

LIBRARY ST. MARY'S COLLEGE



FASTEN
OPEN E



Henry Edward Manning

His Life and Labours





Cardinal, Manning
From the etching from life by Mortimer Menpes

Henry Edward Manning,

His Life and Labours,

282,092
M316l

c.4

By Shane Leslie M.A.
King's College, Cambridge



With Six Illustrations

97260



London

Burns Oates & Washbourne Limited

28 Orchard St. W. 1 8-10 Paternoster Row E.C. 4

And at . Manchester . Birmingham . and . Glasgow

1 9 2 1

LIBRARY ST. MARY'S COLLEGE
WITHDRAWN
ST. MARY'S COLLEGE LIB.

21-12372

H.C.

DEDICATION

TO

JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS

FRANCIS CARDINAL BOURNE

WILLIAM CARDINAL O'CONNELL

ARCHBISHOPS OF BALTIMORE, WESTMINSTER, AND BOSTON

PRINCES OF THE HOLY ROMAN CHURCH



Contents

Preface	<i>Page</i> ix
-------------------	-------------------

Chapter

I. Early Days	I
II. A Captain of Harrow	9
III. Oxford	19
IV. Conversion and Orders	35
V. Life and Love at Lavington	43
VI. Rome and Gladstone	52
VII. Archdeacon of Chichester	68
VIII. The Road to Rome	81
IX. Florence Nightingale and Others	103
X. The Wars of Westminster	127
XI. Archbishop of Westminster	149
XII. The Day's Burden	171
XIII. Ireland	192
XIV. The Vatican Council	214
XV. World Politics	234
XVI. The Case of Dr. Newman	269
XVII. The Religious Orders	288
XVIII. Rationalism and Literature	316
XIX. The Coming of Democracy	347
XX. Ireland Again	382
XXI. Persico and Parnell	412
XXII. Spiritual Politics	442
XXIII. Towards Evening	472
Appendix	498
Index	513

List of Illustrations

Cardinal Manning	<i>Frontispiece</i>	
(From the etching from life by Mortimer Menpes.)		
Henry Edward Manning	<i>Facing page</i>	4
(From a miniature, painted in 1812, in the possession of Lady Salt.)		
Henry Edward Manning	” ”	18
(From a pastel as a Harrow boy about 1820, in the possession of Lady Salt.)		
Archdeacon Manning	” ”	80
(From a cameo, cut in Rome, 1848, in the possession of Lady Salt.)		
Father Ravignan assisting Dr. Manning at his First Mass	” ”	102
(From a drawing by Doyle in 1851, in the possession of Cardinal Bourne.)		
Cardinal Manning in his Eighty-Fifth Year	” ”	472
(From a painting by May, in the possession of Mr. J. E. C. Bodley.)		

Principal Sources

THE Manning Papers in possession of the Oblates of St. Charles ; the Ullathorne Papers (letters to Archbishop Ullathorne) ; the Dublin Diocesan Archives (letters to Cardinal Cullen and Archbishop Walsh) ; the Errington Papers (in possession of the Bishop of Clifton and Lord Clifford) ; the Hawarden Papers (letters to Mr. Gladstone) ; the Wilberforce Papers (letters to Bishop Wilberforce) ; the Foreign Office (letters to Lord Salisbury) ; Beaconsfield Papers (letters to Mr. Disraeli). The letters of Odo Russell are taken partly from the Foreign Office and partly from the Manning Papers. The letters of Cardinal Persico are taken partly from copies published in the *United Ireland* and partly from originals in the Manning Papers.

PREFACE

“A biographer is an unconscious autobiographer.”—*Archbishop Manning to the Metaphysical Society (1871)*.

THIS book must appear as a supplement rather than a supplanter to Purcell's grandiose Life of Cardinal Manning, since Gladstone congratulated Purcell on leaving not only “the history of a soul, a dividing of marrow and bone” but little for disclosure on the last day. It is well known that Purcell differed from most biographers by committing no avoidable sin of omission with the exception of “an autobiographical note on the corporate action of the Society of Jesus in England and Rome,” which we supply chiefly out of regard for the Jesuits, who have been somewhat maligned on the strength of what seemed unpublishable. A certain mystery curtains the memory of Purcell, which very few documents remain to clear. Purcell had conducted an Ultramontane but unsuccessful venture in journalism, for he confided to Archbishop Ullathorne (November 2, 1881): “Since giving up the *Westminster Gazette* I have been exclusively engaged in writing for non-Catholic papers.” His Life of Manning was written presumably for the same public. By the year 1887 the Cardinal, being anxious to recoup him for his losses, allowed him to begin to write a brief memoir of himself to be published and scrutinised in his own lifetime. He lent him one of his diaries on condition that it should not be quoted, but he had already suggested to Mr. J. E. C. Bodley writing the final Life, and had even offered him some of his notebooks and diaries. Mr. Bodley went to France, and the Cardinal died rather suddenly. On the strength of the diary in his possession Purcell persuaded the

Preface

executors to allow him to carry away a half of the Cardinal's private papers, amounting to one cab full. Cardinal Vaughan used to declare that this would not have been permitted to happen if the Cardinal had not removed his name from among the executors owing to a slight disagreement on the Temperance Question. Purcell announced that "all his other diaries, journals, and autobiographical notes, in accordance with his wish and will, passed into my possession." This was not exactly so, as one-half of the papers and diaries remained untouched and unread. As to the Cardinal's "wish and will," he made no mention of Purcell in his will, and his wishes may be judged from some letters he wrote to Gladstone in answer to a request not to allow Purcell to publish any of Gladstone's except such as were "necessary to explain something" of the Cardinal's.

The Cardinal wrote (June 19, 1887): "My friend Mr. Purcell is a bolter. He tells me he has written to you to say that I have promised him the old letters I wrote to you before the flood. I promised to look at them to see if any were fit for use. But even then I should have let nothing go out of my hands without your consent. I believe that when I see them I shall hide their faces again."

September 16, 1887: "They are far too personal and too intimate to be published while you and I are *inter vivos*. The reading of them has been like returning to an extinct world. If they are ever published they will not lower either of us and they tell a continuous history." September 25, 1887: "No letter of yours to me or of mine to you has been or will be in Mr. Purcell's hands. You may trust me that your semi-biography shall not be written. In truth I also have no wish to assist at my own funeral sermon. Mr. Purcell has promised to put nothing in type without my knowledge, and I will carefully guard you."

The Cardinal had already exchanged old letters with

Preface

Gladstone in 1861, for Gladstone recalled in 1890 "the bargain in which you played Diomedes and I Glaucus (what a fool I was!) about the exchange of letters." It was a correspondence which, Manning wrote, "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." It was the most deeply weighed and most sincere correspondence in the lives of both. The two old friends were moved to emotion as each sat rereading their letters through a night of memories and tears. "A night among the tombs," said Gladstone, and Manning wrote of a *lustrum afflictionis et lacrymarum*, adding with wonderful pathos, "God knows that when we parted I chose between Him and you!"

Purcell had none of Manning's letters to Gladstone, and explained the defect in his book by saying, "The only pity is that all the letters written in his Anglican days to Mr. Gladstone were suppressed, because, as he told me, he did not think for various reasons their publication would be expedient. Mr. Gladstone, who set great store on Manning's Anglican letters, was very indignant on hearing from me of their fate." It is possible that the Cardinal only thought their publication by Purcell would be inexpedient. Mr. Gladstone went on to exclaim, "Had I dreamt that Manning would have destroyed those letters I would never have returned them to him. Neither in those letters nor in conversation did Manning even convey to me an intimation or even a hint that he had lost faith in the English Church." Mr. Gladstone would have been less positive if he had noticed a passage in the Life of Bishop Wilberforce as follows:

"Mr. Gladstone wrote to the Bishop on September 17, 1850, from which letter it can be gathered that Mr. Gladstone thought from his personal knowledge of Archdeacon Manning that even before the Gorham Judgment the Archdeacon's mind had become so imbued with the

Preface

Roman Catholic faith that he had ceased to struggle actively against these new convictions."

Purcell accordingly wrote his Life without this and a number of no less important correspondences, such as Manning's with his brother-in-law Bishop Wilberforce, Florence Nightingale, Miss Maurice, Miss Stanley, Archbishops Ullathorne and Walsh, Cardinals Vaughan and Cullen. To be exact, he used one letter from Cardinal Vaughan, two from Cardinal Cullen, and three from Archbishop Ullathorne. But of the letters written to them by Manning not one, and they were the three most intimate and important correspondences of his Episcopate. To have written a Life of Manning without them was a literary *tour de force* which Purcell achieved chiefly through the extraordinary interest arising from the correspondence with Monsignor Talbot, which he published in full with the exception of a few vital letters, which appear later in this book. Intimate as these letters were, Purcell wrote that "Cardinal Manning especially directed the attention of his biographer" to them. As a matter of fact, the Cardinal had especially directed attention to the contrary. Bishop Patrick Fenton gave the following account to us for publication :

"Shortly before the Cardinal died he set me to arrange his letters. For six months I sat in the middle of a room surrounded by baskets into which I sorted the various correspondences. Once he found me so engrossed that he inquired what I was reading. The Cardinal recognised Mgr. Talbot's handwriting, and said solemnly, 'They were written by the most imprudent man that ever lived. I forbid you to take even one out of the house.'"

Mgr. Talbot has been abused more than he deserved for what appears to have been a family failing, for by a curious coincidence we find the Blessed Oliver Plunket writing to Rome in 1673 that "*Monsignore Talbot riprendeva l'impresa come temeraria imprudente e pre-*

Preface

cipitosa"! The publication of the letters of his namesake formed a piquant part of Purcell's book and raised a storm of protest and ridicule from all sides. Cardinal Vaughan in measured words described the Life as "almost a crime," and Lord Morley in a letter to Vaughan as "rather odious." Archbishop Benson with a rival's glee found it a "fascinating tragedy," while Augustus Hare, an old libeller of Manning, referred to it as "a ludicrous apotheosis." The loyal Stead summed it up wittily as "a cheap substitute for Purgatory"! Mr. Gladstone was moved to make a remarkable statement concerning his old friend: "The immense gifts of his original nature and intense cultivation, his warm affections, his lifelong devotion, his great share in reviving England, but above all his absolute detachment, place him on such a level that from my place of thought and life I can only look at him as a man looks at the stars." Cardinal Vaughan's final view was one of striking simplicity: "I do not recognise the portrait of him with whom I was in constant communication during forty years."

Purcell had been tempted to achieve literary fame at a single leap by doing what had never been done before, and publishing, as he believed, the entire papers of a public character, and that of an Archbishop! Possibly the lives of Archbishops, standing as they do at the conflicting poles of what is human and what is divine, ought not to be written. Their true work is noiseless and unseen and is written elsewhere. A biography is chiefly composed of contests and struggles in documentary form which can only reflect incidents of a whole. Cardinal Manning's life was outwardly a battlefield. As an Anglican he fought the Erastians and the Low Church, and he fought the Gallicans and, when need be, the Jesuits, as a Catholic. To a cause or policy in the Church he could give himself so entirely that the human and spiritual motives became indiscernible. Purcell

Preface

laid an exaggerated emphasis on the human. His commentary, where it becomes even embittered against his subject, may be passed over. Not so the documents, which, however, require to be supplemented in order that the whole picture instead of a part may be given. The Talbot papers and the Errington question find their proper level when probed to the depth. Critics made great play of the epigram Talbot attributed to Pius IX., that the removal of Errington from the Westminster succession was a *coup d'état* of the Lord God! But if the Pope is the Vicar of the Lord, the phrase stands. D'Azeglio said a miracle was a celestial *coup d'état*, and Manning's supersession of Errington had the aspects of an administrative miracle in the order of Providence.

Manning's part need no longer be matter of speculation or his dispositions afford theory to the malignant. It is revealed in the correspondence which passed between him and Cardinal Wiseman, of which essential parts follow in Appendix, whereby the Errington episode is exposed for ever. To appreciate the drama played by Manning and Wiseman it is necessary to realise the character of the weak but gallant old Cardinal, who in spite of the old Catholics made life possible in the Church for the converts. Wiseman was of the old block himself, but cosmopolitan and Roman, and therefore tolerant.

As he once wrote to Manning in reminiscent mood (October 2, 1862):

“ I belong to the old time and I have often felt hearty gratitude to Almighty God for having been withdrawn from England just at the age when opinions take hold of the mind so as to become obstinate and at the period when party spirit became highest among Catholics and I should have understood its sides sufficiently to have made a choice. Through my eight years of Ushaw my Spanish recollections remained uneffaced and vivid. I can recollect explaining to companions what a rosary

Preface

was, few if any having seen one any more than a discipline or hairshirt; while there was not a crucifix in the house except those on the altar. Before these impressions had been lost with the language to which they had been associated, I was mercifully sent to Rome on this day to resume them; I may say of divine providence *ibi manum admovit ubi ante desierat*. I certainly had very few English prejudices to overcome when I reached Rome." To which Manning replied (October 3, 1862): "I think I have fully appreciated the facts you mention, and have fully always perceived in you the absence of nationality which strange to say I have found more vivid and obtrusive in English Catholics than in Anglicans. The former seem to me always to be eating leeks to prove their loyalty, and the latter to be disowning it out of shame of the English Erastianism. You have certainly received a singular grace in being the son and disciple of many nations and thereby of none, as a Pastor of all must be. And the twenty years in Rome gave you what only the Holy See can bestow on its own children, and you have been a spoilt child of St. Peter." A later note runs: "I think what you need is freedom from cares. And they wear you, for though you do not grind like *Trebizond* nor take things in grief like Gladstone, you eat your heart, as I used to tell you."

Such was the old Cardinal to whom Manning attached himself with passionate devotion from the first.

Of criticism of Manning, it seems unnecessary to prove or disprove all that has been said. There will always be two views of Manning even among Catholics, but new searchlight can only be thrown into his spiritual character by those who knew him best. By a singular good fortune the unpublished paper written by Miss Bevan, his religious mother, survives. Fulsome laudation he would have despised. His greatness lives in spite of his critics, and even through the act of his political enemy. It was not fair to publish his private letters, but as in the case of Cicero's letters the reader enjoys a far more human and intimate insight instead of an historical legend. It could be said of Purcell's writings, as Blaine,

Preface

the candidate for the American presidency, said of the Mulligan Letters, published in his despite, "The man did his worst, the very worst he could out of the most intimate business correspondence of my life. I ask, gentlemen, if any of you can stand a severer scrutiny or a more rigid investigation into your private correspondence?" We may add what Macaulay wrote of the fierce scrutiny fastened upon Warren Hastings, "It brought many blemishes to light, but it entitles him to be considered pure from every blemish which has not been brought to light." The blemishes alleged in the case of Cardinal Manning need to be considered in the light of further documents.

Though Purcell's book was considered an obstacle and a stumbling-block in the Catholic revival of England, the Talbot correspondence need not have been kept unpublished as long as the vital letters were included, which were written between the death of Cardinal Wiseman and the election of his successor. Of this period Purcell wrote tantalisingly, "Between the 24th of February and 18th of March there is a break in the correspondence between Dr. Manning and Mgr. Talbot. Either no letters were exchanged during those weeks of suspense and expectation or the correspondence has not been preserved."

Both of these conjectures have proved incorrect! It is true that Manning had protested vigorously by a Churchman's right against the three candidates chosen for the succession, believing them to be unfit. The unpublished letters reveal the lost names of his candidates, whom the world will be surprised to learn did not include his own! The conclusion of one of many Protestant critics was the not unnatural one that Manning all the time was "blackening the character of every possible candidate"! He was not, for he thought both Ullathorne and Cornthwaite admirable candidates for the See to which he ascended.

The part Manning is alleged to have played in the

Preface

drama that led to the supersession of Archbishop Errington by himself in the See of Westminster is no doubt the crux of his biography. The case of the *advocatus diaboli* has often been stated and is so generally accepted that it is best to lay down what can be abundantly proved by original documents: that Manning did not believe it was possible for himself to succeed, though he felt he could prevent the succession of those whose policy he believed fatal to the Church in England. Accordingly he deprecated some and recommended others, and in no measured terms. Neither Manning nor Wiseman had initiated the suggestion that Manning should succeed. It had long lain at the back of the mind of the Roman authorities, and it only needed the attack by Errington on Manning's works, followed by the Chapter's obstinate representation of Errington's name to the Pope for succession, for Rome to carry out what Pope Pius the Ninth felt was best for the Church. It is true Manning had seemed to prepare the way by helping to dispossess Errington of the right of succession, but he was acting for and under his Cardinal. Letters written by the future Cardinal Vaughan to Wiseman from Rome three years before the event show that Rome acted for Rome's purposes and hidden intent and not through the Machiavellian manipulations of two converted parsons!

Vaughan wrote to Wiseman (January 10, 1862):

"I saw Cardinal Barnabo last night and presented the letters, which he bade me say he would attend to at once. He was going to the Pope to-day. One of his first questions was, '*Cosa fa quel benedetto Errington?*' He is in Dublin, and the reports which have reached me more than once are that he intends to remain there till Westminster is vacant, and then by the help of the Chapter to return. Barnabo thought this hardly possible, but said that a man who could take down the Pope's words in a private conversation in his presence was capable of doing many strange things. I said all were thankful to have got rid of him, and I explained

Preface

how much was being done in London now with new missions, churches, and various works." February 26, 1862: "And now there is a matter—one upon which I have been hesitating whether to write or not to you. It would be a point of delicacy and open to suspicion if you did not believe that my first affections as well as my first duties are towards you. I learnt from Talbot on Sunday that Barnabo had been suggesting the advisability of making Dr. Manning your Coadjutor. Talbot replied that the Bishops would feel aggrieved at such an appointment, and I urged strongly that you wished, so far as I believed, to die in harness and at work, and that the best move would be to appoint him to the See to be created in Yorkshire. Talbot had told me before that Ullathorne had assured him that the Bishops would willingly see Dr. Manning amongst them. Whether there may be some idea that you would not like to part with Dr. Manning from London or that his work is more in London than the provinces I cannot say. This may have given rise to the question of coadjutorship. I have taken care not to say a word of all this to Father Superior, nor has Talbot; and I believe Barnabo has not hinted anything of the sort to him, nor has he himself, I am sure, promoted or looked for such an appointment." March 22, 1862: "I hear nothing more of the idea Barnabo started about Dr. Manning of which I wrote to you. Talbot wants him to be in the North, but then he says the Pope will do nothing unless it is proposed to him by you or the Bishops."

A number of important diaries escaped Purcell's notice, including the description of Manning's first visit to Rome in 1838, and one of an intimately sacred nature, which he wrote in retreat before his consecration. The diaries published by Purcell are sadly confused in the matter of dates. For instance, in vol. i., chap. xiv., Manning's holiday begins in the autumn of 1844 and continues with the help of an 1845 diary to Paris. Manning then writes a few letters dated 1844 from Rouen and Dieppe, and "earlier in the same autumn" attends the founding of a church at Pantasaph in Wales, which actually took

Preface

place in 1849! Purcell also suffered from the considerable disability of not being able to read the handwriting of his subject. A careful collation of the printed diaries with the MSS. reveals no less than 150 mistakes, some of them ludicrous. For instance :

MSS.	VOL. I. <small>Page</small>	PURCELL.
Queen Elizabeth, etc., . . .	286	Queen Elizabeth and Catholic . . .
The students there at the Rev(olution) . . .	351	The students there, although called reverend, . . .
As quiet as Sunday . . .	372	As quiet as Lavington . . .
The shouts were deafening . . .	374	The revolutionists were in a hurry . . .
A Borghese Cardinal . . .	400	A Bishop of Risi, Cardinal . . .
City reminded me of Hever . . .	405	City reminded me of Herne Bay . . .

The Cardinal's Latin was often produced in the unmeaning form of Purcell's English. For instance, in the famous *Hindrances to Catholicism in England*, where the Cardinal wrote, "The world is dying *positus in maligno*, and we must go into it though *quaterduanus jam foetet*," Purcell substitutes for the last three words "through fire"! When the Cardinal wrote "A *baculus* is a dead thing," Purcell wrote "a vow is a dead thing," which was doubtless more comprehensible and suitable for Purcell's non-Catholic public and papers. One could perhaps apply to Purcell's hundreds of mistakes the Cardinal's phrase, "practical corruptions," if Purcell had not even turned the first word of that into "piratical."

Purcell showed signs of suspecting that all the arrows were not contained in his quiver, or he would not have felt constrained to overshoot the mark. It is curious that in the controversy that followed no one should have pointed out the absence of his letters to Vaughan and Ullathorne, though a reviewer in the *Academy* noted the absence of letters from such correspondents as Cardinals Gibbons and Lavigerie. Under these circumstances it

Preface

has seemed best to publish whatever threw additional light on Cardinal Manning, suppressing only a number of letters which affected the characters of others, both Protestant and Catholic. A locked book containing a private list of converts, whom he had received himself, seemed also to come under the heading of professional secrecy.

It would be unhistorical not to stress his firm opposition both to the policy and mentality of Cardinal Newman. At the same time it is important to publish his private letter to the Vatican in 1875 clearing Newman of all suspicion of unorthodoxy, without which letter from his Metropolitan it might have been difficult for Rome to confer the cardinalate three years later. Manning frankly did not desire Newman to be a Cardinal, though at the urgency of Newman's friends he consented and acquiesced. His struggle with Newman, like his conflict with the old English Catholics, and the even more momentous battle with the Religious Orders, was that of a strong, self-willed, and lonely man, who believed he was fighting the battles of Divine policy in the Church. His sincerity was both his sword in life and his shield after death. He spared few and none spared him. The comment of a Jesuit Bishop after reading Purcell's book was to the point. He said he could then understand how a wrong man could be saved, since he so thoroughly and sincerely believed he was right!

The great ecclesiastical battles which followed the restoration of the Hierarchy in England may be alarming to the weaker brethren, but to those who read as historians the inwardness of the strife there comes only a sense of the majestic power of the Roman Church, not only as the least stagnant of the Churches, but as the only one whose Divine centralisation survives and profits from internal conflicts. At times she seems to batten on the battles which would suffice to tear another Church into sect and schism. The stern loyalty of the old

Preface

Catholics in England, the unconditional surrender of the Gallicans at the Vatican Council, the patient pathos of Cardinal Newman, and the brave acquiescence of the Jesuits are as edifying to the faithful discerner as the hammer-blows of the great Ultramontane Cardinal, who fought them one by one in the lists of Rome, in some ways the freest and fairest lists open to the world.

