likely to lead to grave consequences.

useful: but in the abstract. The condition of Ireland is abnormal. The Decree contemplates facts which do not exist. The political condition of the world is not contained in the Deposit. Pontiffs have no Infallibility in the world of facts except only dogmatic. And prudence is the first of the cardinal virtues. Moreover, facts are more surely known, and more safely judged on the spot. Take Monsignor Capel's case, or like cases in Toronto and St. Louis, in all of which Rome was misled, went wrong, and had to revoke its decisions.[1]

How can such questions of fact be judicially decided without witnesses, and with documents of the genuineness of which there is no evidence?

It would seem to me, therefore, that the *magisterium* of the Roman Pontiff is limited by the four Cardinal virtues, of which prudence is the first, and by the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, especially by the gifts of counsel and wisdom. It would seem to me, therefore, that the July 13, 1890, *Magisterium* of the Pontiff in political matters is not limited, except by natural and supernatural prudence. But this is a very absolute limit, and I do not know how this prudence is to be ensured except by the antecedents and conditions common to all men. I know of no special assistance. When, therefore, theologians say, that the Pope may err as a man, as a private theologian, as Bishop of Rome, but not as Pontiff defining *ex Cathedrâ*, they add, in Faith and Morals. This certainly does not include all questions of fact. The Plan of Campaign is not a Dogmatic fact, and it is one thing to declare that all legal agreements are binding, and another to say that all agreements in Ireland are legal. I know no more flagrant example in history of the axiom *summum jus, summa injuria* than the state of Ireland. What is legally just is there morally unjust. And the sanction of the former ought to have been followed by a condemnation of the latter.

In the year 1890, a period especially rich in Notes and Reminiscences, in comments on passing events, and in final judgments of *men and things*, Cardinal Manning

[1] What a contrast, startling to ears unaccustomed, do not Cardinal Manning's limitations of Papal authority in 1890 present to the principles he proclaimed in 1870—*quantum mutatus ab illo.* In the year of the Vatican Council it was the "opponents" of the Holy See who declared, *ore rotundo*, that "Rome was misled, went wrong, had to revoke its decisions." Such an example, however, is only another illustration of the fact that when the shoe pinches themselves even the most stalwart defenders of Papal authority are sometimes apt to develop Gallican tendencies or make use of Gallican language.

expounded his latest views on the Irish Question. It was a period of the fiercest political conflict. His ancient friend, Mr. Gladstone—in bonds of friendship once more renewed—was in Opposition. The Home Rule Party was in despair. England had pronounced judgment against the disintegration of the Empire. The Tory Government was in power. The Party in opposition combined forces in disparaging and misrepresenting the acts of the Government. Siding with the political Party to which he was attached, Cardinal Manning, with mind tinctured with the colour or passions of the hour, pronounced judgment on the Tory Government in the following "Note":—

The Irish Question and the Tory Government.

An autobiographical Note, 1890.

I will put down what I believe of the Irish question and of the Intervention of the Holy See.

1. The English Government maintains itself in Ireland by the help of 14,000 armed constabulary, a force of highly disciplined troops, and at least 28,000 of our regular army, that is by 42,000 armed men.

2. Why is this necessary?

(1) Because the Irish people have been put out of the soil of Ireland, which has been given to Englishmen, Scotsmen, and Irish Protestants.

There is a conflict of race against race in the landlords and the people.

(2) Because for 300 years Catholic Ireland was persecuted, even unto death, by Protestant England. Active persecution has ceased. But there is the conflict of religion against religion embittering both public and private life.

These are two living and palpable facts.

The government of Ireland is in the hands of officials, English, Scotch, and Irish, almost exclusively Protestant. Even the magistrates are removable by Dublin Castle.

The effect of this is perpetual irritation, suspicion, and resentment.

The present Government would fall to-morrow if it were not upheld by this Protestant party.

And their policy, which began with large promises, has shrunk to the single function of enforcing exorbitant rents by eviction

with the aid of police and soldiers, and the batôning of the people cruelly, and the imprisonment of newspaper editors and excited orators.

And who has excited them?

The case of Ireland is in one word. The rents are 33 per cent exorbitant. They are legally due. They are morally unjust. To refuse to pay is illegal. The landlords have a legal right to distrain, to evict, to burn the houses on their lands, to call in police and soldiers. All this is legal. But it is morally unjust. *Summum jus, summa injuria!* Law, order, and authority may be maintained, but at the cost of violating the moral justice by which alone nations are governed.

Since this Government came in, Ireland has had a Crimes Act, but not a remedy for one of its just complaints.

I told ——— at the Athenæum: "If you had held out a ray of hope you might have governed Ireland." But no, this Government relies on force. For the humiliation of England, Trafalgar Square was filled with Guards, horse and foot; the crofters had a gun-boat; in the Thames Strike the Guards were ready in the Tower. Troops were moved into Liverpool, Cardiff, and Southampton, where men were bayonetted. This week 1000 men were ready at Chatham with tugs, steam up, to go to the Gas-works at Beckton.

In 1848 when Europe was in Revolution and London was threatened by thousands of Chartists, not a soldier was seen in the streets. The present Government is morally weak and unpopular. They know it, and they rely on force under the plea of maintaining law, order, and authority. And they are irritating and goading Ireland into intemperate speech. A goaded people loses calmness and self-control. It puts itself in the wrong under provocation; and is put down by force.

Ireland is less governable now than it was four years ago.

And England is becoming seriously disturbed. The classes are alarmed and the masses irritated.

No more fatal policy can be conceived.

The millions of what I may call the "labour world" possess the suffrage. And to them the political power is steadily devolving. They are both reasonable and just. They are calm and conservative. The Thames Strike was ended by reason and free will. The Miners' Strike of 300,000 men was ended by reason and free will. If Government will meet the people face to face, neither soldiers nor police will be needed. If Government treats the people as lords and squires treat their gamekeepers and their labourers, the manhood of Englishmen will rise against them.

Now I am calmly convinced that, if the Bishops of England side with any political party, they will forfeit the confidence of the people both in Ireland and in England. This will be true of every several bishop, and it will be above all true of my Successor.[1]

It is a rare advantage to be in a position to give Cardinal Manning's own exposition of his political opinions. Such an exposition imparts personal colour and character to the treatment of a subject which might, perhaps, otherwise be considered as somewhat too trivial and thin. For, unlike Edmund Burke, Cardinal Manning was not a profound student of political principles. But the following account of the genesis of his political views possesses the charm of an autobiographical sketch :—

Genesis of my Political Opinions. An autobiographical Note, 1880.

And now I will try to answer a question about my political opinions and principles as they are called, how I had strong popular tendencies, and why I call myself in irony a Radical.

1. I can remember as a boy, that I felt a pain when servants or poor people were roughly spoken to. They were always very kind to me, and willing to do anything for me. I used to feel that we were all alike before God.

2. The public school-life of Harrow in which all are equal and dukes are fags, is a great leveller, not in a bad sense, but in teaching human equality and the inequality of merit rather than of rank.

3. The commonwealth of Israel always impressed me with the equality of all men before the law, with the duty of tenderness to the poor, and of restraining the excesses of power and passion. I have often said in joke that "Moses made me a Radical." The Hebrew theocracy was a true Republic, and the Hebrew monarchy was most truly free and popular. The King was under the Law.

4. All this was profoundly confirmed by the whole of the

---

[1] In the above exhortation to the Bishops of England and to his future Successor in the Diocese of Westminster, Cardinal Manning, as was not unnatural in a man of his eager and self-confident temperament, seems virtually to say, "My political 'doxy is the right 'doxy; your 'doxy, if opposed to mine, is infallibly wrong."

New Testament—by (1) the life of our Lord among the people, His love of the poor, His compassion on the multitude, by His indifference to all human inequalities, and equal charity to all. (2) Then the Book of Acts and the whole Christian brotherhood, and the equality of all men before the Altar.

5. The whole of my classical reading, the history of Greece and of Rome, Aristotle's Ethics, and Butler's Sermons; all these made the people the first thought and the first object of sympathy.

6. Next, from the time I took to politics, the whole tradition of English history and of English law from the Saxon times to Magna Charta, and from Magna Charta to 1688, made me always on the side of the people. Bracton's dictum, "*Lex facit Regem, Rex facit Legem,*" sums up all politics. Then my reading of Lord Somers's Defence of the Revolution of 1688, Bolingbroke's *Patriot King*, and Burke's works, especially his *Appeal from the New to the Old Whigs*, which is a constitutional Treatise—all these again convinced me when I was twenty-two, of the principles I have ever held to this day.

7. When I was at Oxford, I was in favour of Catholic Emancipation and Free Trade. In 1833, I was in favour of Parliamentary Reform.

8. When I began to read Catholic books I found St. Thomas saying, "*Reges propter regna, non regna propter reges.*" And again that "God gives sovereignty immediately to society, and mediately (*mediante Societate*) to the Prince, President, or Consul, one or more, whom society may legitimately designate."

9. All this showed me that Whig and Tory are names without equivalents. The Revolution of 1688 wiped them out. The parliamentary title of the Crown equalises both. They survive as two forms of class selfishness. The aristocratic selfishness, and the well-to-do selfishness. Liberal and Conservative are still more unmeaning. The law and constitution of England excludes all such political sections. Our monarchy is a commonwealth, and in a commonwealth the people are the first and highest entity—"*Salus populi Suprema Lex.*" "Class legislation" is treason against a commonwealth—legislation that does not reach and benefit the whole people is a political injustice.

10. When I became a clergyman I lived among shepherds and day-labourers, and felt every day the truth,

> When Adam delved and Eva span,
> Who was then the gentleman?

And yet all my friends were of the *haut ton* and I was at home among them.

I remember that S. Wilberforce used to assail me as a Radical at Lavington, holding 17th century Toryism himself. Gladstone was then Tory. Both ended as Radicals, if S. Wilberforce's Diary be trustworthy.

11. I must now make a comment which may give offence. When I came from the broad stream of the English Commonwealth into the narrow community of the English Catholics, I felt as if I had got into St. James's Palace in 1687. It was as stately as the House of Lords and as unlike the English Commonwealth as my father's mulberry velvet court-dress was to his common-day blue coat and brass buttons. The old Catholic Toryism is the Toryism of Laud and Strafford's instincts, feelings, and tradition, without reason, principle, or foundation in the law of England at any time from King Alfred to Queen Victoria. The Catholics of England seem to me to be in their politics like the Seven Sleepers. If anything they are Charles the First Royalists. But there is no Charles the First left.[1]

12. The people of England have outgrown both Church and State. The Dissenters are out in the cold, and the unenfranchised millions have no civil status. Church and State must either enlarge their borders to take them in, or a new Constitution and a new commonwealth will grow up outside of the old Church and State tradition. I believe the latter will be the future of England. What Manchester is to London, such the future of England will be to the past. As the Board School system will push out and destroy the Anglican Schools, so the Manchester politics will reduce the old Anglican and aristocratic tradition to a tolerated survival.

13. All this I lament. It is the last act of the schism of Henry VIII. I am as strong in upholding authority as I am popular in desiring the largest legislation for the welfare of the people. I am no democrat or Radical in the sense of opposing or weakening the authority either of administration and of coercion, or the sovereign power. The Temporal Power of the Pope is the type and warrant of all sovereignties.[2] Every Christian must be conservative of authority in the law of the law-giver and of the authority that does not bear the sword in vain.

My censure of Gladstone's Government is not for their Coercion Bill, but for not coercing horseplay before it grew into Boycotting, and Boycotting before it grew into outrage, beginning a year a half ago. But in their Land Bill I go beyond all that

---

[1] When Manning "entered into the narrow community of English Catholics" they were, for the most part, not Tories but hereditary Whigs.

[2] At the date of this autobiographical Note, 1880, Cardinal Manning had not as yet changed his views on the Temporal Power.

they have done. In 1867,[1] when I wrote the "Letter to Lord Grey," I saw that it was inevitable, because it is just. It is thirteen years of added injustice, not coercion, that has demoralised the people of Ireland.

The leading articles which I wrote from last Christmas to 25th June in the *Weekly Register* say all I need to say. They are Imperial and popular. Nothing can be stronger for authority or larger in sympathy for the people.[2]

My belief is that you will all put off Toryism and Conservatism in the party sense, and will see that if England is to be governed it must be *mediante populi voluntate!* and that if the Church is to be spread in England, it will be by its large popular sympathies indentifying it, not with the governors, but with the governed.

Ten years later, Cardinal Manning gave a revised edition of his politics, as developed by his more recent experiences. In describing his politics as "social politics," he struck the key-note of his political action. Touched to the heart by the sufferings of the poor, by the hardships and privations of too many of the working classes, housed in wretched hovels, their dull lives unbrightened by a ray of hope—that gleam of sunshine which is as life to the heart of man; moved to indignation at the terrible contrast between the extremes of poverty and wealth, Cardinal Manning, carried away by the promptings of his heart, did not stop to consider causes and effects, the causes of the evils which he denounced, or the effects of the remedies which he suggested with such absolute assurance. But his generous impulses and his wide sympathies with all who suffered; his ardour and activity, which no in irmities of body could

[1] Manning's "Letter to Lord Grey" was written in 1868.

[2] The *Weekly Register*, a Catholic newspaper of which, in its earlier and prosperous days, Henry Wilberforce was editor, being in a state of collapse was placed in Cardinal Manning's hands in the view of saving it from extinction. The leading articles written before his conversion to Home Rule were naturally "Imperial and popular"; but, together with light Essays on various subjects, though graceful in diction, possessed only, like most newspaper articles, an ephemeral interest. They, however, answered the purpose for which they were written.

Before his conversion to Home Rule, Cardinal Manning had said he would like his articles on Imperial politics to be published some day, but, of course, the change of his views rendered it inexpedient.

chill, or weight of years deaden in the cause of philanthropy, won the admiration and respect of all lovers of their kind, even of those who denied to him the gifts of a profound political thinker.

In the following Note, which fitly closes his political life, Cardinal Manning makes a noble profession of faith in the Constitution of England, justly described as a Catholic structure inherited from our fathers. Besides insisting on the duty of jealously guarding it, and keeping inviolate the Commonwealth of England, he severs himself completely from the apostles of Radicalism and condemns their destructive principles.

Apart from political or partisan prejudices, not perhaps unnatural in an ancient Whig and a Home Ruler of yesterday, there is much in Cardinal Manning's last political testimony which may serve as a wholesome lesson or well-deserved rebuke to Radicals, Home Rulers, or other Revolutionary politicans, the inveterate enemies of the Constitution of England.

What, perhaps, may astonish most, or most annoy his Radical friends, guides, and leaders, who at the close of his life claimed him as one of themselves, is Cardinal Manning's solemn abjuration, in what may be fitly described as politically his last Will and Testament, of the principles of destructive Radicalism. His "Radicalism," which he describes "as going down to the roots of the sufferings of the people," was a social Radicalism; but not a Radicalism that aims at subversion of the Constitution, the abolition of the House of Peers, and the disestablishment of the Church. Cardinal Manning wisely made his repudiation of the destructive Radicalism of the day clear beyond room for doubt or quibble in the following unequivocal words:—

But there never has been a taint or a shadow of subversion or destructive policy in all that I have said, written, or done. No man is more constructive and conservative of all just law or tradition, even when inequalities are most salient, as in the upholding of a hereditary Chamber.

Verily, if Cardinal Manning was a Radical, he was a Radical without guile.

Cardinal Manning's Revised Edition of his Politics. An autobiographical Note, 1890.

Why are my politics popular even to Radicalism.

My whole birth, training, and relations in life would have carried me into the Primrose League.

My father was in his day one of the richest merchants in the city of London. He was almost his whole life in Parliament. He was in friendship with Pitt and the Pittites; a Tory, intimate also with men of both sides of the House. He voted steadily with Pitt, Perceval, Lord Liverpool, and the Duke of Wellington. Everything would have made me of the same mind. But I never was. From my birth to the ruin of my father's fortunes I was pampered with all indulgence, and I was very early in the midst of my father's friends, both private and political. And yet nothing ever drew me to Toryism. First I lived much by myself, a sister one year older was my only companion. The others were much older. She died in her twenty-first year. After that I was all alone. She was truly good and pious, and we found the prayers she had written. All this time I had a sense of the interval between my family and the household, and between that and the poor of the village. Yet both my father and mother were profuse in their almsgiving; and my father was in perpetual request for kind services for needy people. When I was about twenty, I read a great deal of the Anglican and Puritan devotional books; and I became intimate with some extremely Low Church Evangelical friends, truly good people mixed up with Quakerism.[1] This made me understand the state of the people outside of the Established religion, which never attracted me. Then I made a study of the New Testament in English, and in Greek. Gradually the people widened out before me. Then the theocracy of the Old Testament brought before me God and the people as the commonwealth of man. Monarchy was a revolt and a chastisement. At the same time hoping to go into political life, I read English history, especially of 1688, with Bolingbroke, Somers, Burke, Blackstone, and books that I have forgotten. The result was that I saw that Toryism and Whiggism are

---

[1] These unnamed friends were Robert Bevan and his sister Miss Bevan. Miss Bevan in his "unregenerate" Oxford days plucked, as she described it, Henry Manning as a brand from the burning, and became, as already related (see vol. i.), his "spiritual mother," and inoculated her spiritual son with his early Puritanism.

nicknames. They have no distinctive principle. So long as Tories believed and Whigs denied the divine right of kings, they had each a cause of contention. The Revolution of 1688 abolished the theory of the divine right of kings. Our kings reign by a parliamentary title. *Lex facit regem.* Since then Toryism is dead. Tories represent the Cavalier Royalist party, the aristocracy, the Established Church, the plutocracy, and the upper ten thousand. The Whigs represent the Roundheads, the Puritans, the Dissenters, the disinherited people in town and country.

What part or lot can a Catholic have in a Constitution sworn to schism and heresy? Such is Toryism in its essence. From this my soul always recoiled. Moreover, I found that Toryism defended the Slave trade, the Penal laws against Catholics and Nonconformists, upheld Slavery to the end, defeated Reform in Parliament, hindered all Lord Shaftesbury's Bills for the protection of men, women, and children in mines and factories (by which legislation two million and a half of people have been raised from oppression and degradation), defeated the whole line of successive Bills for the amelioration of Ireland. It would be endless to go on.

My whole soul recoiled from this anti-popular and anti-Catholic despotism.

Politically I have always abhorred their obstruction of all mitigation of the state of the people.

For more than fifty years I have lived among the people; seventeen among ploughmen and shepherds in Sussex, and nine and thirty among the people of London. I have seen and heard and known their wants, sufferings, hardships, and the defeat of their petitions and hopes, and my whole soul is with them. The rich can take care of themselves, and their underlings can help them. But who can speak for the poor? crowded and stifled in hovels where the death-rate is double or even three-fold as compared with the houses of the ground landlords in the West End. My politics are social politics, I have said often, but I write it for the first time. I have had a parliamentary vote, with a short interval, for over half a century. I have only voted once, not to bring any man in, but to keep a man out, who, I believed, would do mischief to education. This was twenty-six or twenty-seven years ago. My vote has never been on the register since. I have a contempt for politics and for the Talking-mill at Westminster.

The conditions of millions under pestilent and immoral housing, and under the drink Trade, cries to heaven. I pray God that my Successor will renounce politics and parties, sup-

porting and opposing them in absolute independence, and give himself with all his powers of intellect and will to the welfare of the people. I hope, too, that he will join the United Kingdom Alliance—the only real power outside of Parliament to hold the drink Trade in check.

Such is my Radicalism, going down to the roots of the sufferings of the people.

But there has never been a taint or a shadow of subversive or destructive policy in all that I have said, written, or done. No man is more constructive and conservative of all just law and tradition; even when inequalities are most salient, as in the upholding of a hereditary chamber, and my refusal to promote the disestablishment of the Anglican system by Act of Parliament. It would be a work not of religion, but of revolution, for which neither the Catholic Church nor the people of England are prepared.

The Constitution of England is a Catholic structure inherited from our fathers, and must be jealously guarded by Catholics. But three plagues are destroying the people (1) The land laws since Henry VIII. and Charles II. (2) The relations of Capital and Labour during the last hundred years of selfish Political Economy. (3) The drink Trade which has been fostered by Capitalists, and favoured by Government for the sake of Revenue.

Keep inviolate the Commonwealth of England, but destroy these three gangrenes which are inevitably destroying its life—that is, the human and domestic life of the people—for the enrichment of a handful of Capitalists and Landowners.

I believe the extension of the franchise and the admission of nearly two-thirds of the grown men of the people to the parliamentary suffrage to be a real return to the spirit of our old Saxon monarchy. It was the Norman and Angevin Kings that brought in Absolutism. It was military at first, and legislative afterwards. The Barons destroyed each other, and made the King absolute. The century of the Tudors was unmitigated despotism, the century of the Stuarts was a degradation. But it created the middle class and the parliamentary government of the people. Since 1688 this has been continually expanding, checked by profligate nobles and by the corruption of Walpole, and the influence of George III.; but from Mr. Pitt's second administration to the fall of the Duke of Wellington, the Tory party were in for forty years, less a few months. From 1830 to this day the popular government has continually unfolded itself, the Tory Governments of Lord Derby, D'Israeli, and Lord Salisbury are dying out. Their whole policy is

changed. They are Whigs of 1835, and the Parliament of the future will be more and more popular.

It ought to be so. "*Reges propter regna, non regna propter reges.*" Oligarchy of land and capital has ruled till now. The people have suffered, and the three plagues I have noted above will inevitably be dealt with, and I hope wisely and peacefully redressed.

The Holy Father has taken the millions who labour under his protection.

So must the Bishops of England. Do they see this? Will they deliberate upon it? God forbid that we should be looked upon by the people as Tories, or of the Party that obstructs the amelioration of their condition; or as the servants of the plutocracy, instead of the guides and guardians of the poor.

I have endeavoured to keep myself absolutely independent of all political parties. Lord Salisbury acknowledged this in describing the politics of the Royal Commissioners. When he came to me, he said, "As to Cardinal Manning, no one can say of what Party he is." I have held myself bound to be neutral as the Holy See is. It refuses to be Royalist in Naples, or Carlist in Spain, or Legitimist in France.

Nothing is more certain than that the Absolutism of the Crown, the Oligarchy of the aristocracy, the Parliamentarianism of the middle class are all past. My early life was under the then existing Government of the aristocratic Tory party which went out with the Duke of Wellington. Then came the middle class with Sir Robert Peel. And now we have the people with Gladstone. The future is in the hands of the millions who have the Parliamentary Vote. The Electoral body is nearly co-extensive with the manhood of England. Parliament is its offspring, and it will be more and more assimilated to the Electoral body. The Catholic Church is the only power that can win the confidence of the people. It has it already in Ireland. It is gaining it in England, and the next Archbishop may stand first in its confidence if he will. If he will not hold this place he will be nowhere. But for this he must have the confidence of Ireland: and he must be face to face with the people of England. Reginald Brett's Article in the October *Nineteenth Century* is in the main true. The public feeling of the country is not and never will be with either Anglicanism or Dissent. It is not irreligious, the leaders of the Labour Union are religious men; but its Unionism and public action is outside of all religion. It therefore is ready to listen and even to be led by a Catholic, if only he has their confidence; and that confidence is created by what we *are* chiefly, and by what we *do* in sympathy with the people.

Social Reformer

Cardinal Manning's popularity among the working classes of England, especially of London, rested on the sure foundation of his active work on behalf of the cause of labour, undertaken mainly out of profound sympathy with the privations and hardships endured by the toiling masses in their struggle to obtain a livelihood. This work was taken up with his wonted energy about the period when his career as an ecclesiastical statesman came to an end. He had been long known and held in high esteem as a philanthropist by the country at large, especially in his crusade against intemperance. But the working classes, except such as were reclaimed from the vice of drunkenness, had but little sympathy with the Temperance movement of which Sir Wilfrid Lawson and Cardinal Manning were the chief or most conspicuous leaders. But when Cardinal Manning, at public meetings or in Magazine articles, took up the cause of labour, insisted on the right of the working man to "a living wage," to reduced hours of labour, to a decent dwelling-place fit for a Christian home, the hearts of the masses of the people turned towards him as to a friend and benefactor.

The active part which he took as a member of the Royal Commission, appointed in March 1884, to secure better provision for the housing of the working classes, established Cardinal Manning's position as a Social Reformer. He was familiar with the terrible contrast, "dangerous to society and to spiritual welfare," between extreme wealth and poverty, for in a Pastoral Letter, delivered in the Lent of 1880, he had pointed out the evils and dangers arising from such a state of things as follows:—

In no country and in no age has the world ever yet seen such commercial activity and prosperity as that of England. But in the midst of immeasurable wealth is a want which the poorest country in Europe scarcely knows. We have in the midst of us, not poverty alone, which is an honourable state when it is honest and inevitable, but also pauperism, which is the corruption of poverty and the debasement of the poor. The in-

equalities of our social state, and the chasms which separate classes, the abrupt and harsh contrasts of soft and suffering lots, unless they be redressed by humility and charity, sympathy and self-denial, are dangerous to society and to our spiritual welfare. In London all these inequalities and evils are before us.

But Pastoral Letters and Sermons in Catholic churches did not reach the ear or touch the hearts of the masses, as did Cardinal Manning's attendance at the Royal Commission, and his share, not a small one, in drawing up the Report which was issued in 1885. Of the Royal Commission, of which Sir Charles Dilke was chairman, the following were members:—His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, Lords Salisbury, Brownlow, and Carrington, Mr. Goschen, Sir Richard Cross, Sir George Harrison, Lord Provost of Edinburgh; Bishop Walsham Howe, the Hon. E. Lyulph Stanley, Mr. Dwyer Gray, Mr. Torrens, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Jesse Collings, Mr. George Godwin, and Mr. Samuel Morley.

On this Royal Commission Cardinal Manning displayed his quick intelligence and judgment in putting questions to the witnesses under examination. He was, with a few exceptions, the most regular of all the members, in his attendance.

Not satisfied by his labours on the Commission, but, on the contrary, spurred to further exertions, he attended a Mansion House Conference on the dwellings of the poor, and spoke with considerable effect, and after pointing out the obstacles to be overcome, thrown in the way of improving labourers' dwellings by the owners of houses, he said:—

If only those in London who have heads and hearts to care for the condition of the poor, and who have been aroused within the last six months to the consciousness of an intolerable evil, would continue and sustain the movement by their own self-denying efforts, I believe there would be found the dynamic force that would put the law into operation; and then gradually and with patience, with these kindly and generous modes of treatment with which alone human affairs can be governed, we shall find a full and complete remedy for these sufferings of the population.

But though the active and benevolent part which he took in advocating and advancing the great social reform in regard to the unwholesome and disgraceful state of the overcrowded houses in which, in too many districts of London, the poor were forced to dwell, first brought him as a reformer and friend of the working classes into public notice, it was by no means Archbishop Manning's first effort on behalf of the cause of labour. For, as early as 1872, he was invited to preside at a meeting held on the 10th of December at Exeter Hall to promote the interests of the Agricultural Labourers' Union.

In speaking to me in 1886 of his first appearance as a Social Reformer on a public platform, Cardinal Manning gave the following reasons for declining the offer of presiding at the meeting at Exeter Hall:—

I thought it would be inexpedient for me as a Catholic Archbishop to preside at such a meeting. To some it might give offence, or otherwise be detrimental to the interests of the Agricultural Union, which was then so recently established. I promised the Committee, however, to procure them a better chairman, hoping to prevail on the Lord Mayor to preside. The Lord Mayor was unable to attend, but he induced Mr. Samuel Morley to take the chair. No better chairman could have been selected.

I promised the Committee of the Agricultural Labourers' Union to propose the first Resolution, but refused to co-operate with Mr. Bradlaugh, intimating that I would leave the platform if he were invited or permitted to take part in the meeting, as had been reported was his intention.

On the platform, when Archbishop Manning moved the first Resolution, were, among others, Sir Charles Dilke, Sir Charles Trevelyan, Mr. Mundella, Mr. T. Hughes, Mr. Potter, Mr. Odgers, and Mr. Arch. Archbishop Manning began by explaining that he would not have attended the Meeting had not the Committee undertaken that the subject would be treated in a law-abiding spirit and a God-fearing way. He claimed the right to speak, saying that:—

For seventeen years I sat day by day in the homes of the labouring men of Sussex, and I knew them all and their children

by name as well as I knew the scantiness of their means of subsistence.

This allusion to his early days and work as rector of Lavington brought the Archbishop of Westminster into touch with the meeting, which he maintained to the end, while pleading with eloquent feeling for "the amendment of the land laws in England and a reconstruction of the domestic life of the labouring poor."

Soon after the close of the speech, Mr. Bradlaugh appeared on the platform, and took part in the proceedings. Whereupon Archbishop Manning left the hall in protest against the presence at such a Meeting of so aggressive an assailant of Christianity and of Revealed Religion. Archbishop Manning did not escape criticism for taking part in an Agrarian agitation. His name was coupled with that of Mr. Arch, and even with Mr. Bradlaugh's. The reply to these attacks was as follows:—

To couple my name with that of Mr. Arch gives me no displeasure. I believe him to be an honest and good man. I believe, too, that the cause he has in hand is well founded; and I confide in his using no means to promote it but such as are sanctioned by the law of God and the law of the land. I was sorry that the meeting at Exeter Hall was diverted from the purpose for which it was called, and for which I attended it.

In receiving a Deputation of agricultural labourers in July 1881 in reference to the Irish Land Bill then before Parliament, Cardinal Manning expressed his deep sympathy with the cause of the Irish tenants and labourers, and gave his sanction to the Land League, with, however, the following limitation:—"So long as it operated within the limits of the law, human and divine." He said further:—

I am no politician; I speak as an independent pastor of the Church. . . . I decline to enter into the question of political economy; but this I will say, that it is quite obvious that a certain amount of land being left to any individual, he is entitled to live upon it and to live by the proceeds. . . . There is not a mouth in Ireland that might not be fed, nor a hand that might not be occupied. I know that many of those who have lived on

the soil have been compelled to seek a livelihood elsewhere. But I would not have one man leave Ireland until the soil entrusted to him has been carefully tilled.

At a meeting, presided over by the Prince of Wales, at the Guildhall, in August 1894, to celebrate the Jubilee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, Cardinal Manning, with rare fervour and eloquence, denounced the horrors of the abominable Slave traffic. In an eloquent passage, which evoked the cheers of the Meeting, he alluded to the name and testimony of Dr. Livingstone as follows:—

We are told that Livingstone, whose name cannot be mentioned in this hall, or anywhere, without awakening the sympathy of all Christian men, has left it on record as his belief, that half a million of human lives are annually sacrificed by this African Slave trade. This horrible traffic runs in three tracks, marked by skeletons, from the centre of Africa towards Madagascar, towards Zanzibar, and towards the Red Sea. Also we are told that, of those who are carried away by force, some are so worn out by fatigue as to die, others falling by the way are slaughtered by the sword, so that of this great multitude only one-third ever reach their horrible destination. It would seem to me that never in the "middle passage" was murder and misery so great. And again, what was the market supplied by the "middle passage"? It was our West Indian islands and the plantations of America. And what is the market supplied by these three routes? It is the countless millions of the whole Mahometan world, which reaches from Morocco to our Indian frontier. The demand is in Cairo, in Constantinople, and throughout the East. I will not enter into its abominations. . . . I know no people on the face of the earth so bound by strict obligations to give freedom to men as we. We are bound by the liberty which is an heirloom from our ancestors, the liberty of our own land in which slavery became extinct, and serfdom could not survive; on the coast of England if a slave set his foot he was free. We are bound by the great federation of our Christianity, which binds us in sympathy not only with Christians but with the whole human race. We are bound by the wrongs that we have done in the past, by the deep and indelible memories of the wrong which England has inflicted on the African race in centuries gone by; we are bound by the memory of the reparation which England has nobly made; and lastly, by the responsibility of the great Empire

which has been entrusted to us, for Imperial power is a stewardship, laying on us the obligation to serve all peoples and nations with whom we come in contact. If these things be so, then we are above all men bound by the strictest obligations which bind a civilised, a Christian, and an Imperial race.[1]

But what is of far more importance and of more general interest than his eloquent denunciations of the Slave trade, on which all men are of one mind, are Cardinal Manning's views or theories on the Labour Question. His latest views were fully expressed in a Tract, entitled "The Rights and Dignity of Labour." This tract was originally a lecture delivered at Leeds in 1877. But since that date Manning's views on the Labour Question had greatly developed. He had been brought into personal relations with the leading Social Reformers and Radical politicians. He had gained experience from the movements and agitations which were going on in America and Ireland as well as in England. His sympathy went with every Movement which had or purported to have as its end and aim the amelioration of the lot and life of the working classes. He agreed apparently, or to a certain extent, with the extreme views propounded on Capital and Labour and on land by advanced Social Reformers.

On the republication of his Tract on "The Rights of Labour" in 1887 Cardinal Manning's theories and views were thoroughly revised and brought up to date.

In this Tract or Lecture, speaking of the rights of labour, Cardinal Manning says:—

I am not going to be Communistic, and I have no will to be revolutionary. Adam Smith says, "The property which every man has in his own labour, as it is the original foundation of all other property, so it is the most sacred and inviolable. The patrimony of a poor man lies in the strength and dexterity of his hands; and to hinder him from employing this strength and dexterity in what manner he thinks proper, without injury to his neighbour, is a plain violation of

---

[1] In reference to this speech the Prince of Wales, so at least I was told at the time, said, "Cardinal Manning's fervent eloquence reminded me of the late Bishop Wilberforce."

this most sacred property." Therefore, first of all, I claim for labour the rights of property. There is no personal property so strictly our own. It is altogether and entirely personal. The strength and skill that are in a man are as much his own as his life-blood; and that skill and strength which he has as his personal property no man may control. He has this property in him. Lawyers say a man's Will is ambulatory, that is, it travels with him all over the world. So the working man carries this property with him as ready money. He can buy with it, and he can sell it. He can exchange it. He may set a price on it. And this ready money which he carries with him he may carry to every market all over the world; and what is more he will not be impeded by any foreign currency. No coins, no difficult calculations, decimal or otherwise, obstruct his exchange with other nations of the world. And further, in one sense it is inexhaustible, except that we all have limits and dimensions, and our strength and skill are bounded by what we are. But there it is, perennial, going on always through his life till old age diminishes it; then what remains in him is to be honoured with a reverence of which I spoke just now. Shakespeare gives an account of what a true labourer is in this way. He says in *As You Like It*, and puts it into the mouth of a labourer, "I am a true labourer; I earn that I eat, get that I wear; owe no man hate, envy no man's happiness; glad of other men's good, content with my harm." Well, then, I claim for labour (and the skill which is always acquired by labour) the rights of capital. It is capital in the truest sense. Now, our Saxon ancestors used to call what we call cattle "live money"; and we are told that what we call chattels and cattle and the Latin word *capita* are one and the same thing; that is, "heads" of cattle, or workers or serfs. This was "live money." And so is the labour, the strength, and the skill in the honest workman "live money." It is capital laid up in him; and that capital is the condition of production. For capital which is in money, which I will call dead capital, or dead money, receives its life from the living power and skill of the labourer. These two must be united. The capital of money and the capital of strength and of skill must be united together, or we can have no production and no progress. And, therefore, "labour and capital must," as the book I quoted from before puts it, "ride on the same horse"; and that book says, in a sort of mother-wit way, that "when two men ride on a horse one must ride behind." It says that capital rides before. Well, now, if they cannot ride side by side, they ought to walk hand in hand. Whatever rights, then, capital possesses, labour possesses. . . .

Labour has a right, not only to its own freedom, but it has a right to protect itself. And now, gentlemen, I know I am treading very near to dangerous ground; nevertheless I will speak as an historian or as a political economist, but certainly not as a demagogue. If you go back to the earliest period of our Saxon history you will find that there always were Associations distinct from the life of the family on the one side, and from the State on the other. The family has laws of its own —laws of domestic authority, laws of domestic order, and, I will say, after King Solomon, laws of very salutary domestic punishment. On the other hand, the State has its public laws, its Legislature, and its Executive. But between the public and the domestic life there is a wide field of the free action of men and of their mutual contracts, their mutual relations, which are not to be controlled either by domestic authority, and cannot be meddled with by the public authority of the State—I mean the whole order of Commerce. Commerce existed as soon as there was the interchange of one thing for another; and these free contracts between man and man, between employer and employed, are as old as civilisation. Clearly, therefore, there is a certain field which must be regulated by a law of its own, by tribunals of its own; and as soon as we begin to trace anything in our Saxon history, we begin to trace the rise of Guilds. They were of a religious character at first. Some have thought they were religious only, but that is a mistake; they were also what we should call benefit societies; they were also for protection; they were again for the vindication of liberty from the oppressive jurisdiction of those who held local authority. There were Guilds, or Gilds, of many kinds—some were called "Frith-gilds," and others were called "craft-gilds," and these craft-gilds were composed of masters and of men—of employers and of employed. . . .

I am now, I fear, going to utter a politico-economical heresy. I have great respect for political economy. I entirely believe—as you may have seen—in the law of supply and demand and free exchange and safety of capital, which are the first conditions of industry; but there is one point on which I am sorry to say I am a very lame political economist, and I cannot keep pace with others. I find political economists denouncing all interference, as they call it, of Parliament with the supply and demand in any form of any article whatsoever. They argue that as a reduction of the price of bread gives the poor more food, and as the reduction of the price of cloth gives the poor more clothing, so the reduction of the price of intoxicating drink gives the poor a greater abundance of comfort. Now,

gentlemen, I do not introduce this for the purpose of giving any expression on the Permissive Bill. I have done that at other times and elsewhere; this is not the place for it, neither was I invited for that purpose. But I give that instance to show that the principle of Free Trade is not applicable to everything. Why is it not applicable? Because it is met and checked by a moral condition. There is no moral condition checking the multiplication of food and the multiplication of clothing—the multiplication of almost every article of life which is not easily susceptible of an abuse fatal to men and to society. Well, now, I am afraid I am going to tread upon difficult ground, but I must do so. I am one of those, which is of no importance, but Mr. Brassey is also one of those, and that is of a great deal more—who are of opinion that the hours of labour must be further regulated by law. I know the difficulty of the subject, but I say the application of unchecked political economy to the hours of labour must be met and checked by a moral condition.

If the great end of life were to multiply yards of cloth and cotton twist, and if the glory of England consists or consisted in multiplying without stint or limit these articles and the like at the lowest possible price so as to undersell all the nations of the world, well, then, let us go on. But if the domestic life of the people be vital above all; if the peace, the purity of homes, the education of children, the duties of wives and mothers, the duties of husbands and of fathers, be written in the natural law of mankind, and if these things are sacred, far beyond anything that can be sold in the market, then I say, if the hours of labour resulting from the unregulated sale of a man's strength and skill shall lead to the destruction of domestic life, to the neglect of children, to turning wives and mothers into living machines, and of fathers and husbands into—what shall I say, creatures of burden?—I will not use any other word—who rise up before the sun, and come back when it is set, wearied and able only to take food and to lie down to rest; the domestic life of men exists no longer, and we dare not go on in this path. I am not going to attempt a prescription: I should fail if I were to attempt to practise in an art which is not my own, but this I will say—Parliament has done it already. Parliament, at the instance of Lord Ashley, now Lord Shaftesbury, whom all men honour for his life of charity, has set the precedent. . . . Parliament has again and again interposed to forbid the employment of children in factories before a certain age. Parliament has interposed over and over again with the freedom of labour. More than this, Parliament has interposed to prevent fathers

and mothers from selling the labour of their children. . . . They may not use the labour of their own children to enrich themselves if the employment of that labour be injurious to the child. Do not let it be said, therefore, that Parliament has not interposed in the question of labour and in the question of the hours of labour. I will ask, is it possible for a child to be educated who becomes a full-timer at ten or even twelve years of age? Is it possible for a child in the agricultural districts to be educated who may be sent out into the fields at nine? I will ask, can a woman be the mother and head of a family who works sixty hours a week? You may know better than I, but bear with me if I say I do not understand how a woman can train her children in the hours after they come home from school if she works all day in a factory. The children come home at four and five in the afternoon; there is no mother in the house. I do not know how she can either clothe them, or train them, or watch over them, when her time is given to labour for sixty hours a week. I know I am treading upon a very difficult subject, but I feel confident of this, that we must face it, and that we must face it calmly, justly, and with a willingness to put labour and the profits of labour second—the moral state and the domestic life of the whole working population first. I will not venture to draw up such an Act of Parliament further than to lay down this principle.

I saw in my early days a good deal of what the homes of agricultural labourers were. With all their poverty they were often very beautiful. I have seen cottages with cottage gardens, and with scanty but bright furniture, a hearth glowing with peat, and children playing at the door; poverty was indeed everywhere, but happiness everywhere too. Well, I hope this may still be found in the agricultural districts. What may be the homes in our great manufacturing towns I do not know, but the homes of the poor in London are often very miserable. The state of the houses—families living in single rooms, sometimes many families in one room, a corner apiece. These things cannot go on; these things ought not to go on. The accumulation of wealth in the land, the piling-up of wealth like mountains in the possession of classes or of individuals, cannot go on if these moral conditions of our people are not healed. No commonwealth can rest on such foundations.

Cardinal Manning concluded his lecture, which, it must be borne in mind, was, in spite of its revisions, a popular Lecture rather than a scientific Treatise on the rights of Labour, in the following words:—

I have endeavoured to draw out before you what is the dignity of labour. It is the law of our state, the law of our development and perfection, the source of invention, the power of creation, and the cause of manifold capital in money and in skill. And as to its rights, I have shown that it is true property, true capital; that it has a primary right of freedom, a right to protect itself, and a claim upon the law of the land to protect it. I will only add that there can be nothing in a working man undignified unless he be himself the cause of it. Forgive me if I use a very common proverb, and if I make another like it: "An idle man is the devil's playfellow; and an intemperate man is the devil's slave." As to the rights, I know nothing that can ever limit the rights of a working man excepting his committing wrong. If he commits wrong, the strong may retaliate; if he does no wrong, the supreme power of law will protect him.

Now, gentlemen, I have detained you a great deal longer than I ought—a great deal longer than I intended. I will therefore bring what I have said to an end. . . .

I ought to have my say, but at the beginning, not at the end, of an evening; and therefore with ethics I will conclude. The science of morals rests on four foundations—on prudence, which guides the intellect; on justice, which guides the will; on temperance, which governs the passions; and on fortitude, which sustains the whole man in the guidance and government of himself. These four cardinal virtues of the natural order perfect the character of man; and to-night I am not speaking in any other sense. They underlie all the dignity of man, and they justify all his rights. The labourer in our common field of toil who is prudent, just, temperate, and brave, is indeed "A workman that needeth not to be ashamed" (2 Tim. ii. 15).

It was in the nature of things that Cardinal Manning, having given such free expression to his sympathy with social reforms, should be beset with the polite attentions of such advanced agitators against the rights of property as, for instance, Mr. Henry George, the American advocate of the Nationalisation of Land, and his Irish disciple Mr. Davitt. These agitators, eager to obtain Cardinal Manning's sanction of their theories, came to Archbishop's House, Westminster, where they found not only a ready access, but a warm welcome. Cardinal Manning took pleasure in listening to their views, and discussing with them social

problems. The apostles of the doctrine of Land Nationalisation were delighted with the sympathetic way in which Cardinal Manning spoke, and left under the impression that he was in agreement with their social theories.

In express reference to the reports circulated by social reformers, political agitators, and others of a like character as to his acceptance of theories and views which they had submitted to him, Cardinal Manning made the following remark :—

> In writing my "Life" great care ought to be taken in discriminating between my own statements, guarded by conditions and limitations, and the impressions as to what I did say, recorded by those who sought my opinion or judgment of their theories.

Such a warning was a wise provision. For the Social Reformers, Radicals, Home Rulers, under the influence of his expansive sympathy, either did not notice at the time or soon forgot how, by his conditions and limitations, Cardinal Manning had differentiated his views from theirs. The natural result was that they left Archbishop's House under the impression that Cardinal Manning was of one mind with them; and spread abroad their own belief as an absolute fact.

In a letter to the editor of the *Brooklyn Review*, as well as to several of his friends, Cardinal Manning, soon after Mr. George's visit, expressed how much he was pleased by the quiet earnestness with which Mr. George spoke, and the calmness of his whole bearing. Cardinal Manning, at the date of his interview with Mr. George, was unfamiliar, it is as well to state by way of explanation, with his Socialistic writings. Having, however, something more than a suspicion that he held unsound views on the Rights of property, Cardinal Manning opened the conversation with Mr. George in the following words :—

> "Before we go further, let me know whether we are in agreement upon one vital principle. I believe that the law of property is founded on the law of nature, and that it is sanctioned in revelation, declared in the Christian law taught by

the Catholic Church, and incorporated in the civilisation of all nations. Therefore, unless we are in agreement upon this, which lies at the foundation of society, I am afraid we cannot approach each other." I understood him to reply that he did not deny this principle; that his contention was mainly, if not only, on the intolerable evils resulting from an exaggeration of the Law of property, meaning, in fact, the old dictum, *Summum jus, summa injuria.* He added that the present separation and opposition of the rich and poor were perilous to society, and that he saw no remedy for them but in the example and teachings of Christ. He spoke fully and reverently on this subject.

Mr. George left Cardinal Manning under the pleasant impression that so high and orthodox a dignitary in the Church sympathised with, or approved of, his Socialistic theories which had been elsewhere so severely censured or condemned. Mr. George was not slow in publishing in America so favourable a testimony. If Cardinal Manning had found nothing to censure in Mr. George's *Social Problems*, later on, when he was apprised of the real character and extent of the Revolutionary Socialism taught by Mr. George in his *Progress and Poverty*, Cardinal Manning, on reading that work, found in it grave cause for condemnation.

The letters of his Eminence Cardinal Gibbons on the Labour Question in America made no little impression on the mind of Cardinal Manning. In America the whole subject was discussed with singular ability and thoroughness. The views of Cardinal Gibbons were considered by many as extreme and too far-reaching. The "Knights of Labour" were regarded as Socialistic; and not a few of his fellow-Bishops were more than alarmed at the advanced theories on the rights of Labour which were held and avowed by Cardinal Gibbons.

Complaints and charges were carried to Rome.

To Cardinal Manning the American Cardinal explained his views in several interesting letters. Cardinal Manning, who was deeply interested in the Labour Question and the relations between capitalists and the working classes, fully concurred with the theories maintained by Cardinal Gibbons.

It was an extreme satisfaction to Cardinal Manning to find his own views on the relations between Capital and Labour shared, in a measure, by one occupying a position of such ecclesiastical authority and eminence as Cardinal Gibbons.

In France one or two Bishops and writers of distinction had expressed alarm at what they regarded as Socialistic tendencies or sympathies manifested by Cardinal Manning. But among American Catholic Bishops, as well as writers in the Reviews and Magazines, Cardinal Manning's support and advocacy of the cause maintained by Cardinal Gibbons was welcomed in terms of the highest praise.

In advocating the cause of the Knights of Labour Cardinal Manning expressed his firm conviction that the Church would identify itself more and more with the cause of Labour; and that the Holy See, far from condemning, would give its sanction and support to every movement to broaden the rights and liberties of the working-classes.

He considered that Cardinal Gibbons, as the advocate of the cause of Labour, was doing a great work in ameliorating the lot and advancing the position of the labouring classes in America.

Cardinal Manning denounced afresh as obsolete the hard and cruel laws of Political Economy. A happier epoch, he maintained, was opening up for the people; for the time had arrived when the rights of Labour should be recognised as equal with the rights of Capital.

Cardinal Gibbons won the day at Propaganda; for he refuted the charges which had been alleged against him, as teaching erroneous opinions and theories. Cardinal Manning's support may, perhaps, have helped the cause of his fellow-Cardinal in America.

Every scheme advocated by philanthropists, politicians, or Social Reformers, to better or brighten the lot of the working classes, found in Cardinal Manning a glad and ready helper. His heart was in the cause. He was fond of public work. His hand, no longer busy as of yore in the work of an

ecclesiastical statesman, turned with eager joy to the work of a Social Reformer. His voice was heard on every platform. In speaking at a meeting of the "Shop Hours League and Trades Parliamentary Association," in St. James's Hall in May 1886, he alluded once more to his early labours in Lavington :—

I first interested myself in this movement for the shortening of hours in the case of shepherds and ploughmen; and I am now continuing it amongst the over-worked people of London; having no desire nearer to my heart than to see your lot, which is heavy indeed, lightened and brightened by any effort that can be made.

And when owing to the infirmities of illness and age his voice was no longer heard abroad, at home he was ever busy writing articles for Reviews and Magazines in support of social reforms, or in advocating the cause of the "Society for the Protection of Children," or in holding up to public reprobation the practice of vivisection.

In the latter days of his life every comer, Jew or Gentile, to Archbishop's House, was welcomed. He or she who had a "cause" to support, or a "mission" to proclaim, or a "message" to deliver, or a "grievance," real or imaginary, to ventilate against society, was sure of a hearing and of sympathy from the Cardinal Archbishop. "General" Booth found sympathy for the Salvation Army and its works. The sufferings of men on Strike touched the heart of Cardinal Manning, and he gave an ear to the Social Reformers. Mr. John Burns, Mr. Ben Tillett, Mr. Tom Mann, and others of a like kidney, preached their gospel at Archbishop's House.

The Jews of London ever found in the Prince of the Roman Church a sympathetic advocate in lifting up an indignant protest against the cruelties inflicted on their race and religion in Russia. Cardinal Manning never failed to manifest a partiality for the Jewish race, and in Rome itself he vindicated the Jews from the fantastic charges of cruelty imputed to them in the practice of their religious rites. He was deeply gratified by receiving from the Jews of

London their warm-hearted congratulations, offered by a Deputation, on the occasion of his Jubilee.

One Society, and one only, of all these Social Reformers failed to gain a footing at Archbishop's House. Cardinal Manning thought it necessary to draw the line at the "shrieking sisterhood." Their shrill-voiced appeals and protests were uttered in vain. He declined to give his sanction to the Society for promoting the social rights of women. He refused even to receive the more importunate members of the sisterhood, eager to argue with him on the question of the rights of women. Not that he undervalued the power and capacity of women, but because he considered the sphere and centre of woman's action was home and home-life.

It is with diffidence and shrinking of heart that I venture, as I needs must, to touch upon an episode in Cardinal Manning's life which every man of right mind cannot but recall with infinite regret. Himself of stainless purity of life and thought, it never entered into his imagination to conceive the grossness of the methods pursued, under the pretext of purging the streets of London and its sin-spots from their moral foulness and impurities, by a pseudo-apostle of purity. Even good motives do not suffice to atone for methods so atrocious. Deluded, deceived by a sensational journalist's gross imaginings; accepting as true, horrid and harrowing tales of lust and cruelty which turned out in the main to be the product of a foul imagination running riot, Cardinal Manning gave his countenance and confidence to a man, whose name shall not defile even this unhappy page in the life of an austere and holy prelate. Even after the offender against the law of man as well as against the Divine Law was condemned to purge his rank offence in gaol, Cardinal Manning, in his strange infatuation, kept up communication and correspondence with the evil-doer, still regarded him as a martyr to the cause of public purity.

In one of his Notes Cardinal Manning expressed his horror at a huge theatrical portrait of a worse than semi-nude woman which had defiled so long the walls of London. Had

he been abroad in the streets when a broadsheet headed the "Maiden Tribute," infinitely more revolting in its sensational grossness and impurity than the theatrical Portrait, was thrust into the hands of every passer-by, man, woman, or child, Cardinal Manning would have understood at a glance—at the horrid shouts of the sellers of the sensational newspaper, at the ribaldry of the gaping or laughing crowd—the meaning of the evil that was being done in the name of purity in the streets of London.

Of all the prurient scenes that were enacted, day by day, Cardinal Manning in his seclusion knew nothing. He took for granted the reports which he received from the evil-doers. Having made up his mind on the question, he listened to no counsel, no warning, no prayer. The chaplains or secretaries of his own household remonstrated in vain against the display on his table of a Gazette of ill name and fame.

So grave an error of judgment on the part of Cardinal Manning can only be accounted for by the isolation in which he lived at the time, by the absence of contact with the outer world, with men of sound sense and sober judgment and knowledge of the reality of things. He bitterly resented the criticisms which were published on his association with the "Social Purity" craze or crusade. Priests openly protested against his line of conduct as derogatory to his office as chief Pastor and guardian of souls. They implored the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster not to introduce, as was reported to be his intention, the subject into his Pastoral Letter.

The resentment which he felt at such a protest and remonstrance is shown in the following passage of a letter, written at the time to a friend, which tells its own tale:—

As to the Pastoral, not a word. I should forget all laws of proportion and fitness if I took notice of the gross impertinence of Abraham's children. If, and when, I saw fit to issue a Pastoral, twelve tribes of Pharisees and Scribes would not hinder me. What do they take me for, and what do they imagine themselves to be?[1]

[1] *Tablet*, 16th January 1892, p. 84.

Turning in anger from wise counsel, Cardinal Manning gave himself up in an unhappy hour to sentimentalists and sensation-mongers, who, trading on his horror of lust and its misdeeds, or his fierce rage against its cruelties inflicted on the young and the innocent, plied him day by day with fictitious tales of horrors unspeakable.

What a sad and pathetic picture—the austere Cardinal with a tissue of prurient fictions in his hand and a revolting purity-monger at his ear.

With Dante let it be said

Non ragionam di lor,
Ma guarda e passa.

Cardinal Manning took a prominent part in promoting every measure to relieve the widespread distress among the poor in London, during the winter of 1887-88. He urged, that since a "Mansion House Relief Fund" had been denounced by political economists as demoralising, the Government in such a crisis ought to take public action in devising permanent remedies in order to avert the recurrence of such terrible calamities in the future, and in the meantime to organise, on an adequate scale, relief for men out of work, for their families, and for the poor too weak or old for work. Cardinal Manning joined Lord Compton's Committee on the Distress in London, and on 1st February 1888 attended a deputation to Lord Salisbury in the view of inducing the Government to organise measures of relief for the immediate distress, and to devise far-reaching remedies for the future.

In the same month, Cardinal Manning entered into a long controversy with Mr. Robert Giffen, of the Board of Trade, the well-known authority on Statistics and Political Economy. In three able letters to the *Times* Cardinal Manning defended himself against the strictures and criticisms of Mr. Giffen.

Cardinal Manning, after the smart abuse which fell to his lot as an advocate of Socialistic Theories, was much gratified by the following just tribute to his zealous labours

on behalf of the suffering poor of London by Lord Carrington, Governor of Sydney.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE, SYDNEY, N.S.W.,
17*th February* 1888.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—Your Eminence has always been so kind to me, that I venture to send you a line, to wish you all happiness for the New Year, and to say how eagerly and with what interest I read of your efforts to help the poor in London. We have finished our week's celebrations of the Centenary of the Colony, and, in laying the foundation stone of the Trades Hall, I did what I could to bring the subject of overcrowding and all its horrors before the people in time; as Sydney will in years to come, with all its natural advantages, become an immense city. I also enclose a few words I spoke at the meeting of Catholics at St. Mary's Cathedral, with one or two more short speeches, in case you may have an instant to glance at them.

Cardinal Moran shows us all great kindness; and it is a great pleasure to be able to say that the feeling between all the religious bodies in this Colony is very warm, kindly, and sincere.

We are all in the best of health, and this is really a blessed part of the world to live in. The industrial population earn good wages, many have their own freehold houses, the resources of the country are marvellous, and the climate splendid. It makes one's heart ache to think of the poor at home. Cold, under-paid, and generally wet through.—Your Eminence's most sincerely,

CARRINGTON.

During the spring and summer of 1888, Cardinal Manning had constant conferences with Lord Compton and others in the view of devising prominent measures of relief for the unemployed poor in London. Manning laid down the principle that "every man has a right to work or to bread," and in answer to the objection that under the Poor Law every man out of employment can obtain sustenance and shelter, pointed out the failure of the Poor Law to meet the demands made upon it in the recent crisis. He attributed to the harsh methods of administering the Poor Law the increase in the criminal classes of London, and contended that, on this ground alone, it was the duty of the Government to take in hand measures for the reform of criminals.

To solve the difficult problem of finding work for the

unemployed baffled the endeavours of Lord Compton and his Committee. He declares in the following letter to Cardinal Manning that as yet he sees no daylight.

LOCH LUICHART, ROSS-SHIRE, N.B.,
14th October 1888.

MY DEAR CARDINAL MANNING—It was most kind of you writing to me, and directly I return to London I will ask you to see me. I am afraid that the recent horrors in London will not awake the public conscience to the fact of their neglect of the poor and criminal. I turn over and over in my mind what can be done, but as yet I see no daylight. If we could only lay bare the present state of affairs in London we might do good. In publicity seems to me the only chance of success.—Yours very truly, COMPTON.

As a set-off as it were to the labours of attending Conferences, of corresponding, of taking part in deputations, Cardinal Manning undertook the task of explaining his views or principles on the Labour question and the unemployed to the people of America. In an able Catholic Magazine, the *American Quarterly Review*, to which he was not an infrequent contributor, Cardinal Manning wrote an article entitled "The Law of Nature, Divine and Supreme."

The following passage from the article will even to-day be read with interest:—

I have committed *lèse majesté* by rudely reminding some who rule over public opinion in London of the fresh mother earth and primæval laws which protect her offspring. I was unconscious of my audacity. I thought I was uttering truisms which all educated men knew and believed. But I found that these primary truths of human life were forgotten, and that on this forgetfulness a theory and a treatment of our poor had formed, a system of thought and action, which hardens the heart of the rich and grinds the faces of the poor. I am glad, therefore, that I said and wrote what is before the public,[1] even though, for a time, some men have called me a Socialist and a Revolutionist, and have fastened upon a subordinate consequence and neglected the substance of my contention in behalf of the natural rights of the poor.

[1] See Cardinal Manning's three letters to the *Times* in February 1888.

Apart from the moral effects of his action in intervening in the memorable crisis of the autumn of 1889, between the Directors of the London Docks and the men on Strike, the vigour and vitality displayed by Cardinal Manning offered another singular illustration of the power of mind over matter; of the impulse of heart and soul over-mastering the feebleness of age and the infirmities of illness. Force of will, tenacity of purpose, which through life were the most marked elements in Manning's character, were never more conspicuous than in the supreme effort to fight the battle of the men on Strike at the London Docks. He stood up almost singlehanded as the champion of Labour. The odds against him were immense. The Dock Directors resented the interference of an outsider, ignorant of the customs of the Trade, of the merits of the facts in dispute, of the principles, as their supporters in the press or on the platform contended, of political economy.[1] A weaker man than Manning would have fallen back abashed, as some of his colleagues did, in the face of opposition. Self-confidence, however, never forsook him. Benevolence, sympathy, pity for the men on Strike and their wives and children filled his heart. A noble ambition prompted him to perform the part of a public benefactor as peacemaker at a serious crisis. For after the victory over the Dock Directors had been practically secured, the Strike Committee, flushed with success and with large funds still at their command, threatened to keep up the Strike for an indefinite period. The plea put forward by the Leaders of the Strike was as to the date at which the new scale of payment conceded by the Directors was to come into operation. It had been fixed for the first of the following January. The Strike Committee, breaking the agreement which they had provisionally accepted, now demanded that the date should be advanced to the first of October, a fortnight from the date

[1] In the beginning of the Strike Cardinal Manning was under the impression that the Directors of the London Docks were reaping enormous profits. He only learned subsequently, from inquiries made by one of his secretaries, of the unfortunate pecuniary position of the two principal Dock Companies who were the first objects of attack on the part of the Strikers

of their new demand. The Dock Directors absolutely refused the exorbitant demand. Now was the time for Cardinal Manning to show his skill as a diplomatist, and a peacemaker. His first business was to endeavour to obtain concessions on the part of the Dock Directors as to the date of introducing the new scale of wages, in the view of inducing the men on Strike to abate their extravagant demands. The Directors were obdurate. They insisted on the observance of the date as originally arranged. Cardinal Manning, with the Lord Mayor and the Bishop of London, who had come up to town, met the Leaders of the Strike at the Mansion House and drew up the terms agreed to by the Directors of the Docks, namely an advance on the rate of wages of sixpence per day from the first of January. The Leaders of the Strike were fair-spoken and plausible, and promised to submit the terms to the men, and report without delay the result to the Mansion House. The Committee of Conciliation, as it was called, waited at the Mansion House till ten o'clock in the evening; no answer was given. But next morning, Sunday, as Cardinal Manning has recorded, "appeared a manifesto repudiating terms, negotiations, and negotiators." In the afternoon, a meeting of the men on Strike in Hyde Park passed a Resolution declaring that they would accept the Directors' terms only on condition that the date of the new scale of wages should be advanced from 1st January to 1st October.

A dead-lock ensued. The dangers attending the prolongation of the Strike were incalculable. The Bishop of London, indignant at what he considered the duplicity of the Leaders of the Strike, shook the dust from off his feet and left the Committee of Conciliation in the lurch. Had Cardinal Manning followed his faint-hearted example what dangers, what calamities to the community, what evils might not have ensued.

At this crisis the value of Cardinal Manning's intervention was seen at its full. The Leaders of the Strike were elated at what they considered to be their victory over the Directors. They desired to push things to extremes. They were careless of consequences. They rejected with scorn terms of concili-

ation. It was Cardinal Manning's aim and object to bring them to reason, and in order to do so he knew that he must first win the confidence of the men and then gain their hearts. In this view, Cardinal Manning and Mr. Buxton met the various Strike Committees at Poplar, in their headquarters, at "Wade's Arms." The Conference lasted three and a half hours. The meeting was attended by about sixty or seventy men. They were excited and obstinate. They insisted on the full fruits of their victory. Two hours were spent in hopeless discussion. At last, Cardinal Manning made a final appeal to the men. He spoke with earnestness and out of the fulness of his heart. He implored them not to prolong the Strike, not to add to the sufferings of their wives and children, not to imitate the cruelty and hardness of heart of the Directors, not to reject the advice and disappoint the hopes of their friends and champions. Cardinal Manning proposed to split the difference and make the first Monday in November the date for the introduction of the new scale of wages. The hearts of the men were moved at last by his touching appeals and eloquent remonstrances. They began to give way. One of the Leaders of the Strike moved a Resolution, adopting Cardinal Manning's proposal, and empowering him to treat with the Directors. After still further discussion and delay the Resolution was at last carried—nineteen men not voting—by twenty-eight to fifteen.

The final difficulty was to induce the Directors to accept the terms of the men and ratify the compromise. Empowered by the Lord Mayor, who was absent from London, Cardinal Manning and Mr. Buxton saw the Directors with the view of inducing them to accept the proposition of the men. No immediate or definite answer could be given. Collateral issues had to be considered. Several days were spent in negotiations with the wharfingers and lightermen and others still on Strike. At last, late on Saturday evening, the remnant of the men on Strike gave in, and the Directors signed the agreement. The Strike was at an end.

The putting an end to this dispute, which was producing disastrous consequences to all concerned, directly or in-

directly—to the port of London, to the community at large,—seemed to justify Cardinal Manning's interposition. He may have been ignorant of the customs of the Trade, of the merits of the questions in dispute; he may have lacked the technical knowledge essential to the part of an arbitrator; yet, in spite of these shortcomings, and of his, maybe, somewhat crude theories, he succeeded where others failed.

The reason is not far to seek. Beyond the material interests involved, moral difficulties had to be considered and confronted. The "Dockers' Strike" had begotten ill blood on either side. Deep down in the hearts of men in conflict—be they dock directors or men on Strike—lie hidden forces or passions which have to be exorcised before peace and reconciliation can be effected. That was the special work which fell to the lot of Cardinal Manning. What he had to appease was, on the one side, pride and power, self-interest, resentment; on the other, hatred of Capital, enkindled or kept alive by interested agitators, revenge, and pride of victory. It is no disparagement to his fellows on the Conciliation Committee to say that they played, if any, a subsidiary or subordinate part in that hidden drama of the passions enacted under the surface in the hearts of men. To the men on Strike, at least in the supreme hour, the others seemed but as shadows on the wall; whereas the presence of Cardinal Manning in their midst was a reality. His transparent sympathy, earnestness, and force of character, shown in act and word, arrested their attention, took possession of their heart, and, finally, subdued their will.

By some of the men on Strike, or by their half-starving wives and children, the end of the Strike was hailed as "the Cardinal's Peace," and so in substance it was.

At the Cardinal's prodigal exertions, and at times prolonged absences from home, there was no little anxiety or alarm at Archbishop's House, Westminster. On the occasion of his interview with the Leaders of the Strike at Poplar, I remember calling by appointment, and was informed by his chief secretary and affectionate friend Canon Johnson, that the Cardinal had not as yet returned at the, for him, late hour of half-past nine o'clock. It was

not, indeed, till near eleven at night that he reached home. On the following Sunday, when the Lord Mayor called to learn the effect of his interview with the Directors of the Dock, asking whether their hearts were moved by his discourse, Cardinal Manning's reply was, "I never in my life preached to so impenitent a congregation."

In the following autobiographical Note, dated 16th September 1889, Cardinal Manning gives an account of the part he took in the settlement of the Strike at the London Docks:—

On 5th September Miss Harkness came to me from the Leaders of the Strike to tell me that the coal heavers who had returned to work would strike again at noon next day, if the Dock Directors did not grant the demands of their men. If the coal supply had failed, the railroads and the gas factories would have been affected. I went at once to the Home Office; both Secretary and Under Secretary were out of London. I went to the Mansion House; the Lord Mayor was in Scotland. But I found the deputy Lord Mayor, and the second chief of the police. We went together to the Directors. They received us very courteously, but nothing came of it. This was Friday. The Lord Mayor and the Bishop of London came to town. Saturday we met the Leaders of the Strike at the Mansion House, and drew up terms to be laid before the men, *i.e.* sixpence from 1st January. We waited for the answer till ten o'clock. No answer was ever given. But next morning, Sunday, appeared a manifesto repudiating terms, negotiations, and negotiators. In the afternoon in Hyde Park the Meeting passed a Resolution, accepting the terms, to begin on 1st October. This the Directors rejected, and next day, Monday, the Leaders met at the Mansion House, and it was arranged that Mr. Buxton and I should meet the Strike Committees at Poplar next day, Tuesday. We did so at 5 o'clock, in the Wade Street schools. The Conference lasted three and a half hours. About sixty-five men were present. For two hours there was little hope. I had proposed that the difference of time between then and 1st January should be split, fixing 4th November. Gradually a change came, and Mr. Champion moved a Resolution adopting my proposal and empowering me to treat with the Directors. This was at last carried by twenty-eight to fifteen, nineteen Surrey men not voting, their demand being distinct from the north.

Next day, Wednesday, we saw the Directors. The Lord

Mayor by telegram empowered me to urge the proposition of the men upon the Directors. They gave no definite answer. We saw Mr. Norwood in private, and things seemed more favourable. The Directors said they were bound in honour not to come in, until the wharfingers, and lightermen, and Surrey men came in.

The next days were spent in dealing with the two first, but until Saturday we could not get an agreement. It was five o'clock before the lightermen gave in. And six o'clock before the Directors signed.

The Strike then ended.

The lightermen then came to the Mansion House to thank us and to shake hands.

16*th September* 1889.

Three acts in this mediation fell to my lot:—

1. The beginning, on 6th September, when I went to the Dock house with Sir Andrew Lusk.

2. The beginning again on the eighth after the manifesto of repudiation.

3. The carrying of "4th November" at Poplar on the night of the tenth, and the resolutions empowering me to go to the Directors.

To this summary add the interview with the Directors, with the Lord Mayor's telegram empowering me to speak in his name.

I was therefore empowered by both the men and the Lord Mayor. *Hactenus* Balaam's ass.

Besides his own Notes on the part which he took in the settlement of the Dockers' Strike, Cardinal Manning was fortunately on such friendly terms with Mr. S. B. Boulton of Copped Hall, Totteridge, the present chairman of the London Board of Conciliation, as to discuss with him not only the events connected with the Strike, but broader questions of politics and political economy. As an indication not only of the friendly relations he entertained with Mr. Boulton, but of the readiness with which Cardinal Manning recognised sincerity and earnestness in the treatment of all questions connected with Capital and Labour, it will suffice to say, that, contrary to his general wont, Cardinal Manning welcomed criticism and listened to arguments in opposition to his own conclusions.

The latest and most authoritative exposition of Cardinal Manning's views on the Dockers' Strike, on Labour, and on Socialism is to be found in his discussions and correspondence with Mr. Boulton. For the purpose of putting this invaluable information on record, Mr. Boulton has kindly placed at my disposal the following account:—

Summary and extracts of Cardinal Manning's discussion and correspondence on Social and Economic questions in the years 1889-91.

From Cardinal Manning's first visit to me in the year 1881, at Copped Hall, Totteridge, a friendly intercourse sprang up between us which continued until his death, and which was in no way interfered with by my settled convictions on religious questions, and on various points as to politics and political economy upon which I differed from him, although as to the two latter subjects we had amicable discussions from time to time, both verbally and by letters. I remember particularly a discussion with him upon a political subject upon which he asked me to express an opinion upon the occasion of another visit which he paid me after opening the St. Edward's Schools in Totteridge. Our views did not agree, but the charm and quiet dignity of his manner, and his clear and quick appreciation of points of argument, even when urged in opposition to his own conclusions, rendered the recollection of such conversations amongst the most pleasant of reminiscences.

But our friendship was increased and cemented during the closing period of his life by his co-operation as to Labour questions, in which I was deeply interested. On the occasion of another visit to my house, during the autumn of 1889, the conversation turned upon the events connected with the then recent Dockers' Strike. At that time the Cardinal was in the zenith of the popularity which he had acquired by his mediation in the Strike; a popularity which was soon afterwards chequered by adverse, and in some cases very unfair criticisms. In the course of the conversation, I said that in my opinion a debt of profound gratitude was due to him for his exertions towards putting an end to such a lamentable state of civil war, for which every one appeared to have been completely unprepared. The mischief to the whole community from any further prolongation of that disastrous strife would have been incalculable. Nevertheless I ventured to suggest that, valuable as his mediation had been under the exceptional circumstances, yet arbitration applied by

one eminent individual, however disinterested and benevolent, was not the method which should be normally applied to the settlement of Labour disputes. In the first place, prevention was better than cure. Re-adjustments of the rates and conditions of labour were from time to time inevitable, with the varying circumstances of trade and manufactures. In cases where the best of all methods of adjustment had broken down, that of the mutual agreement between employers and employed without outside intervention, it should then be to practical men, themselves engaged in the operations of Labour and Capital, and freely elected representatives of both, that the functions of conciliators and arbitrators should by preference be entrusted. The clergy of all the churches had a high and noble mission to fulfil in preaching the duty and the blessing of industrial peace, and in using all their influence in persuading disputants to have recourse to such practical arbitration as I had alluded to. And I appealed to the Cardinal for his sympathy and support on behalf of the effort which was then beginning to take shape at the London Chamber of Commerce for the purpose of forming a Labour Conciliation Board for the London district.

The Cardinal listened with attention, and after a short pause said "Yes! I think that you are right. It is certainly not part of the business of a prelate to fix rates of wages, but I will tell you how it came about that I intervened in the Dock Strike. I found things going from bad to worse, and how much misery was the result! At last, from positive information, I became certain that fresh efforts which were about to be made to bring labourers from a distance (he specified the locality) would lead to violent resistance, probably to bloodshed. Finding that no other mediation acceptable to the combatants appeared to be available, I resolved to offer my humble services with the endeavour to bring them to meet together. I was received with great courtesy by both parties, with the results which you know." He then described in detail his visit to the "Wade's Arms," the headquarters of the Strike leaders, and also his first interview with, and courteous reception by, the Dock Directors. Finally, he remarked that if an organisation similar to that to which I had alluded could be established on fair and equitable bases, he for one would be prepared to use his influence in its favour. I may add that shortly afterwards I had occasion to speak at a meeting of the Statistical Society during a discussion on Strikes in which the late Mr. Norwood took part, and from a subsequent conversation I found that his (Mr. Norwood's) account of the incidents of the meeting between

the Dock Directors and the Cardinal, entirely coincided with the recollections of the latter.

A Committee of Enquiry had been nominated by the London Chamber of Commerce, with instructions to report as to the practicability of forming a Conciliation Board for the London District. Of this Committee I had been appointed chairman, and Cardinal Manning consented to join it, but his health was so delicate during that winter and the ensuing spring, that he could not leave his house to attend any of its meetings. He took, however, a keen interest in the development of the scheme, and did his best, both by correspondence and by numerous personal interviews, at home, to give all the information in his power, and to exercise his influence in favour of the movement. In October 1889 I was able to forward him a provisional draft, as settled by the Committee, of a plan for the formation of a Conciliation Board, to which he immediately signified his adhesion, as he also did to the subsequent and more matured rules and bye-laws according to which the Conciliation Board was finally constituted. Now it should be borne in mind that the scheme involved from the first the exclusion from the Conciliation Board of all save practical men, elected representatives of employers and employed, with equal numbers of each order, and with equality of voting power. From the moment that this body was in working order the Cardinal entered fully into the arrangement. He entirely abstained from any further attempt personally to settle points of dispute in the London labour market, and strictly confined himself to using his influence in endeavouring to get such disputes referred to the Conciliation Board. I think it due to the memory of the Cardinal to dwell upon this point, because suggestions as to "popularity-hunting" were not spared him in some quarters during the exciting period of the Dock Strike. It is doubtless true that some of his utterances at that period were based upon imperfect information; if it were so, it would be accounted for by the fact that matters of a technically practical nature were suddenly submitted to one whose sphere of duties was entirely unconnected with such details. I am fully convinced that his action throughout the whole of these Labour troubles was dictated by complete disinterestedness and self-abnegation, and the facts which I have stated should bear testimony thereto. One of the first Labour disputes settled by the Labour Conciliation Board was submitted to its decision through the influence of the Cardinal, acting in conjunction with Mr. Sydney Buxton.

I subjoin extracts from correspondence :—

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE, WESTMINSTER,
24th October 1889.

MY DEAR MR. BOULTON—I thank you much for the copy of the Arbitration Scheme, which I have read with complete assent, and if I can in any way be of use in it I shall be truly glad. This I leave to your judgment.

Of the lawfulness of refusing to work I can have no doubt, but of its mischievous effects, and of its prompt tendency to become political and turbulent, there can be also no doubt. Hitherto our trades' unions and strikes have been economical, but on the Continent they are dangerously political, and ours will become so unless voluntary arbitration shall keep them within the control of social intervention. It seems to me that the Chamber of Commerce is the true centre of what may be called a voluntary jurisdiction in labour and wages.

I am very thankful to know that Harold is safely recovering.—Believe me always, very truly yours, HENRY E. CARD. MANNING.

S. B. Boulton, Esq.

Extract from Letter dated 14*th December* 1889.

The Secretary has written to me, and I will answer that my name, and such service as I can render, shall be at the disposal of the Chamber of Commerce.

(The above refers to the Committee of Inquiry.)

Extract from Letter dated 20*th December* 1889.

Since Thursday of last week I have been shut up in the house with a cold, and though I have hoped to the last to come to the meeting of to-day, I find it impossible. I can therefore only write to express my true regret, and my hope to be present at the next meeting. Mr. Murray perhaps would be so kind as to send me anything he can of your proceedings.

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE, WESTMINSTER,
31*st December* 1889.

MY DEAR MR. BOULTON—I am still laid up and cannot leave the house. This is a true disappointment, but I must take it as it comes. Your letter to the *Times* was very good. How strangely off-hand our critics are, and how inaccurate. Many happy and useful New Years to you.—Yours very truly, HENRY E. CARD. MANNING.

Extract from Letter dated 14*th January* 1890.

Once more I have been unable to be present at your Committee, for I am still afraid of leaving the house. But I have been continually thinking of the main question of Capital and Labour, and it seems to me that until labour and skill are recognised as Capital, as truly as gold and silver, the primary and vital relations of the employer and employed will never be understood. Even the organ blower is vital

to the organist. But labour and skill can initiate and produce without gold and silver; gold and silver can do nothing without labour and skill. But the relative power of these two quantities is practically inverted. Until this is rectified we shall do little. (He then alludes to an article in the *Contemporary Review* by Professor Nicholson, and ends by saying—) I shall be glad to know what your thoughts are

To this I replied *inter alia* on 24th January 1890—

I think that we are quite agreed as to the relative *duties* of the representatives of Labour and Capital. But I do not, as a matter of definition, accept the theory that labour and skill *are capital*. To my mind, skill, labour, and capital are three very distinct entities, each having a right to, and in fact commanding, its own separate hire or reward. Labour can, if it chooses, hire the other two, as in the case of a co-operative manufactory. But, as we know, in most cases skill is the master; skill the initiator, inventor, organiser, and controller. And at least until there is more self-discipline amongst the men who work with their hands, labour will in most cases be better off by letting skill be the employer of labour and of capital. I have read the article by Professor Nicholson, etc., etc. . . . I am so sorry to hear of your continued indisposition, and I hope to take an early opportunity of calling upon you.

On 9th February 1890, I received a long letter from the Cardinal commencing as follows:—

I have carefully read the further report (*i.e.* the report as to the constitution of the Conciliation Board), and fully assent to it. Experience may modify details, but the substance is sound and sufficient.

The rest of the letter is taken up with detailed information for which I had asked him, and ends by saying *apropos* to a Labour dispute, "The men will listen to reason, but not to threats."

On 27th February 1890, upon receiving the information that the Conciliation Board had just succeeded in bringing a certain Labour dispute to a satisfactory settlement, he writes:—

Many thanks for the good news about . . . Wharf.

And the letter ends—

If now we can get . . . quiet, there will be time for settling down. I see that Trade is going to Harwich.

On 3rd March 1890 he writes, after alluding to an erroneous statement in the press regarding the Conciliation Board:—

As a consolation to you, I may tell you that in Dublin the Archbishop adopted your whole Conciliation scheme, and published it in the *Freeman's Journal.* Mr. (Sydney) Buxton has it, and to-day he has sent me the enclosed (a newspaper report) to show that your work is bearing fruit in Dublin also.

On 9th April 1890 he writes:—

The need of an impartial tribunal is obvious, and it is obvious also that public opinion and conscience will not let conflicts and strikes become a nuisance and a public danger. I hope your daughter is better.

On 12th April 1890, he writes giving particulars of his interview with a well-known Labour leader, who had opposed the plan of the Conciliation Board, but who at the interview in question, whilst not seeing his way to giving it his personal support, promised to withdraw his opposition, a promise which has been faithfully kept. The Cardinal ends by prophesying of the Board, "It will win its way by succeeding."

On 3rd September 1890, he writes me on the eve of my leaving for Ireland, with some information regarding Labour matters in Dublin, and asking me to see him on my return, as he feared that some Labour troubles were coming.

There is not very much more correspondence between us on this subject; the London Conciliation Board had become thoroughly established and settled down to its work, competent and earnest men, both masters and workmen, had been found willing to devote arduous labour and energy to the scheme. Cardinal Manning was warm in his expressions of appreciation at the result, whilst with the arbitration work of the Board he never sought to interfere.

On 20th January 1891 he writes:—

You have done a right good thing in founding the London Conciliation Board. . . . If it existed in Edinburgh, there would be a hope of averting a great public disorder and a great public danger, which at any moment may break out into a great public disaster. It is not true that such contests are the private affairs of masters and men. But the theory will not die until it is killed by some public catastrophe. I am sorry that I have never shared your Conferences at Botolph House, but since October 1889, I have been shut up nearly ten months at least. I hope you are all well at Totteridge.

The Conferences alluded to were the aggregate meetings of Labour delegates and members of the Chamber of Commerce.

The last letter which I received from him on the subject of

the Conciliation Board was on 23rd February 1891. It is as follows:—

I hope you will not lose a minute in proposing to . . . and the men's Union to come together, with the Board of Conciliation, as you did in the affair of the wharves. The men are willing to work with Non-union men, and with their agreement, everything may be settled by clear understanding and fair dealing.

My subsequent intercourse with the Cardinal during 1891, consisted principally in personal interviews at his house. It was becoming evident towards the end of the year that whilst the intellect was still remarkably keen and clear, his life's labours were nearly over; the extreme emaciation of the physical structure told its own tale. In the extracts which I have given from a somewhat voluminous correspondence I have inserted but one of my replies to his letters, and I have merely included this one from the desire to show the nature of the friendly discussions which he sought and welcomed. The Cardinal has at times been accused of leanings towards Socialism, an imputation which he assured me was erroneous. Those who have read his Tract upon "The Rights and Dignity of Labour," can form their own conclusions on the subject.[1]

S. B. BOULTON.

9th August 1894.

In keeping a record of Cardinal Manning's communications and conversations on the subject of the Dockers' Strike and on Socialism, Mr. Boulton has done good service to the cause of truth and justice, and has rescued Cardinal Manning's name and memory from the imputation of Socialism, which after his death was somewhat audaciously attributed by some of its disciples to the venerable Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster.

[1] The following records are of present interest. The Parish Books of Totteridge record the cost of bread, coal, and other necessaries, which were from time to time distributed to the poor. They show that in

1809	bread was	1s. 4½d.	per quartern.
1811	„	1s. 7d.	„
„	„	1s. 5½d.	„
1812	„	1s. 7½d.	„

Considering how much lower were the wages of working-men than at the present time, the comparison with present conditions is interesting and encouraging.

Of his character and career as a Politician all that needs to be said is, that as Cardinal Manning on his own showing was a Home Ruler under limitations, a Radical without guile; so in like manner he was a Social Reformer, guiltless, according to his own recorded testimony, of leanings towards Socialism.

CHAPTER XXIII

LIFE AND WORK AT ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE, WESTMINSTER—READINGS AND REMINISCENCES

1881-1890.

When his ecclesiastical career was practically closed; when the active part he had taken at the Vatican for well nigh thirty years, during the Pontificate of Pope Pius IX., had come to an end, and his visits to the Eternal City had ceased, Cardinal Manning consoled a somewhat troubled and isolated existence by living his life over again. In his lonely and sombre rooms at Archbishop's House, Westminster, he revived the boyish recollections of his earliest home at Totteridge or Combe Bank; glorified his pleasant but idle days at Harrow; gave form and substance to the day-dreams of ambition at Oxford; and converted even the office stool at the Colonial Office into a stepping-stone to political life. The dry bones live again. The Past takes its hue and colour from the light of the present. In his old age Cardinal Manning forgot—not an uncommon occurrence at such a period in the lives of men—the storm and stress of religious doubts and difficulties which beset him in the prime of life. In his "Reminiscences" the crooked ways were made straight and the rough ways smooth.

What a pleasant background do not these bright pictures of his early days form to the sorrows of widowed Lavington, or to the sterner life of the Archdeacon of Chichester, spent for the most part in doubts and difficulties and controversies eating into the very marrow of his bones and casting their

shadow on his troubled brow; or, in his new life as a Catholic priest: to the prolonged and painful struggle with Dr. Errington and the "malcontent bishops"; or to the breaking up—distressing and sad to the extreme of sadness—of friendly relations with John Henry Newman; or to the fears and anxieties which lay heavy on his soul during the stirring scenes of conflict and controversy at the Vatican Council—the most stormy period of his stormy life—in which as Archbishop of Westminster he played a foremost part; or finally to the gloom involved, especially to Cardinal Manning, by a change in the Pontificate on the death, in 1878, of his friend and patron, Pope Pius IX. At a Conference of Cardinals held just previous to the solemn deliberations of the Conclave, there came a gleam of light, a ray of comfort to Manning's disconsolate heart. For at this Conference, after Cardinal Pecci's name had been proposed and accepted as the first name, Cardinal Bilio proposed that of the English Cardinal; but pleading his own unfitness as a foreigner to become a candidate for the Triple Crown, Cardinal Manning declined the supreme honour, and gave his vote and influence to the present successor of Pius IX.[1]

Cardinal Manning was of too practical a nature, however, to dally long amid the reminiscences of the Past. He lived in the present. His active mind was ever on the alert. In the seclusion of his later years, when by the growing infirmities of age and illness he was debarred, except on the spur of grave emergencies like the London Dockers' Strike, from public action, he still kept in touch and in sympathy with the movements of the day. He watched events with unfailing interest. He took special note of what was written or said about himself or his actions in the Past. No book was left unread treating of events and times and subjects in which he, too, had either taken part or might have taken a prominent part, had he not been

[1] This Conference consisted of six cardinals—Cardinals Bartolini, Franchi, Bilio, Monaco, Nina, and Manning. Cardinal Bilio, holding it necessary in the storms which then raged against the Church and the Papacy, that the next Pope should be a foreigner, proposed Cardinal Manning. See Manning's "Reminiscences of the Conclave, 18th Feb. 1878," p. 547.

called by the Divine Will from a life of public action into a life apart from the world.

The following Reminiscences, among others of a like kind, of Lord Shaftesbury and Lord Macaulay and Bishop Wilberforce, together with an account of his relations and correspondence with Mr. Gladstone,[1] and his reflections on the chances and changes which drew them together in the closest bonds of intimacy or drove them apart in open hostility, often engaged during the later years of his life the thoughts and attention of Cardinal Manning. Such reminiscences or reflections never failed, as he recorded them, to evoke memories of events in his own life; of openings and opportunities offered to his ambition; of the two careers which were open to him in early life; and of his final choice under Divine guidance to put them aside in order that, in obedience to the voice of God, he might give himself up heart and soul to a higher calling.

In contrasting his own life and work with the life and work of other men who had stood side by side with him in the earlier beginnings of his active course, or who had gone forth into their careers from the same starting-point, he was at times beset by the haunting fear that, in comparison with theirs, his had been a wasted life. But such fears had no real home in Cardinal Manning's heart. For, in happier or more hopeful moods, he records in his Reminiscences, that the life and work of other men, done in the world and for the world, is not to be compared in height and fulness and lasting utility to the work for Eternity accomplished by those whom God has set apart from the world and consecrated to Himself.

The reading of Macaulay's "Life" in an especial manner revived in Cardinal Manning's breast the day-dreams of his youth. "Macaulay's life of public activity and utility, his contact with men, his share in events: all this was what I once thirsted for; not, I believe, with any low ambition or any empty vanity." Even in the contrasting of Macaulay's life and career with his own, the habit which in Manning was almost like a second nature, of referring everything in

[1] See Manning's relations with Mr. Gladstone, Chapter XVII. pp. 489-491.

his life to God, manifests itself again. Speaking of politics having taken the place in his heart of his clerical vocation, he said, "So I willed, but God willed otherwise. Had I not broken with the world I might not have been saved. I cannot tell what a change might have passed over me, stealthily, insensibly, but down to the very roots of the moral life. I seem to see it in Gladstone. He was nearer to being a clergyman than I was: I believe as fit for it as I was unfit. But God crossed his hands as Jacob did: and called him to the life I had chosen, and me to the life he thought of entering." The conclusion which Cardinal Manning arrived at in the contrast of his own career with that of Macaulay was that "God had led him into the wilderness, had spoken to his soul, and given him a life separate from the world and consecrated to himself," and then, under the guiding light of this conviction, he added "In the sight of this all my aspirations and ambitions disappear; and I see that the fascination of Macaulay's life has no measure beside the life God has laid on me." [1]

7th December 1881.—September last I read Macaulay's life, chiefly at St. Bede's College, where I had nothing to do but to go back to the Past. I was fascinated by it. I seemed to live in my own past. His Cambridge days, and classics, and friends, and aspirations, his entrance into Parliament, just when I took my degree, and entered the Colonial Office. My memory of his first and second speech—his career in the House—all these things were like my own day-dreams at twenty-two. His life of public activity and utility, his contact with men; his share in events: all this was what I once thirsted for; not, I believe, with any low ambition, or any empty vanity. But from a belief, as Warburton says, that "after religion, politics are the chief matters worthy of a wise man's attention." For me, religion as a clergyman had passed away. Politics came next in reality, solidity, and public good. So I willed, but God willed otherwise. Yet in reading Macaulay's life I had a haunting feeling that his had been a life of public utility and mine a *vita umbratilis*, a life in the shade, passive, and of little result. For this world little enough. God has led me through two strange

---

[1] In conversation on this book Cardinal Manning said, Trevelyan's *Life of Macaulay* is the most fascinating book I have read. I knew Macaulay, but until I read the "Life" I was not aware of the religious character of his mind.

careers. The world may think that to mean something. But what does it leave behind? Little indeed. Then I thought, but what may it have sent onward into Eternity. Little again—but perhaps if I had not broken with the world I might not have been saved. I cannot tell what a change might have have passed over me, stealthily, insensibly, but down to the very roots of the moral life. I seem to see it in Gladstone. He was nearer to being a clergyman than I was. He was, I believe, as fit for it as I was unfit. But God crossed his hands as Jacob did; and called him to the life I had chosen, and me to the life he thought of entering. In those days I looked upon him as the most formed, mature, and self-governed man I knew. I thought his moral powers more marked than his intellectual. No doubt I had little fitness for public life; but even less for the life of the sanctuary. But God saw otherwise; and reversed our thoughts. *Optat ephippia bos piger: optat arare caballus.*[1] And I can never bless Him as I ought. Who knows what I might have been now? Who knows how long ago I might have been worn out in the world? Instead of strife in and for this world, God led me into the wilderness and spoke to my whole soul. He gave me a life separate from the world, consecrated to Himself, in search for Truth till I found it; and thenceforward in witness for Truth in defence of the faith, in serving souls, and the Church and the Vicar of our Lord, and for Eternity, when I hope I may see His Face. In the light of this all my aspirations and ambitions disappear; and I see that the fascination of Macaulay's life has no measure beside the life God has laid on me.

13*th December* 1882.—To-day is Gladstone's political jubilee. The anniversary of his election at Newark. Fifty years of public service, and unceasing labour for the country claim what he receives—a public recognition of great merit. His course has been to me intelligible from the first. He began as a Tory. I was always, as I said, a Mosaic Radical. His Toryism was only a boyish and Etonian admiration of Canning, and an intimacy with Lincoln and the like. His whole career has been for the people, always widening out. I remember about 1856 saying to him that Disraeli had pushed him off the aristocracy, the land, the Established Church, upon the Nonconformists, the people, and the Manchester School. He is at this day the leader of a democracy, which need not be a Revolution if the upper classes have manhood, common sense, and self-denial to mix with the people and lead the people. The English people and the British army may both be led by men whom they trust and respect. His has been a great career of public service.

---

[1] See Hor., *Ep.* I., 14, 43.

On Christmas Day I shall have my humble jubilee. On Christmas Day 1832 I preached for the first time at Cuddesdon for G. Anthony Denison,[1] on *Surge illuminari Jerusalem.* Mine has been a life of fifty years out of the world as Gladstone's has been in it. The work of his life in this world is manifest. I hope mine may be in the next. I suppose our Lord called me out of the world because He saw that I should lose my soul in it. Separation from it greater than the last thirty years could hardly be. I remember saying that I had "given up working for the people of England to work for the Irish occupation in England." But that occupation is a part of the Church throughout the world, of an empire greater than the British. I may hope, too, that even upon the English people the last thirty years have not been without effect. In the last ten or fifteen I have been mixed into them again, in many ways, and always by their invitation. Into the private life and homes of the non-Catholic English I have hardly if ever entered for these thirty years. Even into the homes of Catholics very seldom. I have lived among my priests and my poor. When I go from London it is always to the homes of my colleagues; when for work in any place always to the houses of the priests, however poor, rather than to lay houses. I have done this intentionally, because if the laity have two parts in me, the priests have ten.

It has seemed to me to be my duty to be at headquarters and to keep myself for my clergy. They can look after the laity, and I can look after them. I have no doubt that I should have been more popular if I had dined out, and gone from house to house. But I am sure I should have been less of a pastor, little as I am. No man could have been more exiled and shut out of English life private and public than I was thirty years ago. I have returned to it in some remote ways; but if I have any hold on the English people it will be only as I have gained it by mixing among them in their good works, and by writing.

The "Life of Shaftesbury," a noble philanthropist like himself, excited in Cardinal Manning the deepest interest and sympathy. In his Reminiscences he contrasts Lord Shaftesbury's life of benevolence and of public utility with his own, and finds in a moment of despondency or disappointment, but for a moment only, that his has been a wasted life, barren of public usefulness.

[1] In 1832 the Rev. G. Anthony Denison was curate at Cuddesdon; he is now the well-known Archdeacon of Taunton.

29*th December* 1884.—I have just ended Lord Shaftesbury's "Life." It was a noble and unique Christian manhood. What a retrospect of work done. It makes me feel that my life has been wasted. He began with every advantage and facility the world could give him: I began absolutely with nothing in the world. The unity, consistency, and perseverance of his life were wonderful. He took human suffering and human sorrow, and the helplessness of childhood, of the poor as the end for which to live. He spent and was spent for it, and his own life was a suffering life like the Man of Sorrows, going about doing good.

8*th February* 1887.—His whole life was spent in working for the English people. So I began in a little, and then have spent my life in working for the Irish occupation in England. But that occupation is the Catholic Church in all the amplitude of faith, grace, and authority. The last six and thirty years I have worked for the building up again of Catholic, and even of Christian Truth which was wrecked in the great revolt. And truth or faith are the conditions of the whole moral and spiritual life of the people. I have lived out of the world and yet the Catholic Church tells upon public opinion and upholds what still remains of Christianity in England. I hope that in this I may not have lived in vain. So also I hope that I may have helped to bring the Catholic Church once more into open relations with the people and public opinion of England. We are as much known and recognised as if we were known to the law, which absurdly ignores us.

Cardinal Manning, who in the later years of his life took a strong yearning interest in his Anglican days, has, in a monograph dated 15th January 1883, entitled, "Samuel Wilberforce," given a brief picture of his own life and mind when, on becoming a Catholic in 1851, he broke with the world in which Samuel Wilberforce lived:—

SAMUEL WILBERFORCE'S LIFE.

15*th January* 1883.

I have not read it. The two first volumes I turned over. The third I have not seen. But I have seen a multitude of extracts, and censures in newspapers, The world knows now what I knew always. But I have been silent from old affection, true sorrow, and the law of charity.

From 1833 to 1845 we were in close affection. I think he always feared me; and I never fully trusted him. I saw that he pursued worldly interests, and that he was losing simplicity.

Popularity, flattery, and finally the entrance into the Court completed this. In 1845 he was made Bishop of Oxford: and I do not doubt that he shared in the Archbishop of York's invitation to me to succeed as Sub-Almoner to the Queen. I saw that this would draw me into the atmosphere in which I had seen him wither. And I refused it. My reasons are given in full in the White Quarto Journal dated December 1845.[1]

From that time our relations became less intimate. My own mind was moving slowly but steadily and without deviation towards the Catholic Faith. This I never concealed from him. He knew my influence over his brothers Henry and Robert, and over his daughter Emily Pye. But I never touched their convictions by word or deed except when they sought it. I was too deeply anxious, too profoundly afraid of making a mistake in so grave a matter, involving so great a multitude of souls who depended upon me, to expose me to the slightest temptation to speak, or write, or act at random on such subjects. Nevertheless with him I was true, concealing nothing, and forcing nothing. This is proved in letters of his and Gladstone's about me, I think in the second volume of his "Life."

In 1851 by God's mercy I submitted to the Faith, and we parted. Since then a letter or two—twice meeting in Hyde Park, and once at St. Alban's Abbey, is the whole of our intercourse to the hour of his death.

From the time he entered the Court, he entered the world, and from the turn of his mind no man was more akin to it. He had every natural gift to attract the world and to be led captive by it. His fertility of imagination and facility of speech were equalled by no man I have ever known except by Father Faber. His powers of conversation were inexhaustible. He lived for work, politics, and society. If his nature had been masculine and trained in the discipline of a public school; and if his faith had been definite as a disciple of the Divine Voice of the Church, all these lighter endowments would have been guided and chastened under a high and governing reign of a life in the world but out of it! How lamentably and ruinously far he was from this his Diary shows. And I have no will to repeat.

The one point I note it for is this, in No. 1 of my journals I wrote down how mercifully God had plucked me out of political life against my will, while Gladstone was launched into it for half a century.

And here I see how God plucked me out of the world into which Samuel Wilberforce was plunged to his last hour.

---

[1] For Manning's reasons for refusing the Sub-Almonership to the Queen see Extracts from his Diary, White Quarto Journal, Vol. I. p. 279.

I stood upon the threshold and every one about me bade me go onward. What kept me back? God alone. The conviction that I should lose singleness of eye in the atmosphere of the world, this kept me back. But was not this a light of the Holy Ghost? that is of God Himself.

In a wonderful way God has kept me out of the world. I have only gone into it as Fireman on duty for more than thirty years. And yet there was a time from 1840 to 1849 when I might have been plunged in it. . . .

In 1851 I did break with the world altogether, and if I had been an alien living in England I could not have become more exiled from the public and political life, from the private and social life, from the English homes, from the Parliament, from the Court. In all the world where Samuel Wilberforce lived, I was as a dead man out of mind. No doubt my Good Master saw that I should have lost myself and my soul. He has kept me out of the contagions of the English public and private life, with its refinements, fascinations, and subtle transforming power. I have been as dead to this as I have been to the world of politics in which Gladstone has lived. . . .

Harrow, Oxford, and the years from 1850 to 1890, had brought me into contact with the greater number of public men, and into intimacy with many. The Colonial Office needing early and frequent attendance at the House of Commons from 1829 to 1832, had given me both an insight and an interest in politics at their most critical time, the Emancipation of Catholics and Reform in Parliament.

In 1851 I became as dead to all this as if I were in another world; looking on upon men and faces, that I knew in full activity, without any share in all that was going on. I ceased to be all and everything of the past, and became a priest and missionary, *cui patria est ecclesia.* In reading the *Life of the Prince Consort* it is like looking on the world in which I had lived after death.

I believe that it was God's will that I should be a priest, and that only. And that my early life and all that were in it should know me no more.

23*rd November* 1884.—I have just finished reading T. B. Mozley's Letters. They take me back to 1830 and the persons and events of the period from 1830 to 1851. After which my name disappears, except once, at the Union dinner. Unless there are unpublished letters, I ceased to exist. The transitions of T. Mozley's mind were: from 1833 to 1844 he went with Newman; from 1844 to 1855 he went with Pusey; from 1855 to 1878 he

went with the Gorham Judgment, which implies a whole change from Pusey on Baptism to Thomas Scott. He retained so much of positive truth as to be a witness for God, but logically he was a critic and a rationalist. He ended his life with a diminution of faith.

Mozley says that my sermon on Judas, before the University, was not in good taste. I see what he means, and he is not wrong. Pusey had roused us all on the subject of the seventh commandment. Also Munro of Harrow had been speaking to me about the state of boys and youths. I drew out the effect of one sin in the heart as in Judas, but so that, *mutata voce*, it would apply to the other, and reading the sermon over I see that I was very outspoken, I have no doubt also that there were other faults of taste.

He also says of another sermon of mine as Select Preacher that it was "badly delivered." I have no doubt of it, for I never could read [1] as I ought. I was monotonous, and unemphatic. I have always had a dread of dramatism and unreality. He says of the Judas sermon that I was emphatic all through and therefore nowhere. I daresay.

On the whole I escape fairly well, for his criticisms of Samuel Wilberforce and others are much worse. I knew little of him. We seldom met, and hardly if ever conversed on any subject for five minutes. I always thought that he did not like me; and I thought him cold, critical, and cynical, and his articles, which showed great study and literary effort, gave me the impression of conceit. I like him better now, and his letters make him more attractive, but Newman left him and he left Pusey, and then separated from Scott and all who were steadfast for the Regeneration of Baptism, so that at last he stood alone. He says truly that F. D. Maurice explained everything away into vagueness. But his whole career was a transition into indefiniteness. What a change, to begin with Newman and to end with Gorham.