Manning's long and eventful life was thrust into a parting of ways and an opening of eras. He was at a Georgian Harrow and a præ-Victorian Oxford. He was a High Churchman outside the Oxford Movement and a Sussex parson before railways. His wife died in the same year that Queen Victoria came to the throne, and he himself became a Catholic in the year of Lingard's death. He wore the prelatical purple in the last days of Papal Rome. He won his mitre in time to take a leading part at the Vatican Council and his red hat in time to share in the Conclave which elected Leo XIII. In many ways he was a link with the past and a prophet of the future. He was a cricketer before round-arm bowling, a Free Trader before Cobden, a Home Ruler before Gladstone, an Imperialist before Chamberlain, and a Christian Democrat before Leo XIII. He also seems to have preceded his fellow-countrymen by a generation in their antipathy to Prussia. He himself had once desired a political life, though there is no ground for Mr. Paul's statement in his *History of Modern England* that he was "originally destined to a mercantile career."

He had desired to be a statesman, and all his life he corresponded with statesmen. Brougham wrote to him in the forties, "I thank you heartily for your promised charge, which in defiance of your warning I shall read. Our session wanes and your Bill (if I may so term your enemy) is thrown over for a while." And thirty-five years later Manning wrote to congratulate Dilke, and to prophesy the entente with France, on his appointment to the Foreign Office (May 3, 1880): "I was glad because

Preface

I know that you have seen the Greater Britain and that you are conversant with French affairs and with the Continent, qualifications rarely possessed by an official man. You and I have talked of home policy often, but not much of foreign policy, so that I hardly know what you think. But the many years I have been abroad have made me desire that England should not accept *la politique d'effacement*. It has seemed to me that the statesmen in France have understood better the true policy of England on the Continent than many of our countrymen." And eleven years later he was concluding a fifty years' correspondence with Mr. Gladstone by encouraging him to persevere with Home Rule.

However, it is chiefly as the politician, "the ecclesiastical Schnadhorst," that he survives in legend. Though his unpublished and published papers brim with political letters, it is not to the exclusion of the poor and humble. In his drawers two generations of cranks cried aloud for the millennium in all shapes and sizes. If great English families confided their secrets to him, London costers sent him pawntickets to redeem. Wherever there was suffering he lifted his hands; to the Pope in temporal humiliation, to Ireland under coercion, to children under neglect, to animals under torture, to strikers under starvation, to outcasts, both men and women, whom he tried to rehabilitate, to drunkards under their curse, whom he would often bail out of prison in person. It was Manning who cried, "A child's needless tear is a blood-blot on the earth!" and Manning who wrote as lover and apostle of all London, "Give all yourself to London. It is the abomination of desolation. No one knows the depths of the sufferings of the women, save the doctor and the priest."


To the broken and battered he was affectionate and long-suffering. He was accessible to the pariah and humble to the humble. On the other hand he was proud to the proud and unyielding to the obstinate. He could

Preface

be as unkind to the literary conceit of converts as he was scornful of the dull conservatism of the old Catholics. The former he styled "literary vanities" and the latter "conies," whom the Scriptures describe as a feeble folk. The secret of much of his opposition to Cardinal Newman was that he suspected intellectual pride and smote it as such. Many of his views have proved obsolete, and the Church herself has reversed some of his policies. His policy for higher education has been tumbled, and he changed himself a strong support of the Temporal Power into an angry impatience with the same, after the Italians had settled their government in Rome. Indeed, he came to a conclusion that Providence might have sent the Italians after all! In his conversation with politically enlightened Cardinals and laymen he made no secret of his belief that the old Temporal Power was finished, and that the Vatican could dwell at peace with the Quirinal, as has been abundantly shown. "And they would burn me if they could," he used to add humorously. Even when he changed his views, his sincerity remained. Rome, who is wiser and more temperate always than her own children, passed over his views on the Temporal Power, which would not be very displeasing to Benedict XV., and Leo XIII. quietly adopted his policy of winning democracy to the Church. By thirty years of social action on the side of the working people, by his support of the legitimate trade union and the just strike as permissible in modern Christian civilisation, and the acceptance of both by the Church through his direct influence, Cardinal Manning stands in history.

SHANE LESLIE.

GLASLOUGH,
CO. MONAGHAN,
IRELAND, 1920.



Henry Edward Manning

His Life and Labours

CHAPTER I: EARLY DAYS

“As a boy my pleasure was making boats, firing brass cannons, and all like mischief.”—CARDINAL MANNING’S *Memoirs*.

THE family of Henry Edward Manning was sufficiently English to be able to refer their origin to Mannheim in Baden, which they left before the Norman Conquest. The Conqueror ennobled one, Gilbert Manning. In more recent times they served in the Crusades. Simon Manning married Chaucer’s sister. A Manning, Dean of Windsor, was with Henry VI. at his capture, and William Manning was Ambassador to the Emperor. His son was of Elizabeth’s household, and a John Manning was A.D.C. to Marlborough. The Mannings were thinly spread across English history and English geography, as such place-names as Manningford and Mannington denote. “Forty miles from Manningtree” was Diocesan slang for exclusion from the Westminster Archdiocese in days to come.

In his Catholic years Manning entertained a pious fiction that his family had followed Henry II. to Ireland, and been deported by Cromwell to the West Indies. Certainly his grandfather William, after marrying an heiress named Elizabeth Ryan, left St. Kitts and came to Totteridge in Herts. That Mrs. Manning died a young mother; but the probability that the Cardinal’s grandmother was Irish in faith as well as name can be shown indirectly. Her elder sister married John Baker of Horsham, in whose diary this entry occurs: “(Dec. 22, 1771) *Uxor* and *figlia* to West Grinstead, Mr. King,

Henry Edward Manning

Mr. Manning and I to Church.” This cryptic sentence may be interpreted in this wise: that while Mr. Manning and Mr. Baker went to the Church of England, Mrs. and Miss Baker went to a furtive celebration of Mass in the upper room, where the Caryll family kept the Catholic faith alive during the penal days at West Grinstead.

A Protestant gentleman then would no more have recorded the faith of a Catholic wife in his journal than a modern gentleman would inscribe infidelities on the part of his. A further entry, in 1774, shows that a Mr. Copley “stayed and dined” with Mr. Baker the night before his wife died. This was no heartless entertainment, for Mr. Copley was a priest, and presumably gave the Last Sacraments to the sister of Cardinal Manning’s Irish grandmother. “I am rejoiced to see that I may claim kindred with your faithful race,” he wrote to O’Hart, author of *Irish Pedigrees*.

His grandfather was one of the merchants who took precautions for the safety of London during the Protestant revival vulgarly called the Gordon Riots. His father, William, became a Governor of the Bank of England, and sat in Pitt’s Parliament for such extinct constituencies as Plympton, Lymington, and Evesham. By the marriage of William Manning and his second wife, Mary Hunter, of Beech Hill in Berks, Henry Edward was born. The *Courier* of July 21, 1808, records: “On Friday, at Totteridge, Hertford, the Lady of William Manning, M.P. for Evesham, of a son.” Friday was July 15, the Feast of St. Henry, Saint and Kaiser, who by the transition of Heimrich into Amerigo gave the New World its name. “He is ill-heeded in England and ousted by St. Swithin,” wrote the Cardinal.

The elements were not propitious, for the Bishop of Bath and Wells wrote to Mr. Manning (July 18, 1808):

“We rejoice with you very sincerely on the Birth of another Son, but most of all on the Safety of the dear Mother. But I hope she neither heard nor felt anything

Early Days

of the tremendous Storm of Thunder, Lightening, Hail and Rain, in which St. Swithin visited us on Friday last. The Thunder and Lightening were *literally* incessant for more than three hours between six and ten at night. So awefull and tremendous a Scene I was never Witness to before, and hope never to see again! Whatever Name you determine upon for the latter, whether St. Swithin, or St. Francis, the tutelar Saint, I believe, *of Spain*, I shall be most happy to give it to him with my Blessing, if the Christening Cake is not eat before we meet in Town. I would also offer myself in another Capacity on that occasion, if I did not think you were more likely to be puzzled in selecting a Godfather from among your numerous Friends and Connections than at Liberty to accept of me."


Mr. Manning's use for Bishops did not extend to Gossipred, and though Bishop Beadon probably baptised Henry Edward, his godparents were Mr. Cumming, Lord Sidmouth, and Lady Lavington. Mrs. Mary Gasquet left the tradition that "the Mannings were baptised in an old punchbowl with the family arms on it, and registered at a different time." This statement might be omitted in deference to the teetotal Cardinal, did it not throw some light on the obscure phrase of "the three-bottle orthodox." Registered Henry Edward was at St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, London, on May 25, 1809. He was named Henry after Lord Sidmouth, who, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, had relations with his father. Lady Lavington, name of strange omen, according to the Cardinal "was an Austrian Catholic, who, I fear, gave up her religion, for she married a non-Catholic Englishman." By birth a Kolbel and a friend of the last King of Poland, her exquisite likeness fades among the Cardinal's papers.

From the Ryans came the Cardinal's motto, *Malo mori quam fœdari*. In his pedigree the devotion of an Irish Ryan mingled with the religious severity of a Huguenot Bosanquet. Beside his Gaelic descent, he could claim,

Henry Edward Manning

like Newman and Faber, a tradition of persecuted piety in his Gaelic blood. The Mannings were armigerous, and boasted "quarterly gules and azure, a cross flory between four cinquefoils or." When he became Archbishop he had no need to change his arms, as the cross flory greeted him in the arms of Westminster. The heraldry of the Church naturally interested him more than the symbolism of families, and if he referred irreverently to Burke's *Peerage* as "the Studbook," he was proud to share in the mystic pedigree of one whom the Church ordains, he wrote in his *Eternal Priesthood*, to be "without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days or end of life, but likened unto the Son of God, a priest for ever."

His human descent was as follows :



He was once interested to see some Saxon coins bearing the stamp of "Manning *Moneta*," or Mint Master. The hereditary strain of "money-making," possibly under Celtic influences, broke down severely in his father, Governor of the Bank of England. William Manning failed, and his son Henry never forgot seeing him surrender his seals at the Guildhall as tragically as a soldier delivers his sword after honourable defence. "I have belonged to men with whom bankruptcy was synonymous with death," he whispered to his son, who a generation later described his Anglican bankruptcy and



© Mary Walker 2000

*Cardinal Manning in infancy
from a miniature*

Early Days

the delivery of his Archdeacon's seals to a City notary by the same metaphor, Death !

A decline in West Indian property followed the emancipation of the slaves; and by a curious irony the Manning bankruptcy was partly and indirectly attributable to Wilberforce, who was a cousin of Manning's first wife. With the family of Wilberforce the life of Cardinal Manning was inseparably woven. Letters of the Wilberforces form a rich seam through the Manning Papers. The great Abolitionist leaned upon William Manning during his struggle against slavery, and used to write him such sentiments as (January 30, 1789): "When I seem to you at any time to be intoxicated, as it were, by the hurry, the business or the dissipation of life, spare not the best offices of friendship; recall me to that sobriety and seriousness of mind which become those who know not when they may be called away." Henry Edward was born at the centre of the Evangelical Movement. With the Bank of England behind him on earth and the Wilberforces to guide him into the next world, he seemed a fortunate child. No wonder that he saw in time to come his father's bankruptcy as a merciful readjustment by Providence.

The firm of Manning and Anderdon had been worth £25,000 a year. Black servants waited at Copped Hall, and four horses drew the Manning coach to the Bank of England. The Cardinal remembered one of the West Indian negroes, who was instructed to watch for suspicious characters, keeping a Bishop at bay on the mat until he could give an account of himself and his garments! William Manning presented the shield of silver, which the London merchants subscribed for the Duke of Wellington, whose reply is preserved among the Manning Papers (February 16, 1822):

"I have been frequently excited to exertion in the public service by the favour and kindness of the Merchants and Bankers of the City of London, and I

Henry Edward Manning

have now to request you will express my most grateful acknowledgements to the gentlemen on whose behalf you this day presented to me a magnificent testimony of the approbation of my conduct while employed in the command of the Allied Armies in the Peninsula."

The shield appears in engravings of the annual Waterloo banquet, and includes a hundred guineas of Manning money. The social position of the Mannings was enviable. Oscar Browning contributes a glimpse :

"My grandfather lived in the same village. Manning's mother was very beautiful and beautifully dressed, and a leader of society. My aunts were highly gratified when she called upon them. Manning was a very pretty little boy, very like his mother, dressed in velvet knickerbockers. He was so small that he had to stand on the seat of the pew during service."

His brother Charles was page to George IV., and helped to close the Abbey gates when Queen Caroline sought co-coronation. The Duke of Gloucester was pleased to possess a print of Lonsdale's portrait of Mr. Manning, and to write for permission "to consider him a very sincere friend." The portrait depicted Mr. Manning enthroned with some splendour near the Bank of England, and is a contrast to another in possession of his descendants, in which the sad eyes of the bankrupt peer from a shrunken face, while the long white hair adds to the appearance of an exiled French curé. He died in 1835, and all speculations on his character are prevented by the obituary composed by the future Cardinal, which recorded his thirty-seven years in Parliament, his "spotless integrity," and concluded :

"Mr. Manning was a merchant of days now gone by, for in addition to deep regrets for those who with him and through his accidental instrumentality had been involved in losses, he felt the downfall of commercial credit like a wound. After this melancholy close of his active life he retired to a residence in Upper Gower Street, where on Good Friday (April 17, 1835) he

Early Days

exchanged this troubled and stormy scene, in whose vicissitudes he had been deeply taught, for the unchangeable and abiding rest of God."

To return to Henry, the Family Bible (now in possession of Lady Salt) records that "he was inoculated by Dr. Jenner for the Cowpock" in September, 1808, and the next year suffered "the chicken-pock." His earliest reminiscence (remembered by Canon Gildea) was of the old House of Commons. Left by his father in the Gallery, he witnessed the arrival of a dispatch which dismayed the honourable members. It was the news of Napoleon's escape from Elba. Two generations later he delivered the funeral sermon over the mangled body of the last of the dynasty, the Prince Imperial. In 1815 he heard his aunt read out "a great battle that had been fought in a field of corn in Flanders." This same year of Waterloo the Mannings left Totteridge for Sundridge in Kent.

But Totteridge, which passed to Bulwer Lytton and later to Sir Samuel Boulton, remained his dearest memory. Here his birth-room is still preserved, with the seven trees, which mark his and his brethren's arrivals. In the yard he slew his mother's turkey with an arrow. In the squat little brick church, with its tithe-barn and millennial yews, the future Cardinal learnt to pray, assisted by a picture by Petre, presented by his father, of an extremely unlikely and uncomfortable "Resurrection of a Pious Family." There was an institution known as "Mr. Manning's Bread" which bore some analogy to St. Anthony's Bread in the Catholic world. Mr. Manning invested a sum of £100 at George III.'s Jubilee in order to "gladden the hearts and extend great comfort to that useful class of persons, the labouring poor," an effort to meet the social question which "Master Henry Edward Manning," according to the parish registers, extended by an eleemosynary of three shillings in the year 1814.

Henry Edward Manning

At Totteridge he was prepared for Confirmation with Harry Brand, afterwards Speaker of the Commons, and Sidney Herbert. At Hatfield, the fount of Anglicanism, he was confirmed by Bishop Pelham of Lincoln, who not only laid but "shook hands with me then and there, his kindness overcoming his dignity." At Totteridge he learnt of the Book of Judgment, and endeavoured to conceal himself from God under a writing-table. As an old man the Cardinal revisited old haunts with Sir Samuel Boulton, and pointed out the room where he was born and the site of doors that had disappeared into the wainscote. As he passed through the old library he showed where he had once entered at his mother's bidding to take care of a guest while she completed her toilet: "I saw a great man on the hearthrug, and I said, 'You're big enough to take care of yourself,' and ran away." Between the library and dining-room he stopped before a stained window, the handiwork of his brother William, who had died seventy years before.

In the park he recognised the spinney planted by his father to commemorate King George's Jubilee, and found that it was still remembered how his mother had stretched sheets upon the fields to calculate the effects of an artificial lake seen from the house. There were still the trees, which had never been uprooted from his memory—an elm with excrescences, called the "bear-tree," and another from which Creasy, an Irish labourer, had fallen and broken his leg in fetching an owlet. True enough, the owls were still there, and he wrote to his surviving sister Caroline: "So we go, and the owls remain."

CHAPTER II: A CAPTAIN OF HARROW

“ My love for Harrow is as fresh and vivid as ever : indeed, as I grow older and older, the days of boyhood seem brighter.”—*Cardinal Manning (June 21, 1889) in a letter to Dr. Welldon framed in the Harrow Library.*

WHEN he was about ten Manning went to Harrow School. He lived at the house of Benjamin Evans in Hog Lane, now Crown Street, near the cricket-ground, where he spent spare moments. Evans was an old pedagogue acquainted with the learning of every age except his own, and therefore peculiarly suitable to train the rising generation, whom he made read Addison at breakfast. A manuscript record of September, 1822, places Manning in the Second Fourth form, and the next term in First Fourth. By April, 1826, he was in Under Sixth and twenty-ninth in a school of 211. When he left in October, 1826, he was in Upper Sixth. He sat between Lord Thurles and Bevan. Thurles had saved Manning's friend, afterwards Bishop Oxenden, from drowning; while Bevan, another friend, had a sister, the author of *Line upon Line* and other theological works, who was to save Manning as a brand from the burning and dispose him to his career in religion.

Harrow was rife with future ecclesiasts. There were Archbishop Trench of Dublin, Bishop Charles Wordsworth of St. Andrews, and Dean Merivale; while the Catholic hierarchy were to glean not only Archbishop Manning, but later Bishop Coffin of Southwark and Bishop Wilkinson of Hexham. Harrow was and is Low Church. Curiously enough, her High Church rival Eton produced no Catholic Bishop. Perhaps the mighty influence of Manning leaned toward the Harrow convert. Eton could produce only Pusey, whom Harrow capped

Henry Edward Manning

with Faber. But for that century the idol and hero of Harrow was Byron. Manning wrote: "All Harrow boys were Byronians by tradition. Byron died while I was at Harrow, about 1824. The Headmaster preached in the Parish Church on the abuse of natural gifts as soon as the news came. I gave up Byron at Oxford."

Manning and Byron, on the whole, were the two most famed and exceptional of Harrow boys. Both broke the bonds of English insularity in different ways, and incurred the angry pity of their fellow-islanders. Byron could have become King of Greece and Manning might have been Pope of Rome. They were the ripe fruit of the Romantic and Tractarian Movements respectively, though in the eyes of Englishmen their ripeness resembled the workings of decay.

Manning's Headmaster was a great man, Dr. George Butler—dapper, nervous, self-controlled, with cropped and powdered hair, processing in silk gown and stockings into school at the head of his miscellaneous assistants. His dress and diction were perfect. He had quelled a rebellion under Byron, who had satirised him as *Pomposus* in unending verse. He had since ruled the Harrow mob with success. He had visited Schiller, which was an intellectual feat for an Englishman at that time. His policy was an improvement on the great but grotesque barbarity of the Eton Headmaster Keate. He treated his monitors with the same trust he reposed in their fathers. He would no more have accused them of "cribbing" than their fathers of cheating at cards. Sage and athlete, he impressed Manning that it was good to be mocked for religion, for then the angels rejoiced. Instruction in religion and science were equally primitive and useless. The piecemeal propaganda conducted on behalf of religion in English schools has had the uniform result of producing an amused aversion. Evans brightened the dreariness of worship by readings of Paley's *Evidences* and Leslie on *Deism*. "These two

A Captain of Harrow

stuck by me and did my head good. I took in the whole argument, and I thank God that nothing has ever shaken it," wrote the Cardinal.

Butler impressed character more than scholarship on his boys. If he needed an epitaph it was that he believed in a boy's word, and he kept his own. "Whatever he said he would do he did as sure as fate," wrote Merivale. He strove to add to the curriculum of Latin and Greek upon which the English gentry were reared to face the contemporary dangers of fox-hunting and Napoleonic Wars. He instructed the Sixth in that form of oratory which is peculiar to the Butler family. Euclid and the Library of Useful Knowledge seem to have been introduced at this time. But his two remarkable pupils, Lord Shaftesbury and Cardinal Manning, had to betake themselves to the same private tutor to remedy their ignorance before entering Oxford.

Prize-fighting was of high repute with the English gentry, and their sons settled all questions of honour or dispute by resource to the Rules of the Ring. They squabbled like boys, but they fought like men. Manning used to say: "It is a good thing to learn boxing, for it will make one cautious of picking a quarrel with a small cad who might be more than a match for one's skill." Manning found Harrow pleasant, though on the moral score he afterwards reflected, "Harrow was my greatest danger." The Public School was the paradise of the normal boy, and Manning stood at the very top of the average. Bishop Oxenden recorded one of his sayings at Harrow, "You know that my motto is *Aut Cæsar, aut nullus*," which exactly describes the two conditions of school life. After enduring years of nullity he found himself Cæsar, Captain of the Cricket Eleven, to many the greatest position he ever occupied. On hearing Oxenden's reminiscence, he laughed and said: "Perhaps I said it, and why not? Pitt's was a good enough precedent."

Henry Edward Manning

Byron "hated Harrow" until he fought his way up. Trollope, whose novels were to relax Newman, was a contemporary of Manning, and found the School "a daily purgatory." Faber was the only boy who used to receive Communion at Harrow. Manning once wrote to Miss Stanley: "As a boy at school I used to be often sad, and to comfort myself like a young heathen by saying:

Come what come may,
Time and the hour runs through the roughest day."

Wilberforce was so alarmed by the Public School that he would not send his boys, whence the profound difference between Sam Wilberforce and Manning.