8th February.—Croker's "Life and Letters," and Hayward's "Letters" are so full of politics, literature, action, events, collision of mind with mind, and that with such a multitude of men in every state of life, that when I look back, it seems as if I had been simply useless. They seem to me to have been sharpened and strengthened by collisions as "iron sharpeneth iron," and I have no doubt that my mind has been dormant and its faculties undeveloped, and even declining. What has my work been? To keep alive the name of God, His Kingdom, and His laws; to

---

[1] At Lavington I preached from notes, and in London from a written beginning, and an ending from notes.

defend His rights and His truth; to turn men to Him; to guard those who believe from falsehood; to be on the side of the Incarnation against the world; to be the witness of His work and will; to proclaim and to enforce the great laws of natural and Christian morality which created the civilised world, and without which the civilised world could not stand. This is all visionary and unreal to men of the world; but it has governed the world, and it governs them. This, after all, is nothing; and no part of this could I have done if I had been in the world as they were. The little I have done has been done by being out of the world, and having nothing to do with it. A man cannot move a stone so long as he rests on it. He can only use his lever when he is off it, and at a distance.

17*th.*—If motives move men, and if faith and morals create motives, then such a life as mine need not be useless. And if faith and morals move men to the highest life and the most perfect actions, then there must be some harvest, though I may never reap, or see it reaped.

The complete isolation and exclusion from the official life of England in which I have lived, makes me feel as if I had done nothing. But this is in the natural Order. If the natural Order is moved by the Supernatural Order, then I may not have done nothing. Fifty years of witness for God and His truth, I hope, has not been in vain. "Ye shall be witnesses unto me" is after all the greatest commission a man can bear.

19*th.*—It is "Cast thy bread upon the waters." All we can do is to cast the bread. The waters run and sway to and fro, and swallow the bread. But we have nothing to do but to cast it. "In the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withold not thy hand, for thou knowest not which shall prosper." And we have nothing to do but to sow. Fifty years of preaching seems like fifty years of beating the air; and yet every Truth has a vitality like a grain of corn. And though we never may know it, many a Truth strikes root. Though preaching does so little upon masses, it gathers out the elect, and God is making up the *numerus præfinitus.*

I have by word and writing tried to bear witness to

1. The Unity of the Church.
2. The Divine rule of faith.
3. The Infallibility of the Church, and of its Head.
4. The Office of the Holy Ghost in the body and in its members.
5. The Temporal Power of the Vicar of our Lord.

These five Truths I have tried to justify and to defend,

These are three works I have tried to do—

1. The education of children in the faith.
2. The saving of the people from intemperance.
3. The raising of the priesthood of the diocese.

To these I have given both mind and means beyond all other works.

I hope not in vain.

22*nd September* 1887.—Some days ago, Signor Ruggero Bonghi came with a letter of Lady Dilke's. He said, "In Rome we see little of Cardinals, and I am glad to have this opportunity of asking: is it not possible to find a way to heal the *disaccordo* between Italy and the Holy See?" I said, "Before 1870 it would have been possible, but when you came in by the Porta Pia you made it impossible." He said, "No Italian Government could venture to propose the restoration of Rome: the majority of Italians regard it as a part of the unity of Italy." I said, "I have never opposed the unity of Italy, saving the independence of the Holy See." He said, "We have declared the Pope to be a sovereign person; and we could do much to modify the law of guarantees, which I chiefly drew up. We could give land in Italy equivalent to the Civil list—abolish the *exequaturs* and many other details." I said, "But Porta Pia is insurmountable." He said, "Regionalism and Garibaldianism are gone, and the Monarchy stronger from a sense of what it has done for Italy."[1]

If infirm of body, with a mind as alert and active as in his prime, Cardinal Manning was in the habit in his later years of writing elaborate refutations—not for publication, but for self-satisfaction, or after-use—of charges brought against him by such journals as *Truth*, the *Whitehall Review*, the *Pall Mall Gazette*, and others of a like kind. Manning would not demean himself—never did, early or late, as Archdeacon or Cardinal—by entering into controversy on personal questions with newspapers. Yet he was far more keenly sensitive to their attacks than most men, especially if they ventured to go "beyond their last" in impugning not only his acts, but his motives. He could not sleep upon his anger; nor rest of a night, until he had demolished charges, which he describes as "base and brutal," or as

[1] In commenting on Signor Bonghi's visit, Cardinal Manning said:—"We talked long on the Temporal Power and the unity of Italy; and when Signor Bonghi repeats in Rome what I said, the Ruling Cardinals and the Jesuits will be even still more offended with me."

"malicious and mean," or as "calumnious," written, as he declared, by "Romanizing Anglicans or half-tinkered Catholics."

There is perhaps no more curious or unique a spectacle recorded in the lives of men than that presented by the venerable Cardinal, seated on a fine summer evening in a big arm-chair, with feet on the fender before a blazing fire, as with portfolio on knee, he set to work, quivering with indignation to the finger-tips, to make—if I may use a homely but expressive phrase—mincemeat of his puny foes. On coming upon a more than ordinarily mean insinuation of a personal character, on a point, perhaps, on which he was peculiarly sensitive, the pale face flushed and eyes, never too meek, blazed out in one of those "Berseker rages" which sometimes possessed his eager soul.

In his replies to the charges of nameless assailants against the silent but not unsensitive or unheeding Cardinal, Manning in 1881 recalls facts of his early life, and accounts, fifty years after the event, for the interior motives which governed his conduct. Such personal reminiscences impart an interest of their own far beyond their ulterior purpose to writings obviously intended to bear witness to posterity against the mean and malicious attacks of his belittlers and calumniators in *Truth* and the *Whitehall Review.*

In reference to the malicious attacks in these journals Cardinal Manning has left on record the following statements:—

An article of a brutal kind appeared in the *Whitehall Review* ten days ago (Feb. 13, 1881) full of malice against me. Among other things was this.

"There is a whispered tradition among the clergy and laity of the diocese that he proposed to a lady who afterwards married a distinguished poet, and was rejected, from which time began his historical career."

I wish to leave on record that in this statement there is not a shadow of truth.

My *historical career* begins from 1837, since which time for three and forty years I have been as I am now without ever wavering in the purpose of living and dying as I am.

This falsehood is truly brutal. May God forgive the writer.

Another article in *Truth* charges me with ambition. No doubt I have been ambitious. But I do not think that it was ambition, but a sense of loss and shame that made me get up in the dark all my first Christmas holidays from Harrow to learn the Eton Greek Grammar, which I had never been taught at Totteridge; nor which made me play at cricket, and ride, and shoot, and row. All these things gave me pleasure, and to do them ill gave me pain. It was not ambition to try to do things as they ought to be done.

I read hard at Oxford for the pure love of it, and from a sense of fitness, *mihi turpe relinqui*. All this time my father intended me to take Anglican Orders, from which I recoiled. A love of politics and a public life then sprang up, and I have no doubt that ambition came with it. Oxford and all my surroundings, men and books led to it. And I believe I had as strong, if not a stronger desire for public life than Gladstone at that time, for he had a drawing to be a clergyman, and I recoiled from it. I told my father—and he reluctantly gave me my liberty. For three or four years I read for it and shaped everything to it. I do not think that any one could have a stronger desire for public life than I had when I was in the Colonial Office. I shall never forget the last time I went to the House of Commons at that date, and a meeting with one of the door-keepers who knew me well. I acknowledge at once to an ambition for public and political life—and I had read for it; so that it was not a mere ambition, but a desire to serve the public life of England. Nothing but a governing dictate of conscience which told me that I ought to give up all the world to save my own soul and to labour for the souls of others could have made me renounce public life. I did so. Therefore if it was ambition, I renounced it utterly.

If it be ambition to desire to see work done that ought to be done, and to be done as it ought to be done, and when ill done to be done better; and to be done without being the doer of it, if only it be done at all—or to be impatient when, with the evils and wants and miseries of the people before them, men, and above all those who bear the office to do what is needed, do nothing; and if they will not work, but make mountains of excuses and fictitious impossibilities, it be ambition to say let me try them, I acknowledge to ambition, and I hope to die in it. When ambition gains its summit it rests. If God has placed me on a summit He will judge whether I have entered into my rest. Summits are golden, but He knows what little patrimony

I had has long been laid up in His hands, and that if I die as I hope without debts. I shall die without a shilling. However, whether I be ambitious or not, all the world will know one day, and before that, we are not wrong to follow St. Paul—and to judge nothing before the time. Three times, at least, in my life I broke the line in which ambition would have led me.

The same wiseacre in *Truth* goes on to say that as Sir R. Peel could not make me a bishop—and as Lord John Russell would not—there was no chance left for me, and therefore I left the Church of England. Heaven knows that I had nothing to do with either Party; or with any Party. I sought nothing but truth, and as I saw it I spoke it and wrote it, preached it and published it. I took a line of public action contrary to all parties in turn; and, as *Truth* says, I have quarrelled with both the great Parties now, so I did then. I neither sought them, nor cared for them. I cared for the Church of England so long as I believed it was a part of the Church. When it revealed itself to be human in its origin, erroneous in its doctrines, and contrary to the Word and Will of God, it left me and not I it. All the bishoprics in England were nothing to me. In truth I once said that it would be a disaster to be the captain of a ship which, as Lord Dundonald said of his first Frigate, sailed like a haystack. All this gossip has been picked up and pieced together by romanizing Anglicans, and what Ward calls "half tinkered Catholics," helped by such books as the *Life of Bishop Wilberforce*. In it is an amusing entry from his private journal. "Conversation with Trower, who told me that Manning had talked with him on his chance of being a bishop. He said 'unless there is a row and they want me—no chance,'" or some such words, but he does not say who began the subject. Certainly not I—and as certainly Trower himself.[1] I never in my Anglican days began such a conversation, which always seemed to me as it would now, to be indelicate and foolish in a high degree. But both Trower and S. Wilberforce were continually upon it. Both have talked about it to me. And Bishop Wilberforce's second Volume is full of his own speculations about being translated to Canterbury, or to Durham on the way to York. After all, my answer on their showing is not amiss: "No chance," unless in a row they want a man whom they would not otherwise think of touching. I had deliberately and openly gone beyond all parties, and so far from seeking any, had alarmed, or irritated all.

---

[1] Trower, afterwards Bishop of Gibraltar, was on intimate terms with Manning before the Rector of Lavington was made Archdeacon of Chichester. See Trower's letter to Manning on the *Rule of Faith*, 1838, vol. i.

As I have begun to write about *Truth*, I will go on. The article comments on Marlborough House and the Prince and the Queen, etc. Now I never sought the Prince, and was never more surprised than when years ago he invited me to his garden parties. I have been there indeed when the Queen was present, but I never approached her. I might have done so, for I have the full right. In the year 1844 I think I was presented, and used to attend both levees and drawing rooms. Therefore I need no presentation now. But I do not know whether it would be acceptable to her; and I owe it to my office and to myself not to allow a shadow of misunderstanding. I have taken the chance of meeting her, but I would not in the remotest way seek it.

So again, I have been urged again and again to go to the Levées of the Prince. I have always refused. I would never go except with my colleagues. So long as we do not go as a body, I will not go as a private person.

9th October 1881.—13th July, in the garden at Marlborough House, the Prince and the Queen passed me: I saw that she turned to the Prince on recognising me. The Prince sent an equerry to say that the Queen wished to see me, if I would stay where I was. I waited and they came. She seemed embarrassed how to begin, so I said: "It is a great happiness to me to see your Majesty again. The last time was six and thirty years ago at Buckingham Palace." The Prince then began to talk of his visit to St. Elizabeth's Hospital. At Holland House he told me that it was the Queen's own wish. I remember her on her accession —in early youth; and have always had an affectionate loyalty to her.

In his Journal, under date 17th February 1889, Cardinal Manning defended himself against the charge of ambition:—

I have been accused both by friends and enemies of ambition. Every man who rises is supposed to have desired and sought it. Have I done?

I think I had very strong ambitions for public life from 1829 to 1832.

But when I was in the Colonial Office and might have gone onwards I gave it up for conscience sake, and took Anglican orders.

I know that at that time I not only had no ecclesiastical ambition, but a positive repugnance to bishops, their aprons, and titles of Father in God.

When I was made Archdeacon of Chichester at thirty-one, I

began to be conscious of influence: a desire and dream of rising came upon me. I was in the full stream, and constantly named for this and that.

But when I had the offer of office of sub-almoner to the Queen, which led directly to a bishopric, I refused it. This was not ecclesiastical ambition.

Finally, when I had everything before me, I deliberately rendered everything impossible by the open line of writing, speaking, and acting, in the Catholic sense of faith and discipline.

This ended in 1851 by my submitting to the Catholic Church.

Three times, therefore, I acted in direct contradiction of ambition.

Some have said that when I saw it was impossible for me to be an Anglican bishop, I aimed at a Catholic bishopric.

If so, it was indeed a vaulting ambition, and deserved success. "Sometimes even Satan is to be honoured for his burning throne."

Why not believe in a Divine government of the lives of men?

In a Note, dated 25th August 1889, Cardinal Manning described his own relations to the Oxford movement:—

Ward's Life by his son has made me feel how completely external I was from the Oxford movement. I had left Oxford, given up my fellowship at Merton, and hardly knew the men who were round Newman; they were a later generation. I never wrote a Tract: I did not agree in many of them. I was absorbed in active work: what Oxford was to Newman, the diocese of Chichester was to me. I seldom went to Oxford, and had little correspondence with the men. Some I did not know by sight, and Ward I never saw till the time of his degradation.

Newman knew this, and I remember his saying, "I look upon you as an outside witness." I read his books, and the Tracts, and they helped me; but I read my own way, God guiding me, into the Church. I did not come by the way of controversy, but of work. And I worked out the whole problem by myself in solitude. From 1837 to 1851 I was alone, reading and writing incessantly.

Even when Cardinal Manning did not find time or did not think it necessary or prudent to write detailed refutations of the attacks made upon him, he found time at any rate to mark with his nervous hand the brow of his assailants

as with the brand of Cain. He made up for the fewness of his words by their sharpness. For Cardinal Manning could say sharp things when he chose, or rather when he was irritated beyond measure. Referring to the attacks made upon him during the Vatican Council, in which his character for uprightness and honesty was assassinated by Italian papers, Royalist as well as Revolutionary, and by the Roman correspondents of some English papers, his ire was as fierce as if it were yesterday. The Roman correspondent of the *Standard*, for instance, is denounced as guilty of "stupid mulish malice"; a writer in the *Contemporary Review* is accused on account of an attack upon Pius IX. of "pure lying—conscious, deliberate, and designed." "I will not say," Cardinal Manning frankly acknowledges, "that I have not been irritated at the falsehood, malice—still more at the cowardice—of anonymous slander." The revival in his heart of this feeling of indignation and scorn so long after the forgotten battle of the Vatican Council days is accounted for by the fact, that Cardinal Manning had just been absorbed in reading through "The four Red Folio Scrap Books" in his library, containing newspaper cuttings[1] concerning himself during twenty-five or thirty years. Fresh from reading over again the piled-up accusations, lies, it may be, and slander, his quick temper, waxing warm over the "literary dirt and mud" flung at him, he wrote in the heat of the moment, or in a morbid mood, perhaps, the following comments:—

I have already elsewhere spoken of the persistent lying of the Italian papers. The Royalist were the bitterest: the revolutionary were the fairest. The worst of all was the *Gazzetta d' Italia* and the *Fanfulla Veronese*, one and the same hand abused me in both. The *Times* of to-day (26th December 1881), tells us that Leo XIII. spoke of the mud and filth which they flung at his person: and their abuse whensoever he spoke of the Temporal Power. On the Temporal Power

[1] To show what store he set at the time to these newspaper cuttings, he intimated that his future biographer should turn over these huge folios. I found no account or statement or story in these reports half so interesting or important as his own reminiscences and memoranda, not to speak of his voluminous correspondence.

I have been abused for twenty years, and the Italians reviled me as an *intransigente*. But the personal abuse had a deeper cause which will be found in the "Red Book," volume iii. It was the dismissal of a man of the name of Stuart or Mackenzie from the *Daily News*, for the publication about my "laying before the Vatican a plan to guide the Catholics of this country in the coming struggle with the British Government." Stuart or Mackenzie threatened me with action for damages. From that day he and his son, as I suppose Robert Stuart to be, have thrown "mud and filth," all through the Conclave and every time I have been to Rome. Also in the *Contemporary Review* is an article about Pius IX. which was pure lying. I must believe that it was conscious, and deliberate, and designed. These things mislead the other Italian papers—they were reproduced in England: and then went all over the world. The correspondent in Rome of the *Standard* and of the *Manchester Guardian* is either the same man or in contact with him. There is an identity of phrase, and a perpetual round of the same unreasoning and mendacious parade of what is "thought," "believed," "said," "whispered," in the "ecclesistical circles," the "diplomatic circles," "highest circles," without venturing to state anything as fact. It is suggestive lying. Personal animosity was at the bottom of this, and here, in the *Standard*, has been some one, Dr. Littledale or another, to reproduce and embroider it. I will not say that I have not been irritated at the falsehood and malice—still more at the cowardice—of anonymous slander. In the Red Book, vol. iii., will be found what I said on this to the Clergy and to the Laity; and I hope that when I am gone that these lies may not "make history" about me; nor the *Whitehall Review*.

From the library to the Sanctuary in Archbishop's House, the transition was as easy as in Manning's soul was the passing from study to meditation or prayer. There would be much to dwell upon in the singular spirituality of Cardinal Manning's character, in the silent communings of the soul with God, in the ready bending of his will to the Divine Will, and still more in the constant and vivid apprehension of the Voice of God speaking to his soul, were the sanctities of the interior life fit subject for public discourse or disclosure. Constant visits to the Blessed Sacrament in his private chapel deepened and quickened his vivid sense of the presence of God, and exalted his mind, ever

intensely interested in the events of the day, in the things —at least such as concerned him nearly or his work—of this world, to the contemplation of the life "behind the veil."

Prayer before the Blessed Sacrament was the ever-fruitful seed of the work done in the diocese for the conversion of sinners, for the salvation of souls, and for the glory of the Holy Name.

His office as Spiritual director was a perpetual source of the growth of spirituality not only in the souls of his penitents, but in his own. Who is there to mark or measure the inestimable results of this holy and hidden work—hidden from the eye of man, known to God alone. How many souls were not reclaimed from sin, brought back by the Sacrament of Penance to the paths of holiness, or led on and lifted up to the higher ways of spirituality, or to the more perfect life of the cloister. What wonder, then, that the venerable confessor or director of souls was so revered and beloved by his spiritual children?

But men, and women too, came to Cardinal Manning not only in their spiritual troubles, in doubt or difficulties about the Faith or the teachings of the Church; but in their temporal difficulties, in adversity, in family estrangements: and they never went away without consolation or counsel, or, if needs be, without rebuke; but rebuke softened and sweetened by mild wisdom and paternal kindness.

Non-Catholics of every description, Dissenters as well as Anglicans, still came to him, if not in such numbers as in earlier days, to solve religious doubts and difficulties, to seek instruction, or to be received into the Church. Numbers of those pious Anglicans whom he had received, whole families of every class had not lost, as Cardinal Manning has declared from his own knowledge, their baptismal innocence. His own experience on this point was confirmed by the experience of other priests bearing like testimony to the operation of Divine grace in the souls of those who were living in separation, if not from the soul, from the body of the Church. One of the latest statements (1890) he has left on record is this testimony to the holiness of life, the singleness and simplicity of heart,

and to the love of the Scriptures of so many of our separated brethren; and he contrasts their lives with the lives of multitudes of Catholics, in spite of the grace of the Sacraments, in France, Italy, Spain, and South America.

Cardinal Manning was especially careful not to unsettle by word or act those who, steadfast in their own creed, came to him, as often happened, for spiritual consolation or counsel. An illustration of this true spirit of Christian charity was shown on one special occasion on a visit to the deathbed of a former servant, a sincere and pious Protestant. After expressing his deep sympathy with the sick man, the Cardinal, respecting the sincerity of his faith, knelt by his side and simply recited acts of faith, hope, and charity, and an act of contrition.[1]

To the afflicted in spirit, to the oppressed, to the poor and homeless, Cardinal Manning was always at home; his heart was ever open, his hand ever ready to give succour, too often beyond the measure of his limited means. He was the father of the poor, for they were his own special people.

Thoughtful kindness marked his relations with those entrusted to his spiritual charge. He consulted their convenience; for many of the converts in earlier and more bigoted days had difficulty in attending his spiritual ministrations. He lightened for them the ways of penance. The little Notes full of personal kindness and of spiritual unction, which he addressed to his penitents, encouraged them under difficulties, consoled or counselled them with

[1] In his earlier life as archbishop, Manning was sometimes consulted by Anglican bishops, or by bishops of the Established Church in Ireland on matters of grave concern. Cardinal Manning once showed me a note he had received from Bishop Phillpotts of Exeter. On arriving at Arlington Street, Manning found the bishop extended on a sofa, suffering from the gout. "My first words were, 'What can you want of one once guilty of a great public scandal?' Bishop Phillpotts replied, 'You have heard, then, of my words, spoken in sorrow as much as in anger on your becoming a Roman Catholic.' The Bishop of Exeter complained that he was set at defiance by a refractory priest whom he was unable to dislodge from church and benefice, and wanted to know how the Church of Rome dealt with such disobedient priests. Manning's reply was, 'We have a ready remedy for a priest who disobeys his bishop. We suspend him *a divinis* by withdrawing the "faculties" given to him on taking charge of a mission.' 'I envy,' said the Bishop of Exeter, 'the Church of Rome for its possession of such an effective weapon.'"

maxims of prudence, or fear of the Lord, and golden rules from the lives of the Saints.

A few letters out of a large collection must suffice as an illustration of Cardinal Manning's method of dealing with his spiritual children. The Notes varied in manner and tone according to the character or needs of those to whom they were written.

NICE, *December* 1883.

MY DEAR CHILD—Your letter reached Rome after I came away, but has overtaken me here on my way home.

I read it with great thankfulness. You have received the greatest gift which is given in this life; God gives it abundantly, for "He would have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the Truth." But how few receive it in the love of it, and how many from fear, or love of friends, see the light and fail to follow, and in the end lose it. You will find that all the Truth you ever believed before you believe still; that you have not changed your Faith but made it perfect; that you have gained two things—a complete knowledge of Christianity, and a divine certainty for your Faith.

I hope to be at home this week, and to see you when you come up, and if you will, to give you Confirmation.

[You must pray much for * * * . There was a time when she would listen. But the Anglicans surrounded her and she has shut herself up for years.]

Thank God for it. What have you ever suffered for Him, who suffered all for you? May He bless you and keep you always.—Yours very truly, H. E., Cardinal-Archbishop.

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE, WESTMINSTER, S. W.,
29*th October* 1887.

MY DEAR CHILD—Though you have so long waited for the end yet it comes suddenly at last, but very gently—you may trust him in the hands of our Lord, who loves him more than you do. You have soothed him and served him, but He died for him. His kindness and justice to you when you became Catholic, and as a Catholic, is a sure sign of faith and charity.

I will not fail to pray for him and for you.

May God guide and console you.—Yours faithfully,
H. E., Cardinal-Archbishop.

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE, WESTMINSTER, S.W.,
15*th June* 1891.

MY DEAR CHILD—Thank you for the enclosed. It puts me

back into a time when I had little to do, and had time for many things. The last nearly forty years have nearly worn me out. But it is pleasant to look back at quiet days, and to look on to an Eternal rest.

I have been able to do little for you, not from want of will, but from endless work, care, anxiety, and growing age. But I have never wanted the good will. . . . God bless you both.—Yours affectionately,

H. E., C.A.

But Cardinal Manning's letters to his spiritual children were not always restricted to spiritual matters, as the following letter to Lady Herbert shows. Perhaps this variety of matter and manner added an additional charm to the correspondence.

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE, WESTMINSTER, S.W.,
3rd January 1884.

MY DEAR CHILD—I do not know whether you have seen the *Records of an Eton Schoolboy.* It is written and edited by Charles Milnes Gaskell from his father's letters.

It is singularly interesting, and brings out the early days of Canning, Gladstone, Doyle, and dear Sidney at Oxford. The records of the last are few but very pleasing.

I have seen nothing that brings up these Oxford days so vividly. It is privately printed, but I can lend you my copy.

It is not from any change of affection that I have no desire to meet Gladstone. I have never ceased to pray for him every day in every mass.

But his public and printed repudiation of friendship in 1874 has made any advance on my part impossible. I believed that in 1874 a mischief-maker came between us—also that his relations with the Nonconformists and others made intimacy with me politically inexpedient for him. But neither of these reasons justifies his public acts. My confidence in him was lost when he said that our friendship had ceased when I became Catholic. I cherish all kindly feeling to him, but he has made it impossible for me to seek him. We met at a studio last autumn, and shook hands.—Always yours affectionately,

H. E., C.A.

With his Vicar-General, his secretaries, and chaplains, the Cardinal maintained the most pleasant relations; but there was no approach to intimacy. The Right Rev. Mgr. Gilbert as vicar-general, by his abilities and business habits exercised considerable influence indirectly and quietly

and beneficially over the management of the diocese. But Cardinal Manning would allow no one but himself to take the initiative. In accepting suggestions or modifications in regard to his directions or decrees he would treat them, however important, as mere matters of detail, within the Vicar-General's province. Though he had implicit confidence in him this confidence or goodwill was confined to their official relations; but it never passed into personal intimacy. His secretaries and chaplains, who, unlike the Vicar-General, were members of his own household, though they experienced the greatest kindness at his hands, and were deeply attached to him and met him every day, were not in the true sense of the word, intimate with him, or admitted beyond the range of their official duties or spiritual relations into personal confidence.[1]

Such intimacies—though few in comparison with those of J. H. Newman, S. Wilberforce, and Mr. Gladstone—as Archdeacon Manning enjoyed with Robert Wilberforce and Laprimaudaye; and, for a period, with James Hope and Mr. Gladstone; and in a lesser degree with Henry Wilberforce and William Dodsworth, had no counterpart, with one notable exception, in Cardinal Manning's Catholic days. His intimacy with Herbert Vaughan — to-day Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster—relieved Manning's Catholic life from the reproach of utter barrenness in the matter of intimate friendships.[2] For this intimacy, this communion

[1] The following anecdote is an illustration of Cardinal Manning's familiar friendliness and playfulness of spirit towards the members of his own household. Canon Johnson, happening on one occasion to be ill in bed, Cardinal Manning with his wonted thoughtfulness came to see him. In the course of conversation, Canon Johnson, noticing the ragged cuff of the Cardinal's cassock, lifted up one of the hanging shreds saying, "You ought to have a new cassock." The Cardinal playfully replied, "I did not know, Canon Johnson, that you were such a dandy."

[2] The intimacy between Cardinal Manning and Mgr. Talbot was rather an official than personal intimacy. On Manning's side, at all events, it seemed to be so, for in all his reminiscences, memoranda, journals, and diaries, Mgr. Talbot's name is not once alluded to except in connection with official matters. Even when poor Talbot's mind gave way and he was removed to an asylum at Passy, Cardinal Manning made no allusion even to the calamity. Delicacy might, perhaps, have restrained the mention of such a misfortune. But, in like manner, on Mgr. Talbot's death there is no record of

of mind with mind, of heart with heart, was of a like character, though of far longer duration, than that which in earlier days had subsisted between Manning and Robert Wilberforce. But such intimacies, however close, do not preclude occasional differences of opinion or judgment even on matters of grave import.

An intimate friend of Cardinal Manning, one of his spiritual children, gives the following graphic account of his personal attractiveness; and of the deep affection entertained for him by those with whom he was on terms of close and friendly intimacy:—

To the general public Manning is chiefly known as the austere preacher, the uncompromising confessor, the at-all-costs defender of the rights of the Church of Rome. Unsuspected by "the profane vulgar," there lay in him esoteric depths of human feeling—tenderness, thoughtfulness, and playful humour, discovered to his intimates in unbending hours.

It is a public loss that letters of his, full of these qualities, have been in the course of time destroyed by the nearest members of his own family, who did not pay their "prophet" the "honour" of believing that such utterances would have the interest they most undoubtedly do possess for the world at large. It is in these private traits of character that we see the struggles which *the man* must have gone through in bearing out the ideal model which he had set before him of what *the priest* ought to be.

The charms of this personal attractiveness were well known to a select few of his spiritual children; we have already seen evidences of it in the case of Lady Herbert and, I presume, Mrs. Ward. Miss Byles was among the privileged number. On one occasion of his leaving Rome she expressed herself that all the sunlight had gone out of the day, the brilliant sun of Rome was nothing in comparison to this loss, and this, too, happened just at the moment when, under the influences of one of the delightful gatherings of

the event. Had their intimacy been of a personal character some expression of feeling might have been expected on the part of Cardinal Manning.

On the other hand, Mgr. Talbot used to complain that, when no longer needing his help, Archbishop Manning neglected him.

Mrs. Monteith of Carstairs, she had just become engaged to the husband to whom she was so tenderly devoted, under the poetic inspiration of "moonlight, in the Colosseum," in the days when creepers still . . . "grew along the broken arches" of that "noble wreck in ruinous perfection, and the rolling moon cast a wide and tender light that softened down the hoar austerity."

Other instances might be cited did space permit, though it was but to the few that he thus revealed his inner self. One house in which he made himself most at home was that of Mrs. Pitt Byrne, and her sister, Miss R. H. Busk. This house he used to call "neutral ground," for Mr. Pitt Byrne, the most amiable of men, always welcomed his visits, and favoured his meeting there persons of inquiring mind on the borderland of Highchurchism, who would not have dared to seek him out in his own church or house, and among whom Manning made many converts, though Mr. Byrne himself only finally entered the Church later, on his death-bed. Here Manning would come in and out at will, often sinking exhausted with the day's struggles into what he called "my own particular chair," often nursing the kitten he surnamed "Great Delight"; or taking his slice of mutton and sago pudding with *one* glass of wine, while lunch was going on, or his frugal tea, while others dined. Then throwing over "the care of all the churches" for an hour, he would pour out welcome facetiæ. As often as not himself would be the butt of his amusing remarks and reminiscences. A mutual friend, an amateur in photography, had made a very unflattering presentment of him. "Do I look so cunning?" was his surprised comment. A story he never shrank from telling was of a sculptor, who had once attempted his bust in Rome. During one of the sittings, as he was discoursing of phrenology, Manning made him point out on the head he was modelling, the supposed seat of various organs and qualities. At last Manning had asked him where was the seat of conscience, upon which the sculptor had stalked across the room, and touching a certain part of the sitter's cranium, remarked, "That's where it *ought to be*."

Many will remember, in the days when Manning was working at Farm Street, there used to be pleasant gatherings for ladies' practice of church music there, under the presidency of the organist, who was a man of almost gigantic proportions. One day Manning was urging one of his spiritual children above-named to attend this practice,[1] and after he had overcome her disinclination with something like an injunction, he added playfully: "At the same time I hope there will not befall you what happened to *me* when I was practising with him the tones of the mass. I thought I had taken an interval very fairly, when suddenly the accompaniment stopped with what seemed like a crash. I looked up amazed, and to my horror —— had left the keyboard and was standing over me looking for all the world like some terrible retributive fiend such as one only sees portrayed in old Dutch pictures of the Temptation of St. Anthony. I never felt so small in my life."

Another of his stories had reference to his personal appearance, which, though Richmond, and Holl succeeded in presenting it in the well-known painting and engraving with all the spiritual fire which so truly burned within, yet certainly was somewhat spoilt by attenuation. Some Anglican dignitary, whose acquaintance he happened not to have made till late life, had wished to be introduced to him, and this having been arranged by a friend, his commentary on meeting was, 'Son of man, can these dry bones live?'

With the slice of mutton which, as was mentioned above,

[1] Of course it was only some years later that Manning became so impressed with the dangers that might attend the promiscuous gathering of young men and women over church practice that he prohibited the singing of women in church choirs altogether, to the dismay of many an incumbent of a poor living who could hardly supply a choir of entirely paid voices. Monsignor William Manning, his nephew, used to tell of an amusing incident which happened shortly after this ukase had been promulgated. It was at Benediction at St. Mary of the Angels, Manning was waving the thurible, Monsignor Manning, acting deacon, was holding aside the cope. He had "sniffed" very ominously several times during the singing; at last a young boy's voice went up with a pure clear note like a lark flying heavenwards—Manning could stand it no longer—regardless of everything he exclaimed in almost audibly excited tones: "Willie, it's a woman!" and was with difficulty quieted down.

formed the hygienic staple of his mid-day meal, he was used to take mustard as a condiment. This is such an unusual combination that in Meadows' book on China it happens to be remarked that the man who should ask for mustard with his mutton must have the making of a hero. The peculiarity had been remarked by a young clergyman who, in the fondness of his worship of Manning, adopted the custom. The trait was reported to Manning, who observed in reply: "Ah me, yes, the lunar rainbow!" The tone of the remark might be charged with arrogance, but under the circumstances it was hardly such. The imitator had paid him the homage of the so-called sincerest kind of flattery, and the hearers he was addressing esteemed him too affectionately to see in it anything but the playfulness to which they were accustomed in him, and indeed were used to receive his utterances without criticism. It was just this that enabled him to talk so freely and naturally with them.

When subsequently the single glass of wine was dropped out of his *menu* in the course of his campaign against intemperance, and his friends used to urge him to take it, he would tell of an Irishman whom he had been persuading to take the Pledge, using the argument that he himself had done the same—"Ah, but," replied the too cute Hibernian, "may be your Eminence needed to take it."

He excelled in his jocose anecdotes in imitating the Irish accent, and thoroughly enjoyed the *naïveté* of the Irish bull. One of them was of an Irish waiter, who on being asked at what o'clock the first train left a certain town in the morning, gave for answer, "You see, sir, the seven o'clock train now goes at eight o'clock, so there isn't no first train at all, at all."

Another was of a gentleman travelling in Ireland who saw labourers engaged in digging the foundation of some large building.

"Are you going to build a church, Pat?" he inquired of one of them.

"Yes, your honour, and a Catholic church too."

"Oh, I'm sorry to hear *that*, Pat," said the tourist.

"And the divil is jist that same, your honour," was Pat's ready rejoinder.

Another was of a man "who got up at seven and thought it was eight, but on looking at his watch found it was nine."

Another was of a man who, having only one match to light his candle in the morning, struck it over-night to make sure it was a good one.

Another was of an Irish valet who, seeing his master fill the wastepaper basket with torn-up letters, exclaimed, ruefully, "Oh why did you go for to tear them up; they might have come in so useful for me who am always so bothered when I have to write one."

But these stories in no way implied any contempt for their character. On the contrary he was ever speaking of the great work the Irish people had done in spreading the Faith. He would try to find excuses even for their defects. One day a lady, irritated by some annoying falsehood of an Irish servant, said, "They are no great credit to your faith while they all tell such lies." "We will not call it a fifty-one (this was his favourite euphemism for a lie); they are an imaginative people and this often leads to a want of correspondence between their words and their meaning."

His fun was also superlative in taking off the foreign use of the English language. One story was of an Italian, whose portmanteau having strayed on the railway, was seen running up and down the platform exclaiming, in a state of excitement, "Mio baule! mio baule!" leading the English porters to think he was suffering from quite a different cause, the more so that his hands were desperately stuffed into his pockets.

Another was of a priest, also an Italian, who described our Lady as "so loving, so sweet, so *perfectly sheepish*."

And of another priest who, being much annoyed by boys who used to put their heads inside the chapel door to make insulting noises and run away, took occasion to give them a withering reprimand, in case they should be members of the congregation, in these words: "Who can these be who do such things? They cannot be men, they cannot be even boys, they must be *chaps!*"

Such stories were always seasoned with the most perfect good-nature. They were the outcome of genuine appreciation of the *bon mot* without a tinge of making game. And this love of fun would come out all through his ordinary conversation. A lady having said that a certain priest sang mass so terribly out of tune that hearing him was worse than purgatory, Manning playfully observed "wait a little and you'll see."

When he was living at St. Mary of the Angels he used to spend a certain quarter of an hour every day in meditation on a faldstool in a chapel to the north-east, which made an excellent *entourage* to his figure. It was before the days of kodaks and snapshots, and some friends who were very anxious to possess the excellent little picture to be made were obliged to apply to him for permission to set up the camera in Church. At first he was very much averse, but ultimately yielded with the words, "If you choose to steal anything from my person I will not give you in charge."

On occasion of the Synod at St. Mary's, Oscott, there was some mistake as to the hour at which flys were to come to take those who had assisted at it to the station. One or two who walked, or who had been more *prevoyant* in retaining their conveyance, were asked as they went along to send back other flys for those left behind; but zeal outrunning discretion, three times as many arrived as were wanted, this he used to describe very humorously, calling it "the plague of flys."

In Manning's many-sided character the charm of sociability was not wanting. In the congenial society of those with whom he was on familiar terms, as one who knew him intimately has described with such felicity in the preceding pages, he was the most sociable of men. The Athenæum Club, the Committee of which elected him, during his absence at the Vatican Council, as a member in recognition of his distinguished position in the world of action, added a new charm to Archbishop Manning's life. At the Athenæum he renewed acquaintance with many of his contemporaries at Oxford, or of the days when as Archdeacon of Chichester

he had many friends in Sussex and London. He did not frequent the club to pile huge folios on the table, and write sermons after the fashion of Bishop Wilberforce, but chatted pleasantly on the staircase or landings, renewed old acquaintances, or made friends with men famous in the world of art or letters.

In the following letter, Dr. Alexander, the Bishop of Derry, after expressing his regret that unfortunately he could not lay his hands upon any of the few letters which he had had the pleasure of receiving from Cardinal Manning said :—

THE PALACE, LONDONDERRY,
16*th May*, 1892.

MY DEAR SIR—I scarcely knew him personally beyond a bow, until (I think) 1886. After that, in the course of a visit to Canon Bower in Sussex, I became acquainted with his sister (Mrs. Austen I think). The Cardinal, then, used to chat with me about her and Sussex at the Athenæum, and said "his dear sister was a true Christian woman." I asked him to do something for a member of my family by letter, which he did. I remember his writing that "he sometimes thought that the Archdeacon of Chichester lay deepest down in the heart of the Archbishop of Westminster." I sent him a volume of poems which he acknowledged very lovingly, and a book on the Epistles of St. John about which he was (naturally) more reserved.—Yours very truly, WILLIAM DERRY.

The Bishop of Derry described Cardinal Manning as a delightful companion. He was at one time often to be seen of an afternoon at the Athenæum; sometimes ensconced in a big arm-chair with his large hat pulled down over his eyes, with a Magazine or Review in his hand, but carefully scrutinising the incoming members in the hope of recognising friends or acquaintances of his Anglican days. At the Athenæum, Cardinal Manning made friends with Mr. Ruskin, and a kind of intimacy sprung up between them which led to frequent correspondence. The following letter of Mr. Ruskin to Cardinal Manning is of special interest :—

CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE (Arthur Severn's),
HERNE HILL, S.E.

MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP—I gave Mr. Burne Jones very

sincere delight yesterday by the hope that your Grace might some day come to look at his work. It is worthy your doing so, more than ever yet, for, not having seen it for some time, I found that he had been advancing as steadily, by true reverence for old laws, as Mr. Hunt has been sinking by disdain of them.

There is a beautiful St. Christopher, a St. Nicholas (with a little Annunciation, in pearls, on his mitre), and a St. George, with maid and dragon for bearing on his shield—all quite lovely; Heathen gods—very many and worshipful—a Mercury whom it is lucky I have no niche for in my house, or he would make a Greek of me, in my religion, instead of a Turk, which would greatly interfere with my present vocations.

I was very happy with you on Saturday (and I am seldom happy anywhere). Your clergy must have been puzzled a little, I think, by seeing the Catholic side of the beast's skin so carefully turned outwards. They ought to pity him, if they knew, for being able in winter of life to wear nothing but stitched furs. Vaire of the saddest, and for the most part even stitched only by sewing-machine.—I am nevertheless, in my poor furry and four-pawed way, your Grace's very grateful and faithful servant,

J. RUSKIN.

That was a nice piece of gentle writing you gave me to read, by Mr. Tollack.

NEAUM CRAG, LOUGHRIGG,
AMBLESIDE, 28*th September* 1887.

MY DEAR SIR—Will you do me the honour to accept this little volume of Mr. Ruskin's Letters? I am sure he would be glad for you to possess a copy. There are one or two references to you in it, and a playful account of a luncheon with you.

I am sure you will be glad to hear that the Professor has lately spent two days in London, and was able to visit the National Gallery.

May I remind you that it was at the National Gallery that I recently met you, and that you then expressed your willingness to receive this little book.

Pray excuse any informality in my manner of addressing you.—And believe me to remain, faithfully and obediently yours,

ALBERT FLEMING.

To His Eminence, Cardinal Manning.

Occasionally, Cardinal Manning used to look in at the Stafford Club, and have a talk with his old friend Mr. Monsell, or Lord Denbigh, or with Mr. Wallis, not altogether a *persona grata*, and other members. These visits seemed

rather the fulfilment of a duty than a pleasure. Perhaps the risk of meeting Sir George Bowyer, at one time rather a troublesome opponent in the dispute about the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem, Great Ormond Street, may have made Cardinal Manning less at home than he appeared to be at the Stafford Club.

It was a singular satisfaction to Cardinal Manning to take part in the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Oxford Union Debating Society. With rare delight he revisited the scenes of his early oratorical triumphs, and revived the memories of days that were gone. His old college received Cardinal Manning with great distinction, and offered to their eminent guest a generous and cordial welcome. Mr. Gladstone, who was of course invited to the celebration, was unable to attend. In a letter to Manning he said, "I do not care to form part of what seems to me something like a spectacular show of wild beasts."

When growing infirmities and age deprived Cardinal Manning of congenial associations at the Athenæum Club, he found compensation at home in corresponding with Cabinet Ministers, or having interviews with them, or with men of mark associated with him, on Royal Commissions or Committees. By his readiness of resource, by his tact and grace of manner, and by his ability, Cardinal Manning made himself as much a *persona grata* to Tory statesmen as in earlier days he had been to Mr. Gladstone and Sidney Herbert; though with the former he was not on like terms of intimacy as he had been with the latter.

The following letters from statesmen and men of eminence in literature and art are not without interest as showing the activity of Cardinal Manning's mind, and the variety of his interests:—

Private.

10 DOWNING STREET,
WHITEHALL, 30*th January* 1879.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—I will take care of Lady Hackett's case. It shall be well considered.

I regret very much your going away, for I fear your visit may be protracted. I, literally, cannot leave my house in this savage weather; otherwise, I should attempt to call on your Eminence.

I came here, a fortnight ago, in a snowstorm, and I have never since quitted this roof. But I have not been idle, for I have held five Cabinets in a week, a feat unprecedented in the annals of Downing Street. Sir Robert Peel once held four, but they were not so tranquil as these later ones.

Your travel is a great venture in this severe season. I earnestly hope that Rome will welcome you, uninjured by the effort.—Ever, my dear Lord Cardinal, sincerely yours,

BEACONSFIELD.

His Eminence, the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster.

84 PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER BRIDGE,
LONDON, S.W., 29*th January* 1887.

Private Interview with Lord Salisbury.

YOUR EMINENCE—The Marquis of Salisbury has fixed Friday next, February 4th, at 3 P.M. for this interview.

Will you kindly meet the deputation at this office at 2.45 on that date.—I am, Your Eminence, faithfully yours,

ALFRED SIMMONS.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE EDUCATION ACTS.

8 RICHMOND TERRACE,
WHITEHALL, S.W., 20*th April* 1887.

MY DEAR CARDINAL—I *quite* understand the cause of your absence. I am very glad that the cause of ill-health has, as I hope, permanently disappeared. You have, however, lost nothing, as we have for two days been talking Welsh! And there are few of your flock among them.

I will take note of the name you mention.—Always sincerely yours,

CROSS.

The following Memorandum was addressed to Lord Cross :—

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE, WESTMINSTER, S.W.,
26*th April* 1887.

MY DEAR LORD CROSS—My colleagues, last week, requested me to confer with some member of the Cabinet on a question which is both grave and delicate in its public bearing.

I said that I would ask you to give me an opportunity to state it; with which proposal they were well satisfied.

If you are able to give me a quarter of an hour, when and where shall it be?

I am obliged to be at home by 2 o'clock, but I could return by 4 o'clock, at which time I suppose the Commission will end for the day. HENRY E., Cardinal-Archbishop.

Lord Cross replied as follows:—

I have to leave the India Office at 4.15 for House of Lords, but will see you then with pleasure at a little before 4.

Cardinal Manning wrote a Tract entitled "Fifty Reasons why the Voluntary Schools of England ought to share the School Rates," and sent it for publication to the *Times*, but since it did not appear the Tract was widely circulated by post. The following passages from a letter of the Rev. James Rigg show the character and force of the Tract:—

London Quarterly Review,
130 HORSEFERRY ROAD, S.W., 17*th December* 1888.

DEAR CARDINAL MANNING—Your "Fifty Reasons" are a masterpiece. Will you kindly send me a few more to hand to friends?

It is admirably clear, and arranged in most logical and effective order, with cumulative force.

How can you get the whole well before the general Christian public of educationists, and into the minds of statesmanlike and far-sighted men generally?

I wish you could oblige your intemperate Temperance co-adjutor, our Methodist firebrand, Hugh Price Hughes, to study the Series.

Be sure to send them, with an autograph note, to P. W. Bunting, of the *Contemporary*, who is a dangerous latitudinarian, but a man of naturally equitable mind, an admirer of yourself, and an authoritative adviser of H. P. Hughes.

Our Methodist voluntaries are beginning to recover courage and vigour. Unfortunately Gladstonianism fiercely divides us—and Gladstonianism among us just now means almost everything that is unscrupulous, latitudinarian, and secularist.

I believe that henceforth the movement must, with deepening hold and growing volume of conviction, be towards *your* goal—as indicated throughout your Series, but especially in the later articles. The old Secularism is all but dead-beat; the Birming-

ham of 1869 is behind us; in a true sense we may now "forget those things that are behind" and "press" onwards towards the mark of a Christian national education. In this, thank God—and also in much more—I am one with your Eminence. How I long increasingly for holiness and continual fellowship with God in Christ.—Believe me, dear Cardinal Manning, yours with great respect and Christian affection, JAMES H. RIGG.

In conversation with me Cardinal Manning said, "I sent the 'Fifty Reasons' to Mr. Gladstone, asking his aid in support of Voluntary Schools, but he, after his wont, is so absorbed in his Home Rule scheme, that he replied he had no time or heart for anything else."

26 GLOUCESTER TERRACE, HYDE PARK, W.,
22nd Decemher 1888.

DEAR CARDINAL MANNING—After waiting a week, I begin to despair of seeing "The 50 Reasons" in the *Times*.

I suspect that it will *not* appear, unless you allow me to give your name as the writer *in confidence* to the Editor. I suspect that some of our old friends on the Commission will, under any circumstances, detect the authorship!

With all the best wishes of the season, believe me yours very sincerely, J. R. SANDFORD.

KNOWSLEY, PRESCOT, 12*th January* 1889.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—I thank you for your letter and the "Fifty Reasons" which I had partly seen in the newspapers, but am glad to be able to read them in full and at leisure.

The letter which you refer to was written by me in answer to a request for my opinion; I have not attempted to deal with the merits of the question, but only to state my conclusions as to the probable result of parliamentary action.

Lady Derby thanks you for her kind inquiries, and I remain, faithfully yours, DERBY.

15*th January* 1889.

MY DEAR LORD—I am much obliged to you for your letter and its enclosure, "Fifty Reasons," which I will carefully study.

With all best wishes for the New Year.—Believe me, yours very truly, SALISBURY.

H. E. Cardinal Manning.

Private. LANSDOWNE HOUSE, BERKELEY SQUARE, W.,
5th July 1887.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—To complete my pleasure in a Portrait of you that I am about to hang up, I venture to ask you to sign it with a hard pencil.

I hope I am not troublesome in thus again trespassing on your unvarying kindness to—Yours most respectfully,

ROSEBERY.

The following letter from the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol is a pleasing evidence of Cardinal Manning's friendly relations with Anglican Bishops:—

35 GREAT CUMBERLAND PLACE, W.,
22nd July 1887.

MY DEAR CARDINAL—I thank you cordially for the volume. I shall read the letter, and, beside it, several other portions with real interest. It always does heart and head good to realise, first-hand, what honest thinkers really deem to be the spiritual state of the community they disallow. I must now be bold and ask you to accept from me my last work which I shall tell Longmans to send,—my commentary on 1 *Cor.* I have hesitated hitherto because I did not know whether you would care about it.

There is, however, not much in it that will jar. Interpreters are rarely polemical, if true to their calling.—With renewed thanks to your Eminence, I remain, very sincerely yours,

C. J. GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

The Archbishop of York wrote as follows:—

BISHOPTHORPE, YORK, *9th June* 1888.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—I have to speak on a Clergy Discipline Bill on Tuesday; and I have to speak of the value of an efficient Court of Appeal. An interesting conversation which I had with Bishop Gosse many years ago, comes back to my recollection, in which he told me that in Ireland it had been found expedient to create, in your Church, a body of clergy who could not be deprived without an Appeal, if they chose to exercise the right, to Rome. I think he termed them "District Rectors." I think too, that he intimated that the change was comparatively modern. Other priests, not District Rectors, could be suspended or deprived by the Ecclesiastical Authorities in Ireland.

My object in writing to you at this moment is simply to ask you whether my memory serves me well as to what takes place in your Church in Ireland.

It may seem impertinent to trouble you on so small a matter, but you have always been so kind to me, that I am tempted to ask you, not necessarily to write yourself, but to let me know through one of your secretaries or chaplains, that my memory has not deceived me. The answer could be addressed to me at the House of Lords. The only use I wish to make of the fact is to show the value that is set upon the privilege or right of appeal in your Church.—I am, my dear Lord Cardinal, with much respect and regard, yours,[1] WILLIAM EBOR.

Personal association between His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales and Cardinal Manning on the Royal Commission on Education led to friendly relations. Two or three autograph letters from His Royal Highness show that both the Prince and Princess of Wales entertained a very friendly feeling towards Cardinal Manning. In one letter, in acknowledgment of his photograph presented by Cardinal Manning, the Prince expressed the value which the Princess attached to the portrait of the Cardinal.

On the death of the Emperor Frederick Cardinal Manning wrote a most touching letter of condolence with the Prince and Princess of Wales. In reply, His Royal Highness, after warmly thanking Cardinal Manning on his own behalf and that of the Princess of Wales for his kind sympathy, said that his sister, the Empress Frederick, was deeply moved by Cardinal Manning's touching expression of sympathy with her in her sad bereavement, and his reference to the

[1] The following letter from George Denison, the Bishop of Salisbury, is another illustration, more than twenty years earlier, of Manning's friendly relations with Anglican Bishops:—

PALACE, SALISBURY, 26*th December* 1864.

MY DEAR CARDINAL—I thank you cordially for your unexpected kindness in writing to me on the occasion of our fiftieth anniversary of our wedding day. It is pleasant to be recalled to the calm recollections of earlier days, as the days draw nearer of a truer calm, and the old friends are called away one by one, and the few that are left are reminded by their example, and many inward tokens, that their turn is not far off. May it find us all, living or dying, in His faith and fear.—Ever my dear Cardinal, yours affectionately,

GEORGE SARUM.

noble character of the Emperor Frederick. Cardinal Manning's sympathy with sorrow was felt and recognised by the highest in the land as well as by the poor and the outcast.

Cardinal Manning's love and affection for the members of his family, and the playfulness of his disposition in the familiar intercourse with his nearest relatives, cannot be better illustrated than in the following letters to his sister, Mrs. Austen, and to other near relatives. In earlier years he was on close terms of intimacy and correspondence with the first wife—a penitent of his at Lavington—of his brother, Charles Manning. But on her death the Cardinal's letters to her were destroyed.

Cardinal Manning up to the last was on terms of intimate affection with Mrs. Manning, his brother's second wife, and her daughters.

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE, WESTMINSTER, S.W.,
1*st February* 1881.

MY DEAR CAROLINE— . . . I hope we do grow better as we grow older, for I hope we grow more sorry for time wasted and grace lost, and many sins both of evil done and of good undone. If we can only be sorry not only for fear but for the love of God, all will be forgiven. I suppose that longer time is given to us because we need it, to make our calling and election sure. I remember last January when dear Frederick went that I said this will shake us all down. Some people do not like to talk about their end. I do: it helps me to make ready, and it takes away all sadness and fear. It is a good thing to fill our thoughts with the light and beauty of the world beyond the grave, as it is revealed in the Apocalypse. It was this that made St. Paul say "I have a desire to depart." His longing was for the unseen world, because he had seen it. And we may see it by faith. I remembered dear Harriet on Saturday and Sunday. I remember coming home from Harrow on the Sunday on which she died, and in the very moment of her death. What a world of change we have seen; and we are the only two surviving.

Thank God my strength keeps up, and I am able to do anything under cover; but I cannot face the outer air much.

Do not trouble yourself about law or money. The less we have of both the better. I shall die intestate, for I have nothing to leave. All I had is long gone.

May God bless and keep you safe to eternal life.—Always your affectionate brother, H. E., C.A.

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE, WESTMINSTER, S.W.,
9th January 1882.

MY DEAR SISTER— . . . Thank you for the bust, which will be better for us than the picture.

I have found letters from my dear father and mother, and all of you excepting only dear Harriet. Frederick had kept all my letters to him, and had them put into two bound guard books. Dear brother, I never knew how much he cared for me. Some of his letters are most affecting. Indeed, I have been more touched and surprised than I can say at all your letters, and those of my father and mother. Though I don't remember ever having grieved them by any marked and notable disobedience, I cannot understand how they could have cared for me as their letters show. I am afraid I was spoiled and did not recognise how unworthy I was of so much love from you all.

Never for a day have I forgotten them at the altar in the holy mass. . . . —Always your affectionate brother,

H. E., C.A.

The following two letters, one from a distinguished historian, Mr. J. Bryce, the other from Mr. Burnand, the witty editor of *Punch*, bear witness to the esteem and reverence in which Cardinal Manning was held by Men of Letters:—

7 NORFOLK SQUARE, W., *9th February.*

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL—Your Eminence has been kind enough to express, first privately to myself, and afterwards publicly, a favourable opinion of my book on *The Holy Roman Empire;* an opinion which I prized all the more, not only because it came from such a master of mediæval history, but because it was generously given in spite of the dissent which you intimated, and must of course have felt, from some of the views put forward in the treatise. May I ask you to renew the pleasure which your praise gave me by accepting a copy of the last edition (just published), in which there is a good deal that did not appear in the earlier editions? If I have life and health to return to the subject by composing a larger history (which is my hope), I shall not fail to remember and endeavour to profit by your criticisms; and shall hope to bring before English readers, with as much fulness and fairness as lies within my own limited powers, the grandeur and amplitude of that conception of a

spiritual kingdom on earth, by which the Papacy was guided and inspired in its dealings with the States and Princes of Europe. If I have failed so far to describe that conception, it has not been from failing to recognise its magnificence.

Believe me to be, with renewed thanks for your kindness, very faithfully your Eminence's, J. BRYCE.

His Eminence, the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster.

192 BROMPTON ROAD, S.W., 13*th July* 1888.

DEAR LORD CARDINAL—Allow me, as one whom your Eminence received into the Church thirty years ago, to congratulate you on attaining your eightieth birthday, and on being in such vigorous health as I saw you were when, within the last month, your Eminence preached at the Oratory; on which occasion by the way, Mr. John Morley was among the congregation listening most attentively. He subsequently reported (so he informed me himself) what had most struck him to Mr. Gladstone. I see that your Eminence was born at Totteridge and (if you will pardon me the poor pun) I am delighted to observe there is nothing whatever *Totteridge* about your Eminence now.

That your Eminence may long be spared to us, is the most sincere prayer of—Your very unworthy servant,

F. C. BURNAND.

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE, WESTMINSTER, S.W.,
26*th August* 1890.

MY DEAR CAROLINE—St. Paul warned Titus against genealogies, and I have always kept clear of them, even the Lord Mayor's of London.[1]

But I have always believed the Bosanquets to be my mother's cousins. How, I have never heard.

You are so old that you remember Pigtail.[2] I do not, being young. But I fancy our mother was a Sloane, married to a Hunter. And I remember Uncle Hunter told me that their family was Italian, and the name Venatore Anglicised when they settled in England; and there is a picture of an ancestor, a Levant merchant in an Oriental costume, at Mortimer. I saw it again about six years ago when I went there. As to our family, I believe that we came from Saxony and Frisia. The

---

[1] Cardinal Manning's uncle, Sir Charles Hunter, had been Lord Mayor of London early in the century.

[2] Mrs. Austen explained as follows:—I am afraid that I was rather saucy as a girl, and sometimes to dear Henry I used to call our grandfather, who wore an old-fashioned wig, Pigtail.

name is tribal, and is to be found in Norfolk, Leicestershire, Essex, Kent, and Sussex, and widely in Ireland. We must have gone over with Henry II. I suspect that we were deported to the West Indies by Cromwell. There is Manning's Bay, I think in St. Kitt's. My father's mother was a Ryan, and all Ryans are Papists. I have I do not know how many priests in this diocese of the name. My belief is that my grandfather was married to a Ryan in the West Indies, and came over to England. This accounts for our West Indian property. I have old diaries of our grandfather, in which I find the names of Catholic priests of the last century among his friends. Who knows that you are not a Papist after all?

One more fact. I have facsimile coins of the Saxon kings, bearing also the name of "Manning," Monyer, or Master of the Mint. There is genealogy for you in spite of St. Paul.

The family Bible was in Charles's house. I know nothing about it. I hope you are taking care of yourself.—Always your affectionate brother,

H. E., C.A.

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE, WESTMINSTER, S.W.,
24*th March* 1890.

MY DEAR —— —No, take no trouble about houses. If I move at all, it will be to you. But I feel no will to move. I am a worshipper of creature comforts, besides my shaving brush. You cannot understand the unwillingness I have to move. Time was I liked it, though I never indulged it. But now it is irksome, I am soon tired. With a blessing to you both.—Yours affectionately,

H. E., C.A.

The Queen's Jubilee, and the Jubilee of Cardinal Manning's Episcopate, which naturally attracted such vast numbers of the Catholic laity to Archbishop's House, Westminster, were exceptional events, which brought out all the more the social isolation in which Cardinal Manning lived during the last few years of his life. I am not referring now to that episode related already—of agitations, political and social, which drew to Archbishop's House, Westminster, such a strange and heterogeneous assortment of social reformers, political agitators, defenders of the rights of labour, denouncers of the rights of property; advocates of the disestablishment of churches and of the emancipation of women, upholders of a free breakfast table and of free education under the control and manage-

ment of the parish beadle; enthusiastic visionaries who saw the coming of a millenium in which religion turned out of the Churches should be marshalled and regulated according to the gospel of "General" Booth; in which morality should be enforced in the streets and homes of London by fraud or force—by "moral" detectives or booted apostles according to the new code of morals proclaimed by Mr. Stead and the *Pall Mall Gazette* of odious memory.

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.

Living too much at home and too much alone;[1] without a breath of fresh air, material or moral, to invigorate the body or to dispel from the mind a cloud of unreal impressions, Cardinal Manning in his isolation was too apt at times to give way, notably in regard to the laity, to despondency, on the one hand, and, on the other, to be carried away by illusions or vain imaginings. Contact, had it been possible, with the outer world, the sight of things as they were, free discussion with vigorous minds,[2] by bringing him again

[1] Of course Cardinal Manning was never deserted, never left alone by his secretaries and chaplains, or by loving disciples not of his immediate household. To one or two, perhaps, he may have expounded, on occasions, his novel views, or criticisms, which were listened to in awe and looked upon as utterances too sacred to be repeated. They attended to him carefully and lovingly, ministered to his wants, brought consolation to his heart. But it did not lie within their office to remonstrate with Cardinal Manning on his theories, or on the strange visitors he admitted. They knew but too well no such attempt on their part would be tolerated. On one occasion indeed, a protest was raised against the exposure on the Cardinal's table of a Gazette of odious fame. The remonstrance was never repeated.

[2] During the last year or two of his life, Cardinal Manning was on friendly terms with the Rev. Dom Gasquet, a learned Benedictine, and spoke in high terms of the historical researches of the learned writer.

into touch with the realities of life would have averted many mistakes or misconceptions. But in the isolation of his last years he lived a life of his own imaginings, indulged in visionary theories, dreamed dreams, fancying he saw a new order of things—mistaking things ephemeral for things eternal—growing up under his hands. At the first touch of reality, all these visionary theories vanished like "the baseless fabric of a dream."

As the rays of the setting sun disclose swarms of gnats buzzing and blinding, so a swarm of insects in the moral order—fanatics or visionaries or professional agitators, or creatures of a baser sort, social reformers battening on moral garbage, or eavesdroppers big with gossip or guess-work—surrounded the setting sun of Cardinal Manning's life, deafening his ears for a time and blinding his eyes.

Withdrawing from such uncongenial surroundings, I remember on one memorable occasion of the kind, Cardinal Manning exclaiming, not in anger but in sorrow of heart, "I am surrounded only by nobodies, who neither understand my antecedents or the early history of my life, nor the thoughts which most occupy my mind, nor the interests which lie closest to my heart." "Nor," he might have added but did not—"the follies in high quarters which vex my spirit."[1] It was like a cry of pain wrung from an isolated heart. Cardinal Manning's isolation, cut off from communings with the outer world, from converse with men of common sense and wholesome mind, in his lonely old age, was touching and pathetic in the extreme. There was, however, one unfailing resource ever open to him—the presence of God. His great heart and soul, passing by earthly things, found peace, satisfaction, and joy intense in contemplating with eye unclouded unto the last the things of Eternity.

[1] See *supra*, Cardinal Manning's letters to Lady Herbert.

CHAPTER XXIV

SELF-CRITICISM AND SELF-JUSTIFICATION

CARDINAL MANNING was at pains to explain in Notes or Journals, written for the instruction of posterity, or to satisfy its laudable curiosity, that in his Anglican, as in his Catholic days, he was always too busy a worker in the active affairs of life to waste time on mere literature. "The cultivation of style" he denounced "as a vanity": to take pleasure in it as "vain-glory."

In conversation, speaking of his own writings, he once said: "I am not, like Newman, a poet, or a writer of novels, or of an Autobiography; but a priest, and a priest only."[1]

The thought never seems to have occurred to him that fire of imagination, or force of dramatic instincts, possessed whether by priest or layman, will make itself felt, and seek expression as irresistibly as a river flows to the sea. All gifts are not given to all men. To Manning was given in the natural order gifts of rare excellence: a penetrating intellect, sagacity, foresight; a masterful will, patience, and pertinacity of purpose; grace of mind and manner, and a persuasive tongue rarely surpassed.

Genius, or the highest order of intellectual power, given but to few, the elect among men, was denied to him. Massive and profound and subtle thought, penetrating, as

[1] Cardinal Manning once remarked, that his friends had often urged him to follow Newman's example and write an Autobiography. He commenced the work, which was to have taken the shape of "Letters to a Friend." "I wrote the 'First Letter,'" Cardinal Manning added, "and it was the last. I was too busy a man; such a work would have been a waste of time and thought."

far as the natural limits allow, into the origin of things human and divine, which constitutes the thinker, was not his. Neither was he possessed of the divine afflatus, the poet's gift, which gives light and glow and warmth, and a life that never dies, to the works of an inspired writer.

Since Cardinal Manning's reputation does not rest on his writings, graceful in diction though his sermons are, earnest and impressive always, often pathetic, and sometimes containing passages of real eloquence, it is not necessary to criticise them too closely. It is a high merit that his writings answered the immediate purpose for which they were written. They were written on the spur of the moment in answer to some attack, or to explain some question of the day, or to give an authoritative interpretation to some doctrinal difficulty, or to clear up some misunderstanding, or rebut a misrepresentation of more than ordinary importance as to the views or teachings of the Church. Such ready answers or defences justly entitled Manning to be regarded as the champion of the Church and the Papacy. His works, however, are for the most part reprints of Sermons or Addresses, not originally written, but taken down by reporters and corrected for the press. In the nature of things such works, however useful at the moment, must needs be of ephemeral interest. At any rate, they cannot be placed in the same category with works carefully thought out, closely connected in purpose and argument, and written with deliberation and after mature study. On the other hand, Manning's devotional works, sermons delivered either as an Anglican or as a Catholic, are distinguished by their spirituality and by a tone of deep and unaffected piety.

Cardinal Manning gives in autobiographical Notes a more interesting because personal account of his writings, of the motives which inspired him, of the end he had in view, than is in the power of any one else to relate. Of this rare advantage I gladly avail myself. It is all the more important because his self-criticism is followed by self-justification. He accounts for the want of finish and force in his literary work by the contempt he felt for mere style. In a Note dated 1881, he writes as follows:—

I have never endured to spend time in re-writing and in polishing. Still less in writing poetry. If we are to "salute no one by the way," certainly we are not intended to write sonnets. I could have much enjoyed it, but once or twice in doing it I have had, "What doest thou here, Elias?" almost audibly in my ears. If, then, I speak of the paper I have stained, it is with no literary vanity. I have tried to use pen, ink, and English as means to an end, and the only means possible.

In another Note of a somewhat later date, Cardinal Manning wrote on literary vanity as follows:—

I believe I may say that I have had no literary vanity since I became a priest. For some years after ordination I could not write. I felt so shaken by what I had gone through, so mistrustful of myself, so distracted by work, that I could write nothing. Almost everything I have printed was taken down in shorthand, and corrected for press. I knew this to be fatal to style, but favourable to simplicity and clearness. In old days my books used to be quoted for style. When I became Catholic, I was told that I could not write English. One critic put me in the pillory for two inaccuracies of style and taste. The one was a quotation from the Book of *Exodus*, the other from the Book of *Ecclesiastes*. The blessed man knew neither, and I never answered him. I believe I can say with truth that I have never written or spoken for effect as Sibthorpe truly says in one of his letters. I have used words to express the thoughts in my mind without reflection on form or style which is to me like self-conscious postures. And I have never written for popular taste either poetry or fiction. I wrote heaps of poetry when I was between Harrow and Oxford. But I burnt it all. I have since then written as the time and truth demanded, dry and unpopular matters enough. I had no aim but to stand for the Truth. I have this consolation, that ten or eleven of my books have been translated into French, Italian, German, Polish, and Hungarian. They have therefore run the gauntlet of many censors; and I hope I may believe that they have not been found out of the analogy of Faith. It has been my fate, too, to write on unpopular subjects—the Temporal Power, Infallibility, the Vatican Council, and Popery.

Half-conscious, perhaps, that what men, as critics, objected to, was not so much want of force in style as want of fulness and depth in thought, Cardinal Manning justifies himself, not by declaring in so many words that he was not

a writer and thinker, but by insisting on the fact that his whole life was spent in action. This is the true defence, the best apology. They, who are somewhat shocked or scandalised on being told that Manning was not a great writer or thinker, forget that life is not large enough to combine incessant action with profound thought and study. The meditation of the recluse or scholar lies beyond the province of the man of action.

From the following Note about the same date as that I have recited, they who do not know, or cannot bring themselves to believe in, the limitations of Manning's intellectual powers, will easily gather how it came to pass that he was not a writer or thinker. Speaking of the contrast which was incessantly set up between Cardinal Wiseman, Dr. Newman, and himself, Cardinal Manning wrote as follows:—

Cardinal Wiseman fought one great fight, and afterwards was silent and conciliatory. Dr. Newman, since his Lectures in 1850-1857, has gone into silence at Edgbaston. I was planted in London, attacked all round, forced into defence, and then for conscience sake into attack. I had to speak every Sunday on Popery and the Pope in the hearing of reporters, who put it next day into the papers. Every Sunday for five-and-twenty years I have been preaching once, twice, and sometimes three sermons. These have almost always been reported. It is only a wonder to me that I have not been entangled, caught, and convicted of all manner of inaccuracy, imprudence, and bad language. But this has hardly ever been alleged. What has been said is, that I so put truth as to irritate those who hear it; that Cardinal Wiseman and Cardinal Newman said and say the same things without irritating. But the same critics condemn me by saying that I do not say the same things, but extreme and excessive things, which neither Cardinal Wiseman nor Cardinal Newman do say. Then it is not the manner but the matter, for the same people say that although I speak softly I yet irritate. I cannot but hope that it is after all that a quarter of a century of outspoken truth has nipped and pinched. The quantity of talk in sermons and speeches in the four volumes is portentous, and how I could have talked so much and got off with so little just censure I do not know, except that I have never ventured where the Catechism and the Holy See have not guided me.

In a Note of the same year, which is none the less interesting because he intersperses, according to his wont, with the immediate subject-matter he is commenting on, autobiographical reminiscence, Cardinal Manning wrote as follows :—

If any one hereafter tries to give account of the last sixteen years, they will have to turn over the four Red Folio Scrap Books. I have just gone through the first. It is like the history of a running fight. I hardly ever went anywhere, or preached a sermon, but three or four newspapers opened upon me. The Temporal Power, the Italian Revolution, Infallibility, Popery, Mariolatry, every unpopular Truth, fell to my lot; and I hope I told it in plain words, for nobody misunderstood me, and everybody was wroth against me. I doubt if anybody was more assailed. I believe if my words had not pinched them, it would not have been so. Through all this time one running contrast and comparison to my condemnation comes over and over again. There is an article from the *Guardian*, headed "Dr. Newman and the English Barons," which is a true appreciation. Thank God, I did not seek popularity by bating half a tone of any unpopular Truth. But even as early as 1867, the *Standard* Roman correspondent began with his absurd lies. I must believe that the inventions were conscious. See the account of the meeting of bishops at Cardinal "Mattei's" rooms. It was the Altieri Palace. The stupid malice of it is mulish. It must be the same hand which, during the Council and the Conclave was perpetually lying against me, for I can hardly believe that there are two equally malicious and equally foolish. My early life, as boy and youth and man, was too full of kindness and popularity—especially the twelve years from 1838 to 1850. Suddenly I passed from midsummer into midwinter. The Anglican world all rose up against me. The Catholics did not know me, and were rather curious than careful about me. From that day to this I have been slung at. I hope I may think for truth's sake. *Signum cui contradicitur.* Nobody has ever mistaken my meaning, and I have never had to complain of being misunderstood. I have been only too plain to please. *Si hominibus placerem, non essem servus Jesu Christi.* I have constantly thought of St. Francis of Sales, *Asperrima quæque perpessus est, sæpe ab hæreticis conquisitus ad necem, variisque calumniis et insidiis vexatur.* If a Saint, faultless for patience and sweetness in word and deed, was so hated, how much more must I be? He for truth's sake without faith; I for my faith, but I hope not without the truth.

This goes down to 1868-69, when I went to the Council, and runs through the first Red Book. The second volume shows a marked change. During the Council they had blown themselves out of breath in abusing me. But they found it of no use. After that they became silent and more civil, that is from 1870 onwards.

The volume from 1870 to 1874 is far less bitter against me. The Vatican Council had changed the balance unconsciously and secretly to some extent.

I have now got nearly through the third Volume, which comes down to 1879 and touches 1880. There is less of bitterness, but some hard knocks—very little foul hitting. In truth I often hit first, as about St. Thomas of Canterbury, St. Edmund, the Hierarchy, the Usurpation of Rome, Religious Education, and the like.

In the following Note, dated 1882, Cardinal Manning gives an analysis of his sermons in his Anglican, as well as in his Catholic days, divides them into groups with the view of showing that the doctrines which he taught as an Anglican found their completion in his Catholic works:—

Before 1851 I wrote eight volumes, chiefly drawn from me by work. I have been urged to reprint five of them, and £250 was offered to me for an edition of the four volumes of Sermons. But I always refused. I wished my past, while I was in the twilight, to lie dead to me, and I to it.[1] As for the many books

[1] Cardinal Manning was not always of a like mind in regard to the republication of his Anglican sermons. In 1865, just before he was made archbishop, he consulted Dr. Bernard Smith in Rome as to their reproduction. He likewise suggested that if there was anything amiss in his sermons they might easily be corrected. At a much later period Cardinal Manning commissioned a Catholic friend to carefully examine these sermons with the view of republication. The opinion was adverse, on the ground that, though the sermons contained many Catholic truths, their framework was essentially and irremediably Anglican. Dr. Smith's letter in reply to Mgr Manning is as follows:—

POSTA RESTANTE, ROME, 18*th March* 1865.

MY DEAR MONSIGNORE—I duly received your kind letter, dated the 6th of last February. The four Books came also to hand. These I carefully read over in the same order I have been requested.

I confess I was greatly surprised to see how close you seem to bring the Anglican Confession to the Church of Rome. But what I admired most in the perusal of these volumes was not the many strong Catholic truths I met with, but that almost Catholic unction of a St. Francis of Sales, or of a St.

written since, they have all been drawn from me as the sermons will show, or by the Temporal Power, or by the controversy against the Sacred Heart, or by Anglicanism. Almost all were taken down in shorthand, and corrected for press. The only books which were written, are—*England and Christendom*, *The Love of Christ, etc.*, *The True Story of the Vatican Council*, *The Holy Ghost the Sanctifier*, *The Miscellanies*, though some of these are mere reports. This will account for their many faults. But God knows I only wished to make known His Truth without reflection upon myself. I hope they have spread His Word. The many reprints here and in America, the many translations

---

Teresa, that breathes through them all. That the reading of these works must have great influence over the Protestant mind I have no doubt. I also believe that no sincere Protestant can read over these volumes, who sooner or later will not take refuge in the ark.

But you ask me if you can let those Volumes be reprinted. My humble opinion is that you cannot. Recollect these were the works of Dr. Manning, a Protestant. They were the fruits of the Anglican not of the Catholic Church. Call to mind also the second rule of the Index, published by orders of the Council of Trent. It runs thus:—"Aliorum autem hæreticorum libri, qui de religione quidem *ex professo tractant*, omnino prohibentur." I believe your volumes, which I have before me, come under this prohibition. Hence it follows that you cannot, *tuta conscientia*, permit them to be reprinted.

But your works could be corrected. To this I would answer, not easily. To me the difficulties seem so great that I think you will never succeed in correcting them so as to reprint them with the permission of the Church. There is a great difference between the Faith of the Catholic Church and the errors of the Anglican Articles on the elevation and fall of our first parents, and on the nature of justification. Now on all these subjects you keep to the Anglican articles—Vol. ii., page 12, your definition of Original Sin is taken verbatim from Article IX. Vol. i., page 252, you write—"Justified . . . that is, we were *accounted* righteous."

But I shall say no more on this topic till we meet.

With regard to Rome I can give you no news. The Holy Father is in perfect health; I trust he may live to see the triumph of the Church. But I fear before that day comes we will have to suffer. Humanly speaking Rome is in a bad position. However, she has not yet played her last card. She has still to make her appeal to all the Powers of Europe. Let her tell these Powers that she has been reduced to her present state by the Revolution of Europe, that she has been offered conditions which no king could accept. There is one thing more the Holy Father has to add to his appeal, that the day Rome will be given up to the Revolution that very day he will leave it. I leave to you to consider the effect of such an appeal on France and all Europe. Let us hope there will be no necessity for it.

Monsignore, I would have answered your letter sooner, but I have been very ill for near a month.

Hoping to hear good news from you before long, I remain, my dear Monsignore, very sincerely yours, BERNARD SMITH.

in many languages, and the many letters, especially from converts (which I have burnt),[1] give me the consolation of hoping that I have so spoken as to find a sympathy in many souls throughout the Church.

I hope, therefore, that as "*Spiritus Domini replevit orbem terrarum*," the same spirit was in my words and in their hearts. This was my only aim, and it has so far been fulfilled. The chief subjects that I have written upon have been, before 1851 (see the early part of this Journal. *Retro*)—(1) The Succession and Witness of the Church. (2) Tradition as the Ground of Certainty. (3) The Unity of the Church. (4) Its Independence of all Civil and Human Authority. This closed my non-Catholic life. Since 1851 the same subjects have been carried on to their completion in :—

* 1. The Four Lectures on the Grounds of Faith.
* 2. The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost.
3. England and Christendom.
* 4. The Temporal Power of the Pope.
5. *Petri Privilegium.*
* 6. The True Story of the Vatican Council.
7. The Independence of the Holy See.

In these the whole argument which brought me to the Church as the *præambulum fidei* is, I believe, fully re-stated and completed, at least in outline.

These seven make one group. A second group is made up of :—

1. Three Volumes of Sermons.
* 2. The Internal Mission of the Holy Ghost, and the Holy Ghost the Sanctifier.
* 3. Sin and its Consequences.
* 4. The Love of Jesus for Penitents.
* 5. The Glories of the Sacred Heart.
6. The Four Great Evils of the Day.
7. The Fourfold Sovereignty of God.
* 8. Confidence in God.

Of these, those marked * have been published in Italian in Rome and Turin ; therefore under *Censura.*

A third lot is made up of the two volumes of Miscellanies, of which some are historical and general.

The *Pall Mall*, in an attack, said truly ten years ago that I was "a parson from the crown of the head to the soles of my feet"—a hopeless and unmitigated parson, thank God.

---

[1] All the letters addressed to him by his spiritual children, converts perhaps for the most part, were carefully destroyed by Cardinal Manning.

What I have here said about writing, I must say still more strongly about preaching. I have spoken of this before in this book.

It was in another of his Journals that Cardinal Manning referred to the subject of his preaching. Indeed, in his autobiographical Notes and Journals, he was not careful about chronological order or continuity of subject. Whenever the spirit moved him he took up one of his Journals or Note-books, and, whilst the iron was hot, expressed his mind. This spontaneousness adds a charm of its own to his reflections or pungent criticisms.

In the following Note Cardinal Manning expresses his horror of mannerism or self-consciousness in preaching:—

If I know myself, I can say that I have carefully and conscientiously prepared the matter of all my preaching, but never the form, or style, or manner. I have had a horror of mannerism, or self-consciousness, which I feel to detect in men by an instinct. It gives me gooseflesh. I heard a sermon lately in which the thoughts were as three, the words as six, and the gestures as nine. And yet the man was a good man, but he had been "taught to preach." Could men have been taught to preach in the Octave of Pentecost? And are we not keeping the Octave to this day? St. Augustus says—*Sapienter dicit homo tanto magis, vel minus, quanto in Scripturis Sacris magis minusve profuerit* (*De Doct. Christi*, lib. iv., c. 5). He gives a complete instruction for preaching in saying, "Let him love to pray before he speaks, so that he may give that which he has received from on high; and let him ask of God out of the multitude of explanations and interpretations which may come into his head, that he may choose those which He who knoweth the hearts of men, may see to be the most likely to teach the souls of those who listen to him" (*De Doct. Christi*, lib. iv., c. 5). I believe I can say with truth that I have tried to choose not that which would be popular and pleasing and attractive, but that which is most needed by souls, by the time, by the condition of morals. I do not doubt that by choosing burning questions and topics of the day, or curious investigations, or popular subjects, and dressing them up in fine words, and above all delivering them with oratorical tones and gestures, I might have gained the commendation of a "Pulpit orator." I thank God that all such hearers have gone away disappointed. One sentence in a letter of Sibthorpe's, printed in his *Life*, is to

me the most consoling I ever read.[1] I have tried to say what I had to say in the fewest and simplest words, and my great comfort has been to watch the altar-boys, and see them listen without moving, and to know that servants and poor people had understood what I said. I have seldom chosen a subject without (1) asking God to guide the choice; (2) applying the matter to myself; (3) making the sign of the Cross on my head and heart and lips in honour of the Sacred Mouth. If I live till Christmas 1882 I shall have been speaking in my poor way for God and His Truth for fifty years; already as a priest I have been speaking for thirty here in London. God grant not all in vain.

On the night of the Sunday in Epiphany 1882 I preached on *Surge Illuminare Jerusalem*, at the Italian Church. It was my first text on Christmas day 1832. I am therefore in my fiftieth year of talking.

On Christmas day 1882 I preached on the same words at the Pro-Cathedral at High Mass, and so finished my fiftieth year of *ululatus in deserto*.

In a letter to his sister, Mrs. Austen, dated 9th January 1882, he also alludes as follows to the text of his first sermon on Christmas day 1832:—

MY DEAR SISTER . . . I wonder why you and I are left the last. Is it because we have most need of time to make ready?[2] This is the fiftieth year since I began to preach. Last night I preached on the same words which were my first text on Christmas day 1832, Isa. lx. 1-3. I hope we may enter into that light. . . . Always your affectionate brother, H. E., C.A.

In a Note of a later date, 15th November 1888, Cardinal Manning returned to the question of style and of the literary worth of his sermons. It is likewise related how, walking one afternoon in the fields at Lavington, it came to his mind that the Apostles going forth *a latere Jesu* must

[1] In a letter dated 25th March 1865, to the Rev. J. Fowler, the Rev. R. W. Sibthorpe, referring to Manning's preaching, wrote as follows:—"Manning is preaching on the conversion of the soul to God—able, sound, close, and searching. I have not often, if ever, heard the like; but I don't think that generally he is popular, though extremely Roman."—*Life of R. W. Sibthorpe*, by Rev. J. Fowler, 1880, p. 172.

In a letter to Dr. Bloxam, dated 22nd June 1865, Sibthorpe, referring to Archbishop Manning's consecration, wrote as follows:—"He looked like Lazarus come out of the tomb in cope and mitre—a richly vested corpse, but very dignified and placid.—*Ibid.* 173.

[2] In reply Mrs. Austen wrote, "It is not time which is of importance, but what use we make of it."

have always preached in His name. "This made me believe that we ought to do the same." In allusion to these sermons—which, though preached soon after the Vatican Council, were not polemical—on Sin, the Interior Mission of the Holy Ghost, and the Sacred Heart, Cardinal Manning said:—

I have preached on other subjects by necessity, but I have preached on these by choice. And I hope I may to the end of my life preach on the Eternal Truths and on the Eternal world.

I have talked above of literary vanities, and I wish to write down what has been my intention and my endeavour.

I remember that when I published my old books, about the year 1840-1844, people commended them and their English, and I paid attention to it. I owe much to a friend who revised them; but he was one of the school which studies form rather than simplicity.[1] In the second volume of my old sermons I broke loose and would not satisfy him. I felt that it would breed self-consciousness. From that time I never did. I tried to write grammatically, but I avoided all study and ornament. The volume was about our Divine Lord's life and character. I do not think after that I ever bestowed labour upon style. But two things happened which have governed me ever since.

The one was that a very simple but devout person asked me why in my first volume of sermons I had said so little about the Holy Ghost.[2] I was not aware of it; but I found it to be true. I at once resolved that I would make a reparation every day of my life to the Holy Ghost. This I have never failed to do to this day. To this I owe the light and faith which brought me into the true fold. I bought all books I could about the Holy Ghost. I worked out the truths about His personality, His presence, and His office. This made me understand the last paragraph of the Apostles' Creed, and that made me a Catholic Christian. From this has come the main teaching of my last twenty-eight years: my two books on the Holy Ghost, my perception of the vital necessity of defining the Infallibility of the Head of the Church, and the line I took in the Council of the Vatican.

The other event was this: I was walking in the fields at

---

[1] This friend was Manning's brother-in-law, John Anderdon, a great worshipper of the Seventeenth century English.

[2] In addition to this simple person Archdeacon Manning owed to Robert Wilberforce a debt of gratitude for his masterly exposition of the doctrine of the Trinity.

Lavington one afternoon, and it came to my mind that the Apostles going forth *a latere Jesu* must have always preached in His name, making Him and it their ἀφορμή and keeping up their consciousness of their personal relation to Him, and His to them. This made me believe that we ought also to do the same; and I have ever since endeavoured to choose the matter and to dispose the manner so as to make Him the beginning and the ending, the chief person and main idea, of all preaching.

I believe that I can say that in choosing the subjects for preaching I have tried to find what is most needed, what will come most directly home. I have tried to know what I was going to say with definiteness and certainty, and to reduce everything to intelligible propositions, studying to be clear, and not to be oratorical. I have had all my life a horror of Pulpit oratory. I believe it to be one of the plagues of the Church. It has blighted the declaration of the Word of God, to the hurt of both preacher and hearer. I have therefore resolved to follow one (*i.e.* Oblate) rule, *Virilis Simplicitas*, and "to talk seriously for God." I know how this is despised, and how oratorical displays are glorified. But I believe St. Paul meant this when he condemned the "plausible words of men"; and preached with "the demonstration of the Spirit and power." I am well aware, therefore, that my books have no literary worth. But I have the consolation of knowing that they have been multiplied; and that they have been translated into French, German, Italian, Polish, and Hungarian. In themselves they are worth only the Divine Truth that is in them. All my share in them is worthless. I have only tried to be clear, and I hope I am so.

I have the consolation of knowing that the little Book on the Eternal Priesthood has been translated into French, Italian, German, Flemish, Dutch, Polish, Hungarian, Spanish, and Portuguese. This, I hope, is a sign that it is in harmony with the spirit of the Church, which is the spirit of Truth and of God.

In the following Note, dated 1888, Cardinal Manning expressly disclaims any pretensions to a literary life. It is an able and vigorous justification of his methods of dealing with opponents:—

I have been constantly accused of affirming without proving, and asserting without reasoning. It is true. I have believed the office of the Church and of its pastors to be to bear witness, not to argue. Our Lord taught "as one having authority or power, and not as the scribes." This seems to me precisely the same. The Apostles were to be "witnesses" unto Him. But

witnesses gave evidence, they do not argue. St. John says, "That which was from the beginning" (see 1 St. John, i. 1-5). "This is the message and declaration that we have received from Him and declare unto you." St. Paul said, "Our preaching is not in the persuasive words of mere wisdom, but in the demonstration of the Spirit and in power."

Cardinal Newman said:

> So the Apostles tamed the heathen breast,
> They argued not but preached, and conscience did the rest.

I have felt for forty years that a preacher comes *a latere Jesu* as a herald. And that he can do what others cannot do—assert and affirm, and leave Truth to do work by its own evidence.

I have felt also that the surest way to keep error out of men's minds is to fill them with Truth. Destructive writing and preaching ruins and sweeps away. It leaves a space or a void. But assertion and affirmation construct and build up. They fill the mind with Truth, or at least with some intelligible statement. Clearness is evidence. Truth looks out upon the human reason. This appears to me to be the divine method of showing and perpetuating the Truth. I have endeavoured to speak in the accents of the Church. And the voice of the Church is positive, dogmatic, affirmative. I know that it irritates opponents, because it refuses to come down from the office of a witness to the Serbonian bog of controversy, and to argue and reason as if the message were uncertain.

The maxim of the world certainly is argument. I am accused of "never coming to close quarters" in argument. How could I come closer? I am accused also of asserting with "a misleading clearness." What could I better do as a witness for Truth delivering a message of divine revelation? At all events I have been intelligible, and have made my message clear. Thirty years of this work has, I hope, left its mark. And I hope there are two sides to this history. The side of this world has made itself both visible and audible by as great an amount of contradiction, criticism, and contempt as any priest in my time has had to bear. But those who have listened and believed have been silent. One anonymous dissentient makes a great noise: a whole congregation who assent and say nothing are neither heard nor known. But perhaps I may know some day. And I have not been sowing for this life.

I have just read over my first Pastoral on 8th June 1865. It gives the outline of my mind and work to this day. I do not think I have departed from it. I have made no pretensions to a literary life. My life has been a life of action, and what I have

written has been spoken and taken down, and written in and for action. If I have written anything it has been. I hope, in the heads and hearts of those committed to me, especially in the last sixteen years. I wish I could say: "You are my Epistle, written in my hand, and known and read of all men," poor children, poor drunkards, and perhaps a few other souls. If so I shall be content to have been in a perpetual motion like the ass in the mill, or like the fly-wheel which gives motion to the wheels that do the work. My life has been an active life, a centre, if not a source, of incessant motion.

In reading over these Volumes I have had a very deep sense of my own unworthiness and unfitness for such an office and such a work. It is now closing—indeed, so far as any new undertaking it is already closed. I can only hope that the Church in England has not been hurt or hindered by my sixteen years. I am not conscious of having pulled down a stone or a grain of Truth, nor of having deviated from the line traced by the Holy See. No one has accused me of this, but of the direct reverse. I remember Passaglia saying to me in 1853: "You will have more to suffer from Catholics than from Protestants." It has been true. *Inimici hominis domestici ejus.* The English people have shown me undue goodwill. From Church of England people, excepting individuals, and excepting a knot of men who revile their own bishops even more bitterly than they have reviled me, I have received great courtesy and kindness. Public men and politicians with hardly an exception—with one only of a public notoriety—I have received more than courtesy. From Catholics it is not for me to say. Others will say when I am gone. I will only say that from the whole Province of Westminster I have received charity beyond all claim or merit: from my own diocese God knows how unworthy I am of what has consoled me, and how deservedly I have been censured and grieved. If I had not been put where I am by the Vicar of our Divine Master I should never have dared to bear such an office.

Cardinal Manning's self-criticism provokes contradiction. It is not only too severe, it is unjust, to say of his sermons that "All my share in them is worthless." The spiritual unction which inspired them; the deep Supernatural faith to which they bore witness; the austere morality which they inculcated, whatever their literary merits or demerits may be, —went home to the hearts of men, already captivated by the preacher's earnest and impressive delivery. Cardinal Manning

never indulged in false rhetoric, or in oratorical displays,[1] which his soul abhorred. I remember his once saying, "The three greatest evils in the Church to-day are French devotional books, theatrical music, and the pulpit orator. And the last is the worst."

His little book on *The Eternal Priesthood* was by far the most popular, as it circulation shows, of all his writings. It was an exaltation of the Priesthood. It placed them on a higher level than the Monastic Orders. The Regulars were bound by vows. The Secular clergy enjoyed liberty, which is the highest standard of perfection. Christ and the Apostles were not under vows. The thought, which is the basis of the little book is not original. It is an extension of St. Thomas Aquinas's disquisition on the Episcopate. Or rather Cardinal Manning, apparently in opposition to the principles laid down by St. Thomas Aquinas, confers the privileges, powers, and character of the Episcopate on the Secular clergy. In his horror of the term Secular clergy, as implying worldliness, and as contrasting unfavourably with the Regular clergy, Cardinal Manning applied to Propaganda, advocating that priests should be called "Pastoral clergy." The authorities in Rome objected. The pastoral office was the office of a bishop. The term pastoral clergy was also in bad odour. It had been adopted by the Jansenists. Moreover, the term "secular" clergy was universal in the Church and of early origin. Rome explained in answer to Manning's objections that the term secular merely indicated living in the world.

The Eternal Priesthood as a devotional book will live; it is full of noble thoughts and high purpose. It is on his devotional books that Manning's reputation as a writer mainly rests. Books like *Devotional Readings* and especially *Towards Evening*, touch the hearts of men and lift their souls to Heaven. They will be treasured by the devout and pious in many a generation to come.

[1] In the First volume, however, of his Anglican Sermons, and to a lesser extent in the Second, there was no little affectation in style, and false glitter. Long quotations from the Apocalypse, delivered in Archdeacon Manning's most impressive manner, produced a startling effect on the sober congregation in Chichester Cathedral. When, however, the Sermons appeared in print they were much criticised for obscurity of style and for thinness in thought.

CHAPTER XXV

THE JUBILEE OF THE QUEEN—DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH ROME—CARDINAL MANNING'S JUBILEE—THE DEATH OF CARDINAL NEWMAN

1887–1890

THE Jubilee of Her Majesty the Queen was an occasion of such a manifestation of loyalty throughout the vast dominions of the Empire as history has rarely recorded of any people in any age or country. In loyalty the Catholics of England were second to none, and Cardinal Manning, the head of the Catholic Church in England, was the most loyal of Englishmen. There are periods in the life of a nation which are epoch-making. Such a period was summed up and personified in the Jubilee of the Queen. The Crown was never so popular; the people never so contented and happy. The power and unity of the Empire resting on the sure foundations of law and order, of justice and loyalty, were never more conspicuous and consolidated. Religious equality is not only secured to all under the law, but is embalmed in the hearts of the people. In no land, in no Catholic State, does the Church, as Pope Leo XIII. has recorded with gratitude, enjoy such perfect freedom of word and action as in the vast dominions of the Queen of England.

On the occasion of her Jubilee the Pope manifested in public his esteem and veneration of the high and noble character of Her Majesty, of her public and private virtues, by sending an Envoy to the Court of St. James's to offer the sincerest of well-wishes to the Queen of England and to the Royal Family on the auspicious occasion.

Such an interchange, twofold in character, of courtesies and kindnesses as passed between the Queen of England and the Pope on the occasion, first, of Her Majesty's Jubilee, and secondly, of the Jubilee of his Holiness Pope Leo XIII., was in no small measure rendered acceptable, and even agreeable to the people of England by the high repute which Cardinal Manning had for years enjoyed as a loyal Englishman, eager in furthering every national movement, and ever active in taking a foremost part in every philanthropic and charitable work.

In the first instance, before Pope Leo XIII. had made known to the Government his intention to send, if agreeable to the wishes of the Queen, a Special Envoy to congratulate Her Majesty on the celebration of her Jubilee, it was contemplated to invite Catholics to take part in the Great National Thanksgiving-Service at Westminster Abbey. A large number of leading Catholics had intimated their desire to be present on the occasion as a public manifestation of loyalty to the Queen. As soon, however, as it became known that at the desire of the Pope his Special Envoy was to celebrate, in the presence of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, a Mass of Thanksgiving at the Pro-Cathedral on the same day as the Thanksgiving-Service at Westminster Abbey, it was, as a matter of course, the duty of Catholics to take part in the celebration at the Pro-Cathedral.

The following letter on the subject was addressed by the Lord Chamberlain to Cardinal Manning:—

LORD CHAMBERLAIN'S OFFICE,
ST. JAMES'S PALACE, S.W., *6th June* 1887.

MY LORD CARDINAL—I was about to address your Eminence some time ago, to ask if it would be possible that you could in any way take part in the Great National Jubilee Thanksgiving-Service at Westminster Abbey, when I was informed that it was the intention of His Holiness the Pope to send a Special Envoy here to congratulate Her Majesty on the occasion.

This, I am glad to say, has now been confirmed, and Lord Edmund Talbot has informed me further, that His Holiness has desired a special service to be held, at the same time as that at

Westminster Abbey, in the Catholic Cathedral, at which the Envoy is to be present.

I feel, therefore, that it would be useless to address your Eminence on the subject; but, at the same time, I should wish your Eminence to understand it is this alone that has prevented me from writing, and to assure you of the pleasure that it would have given me if I could have received a favourable answer.—I have the honour to remain yours faithfully, LATHOM.

His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster.

In an autobiographical Note, dated on the morrow of the celebration, Cardinal Manning wrote as follows:—

21*st June* 1887.—The Queen's Jubilee. The joy and enthusiasm of the people unbounded. So many crowned heads and royal personages never here before. An Envoy Extraordinary from Leo XIII. to congratulate. The loyalty of the people greater now than at any time since the Restoration, and more genuine, spontaneous, and individual. I believe the Jubilee will greatly confirm the monarchical spirit and the conservative instincts of all classes of politicians, except the "envious," who in Great Britain are not many or powerful. The Catholic Church has shown its loyalty, and in the Pro-Cathedral the Papal Envoy sang the mass *De Trinitate* in thanksgiving; and I had the happiness of singing the *Te Deum*. . . .

The *Morning Post* said yesterday, with some malice, that 300 Catholic peers and personages returned their tickets for the Abbey. It is more than I know, but, if so, I thank God for it. They set a brave example which will do good everywhere to our people and to Ireland, and even to the English people. It is a witness for the faith, and to fidelity to conscience rather than to the world. It would have been a shame if we, who the other day were rejoicing in our Martyrs, had shown less firmness in Catholic piety.[1]

Monsignor Ruffo Scilla, as the Pope's Special Envoy to the Queen on the occasion of Her Majesty's Jubilee, celebrated the Pontifical Mass of Thanksgiving at the Pro-Cathedral, Kensington. Cardinal Manning, as Archbishop of Westminster, occupied the Episcopal throne to the right of the altar, supported by the Canons of the Chapter. Another throne on the left was occupied by the Papal

[1] The Beatification of the English Martyrs.

Envoy, attended by his chaplain, Mgr. Merry de Val, and assisted by all the Monsignori in their purple robes, and domestic Prelates of the Pope in England.

The church was filled by representative and leading Catholics, and by a large number of the Secular clergy, and of the members of the Religious Orders. Her Majesty the Queen graciously expressed her satisfaction at the attendance of the Duke of Norfolk, the Earl Marshal of England, and other Catholic members of her court at the Service of Thanksgiving celebrated by the Special Envoy of the Pope.

As Papal Envoy honour and precedence at the altar were duly given to Mgr. Ruffo Scilla; but, when the celebration of the Pontifical High Mass was concluded, and the Papal Envoy had offered up the prayer for the Queen and Royal Family, Cardinal Manning claimed and exercised the right of intoning the *Te Deum*. "I could not, as an Englishman," he declared, "deny myself the happiness of singing the *Te Deum*. This I did with all my heart, for I have loved the Queen ever since I saw her and kissed hands in 1841 or 1842, I forget which. She was then about twenty and looked like a child." [1]

After the celebration of mass, accompanied by the Duke of Norfolk, whose guest he was, the Special Envoy of the Pope witnessed the return of the Royal Procession from Westminster Abbey to Buckingham Palace. On renewing, on a subsequent occasion, his congratulations to Her Majesty, the Queen graciously expressed to Mgr. Ruffo Scilla her gratification that her Roman Catholic subjects had united with her Protestant subjects in offering up a special Thanksgiving Service on her behalf.

On the occasion of presenting to Her Majesty the mosaic which Pope Leo XIII. had sent to the Queen, as a memorial of her Jubilee, Mgr. Ruffo Scilla had the honour of being the Queen's guest at Windsor Castle.

In the national celebration of the Queen's Jubilee, and more especially in the interchange of kindly courtesies between Pope Leo XIII. and the Queen of England, Cardinal Manning was constrained by the necessity of things, much

[1] Autobiographical Note, dated June 1887.

against his natural inclinations as a patriotic Englishman, to play a subordinate part. But he showed his interest in the national celebration in many ways, especially in a speech at a Meeting held to promote "the foundation of an Imperial Institute as the National Memorial of Her Majesty's reign." In this speech, delivered in Westminster Town Hall three or four months before the celebration of the Jubilee, Cardinal Manning gave a graphic account of the changes which had taken place in English life within his own experience, which dated as far back as the close of George III.'s reign. Speaking of his own reminiscences he said:—

I lived through the whole of the reign of George IV. and a part of the reign of George III., and I can remember that in those days the effects of the French Revolution were still active in this country. There was discontent among the mass of the people—a discontent that was not unreasonable. In the reign of William IV. the position of affairs was somewhat mitigated; but there can be no doubt that that period was one of the most dangerous in modern history. There was sedition and discontent, and there were great inequalities of state and condition, great inequalities of law, and various galling Acts and Statutes with severe penalties attached to them. Even the wisest and bravest men were full of anxiety. At that time the Princess Victoria ascended the throne, in age hardly more than a child; and she awakened the spirit of personal loyalty and chivalry towards herself, a spirit which had seemed dead to the time and the people. We owe to Her Majesty in that sense a greater debt than any historian can ever write. The moral effect of her influence and youthful presence had an effect on the minds of men which reconciled them to bear in patience that which was a galling burden to many, until the time of relief could come. The personal character of the Sovereign from that time to this has been a centre of strength—of strength founded upon that spirit of mutual love which binds a people to their Sovereign and a Sovereign to her people. I believe that no Sovereign has ever opened her heart, her sympathies, and her sorrows, to her people so fully as Queen Victoria has done. Nor has any people so sympathised with the domestic life and the bereavements of their Queen as has the people of this land. The Queen's reign has been one in which the liberties of the people have been extended; so that now there is popular contentment where fifty

years ago there was popular discontent, not without reason. Nor has there ever been a period in which the condition of those working in the darkness of collieries and factories, of those degraded in brickfields or suffocated in chimneys, of the lowest and most suffering of our people, has been so watchfully tended and so mercifully cared for.