On Sundays the whole school trooped into the "cavernous and stifling" galleries constructed under Butler's eye in the Parish Church. While Manning was at Harrow, Butler reduced the Holy Days observable to six, which included those of Charles I., George IV., and Guy Fawkes. But the exercises of an English school relate, not to religion, but to cricket. Manning played against Eton in 1825, and in the match against Winchester was bowled by Christopher Wordsworth for nought! In his year of captaincy he took two wickets against Winchester and scored three. The Wordsworth boys were sons of the Vicar at Sundridge, and both became Anglican Bishops. The three playmates once robbed the vinery at Coombe, with the result that there were no grapes for Mr. Manning's dinner-party that night. "This is probably the only case on record where three future Bishops were guilty of larceny," reflected the Cardinal. "Were we punished? No, we were discreet. We gave ourselves up and were forgiven."

Charles Wordsworth, Bishop of St. Andrews to be, gave Manning a cricket-bat, for which he received a long letter in verse beginning:

A Captain of Harrow

“HARROW (*Sept.* 12, 1825).

“DEAR CHARLES,—

I hope you'll make some small allowance,
Being a poet of the brightest rate.
You would, I'm sure, be kind if you could know
once
What pain I've taken to write verse of late.
We've had two games, both quite superior;
The play was glorious, as I'm alive,
Not even to the Eton Match inferior,
Your humble servant, first got forty-five.”

And much else recommending a gun-maker to “Christy,” who became Bishop of Lincoln. Manning, when Archbishop, visited Lincoln Cathedral, and told the verger he could call the Bishop by his Christian name. “But he would burn me all the same!” was Christy's unfeeling comment on hearing of the visit. As an old man Manning wrote to Charles :

“I can see you in your broad-brimmed white hat and green cut-away coat : the admiration and envy of all beholders. It reminds me of how much I owe you in my books : and of your original ingratitude, for you know that I coached you in logic. If you have the other verses from which you quote the thanks for the bat, I should much like to see them. I have burnt almost all the doggrel of those days. I hope you are well in health. We have a long score to be thankful for : you, I think, 76, and I 74 years.”

Manning kept metaphors from cricket in his speech. He used to say he became a Catholic “off his own bat,” and in his last years : “We have had a long innings, Newman and I.” But he disliked the ideal of muscular Christianity, and of a heaven where cherubs played curates at cricket indefinitely. To athletic priests he said : “How would you like to appear in the next world with a cricket-bat in one hand and a chalice in the other?” To a sacerdotal footballer he remarked : “A priest should not run after a piece of leather.”

Henry Edward Manning

Merivale, who remembered him as a "handsome, well-mannered, but mightily-affected boy, giving himself airs of fashion and patronage, but generally agreeable and even fascinating," wrote a half-century later :

" I just now recall to mind how once in playing cricket with him he hit a ball with a very pretty curve to the off, and thereupon, instead of making his run, threw his bat back on his shoulder, exclaiming, ' I say, Merivale, what a mysterious thing a cricket ball is !' and so he has gone on—and *Sibi constat*."

A Manning tradition survived. Even his school nicknames have descended, such as "the General," "the Hare," "Prince Fine Ear," or "the Parson," pointing all to undeveloped possibilities. The Parson was the only nickname he disliked, and it clung to him longest. Dr. Welldon, a later Headmaster, recalls

" that when he was a boy he was an expert stone-thrower. It was the mischievous habit of Harrow boys in old days to throw stones down Grove Hill at strangers making their way to the school; and Manning was believed, whether rightly or wrongly, to have been an excellent shot at far-distant objects. The other fact believed about him was that he was a good slow bowler."

The last time that Manning crossed the bounds of the Harrow Republic was as Archbishop to consecrate a Catholic church. Even then his fame had not departed, and an old apple-woman awaited him outside the church to bid him welcome. The Cardinal had forgotten what she never had, how her barrow had been overturned in the mud and Manning had raised a subscription on her behalf. In one of the classrooms, carved by himself in small lettering, is the autograph, "H. E. MANNING, 1824."

The best influence on Manning at Harrow was his brother-in-law, John Anderdon, who taught him English by correspondence, and was interested enough to send a cricket professional from Lord's Ground to coach the

A Captain of Harrow

Harrow Eleven, including his beloved protégé. Lord's was then associated with Mr. Ward, M.P., "the finest cricketer in the world," and father of the "Ultramontane" Ward, who was to be Manning's partner in many fierce knocks to come.

Anderdon, of the firm of Manning and Anderdon, was described as "a gentleman and a man of business, a scholar, and though a layman he was almost a divine. As a Churchman he was of the school of George Herbert." He encouraged, financed, and corrected the high-strung and manly-fibred schoolboy. Though Manning took a double remove while he was at Harrow, he afterwards wrote to Anderdon (September 18, 1830):

"On examining my own state, I find myself thus situated. In all the reading proper to that age during which a boy is at school I am insecure, even to the foundation. Exertions must be made subsequently, and some I have endeavoured since leaving Harrow to make, but the seed-time was passed, and all the acquisition I was enabled to make fell very short of what I ought to have mastered. I said I must fail, and my failure will be a result of my Harrow days. Inattention there causes deficiency now, and so it is, Jack, through life."

1826 was Manning's last year at Harrow, and Anderdon was urging him to dumb-bells and fencing. "Time waxeth on, melteth like wax, and I want to see you take your first-class degree at Oxford." As for his verses, "There are some very pretty thoughts, or rather half-thoughts, but either we should have twice as many stanzas or half the number of ideas."

Manning was determined to read with a private tutor all to himself, and informed his father: "I have long been anxious that some certain plan should be determined on with regard to my leaving this place and going to Oxford. During the months that intervene between the period of my leaving this and removing to Oxford, I think a private Tutor would be of the greatest advantage

Henry Edward Manning

to me. By a private Tutor I do not mean where I should meet several others, as I am aware that under these circumstances the advantage would be very sensibly lessened. But what I wish to be understood is that I might be alone." It is supposed that Manning had no thought of the Church until his father's bankruptcy in 1831, but this letter of 1826 continues: "That I should enter Oxford at Whitsuntide or October is, I think, not very material, as I cannot take Orders till twenty-three, and therefore have upwards of four years before me."

Mr. Manning's reply was unsatisfactory, and his son wrote again to explain that "by having the exclusive attention of a clever man I should make more rapid progress. I say nothing of the possibility of the young men I should meet not being gentlemanly or well-principled, because it may be supposed that they would in general be so, but if it were otherwise I should find it very difficult to avoid their society." This threat, with Anderdon's good offices, prevailed. Anderdon even corrected the letters before they reached the parental eye. Manning wrote (October 18, 1826):

"I fear you must have forfeited a large portion of your valuable sleep in correcting and revising my Bœotian production, which my father will receive together with this. (*Will he receive this?* corrects Anderdon.) It is not unlikely that my father may consult you on the subject. If he confers with you in regard to his letter to the Vice-Chancellor I think it might be as well if you were to advise him merely to mention the circumstance of his wishing (*What is the circumstance of a wish?*) that I should go there in October, as he may be inclined to say more, and I am aware that the whole tribe (*What tribe of Oxonians?*) are averse to private Tutors. I should like to say two or three things (*To say a thing is not elegant*) if you will not consider me presumptuous (*presumptuous*). Balliol is spelled (*spelt*) with a double 'l' in the centre; why so I cannot say, but so it is. I have read about an (*antiquated*) hundred lines of Herodotus and a few other things. I hope you found no false quantities in my

A Captain of Harrow

epigram, and if you will brush up your Gradus I will tack a few more on (*dele*) to the tail of my next essay. If you should happen to have a translation of Persius in your possession (*If I have it, it must be in my possession*), I should be very much obliged by the loan. (*What loan, Mexican or Columbian?*)”

By such humorous cross-corrections with Anderdon Manning learnt that crisp style which stood him in stead all his life. Meantime, at Lord Colchester's advice, a crammer had been found in Northamptonshire, whereat Manning wrote (November 7, 1826) :

“ I have been considerably alarmed by this disclosure, and wrote immediately to my father to explain the circumstance, also referring him *to you*, that you might more fully make known my reasons to him. I should consider the six months *lost*, were they to be spent with a houseful of pupils with any Tutor : Harrow would be far preferable. Explain it. The fire will be the proper place for this note when read. In haste, good-bye.”

(*Note by Anderdon* : “ Even your hasty notes must be *in order* ; it is a mere habit—a knack ! Your Johnson.”)

Manning left Harrow at Christmas, writing a last schoolboy letter to Anderdon (November 23, 1826) :

“ I had always understood that the nature of an ode would allow of the transition from one thing to another. I had also fancied that I could discover this in the *Odes* of Horace. I will not, however, dispute the point with you. I frequently have been delayed in writing by not being able to say sufficient on one point or to avoid my letter being composed of short, disjointed sentences. Since I have been under your tuition I have found this difficulty decrease ; but I must not say anything, either one way or another, on this subject. If I should say I thought myself improved I should be arrogant, as otherwise it might seem to be a reflection on my master, as well as on my own stupidity. I am glad to see your long absence from Harrow has obliterated Horace sufficiently from your recollection to allow my Lyrics to pass un-

Henry Edward Manning

molested. They smell (eloquent metaphor) slightly of him.

“ It is considered here and by most Cambridge men to be a fair thing, where your subject requires it, to make use not only of the expressions of any of the poets, but also to quote a half line or a whole one. To me it seems the safest means of getting the idioms of the poetry of the Augustan Age. If you do not agree with me on this point, send me a few observations, which I will endeavour to meet, and may form a subject for a literary controversy *entre nous*.

“ I read the King’s speech yesterday, and I must say it appeared to me to be what Brougham described, full of nothing. This, no doubt, is from some policy. I am doing my best, and I hope that on Christmas Day I may be able to say with a quiet conscience :

*Hoc arma defunctorumque bello
Barbiton, hic paries habebit.*

Given at our Club called the ‘ Union ’ on the 23rd day of November, 1826. *Stet fortuna domus.*”

And after Harrow had suffered a defeat at cricket he wrote (August 4, 1827) :

“ Lord’s ground is with Hecate’s ban thrice blasted, thrice infected. However, I am glad we (for I dare not, and cannot, separate my name from Harrow) showed them some play. Be it forgotten.”



Cardinal Manning as a Harrow boy, about 1820

By the artist's father photo



CHAPTER III: OXFORD

“A hopeful aspirant to a first-class, an Oxford Prize Poem, and a niche in the Temple of the Muses between Lord Byron and my friend Timon.”—*Manning to Anderdon, 1827.*

MANNING came home from Harrow on the Sunday, and the very moment that his sister Harriet died. “Her death was a great loss to me, and left me alone.” Mr. Wilberforce consoled the parents with a tract and an anecdote: “I remember the late Archbishop Moore telling me when he lost a sweet young creature, a daughter just about to attain to womanhood, how much he was pleased with it.”

In company with his father, Manning took the coach by the old Bath Road to Poulshot in Wiltshire, where Canon William Fisher prepared him during nine months for Oxford. Here he learnt to read the Classics, and even French and Italian. “I can say I never lost a moment—up early and very late to bed.” His only break was a visit to Oxford, where he matriculated on April 2, 1827. The books at Balliol record—

“*Henricus Ed: Manning fil: nat: 3s Gulielmi Manning arm: de Coombe Bank.*”

On the opposite page was a family name of fateful omen, “*Franciscus Newman admissus socius 1826.*” To Manning “the streets and colleges by lamplight seemed a fairyland.” He was cared for by Edmund Estcourt, who was to read the Apostolic letters at his consecration thirty-eight years later.

He returned to Poulshot, and until July worked till three every morning. Years later Fisher remembered his sensitiveness to dust and his disputes over many passages like “Luke xii. 50, which, to your utter astonishment,

Henry Edward Manning

proved a puzzle to you; how you defied me to do my worst against you in Greek Testament. I never had so happy a time with any man as with you." For Manning, "I have a baptism to be baptised of, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished," was a prophetic text.

The correspondence with Anderdon never ceased—wild and whimsical productions of the moment, the flying foam of a clever schoolboy champing his pen in an isolated rectory. Poems fell thick.

"What did you think of my 'Vision'? Did you ever see the like?" Apparently not. "Sitting one night in my easy-chair I thus soliloquised. In these times it seems as indispensable for a poet to have a dream of his own as to provoke them in the cerebel of his readers. We know from Persius that Ovid, Seneca, Aristophanes, and many more, had sundry snoozes on Parnassus, after which parturition was inevitable and instantaneous. We will e'en try to indulge in a waking dream."

And again :

"I trust you will think this original. Send me your strictures. Oh the Moon! Spirit of Ralph the Rymster, appear. Soft Music. Impromptu.

Selene.

When in thy radiance thou dost smile,
I love to gaze as gaze I now.
And think that from thy hallowed isle,
Whene'er thou lookest down below,
In our still earth thou nought canst see
But innocence and purity.
Not so thou watchedst, when of yore
The countless hordes of Thessaly
Shook the red hand of carnage o'er
The lovely mistress of the sea,
But fleeing didst refuse thy light
To hide the horrors of that night.

"When Alexander made his attacks upon Tyre it was in the night: when suddenly the moon was obscured. I won't inflict any more 'Laura Matilda' upon you,

Oxford

although I could rhyme on it till I confounded night with day, which is not improbable, since 'morning grey' will soon draw away the bed-curtains. Once more good-night. I am sure I shall be a poet, because my hand is deteriorating into a most talent-telling *scrawle*."

June 8, 1827 :

"When I last had the pleasure of your society I used the word 'segment' with perhaps greater latitude than is generally allowed. You very properly corrected me. I have since traced the etymology of the word for my own amusement, and although I am aware it is impossible for me to justify my usage of it, I may adduce some reasons, which if they do not in some measure palliate my offence against rectitude, may serve to make us a little discontented with the narrowness of our language. 'Segment (*segmentum*, Lat.), so much of a circle as is cut off by a chord' (Johnson).

Segmentum—1st, a shred or piece cut from something!
2nd, a collar!!
3rd, a border of a garment!!!
4th and lastly, divisions of a circle.

"If you remember, I quoted from Byron 'a segment of life's vilest sand.' Aye, say you, but that is the 'circle of life.' This strikes me to be a very mixed metaphor; so much so that I should think that illustrious poet would have hesitated ere he wrote it, 'For what is writ, is writ.' Granting that he alluded to the *circle of the hour-glass* (which, by the way, I do not believe), it would surely be a wooden way to cut off the sand in segments: our glasses do not dispose of their charge in that fashion. Yours until the last chord has divided the last segment—LEOPOLSTAD.

"By the way, if you want to read anything that is theoretical to the sticking point of theory and unsound as an Irish bog, send to your booksellers for *The Crisis*, by the Rector of Hamstall Stafford (*obiter* an awful name for one of the Church swine and savours of Tythepig). It tries to fix the end of the period of the 1260 years in

Henry Edward Manning

1792, the year of the Revolution. The King who was to rise at 'the time of the end' he wishes to show to be Napoleon. He knocked down the Pope. Why did we put his Worship up again? My candle is sinking, and I am writing against it, but the odds are on the candle. I have no doubt that I shall find a letter from you on the breakfast-table to-morrow. Oh! the paper of my candle has caught fire, and I can stand the flickering no longer, so good-night. Friday night alias Sat. morn. 3 o'clock."

"The last weed that took root in my brain was discovered by the 'gardener' before it had reached above a few inches in height, which was duly 'rooted up and cast into the fire.' Here, however, is one that has increased *ruris in angulo*, unseen until it has reached (if so ill a weed ever has it) its prime. It is the largest dock of all the crop, which you are at liberty both to crop and dock at your leisure, pleasure, and convenience. I dedicate this to you with the same feelings of exultation that a schoolboy puts a squib on his master's desk after a 'fifth of November row.' It is rather intolerant for a Churchman; but it would be hard indeed were a man to be dragged before a tribunal to answer for the sentiments which he *Musarum numine inflatus* may have expressed.

"I have just finished A of Thucydides, and since it is Saturday a little idleness is allowable. The idleness I allude to is penning this. I have a proposal to make. Let your part be to write me a paper upon whatever first occurs to you, of which I am uninformed (a large field, i' faith). Let yours be a series of *Noctes Urbanæ*, mine *Noctes Rusticæ*. I shall give you my opinions upon languages and my reasons for wishing to attack French and Italian. But let them be papers, not letters."

"I have thrown off something in the shape of what I propose. It is beneath your criticism. Do not laugh at my name. I used to call myself the Pelican of the Wilderness, and until I get a better suit I shall be content with my place in the Ornithology, tho' a swan would be more poetical. You will say a goose were better. When I am inclined to be satirical I shall sign Gnatho from *gnathos*, a nail, because I intend to have a sharp point. My paper is not a reflexion of the Spectator, but perhaps my Hebdomadal practice may add some quicksilver to

Oxford

the back of my Mirror. Write yes or no—no, don't write no, write yes. Here is a proof that one may write iambics involuntarily. Lising in numbers with a vengeance."

"Tuesday night 12 o'clock. You talk of severer studies. I must take honours, and they shall be in Classics. When that is over I'm ready for you from Locke to Mrs. Barbauld's Hymns. My leisure hours at Oxford shall not be thrown away, you old Zenon; go to a nunnery, go! More to-morrow."

"Wednesday morning. I collect from your hurried, worried, and disjointed sentences that you suppose my French and Italian would prevent some of my other reading. In case you should think that I waste my time here on what you compliment by calling poetry and in writing jargon to you, I can only say that for five months I have rarely had more than six hours' sleep at night. How to squander the remaining eighteen hours I know not. But perhaps you may inform me."

"I had expected you to send me a small exegesis of your opinions—in fact, the skeleton of an oration—but, plague on you, you have buried me under a heap of Yankee reviews, *regali situ Pyramidum altius*. Write me a line with more blood-circulated fingers than penned your last. Adieu."

Manning aspired to a "Facciolati Lexicon," but feared the price; also to an English Gradus. Anderdon decided to nip his poesy in the bud (July 30, 1827): "You are to be a reasoner, whether Parson, Lawyer, or Senator, not a poet. *Garde à vous!* There is no English Gradus. So much the better." Manning replied:

"Did you ever hear the story of the Priest and the Ostler? The latter surprised the former at confession by the paucity of his sins, and being asked if he never greased horses' teeth to spoil their eating, answered in the negative. The next time, however, he was much further from salvation, having practised the above trick more than once, and on being reprimanded, he laid the blame upon the priest, saying that till last time he really never heard of such a crime. This story is applicable to

Henry Edward Manning

me, and I have been laughing at it. 'You are to be a reasoner, whether Parson, Lawyer, or Senator, not a poet.' Why law? Your honour, I never thought of no such thing, but 'doing it as you tells I so—why, I will be if I can!' So if I can turn out a ballad-monger, you are answerable."

On reading Manning's poem on Superstition Anderdon sighed "*Heus Jupiter!*" but added: "I really expect that with attention and polish you will some day be in print." Of other "weeds" he wrote: "They have colours and a something of fragrance." It was Manning's besetting sin he watched, "that soft and sweet complacency," and forgave the weeds which were the only wild oats Manning sowed. Indeed, he advised him for the Newdigate Prize in English verse, which was *Cœur de Lion*, "Ponder, reflect, arrange the order of your story;" and Manning, who was to be an unsuccessful candidate with Gladstone, replied (September 1, 1827): "You have taken the very line for *Cœur de Lion* which I had proposed to myself."

In October, 1827, Manning went to Balliol in an unreformed Oxford. It was still eighteenth-century Oxford, and the breach with the Jacobite University that melted its plate for King Charles was less than with the Emporium of Dissent and the Rhodes Caravanserai of to-day. Academic exclusiveness made learning a close corporation. The Chairs were sinecures—"a fellow who had never looked upon the stars soberly in his life Professor of Astronomy, and for History men who had never read anything but *Tom Thumb*." Fellows of the colleges passed their time between Quart and Quarto. Mediocre Heads were elected by mediocre Fellows. Bishop Oxenden attributed his loss of a Fellowship to a revoke at whist after a qualifying dinner. No Catholic or Puritan was admitted. Save for ringing of bells and droning services, there was little religion. Wesley's Holy Club had been, and Manning heard Newman preach, but

Oxford

the avenging blasts of the Oxford Movement had not begun to blow. Old Dr. Routh could remember the Protestants King James drove from their Fellowships, and towards his hundredth year he was yet to see converts to Rome made ex-Fellows in their turn. So short a stretch covered the Anglican domination of the English Universities!

But at Balliol, known as "the prison-house," men worked, thanks to Dr. Jenkyns, the shrewd, finicky, ridiculous, reforming Master, whose foresight prepared the way for the overpraised Jowett. Manning rode and boxed like the Christian gentlemen of the time. He also read. Bishop Hamilton's *Life* records "Manning hard at work getting up the text of the Bible, so as to command great facility in applying it, and Gladstone working at Hooker." It was in Charles Wordsworth's room that Manning first met Gladstone. "Rode to Blenheim with Manning," recorded Wordsworth; "Dined with Hamilton. In all societies it is advisable to associate, if possible, with the highest" (December 8, 1827). Hamilton became Bishop of Salisbury. Another of Wordsworth's pupils was James Hope, whose great mentality was severely tempered by absence of ambition. With Gladstone, he became one of Manning's closest.

Another future Bishop of Salisbury, George Moberley, helped to instruct Manning, on one occasion in Thucydides. Moberley ventured to hold up his "railway speed," whereupon "Mr. Manning looked up innocently and said: 'I beg your pardon, but I feel sure I am right.'" Six years later Manning told him he had been improvising himself! "How well I remember your music and poetry and our metaphysics, and all your malice against me," remembered the Cardinal, and Moberley answered (January 1, 1879): "There are some Greek words in your letter which reveal the memory of a timid, bashful young Tutor *sat upon* by an—well! audacious young undergraduate. But it is fifty years

Henry Edward Manning

since." On another occasion Moberley sent for Manning to take tea in his rooms with a very shy and jerky-mannered Scotsman, whom he was anxious to see ushered into a good set. Manning was accordingly introduced as "an eminent bachelor and safe friend," as he doubtless was at the time. As the two young men crossed the Quadrangle arm in arm, "Mark me," said Mitchell, a Balliol tutor, "those two will both live to be Archbishops." It was a shrewd shot, for the Freshman was Tait of Canterbury to be.

Manning seems to have had a taste for dress, as shown in pink silk riding-breeches (which impressed his friends), but more seriously for the art of address. On the puny stage of the Oxford Union he engaged his untempered steel with the future Viceroys and Ministers of England. Of this circle Samuel Wilberforce had been the burning light, and Gladstone was waiting to succeed Manning, as Manning succeeded Wilberforce. The future champions of English Anglicanism, Romanism, and Liberalism, followed each other in quick succession across that floor of ordeal.