In honour of Monsignor Ruffo Scilla, the Papal Envoy, Cardinal Manning held a special Reception at Archbishop's House, Westminster. The object of the Reception was to enable Cardinal Manning to present the leading or representative Catholics of England to Mgr. Ruffo Scilla as well as to offer an opportunity to foreign ambassadors or ministers and other personages to meet the Pope's Special Envoy to the Queen.

Archbishop's House, with its wide double flight of stone staircases, and large hall and corridors lends itself well to such a Reception. On the occasion of the Queen's Jubilee for two or three hours streams of guests passed in and out of the brilliantly lighted halls.

The Cardinal's large and lofty Reception rooms presented on that occasion a picturesque and unique spectacle. Men from every nation under the sun were present. The Indian prince or potentate in his gorgeous robes, the Chinese mandarin in his peculiar garb, the red Fez of the Turk, the striking raiment and flowing beard of the Oriental prelate, a black priest from one of the foreign Missions, military and naval officers in their gala uniforms; the late General Patterson (to put on record a name or two), presented to the Papal Envoy by his brother, Bishop Patterson; a Civic functionary, Mr. Alderman Stuart Knill, subsequently Lord Mayor of London, with Civic decorations and a distinguished Papal Order; The O'Clery, Papal Zouave, with his Roman Orders; Captain George Merry, the last of the English soldiers who fought in the first Carlist War, with the magnificent Order of Isabella the Catholic on his breast—not to speak of Bishops and domestic Prelates of the Pope, Roman Monsignori in their purple robes, and foreign ambassadors and ministers glittering in their gala decorations, and English peers and commoners in full Court

dress—gave colour and light and infinite variety to this picturesque and interesting scene.[1]

In this moving and many-coloured panorama the two most striking personalities were the Papal Nuncio and Cardinal Manning. Monsignor Ruffo Scilla, of princely birth, trained in the ways of Courts and in the methods of Diplomacy, distinguished in appearance, refined and graceful in manner, standing in the prime of life and in all the glory of a Papal Envoy to the Queen by the side of Cardinal Manning, did not in dignity of bearing, in grace of manner and address, surpass the great English Cardinal. The memories of his eventful and varied career in the Past, his intimate associations with the events and works of the day, the certain promise of bequeathing a historic name to the future records of our generation, together with his intellectual brow and ascetic and spiritual face, produced in Cardinal Manning a personality too interesting and unique of its kind to be easily eclipsed or even rivalled in our generation.

The gracious reception accorded to the Special Envoy of the Pope at the Court of St. James's on the occasion of the Queen's Jubilee; and the subsequent mission of his Grace the Duke of Norfolk to Pope Leo XIII., as Representative of Her Majesty, commissioned to convey to his Holiness the Queen's congratulations and well-wishes at the celebration of his Episcopal Jubilee, marked an epoch in the relations between England and the Holy See. Such an interchange of official courtesies, limited though it was to a special occasion, bore witness, likewise, to the good understanding which now exists between Her Majesty's Catholic and non-Catholic subjects. There can be but little doubt that the Special Mission of Mgr. Ruffo Scilla would in due time have led to the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Court of St. James's and the Vatican.

The semi-official, semi-diplomatic, but unaccredited and unacknowledged mission of Mr. Errington, afterwards created

[1] There was a State ball at Buckingham Palace in celebration of the Queen's Jubilee on the same night as the Papal Envoy in honour of the same event was received by Cardinal Manning.

a baronet, entrusted by Mr. Gladstone with the duty of making or receiving private communications to or from the Vatican, was in itself neither a dignified proceeding nor agreeable to the people of England.

What the people of England before all things admire and approve of is openness and straightforwardness. If public policy demands the establishment of Diplomatic Relations with the Vatican, let it be done openly and above board. On account of its underhand and secret character the Errington mission was a failure. It irritated the people of England; in Ireland it excited suspicion and mistrust. Irish Catholics denounced it as an attempt on the part of Mr. Gladstone to influence the Pope in the nomination of Irish bishops; whilst the Orange faction saw in it an insidious design to introduce in some mysterious and hidden fashion "Popery" into the Church and Realm of England.

Statesmen of both parties and leading politicians have long since recognised the fact that, in an Empire with possessions so vast and varied, which numbers millions of Catholic subjects of the Queen, Diplomatic Relations with the Holy See was a matter of policy dictated by the nature of things. The example of other nations, of a Protestant State like Prussia or the German Empire, which have not such wide and varied relations with Catholics as the English Empire has, point to the wisdom of open and official relations with the Holy See. Had it not been for the fear or jealousy of the Catholics of Ireland, by this time Mgr. Ruffo Scilla[1] or another Roman Prelate might have been accredited to the Court of St. James's, and an English diplomatist, Catholic, or otherwise, have represented Her Majesty at the Vatican.

But Diplomatic Relations with the Holy See are to-day not within the range of practical politics, as Lord Salisbury soon discerned on discovering that the Irish Catholic members to a man, in their blind jealousy of English influence at the Vatican, would oppose by their votes in the

[1] In the death of Mgr. Ruffo Scilla, created Cardinal subsequently to his mission to the Queen, Roman diplomacy and the Sacred College have lost a most distinguished member.

House of Commons, a Bill for the establishment of Diplomatic Relations with the Holy See. Nationalists and Orangemen would work together hand and glove, and oppose with like ferocity any Government, Whig or Tory, which might introduce such a Bill. Irish Catholics and Orange bigots would, moreover, be helped and blessed in their hostility to the Pope by the Nonconformist Conscience in England, awakened once more by a proposal to establish Diplomatic Relations between England and the Vatican.

The idea or suggestion of such relations found in Cardinal Manning an opponent more determined even than the Irish Nationalists, though his opposition was inspired by motives higher than theirs. He regarded with jealous eye the Special Mission of Mgr. Ruffo Scilla. The advent of the Papal Envoy and the friendly reception accorded to him, which was welcomed by the Catholics of England with joy and gratitude, brought sorrow of heart and vexation of spirit to Cardinal Manning. He was persuaded in his own mind that the mission of the Special Envoy meant more than an act of official courtesy. He regarded it as a political device on the part of the Tories and their Catholic supporters to pave the way for the introduction of Diplomatic Relations with the Vatican. The Vatican, according to his view, misled by the misrepresentations of English Catholics, lent itself with more than satisfaction to the ill-inspired design. If Mgr. Ruffo Scilla is sent to-day as a Special Envoy and is well received, he or another will return to-morrow as a permanent Representative of the Holy See at the English Court.

Cardinal Manning's mind was possessed with a profound mistrust of Diplomatic Relations between the Pope and England. He brushed aside with a wave of his hand the objections and petty jealousies of the Irish bishops in regard to English influence at the Vatican; brushed aside the political fears of Irish Nationalists lest the Pope might be induced at the bidding of the Tory Government to condemn their illegal and immoral plans and principles; what he most cared about; what touched him nearly and stirred his heart to the quick, was the danger of a breach between

Catholicism and the people of England, which the Pope's co-operation with the Government in matters lying outside the religious sphere would, as he conceived, inevitably bring about. Political Catholicism, of which the Pope by his Representative in England would be the inspiring spirit, would not fail in an evil day to excite, as of old, suspicion in the popular mind, and end, sooner or later, in the breaking up of the concord and good feeling which for the last thirty years has existed between Catholics and Protestants in England—such, at least, were Cardinal Manning's fears and apprehensions.

On one occasion during the stay of the Special Envoy of the Pope in England, I remember how Cardinal Manning in an almost uncontrollable outburst of indignation, poured out the vials of his wrath on the heads of "those intriguers who," he said, "are planning and scheming for Diplomatic Relations. These good men fancy, forsooth, that they are working in the interests of the Catholic Church. But what good could a Papal Legate in London effect for the promotion of Catholic interests which a bishop, worth his salt, could not do infinitely better, more effectually, and without provoking popular suspicion or antagonism? What use would the presence of a Legate be in England except for the gratification of our figure-heads? What do they know of these things in Rome? I hardly know in Rome a man, high or low, who understands the position of the Church in England; or of the popular feeling in regard to us. The people are friendly to Catholics because we are busy only about religious things; but let us become politicians under the leading of a Papal Legate and all the old antagonism will blaze out afresh."

"But what do they know of these things in Rome? The sight of a 'Redcoat' at the Vatican turns their heads."

Cardinal Manning, who had been walking up and down his room in a state of intense excitement, threw himself into his arm-chair almost exhausted, exclaiming, "The people of England may put up with a Special Envoy for a day or two. But the permanent presence of a Papal Legate would be the undoing of all my work in England during the last thirty

years." Bending his head, and with a tone of sadness, almost of reproach, he added, "*Fiat Voluntus tua.*"

The views which he indicated in conversation, Cardinal Manning expressed more fully, and whilst his heart or temper was still warm, in the following Note, dated 10th July 1887:—

Few men have begun life more in the world and ended it more out of the world. It is a strange and historical exile from the life of England. The Catholic Church is as an alien among our Mother's children. The Crown is bound by Law to schism: and we are unknown to the Law, as the Apostles were. The purity and independence of the Church has been purchased at a great price, the blood of our Martyrs and the loss of all things, and of all losses the greatest, the loss of the English people. But there is a greater gain still, because of a higher order; we have not suffered the loss of Truth. Among the millions of England we stand isolated but immutable, and many hearts are turning to the Church.

I have had lately three invitations to meet the Queen, at the People's Palace, at the Imperial Institute, and at the Albert Hall. I refused them all. I do not think that it is pride, but I cannot go as a private person, and as I cannot go as I am, I think it best not to go at all. Besides I have no will to go where my colleagues are not invited. Until the Catholic bishops are recognised, not in law but in courtesy, as the Disestablished Bishops in Ireland, we are better within our own lines. But it is a stupid survival of Anglican pretensions. Another reason weighed with me. Our figure-heads are on fire for Diplomatic Relations between Rome and the Court of St. James's. I therefore thought it best to mark the complete exclusion of the Catholic Church from the Court and public events. The Catholic Church in the English-speaking world represents not Courts but the people; and its independence of all Civil Powers is its strength. This was fully perceived and understood by Pius IX., and by Cardinal Antonelli. Many times I spoke of it with them. They regarded even Odo Russell as an embarrassment, though they were kind to him personally. I wish this were understood in Rome. The first use made here of Errington was to meddle with the nomination to Dublin, and to mislead Rome within a hair's-breadth of making the Irish people believe that in the nomination of its pastors the Pope is swayed by the English Government. I remember Odo Russell told me that Lord Palmerston was opposed to my appointment, but Lord John

Russell was in favour of it: and he left it alone. I had met Lord John in old days at public meetings, and he was always kind and courteous to the end of his life.

I hardly know in Rome a man high or low who understands the condition of the Church in the British Empire and the United States. They are always thinking of *il Governo* as if it were absolute or dynastic. The absolute equality of English law, and the extinction of all privilege, except the House of Lords in England alone, they cannot understand. The anti-Catholic bigotry of England is not dead, but disarmed by the admission of Nonconformists and Catholics to absolute equality in the public life of the kingdom. In the social life it still exists widely. When it is mitigated it is so as a religion, and so long as we keep within the sphere of religion we have perfect liberty. But if we were to enter the political sphere for any private Catholic interest, or for any privilege beyond the common law of the land, we should provoke a storm of suspicion and antagonism. The three centuries of persecution are over; and the peace of the Church is come. We should lose the substance in snatching at a shadow if we put in risk the liberty founded upon equality before the Law for any diplomatic relations. What one thing could a Nuncio here do for the Church in England which the humblest priest could not do? And that more surely, safely, and directly, without provoking suspicion or fear.

CARDINAL MANNING'S "SILVER JUBILEE."

The celebration of Cardinal Manning's Episcopal Jubilee, on the 8th of June 1890, called forth from the hearts of the Catholics of England and of Ireland a manifestation of gratitude for the services which he had rendered to the Church; for his zealous and successful labours in promoting the cause of education, especially among the children of the Catholic poor, and for the foremost part he had taken in every charitable and philanthropic movement.

On such occasions, it is not so much the formal Addresses or set Speeches which are to be taken into account as the thoughts, impressions, and memories which move the hearts of men, and awake feelings of veneration, of gratitude, of affection. The "Silver Jubilee" of Cardinal Manning was

one of these occasions in which thoughts count for more than words. What words spoken in public could, I do not say express, but indicate even, all that was hidden, buried deep down, not only in the hearts of those who were witnesses far or near of this solemn leavetaking, but in the heart of Cardinal Manning himself. His Silver Jubilee was not so much a day of rejoicing, not even of thanksgiving as of infinite sorrow that his day was done: his work over: his life finished.

At that solemn celebration, above the loud voice of the Official witness to the work of twenty-five years, above the applause that went up, was heard in the pathetic tones of Cardinal Manning, the sound, as it were, of the passing Bell. Never was that final summons so melancholy to the heart of man. His soul was troubled, not at the parting from friends, for his heart was detached from all human affections; but at the giving up the work of his life while so much remained yet to be done. His forecasting spirit was filled with a foreboding of ill for the future of Catholicism in England, when the guiding or restraining hand was withdrawn; when the voice which had pleaded for conciliation, peace, and goodwill among all men, Catholics and non-Catholics, was for ever hushed. So alive and active was this fear in his mind that almost the whole year of his Episcopal Jubilee was devoted to the work of considering and classifying the "Hindrances" which stood in the way to the spread of the Church in England.[1]

In all those who were assembled together, or were present in spirit at Archbishop's House, Westminster, on the 8th June 1890, the predominant feeling was veneration for the high character and holy life of the venerable Cardinal Archbishop. Many were naturally elated at the position which by unwearying labours, skill, and force of character he had acquired in popular estimation and in the public life of England. As Catholics and as Englishmen they were proud of him; and accounted it as one of the greatest of his public works that he had reconciled, as it were, Catholics with their fellow-countrymen, and made

[1] See Chapter XXVII.

the aims and objects of the Church in England better known to, and more fully understood by, politicians and statesmen.

To many more his work in reclaiming those who had gone astray, in checking the vice of intemperance, in opening new missions, in founding schools, in doing so much towards stopping the leakage by which so many souls were being lost to the Church, were his highest claims to their gratitude and homage. His active sympathy with the poor, with the distressed, with the toiling masses, with the homeless, or with those whose homes were homes but in name—over-crowded dwellings, too often consisting of one room where a whole family were huddled together—habitations utterly unfit for Christian or decent living, evoked from the hearts of many, more especially of his warm-hearted and grateful flock, the sons of St. Patrick, love and admiration and gratitude towards Cardinal Manning their friend, father, and benefactor.

In the nature of things, personal affection, close intimacy of mind with mind, of heart with heart, the loving-kindness begotten of a sympathetic nature, are not very common among men of a self-contained nature: self-centred, or centred on objects and ends they have most at heart. Such men, like Cardinal Manning, are not apt, at any rate in mature life, to form new friendships, new ties, new affections. Graciousness and gratitude and kindliness of word and manner is all they have to give; but it often goes very far by its semblance to those deeper feelings of sympathetic natures, to win the love and affection of men. In such a way only is it possible to account for the belief entertained by many who were brought into close and constant contact with him, that they were on terms of such intimacy with Cardinal Manning as to know all the thoughts and desires of his heart, all the purposes and interests which filled his mind, all the sorrows and disappointments which, during the last ten years of his life, vexed his spirit. No doubt, he was not only revered by them, but beloved as children love their father with the warmest personal affection—an affection which it was not perhaps in his

nature to understand, far less to reciprocate. No one will impute it as a fault to Cardinal Manning that he could not go, however much he may have wished, beyond the limitations of his nature.

In this sense the isolation of his life, of his heart, imparted a peculiar pathos to the celebration of his Episcopal Jubilee, the closing scene of his life. Work was the joy of his heart. At work he was never alone; never felt the loneliness of life. The joy and excitement of work fed the fires which burnt low in body and mind. This joy more than food kept him alive. It was a balm to his spirit, a consolation, which no friends could give, to his heart.

There was an inexpressible sadness in the allusion which Cardinal Manning made to the celebration of a Jubilee far higher and fuller than his own—the celebration of the Jubilee of the Restoration of the Hierarchy in England. The joy and pride of celebrating such a Jubilee was not for him, alas, but for them that should come after him.

The formal and official celebration of Cardinal Manning's Episcopal Jubilee was a joint Address [1] from the clergy, and laity presented to his Eminence on their behalf by his Vicar-General, Mgr. Gilbert, and by his Grace the Duke of Norfolk.

Various gifts in money were presented to Cardinal Manning on the occasion of his Episcopal Jubilee. The Trade Unions gave a sum of money which the Cardinal employed to found a bed in the London Hospital. But the money which was collected by a general subscription in honour of the Silver Jubilee amounted to the handsome sum of £7500. This sum, like the rest of Cardinal Manning's fortune, was spent in furthering the good works of the diocese. In reply to the Deputation which presented to him the large sum collected, Cardinal Manning said:—

As I am rendering in all likelihood my last account to you, I will say two things: First, that I have never consciously or

---

[1] The Chapter of Westminster wished to present a separate Address on their own behalf and that of the clergy, but Cardinal Manning intimated his preference for one Address.

willingly wounded any man; secondly, that in many cases I have been bound by duty to act, not as my personal will but as my office compelled me. The three works on which my heart has been set have been the education of our children, the saving of our people by the Holy Sacraments, and the rearing and multiplication of priests true to their Divine Master. What little in these has been begun, my successor will, I hope complete.

In commemoration of his Episcopal Jubilee the Irish Nationalist members presented the Cardinal with an Address of congratulation. Mr. Parnell, attended by about fifty of his followers, went to Archbishop's House, where they were received by the Cardinal. The Address was read by Mr. Sexton; and in the course of his reply Cardinal Manning, after thanking the Deputation for their kindly recognition of his labours in support of the Irish poor in London, speaking of Ireland, said:—

My present feeling is one of the most profound hope. Ireland has entered into the most intimate and cordial union with the English people. If I know anything, I know the working people of England; and I know at this moment that the hearts of the working-people of England have turned to Ireland in true and perfect sympathy.

Death of Cardinal Newman

Cardinal Manning's Episcopal Jubilee was followed in the same year by the death of Cardinal Newman. This double event in the year 1890 brought together for a moment, and, as it were by accident, the names of two men both great though in different ways and in different degrees.

Their names were brought together in close association by the fact that, though he was not present, either in person or represented by his Vicar-General or Chapter, at the funeral at Birmingham, Cardinal Manning delivered at the Brompton Oratory a funeral oration over Cardinal Newman.

Cardinal Newman's death called forth throughout England an expression of profound sympathy and veneration. It was not only a tribute to his genius, but it was more—a genuine recognition of his high and noble character, his simplicity of life, his transparent truthfulness, and the loving-kindness of his nature. Men of all creeds and parties vied with each other in an expression of almost personal gratitude and affection. Cardinal Manning, as might be expected, was not the last or the least in offering to Cardinal Newman a tribute of homage and praise. On such an occasion, when the people of England were all of one mind in their outspoken judgment, it was but natural in Cardinal Manning to go before the multitude, not only in the thoroughness of his appreciation, but by publicly identifying himself in a special manner—a privilege denied to commoner men—with Cardinal Newman in feeling and friendship.

On hearing of Newman's death Cardinal Manning wrote at once to the Fathers of the Oratory, expressing a fear that infirmity and age would prevent his going to Birmingham. His Vicar-General, Mgr. Gilbert, suggested that a Deputation from the Chapter should attend Cardinal Newman's funeral. Cardinal Manning, however, thought it unnecessary, as a Solemn Dirge would be held in London at which the whole Chapter would be expected to attend.[1]

The Dirge for Cardinal Newman was celebrated on the 20th of August 1890, at the Oratory, South Kensington. The spacious church was filled by Catholics from all parts of England and Scotland, and by many Anglicans, friends or disciples of Cardinal Newman. As it was known that Cardinal Manning intended to speak some words on the occasion, no little curiosity was excited among Newman's more intimate friends. Attended in the pulpit by two Canons of his Chapter, Cardinal Manning read a carefully written and eloquent discourse.[2] It was as follows:—

[1] Almost every other diocese in England was represented at Cardinal Newman's funeral, either by the bishop in person or by a deputation from the Chapter.

[2] The sermon was published under the title: "Cardinal Newman: Words spoken by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster at the Solemn Requiem at the Oratory, South Kensington, 20th August 1890."

CARDINAL NEWMAN

Words spoken by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster at the Solemn Requiem at the Oratory, South Kensington, 20th August 1890.

WE have lost our greatest witness for the Faith, and we are all poorer and lower by the loss.

When these tidings came to me, my first thought was this: in what way can I, once more, show my love and veneration for my brother and friend of more than sixty years? It was not in my power to stand beside his grave. For a time I was in doubt whether this last sad and solemn rite should be in my own Cathedral church, or here, as I may say, in his own home. I believe he would have wished it to be here, where the sorrow for his loss is a domestic sorrow, as of sons for a father. With their filial and private grief it is, then, most fitting that we should unite our personal and universal sorrow.

I am not come to pronounce orations or panegyrics. I would not, if I could. I could not, if I would. The memories of an affectionate friendship, as I have said, of more than sixty years, and the weight of old age put it beyond my power.

Few now are living who cherish such a record of the Past as I can. When I was twenty years of age and he was about twenty-eight, I remember his form and voice, and penetrating words at Evensong in the University Church at Oxford. Having once seen and heard him I never willingly failed to be there. As time went on, those quiet days passed into the conflict and tumult of the following years. My field of work was far away; but I knew his thoughts by letter, and when trials came I was not absent from him. Littlemore is before me now as fresh as yesterday. Then came the great decision, in which the toils and prayers of so many years were fulfilled and rewarded.

The next time we met was in 1848. It was in Rome. He was in the Oratorian habit; simple, humble, and dead to the world. Again, four years passed, and I heard once more the well-known voice, sweet as of old, but strong in the absolute truth, prophesying a "Second Spring" in the first Provincial Council of Westminster. Why should I go on? You have known him since then in the midst of you. My last vision of him is when, as a brother and colleague, he leaned upon my arm at the door of this church in a Funeral rite well remembered by many of you, and by some of you never to be forgotten while life lasts. The last time I wrote to him, some months ago, I remember saying that his length of days was a pledge of the

love of God. Such is but the beginning and close of a friendship that can have no end.

If any proof were needed of the immeasurable work that he has wrought in England, the last week would be enough. Who could doubt that the great multitude of his personal friends in the first half of his life, and the still greater multitude of those who have been instructed, consoled, and won to God by the unequalled beauty and irresistible persuasion of his writings—who could doubt that they, at such a time as this, would pour out the love and gratitude of their hearts? But that the public voice of England, political and religious, in all its diversities, should for once unite in love and veneration of a man who had broken through its sacred barriers and defied its religious prejudices, who could have believed it? He had committed the hitherto unpardonable sin in England. He had rejected the whole Tudor Settlement in religion. He had become Catholic as our fathers were. And yet for no one in our memory has such a heartfelt and loving veneration been poured out. Of this one proof is enough. Some one has said: "Whether Rome canonises him or not, he will be canonised in the thoughts of pious people of many creeds in England." This is true; but I will not therefore say that the mind of England is changed.

Nevertheless, it must be said that, towards a man who had done so much to estrange it, the will of the English people was changed; an old malevolence had passed into goodwill. If this is a noble testimony to a great Christian life, it is as noble a proof of the justice, equity, and uprightness of the English people. In venerating John Henry Newman it has unconsciously revealed and honoured itself.

It is too soon to measure the work that has been silently wrought by the life of Cardinal Newman. No living man has so changed the religious thought of England. His withdrawal closes a chapter which stands alone in the religious life of this century. It has, for the most part, been wrought in silence; for the retiring habits of the man, and the growing weight of age, made his later utterances few. Nevertheless, his words of old were as "the hammer that breaks the rocks in pieces," and as the light that works without a sound. It has been boldly and truly avowed that he is "the founder, as we may almost say, of the Church of England as we see it. What the Church of England would have become without the Tractarian movement, we can faintly guess; and of the Tractarian movement Newman was the living soul and the inspiring genius." This sentence will be implacably resented and fiercely attacked; but it is true as the light of day. This intellectual movement was begun and

sustained by one man. But for this movement, Erastianism and Rationalism would by this time have reigned supreme in the National religion. The penetrating influence of this one mind has pervaded also the bodies separated from the Established Church, and most opposed to it. They have been powerfully attracted, not to the Tudor Settlement, but to primitive Christianity. And the same sweet voice and luminous words have been working among them, all the more persuasively because he had rejected all things of this world, even more than themselves. He spoke to them as a simple voice of truth, which could neither be warped by prejudice nor bribed to silence.

In 1861 the following words were published in a letter to Father Newman, as he then was. "You have been a master-builder in this work, and I a witness of its growth. You remained long at Oxford, still, with all its disfigurements, so dear to both of us; but I was removed to a distance, and had to work alone. Nevertheless 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." I little thought in 1861 that I should have the consolation of repeating these words, as it were, over his grave.

I have no heart at such a time as this to go into details. It is for others, who will hereafter give their mind to record minutely the history of this great life, and all that it has done. But we cannot forget that we owe to him, among other debts, one singular achievement. No one who does not intend to be laughed at will henceforward say that the Catholic religion is fit only for weak intellects and unmanly brains. This superstition of pride is over. St. Thomas Aquinas is too far off and too little known to such talkers to make them hesitate. But the author of the *Grammar of Assent* may make them think twice before they so expose themselves. Again, the designer and editor of the *Library of the Fathers* has planted himself on the undivided Church of the first six centuries, and he holds the field; the key of the position is lost. Moreover, his hymns are in the hearts of Englishmen, and they have a transforming power. He has taught us that beauty and truth are inseparable; that beauty resides essentially in the thought, so that nothing can make that to be beautiful which is not so in the plainest words that will convey the meaning. The English people have read the thoughts through his transparent words, and have seen the beauty of Eternal Truth as it shone forth in his mind.

Thus far I have spoken of his work upon the world without: what can I, or what need I, say of his work inwardly upon the

Church? You all know it, and have felt it. His writings are in your hands. But beyond the power of all books has been the example of his humble and unworldly life; always the same, in union with God, and in manifold charity to all who sought him. He was the centre of innumerable souls, drawn to him as Teacher, Guide, and Comforter through long years, and especially in the more than forty years of his Catholic life. To them he was a spring of light and strength from a supernatural source. A noble and beautiful life is the most convincing and persuasive of all preaching, and we have all felt its power. Our Holy Father Leo XIII. knew the merits and the gifts, both natural and supernatural, which were hidden in his humility, and to the joy of all he called him to the highest dignity next to his own.

The history of our land will hereafter record the name of John Henry Newman among the greatest of our people, as a confessor for the faith, a great teacher of men, a preacher of justice, of piety, and of compassion.

May we all follow him in his life, and may our end be painless and peaceful like his.

These eloquent words spoken by Cardinal Manning on such a memorable occasion were a noble, just, and not ungenerous tribute of homage and gratitude to Cardinal Newman. The leading points in his life, as an Anglican and as a Catholic, were touched upon lightly now, or now brought out with singular felicity of expression and an admirable condensation which betokened considerable thought and study. In this Address over Newman's grave, as it were, not a word was misplaced, not a word was omitted, not a word spoken which went beyond the reticence and reserve proper to the occasion, or imposed by the necessity of things and the force of circumstances. With happy inspiration, Cardinal Manning reserved almost to the last Pope Leo XIII.'s recognition of "the merits and the gifts, both natural and supernatural," in Cardinal Newman.

In the opening passages of his Address, Cardinal Manning drew a most touching and pathetic picture of his relations with John Henry Newman, which he described as "a friendship of sixty years and more." In the emotion of the moment, under the stress of conflicting memories, in the agitation, which he could not but feel, and which he showed at making history, as it were, in the face of the world,

Cardinal Manning, perhaps not unnaturally, forgot his prolonged opposition to Newman in Rome and in England: forgot his avowed hostility and mistrust: forgot that for half a century from 1840 to 1890 he had not met or spoken to Newman more than half a dozen times. At Littlemore[1] they met but once, and once at the Oratory in Birmingham. As Cardinals they met but twice. For the first time in June 1883, at the Archbishop's House, Westminster; and their second and last meeting was in 1884 at Birmingham.

Manning and Newman were never intimate, either early or late in life; not at Oriel or at Littlemore, nor at the Oratory in Birmingham. Apart from a few letters of congratulation or courtesy or explanatory notes, all correspondence or communication between Newman and Manning ceased in 1866.

It seems almost a pity to disturb the illusion indulged in by Cardinal Manning, and left as a legacy to future generations, that he and Newman were knit together in the bonds of the closest friendship "for sixty years and more." In the "Words" which were spoken in the London Oratory Manning's mind went back to those far-off days, when he remembered Newman as a leader and a guiding light in the days of Anglican darkness and perplexity; went back to the days, when both alike had entered into the fulness and the light of the Faith. At the close of his days Cardinal Manning forgot the stormy periods of his turbulent life; forgot how utterly he had broken with Newman; saw, as in a glass darkly, only what he wished to see; saw in the clouded vision of bygone things the pathetic picture he described. At that supreme moment, the not unnatural desire of Manning's heart was that his name should go forth before the world linked with that of Newman's as a life-long friend and fellow-worker; that he might, in a sense, be a co-partner in Newman's glory. What he greatly desired, all through his life, he rarely failed to achieve. No act or effort was spared in the words spoken on that memor-

[1] In an autobiographical Note, speaking of his relations with Newman Cardinal Manning said, "I remember once going to Littlemore, and Newman I think, walked with me half-way back to Oxford."

able day to create the impression which he wished to leave on the minds and imaginations of men. Hence in such an overwrought state of feeling it came to pass that Manning's mind and memory were taken possession of by an over-mastering idea, so that in his illusion he saw only the "what might have been," and not the things that were.

But the things that were, the reality of things, have had to be told in this biography; told not indeed by me, but by Manning himself, told not to create an impression, but to express the inner belief of his heart, the mature judgment of his mind. Not this deliberate judgment and belief, but the last "Words" spoken on so solemn an occasion as the death of Newman, spoken in the face of the world, will be the words which will live in the minds and memories of men. To the falsification of history, illusion will take the place of reality, fiction of truth. And what would be gained by such an effeminate paltering with facts? To wink in silence is only owl-like wisdom. Not sentimental suppressions, but the simple truth is the only tribute worthy of such a man as Manning.

What then is the truth?

Not more than three or four years before the illusive and fancy picture of 1890, Cardinal Manning, not to speak of contemporary letters extending over a long period of years, avowed and put on record his condemnation of Newman in terms so clear and incisive as to leave no room or foothold for an after fiction of friendship. I will only recite one sentence from an autobiographical Note dated 1887.

If I was opposed to Newman; it was only because I had either to oppose Newman or to oppose the Holy See. I could not oppose the Pope.

It was not in Manning's nature to make a friend of a man who was, as he believed, the Pope's "opponent."

In such a biography as Manning's the best, the only rule or principle is the simple truth. It is too late now surely to be inconsistent to this principle. And why? Because, it is urged, there are many living men by whom Cardinal Manning is deeply revered and beloved, who would be

pained if the illusion of a life-long friendship between him and Newman were blotted out, and it became known that instead of friendship there was a life-long opposition. But has there not been opposition, fierce and bitter, between canonised Saints? St. Bernard, for instance, attacked and maligned St. William of York, brought false accusations against him in letters innumerable. Friends of St. Bernard brought these false charges to the ear of the Pope, with the result that St. William of York was unjustly deposed from his See. These false charges, however, errors of judgment or betrayals of temper, did not stand in the way of St. Bernard's canonisation. Nor, in that robuster day, did men hesitate to make known to the world St. Bernard's letters, no matter what illusions may have been broken by their publication.

Cardinal Manning himself—and that is enough—has laid down a rule against concealing the sins or shortcomings of Bishops and others in the following words, spoken on the occasion of his final visit to Rome in 1883, to Pope Leo XIII.:—

Se l' Evangelista non ha celato il peccato e la caduta del Giuda, perchè dobbiamo noi celare il peccato di vescovi ed altri personaggi? [1]

---

[1] Pope Leo XIII. gave his cordial assent to Cardinal Manning's proposition that "If the Evangelist did not conceal the sin and fall of Judas, neither ought we to conceal the sins of Bishops and of other personages." The Pope, in his conversation with Cardinal Manning, reprobated the vicious system of suppressing or glossing over facts in history, sacred or profane, or in the lives of men, Saints or sinners, as repugnant to truth and justice, and, in the long run, as detrimental to the spiritual interests of the Church.

CHAPTER XXVI

SECULARS, REGULARS, AND JESUITS

THE relations between the Bishops and the religious Orders are two-fold in character. There is, first and foremost, the ecclesiastical relation between the ordinary jurisdiction of Bishops, and the special privileges of the religious Orders; and, secondly, the relation in the natural order between two such forces in the Church as the Episcopate and Monasticism.

From the two-fold source and character of the relations between the Bishops and the religious Orders, it was only in the nature of things that complications and conflicts should from time to time arise. Episcopal authority had to be maintained intact. Encroachments on the part of the religious Orders, or what to the jealous eye of the Episcopate seemed encroachments, had to be resisted, or perhaps, at times resented with extra-episcopal wrath. The extent of Episcopal authority, or the mode of its exercise, is a delicate question. Bishops are not always infallible judges of the limitations of their own rights. It does not necessarily follow that in resisting Episcopal claims on their obedience, the religious Orders were always moved by a rebellious spirit. It was not impossible, as they not infrequently contended, for Bishops to err in their judgment. In good faith they might exaggerate the extent or character of their authority. The Regulars, on the other hand, enjoyed special privileges, and were in some cases, or under certain circumstances, exempt from Episcopal authority. How easy for them to enlarge their privileges; how tempting to withdraw themselves under the shelter of their Rules, from the

Bishop's intrusive eye; or to bar the gates of their religious houses against his meddlesome hand or intruding foot.

But beside and beyond the ecclesiastical adjustment of the difficult questions touching Episcopal authority and Monastic privileges, there are other factors to be taken into account in the story of the relations between the bishops, the secular clergy, and the regulars. Though the Church is Divine in its origin and character, the agencies which it employs are human and not exempt from human frailty. The Episcopate, as a Divine institution set up by Christ himself for the rule and government of the Church, is the first and highest in order of pre-eminence and in point of time. The religious Orders were established by the Church at a later period to lead the souls of men into the higher ways of perfection. Monasticism, the product of mediæval times, has always been accounted, and still is, one of the chief glories of the Church. Not to speak—for, it might, perhaps, seem invidious—of the glorious multitude it has added to the bead-roll of martyrs and saints, it has given out of the plenitude of its gifts and graces to the Episcopate, in every land and every age, some of the holiest, most spiritual, and most enlightened of Ecclesiastical rulers. The Episcopate throughout the world, would have been all the poorer, all the lower, had it not been from time to time enriched and elevated in the sight of God and man by many a lowly friar—a white-corded Franciscan, a bare-footed Carmelite, a humble Capuchin, as well as by the highest scholars and profoundest thinkers of the teaching and preaching Orders. It is another glory for Monasticism, that so many of the holiest and most illustrious of those, who have sat in the Chair of Peter, were members of the religious Orders.

The distinguishing merit and special power of Monasticism in the Catholic world, and its abiding hold on the hearts and minds of men was not, that so many of its sons had, for the glory of God and for the good of mankind, filled the Episcopal throne, or sat in the Chair of Peter; but that the religious Orders in every age and in every land, were the advance-guard of the Church in preaching the

Gospel; in reclaiming sinners; in redeeming slaves; in keeping alive, in ages of darkness and ignorance, the light of learning, sacred and profane; and last, but not least, in leading the souls of men and women into the higher ways of spirituality. Another merit attaching to Monasticism was that it served as a reserve-force, as it were, in the hands of the Holy See, when evil days had fallen on the Church. But Monasticism was not only a rod of chastisement in the hand of the Vicar of Christ; it was possessed of a healing power to staunch the wounds of the Church in an evil day. If at one time or another, when in too many a land wealth and luxury and power had corrupted the hearts of bishops; when the Lord's Anointed were tinged or tainted with the spirit of worldliness; when they laid aside the mitre to put on the helmet; when they converted their Pastoral crook into a spear; when they forsook the sanctuary and the altar for the camp and the saddle; when their people knew them no more as their Spiritual guides: then it was that the Holy See called into action the reserve-force it held in hand. The lowly friar was called from his cell; the hermit or recluse from his cave among the rocks or in the wilderness, to go forth in the spirit of poverty and obedience into strange cities or into foreign lands —as St. Anselm was sent into England—to reform abuses, to banish luxury and laxity of discipline, and to revive piety among priests and people. If in their turn, alas, the monastic Orders were overtaken in an evil day by wealth and worldliness, by laxity and corruption, they, too, had to be reformed or suppressed. For the cell of the monk was not always the home of poverty, nor, any more than the bishop's palace, always the dwelling-place of righteousness. It is too late in the day, however, to reproach the religious Orders, and especially the Jesuits with their frowardness, with their untiring energy, with their tendency to lay hold of every opportunity or opening to advance into "pastures new" on the lines mapped out for them by their Rules. Too late, for the results of time and work have long since proved that the cause of the Church and of Religion is promoted not by jealousy of the religious Orders, but by allowing them to follow out their vocation in

co-operation with the secular clergy, in union and harmony with the bishops. The eviller days of open conflict are happily past, but human motives, as things are constituted, human weaknesses, passions even, are not shut out from the heart by the cowl of the monk, or altogether restrained by the chrism with which bishops are anointed. A spirit of rivalry may, perhaps, still be found here and there in the religious Orders; a feeling of mistrust or jealousy may still possess, now and again, the hearts of bishops. One bishop may regard the religious Orders with a loving, another with a jealous eye. Cardinal Wiseman, for instance, gave his heart to the religious Orders. On his advent as pro-Vicar-Apostolic in 1847, there was not a single monastery to be found in the London District. Wiseman's predecessor had refused permission to the Jesuits, to open a mission or even to set up a school in London.[1] There was, indeed, a solitary Jesuit[2] living by himself in a small house, but the help and consolation of a second Jesuit with the "faculties" of a priest was denied unto him until, after an appeal to Rome in 1844, warmly supported by Dr. Wiseman, permission was given at last to the Jesuits to found a mission at Farm Street, and build a Church. Wiseman established in the diocese of Westminster all the old monastic Orders of the Church which now exist in London, with one exception, introduced at a later period, and founded new Communities and Congregations. The Jesuits especially he befriended in the most cordial way. He was delighted with their zeal, their activity, and the command which they possessed of the money necessary for founding missions, schools, colleges. He gave them a free hand and his blessing, a double gift, which, unaccustomed to such favours, the Jesuits highly appreciated and made the fullest use of. Even to this day they retain a grateful memory of Cardinal Wiseman's largeheartedness and sense of justice. Cardinal

[1] The Jesuits had at one time, indeed, a small temporary school in Marylebone Lane, which was attended by Richard Doyle, the famous artist, and by his brother, James Doyle, a historical writer of repute.

[2] That solitary Jesuit in London was Father Lythgoe, a man massive alike in body and brain. Cardinal Manning, in one of his Notes, says, "I just remember him."

Wiseman, in fact, was not jealous of his authority; he had no fear of being superseded in power or influence even by the Jesuits. His successor, however, was naturally inclined to concentrate all authority in his own hands. He took counsel of no man. Unlike Moses, he stood in no need of an Aaron, in the person of his Vicar-General, to hold up his arms in prayer, or to strengthen his right hand in action. As Archdeacon of Chichester, in the days before the flood, as he called it, Manning was accounted the "Bishop's Eye." Sometimes, as he once acknowledged, he was also the "Bishop's Tongue."[1] Bishops—and perhaps not only bishops of the Established Church—are inclined to take things easy. Not so archdeacons on promotion: they are, as a rule, a most restless race of men. Manning, as Archbishop of Westminster, stood in need of no man's "Eye," of no man's "Tongue," restless or otherwise. To him an archdeacon or a vicar-general was, in the nature of things, an uncomfortable neighbour. Advice, though couched in the most delicate terms, he regarded as a rebuke; or looked upon in the light of a reminder of defects or shortcomings in his administration of the diocese. If he dispensed with the help of his natural advisers, of his own clergy, no one need be surprised that he looked with eye askance on the proferred help or counsel of the religious Orders, especially of Jesuits, whom he accounted a more restless race of men even than archdeacons on promotion. His answer to all such offers practically amounted to this—*Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.*

Long before he became Archbishop of Westminster, Manning had discovered that there were in the Church two forces which he accounted opposing forces—the Episcopate and the religious Orders. Without hesitation or a thought of revising his original conclusion, he made it his duty to oppose the religious Orders, if not *per se*, on account of the claims which were advanced on their behalf—and

[1] In a letter to Manning in his archidiaconal days, Mr. Gladstone complained that "archdeacons nowadays in their Charges, with their far-reaching counsels, admonitions, or rebukes, touching doctrinal matters, were too much in the habit of obtruding upon the domain of their bishops."

accepted, it is not too much to say, throughout the Catholic world—as representing the mind of the Church in the matter of the higher spiritual life and in the counsels of perfection. The members of the religious Orders are not only accepted as approved teachers and writers on spirituality, but they are entrusted, and have been for many an age, by the bishops of the Church with the duty of holding spiritual retreats and missions, with the office of spiritual directors, especially in colleges, schools, and convents. In every diocese, the religious Orders act as confessors, aiding parish priests in their arduous work. It is an all but universal tradition in the Church that the religious Orders, especially, perhaps, the Society of Jesus, have a special aptitude, by their training and traditions, for the office of Spiritual direction of souls. The practice of the faithful in every land bears striking witness by its unanimity and its universality to the high esteem and appreciation in which the religious Orders are held as confessors and spiritual directors. They do not supersede, but supplement the work of the parish priest, too often overburdened by the multiplicity and variety of his parochial labours for leisure adequately to discharge the office of Spiritual direction.

When his clergy were assembled in Retreats Cardinal Manning often took occasion to rebuke them for tamely acquiescing in the assumed superiority of the religious Orders and the Jesuits, as confessors and spiritual directors. The secular clergy he contended, although he never called them by that name, had far wider experience of men and the world than mere monks. The clergy were bidden to give missions and hold spiritual retreats themselves, instead of entrusting such an important work to members of religious Orders. "Why," he asked with something like indignation, "do you refuse to give your own judgment to those who come to you for help in discerning or deciding as to what their vocation is. Why bid them seek counsel or direction from the Regulars or from the Society of Jesus. You, not they, are the better judges. Do you for a moment in your simplicity imagine, that if the candidate for the priesthood you send to them, turns out to be in every

way an eligible candidate, that they will send him back to you? No; they will make a monk of him, or a Jesuit."

Cardinal Manning made it a point to exalt[1] the secular clergy; and to dispel from their minds the delusion, that because of their vows the Regulars had higher claims to spirituality. "The secular clergy like the Lord and his Apostles were not under vows. Not vows, but the law of liberty is the way of perfection."

In an autobiographical Note, referring to this subject, Cardinal Manning made the following statement:—

> The Fourth Council of Westminster gave me the occasion to put into the Decrees that the Episcopate is the state of perfection, and that the priesthood requires interior perfection as a prerequisite to ordination. And yet they would not let me say, as is said in Rome, *perfectionis jam adeptæ signum sacerdotium.* If it be a prerequisite, how is it not so? If priests are *aliorum perfectores*, it must be. But such is the complete effacement of the idea of the priesthood, as the state of perfection divinely instituted, and the exaggeration of the state of ecclesiastical institution . . . In that Council the first seeds of the contest of the Bishops and Regulars were sown in Gallwey's unseemly speech, and Father G. Porter's theory that the *Sincere Christian* and the *Catechismus ad Parochos* are the books for the secular clergy. He did not say, but this means that all that is higher is not for them.

In one of those deliberate judgments which Cardinal Manning has put on record for the guidance of future generations, occurs the following sentence:—"It seems to me that the gospel is 'the law of liberty,' and that the sanctification of the soul is the perfection of liberty, that is the will, the law itself. A vow is a dead thing, but the will is alive and freely obeys the Will of God."

This thought or theory Cardinal Manning worked up and developed in the following interpretation of what he believed was in the mind of St. Charles of Milan, when he founded the Congregation of the Oblates:—

[1] With this end in view Manning as archbishop imposed upon the secular clergy the appellation of "Father," which before his time in England applied only to members of the religious Orders. Many of the secular clergy objected to this appellation.

When the Congregation was founded I clearly saw three things; that it was intended: (1) To help us to live a higher life for our sanctification. (2) To make us ready for any work the archbishop might require. (3) To found or direct seminaries. All this I saw in St. Charles' Rule and in Milan. But I did not see, even at Bayswater, what I have seen since in the sixteen years of my office as a pastor. I seem to have entered by experience into the mind of St. Charles. It was towards the end of his life that he founded the Oblates. It is towards the end of mine that I have come to understand what he did. I believe it to be this. He saw—

1. That our Lord revealed in His life and mind the law of perfection, to which He willed that all should be called and conformed.

2. That He chose out and assimilated His Apostles to Himself, impressing on them the outline of His own perfection.

3. That He consecrated them to the office of perpetuating that perfection, by impressing it on others to be continued by them again in like manner. He made them therefore *perfecti et aliorum perfectores.*

4. That they were also Apostles, that is priests and bishops with universal mission and jurisdiction.

5. That He gave them the law of perfection as their rule and the law of liberty as their motive: that is, their obligations were the priesthood and charity without vows.

6. That the Episcopate and the priesthood is the state of perfection of Divine ordinance, and has been from the beginning, and in all the world without vows.

7. That this state is also religious and secular; religious because set apart to God, *Deo religatus*, and secular, because He sent it into the world to be the light of the world, the salt of the earth: to war against the world, and to save His elect out of the world.

8. That finding both bishops and priests living below their vocation, St. Charles recalled them to it: that is, the rule of St. Charles is the rule of our Lord given to His priests and pastors; the oblation and the common life being means and instruments to help and to sustain them in living up to the law of liberty and the law of the state of perfection.

9. That the priesthood is a true Order, the first and chief of all religious Orders, founded by our Lord Himself, *in bonum universale ecclesiæ.*

10. That all other Orders are of ecclesiastical foundation, formed *in bonum particulare, i.e.* of penance, study, redemption of captives, care of the sick, and the like.

11. That these are states of perfection not because of vows,—for vows do not constitute the state of perfection, the Episcopate is the state of perfection and has no vows,—but because the life of counsels, which is the law of perfection, is the rule of the Orders and of their state.

12. That every Order was by inspiration of the Holy Ghost, in His manifold wisdom for special and particular ends; but the priesthood and the pastoral office was instituted by our Lord, and anointed by the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, "for the work of the ministry, the perfecting of the saints, the edifying of the body of Christ," that is, for the *bonum universale*, the whole work and office of the mystical body edifying itself in charity. This and nothing less or lower than this is the rule of the Oblates of St. Charles. And he is in a special manner the patron saint of bishops, priests, and of the whole clergy, because he recalls them to the divine state of perfection in which they are by consecration and ordination.

13. That all religious Orders are to be loved and venerated as the work of saints, sanctioned by the Holy See, useful each one for the end of their creation—the *bonum particulare* of each severally, but it is erroneous at least to affirm that they are higher, better or more perfect than the divine state of perfection, instituted by our Lord Himself for the edifying and perfecting of the whole Church.

I have searched and endeavoured to find a flaw in these propositions. I cannot find it. I have heard and read much of human thought and human tradition written by members of the regular Orders each laudibly full of itself, and I have seen the disastrous and unintended harm done to the Episcopate and priesthood of the Church, which is treated as in a lower grade of perfection. As Gury[1] says: "*Sacerdos dignitate major, perfectione religiosus.*"[2] In my belief that proposition is erroneous and offensive to pious ears, and injurious to our Divine Master and to the Holy Ghost. Gury did not think so, because he believed what he said: and he believed it because a tradition of human thought made him believe it.

Every Order has a special end and witnesses to some special truth. The Benedictine to the life of meditation out of the world,

---

[1] Father Gury is the celebrated Jesuit Theologian. Before Manning became archbishop, Father Gury's work on Moral Theology was the text-book used in some colleges in the diocese of Westminster.

[2] Cardinal Manning adds in a Note:—"Gury says worse than this: 'Status sacerdotalis licet dignitate omnium præstantissimus sit, ratione tamen perfectionis longe vitæ religioso cedit."—*De Statibus Part.*, P. TERTIA, S. 136, tome 11, 85.

the Franciscan to poverty, the Dominican to preaching the Word of God, the Trappist to penance, the Trinitarian to the redemption of captives, the Oratory of St. Philip to perfection without vows, the Oblates to the divine institution of the state of perfection in the Episcopate and the priesthood.

I have endeavoured in the last year to collect evidence of this truth, and I have put it together in the Notes on "The Episcopate including the Priesthood." Let it be refuted or corrected or accepted as true, and let the tradition of human thought and speech which has made "the fine gold dim" be cleared away.

1. Gury here compares the *state* of the priesthood and the *life* of religion. The comparison is of *state* with *state* and of *life* with *life*.

2. Is the *state* instituted by the Church far *above* the *state* instituted by our Lord?

3. Is the religious *life* above the sacerdotal life?

4. Is the religious *state* a sacrament of Divine institution?

5. Has it a sacramental grace *jugis et perennis gratia ad omnia sacerdotis adjuncta adaquate concessa*?

6. Is the sacerdotal life lower than the life of counsels?

7. Is it not the life of counsels *vita libertatis in spiritu*?

8. The whole Episcopate and the whole priesthood in all the world and from the beginning has been without vows. Therefore of two things, one—(1) Either it was instituted without vows by our Divine Lord; or (2) It has universally, everywhere and always, departed from His will.

Such a proposition I believe to be offensive to pious ears; scandalous, injurious to the Holy See, erroneous, contrary to the doctrine of the passive and active infallibility of the Church, and therefore materially heretical.

9. If Gury means that the state of a faithful priest *perfectione longe cedit* to the state of a Jesuit lay brother, I think it deserves all censures below heresy.

10. If he only means that a good lay brother is more perfect than a less good priest, it is most true. But why did he not say what he meant? And why say what he did not mean?

In a statement of a later date, Cardinal Manning enforced anew his novel theory, offensive at any rate to the pious ears of the religious Orders, in the following passage:—

It seems to me that the Gospel is the "law of liberty," and that the santification of the soul is the perfection of liberty, that is the will, the law itself. A vow is a dead

thing, but the will is alive and freely obeys the will of God. The Holy Ghost perfects the intellect and the will. The whole life of faith is a continuous work of human liberty. All merit is measured by liberty. If it be said that the vow of obedience is an act of liberty, and that all obedience is liberty. I ask if vows be the way of perfection, then the whole Christian people ought to be under vows, for all are called to perfection. But this is a moral fiction, which common sense rejects by instinct. The Apostles were under the counsel of perfection, but without vows. The life and love of our Lord, the coming and guidance of the Holy Ghost constrained the Apostles to live up to the counsel of perfection; which was not either a commandment, or a precept, but fulfilled by the law of liberty. Neither the Episcopate, nor the priesthood has been under vows; nor the Christian people. Ferraris [1] and the like have no warrant for saying that the Apostles were under vows, but that the Church added the solemnity.

This doctrine has had a disastrous effect. It has led to the denial that the priesthood is in the state of perfection. It shares in the state of the Episcopate. But this reduces the superiority of the regulars; and they depress the priesthood to elevate the state of vows. I am obliged to say that in this the Jesuits are the chief offenders.

Poor Charles Karslake said bitterly to me, "If the Oblates were founded to keep priests from becoming religious, I wish they were abolished." Again I thought to myself, "If the religious Orders were founded to prevent the priests from believing that they are bound to perfection, I also wish they were abolished." Ivy is beautiful upon a wall, but it pulls it down.

It is said that the effect of the Society as a whole upon the clergy as a whole is to stimulate and elevate, even by provocation in good works. The Lord said to Isaiah, "I will provoke you to jealousy by a foolish people, and by a people that is no people I will anger you." The converts of the Gentiles no doubt provoked many to the faith.

But I cannot admit this parallel.

First, because as I have said the action of the Society upon the clergy has been impoverishing both in men, and in money, and depressing in spirit and standard.

Next, because its "provocation" has chiefly been by rivalry, and intermeddling.

Thirdly, because it is only goodness and charity that generates the same in others.

---

[1] Father Ferraris the celebrated Friar Minor, canonist, and historian.

If the religious Orders were really perfect the clergy would by their example be drawn upward higher in perfection. If the imperfect claim the privileges of the perfect, the priesthood is justly provoked not to charity but to recoil.

To Cardinal Manning "the Jesuits were the chief offenders, not only in denying that the Priesthood was in a state of perfection," but in matters of graver, or at any rate, of more practical moment. Indeed, the unfriendly relations which subsisted between Cardinal Manning and the Jesuits in England during the whole period of his rule as Archbishop over the Diocese of Westminster is an open secret. But the grounds of his opposition were never divulged; scarcely even hinted at. His prohibiting Father Anderdon, his nephew and private secretary, and Father Humphreys, an Oblate of St. Charles and an able preacher, on their joining the Society of Jesus, from preaching and officiating in the diocese, indicated at all events that Archbishop Manning did not regard the Society with an over-benevolent eye. When Canon Morris, who as his secretary lived with him for a year or two at York Place, became a Jesuit, the Archbishop was much concerned, and in sorrow of heart said "Since you, too, are deserting me, you had better complete your work and make Newman, my faithful attendant, a Jesuit lay brother."

Such acts as these, and others of more serious import, such as the absolute prohibition, imposed by the Archbishop upon the Jesuits, of carrying on within the diocese the work of education, provoked at the time much discussion. Manning's opposition to the Jesuits showed itself during the latter years of Cardinal Wiseman's life. The first effect of this opposition was felt in Wiseman's revoking his permission to the Jesuits—or rather, his suggestion, for the idea originated with him — to open a large house and mission at Westminster. Cardinal Wiseman objected in the first instance to what he called the "pokey place in a mews" occupied by the Jesuits. He bade them build a large house, form a mission and school in an open and central position. Nothing loth, they purchased ground on the site now occupied by the Victoria Station. Mgr.

Manning, who had opened a small mission in the neighbourhood, after he had ceased to work with the Jesuits in Farm Street, induced Cardinal Wiseman to prohibit the Jesuits from founding a house in Westminster; their proposal to open a grammar school on the site which they had purchased was likewise refused. Besides other attempts to found grammar schools in London, at a later date Father Weld purchased in the open market a convent at Chelsea, abandoned by the Servite nuns, who had returned to France, in the view of opening a house for himself and for Fathers coming from abroad, with occasional students, and a staff of writers with a press by their side. He likewise contemplated establishing a course of lectures in philosophy, and other classes as circumstances offered. These buildings on a large enclosed site cost between £30,000 and £40,000. The Oratorians at Brompton, however, objected to the presence of the Jesuits at Chelsea. Archbishop Manning, giving ready heed to the objection, forbade the Jesuits to carry on their work at Chelsea.

Father Weld, the Provincial of the Society in England, had a long correspondence with Archbishop Manning on the subject of the hindrances and restrictions which were placed in the way of the Society in carrying out the work of education—a special duty imposed upon Jesuits by their rule and calling—in the Diocese of Westminster.

The following is the conclusion of a long letter of Father Weld on the relations of the Jesuits with the Archbishop of Westminster:—

STONYHURST COLLEGE,
BLACKBURN, 19*th March.*

MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP— . . . I now come to the most important point of my letter, and your Grace will, I know, allow me to speak openly.

Your Grace can hardly know how much I share your desire of the most complete union between the diocese and the Society. I am very grateful for what your Grace tells me of your desire in our regard. I now say with full liberty, that I think this is an occasion in which your Grace may prove to the Society your determination to encourage its legitimate development in the diocese and in London. The Society is a literary and scientific,

and generally a teaching body, and, to be properly represented in the diocese, ought to have an establishment where it can develop that part of its work generally, as regards higher studies. I think it might now be fairly impressed on the clergy that we have a right to some fit position in which we may carry out the educational and literary portion of our vocation.

Perhaps there is no position in London which would satisfy all our wants as well as the Chelsea convent.

We are most willing to make any sacrifice that cordial union and brotherly affection require, but I think we may reasonably claim some other suitable position in exchange.

I would ask your Grace to represent to the clergy that we have bought this place legitimately in open market, and in perfect good faith, and, especially as Westminster has been a disappointment to us as a centre of work, we have a right to something suitable in exchange.

I am sure that your Grace in giving due weight to the reasons of the clergy will be able to convince them that what I ask is just and reasonable. It has occurred to me that St. Elizabeth's hospital is not far from coming to grief. Arrangements might be made to let us have that. I have not been over the place and do not know what room there might be. A roomy place in the west or north-west of London is what we want. If it is too far east, we shall be out of the reach of those whom higher education can influence.

I trust your Grace will excuse the freedom with which I have written. I feel sure that we both seek the greater glory of God in the perfect co-operation of all orders of the clergy.—I remain, very sincerely, your Grace's humble servant in Xt.,

A. Weld, S.J.

The final result, after a prolonged correspondence, lasting several years, was an absolute refusal on the part of the Archbishop of Westminster, dated early in the year 1875, to allow the Fathers of the Society of Jesus to establish middle or grammar schools in London.

Father Clare, soon after Manning was created Cardinal, again brought forward the question in the following letter:—

111 Mount Street, W., 27*th July* 1875.

Your Eminence—Father Bond tells me that at a meeting held at the Archbishop's house, your Eminence urged the clergy to establish grammar schools in their respective districts. Further he says that he has received a circular in the same sense.

I have however refused to take any steps to carry this recommendation out, without first asking your Eminence whether the expression of this wish for grammar schools was intended to cancel that which your Eminence communicated to Father Provincial in the beginning of this year that the Fathers of the Society should not establish a middle school or grammar school in London.

Begging your Eminence's blessing, I remain, your servant in Xt., JAMES CLARE, S.J.

Father Clare's appeal was made in vain.

Cardinal Manning's opposition to the Jesuits was maintained unto the end. During his Episcopate the Jesuits were prohibited from establishing a single school in the Diocese of Westminster.[1]

The motives which conduced to Cardinal Manning's persistent opposition to the Society of Jesus have been variously accounted for, with more or less accuracy, sometimes in a friendly, sometimes in a hostile spirit. But from prudence, or out of charity, or from a desire to keep up appearances of unity of opinion among Catholics, the reasons which dictated his action or attitude towards the Jesuits were not disclosed.

Hence it came to pass, not unnaturally, that Cardinal Manning was often misunderstood; and not in this case only, but in other instances, and on like grounds. A veil of mystery, for instance, seemed to hang over his relations not only with the Jesuits, but with Cardinal Newman; and mystery, like shadowless night, magnifies every object it touches. Hence a haunting fear possessed the minds of many, that his antagonism to the Jesuits arose from jealousy of their hold on the more educated laity:[2] or of their influence social as well as religious over the higher classes; or to a touch of resentment at the careless way in which the misjudged Jesuits seemed to treat alike his favour or disfavour.

The reverence and gratitude entertained, however, by English Catholics for the eminent services rendered by the

[1] His Eminence Cardinal Vaughan has reversed the policy of his predecessor on this point, by authorising the Jesuits to set up a grammar school in London.

[2] See letter to Mgr. Talbot.

Society of Jesus to Religion and to the Church in England, in the present as in the past, was far too deeply seated in their hearts and minds to have been perturbed even by the persistent opposition and prejudice displayed by Cardinal Manning against the Jesuits during the whole period of his Episcopal rule.

CHAPTER XXVII

HINDRANCES TO THE SPREAD OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN ENGLAND[1]

In a series of autobiographical Notes, written in the summer of 1890, Cardinal Manning entered into a most searching inquiry into the "Hindrances" which stand in the way of the spread of Catholicism in England. In these Notes Cardinal Manning relates, with admirable force and directness, the difficulties which he had to encounter, not so much from opposition on the part of the people of England, as from apathy, ignorance, and prejudice on the part of Catholics themselves. The results of Cardinal Manning's long experience are not only of personal interest but of great public utility. The candour and openness with which he does not fear to rebuke his own people, and the just and generous tribute which he offers from his own experience, both as a Catholic priest and an Anglican, to the piety, religious-mindedness, and exemplary lives of so many Anglicans of every rank and condition of life, is a noble legacy which cannot fail to soften antipathies and lessen any lingering prejudices in the hearts of the people of England.

The first Note in this series of autobiographical Notes serves, as it were, as a Preface; for Cardinal Manning in a few broad lines sketches the history of the Catholic Church

[1] The original heading put to this series of autobiographical Notes was "Prospects of the Catholic Church in England in the Future." But Cardinal Manning had either no time or no inclination to carry out his original design. Instead of speculating on the unknown future, he wisely contented himself with describing things of which he had a personal knowledge, hindrances, which he had himself encountered, to the spread of the Catholic Church in England.

in England from its foundation by St. Gregory the Great to the restoration of the Hierarchy by Pius IX.

The Catholic religion has existed in England from the foundation of the Hierarchy of St. Gregory the Great. I set aside the remnants of British Christianity wrecked by the Saxons, which were either absorbed in the Church of St. Augustine or died out in Wales.

But the Catholic Church was extinguished when Elizabeth destroyed the Hierarchy. The religion survived, and a number of priests, but the Church was gone. It was long without a Bishop. Then it had a Vicar-Apostolic for England and Scotland; then for long years no Bishop at all. Then a Vicar-Apostolic or two, then four and in this century eight; then at last the Hierarchy of Pius IX. From that Michaelmas Day 1850, dates the Catholic Church in England, after three hundred years of ruin.

The effect of this interval of desolation has been the loss of the English people. The people of Ireland have been sustained in their faith because the succession of their bishops and pastors has never been interrupted. But for this unbroken and watchful Pastoral care millions would have fallen away as in England.

If it be answered that the persecution of the Civil Power fell more heavily on England than on Ireland, the answer is at once easy. The persecution fell first on England, but it fell more heavily and for a longer time on Ireland. In England it had ceased by the reign of James the First, or at least of Charles the First. In Ireland it continued down to the atrocities of Cromwell, and even into the time of Charles the Second, in whose reign Archbishop Plunket was martyred at Tyburn. No, this is no answer. The Catholic Faith lived on in England secretly all over the land in great multitudes of individuals and of families, even to the time of William the Third. In every county of England many of the chief families remained Catholic. They had their chaplains to keep their Faith alive. But the multitude of the poor had no pastor. Their Faith died out. At the end of the last century, Burke put the number of Catholics in England at 30,000 or 36,000. No doubt they were chiefly of English blood. The great Irish immigration had not yet begun.

Neither is it true that it was impossible to restore Catholic Bishops in England, because of the persecution of Government. In Tierney's edition of Dod's *History* there is evidence to show that under the two first Stuarts the Government would not have prevented the consecration of Bishops, provided that they

did not assume the titles of the Anglican Sees. At one time a consent was on the point of being granted, when some Catholic false brother told the Government that the plan was to assume the title of York.

Moreover, if priests could come into England why not bishops? If they were to be hung, drawn, and quartered, why not a bishop as well as a priest? The power of confirming and ordaining was not more terrible to the Civil Power than the power of saying Mass. The extinction of the Episcopate destroyed the Priesthood.

Nine Hindrances

I. *Clero nc c[illegible] nc civile.*
II. *Predica superficiale.*
III. Reaction against Holy Scriptures.
IV. Non-perception and unconsciousness of the Spiritual Life of England.
V. Sacramentalism. Objective and mechanical.
VI. Officialism. Not subjective.
VII. Controversy *v.* Charity.
VIII. Dominoes.
IX. S. J.[1]

High—Highest: Law of Liberty. Expiation.

I. In 1848 I was in Rome and read Gioberti's *Primato degli Italiani.* In describing England and its religion he says that the Anglican clergy are *Un clero colto e civile.*

As to culture they certainly have a literary and scientific culture, more general and more advanced than the body of our priests; sacred science and theology hardly exist among them. Here and there only such men as Lightfoot and Westcott are to be found. Nevertheless they are literary: history, constitutional law, and experience in politics they have very generally. Moreover, they have an interest in public affairs, in the politics and welfare of the country. They are therefore *civiles.* They share and promote the Civil life of the people. It is here that we are wanting, and mischievously wanting.

The long persecution of the Catholic Church by the laws of England has alienated the hearts of Catholics from the public and political life of England. Till fifty years ago they were legally *ex-lex.* The law is changed, but not the habit of mind formed by it. *Ecclesia patria nostra.* Catholics have not only been alienated from public life, but have been tempted to think that patriotism is hardly reconcilable with Catholic fidelity. Penal Laws are gone, but social ostracism still exists. It is dying, but to this day hardly a Catholic can get to Parliament. No doubt

[1] The note on the Society of Jesus in this Series is omitted for reasons stated in the Preface.

it will die out, but not until we have a priesthood *colto e civile*, for as the priest so is the people, *Sicut sacerdos, sic populus.* The 200,000 English Catholics have much of John Bull in them, but the million of our people are born into an animosity against Queen Elizabeth, Cromwell, and William III. It is with difficulty that our people will petition Parliament for anything. Once it was my fate to ask the people at St. Mary's to sign a Petition to Parliament. The Petition lay for signature in the school next to my house. I found that a young Irishman had emptied the ink-bottle over it as a protest against Parliament.

By the law of nature a people grows up into social and civil life on the soil where they are born. By the sin and persecution of England this has never been true of the people of Ireland. They are the most Christian people on the face of the earth. But not the most civilised in Gioberti's sense. Christianity is their civilisation, and before God it is the highest, but for this world it is not so. We have a million of people, priests, and faithful of Irish blood, faith, and civilisation in England, and they are not only alienated from our laws and legislature, but would upset the ink-bottle over the Statute book. So long as this habit of mind lasts we shall never have a Civil priesthood; and so long as our priesthood is not Civil it will be confined to the Sacristy as in France, not by a hostile public opinion, but by our own incapacity to mix in the Civil life of the country; and this incapacity hitherto has sprung from hostility, suspicion, and fear. A capacity for civil and public action needs, of course, a training and education, but it springs from a love of our country. The Irish have this intensely for Ireland, but can hardly have it as yet for England. Many English Catholics, also, from religious prejudice are quite as incapable and useless.

In truth, the whole civil and political life of England is open to us if we know how to enter and how to bear ourselves. Our Faith must go with us and govern us everywhere, but except on the rarest occasions it need not be proclaimed. If such occasion arise let it be done in an open and manly way, and not only no offence is given or taken, but confidence and respect are notably increased. In my forty years in London I have had all manner of proof of what I write.

The dictum of Terence: *Homo sum et humani nihil a me alienum puto* is not repealed by "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." It is quickened, enforced, extended, and elevated. Everything, therefore, that affects the human sufferings and state of the people, it is the duty of every civilised man to note and tend, much more of every Christian man, and above all of every Catholic man and woman, and emphatically of every priest

and bishop. We cannot multiply loaves or heal lepers as our Lord did, by which the people were won to follow and learn of Him, but we can be prompt and foremost in working with all who are labouring to relieve every form of human suffering, sorrow, and misery. If we come forward gladly and usefully the people of this country are visibly glad to receive us among them.

July **17.**

II. A still greater obstacle to the spread of the Faith is the shallowness of our preaching. This appears to me to come—first, from a want of wise choice of the subjects we preach upon; and, secondly, from a shallow mode of treatment.

As to the choice of subjects: compare the Epistles of St. Paul with a volume of modern sermons. The chief and prominent topics of St. Paul are—God, the Incarnation, the Holy Ghost, that is, the Eternal Truths from which all other truths descend. These are always present. Whatever details follow, they are as consequence from the theology, which is always present as the sun at noonday. St. Paul tells the Corinthians that he knew nothing among them but "Jesus Christ and Him crucified." This truth contains and justifies the whole faith and piety of the Gospel. But how often do we hear it preached upon? If the great Truths are not perpetually held up, all consequent truths seem to be arbitrary and mere assertion; *e.g.* the title "Mother of God" is incomprehensible without the explicit knowledge of the Incarnation, and the Incarnation itself without the explicit knowledge of the Holy Trinity. A French priest of Pontigny published a book on "The Deified *Soul*" of our Lord, because he had found the Apollinarian heresy so widely held by pious Catholics. The articles of the Apostolic Creed ought to be so continually held up before the intelligence of the faithful that all other subjects, such as the dignity and sanctification of the Blessed Virgin, the real and substantial presence of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament, may be seen to be direct and evident consequences. There is also a majesty and greatness in these divine and eternal realities that subdue and attract the intellect and conscience. It would seem inevitable that our preachers should preach the Gospel in all its length and truth and depth and height.

The confraternities of the Sacred Heart and the Most Precious Blood, the devotion of the Five Sacred Wounds, the mysteries of the Rosary and the Crucifix, all are the Gospel in its fulness. So also the work of the Holy Ghost, the Sanctifier and the Absolver, with the Sacrament of Penance, enable us to preach and to outpreach all Evangelists, Methodists, and Salvationists that were

ever made. Why then do we not draw men as Spurgeon and "General" Booth or Hugh Price Hughes?

I am afraid that there are two obvious reasons. We choose our topics unwisely, and we are not on fire with the love of God and of souls.

Nevertheless, when we give retreats or missions our priests can preach the Eternal Truths and the Gospel as fully and as powerfully as anybody. But why reserve these vital and sovereign Truths to once a year? Surely they ought to be proclaimed "upon the housetops." If they were, the English people would feel that we are more scriptural and more evangelical than their own preachers. When we preach pieties and controversies it does not touch their souls. They are neither won nor moved by us. But surely we ought to win and move, and draw and soften the souls of men as our Lord did, and by the same truths. His preaching of the Eternal Truth was "as fire, and as the hammer that breaketh the rocks in pieces." So also was the preaching of the Apostles, when they preached in the name of Jesus. This preaching converted the world, and no other will convert England. The English people as a whole, still believe in our Lord, His love, His passion, His absolution, His most Precious Blood—and also in repentance, grace, and conversion. Why do not we meet these Truths in their minds and the needs of their souls, by offering to them all these things in greater freshness and beauty? They come to hear us hoping for these things, and they go empty away, saying that our preaching does not come home to them, and is not what they need. When we have got them to confession we can teach them Rosaries and the use of Holy Water.

July 19.

The other cause of our shallowness is our shallow treatment of the subject we have chosen.

No doubt overwork is the reason with some. But a priest who is overworked in the saving of souls can never be much at a loss to preach the Gospel. He is always habitually speaking of God, His will, His kingdom, and he has only to think aloud. Our difficulty is in ourselves. It is what we are that preaches, and we are not only what we know but what we feel, what we realise, what by experience has become a part of ourselves. Every man speaks readily of that which chiefly fills his mind. If we lived more for God, with God, and in God, we should have little difficulty of speaking about Him. But is this true of us? Even good priests preach daily: and choose dogmatic or moral subjects rather than mystical or ascetic. By mystical I do

not mean in the sense of St. Teresa's Visions—but on such texts as *Quam magna multitudo, etc.*, or *Gustate et videte quoniam suavis est Dominus.* Is not this because our wells are shallow, or dry?

Another cause is hurry and haste. I have known men who have not even chosen their subject or their text till they are on their way to the Church. Surely this is tempting God; if not doing his work deceitfully. Others again take the first subject that comes to their mind, or that comes most easily to them because they have so often talked about it. But surely we ought first to think what our people most need.

III. A third hindrance to the spread of the faith is the reaction against the popular use of the Holy Scriptures—I say reaction because it has followed and been caused by the profane and heretical abuse of the Holy Scriptures by the so-called Protestants. St. Teresa said that one of the chief causes of evil in her day was the ignorance of Holy Scripture. It is certainly so among us. It lowers the standard of Christian life and aspiration. The Scriptures are the voice of the Divine Spirit, and they that know them aspire after a higher life. The standard of society, and even of good people is the human spirit at best, and its standard is immensely below the standard of the divine.

This lowers the standard of our preachers and confessors. The law of liberty is the most constraining we have to aim at perfection. It is used to sanction everything which is not intrinsically sinful. All things are lawful to me, but not all things are expedient or edifying, but we must not limit human liberty, and therefore what is expedient and edifying is not of obligation. This gospel of narrowness and illiberality is in the ascendant. Some have been found to say that to keep souls out of mortal sin is all that secular priests can do. Many of us, I fear, have earned this rebuke.

IV. A fourth hindrance is the unconsciousness of the hereditary Catholic of the spiritual state of the English people.

They and their forefathers have until 1829 been so shut out of the society and life of the English people, and so thrown in upon themselves, and so wounded by the pride, suspicion, and religious prejudice of Englishmen, that they have been always in an antagonistic attitude of mind, bitter and hardly charitable.

They have, therefore, held with all rigour the axiom *extra ecclesiam nulla salus.* They have believed Protestants, as a whole, to be without faith or baptism; or even if baptized, to be none the better. This has so possessed even Priests, that I have known instances of priests refusing to receive a convert into the Church; and also of a Priest who said "Thank God, I never received a

convert into the Church." They supposed us (Anglicans) to be impostors, or to have worldly motives, as we did when Jews came to be received. This temper is now happily passing away.

It is a strange state of mind, for they could not help knowing that the great majority of the English people are baptized, and are therefore elevated to the Supernatural order. If they live in charity with God and man, their baptism would save them; if they have forfeited their union with God by charity, nevertheless, they are still in the Supernatural order by faith and hope. And who can limit the grace of God? Nineveh repented and was spared. Therefore, not only the time, but the grace of repentance was given to Nineveh. If Tyre and Sidon had repented they might have been saved, therefore repentance was possible to them, but repentance is impossible without the grace of repentance.

I have found among hereditary Catholics a belief that the English people are without faith, without Christian doctrine, without means of contrition, and that, therefore, the hope of their salvation is most uncertain. This error paralyses their hopefulness, and without hope men do little. How men that have read the Treatise of Grace can believe such things I cannot tell. But I see that as soon as they come to know the singular goodness and piety of non-Catholics, they swing round into the other extreme, and believe that all religions are the same. This seems to me to be Scylla and Charybdis of no hope and false hope: both very mischievous, hindering zeal and breeding laxity.

1. I have found not only laymen, but priests ignore absolutely the fact that the greater part of the English people are baptized, and therefore are in the Supernatural state of grace.

2. They take for granted that they have lost their baptismal grace by mortal sin.

3. And that therefore, as they have not the sacrament of Penance they have no means of rising again to the grace of Baptism.

4. That for this reason their life is without merit.

5. And their salvation most uncertain.

I do not believe one of these propositions to be true, and I am convinced that no one ever believes them without being checked in his action, and chilled in his charity towards the non-Catholic people of England. What I believe in this matter may be seen in a sermon in my old Anglican fourth Volume, called "Christ preached every way a cause of joy," which has been read without censure by two Catholic theologians; and also in a letter to Dr. Pusey on "The Workings of the Spirit in the Church of England," in "England and Christendom."

Both these arguments are founded on Catholic theology; and especially on the *systema morale* of St. Alphonsus, and on moral theologians as Pichler and others.

Our Lord said "I am come that they might have life, and that they may have it more abundantly," by which I understand that the fulness of grace in His precious blood does not revoke or take away, or diminish in a jot or tittle, the grace of salvation under the old Law of Israel, or of nature.

And what was this? Suavez calls it *gratia naturalis*, *i.e.* the grace of the Holy Ghost in the state of nature.

1. That every man born of Adam is born into a world redeemed in the blood of the Lamb slain from the beginning of the world.

2. That to all men, *i.e.* to all mankind, *etiam infidelibus et hæreticis* is given grace sufficient *ad evitandum mortem eternam.*

3. That the *virtus penitentiæ* is universal, from the fall of man.

4. That to those to whom the sacrament of Penance is physically or morally impossible the virtue of Penance is sufficient. And to us the Sacrament, without virtues, is not sufficient.

5. That to those who use the grace they have received an *augmentum atque proportionatum* is given.

6. That God would have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the Truth.

7. That to all who seek the Truth is given so much as will bring them to the soul of the Church, if not to its visible body.

8. That no member of the soul dying in union with God can be lost.

No penitent soul can perish, and
No soul that loves God can be lost.

9. Will any one affirm that souls born again of water and the Holy Ghost cannot be penitent or cannot love God?

10. Now a life of forty years out of the Church has taught me what I have written.

11. And the experience of a priest's life of nearly forty years has confirmed all I have written.

August 1.

My experience among those who are out of the Church confirms all I have written of the doctrines of grace. I have intimately known souls living by faith, hope, and charity, and the sanctifying Grace with the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, in humility, absolute purity of life and heart, in constant meditation on Holy Scripture, unceasing prayer, complete self-denial, personal work among the poor; in a word, living lives of visible santification, as undoubtedly the work of the Holy Ghost as I

have ever seen. I have seen this in whole families, rich and poor, and in all conditions of life.

Moreover, I have received into the Church I do not know how many souls in whom I could find no mortal sin. They were evidently in the grace of their Baptism. This same is the testimony of priests whom I have consulted; and it was the unanimous testimony of the Jesuits at Stonyhurst, in 1848, as F. Cardella, I think if I remember right, told me. How with these facts can men go on speaking of those who are out of the Church in England as in the state of nature and in bad faith, and to be avoided as immoral? There are no doubt such persons among them. But what is the state of France, Italy, Spain, South America? All the light and grace of the Catholic Church is in vain for multitudes in those Catholic nations.

And further, all the great works of charity in England have had their beginning out of the Church, for instance the abolition of the Slave trade and of Slavery; and the persevering protest of the Anti-Slavery Society. Not a Catholic name so far as I know shared in this. France, Portugal, and Brazil have been secretly or openly Slave trading or, till now even, Slave holding. The whole Temperance movement. It was a Quaker that made F. Mathew a Total Abstainer. Catholic Ireland and the Catholics of England, until now, have done little for Temperance. The Anglican and Dissenting ministers are far more numerously Total Abstainers than our priests. The Act of Parliament to protect animals from cruelty was carried by a non-Catholic Irishman. The Anti-Vivisection Act also. Both are derided to my knowledge among Catholics. The Acts to protect children from cruelty were the work of Dissenters. On these three Societies there is hardly a Catholic name. On the last, mine was for long the only one. So again in the uprising against the horrible depravity which destroys young girls—multitudes of ours—I was literally denounced by Catholics, not one came forward. If it was ill done why did nobody try to mend it? I might go on. There are endless works for the protection of shop assistants, overworked railway and tram men, women and children ground down by sweaters, and driven by starvation wage upon the streets. Not one of the works in their behalf were started by us, hardly a Catholic name is to be found on their Reports. Surely we are in the Sacristy. It is not that our Catholics deliberately refuse, but partly they do not take pains to know, partly they are prejudiced. "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" partly they are suspicious "who knows it is not a proselytising affair?" and finally they live on easily, unconscious that Lazarus lies at their gate full of sores.

I pray God that when a better man comes into my place he will go and see with his own eyes that my place may not remain empty.

If he will do this the English people will know him and trust him; and seek his presence and help in their own works with a sensible confidence and good will. Surely we are bound to work with them in everything that is not contrary to faith or morals. The millions outside the Established Church draw away from them from social jealousy. They draw to us because we have nothing to do with the State or the world. Because in fact we are Dissenters and the chief of Nonconformists.

August 3.

V. A fifth hindrance is what I, for want of a better name, must call Sacramentalism. Priests have a danger of becoming Mass priests, or Sacrament-mongers. They possess, by Divine commission, the power of administering sacraments which confer grace *ex opere operato*, to which they can add nothing, nor can their own unworthiness hinder its effect. It is easily possible for a Priest, *citra peccatum mortale commissum*, to neglect his meditation, examination of conscience, and spiritual exercises, and therefore to become unspiritual and dry. Still he administers sacraments exactly and mechanically. He has committed no mortal sin. And a thousand venial sins are venial still; but the man is dry, and everybody feels it when he preaches or is in the Confessional, or by a death-bed, or in a house of sorrow. Now, under the old Law the subjective piety was everything. Both priest and people in this were alike. But there was great discipline to train the priests to higher subjective piety, and a still higher subjective fitness was required for a priest ministering in his course in the Temple. Surely this subjective fitness is raised to a higher degree and standard under the new Law of grace. The objective efficacy of sacraments was not intended to dispense with the subjective fitness either in the minister or in the receiver. All that was required for the *sacramentalia* is *a fortiori* required for sacraments. A Christian Priest is bound to be all that a Jewish Priest was bound to be, and much more as the substance exceeds the shadow. When a priest went in to minister in his course he was forbidden to drink wine or strong drink. But a Christian Priest goes in to minister every morning in the Holy Mass. I do not say that he is by this type forbidden to drink wine. But the precept becomes a strong counsel.

August 5.

VI. A sixth hindrance is what I may call officialism, that is a

dependence for our work not on our subjective fitness, but upon official powers. It is certain that, as the objective is over-valued, the subjective is under-valued. It is curious that in the Anglican body, High Churchmen are dry, and Low Churchmen exalt their own persons. In the Catholic Church all priests are High Churchmen. And there is a danger of official assumption. But for this we should not have had the hatred and contempt of sacerdotalism. I am sorry to say that even good priests sometimes swagger; they think to magnify their office, but they belittle themselves. This has been the cause of endless troubles in hospitals and workhouses. Unfortunately even good priests are not always refined, and they resent any hindrance in the way of their sacred office with want of self-control which gains nothing, and often loses everything. The main contention is lost in a personal dispute. I have often said that our priests are always booted and spurred like cavalry officers in time of war. But they will not fight worse for being chivalrous and courteous.

I may now say what has been the one chief aim of my whole life since I became a priest, and in a special fixedness since I became what I am, five and twenty years ago. It has been the perfection of the priesthood first in ourselves as Oblates, and then in the priesthood of the Diocese of Westminster.

Humanly speaking this idea came to me from St. Charles. Some years before I was in the Church I read his life, and I bought the *Acta*. This filled me with the idea of the Pastoral office, I had already written on the Good Shepherd, and I was full of the image of the pastoral care. But St. Charles made it concrete and practical. After my weak way I tried to live by it.

When I came into the Church I remember being attacked by a zealous Sacramentarian convert for saying "Our work is what we are." Taken *ut sonat* this dictum would indeed exclude not only Sacraments, but the Holy Trinity. And, if I had been talking to a Scotsman, I should have guarded myself by theology, "*Paulus baptizat, Christus baptizat.*" But Paul was also inwardly conformed to His Divine Master, and outside of all Sacraments he won souls by what he was in himself. Indeed he said "Christ sent me not to baptise, but to preach the Gospel." The old Law with its *sacramentalia* demanded a subjective fitness of a very high degree. The new law with its sacraments demands not only the same subjective sanctification in the priest, but a perfection as complete as he can attain. This was my idea of St. Charles's Congregation of Oblates. What I had in my mind in 1856 and 1857 was this and nothing else. What I intended

and did I have written in my MS. books which are at Bayswater, and I need not say more.

My chief subject then is what I have tried to do in the last twenty-five years, and my reasons.

First I must say that I found myself set over a body of clergy better than myself. For goodness, conscientiousness even to scruple in the life of priestly duty, they were exemplary and highly meritorious.

They were chiefly formed at St. Edmund's in a system of humble and unworldly goodness. But St. Edmund's had not all the advantages of sacred and spiritual science which it might have acquired by longer life and greater maturity. It was only fifty odd years old, and it was the offspring of the culture and quality of the old Vicariate. Good as it was it had much to learn, to master and to complete both intellectually and spiritually.

The clergy in 1865 were 214. The Diocesans were 160, the Regulars 54. There were 9 religious Orders of men, and of women 31.

The Regulars were Jesuits, Augustinians, Passionists, Carmelites, Pallotini, Rosminians, Servites, Marists, Oblates of Mary.

My first thought was that no Provincial or Father-General had any obligation to multiply and perfect his Order greater or or more absolute than I had to multiply and to perfect the priesthood of the Diocese of Westminster. Now I have borne my testimony to what they were, and to what they themselves, or the more thoughtful of them, desired to see growing and ripening among them.

But I must add what was the esteem in which the laity held them?

They, with exceptions, were held to be at a disadvantage as compared to the Regulars: as preachers, confessors, directors, judges of vocations, advisers in spiritual, and even in worldly, things they were held to be of less esteem. Many of them no doubt were so. But the whole as such was higher in parts. On the other hand many of the Regulars, with longer training and greater advantages, were better qualified than the priests of the diocese, but many were not so. And yet the laity took for granted that the clergy were "seculars," and spoke of them as such. "He is only a secular priest" was often heard, and it revealed a whole world of prejudice, depreciation, and mistrust. This was bad enough, but there was worse to come. The priesthood accepted the depreciation which depresses and paralyses the will. A conquered people lose the sense of power, and what is worse take their state as a standard; so that priests

have come to plead against invitations and exhortations to higher things, "I am only a secular priest." What can be greater than a priest? For itself does it not contain all perfection? What can black or white or brown cloth add to it? This seemed to me to be the first thing wanting. The world is governed by ideas; and the idea of our Lord's priesthood, truly and fully conceived, has a motive power to raise men to anything.

The first thing needed, as it seemed to me, was to bring out into the clearest light what the priesthood is.

It seemed to me to be obscured by the traditional prejudice that to be a Regular is to be everything, and to be a priest is to be functionary for sacraments and ceremonies. Even the priesthood of the Regular was lost sight of in his Order, habit, and privileges.

This conviction was the motive of all that I did and wrote at Bayswater.

And more explicitly since 1865 in St. Thomas's Seminary and in two books, the *Pastoral Office* and the *Eternal Priesthood*.

The next aim I had was to make the priests of the diocese conscious of their own power as priests.

For this cause I have held the Diocesan Synod every year. At first some murmured at the trouble; but they have come to see that it is good for them to be conscious of their number, and their Corporate existence, relations, and power. It is the one only day and place in which they meet together.

It is also the only day and place where the bishop can speak to them all at once.

I have tried to make use of this opportunity.

Our first Synod had a representation of a hundred and sixty priests. Our last of 353.

But it forced itself upon me that dormant powers diminish, faculties in activity are enlarged, energies exerted continually grow in strength.

Why then, I asked, should our priests always ask others to preach for them, to give Missions and Retreats?

Is it because they know themselves to be incapable? or because they have come to believe themselves to be incapable because the laity so regard them?

Is it true? If so *in nomine Domini* let us wipe away this reproach as speedily as ever we can.

Is it that our priests are discouraged and believe themselves to be what is said of them?

At all events the way to cure this incapacity is to do the things of which they are told that they are incapable. Let them preach, give Missions and Retreats, "Use legs and have legs."

I have therefore encouraged them to give parochial missions, which have greatly prospered; chiefly to the priests themselves. Many have told me that they had no knowledge they possessed such power over their people; that in giving the missions a new light and strength came to them, and a new piety came to their people. They had never before made full trial of the priesthood and of the powers dormant in it.

They also saw that the apparent success of Triennial missions comes from two causes—the one that the accumulation of three years has to be worked off, the other that the number of confessions heard is explained by the fact that the central mission gains what the neighbouring missions lose. The aggregate within an hour feel the same.

If the Pontifical law had not ordered that the ordinary confessors of convents should be secular priests, and forbidden the appointment of Regulars except under stress of necessity, we should perhaps be told, that no secular priest is capable of hearing the confessions of nuns and of directing them.

Of the eighty convents of this diocese I have laboured to provide confessors of my own clergy, and to call in Regulars only in case of need.

I believe the hearing and direction of nuns is one of the surest means to illuminate, and to sanctify the Priests of the Diocese.

August 28.

Surely this phrase *In auxilium Sæcularium* shows that the priests ought to be ahead of any and every work, and only helped, not superseded or supplanted, when they fail numerically, intellectually, or spiritually. This does not justify voluntary or deliberate failure in capacity *data opera.* But the abdication of the highest functions of the priesthood is a culpable self-depression, an ὑστέρησις, like folding the talent in a napkin. Against this I have laboured by making everyone do his own work to the best of his power, and I hope I have not spared myself. The result I see in the visible and palpable increase of efficiency in a large number as preachers, confessors and pastors.

It will be said that the *auxilium sæcularium* is not only from the *penuria sacerdotum*, the fewness of priests in number, but emphatically the help of higher intellectual culture, and riper spiritual perfection, which regulars attain by their life in community, their learned leisure, their spiritual asceticism.

Now, this is precisely the evil I am contending against. Priests as such are *perfectores aliorum*, and before Ordination, as St. Alphonsus affirms, according to the doctrine of fathers and

theologians *uno ore*, they ought to have attained "interior spiritual perfection" as a pre-requisite to Ordination.

Moreover it is an axiom that the priesthood is a sign *perfectionis jam adeptæ*. The imperfect enter Religious Orders *ad perfectionem adquirendam*. The secular priesthood therefore is supposed to be already in moral, intellectual, and spiritual maturity, and the *auxilium* they need is not to supply what they have not already, but to support them in the spiritual qualities and acquirements they have already attained by the same qualities and acquirements.

To this it will be answered: "Look at the secular clergy, where is their spiritual perfection?" I answer look at the Regulars, are they all perfect? The secular priests are hundreds of thousands, the Regulars not twenty thousand. There may be less mud in a canal than in the river St. Lawrence; but the one is God's creation, the other is of man. Moreover, if the secular clergy are on a lower spiritual level than regulars, which I am granting, but not conceding, I ascribe it to three brief causes:—

1. First, to the low and depressed notion of the priesthood which has become tradition. The higher the mark the higher the aim. A low standard breeds a low desire, and paralyses the affections and energies of the soul.

When are our Seminarists told that they must aim at perfection: and that, without this, no treatises of philosophy or theology will be enough.

2. Secondly, the inefficient state of our Seminaries. We have boys from twenty-one to twenty-four. If they are ordained without "interior spiritual perfection," who is to blame? Who is responsible? Where is the remedy? With a postulancy of eight years and a novitiate of four we ought to bring them up to spiritual perfection. And so we should if we ourselves were spiritually perfect. They are what we are; and they will be what we make them.

Is it not the want of a higher aspiration in ourselves that depresses the standard of our Seminarists?

One consequence of this is that when they grow up and become prefects and professors they have no unity of mind, no union of will for the college, no zeal *in solidum*, so as to take to heart not only their own class, but the studies and discipline of the whole house. How can men work together if they have no community of heart or spirit?

3. Lastly the clergy of a diocese will be what the bishop is: if he is lax they will be lax, if he is strict they will be strict also. If he keeps up the aim and standard, not all, indeed, will

do the same, but those who have a good will and the same aspiration will surround him, and even the lax and the lower will not preach laxity even if they practise it.

But further, a bishop must not be a dependent on the Upper Ten thousand, nor a diner-out, nor a waster of time, nor a joker of jokes, nor a reader of newspapers, nor a centre of favourites, but open to all his priests, at any day and at any hour, sharing their burdens and troubles, and unselfish in word and deed. He ought to live for his priests, and among them; in the habits of his life as like to their habits as possible. God knows how imperfect we are, but if we aim at perfection, and say "Come," our priests will follow us. If we aim at anything lower and say "Go," they will fall back. If the diocesan priesthood is lower in life and attainments than the Regulars, the chief cause is to be found in the bishop, first in the seminary, and next in his life, spirit, and discipline.

Now some bishops having a clergy of a lower culture are disappointed and discouraged, and tempted to turn away from their own priests, and to call in Regulars to do what they need to be done. The effect of this is to chill and depress the clergy still more, and even to confirm them in their lower state. The duty of the bishop is to elevate, and to encourage them to make efforts for their own advancement. If they are passed over or set aside they will sink lower, and losing heart and hope they will become less efficient and productive even in their spiritual life.

No bishop thoroughly penetrated by the belief that the priesthood demands perfection, and gives the grace to attain, and to maintain what it demands, could act in the way I have written.

His way of treating his priests is the *experimentum crucis* to detect and to measure his convictions. If even bishops have not the *zelus sacerdotii* to believe the priesthood to demand perfection I do not wonder at the depression and decline of the so called "secular clergy."

So far as I can find they were never called "secular" till about the thirteenth century, and I suspect that many deserved the name. The multiplication of Regulars, and of Regular Pontiffs led to the distinction; at first no doubt without an adverse intention, or slighting animus. But though the word may mean living and labouring in the world, striving and suffering for the sanctification and salvation of the world, its worse sense has prevailed over its true meaning; and it is understood to mean a lower life and a lower mind.

For this cause I have for long years never used it, and have excluded it from the heading of Pastorals.

Believing the priesthood to be the first religious and regular Order instituted by our Lord Himself, and the highest state of perfection in the world, for the Episcopate is only the *Sacerdotium supremum et absolutum*, and contains the priesthood with all its obligations and graces. With this belief I look upon all religious Orders as of ecclesiastical institution *ad auxilium*. They are reforms not of the priesthood but of the laxities of priests in all ages and lands, *in auxilium non in supplantationem*. I have felt it to be my duty to leave nothing undone to make the clergy of the diocese able to do all its own work, and "to edify itself in charity."

August 30.

VII. A Seventh and grave hindrance to the spread of the Catholic religion has been the controversial spirit both in matter and in manner of preaching and writing. There is no doubt that this was forced upon the Church in England by the so-called Reformation, which denied Catholic truth and affirmed doctrinal errors. But controversy is at best polemical theology, and polemical theology is simply if not wholly destructive. But destruction builds up nothing. At best it only clears the rubbish off the site so as to make building up possible. And yet positive theology will clear away rubbish, without seeming to do so. For clearness of statement is evidence in itself. *Evidentia* is Truth looking out of the cloud and making itself visible like light. The great majority of men are convinced, not so much by reasoning, as by a clear conception of Truth. There are two ways of proving a problem. The one to show that every other conception is impossible; this is polemical and destructive. The other to show that the true conception is evident. This is positive and expository. The advantage of this method is that you refute an adversary without naming him or his assertions. This is therefore peaceful and conciliatory. There is no doubt, as the founder of the Quakers said, "when I am in argument I take care not to provoke my antagonist, for so long as he is calm, all the grace of God there is in him is on my side." Thus far I have spoken of the natural power of clearness in convincing by pervading the intelligence by coherent and intelligible conceptions. Clearness is light and light is self-evident. It manifests itself.

But there is in Truth when held up in its evident clearness a supernatural, and sacramental power. The grace of baptism needs the *magisterium* of the Church to elicit and to inform it. But it is in the soul not only by the affinity of charity to the truth revealed by the Spirit of Truth, but by the infused virtue of faith which responds to the truth as its proper object. More-

over it is certain that an actual grace goes with every Truth, enabling the hearer to believe if he will.

VIII. And this leads on to another hindrance in our way. We do not sufficiently ascertain before we begin to teach what those who hear us already believe. In truth, teaching is like a game of dominoes. If the hearers put down three we must meet it with a three, but for this we must know their intellectual holdings. Now the people of England believe—

1. That Christianity is revealed by God.
2. That the Baptism of children is a duty.
3. That Education ought to be Christian.
4. That the baptismal Creed is true.
5. That Our Lord is a Divine Person.
6. That He died for our salvation.
7. That if we sin we shall be lost.
8. That if we repent God will forgive our sins.
9. That the Bible is the Word of God.

I might add a long list of Christian Truths which may be taken for granted.

But my object is to show that so long as we appeal to these Truths as they exist in the minds of the English people they will respond to us, and we shall thereby gain their ear and their confidence. And if we preach these things better than their own preachers, we shall thereby establish a superiority of fire.

Having once laid this foundation, all other truths which flow from these "Waters that are above the firmament" will be seen to be consequences, inevitable, true, and safe, as, for instance, the Incarnation once believed, two things follow, or radiate like two beams of light: (1) the Real and Substantial Presence, and (2) the dignity and the glory of our Blessed Mother. St. Paul and the Unknown God at Athens precisely shows what I mean. Our work is build up, and to build upon the foundation. But the foundation consists of the eternal and sovereign Truths which are still taken for granted.

We have lost the people of England. They have lost the Faith, and, as a dead body generates all manner of corruption, the loss of Faith has brought on all manner of immoralities. Half of the population nearly is gathered into towns and cities. London alone has in its streets four millions, of whom half are without God in the world. From Wesley to "General" Booth the non-Catholics are working among them. Is the Catholic Church to do nothing? Certainly our first work is *ad intra* on our own people, and grievously we need it. But are we to do nothing

ad extra? What can we do, a million and a half among twenty-six millions? I believe we could do much. But it must be by a simpler and more self-sacrificing way of work. The Catholic Church has adequate means to its internal ends. The priesthood and the nuns can deal with the needs of the Church *ad intra.* Its missionaries, priests, and nuns are adequate in quality not in quantity to its work *ad extra.* But London is a mission; and we need both priests and nuns for the English people out of unity. I have said before that we ought to play at dominoes with the English people. Where is the good of preaching on the Immaculate Conception to people who do not believe in the Incarnation? or on the Church to those who do not believe in Christianity? Surely a procession through the streets would do better to sing or say the litany of the Holy Name than the litany of Loretto. Give the English people what they can understand, and they will listen, and listen gravely. Is it not better, as St. Paul says, "to speak five words with my understanding, that I may instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue" (1 Cor. xiv. 19). So again to sing English hymns through the streets rather than to say the rosary. Hymns are intelligible to all. The rosary is to non-Catholics not only unintelligible, but by its perpetual repetition a stumbling-block. We need open-air preaching, and instructions given anywhere and everywhere in secular places—not in our churches. The Little Servants of the Mother of God, and the Little Auxiliatrices, the Sisters of St. Francis of Sales, have as their work the helping of the poor in their homes, doing all domestic and menial works of the lowest kind, spending the whole day with them, but returning to their convent at night. This is the most direct agency to teach the domestic life, and where it is possible to restore it. But we need also the help of women who are not nuns. They may be Tertiaries, and under strict direction, but without the habit, and free as to hours, going two and two. We ought to be able to do this in London as well as in China.

The work of the Salvation Army, with all its faults, is too real to be any longer disregarded and ascribed to the devil. We are bound not to be outdone in self-sacrifice and in love of souls.

At a meeting in the United States it is said "that the mention of Jesus Christ was received with applause, and the mention of the Church with hisses." This is a terrible sentence. A doom of death to the human element of the Christian Church, but it showed a belief and love for Christ Himself. So long as this survives we can appeal to it.

I have long thought with fear that the visible Church is now as Jerusalem was in the time of Isaias, and when Titus was round the walls. The Divine Spirit reigns over the *Ecclesia docens et regens*, but the human spirit reigns over the Christian society. If this were not so London could never be as it is at this day. And how to deal with it? Certainly not with the pieties of our Upper Ten thousand, nor with the devotion of the *Faubourg St. Germain*. They are good in their place, and the Church must keep its garden in all the order, beauty, and perfume of flower and fruit. The fervour of its heart and head keeps the central light and fire by which the whole body is quickened and sustained in its energies. Therefore we must have our pieties and fashions in devotion. But the world is dying *positus in maligno*, and we must go into it through fire.

I fully see that we cannot relax the parish work of our priests and nuns. Therefore we must have missionary priests and nuns separate from all parish work, as if they had no faculties *ad intra*.

Our chief difficulty would be want of money, at least at first. Our Lord would not forsake us, nor the poor, nor those who would be roused and moved to help.

Moreover the nuns at least ought to give alms in all forms of temporal help. If priests give there is the danger of interested motives. It would be less with nuns; but hypocrisy must always exist till the regeneration of all things, and we must not cease from what is lawful and good, because it is abused by hypocrites.

Law of Liberty. Expiation

There can be no doubt that the "Tudor settlement in religion" is gone. It has departed from its intellectual type, and is now without outline or theology. It has no hold on the intellect of the people. It is unintelligible to them and in perpetual flux. Not so the Catholic Faith. But I do not believe that the English people will be won back through the intellect. Their will has been lost by the sins and miseries of the past. But their will is already changing and may be won by finding sympathy and care in the bishops and priests of the Church, that is to say by the law and power of the Incarnation, human love, care, and brotherhood drawing the human will to the Divine presence. There is no other way to open the ear, the intellect, and the soul of man. And we are happily as independent and detached from the world, from its titles, wealth,

classes, and privileges as the Church of the Apostles. Woe to the man that entangles the Church with governments and politics. And woe to the bishop who is of any party or prejudice within the Church. He ought to be above them all. Being in the state of perfection, he ought to be both human and Christian: human in all sympathy with the creatures of God, from the sorrows of man to the sufferings of the lower animal world; Christian in the charity of God and man, to friends and to enemies, in tenderness of heart, self-sacrifice, humility, and patience.