The Union records tell that Manning successfully attacked protected wool, the Pallium of Toryism, in his first speech (March 12, 1829). A week later Manning and Wilberforce carried a majority against an unsparing death penalty, but from the latter's anti-slavery motion Manning tried to exclude the accusation of Colonial slavery as a crime. The filial piety of each conflicted. The fathers of both Manning and Gladstone had been interested in the West Indies. Manning spoke against a motion condemning the Parliament during the Civil War, and against the necessity of unanimous juries. On October 22, 1829, he opposed a vote of thanks to the President, Mr. Wilberforce, for his determined conduct in the chair. On the same day a greater friend and a greater enemy was elected a member—Gladstone. A fortnight later Manning was elected President, but

Oxford

refused owing to his coming examinations. His name was inscribed once in the chair, but erased for that of Wilberforce. That November occurred a famous debate with Cambridge men, who insisted that Oxford's Shelley was a greater poet than Cambridge's Byron.

The Cambridge orators, Monckton Milnes, Sunderland, and Hallam (the latter two immortalised by Tennyson), arrived in post-chaise, and were received by Mr. Manning of Balliol and Mr. Gladstone of Christ Church. Oscar Browning recalls the tradition :

“ After the opening of the debate the Oxford men were silent, and Sunderland, a great Union orator (Tennyson's ‘ dark-browed cynic ’), arose and said, ‘ Which silent one, silent all ! ’ When he sat down a frail figure with a girlish face rose from the back benches, and in a very fine speech defended the expulsion of Shelley from Oxford. It was Manning.”

True to Harrow, Manning defended Byron, and, moreover, proved him the better poet by the unanswerable argument that all present confessed to have read him, but not Shelley ! Manning's speech defeated the motion by 90 to 33. “ It was like provoking a wasps' nest,” he recalled.

Debating seems to have been his keenest pleasure. To Anderdon he wrote (November 7, 1830) : “ I long to make an oration in our Society. They have enlarged the room, and it is very respectable. Party runs very high, and I anticipate great amusement.” He was an interested critic of Gladstone's first speech. Henceforth they became interwoven in each other's lives, the two great antitheses of the Victorian era. Gladstone was thinking of the clerical career Manning's debating success had led him to abandon. “ He was one of the three handsomest men at Oxford. He was not at all religious,” was Gladstone's recollection of Manning, who in later years told Lord Salisbury that at Oxford Gladstone was quite a sober and sound young man. “ You astonish me,”

Henry Edward Manning

was the reply; "I thought he was always an Italian in the custody of a Scotsman."

The Oxonian Manning revealed himself in a letter to Anderdon :

"Hang me, Jack, if I do anything by halves hereafter. I will endeavour to be Cæsar; I know I can be *nullus*. But never will I be *Nullo-cæsar*, which is an amalgam of craving ambition and yielding softness, inadequate exertion and harassed tranquillity. Just enough of one to make one miserable, and too little of the other to succeed in any attempt."

During 1830 he spoke rarely, once to move "that there is as great an infusion of popular power in the House of Commons as is consistent with the spirit of the Constitution," which he carried as well as an attack on Canning, with Gladstone for an ally. Again, he criticised the stability of the American Constitution. Both Gladstone and Manning were Tories, but Manning broke away the soonest, supporting the Reform Bill Gladstone abhorred. On Catholic Emancipation Peel resigned the University seat, and was supported by Gladstone, but opposed by Newman! "What do you think of civil and religious liberty?" Manning wrote to Anderdon. "The old drones will come out of the hive before long." Manning consistently smoked out old drones through his life. He was not less the reformer when he joined the Church against which the Reformation was directed. In 1865 he wrote to Gladstone: "The first speech you made at Oxford on the Rights of Man was sounder and not far from what I hold now. I may be wrong in my political principles, but I have not varied much."

Only an inkling crossed Manning's mind on Catholic affairs. "What do you think of politics? You have at least thought of Daniel O'Connell and the Union Society," he wrote to Anderdon. His Oxford days were reflected in letters to the faithful Anderdon, "my Jo John." They displayed a high-faluting and pompous

Oxford

egotism, but they were good practice and "a kind of manifestation of conscience." His first note from Oxford survives :

"I am pretty well initiated now, and do not feel quite so *fresh* as I did during the first few days. I have got rooms, very small, but I think I can make them equally comfortable; but there is one sad drawback, the bookcase will not hold a Quarto, much less a folio, and where to erect another I scarcely know. One I will have if it block up the window. My books have not arrived from Fisher's. My lectures are two a day—Herodotus and either Euclid or Livy; the latter is a freshman's lecture, and for this term I must submit to the ignominy. I speak it in half shame, at the Herodotus I need not and at the Livy I do not look. Again I say, when my books come I will begin. I will now to bed."

The following are fragments :

"I am satiated of classics without being a scholar, of logic without being a reasoner, of book-learning without being a master of my own subject, either literary or scientific."

"Ambition and Avarice differ only in the selection of means. The former is as unmixedly selfish as the latter, and in the generality of instances incalculably more pernicious and destructive to others. Vanity is the mainspring. Vanity, boundless, blind, empty, insatiate vanity. It was vanity that first made me desirous of becoming a speaker. It is vanity that still keeps me to the object. I can trace vanity in every word I utter, possibly in every word I now commit to paper. Is it not the duty of man to mortify so contemptible a propensity?"

"One thing bores me above all measure, the getting almost by heart, or at least by rote, such important historical data as that Hegisippus was son of Hegistratus, who was son of Ariston, lineally descended from Hercules, and went to Chalcis with two triremes and a rowboat."

"To answer your letter *seriatim*, the next topic is tea. As I live on nothing else and Oxford produces nought but sticks and sloe-leaves, I should be obliged to you if

Henry Edward Manning

you would procure me a quantity for about six weeks."

"Do you think that I am relapsing; I will prove myself to you a very Leviathan in practice, so that you shall never discover my having doubted the existence of matter, without which Turgot despairs of a man's becoming a metaphysician."

Philosophy, Vanity, Teetotalism, all themes which follow him through life. Reams and reams survive, signed with a variety of names, such as "Anti-Dodo" (Anderdon being known as Dodo). Verse is scarcer, but slips in :

When Florio speaks, what maiden could withstand,
If gentle Damon did not squeeze her hand?
When Dodo writes, what student could withstand
If Whateley's Logic were not close at hand?

In his last year he was sobered by illness and approaching examinations (May 13, 1829) :

"Who could have imagined that I, who was so lately declared to exhibit human frailty at an early age, should be called upon to administer antidote to the hipped and hypochondriac? This would be to assume a character you once thought little fitted to my abilities, and I cannot but fear that you may denounce me as a quack or empiric when you find me in sober madness attempting to make joyful the heart of man. The last month, however, has altered my image and superscription. I am a bit from the new coinage, and although I may not be so dainty a specimen, I hold myself true carat and unalloyed. The Philosophy of Greece is specious but empty; it is a gorgeous balloon well fitted to raise the minds of men, during serene weather, above the bounds of ordinary contemplation; but in a high wind it proves itself a scoundrel composition of shreds and patches. The Stoics were coxcombs. Believe me, Jack, pain, mental or bodily, is an evil; don't try to think it otherwise. If man could bring himself to such an insensibility as Zeno or Epicurus would command, he would run a hazard, not of unmanning, but of unhumanizing himself. Mental

Oxford

pain is *μέγα κακόν* when once admitted ; but admit it not. Let him knock at your oak ; but he is like a Scotchman, if he can get his little finger in, his body will soon follow."

Dec., Kal. III., 1829 : "The tone of your letter belied your assertion that your mind had recovered its equilibrium. I hope you are conscious of it. I require no bookcase, as I intend to be the man of one book for the next two months. You charge me of secretiveness. You are right in so doing. You know Toilus but little if you think the Hunca Munka of your last letter would disturb his philosophic indifference. I send you an epigram on Shelley.

Peace Rhetorician ; canst thou syllogize
From Moonshine premiss or ethereal question ?
Hath not great Bacon said the subtleties
Of Nature scorn the Stagirite's suggestion ?
Seek not Sorites in the moon's thin beam,
Much less from Shelley seek an enthememe.

I am sure the managers will cry 'Enough!' to escape a surfeit of this sorry stuff. You won't know me when I come home. I am grown fat, idle, and impudent. I only hope you may be the same, on the true Aristotelian principle that like loves like."

Referring to the ups and downs of trade, he wrote (June 16, 1830) :

"I rejoice with you in sugar and condole with you in rum. I shall be very surly this vacation save at my lucid intervals. Of these you shall have timely advertisement. I intend to have all your house to myself, unless you and yours turn my Academus into a Gymnasium. I long to have a talk to you ; unless abstinence from beans constitute the whole character, I shall be no Pythagorean. Yours, HAL."

But he dreaded his examinations (September 18, 1830) :

"In all the most of the reading proper to my University course I feel myself more confident I have not done amiss with it, save where the attempt to make

Henry Edward Manning

good old deficiencies has interrupted my attention. This gives me comfort as regards my own power of application and comprehension. I must fail here, although I neither despond nor despair; you know my sentiments too well to need much asseveration on this point. I almost fear I am too indifferent; yet I pledge myself to work it through."

He found himself unimpeachable on Butler, Aristotle, and Demosthenes. Divinity he feared not, "although it is an unexhaustible and perilous subject." In any case he felt buoyant, and that his failure would be "in Livy, not in steadiness of principle." He wrote in the lull before Schools:

"I shall be at work in three weeks, and begin to long most ardently for its termination. Nothing very essential can that period effect in my favour. I have spent the last three days somewhat idly; but do not regret it, as I hope to be merely in good health for the Schools. In good spirits I shall not fail. I have no dereliction from my former protestations on this subject to confess, and never enjoyed so much philosophic indifference. My friend Wood has over-read himself. Another of my friends has also been prevented. All the coaches seem upsetting. If I can keep my omnibus on its wheels I shall be well content."

When Anderdon failed to respond, Manning threatened:

"My *Fidus Achates*, thou art silent, taciturn, vapid, spiritless, and dull. Come, cheer me on. A few days will land me on the island of scholastic ethics and critical erudition. Cheer me on, I flag not; albeit I be somewhat weary. I see the term and therefore bear me up. Respond under peril of ban and anathema."

The examinations over, Manning fled dead-beat to Fosbury, in Wiltshire, whence he wrote (December 6, 1830):

"My examination continued until Thursday last, and at the conclusion I had so many engagements to

Oxford

breakfast, dinner, and supper that I scarcely [expect] seeing the inside of my rooms again. I delivered a small oration at the Union the day I was out of the Schools.

“I need a little relaxation mentally; I am endeavouring to get it bodily by peregrinating the country. I cannot understand myself, and feel in the most unnatural state. Last night and the night before I snored thro’ above ten clear hours, and feel myself the better for it. I am in hopes of satiating my locomotive propensity by spending a few days in scampering from pillar to post. Get me a bed ready wheresoever you may be staying, and pray mind I have a blazing fire, for I am as deficient in caloric as an old man. If I receive an answer from Fisher I shall go to Poulshot to-morrow. If otherwise, you may perchance see me, ere you receive this letter, my jewel.”

Which was the case, for

“Mr. H. E. Manning presents his compliments to Mr. John Anderdon, and begs to assure him of his intention of sleeping in Harley Street on Thursday night next. Poland is up. Huzza! *Philoeleutherios.*”

The result was soon after declared, and justified all his work and anxiety. With five others, “*Manning, Henricus E., Coll. Ball.*,” was awarded a First Class in *Literis Humanioribus*.

Among the congratulations was a Pecksniffian note from Mr. Wilberforce, whose son was also in the First Class (January 22, 1831):

“I have to return in kind your congratulation on my Henry’s Success. Your Son did himself great Credit, and what will be, I doubt not, to you, as it would be to me, a much higher ground of congratulation, Mr. Robert, who, you know, is in Oriel a *Don* and a Tutor, tho’ a Boy with us, speaks of your Son in high terms as to his Character and Conduct; to have passed thro’ such an ordeal without Injury is no little praise and excites just Hopes of future Well doing.”

When Manning came of age his father had given him £700 in Consols, with the regret that (August 18, 1829)

Henry Edward Manning

“ I cannot at present do more for you, as your uniform good conduct has entitled you. Your future success in life must depend entirely upon your own exertions.” His bankruptcy followed his son’s success, but the latter had realised what was coming when he wrote (January 20, 1830) :

“ Believe me, brother, Mercury, the God of Merchants, was the God of Rogues—rogues and merchants are convertible terms, and have ever been so from the establishment of the Port of Tyre to that of the Port of London : whether at the Deigma in the Piræus or the Exchange in Cornhill.—ANTI-DODO.”

CHAPTER IV : CONVERSION AND ORDERS

“Time lost in his state of mind is time gained. The change would indeed be sudden from inflamed ambition to deadness to the world.”—*Miss Bevan on H. E. M.*

MANNING leaped into life with political ambitions struggling against monetary depressions. He had little faith. At Balliol he prayed not. Unknowingly he had walked amongst the prophets. He had preferred to hear himself argue than Newman preach. While Pusey was being initiated into the Breviary by Blanco White (an extinguished altar-light), Manning read Adam Smith. His notebook was political save for imaginary dialogue with a sceptic, concluding that “things are above but never contrary to reason.” Chance is “such to us, not to God.” Materialists are “moon-blind wits.” He dived into questions of Federalism, Canada, Switzerland, Ireland. The treatment of Hottentots seemed “a farrago of guilt and ignorance.” He calculated the Catholics of England and Wales were 300,300.

But ruin pressed. Coombe was in the market, deserted save by a lonely, embittered boy. Anderdon offered him a clerkship at £80, but Oxford friends found him a Government berth, where, as he used to tell his priests, pointing to Whitehall, he learnt business habits.

For a short time Manning was a clerk in the Colonial Office under “Goody” Goderich, “a routine of monotonous existence,” which filled him with dismay. To Anderdon he appealed (March 6, 1831):

“I confide in your consistency to my cause. If the higher Powers positively refuse to bear upon my point, it will be my part to look for some other assistance.”

March 13, 1831 :

“I thank you for your advocacy, not omitting to estimate ‘your convictions.’ Suppose I were to begin

Henry Edward Manning

twaddling about convictions—not another word. Your argument of apprenticeship is based in false analogy. As to Lucian's dialogue, the young man was desirous of legislating before he had learned how; I wish to learn how before I legislate. The Athenian Agora was no school for statesmen; the British House of Parliament the only one. If I be competent to undertake public life, for the sake of reason give me such encouragement as may hearten me, while it puts others to no expense; at the least, do not deny assistance and augment difficulties besides. If I be incompetent, let me be told so; I will believe it. But not by such an argument as this, 'you are inexperienced, while we are consistently endeavouring to prevent your acquisition of that experience,' and above all by no stolidity about 'too young.' None are 'too young' to begin but fools. In whatever race I run, I will never voluntarily carry weight; in whatever contest I engage, I will never bind an arm round my back. I know from experience what is an uphill game; I have played one, gained one, and suffered by one."

He consoled himself by swearing at Anderdon that Easter: "Art busy, man? or idle, or contemplative, or among autographs pulverulent, or with hot-cross buns dyspeptic, or with fly-fishing? I flogged some miles of Shoreham river without a rise, but we fishermen are such quiet pleasant folk that I sware never a d—n, and gat me home again." ("Isaac Walton says that swearing frays the fishes," added the Cardinal in re-reading in late life.)

He rushed back to a debate at Oxford, or revisited scenes of schoolboy splendour:

"You promised to dine at the Harrow dinner. Robert Bevan intends doing so likewise—moreover, I. I am going down to the Harrow speeches, having got a cart in a friendly Phaeton. I did not explain to you yesterday about your Dante cap. I received your note while at Kippington, and sent word back to your wife in order that she might send you your morion in good time, not

Conversion and Orders

being myself certain on what day I should return to Coombe Bank. Thus between the love of a brother and a wife thou art unhelmed, Sir Knight."

His mind ran to playfulness, testiness, restlessness. "I am splenetic, sick, savage, rabid, indolent, useless, and ill at ease." At this time Robert Bevan took him to stay at Belmont in Herts. There was a professional link between the two families. They both did business with banks. The Bevans were deeply interested in Evangelicalism, and were probably as sure of their accounts in one world as in the other. The pious and gifted Miss Bevan set out to save Manning's soul. Her notes of that autumn survive. She was the author of *Reading without Tears*, but not untearfully they studied Scripture together :

"Robert is improved by his friendship with Manning, and seems flattered by his confidence. The total ruin of his fortunes does not lessen him in his esteem. [Oh, banker's daughter!] I greatly admire the candour of Manning. It affords a good foundation on which to raise the superstructure of truth.

"Mr. Manning dined with us. I think a work of grace is going on in his heart. He is deeply convinced of the vanity of the world and the sinfulness of sin. He is much interested in the Scriptures, from which he has formed a very high standard of religion. It is delightful to see him so much humbled and sanctified, but he does not for a moment think himself religious; he looks very poorly, and is not happy. He remains at the gate knocking; reflecting on his conversation, I perceive he is in bondage to the law."

Before Christmas Miss Bevan claimed victory (November 24, 1831):

"H. M. is in the hands of One Who can guide by His counsel and fit for His own work by His Spirit. Who knows but that after being tempest-tossed for a season he may seek the service of his Master?"

Henry Edward Manning

While taking refuge from rain in a bookshop, Manning announced his new vocation to Anderdon. His fingers held, not an Oxford Tract, but a sermon of Wesley. (Did not Cardinal Wiseman's vocation come in a thunderstorm?) On January 31, 1832, his father was informed, and gave no opinion; but, fearing he had disappointed his son, wrote the next day prophesying "permanent happiness." On February 3 Manning left his office for ever, writing to his elder brother Frederick :

"I have ever felt, when opposing your wishes on this subject, that you were urging me to a better, while I was persevering in the pursuit of a worse object. You are aware that my reasons for not entering the Church were scruples, I say not whether erroneous or correct. I could not consent to regard so sacred a profession solely as a means of procuring an income; and I also felt that the absence of a positive wish to undertake its duties constituted a sufficient disqualification in my own case."

Feeling he might satisfy the Bishop of London's Chaplain, but not himself, Manning retired to Oxford to discover and acquire such traces as remained of the Divine Science. In April he was elected Fellow of Merton College, whither his mother sent his "pet iron bed," and where he read the Anglican Divines undisturbed by the clamour attendant on the first Reform Bill. In the old wainscoted library are still preserved the entries of his reading—Berkeley, Hooker, Tillotson, Donne, Hall, Hammond, Bull, Butler, but the real Fathers as well. He helped to drone service in the mighty College Chapel, where John Pollen afterwards painted him as a model for Daniel, with Pusey as Isaiah. To Mrs. Anderdon "the old Monk sends peace and good wishes." On December 23 Bishop Bagot of Oxford raised him to the diaconate, and his proud father wrote "confiding fully in your proving yourself a most useful member of the Protestant Church." At Christmas he preached his first sermon in Cuddesdon Church on the

Conversion and Orders

Surge illuminare of Isaiah. With a Sussex curacy in view, Bishop Maltby of Chichester ordained him priest in Lincoln's Inn (June 9, 1833). The little William Anderdon was taken to the edifying scene in his father's hope he would follow his uncle's profession, which indeed he did, but by ways undreamt.

Of the newly ordained a Harrovian (Sir John Leslie) remembered (1913):

"Manning came to Harrow on his way from the North, and stayed with the Headmaster. He was nearly mobbed by the boys crowding round him to exchange stories, but he seemed to fight shy of being made too much of. He was deeply interested in the cricket, and used to tell the boys that clergymen should be ready to take part in everything. He was very particular about his dress. He wore two suits, one brown, one black and pepper, with a conspicuous clerical hat. He was a beautiful rider in the Rotten Row. His face was thin and sallow, and looked like a priest's even then."

These were the features, so marvellously fitted to his parts in life, which to Father Lockhart were "some first dim revelation of the meaning of the supernatural in man." "I see a word written on the forehead of that man, and that word is *Sacerdos*," wrote Aubrey de Vere. But of his mental and spiritual lineaments there survives the keen diagnosis of his spiritual mother, Miss Bevan, which is so unique and penetrating as to save reams of biographic research and conjecture: *Ecce Manning!*

Character of H. E. M. (February 9, 1832):

"I know of no power in which he is deficient. His imagination is warm, his taste refined, his memory retentive and accurate in no common degree; yet judgment holds her rightful supremacy, and gives an air of precocity to his mind. Perhaps it is rare to see united so much delight in the grand with equal attention to *minutiæ* in matters of taste. His mind is adapted to enter into the niceties of criticism, did he not value essentials too highly to condescend to the occupation.

Henry Edward Manning

He is fond of reasoning rather than of argument. All his ideas are clearly defined, and he needs a vocabulary as extensive as that of which he is master in order to give them expression.

“Pride is the natural accompaniment of talent. This is the ruling passion of H. E. M. One characteristic, however, of a truly great mind is also his—namely, an ardent love of truth, which leads him to pursue investigations, and not to remain content with knowledge that has no ultimate purpose. It leads him to be unsuspecting in his intercourse with the world. Despising a mere appearance himself, he will not readily believe that any will assume it. It leads him to be jealous of himself, even to scrupulosity; to act and speak beneath the tone of his feelings, lest he should impress others with too high an opinion of them; and lastly, it gives a peculiar colouring to his proud, ambitious desires. He seeks not only praise, but *deserved* praise, praise doubly deserved because hardly earned. He seeks rather merit than praise, a merit of the highest order. His estimation of things according to their true value would not permit him to be content with a reputation for talents unconnected with moral worth, but the latter alone would not content him. He covets *every* gift from the highest to the lowest, the admiration of every creature from the highest to the lowest. So towering an aim, so grasping an ambition, can never be gratified. Convinced of this fact, when called to make a selection he prefers the more substantial to the more showy portion, and forgoes the praise of the indiscriminating multitude for the approbation of the discerning few, and especially for his own. His imagination comes to his aid to conceal from him painful realities. Eminently reflective and visionary, his love of truth would help him to make invaluable discoveries and arrive at invaluable conclusions, could he always effectually silence that deceitful, busy friend, the imagination. I have said that judgment has the supremacy in his mind; this is true concerning those things not connected with himself, but imagination works upon his weakness and deceives him in many points that touch him the nearest. So that he is liable to be mistaken in his review of his own past conduct, in his view of his present position, and in his anticipation of his future

Conversion and Orders

course. With regard to himself he is a theorist, though in respect to abstract truth he is a trampler upon theories.