Sin, sorrow, and suffering, not only in the unity of the Church but out of it, ought to command his sympathy and service.

The charities of London are manifold, and without number, and any man holding the office ought, subject only to Faith, to sympathise with all, and so far as possible to share in them, if not by alms at least by encouragement. Till now what have we done? We have left them all to those who are out of unity.

The conclusion of all I have written, I believe to be this—"that whosoever represents the Catholic Church in England is bound to aim at the highest standard in all things." "All things are lawful to me, but all things are not expedient," nor are they "edifying." And though he is not bound by commandment, or precept, yet he is bound by counsel to the highest life of prudence, charity, and self-denial; to set up the highest standard and example of Priestly and Pastoral perfection. St. Gregory says "*summa dicere et ima facere*" is the ruin of a pastor. He certainly means also that *summa* "*dicere et mediocria facere*" is a miserable and dangerous downward path. A pastor is "*Alter Christus, Imago Jesu, Forma Gregis, Vicarius Spiritus Sancti.*" How can he aim at anything lower than the highest? Every priest is bound to charity, poverty, and obedience in the measure and spirit of the Apostles. Bishops are in the state of perfection already, and need no admonition beyond their own conscience. Surely for a bishop to aim at anything lower than the *Vita Apostolica* is not without the sin of sloth at least. It is interpreting the Divine Spirit by the human.

Why should a bishop be a diner-out?

Because it is lawful? expedient? edifying?

Why should he be a drinker of wine?

Who will be the better for his example of "Temperance"? Moderation?

Why should he encourage Theatricals in schools, convents, and colleges?

Why is he forbidden to go to theatres?

Why should he encourage, even by his silence, the doing works of charity on worldly and mixed motives?

What would he lose by taking the highest line in all these things?

What would he not gain of spiritual fervour? both in his own soul and in his flock?

Why should he encourage a lower or laxer way of sanctifying the Lord's Day?

Is he not surrounded by those who are relaxing and declining in spiritual life and practice?

Why should he go down with them because it is not unlawful?

Would not a raising hand and a cheering voice lead them upward?

What is the meaning of "With Christ I am nailed to the Cross?"

Who can say this? And if we cannot, are we aiming as St. Paul aimed? Do we not feel ourselves to be unreal when we say these words? What reparation or expiation are we making for the sins of men or for our own?

If there were no centre of gravity would not all things go to pieces? If there were not somewhere a will that inflexibly tends upward, and a voice that is always calling "Come up hither," would not the spirit and standard, the mind and the life of the Christian and the Catholic be always settling down through all the levels of things lawful to the border line where liberty passes into licence? And what a world of occasions, and what a thicket of temptations are upon that border line. The laity are lifted by the life of their Bishop. His self-denial, if it silently reproves them, does not provoke or anger them. They are secretly encouraged by it, and they commend it even if they do not imitate it. But a multitude sooner or later follows the example, and does likewise. But not if he comes down to their level. This disappoints them.

No man having care of souls can fail, when any thing of evil comes, to accuse himself of being positively or by omission directly or incidentally the cause, or the occasion. He will ask our Lord whether it be not for his rebuke and chastisement, and he will redouble his watchfulness over himself, and will go even to the contrary extreme of distance from the evil, and from the brink. He will desire to make reparation and expiation for his people. What was the whole life of our Lord but a continuous expiation? How can we be like him if we have not this motive?

Under the old Law of commandments the people are bound to pay tithes. Under the new Law of liberty people are free to give as they will, and the measure of their gift is the measure of their will. The will is regenerated in Baptism, and the law

of God is written on the heart, and the heart is united by love to the love of God, and the will is conformed by love to the Will of God, *pondus voluntatis amor;* and the will in all its liberty becomes a law to itself. What limit ought a bishop to put upon the use of his liberty in the service of his Divine Master? No limit short of the use that our Lord made of His liberty for us. He gave Himself for us, and we ought to give ourselves to Him. And if a priest is called to this use of His liberty: how much more a bishop as the head and leader of his priests?

Therefore "*summa dicere*" means "*summa semper velle, et summa facere.*"

I should not have written what is in this Journal if I had not been bid to do so. What I have written will perhaps seem to some to be extreme, but it seems to me that some one ought to be extreme, that is, to pursue Truth to the utmost, and to hold up in everything the highest standard. There will always be many, too many, and those good men, who will refine and palliate and enlarge the ways of liberty. Let one then, at least, bear witness for the higher and the best, the happiest and the safest way.

I have been led to this by the study of the New Testament, and by devotion to the Holy Ghost, to whom almost palpably I owe all things.

About the year 1841 or 1842, I published a Volume of sermons. A simple soul asked me why I had so seldom spoken of the Holy Ghost. I went over the book and found the question to be well founded. From that day I have never passed a day without acts of reparation to the Holy Ghost. I bought every book I could find on the work of the Holy Ghost and studied them. After five or six years I reached the last step to which reason alone could lead me, namely that the unanimous witness of the universal Church is the maximum of historical evidence for the revelation of Christianity. But historical evidence is only human, and human evidence is fallible after all. Then, and not before, I saw that the perpetual presence and office of the Holy Ghost, etc., raises the witness of the Church from a human to a Divine certainty. And to Him I submitted in the unity of the one Faith and Fold.

Since then the Holy Ghost has been the chief thought and devotion of my whole soul.

And I have found that in Him there is no relaxation, or diminution of commandments, precepts, or counsels. As he speaks in the New Testament, so I believe we ought to speak. We are debtors to the believing and to the unbelieving, to lift up before them the way of perfect santification. We are bound

to speak in His own words. The world is the world still. The way of salvation is narrow and straight. The preaching of the Apostles is our rule, and their standard of the Christian life is our measure. As they taught we must teach, as they directed souls, so, if we desire to save souls, even our own, we ought also to direct them without fear. I would rather by counsel and free choice make all men *tutiorists*, rather than have on my conscience the laxity of one soul. We have no right to constrain men, except in the Sacraments, to be *tutiorists*, but they have absolute freedom to become *tutiorists*, and we have perfect liberty to advise them so to use their liberty.

CHAPTER XXVIII

"A SLOWING INTO THE TERMINUS"

1888–1890

In the lives of men, who have borne all the day long, from the first to the eleventh hour, the heat and brunt of battle; who have never for a moment flinched from the fight; never stayed hand or brain in the service of the cause to which heart and soul were devoted unto the last, there is no more pathetic moment than when the veteran—be he priest or soldier or statesman—compelled by the weight of advancing years and growing infirmities, had to doff his armour and lay aside for ever his trusty sword. The joy of battle is over. His work is finished. He is almost hustled from off the living stage, whereon he had played all his life long so prominent and noble a part. He steps reluctantly back from the light of the public eye into the shadow of death. There is so much work yet to be done—unfinished work perchance yet to be completed. A haunting fear possesses his soul that none can carry on half so well the work he has had to lay aside.

This stepping aside is a trial and a test and a temptation: a trial of hearts, of the human side of a man's nature; a test of faith and of all that is spiritual and supernatural in the soul; a temptation to murmur and repine, even if with shut mouth, at the Divine Will.

This trying and threefold ordeal Cardinal Manning passed through when, without resigning his office, he gave up, some five or six years before his death, the public

duties he loved so well as Preacher and Teacher of the people. In this ultimate trial, especially painful to a nature like his, his vivid belief in the Supernatural stood him once more in good stead; for he passed through it with the resignation and firmness of a true Christian hero, I had almost said martyr.

To-day, his ancient fellow-worker in their early days, his lifelong friend, Mr. Gladstone, is passing through a like pathetic ordeal with the superadded pang of seeing—to make use of Cardinal Manning's words in regard to the trial he himself was spared—"The work of so many years changed and checked."

The interval between life and death, the *tempus clausum*, as Cardinal Manning called it, is in most men's lives a closed book; the last page turned down; the last word spoken. Not so in Cardinal Manning's life. To him, in his mental activity, the interval between life and death was no *tempus clausum*. The book was open still. New chapters were written, perhaps amongst the most interesting, certainly the most pathetic, in his life.

It is curious to note with what hopefulness at times Cardinal Manning clung to life. He seemed to find hope and comfort in recalling and recording the fact that "Newman is in his eighty-ninth year, my sister in her eighty-eighth,[1] I am in my eighty-first." But then follows, "Eighty years is a life: and that over: what remains may be treated as . . . a time of rest . . . and of preparation for the end. But to Cardinal Manning, even in his eighty-first year, work was rest.

"My active life is over; but much may still be done by word and by writing." And much was done "in this time of rest," of exceeding great interest, as I have already shown in those retrospects and reviews of his past life, and contrasts between the work of other men's lives and his own.

But now with slow and reluctant step he is approaching the end; "a slowing," as he called it, "into the terminus." In reverence, let me now record the last words of the

[1] His sister, Mrs. Austen, survived Cardinal Manning, and died at the close of 1893 in her ninety-third year.

faithful son and servant of God who—though he himself did not dare say so, we may—"had fought the good fight," written not long before his passing away into his Eternal rest and reward.

23*rd September* 1888.—For a whole year I have not written a line in this book, and yet the last months have not been unmarked. On 15th July I was eighty, and I feel as if life were over. I have no craving, or wish, or intention, or unfulfilled desire. The time is too short to begin anything new. Any day I may go, and in a moment. I have but one desire and prayer, that is to make a good end. After so long and full a life, I hope I shall not break the pitcher at the fountain. I dare not say *bonum certamen*, etc., and yet my life has been a conflict, and a career for the faith, and I hope I have kept it inviolate. Even in the days before the flood I was always in conflict about Erastianism, Cathedrals, Education, Royal Supremacy, and the like; and in the last thirty-seven years, about the Catholic Faith, and Church, the Temporal Power, the doctrinal authority, and the Infallibility of the Holy See; and now the Christian education of England. I hope I may say *fidem servavi*. I do not remember that I have compromised the Truth, or deserted it by silence, or struck a low note.

18*th October*.—About the time of the last entry I caught cold at the opening of the college at Tooting, and have been ill ever since. For twelve days I have not said Mass. I could not stand through it, and the getting up in the morning is a long effort. The sudden and sharp cold of the first days of this month took hold of me, and I fell ill.

σμικρὰ παλαιὰ σώματ' εὐνάζει ῥοπή,

how slight a push will send an old man over into sleep!

I have ceased all out-door work, and have not been out of the house. It is a *tempus clausum*, a slowing into the terminus And I feel very passive and content. Sometimes I think that I could be more at rest if I were out of all responsibility. At others I feel that I should be greatly tried to see the work of so many years changed and checked. So long, therefore, as I can mentally do the work of the diocese and of the Church, I believe I ought to stay. And I hope I may die on the field and in harness. But all this will settle itself, or rather our Lord will settle it for me.

27*th October*.—I have had a week of suffering; three days and three nights sitting up with asthma. Then a fourth day

and night slightly easier, and the last two still more relieved, but not free from a feeling of breathing through gauze. If this is merely a bad cold and bronchitis I do not care for it; but if it is asthma, I pray God to spare me in the end of my life the sufferings I had in the beginning. When I have asthma on me I can do nothing. It would be the close of all work. And my task would be done. If so I am well content. But I had hoped to speak once more for the Christian education of England. Nevertheless what has been granted to me is enough, and I crave for nothing more.

31*st December* 1888.—The last night of the year 1888. I feel that I may be called at any moment. So many men are well to-day, and gone in a month or a week, that I count upon nothing but the day. If I live to April 30, I shall enter the twenty-fifth year of my Episcopate. I hope I have not hindered the work of the Church or of this diocese.

2*nd March*.—I do not venture to think how long my life may linger on. Newman is in his eighty-ninth year, my sister in her eighty-eighth, I am in my eighty-first. But it is so small a thing that would put life out. A chill would do it, and a chill may come at any moment. The cold of to-day would do it if I were forced to go out.

Eighty years is a life, and that over what remains may be treated as a σαββατισμός—a time of rest, retrospect, review to correct errors and of preparation for the end. It is an interval between life and death. My active life is over, but much may still be done by word and by writing.

If it be the will of my good Master, I should hope not to outlive my faculties. But He will take care, and His care will be the best.

7*th April* 1889, *Passion Sunday*.—6th April in 1851 was Passion Sunday. On that day, before High Mass, I submitted to the Church, and heard Mass for the first time in its unity. Since then, London has been my home and place of work for eight and thirty years, that is in four periods:—(1) over three years in Rome; (2) about three years without a fixed place; (3) eight years at Bayswater; (4) twenty-four years as I am now. I am thankful that I have only been in two places during fifty-five years, from 1833 to 1889, Lavington and London. Moving to and fro seems to me to leave little behind it. I hope that a lasting work has been left at least in London. I have not lived in society, but among my priests, and for my people; open on all days and at all hours when they needed me or liked to come to me. If I had gone out into society I could have done little. My time would have been wasted. My

evenings lost. I should have pleased a few and offended many. A Society bishop, like a Society paper, is the centre of gossip and in perpetual risk of scandal. I have no doubt that I have been unpopular, and have disappointed many, but I believe they would have trusted me less, and in their troubles would not come to me as they do now. And I feel sure that my priests would have felt that I was less to them, and my poor would have thought me less their friend and pastor. My only contacts with the world have been public and for work, and especially for the poor and the people. Looking back I am conscious how little I have done, partly from want of courage, partly from over-caution. And yet caution is not cowardice. For the highly sensitive state of England and of London, one step too fast is worse than ten steps too slow, and somehow the steady and peaceful gain and growth of the Catholic Church in the last twenty-four years—for I am speaking only of my reckoning—has been very sensible.

9th November 1890.—It is more than six months since I wrote in this book. The chief reason is that I have been writing, at the bidding of the Bishop of Salford, in another MS. book for my successors.

But there is one thought, I may say fact, that has come before me, and I wish to note it. I remember how often I have said that my chief sacrifice in becoming Catholic was "that I ceased to work for the people of England, and had thenceforward to work for the Irish occupation in England."

Strangely all this is reversed. If I had not become Catholic I could never have worked for the people of England, as in the last year they think I have worked for them.

Anglicanism would have fettered me. The liberty of Truth and of the Church has lifted me above all dependence or limitations. This seems like the latter end of Job, greater than the beginning. I hope it is not the condemnation when all men speak well of me.

These are the last words, the last message and legacy left to us—to his own children in the household of the Faith; to the people at large, the poor and oppressed, whom in life he loved to serve and succour—by Cardinal Manning, so venerated and beloved of men. All his Diaries and Journals and Note-books are closed for ever. If the echo of his voice be retained a prisoner to-day in the phonograph, his last word was written on November the ninth, 1890, in the final page of his last Journal.

CHAPTER XXIX

DEATH OF CARDINAL MANNING

1892

DEATH did not come to Cardinal Manning like a thief in the night, but approached with slow step in the light of day. For two years or more, as Cardinal Manning has recorded in his last Journal, its warning voice fell upon his listening ear with no uncertain sound. Death, arrested by Divine compassion, hesitated long, with hand upon the latchet, at the threshold of Cardinal Manning's life. They of his own household, buoyed up by loving hope, did not recognise so readily as those who saw him at rarer intervals the fatal effects of wear and waste on the vital energies of the body, though happily Cardinal Manning's intellectual vigour and vision survived unto the end unbroken and unclouded.

No better illustration can be offered of his mental energy and strength of will than the fact that Cardinal Manning never for a day up to the end of his life relaxed his hold on the government of his diocese. No step was taken in the ordinary routine of ecclesiastical business without his express sanction, either by letter or word of mouth. Even his Vicar-General, a most able and experienced administrator, never ventured to act on his own initiative even in matters of detail. Every week he attended regularly at Archbishop's House, Westminster, to report on diocesan business and to receive detailed instructions. Even the infirmities of age and illness, which during the last five or six years of his life confined him to all practical intents and purposes to the house, made no perceptible difference to the clergy of the

diocese. It was not Cardinal Manning's practice, early or late, to hold Visitations at the various churches or missions, and by such means to put himself into personal contact with the clergy.[1] Even the Visitation of convents, a practice prescribed by the Council of Trent, was not observed. Visitations, indeed, were occasionally held by deputies appointed by the Cardinal Archbishop. In truth, it was impossible for him to attend to such administrative work. His time was too fully occupied. He had not an hour in the day, or a day in the month to spare from the multifarious labours devoted to the public defence of the Church; to the support of the Papacy and its rights, temporal and spiritual; to the promotion of such imperative Catholic interests as the founding of schools for the poor; the rescuing of Catholic children from workhouse and reformatory schools; and last, but not least, to the crusade against intemperance, the besetting sin at that time of too many of his spiritual children. The work of an ecclesiastical statesman, the public championship of the Catholic Cause at home and abroad is incompatible with the administrative work of a bishop. Cardinal Manning from the beginning made up his mind not to risk failure by attempting the impossible. He wisely economised time for his public labours by abridging or foregoing the work of personal supervision of the diocese. Such a sacrifice of Episcopal administration was not a matter of choice, but imposed upon him by the necessity of things. It was not in his nature to share his responsibility with a Coadjutor empowered to carry on the purely administrative work of the diocese. Even when physically unable to leave the house during the latter years of his life, he would not abate by an iota his Episcopal rights or responsibilities by sharing them with a Coadjutor.

To economise time for the part he took in public affairs: in corresponding with leading politicians or statesmen; in attending public meetings or private conferences; or in

[1] As Archdeacon of Chichester, Manning was so indefatigible in the work of Visitation, that in a little more than three years he had visited every parish in his rural Archdeaconry, and made the personal acquaintance of two hundred and fifty clergymen.

writing articles in the Magazines on educational or social subjects, Cardinal Manning governed the diocese not by the slower process of Visitations; not by the aid and advice of his chapter, but by secretaries and by letters. There was, however, no relaxation in discipline. Letters dictated by the Cardinal Archbishop from his sick-room were effective instruments in rebuking remissness, or in stimulating energy, or in putting searching questions as to the progress of any special work which at the time he had most at heart, or as to the hindrances alleged to be thrown in its way, in certain missions or by certain priests. Weekly reports from various sources were sent in to Archbishop's House. Vigilant volunteers ventured even to criticise working priests or their methods. Hence it came to pass that priests were occasionally summoned on a Monday morning by a note requesting their attendance to answer alleged complaints, for the most part unfounded or of a trivial character. To be "talked to" by the Cardinal Archbishop was not a pleasant ordeal, especially if the delinquent defended or excused himself. On the other hand, did he throw himself on the Cardinal's clemency without extenuating an offence of a character, however trivial in itself, the episcopal blessing, accompanied by kindly words, was bestowed on the humble and obedient priest.

Cardinal Manning made up for the absence of Episcopal visitation by the readiness which he showed in preaching on Sundays at distant missions or in the poorest districts. He often preached two or three times of a Sunday. The priest, especially of a poor mission, was deeply grateful for such a kindness. For even in his old age, when his voice was too feeble to be heard at a distance, the presence of Cardinal Manning alone sufficed to fill the church of a Sunday afternoon as no other preacher could. Non-Catholics in crowds came to see the venerable Cardinal on such rare occasions. All were delighted with his kindness and affability. He was ready to receive everyone, Catholics and non-Catholics alike, in the sacristy or in the priest's room.

Cardinal Manning, however, was known, at least by sight, to every priest, secular and regular, in the diocese. For at

the Annual Diocesan Synod held at the Pro-Cathedral, after High Mass and the dismissal of the congregation, the Cardinal Archbishop was wont to speak to his beloved sons in the kindest and most Fatherly terms; praising their zeal and religious fervour; encouraging them in their work; and giving friendly counsel; whilst acknowledging, on the other hand, the deep sense of gratitude he owed to them for their personal kindness and for their loyal co-operation with their Bishop. Their strength, working together in unity, he would say, supplied the weakness of him who was set to rule over them; and their self-sacrificing labours in the cause of God, of the Church, and of the poor, set an example and gave an encouragement to their Bishop, whose daily prayer was that God in His mercy might make him a less unworthy father of such faithful and zealous sons. After the Episcopal benediction the priests of the diocese went their way, and the majority of them never saw their Archbishop again for another year.

It is true they were invited to attend the Reception held by Cardinal Manning at Archbishop's House on the Tuesday in Low Week, on the occasion of the Annual Meeting of the Bishops. These Receptions, however, as a rule were not largely attended by the clergy. And for those who did attend, there was no time or opportunity for conversation with the Cardinal; they bent the knee, kissed his hand, and passed on. As to private visits to Archbishop's House, it never entered into the head of an ordinary priest to intrude upon the presence of Cardinal Manning unless for a special reason, or on a matter of business connected with his mission or school.

But the appointed time is at hand: the day is come when he no more might receive his priests; no more hold Receptions or Synods.

The last hour of Cardinal Manning's life came at the end almost like a surprise. "He had been," as he said of himself, "so long ailing yet never failing," that it was not only hoped, but expected by his friends that he would be spared a while longer to his diocese, to his people, to England. The tenacity of his will, his great hopefulness and

love of life were in his favour. He had expressed a belief that what turned out to be his last illness was merely one of his usual colds in winter. His hopeful clinging to life up to the very last is illustrated by the last words he spoke to his friend and doctor, Sir Andrew Clark. "Is there any use in your coming to-morrow?" "Certainly there is use," was the reply. "Then mind you come, Sir Andrew, at nine to-morrow." "To-morrow" never came to Cardinal Manning.

On 13th January 1892, the Vicar-General, Canon Gilbert, summoned the Chapter of Westminster to assemble at Archbishop House to witness the Profession of Faith of Cardinal Manning, Archbishop of Westminster. On the morning of the 13th of January 1892 the Cardinal Archbishop had received the last Sacraments. The Canons who were in London attended without delay, and assembled around the dying Cardinal. He then made his solemn Profession of Faith. The Bishop of Salford, Dr. Vaughan, now Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, who attended the ceremonial, held the *Pontificale* before Cardinal Manning; and the Bishop of Amycla, Dr. Weathers, vested in his episcopal robes, bore the wax-taper. The Provost, Mgr. Gilbert, read aloud the Profession of Faith on his knees, surrounded by Canons Macmullen, Johnson, Purcell, Barry, and Keens. Cardinal Manning was vested in rochet and mozetta, and wore his red biretta. At the conclusion of the ceremonial, about 5.30, the Canons approached singly, kissed his cheek and received his blessing. Cardinal Manning was fatigued and could scarcely speak from excessive weakness. After the Chapter had departed he expressed to Canon Johnson his extreme satisfaction at having been able to fulfil all the Rites prescribed by the Church.

During the night the dying Cardinal was tended with loving care and watchfulness by Bishop Vaughan, Canon Johnson, and by Dr. Gasquet, husband of his beloved niece, Mary, daughter of Charles Manning. Cardinal Manning manifested on various occasions in the night his perfect resignation to the Divine will, and his implicit trust in the love and mercy of God. The Pope had bestowed upon his

faithful son his Apostolic blessing. The last absolution had been pronounced. In the early grey of the morning, Bishop Vaughan left the room of the dying Cardinal to offer up mass for him in his private chapel. Before the mass was finished all was over, and the soul of Cardinal Manning had passed away from earth. His faithful and attached friend, Canon Johnson, closed the Cardinal's eyes.

On the day of Cardinal Manning's death, died also the Duke of Clarence, the eldest son of the Prince and Princess of Wales, and the grandson of the Queen. There was a strange and touching contrast between the death of the young Prince in the prime and promise of life, full of hope and anticipation of joys to come, and the death of the venerable Prelate, full of years and of honours, who had lived out his life to the end; had finished his work; had spent his strength in labouring, heart and soul, for the honour and glory of God, and for the welfare and happiness of his fellow-men. The coincidence of his death with the death of the young Prince would have been gratifying to Cardinal Manning, as linking in a subtle way the sorrow and reverence manifested towards himself by the people of England with the universal sorrow and sympathy felt by the nation at the death of the Prince, who was the hope and pride of the Queen and the Royal Family.

As was beseeming, Canon Gilbert officially announced the death of Cardinal Manning in the following telegraphic message to Her Majesty the Queen:—

Message from the Vicar-Capitular and Chapter of the Archdiocese of Westminster to Her Majesty the Queen.

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE, WESTMINSTER,
16*th January* 1892.

At the first meeting of the Chapter of Westminster, after the death of their beloved Cardinal Archbishop, the Vicar-Capitular, Right Rev. Mgr. Gilbert, who was elected this morning, and the Canons on their own part and on the part of the Clergy and Faithful, desire to express to Her Majesty the Queen their true sympathy and sorrow for Her Majesty's bereavement on the death of the Duke of Clarence and Avon-

dale. In doing so they cannot refrain from mentioning that shortly before his end, their lamented Cardinal Archbishop expressed his own deep sympathy with the Royal Family on hearing of the dangerous illness of His Royal Highness the Duke of Clarence and Avondale. On learning subsequently that there was some improvement in His Royal Highness, the Cardinal said earnestly, "Thank God."

Answer of Her Majesty the Queen to the Right Rev. Mgr. Gilbert,
22 Finsbury Circus.

The Queen is very grateful for the kind message of sympathy transmitted by your Chapter, and commands me to convey to you her sincere condolence on the death of Cardinal Manning, whose death Her Majesty deeply deplores.

HENRY PONSONBY.

In reply to a similar message of condolence sent to the Prince and Princess of Wales on the death of the Duke of Clarence by the Vicar-Capitular and Chapter, His Royal Highness wrote as follows:—

The Prince and Princess of Wales deeply appreciate, and are very grateful for, the warm sympathy expressed by the Chapter of the Archdiocese of Westminster on their behalf and on behalf of the clergy of the Diocese. I had the pleasure of a close acquaintance with Cardinal Manning, and found him always a most loyal and sturdy friend and supporter of the Royal Family. I greatly regret His Eminence's loss, and am deeply touched by the kind words he used about my dear son.

ALBERT EDWARD.

Right Rev. Monsignor Gilbert,
Archbishop's House, Westminster.

The deep and universal sorrow manifested at his death shows in what high esteem, in what reverence, Cardinal Manning was held by his clergy. They were all proud of him; proud of the great work he had done in the cause of Religion, of the Church, of the Poor. They were proud of the high position which he held as a champion of the cause of labour, as a friend of the working-classes, as the advocate of Social reforms. The priests of London, themselves the most hard-working and self-denying of men,

appreciated to the full the unresting energy and indefatigable labours of their Archbishop. He never spared himself; never complained of over-work—such a complaint which might seem natural to most men never for a moment crossed his mind—for work to him was the delight of life. The high esteem in which Cardinal Manning was held by his fellow-countrymen for his public work; for his success in life; for his noble mind and character, was shared to the full by his clergy. But their esteem and reverence rested on still higher grounds—on his personal holiness, on his Supernatural faith, on his love of God and of souls. When Cardinal Manning died it was felt by his priests that a great light had passed from their midst; that a shining example, which perhaps unconsciously had been for years a guide to their soul, a monition to their will, a restraint to their feet, was lost to them for ever. A living presence, it will not readily be denied even by the most spiritual-minded, is something nearer, more potent in its action, more binding in its influence, than the example of the greatest of saints who have passed from our midst. The heart of man, be he priest or no, is very human; the soul, still confined in its prison-house, is apt to lean on things human, on human aids for its spiritual guidance. It loves to listen to the living voice; to watch the hand that guides; see the light of the inspiring eye.

On the morrow of Cardinal Manning's death, how many of his loving priests did not in their bereavement share the sad and touching sorrow expressed in Tennyson's lines—

> O for the touch of a vanished hand,
> And the sound of a voice that is still!

But change, alas, is the order of all things human. Is it not wrong, indeed unfilial, to regret the inevitable law of our nature? That no man is indispensable is a wise provision of Providence. Even the influence of Cardinal Manning's actual presence in our midst must needs, in the nature of things in a few years, more or less, fade out of the memory of men. But his zeal for religion, his love of souls, his holy life, will remain, who shall doubt? for many

a generation as an example and an encouragement to the priests of the Diocese of Westminster.

The Catholic laity of England in every rank of life mourned in the death of Cardinal Manning the loss of a trusted leader, who, as Archbishop of Westminster, had stood for three-and-twenty eventful years in the forefront in defence of the Catholic Cause. Every one recognised in him the union of high character and lofty ideals combined with rare ability and a masterful will. He made himself a power in the land. He changed in a sense, and to a certain extent, the drift and current of Catholic thought and action. If, in regard to certain questions of ecclesiastical policy, he was not at one with the majority of the educated laity, there was no open conflict. At most his views—and Cardinal Manning's views were always strong, sometimes extreme—were met with passive resistance. Take as an illustration his policy in regard to University Education. For a whole generation he opposed the frequentation by Catholics of Oxford and Cambridge, although he was unable to provide for them, what he had admitted was a necessary alternative, a University of their own.

In truth, Cardinal Manning was not the leader of the educated Catholic laity, but their master. He did not attempt to mould and shape their views, but succeeded by his masterful will, and the influence which he was enabled to exercise, not only over his fellow-bishops but with the ecclesiastical authorities in Rome, in imposing his policy on the Catholic community in England. No sooner, however, was his hand withdrawn from the control and direction of Catholic affairs than the natural result followed—his too autocratic policy was revoked. Listening to the counsels of the Bishops, and the petitions and arguments, based on experience and practical knowledge of Catholic laymen interested in the question of higher studies, the Holy See has now withdrawn the prohibition obtained by Manning against Catholics attending the national Universities. No one, indeed, had ever imputed to Cardinal Manning any fault other than an error of judgment. Even they who were most aggrieved by his line of action were fully per-

suaded that he was actuated by an implicit belief in the wisdom of the course he pursued and enforced. No higher testimony can be adduced to the loyalty of the Catholic laity, to their respect and reverence for his high character and Episcopal authority than that they submitted for so long a period, and almost without a murmur, to Cardinal Manning's withholding from them the advantages of University education.

So much as was necessary to be said in explanation of the relations which subsisted between Cardinal Manning and the educated laity in regard to certain questions of ecclesiastical policy has been said, and no more. It would have been absurd to ignore such divergences on matters of opinion. In such a life as that of Cardinal Manning there is no call, no temptation even to attempt such an absurdity as an idealised picture. The record of the simple truth is the only tribute worthy of a character so high and noble.

In all the great works of his long and fruitful life, Cardinal Manning was cordially supported by the laity. They stood manfully by his side, they responded with munificence to every appeal, they lost no opportunity of publicly manifesting their veneration and gratitude; and when at last he was taken away from them they were second to none in genuine and heartfelt sorrow.

To the poor of his own flock, to the distressed, to the mass of the working-classes, the death of Cardinal Manning was almost a personal loss. To the hearts of multitudes it seemed as if they had lost in him a friend, a father. His sympathy with distress, suffering, oppression, had drawn to him, during the latter years of his life, the hearts of the working-people of London. They looked up to him as a friend, as a counsellor. His name was a household word in their mouth. There was not another man in England who, in an equal degree, or in anything approaching it, possessed their confidence. The Roman Cardinal, not because he was a priest and cardinal, but on account of the active interest he manifested on every occasion, in public and in private, in the cause of Labour was venerated by vast multi-

tudes of the people as the best and truest friend of the poor and of the working-classes.

Cardinal Manning's heart was profoundly touched by the gratitude of those whom he had served so long and loved so well. Perhaps there may be some truth in the words spoken by Mr. Sydney Buxton on the morrow of Cardinal Manning's death—"His memory would live, perhaps, not so much in the minds of the wealthy few as in the hearts of the toiling masses."

Second only to the sorrow of heart felt by his few surviving relatives, and by the members of his own household, was the sorrow and sense of irreparable bereavement which fell upon the souls of his spiritual children at the death of Cardinal Manning, their friend, counsellor, and Spiritual Director. To a large number of his children in religion for half their lifetime he had been a guide, friend, and teacher. He had, by the grace of God, brought perhaps most of them out of the darkness of error, and from the ways of confusion into the light of Divine truth and into the paths of peace. To not a few he had been a Spiritual Director all their conscious lifetime. He was so even in the days when he himself and his spiritual children were still members of the Anglican Communion until under his guidance they reached, by the grace of God, the haven of the Catholic Church. As the years went on his spiritual children, in the world or in the cloister, increased and multiplied. To the end of his life many still came to him for guidance and direction. All knew that they might look to him for counsel or consolation; or, if he was not always able to receive them personally, find in his spiritual letters or notes encouragement or food for meditation.

Not only in the concerns of conscience or religious life, but in worldly troubles, domestic difficulties, sorrows of life, many opened their troubled hearts to Cardinal Manning, and ever found in him a sympathetic friend, a wise and experienced counsellor. It can be more easily conceived than described what an irreparable loss to them was the death of their friend and Spiritual Father. The place of refuge for souls in difficulty or doubt, for troubled hearts, was theirs no

more; the house of consolation, to which his spiritual children had repaired for half a lifetime or more, was now for ever closed. They, and his beloved children, the sons of St. Charles, shared a common sorrow and a common loss, for they alike were left orphans by the death of their Spiritual Father.

The large Reception Rooms in Archbishop's House, Westminster, were converted into a chapel for the lying-in-state of the mortal remains of Cardinal Manning. Spontaneous exhibition of popular feeling was never manifested in so marked a manner as by the vast assemblages which gathered round Archbishop's House and filled the street from end to end. In long files dense masses of people moved slowly and patiently down the street awaiting in regular order their turn for admission into the presence of the mortal remains of the venerated and beloved Cardinal: all day long from morning to night—people of every rank and condition of life, private friends, public admirers, and working-men, Catholic and non-Catholic alike, and the poor, ill-clad, half-fed, and the women often with children in their arms—all alike eager to offer their last homage of veneration, affection, and gratitude. For three days masses of the people of London passed through the open portals, and in single file passed through the chapel before the body of the Cardinal lying-in-state. No one was permitted to stop or kneel. It was a solemn and pathetic sight this slow passing by, one by one, of vast masses of the people of London, sons of toil, as the Cardinal used to call them; or the children of the household of Faith; or the poor whom in life he had always loved. As they passed away with reluctant feet and a last lingering look at the well-remembered face, it needed no words to show with what veneration, with what love and gratitude, they mourned the loss of their friend, benefactor, father.

The demeanour of the people in the street as they passed to and fro or lingered near the house which they had just left bore witness to the genuineness and depth of the sorrow felt at the death of the revered and beloved Cardinal. The dense crowds which attended the removal of Cardinal

Manning's body from Archbishop's House, Westminster, to the Oratory on the night previous to the Funeral, bore a singular testimony to the love and veneration in which he was held by the vast masses of the people. In the Oratory itself the emotion felt by the crowds who filled the church—for most of them it was the last farewell to the beloved Cardinal—was touching in the extreme.

The Funeral of Henry Edward Manning, Archbishop of Westminster, Cardinal Priest of the Holy Roman Church, on Thursday, 21st January 1892, was the occasion of a public manifestation of feeling on the part of the people of London, unique in its character and rarely equalled. The funeral of the Duke of Wellington in 1851, and of Cardinal Wiseman in 1865, can alone bear comparison to the public demonstration exhibited on the occasion of that of Cardinal Manning.

The solemn Requiem Mass at the Oratory bore striking witness to the growth and recognition of the Catholic Church in England since the death of Cardinal Wiseman in the number of bishops, priests, and monks who attended the ceremony, and in the character of the congregation, which numbered among them a representative of the Prince of Wales.[1] There were sixteen bishops present, including Archbishop Walsh of Dublin, the Archbishop of Cashel, and the Bishop of Ossory. The Requiem Mass was sung by the late Dr. Clifford, Bishop of Clifton; the funeral sermon, preached by Dr. Hedley, Bishop of Newport and Menevia, from the text: "And he spoke to the man who was clothed with linen, and said, go in between the wheels that are under the Cherubim, and fill thy hands with the coals of fire that are between the Cherubim, and pour them out upon the city," was not only a just and noble tribute to the life and work of Cardinal Manning, but gave an eloquent expression to the thoughts of sorrow and of love that filled the hearts of men. Impressive in their severe simplicity were the

[1] As the male representative of Cardinal Manning's family, the eldest son of the Rev. F. H. Murray, Rector of Chiselhurst, who married Cardinal Manning's niece, the daughter of his eldest sister, Mrs. John Anderdon and Mr. John Anderdon, attended the Funeral Service.

solemn Rites within the church—the chanting in unison of hundreds of priests, the presence of friars of various Orders, "black, white, and grey," reviving the memories and associations of the days of old: the last "absolutions" of the five Bishops in succession, incensing and sprinkling with holy Water the coffin, and above all the indescribable sensation produced by the suppressed emotion of the kneeling crowds as the body of Cardinal Manning was borne out of the church and placed in the Funeral Car, made up a function which, by its solemn devotion and sublime effect, touched the hearts and appealed to the imagination of men. Yet the inner meaning of Cardinal Manning's death was not fully realised until it was brought out and emphasised by the new elements introduced by the procession through the streets, crowded all along the route by masses of the people of London. It was a spontaneous manifestation of public feeling, a homage of honour and reverence paid to Cardinal Manning, not as priest or Cardinal, but as a man of high character and of exalted ideals, who had lived a good and noble life and laboured with singular devotion for the promotion of the public good and in the cause of suffering humanity. The general verdict pronounced by the people of England on that day was summed up in the words, uttered on every side: "Cardinal Manning was a good and a great man."

The philanthropic side of Cardinal Manning's character was attested by the prominent part taken in the Funeral Procession by public Societies and Unions, with their flags and banners. Besides the League of the Cross, following the Funeral Car were the National League, United Kingdom Alliance, Trades Unions of London, Dockers' Societies, Amalgamated Society of Stevedores, Federation of Trades and Labour Unions, Independent Order of Good Templars, Universal Mercy Band Movement.

This organised demonstration, bearing public testimony to the great philanthropic and benevolent works in which Cardinal Manning had borne so prominent a part, shrank, however, into insignificance in comparison with the spontaneous manifestation of respect and reverence shown by the vast

concourse of people lining the streets through which the Funeral Procession passed. London offered an unique spectacle on that memorable occasion. No Funeral in our day was witnessed by such vast masses of people. The Procession passed through more than four miles of streets, rendered at certain points almost impassable by the dense crowds. All England was represented, and was of one mind in doing honour to Cardinal Manning.

The final Rites of the funeral service at the grave were performed by the Bishop of Birmingham, the successor to Dr. Ullathorne, who had predeceased the Cardinal. In the dim twilight of a January day, the tapers making darkness visible, the plaintive chanting of the *Miserere*, faintly heard amid the moans, ejaculations, and prayers of the dense dark masses which filled the Catholic cemetery at Kensal Green, all that was mortal in Cardinal Manning, "earth to earth," was reverently lowered into the silent grave. The second great English Cardinal since the Reformation was laid in his last earthly resting-place by the side of his illustrious predecessor, Cardinal Wiseman.

A holy, just, and noble life in its measure and degree, like the blood of martyrs, is the seed of Christians. Hence, beyond and above natural sadness and sorrow attaching to it, the death of Cardinal Manning filled with Supernatural gladness the souls of men whose spiritual eye saw like a revelation from Heaven a vision of things to be—the conversion of sinners, the purification of society, the healing of the breach between England and the Holy See, caused by the sins of our fathers, perpetuated by our own. And in this vision their spiritual eye seemed to see, in recognition or reward of their faith, a sign as it were in the Heavens—a glory and a light shining over the grave of Cardinal Manning, like unto the halo that crowned the head of St. John of Nepomuck, whose body, cast into the river by the enemies of God, floated on the surface of the waters beneath the walls of the city of Prague. Be this pious fancy or figment —if it ever existed—what it may, interpreted it means what verily may be predicated of Cardinal Manning: "Dead, he yet speaketh."

All England paid not only a tribute of respect on the day of his Funeral, but grieved, it is not too much to say, almost with one heart at the passing-away of Cardinal Manning. His fellow-countrymen recognised with one accord that England had lost in him one of the greatest and noblest of its sons. The world was all the poorer by the death of a large-hearted philanthropist, a friend of the oppressed, a father of the poor. The Church, too, and not in England only, was all the poorer by the loss of one of her most faithful sons and servants; an unflinching champion of her rights, temporal and spiritual; a holy and ascetic prelate, inspired in word and deed by faith, spiritual fervour, and the love for souls. English life, already dull enough, was all the duller by the passing-away from the stage which he had so long and so gracefully filled of a unique and picturesque personality.

The chain of old associations, linking the beginning of the century with its end, the early beginnings of the Catholic Revival in England with the glorious results witnessed to-day all over the land, was broken by the death of Cardinal Manning. He was almost the last survival, at any rate with perhaps one exception the most distinguished of his generation. If not the last, he was the most illustrious survivor of that noble cohort of Oxford men, with whom for a while he was more or less associated, who followed John Henry Newman into the Church. One by one they had almost all passed away, and Cardinal Manning, though not one of them, except as a witness standing apart from the movement, still remained. Now he, too, is gone. The voice of the witness is for ever stilled. What events in the story of his long and unresting life: what turbulent struggles: what hard-fought victories were not closed: what memories, traditions, affections, old sorrows of heart were not for ever quenched in the death of Cardinal Manning.

On the final page of the *Life of Cardinal Manning*, I may perhaps, as a last homage to his memory, be permitted to inscribe the tribute of honour and praise dedicated to St. Thomas à Becket, the most heroic of England's saints and martyrs. The words recited in the Antiphon of the Old

Sarum Rite in commemoration of St. Thomas of Canterbury may, perhaps, with due limitations, not unfittingly be applied to his successor, Cardinal Manning, Archbishop of Westminster :—

Felix locus, felix Ecclesia
Ubi vivit Thomæ Memoria.

INDEX

Academy of Letters in London, the, i. 690 ; ii. 384
A lay, in Rome, ii. 378
Accademia Ecclesiastica, the, in Rome, ii. 10
Acton, Sir John (Lord Acton), ii. 384, 434, 490
Aix la Chapelle in 1847, i. 352
Alexander, Bishop, ii. 702
Allies, T. W., his work in the Church, i. 676 ; correspondence with Manning, 559, 699
Ambition, the danger of, i. 38
Ambrosoli, Signor, i. 397
American Quarterly Review, the, ii. 657
Anderdon, John Lavercourt, i. 6 ; influence on and for Manning, 19, 20 ; relations with, 57 ; soubriquets, 76 ; correspondence (see Letters)
W. H., ii. 767 ; letter to Manning, 550
Anglican orders, i. 619
Services, attendance at, ii. 242
Antonelli, Cardinal, ii. 168
Apostles, the Society of the, i. 32
Apostolic succession, the, i. 113
Appellate Court, scheme for an, i. 534
Assissi, i. 404
Arch, Mr., ii. 641
Archdeacons and vicars-general, ii. 760
Athenæum Club, the, ii. 701
Augsburg Gazette, the, ii. 424
Austen, Colonel, i. 348, 358
Mrs. (Caroline Manning), i. x, xi ; 3, 77 ; ii. 797 ; correspondence with Manning (see Letters)
Aut Cæsar aut nullus, i. 28
Author, the, his outspokenness, ii. 236

Bagnall, Provost, correspondence with Manning, ii. 248
Bagshawe, Mgr., correspondence with Manning, ii. 202
Barff, Professor, ii. 497
Barge, Father, ii. 142
Baptism, the grace of, in England, ii. 691, 779
"Barilla," i. 37
Barrow, his historic doubts, i. 605
Barnabò, Cardinal, in the Errington Case, ii. 102, 106, 107 ; in the case of the Bishops, 117
Beaconsfield, Earl, relations with Manning, ii. 516 ; correspondence (see Letters)
Bedini, Mgr., ii. 154
Bellasis, Mr., i. 595
Bennett, W. J. E., i. 319, 624
Bevan, Robert, i. 57, 62
Miss (Mrs. Mortimer), i. 62
Bernin, Rev. Mr., ii. 143
Bethell, John, ii. 142
Bilio, Cardinal, ii. 550
Bishop, the ideal of a, ii. 788, 793
"Bishop of All Bubbles," the, i. 511
Bishops, and religious relations between, ii. 756
Anglican, i. 97
Bliss, Mr., i. 340
Blomfield, Bishop, i. 145
Blunt, Henry, of Chelsea, i. 93
"Bò" ; see Barnabò, Cardinal
"Body-guards," the Cardinal's, ii. 597
Bon Sauveur, Society of the, ii. 7
Boulton, S. B., i. 4 ; ii. 663 ; correspondence with Manning, ii. 66-69
Bowyer, Sir George, ii. 403
Bracton, his dictum, ii. 630
Brandy-and-soda, *bon mot* about, ii. 593
Brougham, Lord, his signature, ii. 524
Brown, Bishop, ii. 310
the two bishops, ii. 93
Bryce, J., ii. 711

Bull, the Papal, restoring the hierarchy, i. 576; *Romanos Pontifices*, ii. 508
Bulls, Irish, ii. 699, 700
Bunsen's *Church of the Future*, i. 506
Burder, Abbot, ii. 51
Burnand, F. C., ii. 712
Busk, Miss R. H., i. 345; ii. 697
Butler, Mr. Charles, i. 669, 673
W. J., i. 490
Byles, Mrs., i. 442
Miss, ii. 696
Byrne, Mrs. Pitt, ii. 697
Byronism at Harrow, i. 20; Oxford, 32

CAMBRIDGE oratory, i. 33
Campden, Lord, his conversion, i. 598; correspondence with Manning, *ib.*
Camus, Melchior, his *Loci Theologici*, i. 601
Canning, Viscount, i. 39
Canterbury, the See of, i. 97
Capalti, Mgr., ii. 156; letter to Manning, 219
Capel, Mgr., Rector of Kensington College, ii. 497; his resignation, 502; history of the case, 503; suspended in diocese of Westminster, 581; conference between Cardinals Bilio and Manning, 582; suspended *à divinis*, 584
Capital and Labour, ii. 644
Cardinalate, the dignity of the, ii. 537
Cardinals, election of, ii. 533
"Cardinal's Guards" and their "Captains," ii. 602
Cardoni, Mgr., ii. 68
Cardwell, H. (Lord Cardwell), i. 39
Carey, Mrs. (Mary Manning), i. 1; at Graffham, 100
Cathedral of Westminster, the, site first proposed, ii. 265; meeting at Willis's rooms about, 353
Carey's *Dante*, i. 506
Carnarvon, Earl of, ii. 525
Carrington, Lord, ii. 659
Carter, T. T., of Clewer, i. 634
Catacombs, the, i. 399
Catholic Institute, the, i. 650, 651
Magazine, the, i. 648, 649
Revival, the, i. 648, 658
University of Dublin, the, ii. 516
Catholicism, English, in 1836, i. 646
Catholics and the Universities, ii. 288; Cardinal Wiseman's view, *ib.*; a Catholic hall or the old colleges, 289; Cardinal Manning's view, *ib.*; decision of the bishops, 290; Dr. Ullathorne's pamphlet, 292; his correspondence with Newman, 294; Dr. Newman's circular, 295, petition to the Pope, 297; rescript of Propaganda, *ib.*
Chadwick, Bishop, ii. 269
Chandler, Dean, i. 179; correspondence with Manning (see Letters)
Chaplains, army, in the Crimea, ii. 52
Chapters, powers of, ii. 273
Charges, archidiaconal, 1841, i. 203; 1842, 213; 1843, 214; 1845, 306
Charity, works of, in England, ii. 781
In London, 793
Choirs, prohibition of mixed, ii. 698
Christian truths believed by the people of England, ii. 790
Christianity, British, ii. 773; the evidences of, i. 18
Church, Dean, i. 696
Church and State, Mr. Gladstone on work in, i. 536
Of England, a dream of her destiny, i. 208; an indictment of, i. 483
Union of London, the, i. 429
Circolo Romano, the, i. 394
Cis-alpine Club, the, i. 669
Civiltà Cattolica, the, ii. 424
Clare, Father, ii. 769
Clarendon, Lord, ii. 399
Clergy, the Anglican, ii. 774
Clifford, Bishop, ii. 266, 814
Clifton, Society of Mother Margaret at, ii. 7
Coercion in Ireland, Mr. Gladstone on, ii. 250
Coffin, Rt. Rev. R. A., ii. 78, 189, 213; letter to Manning, 213
College for higher studies, a, ii. 965
Colleges, training, for Holy Orders, i. 150
Colonial Bishoprics Fund, the, i. 200
Combe Bank, Kent, i. 1, 13; its beauty, 70; sold by Mr. Manning, 71
Commission, royal, on housing of working classes, ii. 638
Committee, Lord Compton's, on distress in London, ii. 633
Communicants in a country parish, i. 111
Communions, Easter, in Rome, i. 392
Compton, Lord, ii. 651
Conciliabula, i. 61
Conclave, the, ii. 547
Confession in the Church of England, i. 232, 493
Controversy, on religious, ii. 789
Convent, the Bermondsey, i. 652
Conventual Institutions, enquiry into, ii. 442
Convocation, the revival of, i. 145, 225

Copped Hall, Herts, birthplace of Cardinal Manning, i. 1 ; description of, 3 ; revisited, 5 ; reminiscences of, 9
Cornthwaite, Bishop, ii. 269
Council, the Vatican, ii. 413 ; bull of indiction, 422 ; election of deputations, 427 ; party warfare outside, 428 ; threat of foreign intervention, 432 ; definition of infallibility, 448 ; results, 452
Creeds, the Apostles', Nicene, and Tridentine, i. 605
Cross, relic of title on the, i. 401
Cross, Lord, correspondence with Manning (see Letters)
Crusade of prayer for restoration of unity, i. 698
Cullen, Cardinal, ii. 359, 610 ; letters to Manning, 275, 471
Cultus Sanctorum, the, i. 604
Cuttings, newspaper, books of, ii. 156