“It is easy to conclude that his character must abound in inconsistencies, but the conclusion will be strengthened as we proceed. Do you judge him to be a stern, firm character from the outline I have drawn? Know that he struggles with a temperament of a most susceptible, excitable, I may say morbid, kind. He would find it difficult *indeed* to carry into effect the suggestions of his ambition, or the resolutions dictated by his upright, noble intentions. He has courage sufficient to enable him to face the world in arms against him. His pride would spur him on, but his nature is incapable of seconding his inward impulses. He is well provided with offensive weapons to sustain the onset, but he has no shield to defend him from the most puny foe. *His* satire would lay prostrate a mighty enemy, but he himself would wither beneath the most despicable sarcasm. He has bullock’s horns, but not the bullock’s hide. Could he therefore put in execution the devices of his aspiring mind, how great would be his misery!

“With regard to the qualities of his heart, I own *they* are the most difficult rightly to estimate. But I am mistaken if his heart is not tender, kind, and constant. His sensitive disposition calls for the consolations of friendship. He cannot readily dissolve a tie once formed, nor harbour a suspicion of anyone who has given him proof of amity. He is confiding as well as communicative, and expects to find that faithfulness and generosity in others that they will find in him. He is easily won by kindness and deceived by flattery. His excellent judgment vacates her throne on many occasions. His kind feelings and his self-love continually hinder the exercise of his sagacity.

“When these do not interfere he acts admirably, with a steadfastness and a self-denial to be rarely met with. He has strength of mind and decision of character, but he has more to contend with than other men, the hallucinations of ambition, the morbid scruples of a sensitive nature, the closely entwined associations of a feeling heart, are sometimes arrayed against him, and though in his understanding, as I said twice or thrice before, judgment holds the reins of government, yet

Henry Edward Manning

imagination often places her hands upon them—nay, takes possession of them for a time, and then alas for the poor master of all these powers. He is driven to and fro like a leaf before the wind, and the honour of his little kingdom is endangered.

“I have not yet enlarged upon a remarkable feature of his character, his candour, the infallible result of his ardour for truth. Prejudice has no existence in his mind. He is ever ready to hear, careful to weigh, slow to condemn. Radical errors he denounces without mercy, but minor differences he overlooks. He does not believe wisdom confined to any sect or party. He seeks her everywhere, and therefore cannot miss her. The want of candour in another is the fault that irritates him the most.

“Does his character as a whole stand before you? A few lines will not define it. I must touch and retouch. If I called him great and daring you would not believe in his sensitive points and fits of despondency. Well, I do declare him capable of braving public opinion. What should you say when you saw him full of anxiety to please, and solicitous to gain every suffrage? He is a complicated creature, and calculated to disappoint expectation in some respects and at some seasons. Yet he may take a flight beyond the warmest hopes of those who wish him well. I fear he will occasion his friends to lead an unquiet life, if they give full scope to the interest they may feel. He will himself need the exercise of no ordinary vigilance to steer his course right, of no common degree of faith to enjoy a moderate share of repose.”

CHAPTER V : LIFE AND LOVE AT LAVINGTON

“ Nothing in this life except the Altar can ever again be to me as Lavington.”—*Manning to his Curate*, 1852.

OF three great women who entered into Manning's life, Miss Bevan's influence was the most important. (The others were Miss Maurice and Florence Nightingale.) When she advised him to take the lowest place and wait unnoticed, he did not refuse an obscure Sussex curacy. There were no railways, and he reached Lavington by coach in January, 1833. He served the Rector, John Sargent, in place of Henry Wilberforce, and by June reigned in his stead. On November 7 he married his Rector's daughter Caroline, Samuel Wilberforce presiding. For seventeen years he worked in an unspoilt Sussex, where the hamlet was undestroyed by the villa and tram-stops were turnpikes. Horsham and Midhurst were pocket boroughs on his parish bounds. The wild bustard lingered on the downs. Tramp, tourist, and tripper were not. Manning's notebooks show spiritual dealing with mole-catchers, copse-cutters, poachers, and all Cobbett's "leather-legged race." The downs were scoured for lost sheep. He made almost the entire parish communicant. He introduced a daily service, tolling the bell and reading the Psalms by himself. He showed himself paternal, instead of patronising, to the simple folk, who came to love and trust him as their father and protector. They were the hard-working and patient beings who paid off the debts of the Napoleonic Wars. In their brodered smocks they offered their prayers in the Sussex dialect in the presence of the "Lion and the Unicorn," or snuffed branches of southern-wood during

Henry Edward Manning

the sermon, while their wives gossiped lightly in red cloaks and black bonnets in the shadow of the green-baized pews—when hymns were delivered upon the pitch-pipe, and the parish clerk, like some fossilised acolyte, answered the Psalms from the lower tier of the “three-decker.”

Even so the laws pressed hard upon the face of the poor, and Sussex tithemen marked “hay in cock and wheat in shock” and carried away a tenth. The great houses of Goodwood and Arundel brooded in benevolent feudalism. The Duke of Richmond stirred the Rector of Lavington to denounce “the sin of exacting the largest rent and doing the least repairs.” The commons were being rapidly enclosed and the lords of the land were driving a press-gang for the lords of the loom, and Manning did not love a lord. “And I remember the disquiet and self-reproach I felt if I did not go among the people. I continually heard in my conscience, ‘What doest thou here, Elias?’” In 1838 he wrote to Gladstone that he did “not despair of soon having two services every festival.” Weekly Communion he restored the next year. The flint in Lavington Church he placed with his own hands. His other church, Graffham, he restored, remarking: “See how an Arch-deacon with the best intentions can spoil a church!”

Morning after morning in the grey mist the shepherds and downsmen could hear the bell of their vigilant pastor. He became a legend. Other Rectors came and went, but they remembered the tall, lonely man, wearing a threadbare cloak over his white surplice, who passed them twice daily in the road. “He wore his father’s cloak to go to say Vespers every evening,” wrote Aubrey de Vere. “One evening at Lavington we read alternate passages out of Dante’s *Paradiso*, and agreed there was more theology in the grand old bard than in the heads of half the Bishops now living.”

The Church of England counted few more faithful

Life and Love at Lavington

sons. Manning was among those who allowed the Pope "no jurisdiction in this realm of England." Not only did he hold folk back from Rome, as, for instance, Mr. Stuart of Munster Square (and "God forgive me for it," he added), and as he wrote to Gladstone (February 2, 1840)—"I was in London last week, but only for a day, and that on no pleasant business, being another case of the kind I had in Rome. This fish seems to sail to my net. Certes it is hard at the same time to be accused of Popery"—but he was also ready to convert any Roman that strayed within the pale of Lavington. Winifred Shirwin, from the Catholic nest at Burton, came into his parish, and he converted her to Anglicanism before she married Tom Challen.

One of her sons still lives, the last of the Sussex men who were brought up in the love and the fear of the Archdeacon M-ä-ä-nning (Sussex dialect). He saith (1913):

"He came up every morning in his surplice, and he said service to himself. He could make a sermon out of nothing. Once he preached from 'Jesus wept.' The schoolboys had to write out a sentence of his sermons the next day. He took away the Gallery from the Church, and the Lion and Unicorn. There was an old man who wouldn't go to Church, and kept away from him. The Archdeacon hunted him down and caught him in a barn. He gave up his carriage and coachman and butler when he became Archdeacon. The people were expecting he would turn. He came back to see old Winifred."

The Rev. Rowley Lascelles took down the memoirs of another of the Lavington flock in 1873:

"A wonderful, vigorous man, he counted to call on every house in his Parish once a fortnight—most of his visiting was done by walking—clad in cassock. He brought in these Gregorian chants sung with the naked voice and no instrument. He turned out Lady Sargent's little girl to make room for we boys. People said he was cold. He never got excited. He loved us boys. He

Henry Edward Manning

would do anything for the children, but we were afraid of him, tho' we knew he was very much took up with children. He were very strict. But you should ha' seen him in Church. He were a wonderful Churchman. He looked like an Archangel when he prayed. He never missed going up to Church every day, no matter alone or without a congregation. He was an out-of-the-way serious man. Always reading and walking up and down in front a-reading as if seemingly he couldn't find no rest. He came along several times to see old Winifred. He told her she wouldn't find no rest where she were, and that he had found rest. Always drove a pair of greys. Old John Tribe he used to have to stop 'em half an hour together while he got out and sat down somewhere and took no notice of no one. He were a wonderful man, but he wasn't such a man for the parish, after they made him Archdeacon."

One evening at sunset Manning said: "John Tribe, we will go down like that setting sun." Mrs. Tribe was a visionary, for she told Mr. Lascelles: "I see Elijah the Prophet once—I tell ye I see him just over agin that wood-stack. Dear me, it were nigh thirty year ago. I told the Archdeacon too. He knowed very well all about Elijah. He said I should see him again one day, but I ha'n't!"

At Graffham, with his Curate Laprimaudaye, Manning kept a very exact register of the state of his flock. Not only was every individual attendance at church noted, but moral or ecclesiastical delinquencies were recorded, the former in Latin and the latter in Greek. Thus we find staunch Churchmen like James H—— "*inebrietati addictus*," or James S—— "*actibus pessimis deditus*," while local Dissenters were labelled "*σχισματίχως*." Of these latter was Edward Bookham, a reprobate mole-catcher nigh on a hundred years old, who was entered for future judgment as "*σχισματιχίστος*!" Pain also will the recording angels feel when the books are opened and Sarah Webb's life and character are summed in the words: "Sells gingerbread—deceitful!"

Life and Love at Lavington

The high standard to which the parish was brought in ten years is shown by the Easter statistics of 1843 :

Communicants	136
Three times and at Easter	61
Three times and not at Easter	24
Twice only	20
Once only	31

to which were added some pencilled figures in the same neat hand, with which votes at the Vatican Council were recorded in after years—

			1844.		1843.
Palm Sunday	10	...	9
Easter Day	72	...	76
Low Sunday	6	...	7

It was always typical of Manning's mind to endeavour to figure results.

Manning was interested in their daily toil. He went down to the pottery one day and astonished the men by saying, "I have faith to-day that I can make a pot"; whereupon, in the words of a potter present, "he shaped the best pot any man ever made for the first one."

Although as a Catholic Archbishop he could not win old Winifred (it is not given to convert twice), he found his old gardener dying in a home at Hoxton and crying for his master the Archdeacon. The gardener's relief and baptism into Catholicism was the last act of the Lavington pastorate. But the legend lasted, and two-score years after he had left, a generation, who had never seen him, asked, "Is it true that the Archdeacon is dead?"

Four years of wedded life were his. The form of Manning's proposal is a tradition in the Ward family. "Caroline," was all he suffered himself to say—"Caroline, I have spoken to your mother." Like her sisters, she sank into consumption. A day came of fiery

Henry Edward Manning

trial for Manning, and as he passed down the narrow corridor at Lavington, he halted outside the sick-room and offered his wife to God, saying only, *Fiat voluntas tua*. The sacrifice was accepted.

Years later he wrote :

“Knowing nothing of the Catholic life, or instincts, or perfection, in November, 1833, I married, and in July, 1837, found myself again in the state in which I have been for more than forty years.”

In this simple statement of the holy and honourable wedlock that had been his portion, he made no reference to the touching grief with which he venerated his wife's memory.

The years passed, but the memory of the dead was not allowed to pass. Irreverent hands have been laid upon the veil. He was said to have loved another as an Anglican, and as a Catholic to have forgotten both. It was made a reproach that he allowed neglect to touch her grave. It was the waters of Marah, not Lethe, that held his utterance. He had tried to throw himself into the open grave. Her living-room was kept with work-box and thimble in place. The grave cross he intended was never erected, because he could not place the inscription he wished, so he told Reginald Wilberforce. The window he gave to Chichester Cathedral was to her memory. The death of Mrs. Manning was a fateful event in Catholic history. She died a month after Victoria came to the throne. On the day Disraeli was returned to Parliament Manning wrote to his bosom friend, Gladstone, also enjoying triumph (July 27, 1837) :

“God has been graciously pleased to lead me into a way that is desert, and to bid me serve Him with entire surrender of myself. On Monday last at ten minutes to 5 in the evening my beloved wife was taken out of this evil, changeful world. I bless God for the tender, pitiful

Life and Love at Lavington

hand with which He dealt out both her sufferings and my sorrows. I know you will both feel and pray for me. As indeed I do for you in your very different and perhaps severer trial—for I have ever found the time of our tribulation safer than the time of our wealth. I give you joy in your success, and may God be with you always."

One by one the "sylph-like" Sargent girls died, fulfilling what Manning had written in a book in 1838: "Of four brothers, I am called to go first through this fire." Samuel Wilberforce had buried Mrs. Manning, and his brother-in-law was to write to Gladstone (March 19, 1841): "Poor Wilberforce left me yesterday, well and calm. On the day before I requited to him the service he did me not four years ago." Old Mrs. Sargent, whose daughter had bidden her "take care of Henry," now went to keep house for Samuel. Had she lived longer than 1861, she might have found herself in the strange position of mother-in-law to the most conspicuous Bishops on the Anglican and Roman side in England. Manning mourned her becomingly: "In His hands I leave her with all confidence, knowing that no soul that loves God can be lost; and that she loved Him I know with a full and perfect certainty."

But he did not forget his wife. July, he wrote, was "like a churchyard path to him." He kept the Octave of St. James as a "holy week," and offered the Holy Sacrifice "for my beloved wife." A fragrance, bitter enough as from the flowers on her grave, where he would sit composing sermons, clung to all his Lavington days. In his diaries there was an occasional and piteous cry, "a wounded heart, alas!" As he drew near to the Catholic Church he came to think of her as a Guardian Angel. To Mary Wilberforce he wrote: "How often I have said, 'What would she have thought of what I am doing and feeling and believing? If it is a delusion, perhaps she could have saved me.'"

By fragments only from letters to his friends may

Henry Edward Manning

the pure devotion of Henry Manning be judged. To Archdeacon Hare he wrote (July 21, 1841):

“ We are so lovingly bidden to liken ourselves to the Man of Sorrows that I do not fear to say to you that this is to me the shadow of the week of Sufferings. Before we met what I once was had been abolished. You have only known me a sadder and, God grant, a better man. Between this and that glad morning when we shall sit down with our sainted ones in our Father’s Kingdom there lies only one thing, toil for Christ’s Church in warfare here on earth.”

July 25, 1841: “ Yesterday four years (then a Monday) at five o’clock, and Wednesday next (then a Friday) at the hallowed hour of burial towards the going down of the sun, are sainted hours with me. And the old man whose hands wrought the last work said, little thinking how he chimed in with my thoughts, ‘ The rock had never been broken since God Almighty laid it.’ ”

When Hare himself came to marry the sister of Miss Maurice, Manning could hardly bring himself to rejoice (September 20, 1844):

“ May you be blessed as I have been. May you be blessed much longer. And yet, if sorrow be as good for you as for me, may your lot be as mine. What can I say more?”

And to Miss Maurice: “ Fifteen years ago a Crucifix stood in sight of the dying bed, which taught me the article of the Communion of Saints. And I never have been without one.” To Robert Wilberforce, his last Easter as an Anglican: “ For some years I have thought, even half-believed, that intercessions within the veil have been drawing me whither they now see the One Light to shine. But this is only a daydream, perhaps.”

Her he invoked as he set out to Rome, and her miniature remained on his desk. By an accident which pierced him deeply he lost her letters on that journey.

Life and Love at Lavington

On the day he entered the Roman Academia as a priest he made a last allusion in his diary. It happened to be her birthday, and he penned her initial for the last time : "*Natal. C. dssimæ.*" (Nativity of Caroline most lamented.)

Then he turned to the service of the Bride that liveth for ever.

CHAPTER VI: ROME AND GLADSTONE

"I am not so unobservant as to suffer the many and ample opportunities I had at Rome to pass without forming a very distinct judgment on the matter, which must interest you. I will only say that it coincides with and confirms my own."—*Manning to Gladstone*, 1839.

HAVING found that "the end of life is not happiness but usefulness," Manning undertook to save the Church from being "reduced to a mere creature of the State," chiefly through gigantic correspondence with Gladstone. The portentous essays and theological disquisitions which they exchanged almost seem an effort to rise to the level of the eightpence of postage between London and Lavington. The slightest symptom in Church or State was a signal for literary deluge, of which some 200 pages of unpublished and mostly unpublishable material survive. That Manning destroyed his own letters is a fiction.

The correspondence was of Rome and Canterbury, of Church and State, of Church without State, of State with Church, and world without end—endless spinning and cross-spinning and weaving of webs which the most Protestant reader is relieved to see Manning cut with Gordian steel at the end of fourteen years. They discussed Convocation, which Manning thought gave "usurped powers to Presbyters," ending in a "Socinianised *caput mortuum*." To the horrified Gladstone this was "as the worm to the chrysalis, or rather to the butterfly." Reams of what Gladstone called "wrangling letters" followed. "In great haste, my church bell going," Manning implored him to read Leslie's *Regale* and *Pontificale*. In reply Gladstone announced that the situation of the Church (which had never been so comfortable) was "such as seems to give

Rome and Gladstone

an accumulated responsibility to life, to make almost all mirth guilt, and triviality profaneness."

Manning reassured him (November 1, 1837): "The Church of Christ in England wields the *Spiritual* sword absolutely. The Crown of England bears the *Civil* sword absolutely. These two powers can never clash except by the one usurping on the other," which the one has always done. The wriggling was triumphant. Bishops sat, not as Bishops, but as Members in Parliament. The Queen's mandate was glossed as a "primitive Catholic organ!" The Commission into Church Property gave Manning his spring-board. He was indignant at the suppression of Cathedral stalls, to which he referred with unconscious humour as "a bond with the Saints that are asleep." He threw off an open letter: "I am afraid they think me an impertinent Priest, but there is the end of it."

The first Diocesan Board was drawn up by Manning and completed by Gladstone. "Do you remember," wrote Manning fifty years later, "I believe the Chichester Board was the first in existence, and for two years I was secretary."

Meanwhile Manning decided "the Anglican *Regale* and the Italian *Pontificale* are the true antagonists," but that "our theory ought to be the projected Shadow of History!" But there were darker shadows—Maynooth, Presbyterianism, and Peel. "How did you like his coquetting with Presbytery?" asked Manning. Gladstone perceived Dissent rampant. "I look to Ireland, Maynooth stares me in the face. I look to Canada . . . I look to the West Indies . . . I look to Australia." The State, even, was helping Dissenters, but he defended himself going to Presbyterian worship in Scotland, whereat Manning: "Can you partake of such acts? The picture drawn in your last letter is frightful. I take as examples Maynooth and the Colonial Presbyterian bodies." About this time Manning called the Scotch

Henry Edward Manning

Kirk schismatical in public, and Miss Bevan was lost to him for ever. She protested in vain. "Alas, alas! those midnight letters, those private conversations, produced no good result." To Manning Anglican diversity was as shameful. "We are no better than a pack of Protestant, self-willed, self-wise Presbyterians. Nineteenths of our priests and people neither know nor care more for a Bishop's wig than for a broccoli head."

In righteous zeal he restored the "sacredness" of parish clerks, whom he found "sunk into the sexton," and hauled down the Lion and Unicorn, denoting Royal supremacy, that Unicorn which was to gore him yet unto his Anglican agony and death-bed.

The appearance and preaching of Chalmers was the signal for some ludicrous emotions. "A jumble of Church, un-Church, and anti-Church principles," quoth Gladstone, who heard him when "he flogged the Apostolical Succession grievously, seven Bishops sitting below him, and the Duke of Cambridge incessantly bobbing assent." Manning exploded, but with humour (May 22, 1838): "It was the birth, parentage, education, and adventures of Chaos. I firmly believe he thinks Constantine was a Dutch Presbyterian. What of the 1,800 Bishops who held the Church when Constantine was a pagan? Were dioceses, like wigs, not invented? He might have got hold of the Sacraments and Jero-boamed a Priesthood for himself, but his theology would not have made him and his ministers to be a Church. The Reformation has brought on a most perplexing problem—how we are to deal with persons having the Christian theology without participating in the continuity of the Christian Church." It was the problem which was to drive Manning on to the Roman Rock; meanwhile he felt sincere melancholy at Dr. Chambers's "statistical carnalising ethos"!

Before the end of the year "friends and doctors have conspired against me, and have sentenced me to trans-

Rome and Gladstone

portation," and he left England with his brother-in-law, Captain Austen, who "sucks in theology like a Cherubim." Newman wrote: "How I envy your going to Rome!" Anderdon gave him a blank diary, which he proceeded to fill. It was before the days of the Continental express, and Manning started to drive slowly in the direction of the Eternal City, which he reached "in twenty-five days after leaving England," the same time that a Roman Proconsul would have taken. Amiens Cathedral he saw on November 17, and the next day recorded Vespers at Breteuil. His first Catholic service only left a memory of "chanting, monotonous and harsh." At Sens the scenery was "like Chichester from Littleton Down." He visited the Vatican and St. Peter's for the first time (December 13, 1838). The next day to the Capitol with Gladstone, where he found a sermon in marble, writing later: "Whensoever you chance to look at the Sermons I sent, you may recall, if you care, a conversation we had when we were standing looking at the Dying Gladiator in the Capitol, on the bodily sufferings of those whom we believe to be in a high degree holy." He indicated a passage in his best style, which need not be lost while pain is in the world:

"If we ponder on the incomprehensible nature of pain, mental and bodily; of its invisibleness, its vividness, its exceeding sharpness and penetrating omnipresence in our whole being; of its inscrutable origin and the indissoluble link which binds it to sin; and lastly, of its mysterious relation to the passion and perfection of our Lord, we shall see reason to believe that a power so near and awful fulfils many designs in God's Kingdom secret to us."