Daily service at Lavington, i. 110
Dalgairns, Father, ii. 220
Dalhousie, Lord, i. 39
Darby, Archbishop, his martyrdom, ii. 467, 468
Davidson, Dr., ii. 545
Davies, Rev. Mr., i. 10
Declaration in Gorham Case, the, i. 532
On Royal Supremacy, the, i. 541
Deffell, Miss, i. 153
Deffells, the, i. 23, 79, 80
Delafield, Count, i. 190
De Lisle, Mr., of Garendon Park, ii. 51 ; letter from Manning, 252
Mr. Phillipps, of Grace Dieu, i. 634 ; letters from Manning, ii. 488, 489
Denison, Archdeacon, i. 99, 425 ; letter from, 432
Derby, Earl of, ii. 525, 707
Development, the theory of, i. 311
De Vere, Aubrey, i. 640
Diabolus Concilii, ii. 418
Diplomatic relations with Rome, ii. 624 ; the Errington Mission, 738, 739 ; opposed by Irish members, 740 ; and by Cardinal Manning, *ib.*
Direction, spiritual, in the Church of England, i. 498
Disestablishment, Irish, effect of, ii. 594
Dispensations, Papal, in England, ii. 7
Disraeli, Rt. Hon. B. ; see Beaconsfield.
Dissuasions from conversion, i. 233
Dockers' strike, the, ii. 658
Dodsworth, W., i. 348, 547, 595 ; letter from Manning, 496
Döllinger, Dr., ii. 323, 432
Dominic, Father, i. 369
Dominican Preacher, a, i. 155
"Dominoes, playing at," ii. 791
Douay, the College at, i. 655
Doyle, Sir Francis, his Reminiscences, i. 34, 36, 37, 41
James, ii. 749
Richard, *ib.*
Father Thomas, i. 667
Douglas Edward, i. 15
Dublin Review, the, i. 648 ; ii. 199, 273, 385
Dupanloup, Bishop, ii. 421

Emly, Lord, ii. 313
Ecclesiastical Commission, the i. 140 162
Titles Act, the, i. 604, 671
Do., repealed, ii. 520
Education question, the, i. 148, 418
Bill, Mr. Foster's, ii. 492
Fund, the Westminster Diocesan, 359
Elgin, Lord, i. 39
Ellicott, bishop, letter to Manning, ii. 708
Encyclical, the Pope's, 1864, ii. 272
England, Italian ideas of, i. 388
English Churchman (newspaper), the ii. 402
College in Rome, the, ii. 365
Life, modern, ii. 736
Prayer and hymns, public use of, i. 672
Epigrams, i. 24
Episcopal authority, limits of, ii. 756
Equality of all men, the civil, ii. 629
Errington Case, the, ii. 81 ; character of Dr. Errington, 82 ; question of his removal, *ib.* ; Canon Searle in the contest, 84 ; Mgr. Talbot, do. 85 ; Cardinal Manning, do., 88 ; appeal to Rome, 93 ; the decision, 94 ; the opposing forces, 95 ; importance of the case, 96 ; attempts to restore Dr. Errington, 106 ; address of the clergy, 110 ; result of his removal, 132 ; the case reopened, 171 ; his nomination by the Chapter, 203 ; the Pope's displeasure, 207, 213, 216 ; Dr. Errington's later life, and death, 255
Mission, the, ii. 578, 738, 739
"Establishment," the, i. 159
Estcourt, Edgar, i. 43
Eucharist, a daily, i. 217
Evangelical party, the, i. 107, 230
Evans, B., i. 16

Faber, Father, i. 81, 412, ii. 155

Farm Street, the Jesuits' Church in, i. 625, ii. 50
"Father," the appellation of, ii. 762
Fielding, Lord (Earl of Denbigh), i. 287
Fenianism, ii. 274, 393
Fenton, Mgr., ii. 504
Ferraris, Father, ii. 766
Ffoulkes, E. S., ii. 302; his "Second Letter," 342
Fisher, Canon, i. 23
Fitzstephen, Sir James, i. ix.
"Florence telegram," the, ii. 531
"For God and the people," i. 29
Foreigners in England, stories of, ii. 700
Forest, Friar, his martyrdom, i. 644
Forester, Lord, i. 64
Formby, Rev. Mr., on education, ii. 494
"Four Doctors," Mr. Gladstone's, ii. 250
"Free Church," scheme for a, i. 592
Freethinkers, Belgian, i. 681
Friedrich, Professor, ii. 424, 470
Froude, James Anthony, i. 249
Richard Howell, i. 108

GALLICANISM in England, i. 673, ii. 267, 308
In Scotland, ii. 149
Gallwey, Father, ii. 506
Gand (Ghent) in 1847, i. 349
Garibaldi, his reception in England, ii. 168, 460
Gaskell, Mr., i. 39
Gasquet, Dom, ii. 715
Gaume, the Abbé, ii. 273
Genoa in 1847, i. 361
Gentleness, the value of, i. 196
George, Henry, ii. 649; his writings, 650
Gerbet, Bishop, i. 399
Germany in 1847, i. 355
Ghent in 1847, i. 349
Gibbons, Cardinal, ii. 650
Gilbert, Mgr., i. 678, ii. 271, 694
Giles, John, i. 443
Gioberti, his *Primato degli Italiani*, ii. 774
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E., i. 32; *mos suus*, 40; on a political career, 77; Manning's opinion of him, 97, 116; Archbishop Howley's do., 116; on Gorham and Hampden controversies, 536; dictum as to work in Church and State, *ib.*; resumption of intercourse with Manning, ii. 161, 162; "Four Doctors" his, 250; his visit to Rome, 398; Thursday breakfasts, 487; reconciliation with Manning, 619; retrospect of his career, 676; publications on the Vatican Decrees, ii. 491; second pamphlet, 476; third pamphlet 487; *Rome's New Fashions*, 519; correspondence (see Letters)
Gladstone, W. H., ii. 530
Gorham Judgment, the, i. 517, 522
"Goths and Anti-Goths," i. 673
Graffham, Sussex, i. 441
Grace sufficient given to all, ii. 780
Grant, Bishop, differences with Cardinal Wiseman, ii. 56, 57; do. with Cardinal Manning, 77, 113; audience with the Pope, 149; letter to Manning, 423
Gratry, Father, ii. 426
Griffiths, Dr., i. 658, 669; on the Jesuits, 670
Guardian (newspaper), the, ii. 563
Guizot, M., ii. 426
Gury, Father, ii. 764

HALLAM, Henry, i. 32, 34
Hamilton, Bishop, i. 531, 634
Hammersmith, Nazareth House, ii. 404
do. seminary, the, 361
Hampden, Dr., Regius Professor at Oxford, i. 114; appointed bishop, 476; consecrated, 508; his opinions, 513
Hanmer, J. (Lord Hanmer), i. 39
Hare, Archdeacon, i. 166, 634; correspondence with Manning (see Letters)
Harrow School in 1822, i. 18
Harting, Mr., his papers, ii. 502, 504
Hearn, Canon, ii. 125; letter to Manning, 244
Hedley, Bishop, ii. 597, 814
Henn, William, ii. 32, 33
Herbert, Sidney (Lord Herbert of Lea), i. 13, 39, 362; correspondence with Manning (see Letters)
Lady, correspondence with Manning (see Letters)
Hierarchy of St. Gregory, ii. 773
The new, effect of its establishment, ii. 137
Highest standard, duty of aiming at the, ii. 795
Hindrances to spread of the Church in England, ii. 773
Hogarth, Bishop, ii. 269
Holiday, a village, i. 161
Holy Ghost, devotion to the, ii. 795
Home Rule, ii. 579, 617
Hook, Dean, i. 129; letters to Manning, i. 326, 328
Hope, James, Q.C., i. 39; correspondence with Manning (see Letters)

Hospital, the Great Ormond Street, ii. 403
Sunday, ii. 590
Hours of labour, regulation of, ii. 646
Howard, Cardinal, ii. 20
Lord Edward, ii. 494
Philip, M.P., i. 666
Howley, Archbishop, i. 116
Humanitarianism, modern, a reason for, i. 645
Humphreys, Father, ii. 767
Hunter, Sir Charles, ii. 712
Henry Leroy, i. 1
Hymns, vernacular, ii. 791

Ideal Church, Ward's, i. 294
Infallibility, Papal, the doctrine of, previous to the Council, ii. 415; reasons for defining it, 416; ruled out of order, 417; threats of State intervention, 432; petition of inopportunists, 438; deputation to the Pope, 446; the doctrine defined, 450; its limits, 626
Irby, George (Lord Boston), i. 26
Ireland, coercion in, ii. 250
Irish *bon mot*, an, ii. 592
M.P.'s, old and new, i. 683
Question, the, ii. 610, 627
Nationalists, ii. 747
Irving, Henry, i. 274
Italian politics, ii. 611-17, 683

Jelf, Dr., Newman's letters to him, i. 211, 212, 213
Jenkyns, Dr., Master of Balliol, i. 44
Jerusalem bishopric, the, i. 272, 485
Jessel, Sir George, ii. 543
Jesuits, the, Father O'Ferrall on, i. 371; why expelled from Rome, 386; their work in England, 656, ii. 759; Cardinal Wiseman on, 3; Archbishop Manning on, 324, 388; influence over the laity in England, 495; powers as teachers, 496; friction with the episcopate, 505; relations with Cardinal Manning, 767; do. Cardinal Vaughan, 770
Johnson, Canon, ii. 382
Jowett, B., i. 58
Jubilee, the Queen's, ii. 713, 732
"Judas," i. 530

Karslake, Charles, ii. 765
Keble, John, i. 442, 634; correspondence with Manning (see Letters)

Kensington, *Filles du Cœur de Marie*, ii. 7
Pro-Cathedral, the, ii. 355
Kensington University College, ii. 497
Knill, Alderman Stuart, ii. 737

Labour, restriction of hours of, i. 199
Knights of, ii. 650, 651
Rights of, ii. 644
Labourers, the agricultural, i. 161
"Lambert," i. 679
Land League, the, ii. 641
Land question, the Irish, ii. 402, 403, 649
Langdale, Hon. Charles, M.P., i. 666, 688
Laprimaudaye, Charles, conversion, i. 595; purchase of land for mission, ii. 57; death, 71; correspondence with Manning (see Letters)
Mrs., ii. 71; correspondence with Manning (see Letters)
Latimer, Bishop, on the sins of his time, i. 644
Lavington, Sussex, i. 100; life at, 440
Lay teaching of theology, ii. 113
League of the Cross, ii. 591, 594, 603, 604
Lee, Rev. Dr., ii. 283
Lefebvre de Cheverus, Cardinal, i. 654
Lendon, Abel, i. 10, 12
Leo XII., Pope, his election, ii. 550; a stranger to Cardinal Manning, 552; on the necessity of truth in history, 755
Letters of Cardinal Manning to a friend, ii. 231, 275; a near relative, i. 473; a penitent, 482; a priest, ii. 600; John Anderdon, i. 47, 50-4, 56, 59, 73, 76, 81, 82, 88, 90, 98; ii. 401; Mrs. Anderdon, i. 98, 99, 383, ii. 59; Mrs. Austen, i. 3, 99, 546-7, 584, 625; ii. 221, 489, 726; Provost Bagnall, 248; Earl of Beaconsfield (see Disraeli); Mrs. Bishop, 488; S. B. Boulton, 66-9; Lord Campden, i. 598; T. T. Carter, 614, 615; Lord Cross, ii. 705; Mr. Davidson, 530; Mr. De Lisle, 252; Mr. Phillipps De Lisle, 488, 489; B. Disraeli, 218; W. Dodsworth, i. 496; Lord Forester, 64; Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone, ii. 444, 477, 478, 493, 619; Archdeacon Hare, i. 163, 165-7, 171, 174, 177, 178; Sidney Herbert (Lord Herbert of Lea), 301, 376, 379, 419, 421, 424, 622; Mrs. Herbert (Lady Herbert of Lea), 378, 381, 385, 491; ii. 228, 237, 240, 241, 694; James Hope, Q.C., i. 622; C. Laprimaudaye, 318, 467, 596, 636; ii. 58; Mrs.

C. Laprimaudaye, i. 381, 455, 621; Justin M'Carthy, M.P., ii. 621; Charles Manning, i. 453; Frederick Manning, 86, 158, 585-7, 623, 624, 639, 693; Mrs. Frederick Manning, ii. 710, 711; Mrs. Manning (the Cardinal's mother), i. 286, 287; Thomas Mozley, 145; Cardinal Newman, 157; ii. 315, 329, 331, 339, 340, 341, 345; the *New York Herald*, 475; Cardinal Nina, 555; the Duke of Norfolk, 537; Canon Oakley, 331; W. O'Brien, M.P., 621; Rev. Dr. Pusey, i. 236, 251, 308, 325; Bishop Selwyn, 200; some of his spiritual children, ii. 693, 694; Mgr. Talbot, 98-102, 105, 106, 119, 121, 122, 125, 126, 129, 130, 131, 133-5, 139, 143, 147, 148, 150, 154, 156, 158, 159, 163, 167, 173, 176, 188, 192, 205, 209, 212, 214, 221, 223, 225, 226, 228, 232, 244, 258, 260, 262, 264, 269, 281, 282, 291, 299, 300, 301, 302, 315, 316, 322, 326, 342, 358, 364-7, 369, 370, 372, 375, 376, 387, 389, 390-9, 401, 404, 410, 411, 412, 421; the *Times* (newspaper), 473; Bishop Ullathorne, 343, 344; Archdeacon Webber, i. 162, 168, 169, 188; Father Whitty, ii. 120; Henry Wilberforce, i. 454; Robert Wilberforce, 298, 310, 340, 341, 357, 385, 423, 455, 496, 501, 503-521, 538, 539, 542, 554-65, 577, 578, 588, 590, 599, 600, 602, 604, 606-9, 610, 620, 636, 637; ii. 26-29, 30-47; Cardinal Wiseman, 61-63, 65-8, 75, 107, 108, 122, 126, 127, 129, 144, 146, 168, 172, 179, 181, 182, 184, 188, 191, 378, 385

Letters to Cardinal Manning from T. W. Allies, i. 559, 699; Lord Ampthill (see O. Russell); J. L. Anderdon, 21-3, 182; W. H. Anderdon, ii. 540; Mrs. Austen, i. 183, ii. 726; Provost Bagnall, 248; Mgr. Bagshawe, 202; Earl of Beaconsfield, 400, 525, 705; J. Bryce, 711; F. C. Burnand, 712; Dean Butler, i. 490; Mgr. Capalti, ii. 219; Earl of Carnarvon, 525; Lord Carrington, 659; Dean Chandler, i. 170, 172, 173, 179; Dean Church, 696; Father Clare, ii. 769; Father Coffin, 213; Lord Compton, 657; Lord Cross, 705, 706; Cardinal Cullen, 275, 471; Father Dalgairns, 220; Count Delafield, i. 190; Bishop Denison, 186; ii. 709; Earl of Derby, 525, 707; W. Dodsworth, i. 430, 479, 550, 563; Bishop Ellicott, ii. 708; C. E. Fisher, 406; Albert Fleming, 703; Mr. Freeland, i. 187; Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone, 185, 198, 242, 255, 256, 259, 263, 264, 267-269, 295-8, 300, 301, 312, 313, 315, 316, 406, 436, 440, 477, 493, 515, 520, 545, 570-5, 580, 611; Bishop Grant, ii. 423; Bishop Hamilton, i. 531; Archdeacon Harrison, 152; Canon Hearne, ii. 244; Dean Hook, i. 326, 328; J. R. Hope, Q.C., 525, 530, 534, 587, 589; J. R. Hughes, 195; Sir George Jessel, ii. 543; John Keble, i. 137, 144, 146, 326; Lord Lathom (Lord Chamberlain), ii. 733; Charles Manning, i. 182, 247; Frederick Manning, 182; W. Maskell, 551; Bishop Moberly, 187, 479; Duke of Newcastle, 624; Cardinal Newman, 137, 142, 186, 224, 226, 227, 229, 233, 254, 258, 305, 309, 330, 334, 339, 341, 346, 348, 540, 568; Cardinal Nina, ii. 558; Duke of Norfolk, 557, 561, 562, 569; Dowager Duchess of Norfolk, 540; Father O'Callaghan, 486; Bishop Otter, i. 135, 164; W. R. Otter, 187; Lord Petre, ii. 556; Canon Pope, 541; the Prince of Wales, 709; Cardinal Reisach, 246; J. H. Rigg, 706; Mgr. Rinaldini, 114; Earl of Rosebery, 708; Odo Russell (Lord Ampthill, 437-47, 463-7, 542; Rev. Dr. Russell, 541; John Ruskin, 703; Miss Ryle, i. 451; Marquis of Salisbury, ii. 707; J. R. Sandford, 707; Bishop Selwyn, i. 187, 201; Dr. Bernard Smith, ii. 722; John Sterling, i. 275; Mgr. Talbot, ii. 99, 110, 111, 112, 123, 127, 142, 143, 147, 148, 149, 153, 154, 155, 157, 159, 164, 165, 166, 168, 173, 174, 177, 180, 198, 207, 210, 221, 227, 256, 259, 260, 261, 264, 265, 269, 270, 280, 282, 283, 317, 322, 359, 361, 368, 369, 370, 371, 373, 375-378, 399, 409, 422, 462; Archbishop Thomson, 708; R. Tredcroft, i. 191; Bishop Trower, 138; Edward Twisleton, 92; Bishop Ullathorne, ii. 558, 559, 567; Cardinal Vaughan, 245; Father Weld, 768;

Henry Wilberforce, i. 183; Mrs. Henry Wilberforce, 184; Robert Wilberforce, 184; Isaac Williams, 237; Cardinal Wiseman, 690; ii. 130, 186; S. F. Wood, i. 91, 102, 103, 118, 119, 148, 149, 150, 151, 165, 192, 218, 224, 228, 292, 695
Letters to the author—
Bishop Alexander, ii. 702; Archdeacon Denison, i. 432; Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, 257, 569; B. Jowett, 58; Captain Laprimaudaye, 447; David Lewis, 307; F. D. Maurice, 270; E. D. Wickham, 58; Bishop Charles Wordsworth, 16, 80
Forester, Lord, to the *Times*, i. 64
Maurice, F. D., to Miss Hare, i. 431
Mozley, J. B., to his sister, i. 194, 249
Newman, Cardinal, to Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone, i. 44; Dr. Jelf, 211-213; David Lewis, ii. 566; W. Monsell (Lord Emly), 313; Duke of Norfolk, 561; Canon Oakeley, 305, 327, 328, 335, 342; Bishop Patterson, 314; *The Standard* (newspaper), 350; Bishop Ullathorne, 292, 294, 295; Dr. W. G. Ward, 321; Father Whitty, 500
Oakeley, Canon, to Bishop Grant, ii. 256; Cardinal Newman, 327; Mgr. Stonor, 379
Ponsonby, Sir Henry, to Mgr. Gilbert, ii. 808
Pope-Hennessey, Sir J., to Lord Naas (Earl of Mayo), ii. 516
Prince of Wales, the, to Mgr. Gilbert, ii. 808
Wilberforce, Bishop, to C. Anderson, i. 140; Miss Elliott, i, 139; Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, 568
Wiseman, Cardinal, to Father Faber, ii. 2; Propaganda, 211; Mgr. Talbot, 56
Lewis, David, i. xii; ii. 556
Liberatore, Father, ii. 420
Library of the Fathers, the, i. 224, 226, 227
Liège in 1847, i. 352
Lincoln, Earl of (Duke of Newcastle), i. 39
Life of Cardinal Manning, care needed in writing the, ii. 649
Lingard, Dr., i. 659; ii. 322;
"Literary Vanities," the, ii. 301, 719
Lockhart, William, his "Personal Reminiscences," i. 449
Lockhart, Mrs., i. 448
Losing cause, a, i. 240
Love, human, Faber on, i. 81
Lubienski, Father, conversations with Father Coffin, i. 189, 213
Lucas, Frederick, i. 649, 650
Luigi, Father, of Assissi, i. 402
Luther, i. 644
Lythgoe, Father, ii. 759

MACAULAY, Lord, Trevelyan's life of, ii. 675
Macmillan, Canon, i. 677; ii. 310
Macguire, Dr., i. 670; ii. 76, 120
Magalo, Padre, i. 372
Magisterium, the, ii. 625
Maltby, Bishop, i. 127
Manchester School, the, ii. 526
Mannerism in preaching, on, ii. 725
Manning, Caroline; see Austen, Mrs.
Caroline; see Manning, Mrs. Henry Edward
Charles, i. 635; ii. 13, 14; correspondence with Cardinal (see Letters)
Mrs. Charles, i. 635
Elizabeth, wife of William Manning of Billiter Square, London, i. 6
Elizabeth, first wife of William Manning, M.P., i. 1
Elizabeth, daughter of William Manning, M.P., i. 1
Frederick, i. 586; correspondence with Cardinal (see Letters)
Harriet, daughter of William Manning, M.P., i. 2, 25
Henry Edward, birth and parentage, i. 1; early home, 2; baptism delayed, *ib.*; ancestry, 6; ii. 712; destined for holy orders, i. 7; to school at Streatham, 10; removed to Totteridge, 12; confirmation, 13; at Combe Bank, 14; to school at Harrow, 16; boyish escapade, *ib.*; early religious impressions, 18; work and recreations, 19; to a private tutor's at Poulshot, 23; began serious study, 25; at the Oxford Union, 29; matriculation and residence, 43; first visit to the continent, 48; degree, first-class in classics, 60; religious opinions then unformed, 61; "Conversion," 64; Theological reading, 68; in the Colonial Office, 72-84; resolve to take Holy Orders, 86; elected Fellow of Merton, 89; ordained deacon, 99; curate of Lavington, 100; rector of Lavington, 103; marriage, 104; opinions in 1833, 112; death of his wife, 121; development of opinions, 126; became rural dean, 147; winter in Rome, 1838-39,

153 ; at Lavington, sad thoughts, 157 ; archdeacon of Chichester, 180 ; first charge, 203 ; relations with Tractarians, 215 ; break with that party, 244 ; candidate for preachership of Lincoln's Inn, 266 ; offered the Sub-almonership, 276 ; first doubts as to Anglican position, 317 ; severe illness, 323 ; summer in Belgium, Germany, and Switzerland, 348 ; winter in Rome, 1847-1848, 358 ; at Lavington, 440 ; a "double voice," 465 ; last charge, 478 ; development of doubts, 552 ; the end of doubt, 608 ; last act of worship in Church of England, 617 ; reception into the Church, 620 ; reception of the tonsure, 628 ; a retrospect, 630 ; three calls, 632 ; ordination, 633 ; winter in Rome, 1851-52, 639 ; entered Accademia Ecclesiastica, ii. 10 ; established a mission at Westminster, 57 ; founded the oblates of St. Charles, 62, 71 ; appointed provost of Westminster, 75 ; do. Protonotary Apostolic, 92 ; to Rome on an appeal 1862, 126 ; his lectures threatened with the Index, 153 ; to Rome on question of the Succession, 1863, 172 ; second journey on same subject, 1863-64, 180 ; nominated Archbishop of Westminster, 218 ; visit to France and Switzerland, 1865, 252 ; to Rome to do homage, 263 ; reception of the pallium, 271 ; relations with Newman, 304 ; his own account of the variance, 346 ; the variety of his works in England, 382 ; vow at assembling of Vatican Council, 420 ; his triumph, 459 ; suggestion by Lord Salisbury of a life peerage, 529 ; proposed by the Pope for the Cardinalate, 532 ; elected by the Sacred College, 533 ; took possession of Church of St. Gregory, 534 ; ceremony of investiture, 535 ; visit to Rome in 1876, 545, 572 ; suggested for the papacy, 550 ; an unrecorded visit to Rome, 1879, 560 ; last visit to Rome, 1883, 576 ; career as an ecclesiastical statesman closed, 586 ; work in England, 587 ; social isolation, 713, 742 ; silver jubilee, 743 ; retirement from public duties, 798 ; last autobiographical words, 801 ; last sacraments and profession of faith, 806 ; death, 807 ; funeral, 814

Manning, Henry Edwa d—
Administrator, as an, ii. 803 ; Ambition, charge of, and defence 685, 687, Anecdotes, 697, 700 ; Anglican life, notes of his, 509 ; Artist, an, i. 348 ; Autobiography, a commenced, ii. 717 ; Authority, value for, 87 ; Beaconsfield, relations with, 515, 516, 521 ; "Berseker rages," i. 154, 449 ; ii. 684 ; Biography, wish as to his own, i. ix ; Cats, fondness for, 446 ; Chapel, private, ii. 691 ; Character and appearance, 234 ; do., given by himself, i. 414 ; ii. 717 ; do. given by Sir James Fitzstephen, i. ix ; do. compared with that of statesmen, 459 ; do. when at Oxford, 45 ; Church builder, as a, 445 ; Conversational powers, *ib.* ; Correspondence, his, vii ; Diary, character of his, 344 ; Diaries and journals, vi ; Dietary, his frugal, ii. 697, 699, Dogs, fondness for, i. 446 ; Dress fondness for, as a boy, 17 ; do., indifference to, as a man, 18 ; Early possibilities, ii. 418, 419 ; Early riser, an, i. 12 ; Englishman, a true, ii. 528 ; Feeling, depths of human, 696 ; Friendships, 695 ; Gladstone, relations with, 1835-87, i. ix ; ii. 489 ; Horses, fondness for, i. 445 ; Humour, sense of, 448 ; ii. 700 ; Introspection, i. 331 ; Italian, study of, in Oxford, 49 ; Jesuits, relations with the, vii ; ii. 767 ; Jews, sympathy with the, 652 ; Journal, the White Quarto, 679 ; Levees, reason for not attending, 687 ; Loving nature, i. xi ; Moderate, when, and when extreme, ii. 88 ; Pessimism, 88, 89 ; Philanthropist, as a, 587 ; Pius IX., Pope, intimacy with, 547 ; Poetry, early, 719 ; Politics, English, 605, 625, 634 ; do., Irish, 617 ; do., Italian, 611 ; preaching, 725, 727 ; Prejudice against theatres and theatricals, i. 49 ; ii. 377 ; Protestants, tenderness towards, 692

Publications (articles, pastorals, sermons, tracts, etc.)—Anglican writings, ii. 722, 723, 724 ; *Antichrist, Lectures on*, 154, 156 ; *Appellate Jurisdiction, On the*, i. 548 ; *Canonries, On the Preservation of unendowed*, 165 ; *Castel Fidardo, Sermon at Dirge for*, ii. 164 ; *Centenary of St. Peter, On the*, 421 ; *Daily Service, Lectures on*

the, i. 161 ; *Dominus Illuminatio mea, Sermon on*, ii. 544 ; *England Christendom, On*, 723 ; *English Church, its Succession and Witness*, i. 113 ; *Essays and Reviews* (edited only), ii. 385 ; *Fifth of November Sermon, A*, i. 217 ; *Fifty Reasons why Voluntary Schools*, etc., ii. 706 ; *Glories of the Sacred Heart, The*, 545 ; *Grey, Letter to Lord*, 401 ; *Holy Ghost, Internal Mission of the*, 544 ; Do., *Temporal Mission of the*, 259 ; Do., *the Sanctifier*, 723 ; *Holy See, on the Crisis of the*, 152 ; *Law of Nature, on the*, 657 ; *Love of Jesus to Penitents, The*, 545 ; *Magdalen Hospital, Sermon for*, i. 292 ; Metaphysical Society, Papers read before the, ii. 514 ; Miscellanies, 723 ; *National Education and Parental Rights*, 494 ; *Œcumenical Council, The*, 425 ; *Pastoral Office, On the*, 785 ; Pearson's *Vindiciæ*, translation of, i. 219 ; *Petri Privilegium*, ii. 461 ; *Pusey, Letter to Dr.*, 323 ; *Reunion of Christendom, On the*, 285; *Rights of Labour, The*, 643; *Rome, the Capital of Christendom*, 461 ; *Rule of Faith, The*, i. 129 ; *Syllabus, The*, ii. 274 ; *Temporal Sovereignty of the Pope, The*, 152 ; *Unity of the Church, The*, i. 271 ; *Vatican Council, The True Story of the*, ii. 453 ; *Vatican Decrees and Civil Allegiance, The*, 479; *Wiseman, Cardinal, Sermon at Requiem for*, 197

Queen, interview with the, ii. 687 ; Receptions, annual, 805 ; Rule of life, a, 16 ; Scrap books, the Red folio, 689 ; Seculars and Regulars, on, 762 ; Self-consciousness, i. 30 ; Sermons in Rome, synopses of, 347 ; Skater, a good, 449 ; Sketches, pen and ink, 348 ; Sociability, ii. 700 ; Social Reformer, as a, 638 ; Style of writing, obscurity in early, i. 165 ; Susceptibility, 329 ; Tenacity of purpose, ii. 98 ; Total abstainer, became a, 593 ; Verses written in 1835 and 1861, i. 694 ; Weather chart, his daily, 347

Manning, Mrs. Henry Edward (Caroline Sargent), i. 108 ; her life, 109 ; unfinished portrait by Richmond, 110 ; death, 120

Maria ; see Anderdon, Mrs.

Martha, daughter of W. Manning, M.P., i. 4

Manning, Mary, mother of the Cardinal, i. 1 ; life and character, 452 ; death, 452 ; burial, 454 ; letters from her son, 286, 287

Mary ; see Carey, Mrs.

William, of Billiter Square, London, i. 6

William, M.P., i. 1, 6 ; character, 3 ; as described by his son, 7, 8 ; retirement from business, 71 ; death and monument, 120, 121

William, son of William Manning, M.P., i. 2, 6

Mgr. William, ii. 72, 698

Mansion House Committee, the, ii. 588 ; its medal, 591

Maret, Mgr., his *Concile Général*, ii. 425

Margaret Chapel, i. 314

Marists, the, in England, ii. 4

Marriott, C., i. 151

Martin, Mr., correspondent of *Weekly Register*, ii. 328

Maskell, W., letter to Manning, i. 551

Mass, daily, disuse of, i. 672

Maurice, F. D., i. 442 ; correspondence (see Letters)

Maynooth Grant, the, i. 300

Meeting on Gorham Question, the, i. 544

Memoirs of English Cathedrals, Butler's, ii. 267

Merivale, Herman, i. 34, 44

Mérode, Cardinal, ii. 267

Merry, Captain George, ii. 737

Metaphysical Society, the, ii. 467, 513 514

Milan in 1848, i. 409

Milanesi, Signor, i. 388, 389

Mill, John Stuart, i. 39

Dr. W. H., ii. 36

Mill Hill College for foreign missions, ii. 363

Milner, Dr., Life of, ii. 267

Milnes, Monckton (Lord Houghton), i. 32

Miracles, true and false, i. 606

Missionaires diocésains, ii. 8

Moberly, Bishop, letters to Manning, i. 187, 479

Monastic Orders in Rome, the, i. 386

Monasticism, the value of, ii. 757

Moufang, Canon, ii. 416

Monsell, Mr. (Lord Emly), ii. 313, 317

Montalembert, Count, at Congress of Malines, i. 680

Month, the (periodical), ii. 387

Morel, the Abbé, i. 654

Morris, Mgr., i. 696 ; ii. 271, 767

Mortimer, Mrs. T. (Miss Bevan), i. 68

Mosaic Radical, a, i. 29

Mother Margaret Society, the, at Clifton, ii. 7
Mozley, Thomas, Reminiscences of Oriel, i. 34, 35, 101 ; ii. 680 ; letter from Manning, i. 145
Musical practice, story of a, ii. 698

Nardi, Mgr., ii. 265, 484
National Society, the, and Education, i. 418
Neale, Dr., i. 319
Nepotism, a case of, i. 423
Nerrinkx, the Abbé, i. 654
Neve, Dr., ii. 368, 372, 373, 376
Newcastle, Duke of ; see Lincoln, Earl of
Newdegate, Mr., M.P., his Convent Inspection Bill, i. 684
Newman, John Henry, i. 39, 40 ; first acquaintance with Manning, 67 ; soubriquet, 115 ; reasons for leaving the Church of England, 258 ; last sermon at Littlemore, 307 ; conversion, 309 ; essay on Development, 315 ; lectures on Anglican difficulties, 675 ; attacks on, ii. 124 ; *Apologia pro Vitâ Suâ*, 206, 325 ; projected mission at Oxford, 292 ; do., distrust with regard to, 299, 317, 318 ; relations with Manning, 304 ; address from Stafford Club, 313 ; thought of for a bishop, 347 ; opinion of the temporal power, 348 ; letter to Duke of Norfolk, 480 ; why apparently inactive, 500 ; representations in favour of to Pope Leo XIII., 554 ; offer of Cardinalate, 558 ; "the cloud lifted," 567 ; subsequent relations with Manning, 568 ; death and funeral, 747 ; Cardinal Manning's sermon, 749 ; do. opinion of Newman, 754 ; correspondence (see Letters)
Nice in 1847, i. 358
Nightingale, Miss Florence, i. 362 ; ii. 53
Nina, Cardinal, ii. 573 ; correspondence with Manning, 555, 558
"No Popery" agitation, the, i. 594, 691
Norfolk, the Duke of, correspondence (see Letters)
Normandy in 1844, i. 285
Nuncio in England, a, question of, ii. 743
Nuns, insubordinate, ii. 404

Oakeley, Canon Frederick, i. 39 ; on the Tractarian Movement, 300 ; at Margaret Chapel, 314 ; *Historical Notes*, 413 ; correspondence (see Letters)
Oaths Bill, the, ii. 388
Objectivity and subjectivity, ii, 782
Oblates of St. Charles, the, ii. 1 ; foundation at Bayswater, 60 ; not under vows, 62 ; "The Widowers' Children," 71 ; progress, 72 ; removal from St. Edmund's, 106, 113, 118, 119 ; community house in Rome, 365 ; relations with English College, 368 ; the rule of St. Charles, 762
O'Brien, W., M.P., ii. 621
O'Callaghan, Father, ii. 368-9, 485
O'Clery, the, ii. 737
Offering, an eccentric, ii. 405
Old Catholics, the, before Döllinger, ii. 88
Oratory of San Filippo, the, ii. 4
Orders, Anglican, how formerly regarded, i. 85
Orioli, Professor, i. 387
Osburn, Mr., i. 220 ; his book, 223
Otter, Bishop, i. 128 ; on the Church Commission, 140 ; letters to Manning, 135, 164
Oxenden, Bishop, his *History of My Life*, i. 26, 27
Oxenham, H. N., i. 79
Oxford, projected mission at—Cardinal Wiseman's thoughts of it, ii. 288 ; Dr. Manning's objections, 289 ; Bishop Ullathorne's pamphlet, 292 ; Dr. Newman's circular, 295 ; petition to the Pope, 297 ; the scheme at an end, 298
Converts, the, their influence, i. 663
Movement, the, i. 688

Paget, Sir A., despatch on convent question, ii. 520
Palaces, Bishops' and Cardinals', ii. 6
Paleotti, Abbate, i. 368
Pall Mall Gazette, the, ii. 564
Pallium, the, ii. 271
Pallotini, the, ii. 146
Party spirit in the Church in England, ii. 171
Passaglia, Father, ii. 20, 27
Passionists in England, the, ii. 4
"Pastoral clergy," ii. 731
Patten, Mr. (Lord Winmarleigh), i. 31
Patterson, Bishop, i. 677 ; ii. 178, 314
General, ii. 737
Peel, Sir Robert, his death, i. 456
Pendell Court, near Bletchingley, i. 635
Perrone, Father, ii. 20
Persecution, Religious, on, i. 642
Persico, Mgr., ii. 622-3
Perugia in 1848, i. 408
Petre, Lord, i. 364 ; ii. 555 ; letter to Manning, ii. 556

Pews and benches, i. 178
Phillipps, Mr. ; see De Lisle
Phillpotts, Bishop, i. ix, 629 ; ii. 692
Phipps, Canon, i. 26
Pietism, undogmatic, i. 558
Pius IX., Pope, early sympathies, i. 346 ; break with revolutionary party, *ib.*; history of pontificate, 363 ; conflicting opinions concerning, 364, ii. 553 ; death and burial, 549 ; Manning's relations with, 551
"Pig-tail," ii. 712
Placidi, the avvocato, i. 387
"Plan of Campaign," the, ii. 622 ; Papal Rescript against, 624 ; Cardinal Manning on, 625
Platform oratory, i. 176
Pluscarden Abbey, i. 290
Political career, how to enter a, i. 77
Polizia della Chiesa, Bianchi's, ii. 268
Poor Law, the, i. 198
Of London, the, ii. 266
Pope, the ; see Pius IX. and Leo XIII.
Porter, Father George, ii. 506
Positive and negative teaching compared, ii. 729
Poulshot, Wilts, i. 23
Preacher and director, their offices contrasted, i. 439
Preacher's power, a, ii. 70
Preaching, on, ii. 776 ; open air, ii. 791
Priest, an apostate, i. 156, 157 ; his short-lived movement, 306, 343
Primecerias, Mgr., ii. 147
Prison Congress, the International, ii. 589
Pro-Cathedral at Kensington, the, 355
Professorship of poetry, the, i. 235
Propaganda, the, i. 363 ; its working, ii. 113
Protestant Association, the, i. 650, 651
Public and private views, distinction between, ii. 612
Pugin, A. W., i. 649, 652
T. W., i. 662
Punch on Archbishop Manning's appointment, ii. 236
Purcell, Canon A. D., i. 682
Pusey, Dr., i. 634 ; correspondence with Manning (see Letters)

QUEEN, the, her jubilee, ii. 732 ; reign, 736 ; meeting with Manning, 687

RAMBLER, the, ii. 165, 291, 308
Record (newspaper), the, Newman's letters in, i. 107 ; supported Manning, 117 ; withdrew support, 216 ; misrepresentations, 224
Red books, the, ii. 156, 721, 722
Redemptorists, the, in England, ii. 3
Reform bill, the first, i. 37, 98
Reformation, the Tractarians on the, i. 211 ; where wrong, 623 ; origin, 642 ; laxity which led to, 643
Registration of Charitable Trusts, ii. 115
Regulars and seculars compared, ii. 784
Relief fund, the Mansion House, ii. 469
Religious communities, their work in the world, ii. 761 ; wide scope of some, 7
Republic, the French, i. 379
Reunion of Christendom, question of—Cardinal Wiseman's interest in, ii. 275 ; formation of the A.P.U.C., 276 ; deputation to Cardinal Wiseman, *ib.* ; the Holy See on the question, 277 ; Archbishop Manning's Pastoral, 278, 286, 287 ; letter to Cardinal Patrizi, 279 ; answer of the Holy Office, 285
Revolution, the French, i. 653 ; Italian, 345
Revolutions, how made, i. 390
Richards, Upton, i. 319
Richmond, George, R.A., i. 17 ; friendship with Manning, 109 ; portrait of Mrs. Manning, 110 ; residence in Rome, 154 ; reminiscences of Manning, 155 ; on Mr. John Giles, 443
Rigorism, effects of, i. 435, 439
Ripon, Marquis of, ii. 554
Riviera, the, in 1847, i. 360
Roberti, Cardinal, ii. 260
Roberts, Mrs., ii. 50
Robertson, Professor J. B., i. 660
Rock, Dr., i. 659 ; ii. 322
Rome, first impressions of, i. 158
Ronge, an apostate priest, i. 343
Rossi, assassination of, i. 346
Rouz, the Abbé, ii. 69
Royal Supremacy, the, i. 594, 614
Rule of life, a priest's, ii. 16 ; a statesman's, i. 436
Rules of faith, two, i. 132 ; of religious orders, ii. 5
Russell, Arthur, ii. 467
Odo (Lord Ampthill), ii. 433 ; correspondence with Manning (see Letters)
Ryder, G. D., i. 448
Ryle, Miss, i. 457
Rymer, Dr. F., ii. 100

"SACRAMENTALISM," ii. 782
Sacrifice, doctrine of the, i. 607
"Sacrilege Bill," the, i. 162
St. Alphonsus, his rule and teaching, ii. 5, 37 ; treatise on prayer, 79

Barnabas, Pimlico, Church of, i. 553
Bernard's Abbey, Leicester, ii. 51
Charles of Milan, the mind of, ii. 763; Oblates (see Oblates)
Edmund's College, ii. 784
Gregory the Great, Church of, ii. 534
John, Father Ambrose, i. 363
Peter and St. Edmund, mission of, ii. 57, 60
Philip the Oratorian, ii. 5
Saviour's, Leeds, i. 327
Thomas, Church of, in Rome, ii. 267, 409
Vincent of Paul, Society of, i. 652
Sale of liquor, a story of, ii. 598
"Salvation Army," the, ii. 791
Sargent, John, i. 100, 106, 109
Mrs., i. 121, 144
Scilla, Mgr. Ruffo, ii. 734
Scotland in 1844, i. 290
Scott, Sir Walter, his influence on the age, i. 652, 653
Scrap-books, the red folio, ii. 156, 721, 722
Scripture, the Holy, use of, ii. 778
Sculptor, story of a, ii. 697
Searle, Canon, likeness to Cardinal Wiseman, ii. 83; his policy, 100, 103; collision with Manning, 104; later relations with Wiseman, 178; œconomus to Archbishop, 256; removed from that post, *ib.*
"Secular clergy," origin of the name, ii. 788
Selwyn, Bishop, i. 200; correspondence with Manning (see Letters)
Seminaries, the English, ii. 787
"Senex," letter of, ii. 600
Sermons, effects of, i. 435
Shaftesbury, Earl of (Lord Ashley), i. 23; ii. 678
Shepherd, a Scotch, i. 291
Shuttleworth, Bishop, i. 172, 173; unfavourable to Manning, 179; conciliated, 196; his death, 197
Sibthorpe, R. W., ii. 726
Simpson, Mr., ii. 384
Sisk, Rev. Mr., of Chelsea, i. 670
Slave trade, the, ii. 642
Smith, Abel, i. 1
Dr. Bernard, letter to Manning, ii. 722
"Bob," i. 3
Sydney, i. 172
Socialism, its genesis, ii. 527
"Social Purity" crusade, the, ii. 654
S.P.C.K., the, i. 115, 239
"Sovereignty of the people," the, ii. 607, 608
Spencer, Hon. and Rev. George, i. 688; ii. 536
Spiritual life, rules for, i. 434
Stafford Club, the, i. 685, 686, 687; ii. 313, 317
Standard (newspaper), the, ii. 598
Sterling Club, the, i. 275
John, letter to Manning, i. 362
Stonor, Archbishop, ii. 379
Stonyhurst, i. 656
Strike at the London Docks, the, ii. 658
"Succession, the war of the," ii. 170
Sunday, an Englishman's, in Rome, i. 155
Sunderland, Mr., his oratory, i. 32; his fate, 34
Sundridge, Kent, i. 1
"Surplice Riots," the, i. 603
Switzerland in 1847, i. 356
Syllabus, the, ii. 272
Synod of Westminster, the first Provincial, i. 689

Tablet (newspaper), the, i. 649, 650; ii. 145, 387, 391, 600
Tait, Archbishop, i. 39
Talbot, Mgr., his life and character, ii. 86; connection with Cardinal Wiseman, 194; removal from the Vatican, 346, 485; Pope Pius IX.'s regard for him, 574; friendship with Manning, 694; correspondence (see Letters)
Taylor, Jeremy, his teaching, ii. 39
Temporal Power, the, ii. 460; Cardinal Manning on, 151, 161, 523, 610; Cardinal Newman on, 348
"*Tempus clausum*," of life, the, ii. 798
Thanksgiving service, the Jubilee, ii. 734
Theology and Politics, ii. 622
Thiers, M., ii. 426
Thornton, Charles, i. 27
Tierney, M.A., F.S.A., i. 659, 670; ii. 137, 322
Tory Catholic party, rise of the, ii. 163
Toryism and Whiggism, ii. 634
Torre Diaz, Count, ii. 310
Total abstinence, the question of, ii. 594; truce of St. Patrick, 595; League of the Cross, 596; letters and articles in the newspapers, 598; Cardinal Manning's action, 599
Totteridge, Kent; see Copped Hall
Tractarian Movement, the, i. 114; first effects of, 127; Manning's opposition to, 203; later influence

upon him, 225; affected by Newman's conversion, 319; characteristics, 320
Tredcroft, R., i. 191
Trench, Miss, i. 385
Trent, Council of, i. 644
Park, i. 62
Truce of St. Patrick, ii. 575
Truth (newspaper), ii. 685
And falsehood, questions as to, ii. 39
"Tudor Settlement in religion," the, ii. 792
Turner, Dr., ii. 133
Twisleton, Edward, i. 39; letter to Manning, 92

ULLATHORNE, Bishop, early life and work, ii. 21; in the Errington case, 90; case of Midland district funds, 103; suggested as Cardinal Wiseman's successor, 182; consecrator of Archbishop Manning, 231; in the University question, 292; Manning's opinion of him, 375; death, 816; correspondence (see Letters)
Undergraduates, Oxford, i. 193
Union, the Oxford, i. 29-41; anniversary of, ii. 704
United States, religion in the, ii. 791
Unity in religion, i. 387
Univers, The, ii. 273
Universities, Catholics at the English, ii. 810
University training, the advantage of, ii. 288
Unsworth, Thomas, ii. 54
Upwaltham, Sussex, i. 100
Ushaw College, ii. 128

VAUGHAN, Cardinal, early relations with Manning, ii. 20; intimacy with him, 71; at the Accademia Ecclesiastica, 74; tolerant of opposition, 507; "Bishop of Trastevere," 508; relations with Jesuits, 770; letter to Manning, 243
Prior Bede, i. 681
Ventura, Padre, i. 346; on Italian politics, 367; on Ireland, 394
Veuillot, M., i. 680; ii. 273
Via Media, the, i. 224

WALLIS, John (editor of the *Tablet*), i. 686, 687, 688
Ward, W. G., i. 293; his "Ideal Church," 294; degradation, 299; subsequent work, ii. 113; Manning's stanchest supporter, 220; denunciation of Newman, 231; on the Syllabus, 274; not afraid of joking, 309; Mgr. Talbot's opinion of him, 318; book on Papal Encyclicals, 320; letter from Newman, 321
Wardour Castle, i. 648
Waterloo, news of battle of, i. 5, 10
Waterworth, Father, ii. 57
Webber, Archdeacon, i. 162, 168, 169, 175; correspondence with Manning (see Letters)
Weekly Orthodox Journal, the, i. 648, 649
Register, The, character of the paper, ii. 148; hostile to Manning, 159; attacks on Newman, 312; passed into Manning's hands, 632
Weld, Cardinal, i. 649; ii. 768
Westminster, Archbishopric of, nomination by Chapter, ii. 203; suggestion of Mgr. Talbot, 214; appointment of Mgr. Manning, 218; expenses of the See, 538
Synod of, ii. 21
Whewell, Dr., i. 442
Whitehall Review, the, ii. 684
Whitty, Father, ii. 120
"Widowers' Children," the, ii. 71
Wilberforce, Henry, i. 39; at Leamington, 100; his marriage, 102; early evangelicalism, 107; youthfulness, 195; conversion, 595; work for the Holy See, ii. 148; correspondence with Manning (see Letters)
Robert Isaac, i. 39; value of letters to him from Manning, 502, 503; his conversion, ii. 45; his death, 48; correspondence with Manning (see Letters)
Samuel, i. 34; as an orator, 38; his marriage, 101; his friendships, 192; attack on Pusey, 249; made a bishop, 269; bitterness against Manning, 634; his published life, 679; correspondence with Manning (see Letters)
William, M.P., i. 38
Wilds, Rev. Mr., i. 670
Wiseman, Cardinal, lectures at St. Mary Moorfields, i. 118; in Rome in 1838, 155, 156; estimate of his character, 657; his learning, 666; first coming to England, 668; opposition to, 670; letter to the *Times*, 671; four resolutions, 672; attitude towards the Oxford converts, 677; well acquainted with France, 678; admirer of English

institutions, 679; reception at Congress of Malines, 681; belief in Napoleon III., 683; failing health, ii. 131; visit to Rome, 1862, 147; pastoral, 165; last illness, 176; journey to Belgium, 186; death, 193; funeral, 196; proposed memorial, 354; attitude towards religious orders, 759; correspondence (see Letters)
Wood, S. F., i. 77; Manning's "good angel," 220; his death, 292; correspondence with Manning (see Letters)
Woodgate, H., i. 43
Woolfrey Case, the, i. 651
Woman's influence in the world, ii. 428
Women in church choirs, ii. 698
Their rights, ii. 653
Wordsworth, Bishop Charles, i. 14, 16; tutor to Manning, 47; correspondence (see Letters)
Bishop Christopher, i. 14
Dr. Christopher, i. 13
Wynter, Dr., i. 251

"Xs," the, i. 230

YOUNG, the actor, i. 274

END OF VOL. II

RECENT BIOGRAPHIES.

The Private Life of Warren Hastings, the first Governor-General of India. By Sir CHARLES LAWSON, Fellow of the University of Madras. With Portraits and Illustrations. Demy 8vo. $3.50.

John Knox. A Biography. By P. HUME BROWN, Author of "Life of George Buchanan." In 2 vols. 8vo. Cloth. $7.00.

Life, Letters, and Works of Louis Agassiz. By JULES MARCOU. With Portraits, etc. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. (*In the Press.*)

Baker, Sir Samuel. A Memoir. By T. DOUGLASS MURRAY, F.R.G.S., Executor to the late Samuel Baker, and A. SILVA WHITE, Hon. F.R.S.G.S., author of "The Development of Africa," etc. 8vo. Buckram. $6.00.

The Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman, D.C.L., LL.D. By W. R. STEPHENS, B.D., Dean of Winchester. 2 vols. 8vo. $7.00.

The Letters of Matthew Arnold. 1848–1888. Collected and arranged by GEORGE W. E. RUSSELL. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. Cloth. $3.00.

Recollections of a Happy Life. Being the Autobiography of Marianne North. Edited by her sister, Mrs. JOHN ADDINGTON SYMONDS. With Portraits. 2 vols. $5.00.

Letters of Edward Fitzgerald to Fanny Kemble. 1871–1883. Edited by WILLIAM ALDIS WRIGHT, M.A. 12mo. Cloth. 75 cents.

The Letters and Literary Remains of Edward Fitzgerald. Edited by WILLIAM ALDIS WRIGHT, M.A. 3 vols. Cloth. $8.00.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY,

66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK.

CHICAGO: ROOM 23, AUDITORIUM.