Attendance in the little Protestant church completed Manning's first week in Rome. His note on the services was laconic: "Very full. Sermon, morning, similar. Afternoon, painful."

With Gladstone he sought preaching elsewhere,

Henry Edward Manning

making notes of each sermon. Just before their friendship broke in 1850 he recalled, "when I chode with you for buying apples on Sunday evening after sermon at the Caravita." The diary records: "Feast of Epiphany. The Caravita. Christ suffered for us. If Christ is our Saviour, then our Example. Patience in duty. Purity in tongue, eyes, ears. Very good."

Two days later came Father Hughes, with "a coarse, harsh, forcible sermon. Strikingly defective in all the Evangelical qualities except heavy denunciation." He heard Ventura and Cetarini. Gladstone's birthday they celebrated by visiting Dr. Wiseman at the English College, who had received Macaulay the month before. Some Cardinals were present to celebrate St. Thomas of Canterbury, and Wiseman sent a student to escort the English visitors. In his memoirs Manning thought it was the future Bishop Grant, but Cornthwaite, another of his suffragans to be, claimed the honour. They stood under the window on the court side of the chapel, wondering, no doubt, what all visitors wonder. On St. Agnes' Day Wiseman took Manning to see the blessing of the lambs out of whose wool the palliums are made. "He was not even a Bishop. How little we thought that he and I should have the two first palliums in the new hierarchy of England!" he wrote in his memoir. The diary has more (January 21): "Wiseman told me that the controversy about the Anglican succession turned only on the fact of the Lambeth Register. Lingard affirmative, a Dominican of Downside negative. Four others. Temper bad; therefore Lingard broke off. (Wiseman seemed by his praise of Lingard to agree with him—did not ask.) The *Dublin Review* breaking up."

January 26: "The students at English College thought to be too little restrained. Wiseman unpopular with the Pope. English Romanists not much liked in Rome. People displeased at *English* sermon on Cardinal Weld. Interrupted the preacher twice. He

Rome and Gladstone

spoke and threatened the Police. English Cardinals unpopular—too liberal and munificent. The antipathy between English and Italian not so much religious as national.”

(The Eminent Cardinal-widower Weld died in 1837.)

Gladstone went home, leaving Manning to imagine himself like St. Paul, who “besought the whole world, which was against him, to be altogether like himself for their own good”! But the Papal world was past persuasion, and he could only baptise English babies or rescue stragglers.

March 17: “Lushington told me of a young woman of twenty, a governess in a R.C. family, who had Romanised. The only case he knew.” By March 23 he had added others: “Dr. Carlyle Davis, a Cambridge man, now Secretary to the Prince of Syracuse; Amos, an architect; Anstey, a barrister.” However, “Really pious people may be converted to Rome without perceptibly, perhaps actually, losing anything of their personal piety. The occasional conversion of a serious person hides the taint of the system. I have known four people tampered with by Romanists: (1) Ignorant disputatious. (2) Devout instructed. (3) Nervous uninstructed. (4) Rather conceited.”

He decided the best to be done with Anglo-Romanism was “to foster its full-blown corruption” with a view to extinction. Roman Transubstantiation he compared with Anglican *Metabole*—“the change is from unconsecrated bread to bread consecrated. From bread alone to bread and mystery. From natural bread to bread transfigured. The Romanist change is from bread to the likeness of bread, or bread to no-bread, a physical miracle. And their two instances of the river of Egypt and the wine of Cana are witnesses of truth’s sternness.” He noted a number of those curious tales with which Italians delight to shock or please the peregrinating Protestant, and added delicately: “I really burn with

Henry Edward Manning

shame to write such things." More edifying, but not less curious, were some other notes.

"The present converts to Romanism may be a provision for mitigation in their system; *per contra*, converts always rabid."

"There are two sorts of men at Rome. The one devoted to the Government, the other to religion. The latter are sent on foreign missions."

"The Roman Church does not observe Good Friday!"

"The Papacy is the faction of Diotrephes."

"The English Church—the skeleton of an irresistible spiritual power. Adequate to the mastery of the world, therefore destined to it.

"Grant the Patriarchal Right of the Pope.

"Still, if the Roman Church by the Council of Trent has departed from the Purity of the Catholic Faith, and introduced new and dangerous doctrines, and if the Pope should refuse the Patriarchal Sanction except upon the condition of the English Church participating in the Council of Trent, the English Church had only the alternative of Canonical Order with new and dangerous doctrines, and the Apostolical Faith with Canonical irregularity.

"Discipline is mutable, doctrine immutable. Both Churches have committed irregularity. The English in discipline which is essentially mutable. The Roman in doctrine which essentially immutable. If either, which vitiates the succession of a Church?

"The children of this generation are wiser, etc. :

- | | |
|--|---------------------------|
| 1. We spend our money
on ourselves. | 1. They on their objects. |
| 2. We have no unity of
instruction and order. | 2. They both. |
| 3. We live for ourselves. | 3. They for a system. |
| 4. We only for immediate
results. | 4. They for most remote. |
| 5. We are scattered causes. | 5. They concentrated." |

Later, as if to hide the obvious conclusion, he added :
"Latent and real unity—Artificial and visible unity."

Rome and Gladstone

But he was sore perplexed. He asked himself :

“Take away legal Establishment, and what superiority would remain to us?”

He wrote to Gladstone of a new friend (February 9, 1839) :

“Since you went I have seen much of Sterling, and I have got to know and to have a great regard for him. We see much of each other and talk much; but in the absence of books we end much as we begin. I feel it good for me to have to stand the brunt of his attacks on external and documentary evidence, as it will, I hope, make me more cautious in weighing and examining it. I do not find Sterling able at all to sympathise in the sort of discussions we used to have, so that I am obliged to croak in soliloquy.”

This was the consumptive sceptic from whom the Sterling Club was named. Faith and health were both failing him, but the immortality he could not find in the next world followed him in this. Carlyle wrote his biography. Sterling's opinion of Manning was sent to Richard Trench (March 16, 1839) :

“He is one of the most finished and compact specimens of his school of manhood and of theology that I have ever fallen in with, and it was amusing to see how by faultless self-command, dialectic acuteness, coherent system, readiness of expression, and a perfect union of earnestness and gentleness, he always seemed to put in the wrong the gentleman of the so-called Evangelical class, who muster strong here, and whom he frequently met with. He could not play quite the same game with me, for I knew better than most of them what I meant by my words. I conceive him to be, in his own place and generation, one of the most practically efficient and energetic men I have ever known, and in a state of freer and more fluent life in the ecclesiastical polity he would rise high and do considerable things.”

This was the first vision of an outsider into his character and future. Rome strengthened his friend-

Henry Edward Manning

ship with Gladstone, though it was to be the Rock on which it eventually split. They read each other's proofs and walked as friends in the House of the Lord. Manning became Archdeacon a few months before Gladstone reached the Privy Council. Two years later Gladstone reached the Cabinet, but filled with scruples as to Welsh dioceses threatened by the Government. Manning's ghostly counsel was necessary to induce him to take the step. "I am in," ran Gladstone's sigh of relief (May 17, 1843). "I made the statements, I believe, exactly according to what passed between us."

When the Maynooth Question arose, Manning advised Gladstone that as a Cabinet Minister he could not partake in grants to Dissenters (January 9, 1845): "Questions, powers, and principles, which have been pent up more or less these three hundred years, have burst upon us, and are demanding of every man a deliberate choice of aye or no." Gladstone took his advice and resigned (January 30, 1845): "*(Private.)* It is virtually all over, and I am out. But so far as this is concerned, with a clear judgment and a sound conscience. I am sure I should have broken 'the terms of my compact with public confidence.' I thank thee for that word. It might not have been discovered now, but my sin would have found me out." It was a good occasion well taken to set the candle of principle above the sordid bushel of public life. Its value lay with Newman's resignation of St. Mary's and Manning's coming relinquishment of his arch-deaconry. Gladstone's scruples required perpetual solution. Before the end of the year he was troubled "by indulging sensual sloth under the mask of wise and necessary precautions." Manning excellently referred him to the Jesuits: "The Order of Jesuits seem to give an admonition to men who labour in the world. They are neither bound to austerities nor to the service of the Choir."

When Manning removed his stone altar in consequence

Rome and Gladstone

of a legal decision, Gladstone urged him to break the law rather than his altar (February 20, 1845): "Fust's judgment may be law, but it is at all events no better law than the rubrics. Why should this judgment be of greater force? Here is Westminster Abbey with its stone altar undisturbed, and I presume some Cathedrals. These are quite enough to cover you *pagans*." When Manning set about reviving Confession and reported not only "the decline and extinction of a lingering witness to the Penitential Office," but "that the power of excommunication is abolished by ye act of George III.," Gladstone sympathised deeply, and apprehended "that the only way to revive the system is to do it permissively and, as it were, in a corner." After all, "every time that we shake the keys in the face of some German Protestant the question will be asked, What use do you make of them?" Gladstone, who had taken a vow of social service on leaving Oxford, sent fish into Manning's penitential nets, rescuing a girl in Brighton, whom Manning lodged with his half-sister, Mrs. Carey. The case was particularly sad to Gladstone. "Early circumstances have connected her with the Methodists, but not regularly. I am assuming that she can be brought to an intelligent and fixed adherence to the Church. What do you consider the best book for such a person on such a subject?" Dr. Pusey's attitude was a curious contrast. He wrote on another occasion to Manning: "In Brighton lately I shook off rather roughly a wretched being who touched me, and I heard her say, 'He is a Methodist.' It sent a pang into me to think that even they know of sectarian strictness, of the Church, nothing!"

Such cases brought Manning to restore Confessions and Sisterhoods. Though innocent of ritual at Lavington, he was recorded celebrating at the Wantage Sisterhood amid "five gold crosses, candlesticks and a three-branched light in the centre, and four vases of camellias."

Henry Edward Manning

The early attempts to revive Confession in the English Church were difficult. At Brighton the first very respectable spinster, who yielded to the power of the keys, had a fit! Another was so distracted by the combined ministrations of Manning, Neale, and Dodsworth that she fled to a priest of Rome. To his dear Dodsworth Manning wrote in fine wrath: "This is either mania, hysteria, or an unconverted heart. Now it seems to me Mr. Kyan's treatment was quite right. It mortified vanity in forbidding books. It tried the will in prescribing a medal. It tried faith in requiring docility. As for her scourge and iron girdle, she would have made them of tape and brown paper!" A note of grim humour has been generally overlooked in Manning's character. He wrote to Gladstone (March 7, 1843): "I have told you privately that Our Father of Canterbury stated to me that it was safer to acquiesce in promiscuous admission to the Holy Communion rather than to restore discipline. The Province of Canterbury at this hour would bear the restoration of discipline at the hands of Charles Borromeo. The truth must be told. We have exchanged our spiritual weapons for secular powers, and they fail us in contending against the world of which we have borrowed them." His Bishop was no better. "Into the safe ear of a Privy Councillor be it said. Alas, the Diocese is 40 degrees higher in temperature, and this is a downright douche bath!" There was chaff for Gladstone too. "*(Private.)* The Bishop will visit and deliver a Charge next month. It will fall to me to propose the thanks of the clergy. What if it contains opinions in which I cannot concur? Now, this seems to me a question of practice such as you are well versed in!" But Gladstone was done with Bishops, until he came to making them himself. "For it seems almost to have become the law of our essential lawlessness that Bishops must not lead, but follow."

Manning became godfather to his heir, and had to decide the theological question whether Master Gladstone

Rome and Gladstone

could be taken in a train before baptism. The anxious Gladstone wrote (August 11, 1845): "This has occurred to me in consequence of a sentiment I have heard ascribed to Newman, which sounded to me strange and whimsical, that he could not accept the suggestion to go abroad in order to effect his transition, because he would not cross the sea unreconciled. I do not see in such a case the distinction between sea and land. Were it a balloon one could understand it." Manning replied that their forefathers, "if they had seen the panting, bellowing, fiery beast in the entrails of which your child is to shake its way to Chester, would have baptised it with all speed."

They never ceased exchanging proofs of their books and pamphlets until the day they found themselves exchanging blows. "I have desired Old Clo (Gladstonian pun on the name of Clowes), as you clepe him, to send a proof he is printing for me to Carlton Terrace." Gladstone criticised him calling the Queen and Consort "functionaries" (July 31, 1843), "which I think a Queen might resent quite as justly as the fishwife objected to being called an individual."

When Macaulay attacked Gladstone's book on Church and State, Manning hastily prepared "a catena of forty-five Fathers, three Popes, and four Cardinals" in defence. On reading Gladstone's MS. he wrote: "I think we have lost a great priest, though not without compensation." Together they grieved over their Bishops and over the Romanists' advance in England, whom Manning calculated to be 223,987 in 1840 by multiplying their marriages by 137 and a half. "I have a sort of feeling that you will have the Romanists upon you for some part of your book. Why do they not attack some people? Is it by the rule of the old song, 'Let them alone and they'll come home and bring their tails behind them'?" Rome and Canterbury he compared to Pharisee and publican. "They cover and gloss and claim infallibility and sanctity. We are the accusers

Henry Edward Manning

of ourselves.” “At Rome I was told, but I told only one other person, because they must wish it to be spread, that in the Northern district last year they professed to have 600 converts.”

Manning sought liberty for the English Church in spite of Bishops who, “like a superincumbent weight on the head of a springing tree, will make it grow crooked,” and later he urged Gladstone (June 21, 1849): “If you could take the lead of a liberty movement in this I believe it would draw to you numberless hearts. Only do not give up this principle and get into details which are as bad as the jungle at Chillianwallah.” It is curious, however, to find Gladstone rejoicing that “the perspective of possibility” included a “Heresy Test.” A crisis soon came which tried him and Gladstone to the utmost. The Bishops had applied a heresy test to his dear friend and venerated leader Newman.

The Oxford Movement restoring Catholicism in the Church of England had sped splendidly. The sacramental sail had been hoisted to the mast of dogma, and Newman’s hand entrusted to hold the tiller from Rome. Suddenly Newman resigned from St. Mary’s and in answer to Manning’s desire of “real participation in all that distresses you” wrote a famous letter to Manning, of which the rough draft appears in his *Apologia* (October 14, 1843): “It is felt that I am a foreign material, and cannot assimilate with the Church of England.” Manning sent it with a copy of his reply to Gladstone. “I would have said more to him, but I fear lest I should make him recoil.” Nevertheless, he had hinted the devil was in it, and begged Newman not to play Jonah. “I feel this strongly, and am sure that the adversary both of the Church and of yourself would compass his own ends in casting over you such an illusion as that you should believe yourself to be a foreign ingredient.” Gladstone felt Newman was “overwrought into morbid action from gloating, as it were, continually and immediately upon

Rome and Gladstone

the most absorbing and exciting topics." Newman cut any further diagnosis short by letting Manning know: "I think the Church of Rome the Catholic Church, and ours not a part of the Catholic Church, because not in communion with Rome." Manning broke the terrible news to Gladstone as "clouds return after rain," bemoaning he should be made "the vent of his heavy secret to the world." October 27, 1843: "Newman's letter has deeply moved me, and made me yearn impatiently to be at rest. He seems to tell me that my only stay through six years of sorrow, weariness, and solitude is a shadow. All the world might say it, and I should care less than to hear it from him. God be thanked, it does not shake me, but it is like a chill on a wound under which one suffers to the very quick."

"Disease," concluded Manning. "A disgraced man," echoed Gladstone. Manning urged "breathless caution. . . . We are responsible to the Church for this knowledge. It may become misprision of Treason." And for two years the grim secret was kept. But it affords the clue to Manning's famous sermon on Gunpowder Day (November 5, 1843), which was construed as treasonable to his High Church party. He knew better where the treason lay, and from the very pulpit Newman had made musical with sweet deceit and allurements he smote Rome hip and thigh, and raised the bright Pan-Anglic banner as a "principle of reconciliation between East and West." But he made the mistake of visiting Newman at Littlemore the next day, and finding him "not at home." Newman seemed to enjoy "sighing and heartaches" sufficiently to prolong them for two years.

Meanwhile Manning felt, "If our position be tenable, let us work onward with all hope. If not, let us abandon it. I cannot consent nor endure to be going back in the midst of work to root up first principles to see if they are alive, like children gardening." Gladstone wished Newman's letter sent to a Bishop, but Manning felt,

Henry Edward Manning

“What could St. Cyprian do for a mind in that state? and we have no Cyprians.” Who was to ensnare the snarer and delude Newman back into his Anglican delusions? In vain he invited Newman to visit the parochial perfections of Lavington. In vain he wrote a letter Newman described as a “great gift,” in which he said, “Every trial that gives you pain is a matter of great pain to me.” In vain, by a veiled threat to Dr. Jenkyns that the Newmanites would censure Archbishop Whately for Sabellianism, he tried to ward off the censures the University was dealing Newman. In vain, for Newman passed into the Catholic Church (October 9, 1845) against Manning’s prayer, “May we be guided and kept from and against ourselves.”

The Gladstone and Manning correspondence reveals that each realised the Roman position in the flash of Newman’s act. Though they braced each other up and removed traces of liturgical grief from each other’s cheeks, nevertheless Gladstone wrote from Germany (October 20, 1845): “Almost all I see here drives my sympathies into the Roman camp, *quoad* German matters. Elsewhere there are pious individuals, but it is there alone, I think, that we can anticipate with confidence the essential and permanent maintenance of the Truth;” while Manning concluded (October 29, 1845): “I often think that all will be reduced at last to the simple opposition of the negative and affirmative principle, and that Rome and we shall be thereby united.” By Christmas he had recovered himself, and could comment vividly but unafraid on Newman’s book on Development:

“It seemed to swallow me up with all the thoughts of years. But in the end I feel where I was. On the whole, then, the great debate is where it was, with this gain. Even Newman has not moved its limits in advance against us. The evident and vast difficulty with which he had to wrestle comes out in a multitude of ways. The

Rome and Gladstone

book is to me wonderful. In some things very unlike him. The English is latinised and the style abrupt in points and even odd and freakish, implying, I fancy, the perils of a solitary and intense intellect. The awful passage on St. Mary has no parallel that I know except the *Paradiso*, Canto 33. The whole book exhibits an intellectual compass and movement belonging to an order of minds which live in a region above the reach of all except a few. I am afraid it will open a running sore in our poor body."

After a due meed of tears for Newman, Manning set about realising and energising the Church at hand. She had lost her prophet, but Manning offered a programme. The magic formula "*Credo in Newman*" was laid aside, and "safe as Manning" became the watchword of the hour. The wise, the timid, the moderate, and the patriotic, took refuge under his name. "Safe as Manning!"—safe, indeed, as a bank before failure, as an oak before its last storm; safe as every guide who is not Divine!

CHAPTER VII: ARCHDEACON OF CHICHESTER

“I was as a man trying to hold a province in behalf of his Sovereign.”—*Manning to Miss Stanley, 1852.*

MANNING found the clergy “so many good men in black kerseymere,” and made some effort to rouse them by creating *furor* at meetings. To Samuel Wilberforce he wrote (September 15, 1835):

“Brackenbury’s anti-liturgical eloquence I repeated at our clerical meeting, and the effect was great. Taff vaulted upon his Welsh pony and swore by the sweet metheglin he would apostatise from the Bible Society, so I let his Cambrian ire chafe until he had stirred up two or three more.”

St. Matthew, 1837: “I have not room to tell you of a clerical meeting on Hold Fast the Traditions, etc. Two hours and more of hard fighting, but very uncommonly straightforward and satisfactory. Bliss very hopeful, and the rest silenced at least of bomolochy and common swearing.”

As for his Bishops at Chichester, Dr. Maltby was Presbyterian by baptism and only Anglican by profession. At Durham he became famous as the recipient of Lord John Russell’s letter on No Popery. His successor, Dr. Otter, was eponymous enough in doctrine to be considered “neither fish, flesh, or fowl.” He died, leaving Dr. Shuttleworth the honour of raising Manning to Archdeacon, who noted: “Wonderful is God’s government. Eighteen months ago He took away the man who seemed likely to put me into the charge of authority. He sent another least likely, who did it as his first act. Now He has taken him also.”

Manning’s eloquence at a Brighton meeting “evidently

Archdeacon of Chichester

riveted" the Bishop, who gave him a lift back in his coach, and, in spite of Mrs. Shuttleworth and his own Low Church views, the archdeaconry. Gladstone had inquired if the new Bishop "*otters* or *potters*," and Manning described the diocesan health as "torpid circulation at the heart." The archdeaconry was a glowing surprise to his friends. Newman hardly knew whether to believe "what Gladstone thought almost too good to be true." His brethren chaffed "the most venerable Henry" on his shovel hat and apron. His mother rejoiced that Chichester would better agree with the health of her "beloved child." As for his mother-in-law, "One Archdeacon (Robert Wilberforce) almost turned her head; I think two will clean upset it," wrote Henry Wilberforce, whose sister Mary asked: "How is your head?" Manning's view may perhaps be traced at his first public appearance, when he referred to "the lowliest and unlikeliest of Christ's servants gaining an incredible dominion over the most stubborn and inveterate minds"! It was to be often so. He noted privately: "My desire is to win the wills of men to Catholicism." He perceived "there are disadvantages in being placed early in authority," which "needs a clear revelation in facts of Providence to make it safe."

By Catholicism he meant the Church of England, telling Gladstone (November 11, 1841): "The English Church is Catholic in dogma and in polity. But the subjective, the internal, ascetic, contemplative, devotional, moral, penitential elements are wasted down to a meagreness which is nigh unto death." The question which has troubled many minds, What are archidiaconal functions? was partly answered in the note ". . . subjects on which I think I could write with good effect—Pews; the Rubrics of the Communion; Catechising; the Penitential Office." About these he busied himself with an acquiescent Bishop and a grotesque yoke-fellow in Archdeacon Hare, whom he endeavoured to put both

Henry Edward Manning

into a right mind and right clothing. "When acting officially I think it will be right to wear a short cassock. It would be well for us to do the same, and then there is nothing individual or singular." But Hare would only rise to "a strait-cut coat for dining with the Bishop"! Besides, his motto was "Unity without uniformity." But worse, he improvised in the liturgy to suit his poetical fancy. "I myself heard him make eight or nine alterations in the Evening Service. I add with a great feeling of sorrow that for some time past he has not contributed to unite this Diocese," Manning complained. However, they broke up pews together and plotted an Archidiaconal Synod: "I delight in the thought, and am prepared to run all risks with you to carry it into effect. We will write to our brethren by private letters. The best course seems to be, do it first and discuss it afterwards." One effect Gladstone noticed. Archdeacons began to "charge" like Bishops!

Manning restored Good Friday and Ascension Day to the diocese, though he wrote to Hare on such a conciliatory feast as "gunpowder day"! Hare was horrified at the Graffham altar rails, "those Laudian semi-Roman fences!" Manning replied that he himself was "wanting in the gift of superstition," and "too dull to see occult mysteries of evil in such matters." But if he cared to indulge his sentiment, "I might fancy somewhat with myself when going through it to the Holy Communion of the veil of Christ's manhood, through which God shows Himself to me, and through which we have access to the Father. I might also think of the awe and terrible fear which fenced about the Divine Presence at Sinai."

Manning was neither High nor Low Church, but of what he called "old Church of Englandism." To the Oxford men he was "morbidly moderate." He tilted against Wiseman under the pseudonym of a "Catholic Priest," and grieved his Bishop by writing *The Rule of*

Archdeacon of Chichester

Faith (1838). His spiritual advance was that of a cautious financier who keeps his speculations in hand. "Most fully do I subscribe to Luther's view of Baptism," he began in 1834, writing to Samuel Wilberforce, and later: "You must go to work on tradition without further postponement. I always feel ugly when you speak even doubtfully on points which underlie the deepest convictions of my own mind." He was always, and vainly, trying to persuade himself of agreement with Wilberforce and Archdeacon Hare. He had accepted the Apostolical Succession by the time he wrote *The Unity of the Church* (1842): "It is a golden book, and the ore lies deep," wrote Anderdon. "I believe I shall master it." In the end the theories it contained mastered its writer. "Few books," said Hare, "written with conscientiousness and sobriety have repelled me so frequently and painfully." In vain Manning grafted olive branches to the bald ends of controversy, wishing "the two names (Protestant and Popish), with Transubstantiation, Calvinism, and solitary drinking, well out of the world!" Hare particularly objected "to your trick of turning off from an objective argument into personality." Manning tried to prevent the boat from rocking by keeping in skilful touch with as many parties as possible.

But Hare would have none of Ritualism and consoled himself with Royalty. He reported the christening of the future Edward VII.: "After the royal christening, when the ladies left the dinner-table, the Bishop of Norwich doubted whether to go up to Lord Melbourne or the Archbishop of York, but after a moment joined the latter. The Archbishop said, 'Oh, you are right to join the Church.' 'It is all the same thing,' said Lord Melbourne." "Whether Lord Melbourne meant to be Erastian or Catholic is doubtful," thought Manning. Hare offered to introduce him to the King of Prussia, with the comforting assurance that the King had refused

Henry Edward Manning

a Baptist deputation, "because he will not give any sanction to tenets so destructive of the sanctity of family life!" Hare was conspiring with Bunsen, the Prussian Minister, to place a Protestant Bishop at Jerusalem, but Manning could not be tempted. Bunsen was a pious busybody he had known in Rome, with a scholarly reputation among diplomatists and a diplomatic reputation among scholars. Manning wrote (October 28, 1841): "I do not think we may lawfully consecrate a Bishop of Jerusalem. Our Bishop said last week, 'I find no difficulty in making a Bishop of Malta. The Pope makes Bishops in Ireland, and why should not we in his communion? God forbid that we should take an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth! The Pope is either right or wrong in Ireland. If right, why call him schismatical; if wrong, why copy him?'"

However, Bunsen and many believed in preparing an Anglo-Prussian Church to greet the Second Coming, and Miss Maurice helped to embroider a suitable garment for the Bishop to wear on that occasion.

Gilbert, the new Bishop, reported blemishes in the diocese to his lynx-eyed Archdeacon. H. was removed for immorality, and "I am afraid Mr. B. will have to be watched," mentioned Gilbert. Manning advised him on Roman fever cases: "I doubt if our old writers will avail much. The controversy has refined itself, and their tone is rough and painful to a mind which has given any affections in hostage to the Roman Church. Still, the facts alleged by Leslie are good." They combined to bring home a cleric "who forsook his living for years to reside in France," with the amusing result that to nail the wanderer the Dean and Chapter made him a Canon, and Manning confessed he was "reduced to a profane state of mind!"

To Bishop Phillpotts he confessed "impatient sorrow that we must contest such points as surplices and gowns when the great realities of Christ's kingdom are at stake.

Archdeacon of Chichester

Have we not to choose between purity and numbers?" Old "Henry of Exeter" was the only Bishop Manning admired. Samuel Wilberforce of Oxford he disliked and distrusted. But Phillpotts was a fighter as he was (he had fought Lingard, the Reform Bill, and his Archbishop). It was on his lost fight for Baptism that Manning left the Anglican Church—the so-called Gorham decision. During the "linen controversy" Manning advised him (January 5, 1845): "Our practice must be raised to our ritual, our ritual must be lowered to our practice, or we must struggle on as we are. The two first involve each the submission of too many minds to be brought about without loss. The last is, I believe, fatal." Manning was always setting trilemmas for Bishops, dilemmas for layfolk.

Manning started a seminary (with Gladstone as a subscriber), a House of Mercy, initiated a fighting policy in education, and launched Colonial Bishops. Empire and Church he wished coterminous. "One-seventh of the globe and ten bishopricks!" he noted as an Anglican scandal. "We must answer for the heathenism of India, for the destitution of Canada, for the degradation of the West Indian slaves, for the Tophet we have made in Australia. We are now on trial as Tyre." Even in the United States he saw the "moral arrears" of Empire. Pan-Anglicanism germinated in his notebooks. He dreamed of "a new patriarchate" and "the centre of a new Catholic world." And contemplating "all this tangled mass of life going up in a stream before God scarred, sensualised, energetically warring against God," he concluded: "God has made us His special almoners to a lost world." He seemed a possible "English Xavier" to George Selwyn, whom he inspired to go as Bishop to New Zealand. Selwyn wrote from the Antipodes (November 3, 1847): "The sale of Addington would be worth some thousands a year in moral influence. The sight of mitred carriages plying as Hackney coaches

Henry Edward Manning

would do more good than if they stood at the doors of Lambeth and London House. My heart sank within me when I heard of a park bought for the Bishop of Rochester out of the spoils of the cathedrals." And Manning had moments of despair, as when he wrote to Gladstone: "I seem to question whether this so highly-favoured Church of ours is to open a new Catholic dispensation to the world or to pass like a pageant out of the earth;" or again: "Unless the earth be shaken, you and I shall go to our rest leaving the Establishment between life and death as now and always."

The Archdeacon may well have desired to be a Bishop himself. Bishop Trower is recorded in the *Life* of Bishop Wilberforce telling of a conversation with Manning on his episcopal prospects. Manning thought: "Unless some crisis comes and they require me to quiet it, no chance." Manning did not enjoy Wilberforce's *Life*, and balanced this anecdote with another:

"Canon Prothero was talking to the Queen about my becoming a Catholic. The Queen said, 'Bishop Wilberforce said to me at the time, "If Your Majesty had made him a Bishop, he would not have become a Roman Catholic!"' Canon Prothero said, 'Didn't Your Majesty say, "Now I know why *you* don't become one!"' The Queen answered, 'I didn't think of it or I might have said it!' Poor S. W. had Bishopricks on the brain!"

The Queen's grandfather had said that there would have been no Wesleyan secession if the Ministers had made Wesley a Bishop. Manning was never named for an Anglican bishopric, though we can hardly imagine Gladstone failing him, when episcopal patronage fell to him in later years, including the Primacy of Canterbury. Gladstone urged his name unsuccessfully for a Preacher-ship at Lincoln's Inn, which, however, was bestowed for eleemosynary reasons on a client of Queen Adelaide.

Archdeacon of Chichester

Manning felt so mortified that he took revenge on his ambition by refusing, two years later, the Sub-Almoner-ship to Queen Victoria, vacated by Samuel Wilberforce's translation to the Oxford bishopric.

The struggle between ambition and self-control was considerable, and recorded in his diary at length. The actions and reactions lasted long into the next year.

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

He commenced spiritual diaries before Lent, 1846, calculating and commenting his sins of

"self-complacency, high aims, and professions in the spiritual life. (Give me to see myself.)"

"Sins of the tongue, as in London that morning, and also in repeating a Spanish blasphemy. (Set a bridle on my tongue.)"

"Ostentation of learning and mean concealment of ignorance. (Show me Thy light, and in it my darkness.)"

"Envy, especially in spiritual offices and state."

"Vainglory and self-flattery. Picturing and talking to myself. (Real love of Christ's shame.)"

"Censuring others with an aim. (Charity and simplicity.)"

"Anger, especially with J. L. Anderdon. (Patience.)"

"To this I must add, Fearful want of love towards God; fearful want of repentance; fearful absence of mind in prayer. Dead, sluggish, obstinate unwillingness to pray. It is a feeling like nightmare when one cannot move."

With illness a real religious change came. He noted the milestones: "My admission to Lavington, 1833. My bereavement, 1837. The hearing of Confessions, 1844. The growing up of hope, 1845. My illness, 1847. These are, I think, the chief agents under God in my

Henry Edward Manning

conversion." On March 18 occurred "the greatest conscious act of my life." By April he realised: "Certainly I now know the meaning of 'He maketh all his bed in his sickness'—that is, for body and soul. This has been a precious Lent; never was one like it in my life."

A new influence had been for some time unconsciously acting on the susceptible mind of the Archdeacon, who complained to Gladstone that Pusey was "entangling himself and others in a position out of which there is no natural pass but in a fearful direction." A sheaf of what Carlyle called "spectral Puseyisms" encumbers the Manning Papers. They embodied two themes—admiration for Rome and, in contrast to Manning's official optimism, utter despondence over the English Church. While he drew the pay of the Establishment Manning tried to make out the best case, but Pusey was all Jeremiad. His only sign of cheer was at the death of some Low Churchman, as, for instance, "What an awful dispensation this sudden removal of Dr. Arnold! One dares not speak of it, but it must have much meaning!"

On Manning's Charge of 1845, the critical year, Pusey wrote: "While it is a cheering tone, is there quite enough love for ye Roman Church? However, you do put forth strongly that we are sick, and what you say of chastenings must do good. I desiderated more love for Rome. When the battle with infidelity and rebellion comes, we must be on the same side." To Manning being on the same side meant going there. He was puzzled, and sent Pusey's letter to Gladstone, asking his "mind on the last point about love of Rome." Gladstone replied (August 1, 1845): "I am afraid one-sidedness as to the Church of Rome is becoming an article of religion with Dr. Pusey." Manning accordingly conveyed a rebuke: "The Church of Rome for 300 years had desired our extinction. It is now under-

Archdeacon of Chichester

mining us." Pusey replied that Rome was "for ye most part our Mother," and that "we may be apart and still a part of ye Church." This was a paradox, but shrewd hits followed: "I can hardly imagine St. Anselm or St. Augustine signing ye 39 Articles!" The Reformation "brought a wrong element into our Church, which has been struggling with Catholicity ever since." As for the glorious Revolution, it was "a snare of Satan by which he gradually entangled almost all our clergy into what was to them perjury." As for doctrines, "the Vision in the Acts of SS. Perpetua and Felicitas completely shook me about some Purgatory. I had no answer, although I have only said so in private to three or four." "The conversion of M. Ratisbonne and other things which I cannot doubt to be facts leave me no answer as to the invocation of the Blessed Virgin." Finally, Pusey would accept intra-Communion with Rome on the terms of the Council of Trent, stipulating only the Cup for the laity and the Liturgy in English. After Newman's secession the leadership lay between them, but Pusey would not take Manning's bridle in his lips, and Manning would not wear the garish harness which Pusey prepared for those that loved him. All the while the undercurrent toward Rome was like a continual soundless river. The barometer was ever rising in Manning's mind.

May 15, 1846: "Tho' not therefore Roman, I cease to be Anglican."

July 5: "Right or wrong, this family of doctrines is preserved by Rome and lost or rejected by Protestantism. Something keeps rising and saying, You will end in the Roman Church. I believe the Bishop of Rome to be Primate and by devolution Chief. I would willingly yield in silence to all acts of Councils."

July 12: "The meshes seem closing round me. I feel less able to say that Rome is wrong."

August 2: "Now I see that St. Peter has a Primacy among the Apostles. That the Church of Rome inherits

Henry Edward Manning

what St. Peter had among Apostles. That the Church of Rome is therefore heir of Infallibility.”

The next year brought sickness, and apparently his second conversion. His third and last was yet to come. A sifting of the diary reveals a new note.

February 12, 1847: “What distraction, haste, sloth, insensibility! I have need to ask for forgiveness, specially for the sins of my penance. Unworthy the name. I trust, however, it has brought me down, and changed my tone from a boaster to a penitent. To have been such as I was! What a moral mire was a mind enslaved like mine.”

A week later he wrote to Miss Maurice:

“I am sufficiently unwell to understand many things I have talked about very wisely. I can truly say I thank God I feel as I do. I feel it is a blessed thing not to pray, to be otherwise than I am, but just to lie on the waterflood, knowing Who sitteth above it.”

The diary drags on with his sickness (February 20):

“What can I say I have learned by this sickness? I dare not think of anything I have ever done for His sick poor, for I have learnt how coldly and heartlessly I have visited them, especially if they have been trying or unattractive. It has made me realise much more than I otherwise should the state of the famishing in Ireland.

“How can I die to the world? Should I refuse all visits and invitations? Not all—*e.g.*, when asked as a priest, nor when charity may be served. Shall I give up my carriage and servant? (April 13: To-day I gave William warning with regret, poor fellow!)”

March 4: “I feel to dread my own active choice. And I feel as if there were an active movement going on round about me. Is it God’s leading? Is it a temptation? Is it my own mind deluding itself? How I sink at heart for want of someone of whom I can ask a judgment of these things. God knows I feel very lonely.”

March 20, after Confession: “What a help to reality!

Archdeacon of Chichester

What a safeguard against hypocrisy in receiving confessions! I was beginning to be at ease. At first it haunted me. Blessed Tribunal of Penance *post naufragium tabula*. I wish from this day to note every cognisable sin."

March 24: "I take it to be confessed, That no penitent can be lost. That all who have contrition are penitent. For all beside, I must wait till the end of all controversy, both of that between God and man and between Church and Church."

"The greatest conscious act" alluded to was probably a first Confession, leading to the ecstasy of March 20. Like a drowning man, he recalled all his past life. "The preservation of my life six times to my knowledge. In illness at the age of nine, in the water, by a runaway horse at Oxford, the same on the downs, by falling nearly through the ceiling of a church, again by a fall of a horse."

On March 27 he ran through God's special mercies: "Shall all this be in vain? Shall the dead praise Thee, O Lord?" After passing

"Passion and Holy Week in the fear of death, this Easter day falls like a sunlight and soft dew upon me. I have prayed that all pride, vanity, envy, jealousy, rivalry, and ambition may be crucified in me, and I accept this as a nail driven into me, and desire to be wholly crucified. I had rather suffer my humiliation and disappointment than harbour the accursed slime of jealousy. If ever I wake up after His likeness I shall have it no more, but the sanctity and bliss of others will be my own joy. So be it. Amen. Amen."

April 15: "Either such a life as St. Charles or St. Aloysius is an illusion or mine is. If I were so blessed as to be the shadow of the least of such saints, I might be less afraid to die."

May 3: "I work myself up into a heat and eagerness which either overbears free conversation or challenges contradiction. My mind is like a bent bow, and its moments are instantaneous and intense, as if old sores broke out. This is all very horrible and humbling."

Henry Edward Manning

On May 10 he went out into the air again :

“The earth and the world never looked to me so benign, beautiful and lovely. I fear I love it too well.”

May 21 : “This has been a blessed day to me. After ending my penance I went up to the House of the Lord, and kissed each step of the Holy Altar.”

May 26 : “Is Satan withdrawing all these temptations that I may go securely into a delusion? I am horribly afraid. Then I look to the hand of Providence, which is upon me. It seems to point two ways, which is impossible, and proves only that I cannot interpret. But I am afraid of my own heart.”

In June the doctors examined his chest and he was ordered abroad, writing :


“To-morrow by the will of God I go forth—it may be for a year—it may be for ever. I feel to be in His hands. I know not what is good for myself. *Voluntas Dei*. O my God, as Thou didst guide Abraham, guide me for Thy Son’s sake. If by any means I may attain to the resurrection of the holy dead” (July 5, 1847).



Archdeacon Manning

From a cameo cut in Rome in 1848

Emery Walker Engr.



CHAPTER VIII : THE ROAD TO ROME

“*Tu es Petrus* and *Credo in Unam Sanctam Catholicam Ecclesiam* reveal to me a Divine Monarchy claiming a sentiment of loyalty to a Person in Heaven before which all other kingdoms melt away.”—*Manning to Gladstone*, 1848.

LEAVING his friend Dodsworth in charge at Lavington, and armed with an introduction to Döllinger from Gladstone, Manning left England for Malines, where he was shown Relics, and felt that they “awaken and keep alive a high standard of personal devotion.” He saw Louvain, Aix, and Cologne, all Catholic hives. Protestant Homburg he found “stripped of outward Christianity.” Inquiry gave him to know that the Prussian King was “obstinate, an actor, a humbug.” The joyful news of Gladstone’s Oxford election caused him to write (August 17, 1847): “And now Saladin must die. It is hard on you to tell you so on the morrow of your successes. But so it is. I do not see how it is possible for questions of religious policy to be postponed.” Suddenly he returned home ill: “I am doing no work, but grazing like a Siberian Lamb.” In October he set out again to Rome by Paris, Avignon, and Nice. He took notes of Catholic services, and filled his diary with verbal vignettes. “In a garden by the sea a little girl of eight dancing to the chime all alone.” A symbol of the English Church, perhaps. “Above Genoa the blue loom of the snow, mountains, and below the rose colour, then the silver of the moon chafing upon the waters.”

In Rome friends rose to meet him. At Santa Croce he “saw Newman in his chamber,” a sight still awesome to Anglican eyes. They met once in the street. So ill was Manning that Newman did not recognise him. On

Henry Edward Manning

December 8 Manning set eyes on his future friend and eventual creator, Pius IX. He went about Rome with Sidney Herbert and Florence Nightingale. Until his death the Pope remembered seeing the Archdeacon kneeling in the Piazza di Spagna. These were the days of what Macaulay called Brahminical Government in Rome, of an indulgent despotism tempered by canon law. The great question was whether the Pope would bow to the mob. A half-religious, half-revolutionary crowd cheered for "the democratic Bambino." Manning wrote to Gladstone (January 20, 1848):

"I have been often reminded of you, seeing the same sights and hearing the same litanies we used to hear at St. Luigi. Outwardly Rome is unchanged—the streets, shops, pavements, heaps of dirt not yet taken away. But morally and inwardly there is a vast change: a very visible increase of intelligence and energy, with free, public expression in word and writing. Believing that the unfolding of individual and national character, and therefore of social forces and institutions, is a Divine law and blessing, I cannot but hope more than fear for Italy. It seems to be a law that old countries, if they destroy their organisation, cannot reform and reconstruct themselves—at least, not within a period shorter than a geological era. And I therefore am afraid that anything which upsets an existing order, instead of recalling it to its first idea, only clears a field for confusion. But we have no need to go to Rome. If this upset is not preparing in England, Lord John is at least blameless."

England's only upset was a religious one. At Nice Manning read that the heretical Hampden had been confirmed as Bishop of Hereford, and, when the Dean refused his seal, he wrote to Gladstone: "It is surely an omen that Lord John Russell insulted the Dean of Hereford from Woburn Abbey." To the faithful Dodsworth (January 28, 1848): "Don't tell any soul what I add now, but there is something which has brought you and other days to my mind, and that is the

The Road to Rome

evening Benediction. The sacred beauty with which things are done here is, of course, beyond all places. I am very deeply impressed with what I see of the religious orders here, especially the Passionists. It is impossible not to love Pius IX. His is the most truly English countenance I have seen in Italy."

Pius gave the Constitution to his children. There was more play-acting than revolution, carnival than carnage. Priests wore the tricolor. St. Andrew's head was stolen, and a price put on it! The Austrian Emperor's arms were taken up the Corso by a dwarf mounted on an ass, and burnt. "Alas for the Cæsars!" noted Manning; but Francis Joseph's end was not yet. A nobler sight was Pius blessing the Constitution, "with a mixture of majesty, love, and supplication." Manning went into the Church of Perpetual Adoration, "and as the *Tantum Ergo* was sung, the band outside passed playing *Pio Nono*. A strange clash—the world 'so musical and loud,' and the Lorelei of contact between the natural and the supernatural." But Mazzinian steeds were dragging the papal chariot, and the reins were dashed from the Cardinal-charioteer. To Gladstone Manning wrote (April 3, 1848):

"I may say that six weeks has revolutionised Italy and Europe. What are we to read in this? Is it not the moral and popular development, the fruit of thirty years of peace, demanding recognition and social power? In this view I am inclined to look at it with hope, especially when I see that after all these sudden and violent movements in advance, England is in all popular freedom and power immeasurably ahead. When I think of our social state, the only account I can give of it (as I often have to do to Italians) is that we are a republic under a hereditary President. It is wonderful to see the Catholic Church in America, France, and Italy distinctly of the progress and popular party—indeed, in many ways at the head of it. It falls in with an old belief of mine in which I think you share. I mean that the Church of the

Henry Edward Manning

last ages will be as the Church of the first, isolated and separate from the Civil Powers of the World. In the first ages the Church won them by making them Christian; in these days they are renouncing the Church by making themselves again merely secular and material. And in these has long been and is now my fear for the Church of England. I am afraid it will be deceived into trusting the State too long, and thereby secularising itself. I hope I may find some way of interpreting the insularity you confess to. For myself, I know no real sense in which I dare hold it. I never had much of it, and feel that every year has convinced me more deeply that Protestantism is heretical and Nationalism is Judaic. Farewell, my dear friend. I begin to think of home, but the lines of confusion, three deep, are drawn from Hungary to the Pyrenees, and as yet I have not fixed my route. If I can I hope to see Lombardy in its first days of freedom."

Englishmen encouraged revolution in Italy, but were morally shocked at the contemporary Irish rising, which Ventura, Manning's favourite preacher, seemed to justify. Of his pamphlet Mrs. Sidney Herbert wrote: "He cannot resist a hit at us and poor Ireland in every chapter; and, still worse, have you read Bishop O'Higgins's answer to Rome? It is too hopeless." As an offset Sidney Herbert and Manning arranged for Trevelyan's Irish pamphlet to be translated for the Pope. Ventura told Manning that palliatives would not do for Ireland, and that, like Sicily, Ireland must have her own Parliament. Manning recorded Ventura's famous words to the Pope, "Let not your Holiness look to the Sovereigns of Europe, who are shadows which may vanish within the year, but to the peoples, who are realities and last for ever," which sank into his mind as deep as the beauty of Holy Week. On April 9 he was presented to Pius with other English folk. On May 11 private audience was granted to "*Archidiacono* Manning" at Mount Cavallo. He was given his ecclesiastical title on his paper of entry. The Pope was interested in the work of Mrs. Fry, and startled to

The Road to Rome

hear from him that Anglicans received the Cup at Communion against all liturgical hygiene.

Manning started to drive home, visiting the death-chamber of St. Francis. In Perugia he noted, "The bells broke out and reminded me of Harrow and Oxford, under a cloudless sky and yellow moon." Home-sickness took shape in all his notes. The Church at Assisi, "like the under-Church of York, painted. The form is a Latin cross with an end like the seven chapels at Durham. Windows like the style of Westminster Abbey. After dinner to St. Damiano; reminded me of Hever and the moat." He delighted in St. Clare's Oratory, "like one of our rude Early English." The refectory "reminded me of the groined roof at Cold Waltham." He came slowly home, scribbling thumb-sketches of pictures and services, sermons and cathedrals, but the home touch never ceased. "The country to Forlì like Midland counties." Even the outline of the Apennines "becomes a flat tableland as the South Downs." He went to Benediction in Ravenna, and noted malefactions expiated in Purgatory: "A monk not bowing at the *Gloria*, a preacher making too much of his composition, a virgin careful about her food on Fridays."

He visited the tombs of Dante and Augustine of Hippo, and, greatest of all, of St. Charles Borromeo, his future patron. In after-years he wrote of what occurred at Milan: "I have always felt to be a call from St. Charles. I was thinking in prayer, if only I could know that St. Charles, who represents the Council of Trent, was right and we wrong. The Deacon was singing the Gospel, and the last words, *et erit unum ovile et unus pastor*, came upon me, as if I had never heard them before."

He returned to England with a quiet determination to lead Anglicanism to its conclusions. The Bishops had accepted Hampden, and with almost humorous despair Manning wrote an ingenious Charge, making allowances

Henry Edward Manning

for Hampden's opinions. It was a possible way out of an impossible situation. It was a legal brief for the Establishment. Rumours of Manning's trend in Rome had alarmed his friends. Pusey, Gladstone, and Moberley had written anxiously. To the latter Manning wrote: "My opinions are what they were when I wrote to you from Rome. My Charge is the case for the Church of England." He ceased the orthodox halloo in order to try running with the heretical hare. Still he was riding for a fall. To Dodsworth: "I cannot serve what I cannot defend, and if I had failed to find a just defence I am afraid to think of what must have followed." He told Gladstone in St. James's Park that during his illness he had been assured that the English Church (not the Establishment) was a part of the living Church, but to Dodsworth he wrote: "I feel clearer and more ready for all hazards. I have had things to cheer me, great depth and devotion in individuals with no tinge of Anglicanism or any such sham" (August 14, 1848).

When despondency fell upon him he could not lean on Pusey's tired heart or be comforted by the official unbrotherliness of Samuel Wilberforce. He stayed himself on Dodsworth and Robert Wilberforce, to whom he wrote under the seal. To the former he wrote next year (March 23, 1849): "As to the sacrifice, if I believed the Church of England to condemn what the Church of Rome teaches I should be in a strait. But my soul sickens. And I feel that I am defending, not the Church of England against Rome, but my own position against the Church of England. We are in it, are we of it?"

In the autumn he set out for Wales and Scotland, whence Sidney Herbert wrote: "Expect a rather desolate aspect, and respect me, upon whose skill in venery you will be entirely dependent for food, which I will bring, as in Landseer's picture, to you, the fat Abbot of Glastonbury." In Wales Manning preached at the

The Road to Rome

foundation of Lord Feilding's church, which before completion followed its founder into the Catholic Fold. Manning could later only wearily beg Lady Feilding: "Do nothing in haste. I will use no false or worldly persuasions to stay you from anything. But do not act where you are and as you are, and under the impressions now upon you." They were received in Scotland, whither Manning had preceded them. He visited the graves of Paley and John Knox in contrast to the tombs of Dante and St. Francis the previous year. He preached in Glasgow, and sketched Glamis Castle. At St. Andrews he remembered Cardinal Beaton and Wishart, and at Archbishop Sharpe's monument noted "two deeds of blood and one of sacrilege." He was struck by the "universal drunkenness," and reflected: "I had hoped for a quiet evening in the past, but it is better to have an instructive warning of the present." Elsewhere he tried his pastoral hand by visiting the poor, but "they seemed unused to it." At Dunblane he saw Archbishop Sharpe's Thomas à Kempis, "same edition as mine. At the beginning was written *non magna relinquo magna sequor*. On the last *nec te quæsieris extra*, and on the flyleaf *Honores sprêt summus honor*." Every word seemed to apply to the wanderer. A year later he wrote of his holidays to Dodsworth: "They were very pleasant, and in memory are to me refreshing and soothing. Glamis Castle and St. Andrews often come up before me. We did not think then where we should be now; nor now, where next September?"

Silence and study, patience and the *Patres*, were all that were left to Manning, as he racked shelf and mind in resolving whether St. Augustine was an Anglican. "I suppose you up to the chin in that great Suarez which I saw in your rooms. How can you swim in such dry waters?" asked Robert Wilberforce. "I wish I could see you in my study plunging and gambolling on the great waters of Suarez," was the reply. But

Henry Edward Manning

Anglican Archdeacons can hardly have been in their element.

Manning began to be troubled, not for himself only, but for his followers. Gentle remonstrance took the place of stern anger toward those who passed to Rome. When Henry Wilberforce went he wrote to his wife (Advent, 1849): "Under seal. I do not know whether to be sorry or glad at what has happened. I have intentionally spared you the perplexity of bearing what I was bearing myself. You remember my promise that the day I feel my soul to demand anything for its safety you shall know. I have not forgotten it, and I have never yet felt this demand. But I have felt and do feel an overwhelming fear lest I should be under an illusion. I know of nothing else which weighs with me but this, lest I contradict the will of my Lord. On St. Andrew's Day I offered myself, as I have again and again, and never so often as in Rome, to follow on the spot if only I can have, not sign or token, but the conviction of a moral agent that it is the will of my Lord. Pray for me sevenfold, for to mistake in such a path as this, is to one who must give account of souls something like death." And a year later: "I tremble continually lest I should fall through pride. And you cannot have escaped the shadow of my faults except by an extraordinary grace." But by this time a moral agency had begun to work.

As a witty Frenchman wrote, the revolution reached England in the form of *le père Gorham!* Gorham was a well-read botanist, who was presented to a living in the Diocese of "Henry of Exeter," who declined to institute him as a heretic. Gorham rejected the Grace at Baptism, which did not occur to him to be as necessary to infant souls as dew to the flowers of the field. To the violent distress of the High Churchmen, he wisely put his trust in Princes and appealed successfully to the temporal power against his Bishop, who wrote to Manning (August 7, 1850):

The Road to Rome

“*Private.* Yesterday afternoon, in virtue of the *fiat* of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Mr. Gorham was instituted to the Vicarage of Brampford Speke by Sir H. J. Fust! His Grace’s complicity in this awful work is thus consummated, and I cannot hold communion with him. I cannot communicate *in sacris* with him.”

Into this case Manning tilted with all his strength. He carried his Anglican life in his hands, and was prepared to fall. He wrote, he published and petitioned against “this awful work.” He applied canon law, it was noted, “like arguments from pure mathematics.” He charged gravely that “three hundred years of Statute Law are not to be slipped off in a day.” By law and logic he tested “whether the Church of England be a Divine or a human society.” As he had written to Bishop Wilberforce (April 24, 1849), “One Gorham case is enough for one day, and the peril of this decision, whether for the truth or against it, is great. I dread the day when such a subject as the other Holy Sacrament shall be brought, not into a Council or Synod, not before the Church in any form in which we may believe the Holy Spirit may guide and preserve us, but into a wrangling Court before an incompetent Judge. Do you remember in our walk at Graffham just before your consecration that I said I am full of fear from our want of true and accurate study and interpretation of our positive doctrines? This is just such a crisis as I feared.”

Gladstone was no less alarmed, writing: “If Mr. Gorham be carried through, and that upon the merits, I say not only is there no doctrine of baptismal regeneration in the Church of England as State-interpreted, but there is no doctrine at all!” He found that “there would stand forth clear as day to all who did not shut their eyes the absolute necessity of the living voice of the Church to guard her mute witness against profanation.” Manning at least did not shut his eyes, but

Henry Edward Manning

Gladstone would not sign the declaration prepared by Manning and his friends. "This was the first divergence between him and Hope and myself." Manning preserved a vivid memory, writing to Gladstone (November 13, 1869): "Do you remember the night at your house when the thirteen signed the Resolutions about the Gorham Judgment? And the morning when you were in bed with influenza and I came and told you that the judgment was given in his favour? You will ask me why I should fear that you have gone back from what you were then?"

In after-years Gladstone was indignant because Manning stated "that I would not sign because I was a Privy Councillor," and Lord Morley in his *Life* is at pains to cover the refusal to sign by referring to Gladstone's diary for a note—"March 14. Hope, Badeley, Talbot, Cavendish, Denison, Dr. Pusey, Keble, Bennett here from 9 to 12 on the draft of the Resolutions"—and adding: "This would appear to be the last meeting, and Manning is not named as present," which proves that it was not the last meeting, for Manning and Robert Wilberforce, who is not mentioned either, were both to sign. Hope wrote to Manning that day (March 14, 1850): "I will see Gladstone and talk matters over with him, but there are worse hindrances than he is likely to prove. Pusey came here with Keble yesterday and remained some hours criticising our Resolutions. Hoping to get matters adjusted, I proposed a meeting of all who could be got together at Gladstone's this morning." Gladstone noted of this meeting, "On the whole I resolved to try some immediate effect," as appears in Hope's further word to Manning, "Gladstone still for delay, but I think all but himself for Resolutions to be immediately put forth." Gladstone simply failed his friends in the day of battle. Manning excused him at the time (April 6, 1850):

"I am well satisfied, much as it cost me, that you did not sign our paper. Your address was very valuable,

The Road to Rome

and was a second witness, and it leaves you freer. Not that freedom can long remain to us. In the last fortnight of quiet my thoughts have been settling down calmly into a conviction which is part of my consciousness that this question is vital. As an article of necessary faith. As involving the Divine authority of the Church. You could not be slower than I to come to this point. But it is a question of gold or life."

When Manning hinted secession from the Church, Gladstone hinted retirement from politics, and proposed a society of mutual restraint, who should bind themselves to take no "step of a decisive character" without consultation. Manning declined "any engagement of the kind" (May 22, 1850): "In such a moral probation as is now upon us I conceive that time is not to be measured by the dial, but by events; that it is not chronological, but moral." What this meant appears in a note to Miss Maurice (August 5, 1850): "I see nothing before me within any horizon my eye can ascertain. I have always said to you, not dial time, but moral time. Principles and their issues, events and facts, are the hours and minutes of moral time." And again, showing his love for concise and scholastic sentences:

"I always felt that the Low Church had no objective Truths, the High Church little subjective religion. Now I see that in the Catholic System the objective and subjective are the concave and the convex. I do not say that the body and the soul, because these are two, and the objective and subjective become one. God and man are one by Incarnation. A Theology of 300 years is in conflict with a Faith of 1,800 years. I was born in the 300. My mature thoughts transplant me into the 1,800. This is the real balance, but people will not so look at it. I believe a man might hold what he likes in the English Church if he would be quiet and uphold the Church. The dishonesty is to be honest."

A bitter letter from Bishop Wilberforce he described as "good as the vinegar and the gall was good." A

Henry Edward Manning

week later (October 26, 1850) he asked Miss Maurice, "Ought I to resign before going abroad?" Gladstone he would only promise to let know the news first. Gladstone sparred desperately for time. He went so far as to write that if "the Church of England must be understood really to deny that the Church of Rome is a true Church, because they differ in essential points, I should answer that I know of no such points!" Meantime Gladstone's pamphlet appeared, and Manning made a point, regarding "the Supremacy as known to the Common Law which the Tudor Statutes profess only to declare. My deep conviction is that they went beyond the Common Law in the vital point, and that Sir Thomas More lost his head between the edges of the old and new Supremacy. But the lapse of time seems to give us advantage for restoring the Common Law supremacy, to which I believe Pius IX. would make as little objection as Pius II." (A day came when Manning petitioned the successor of Pius IX. to canonise Sir Thomas.)

The confusion was immense. Gladstone wrote of a famous Dean, "I have seen Hook, he drivels," while "He of Exeter seems to have befooled himself." Exeter's chaplain, Maskell, wrote: "Pusey says one thing, Robert Wilberforce another, Gladstone something else, and you, with an openness for which I give God thanks, speak plainly in contradiction of them all!" "The truth seems to me more and more to be that a Church takes a great deal of killing," pleaded Gladstone, as he denied the rumours affecting Manning, who thought it kindest to state (June 25, 1850): "I dare not say that my conscience will not submit itself to the Church which has its circuits throughout the world and its centre by accident in Rome." He could not help adding: "But I have written too much." Gladstone began to wail: "She nevertheless may be the last compulsory home of all who, in the West at least, intend with God's help to hold by a definite revealed truth;

The Road to Rome

but if it be so, a long and loud alas for Christendom!" Autumn found Manning fencing with the unsympathetic Samuel of Oxford: "I fear our separation from the Church, and even opposition to it, is a self-evident fact. If the authority of the British Empire should cease to flow into Canada it would fall into Civil War. And the restoration of internal peace would be a separation like the United States, unless it should reunite itself with the Empire at large." Secessions rained like leaves. The Henry Wilberforces passed out. William Anderdon, whom Manning wrote he "stayed twice as long as I could," followed. Poor John Anderdon wrote: "I cannot say more of my love for you than that next to the ties of wife and children you bind me closest, nor more of my love for the Church than that I would rather you kept fast hold than even my beloved son." Before the New Year Dodsworth had gone, after a minute exchange of notes (December 30, 1850): "Pray for me. At last the decisive step is taken. By God's grace I am to be received to-morrow. I go at 12 o'clock. Remember me then if you can." The answer was (December 31, 1850): "DEAREST FRIEND,—God be with you. Nothing can part us. Pray for me and trust me with God. Ever your loving friend, H.E.M." And the nineteenth century was divided in twain, leaving Manning's heart not otherwise, for by this time he had left Lavington.

Pius had not only given the Romans a Constitution, but the English a Hierarchy, according to the needs of each. "Can we meet the challenge which comes over the water?" Manning asked Gladstone. The Gorham Judgment had shown a moral agency fail. The restoration of the Hierarchy exhibited an enduring and unflinching one in operation. An archaic wave of No-Popery swept the country, and when it reached Chichester Manning allowed it to carry him gently from his moorings. "I believe that it is set for the fall and rising again of many, and that men are parting upon it

Henry Edward Manning

for life," he told Gladstone, who threw his last shaft by recalling the solemn statement Manning had made to him after his illness. In 1896 Gladstone said he could still take an oath in a court of law that Manning had said substantially, "Dying men, or men within the shadow of death, as I was last year, have a clearer insight into things unseen of others, a deeper knowledge of all that relates to Divine faith. In such a communion with death and the region beyond death I had an absolute assurance in heart and soul, solemn beyond expression, that the English Church (I am not speaking of the Establishment) is a living portion of the Church of Christ." This apparent test of Manning's insincerity Gladstone made in 1850, and again in 1896 after Manning's death, when he understood that Manning's Anglican letters to him had been destroyed. It is interesting to append Manning's original answer, for he never wrote to him from Lavington again (November 17, 1850):

"I have a perfect recollection of the conversation you refer to, and I feel that what I said then is in perfect accordance with my present mind. I have no shame in saying that since then I have seen what I did not see before. I have the deepest anxiety to make clear my integrity before God and man, but to square myself by myself is of no high importance to me. Will you also allow me to appeal to you for such a re-examination of your theological conclusions as you have given to your political opinions? To you I seem what you seem to others."

On November 22 the clergy required him to convene them in order that the Archdeanery might protest against the Roman Hierarchy. To Dodsworth he wrote: "I have therefore seen the Bishop and offered to resign my office, or to convene and express my dissent and resignation. Events have greatly brought this to its issue in the way I waited for. I wish to play it out as on a field until the last move of duty is done. Then I shall lay

The Road to Rome

down my weapons." On the day before the meeting he wrote to his Bishop: "Although my resignation was not formally accepted, I consider it to be morally complete." Years later the Rev. H. D. Clarke recalled the "great murmur of intention to charge the Archdeacon with his Roman tendencies, but no one was bold enough to realise the threat." According to the *Brighton Herald* of November 23, "the pale, gentlemanly, quiet and melancholy looking Archdeacon commenced the proceedings by reading several prayers, most of the clergy kneeling during the time." At the close Manning spoke his last charge. His sorrowful dignity won a vote of thanks. "I began to feel as if every man had gone to his own house and left the matter," he wrote to Hope the next day. "Since then events have driven me to a decision." On November 27 the restored church at Lavington was consecrated, Bishop Samuel preaching in the morning and Manning in the evening. "A day of intense sadness, intensified by the dimness of a November evening. All were oppressed with the feeling of the great loss they were to sustain," remembered Dean Randall. On December 3 he departed for good. To Miss Maurice he wrote (December 5, 1850): "I read your kind words as I passed out of Lavington on Tuesday morning. Last Sunday was a time of strange spiritual sorrow, a heaviness of soul such as I dare hardly speak of. Love, tenderness, long and fond memories of home and flock, were around me and upon me. But through all a calm, clear conviction stood unmoved. And now I am here, and all things seem fulfilling themselves as I look on."

Manning withdrew to London and assumed plain clothes. Gaiters and shovel-hat he hung over his Anglican grave. He had preached his last London sermon in St. Barnabas's in June. "I remember what I preached about, the Love of God. There was nothing else left." Lord John Russell had thrown the country

Henry Edward Manning

into a religious perspiration. The so-called Catholic "aggressors" were thrown into a panic of timidity, and Catholic peers declared the Pope ill advised. But the challenge from over the water held good. "I feel thankful," wrote the wearied Manning, "that at last the Erastian spirit has found a reality which it can neither frighten nor seduce."

On arrival in London Manning wrote Gladstone a letter (December 6, 1850), of which he noted in 1887: "It seems as if I had a spark of second sight and foresaw your present lot."

"Let me say what I believe. Parties will from this time form round two centres: the one will be the Protestantism of England protecting or trying to protect itself by legislation; the other, political Government, maintaining a powerful neutrality and arbitration among all religious communities. If you retain your seat for Oxford and accept the leadership, which is approaching you through the old Conservative parties, you must take the former centre as your standing point. Which God forbid! If you take the latter centre you know the cost. But I believe that it is the path of Truth, peace and Christian civilisation to this great Empire."

English Protestantism had begun to protect itself by a Bill forbidding the assumption of ecclesiastic titles—a ridiculous Bill, inflicting an inapplicable penalty to an unpunishable offence. The gracious Sovereign who had clapped her hands at the Gorham Judgment naively added a Royal to the Papal Bull by inquiring of Lord John what should be done with Dr. Cullen for styling himself Archbishop of Armagh, "which is punishable under the *Emancipation Act!*" Lord John collapsed, to Manning's indescribable comfort. "What a strange event is Lord John's fall! And, let those deny it who will, he has fallen before the Church of God!" He might have added the old French proverb that who bites the Pope dies of it! In the early seventies the Bill was removed from the Statute Book by Gladstone through a Committee which

The Road to Rome

called Archbishop Manning as a witness. "I have just received a subpoena under the Ecclesiastical Titles Act. If you do not make haste I shall have the glory of martyrdom," he wrote to his old friend.

In London Manning found himself, "as it were, without priest, without ephod, and without sacrifice." To Miss Maurice he poured his lingering regrets for "the old Parish Church and family pew, the Christmas snows and Christmas hollies, the intonation and cadences of its choir." He was prepared for exile and lowliness. "I shrink from the pinnacles from which I see many fall and falling." To Dodsworth he sent a cautious feeler (January 26, 1851): "Let me have lines telling me how you fare and how your home is. I know that you will speak to me sincerely, and not think any economy between us to be needful or right. Some insight into your reflections and thus far experience would be very acceptable." Meantime the ends of the Anglican firmament had been stirred. His own Bishop begged only him "not to leave England without hearing again from me, or to let me know where on the Continent a letter may find you." The Bishop of Newfoundland cried: "Why, dear brother, are you not in your parishes and among your flocks—those happy parishes, those beautiful flocks? Why do you attend and assist at festivals at this season of rebuke and chastisement? Why do you lend an ear to ——?" Henry of Exeter implored him to stay with him. "Your resignation makes me more wretched than any of the actual abandonments. I am deeply, painfully sensible of all the difficulties which beset my own path. I dare not be a coward, but I fear doing harm by following the rash counsels of my own mind. You would be of inestimable use, comfort, support to me." The Bishop of New Zealand wrote: "Urge all to stand firm in their own cause, and not to cast upon our holy and injured Mother the blame of the chains which she is compelled to wear. Keep the Church

Henry Edward Manning

itself whole or we shall be lost. I am so used to beating against a contrary wind in my little vessel that I care little for it if the vessel itself be seaworthy!" The letter arrived three weeks after the *Ship of Peter* received Manning.

The end had come. Break had followed break. He parted from Archdeacon Hare in silence, each reading the truth in the other's eyes. From Gladstone he parted in the Chapel of Buckingham Palace Road. "I can no longer take the Communion in the Church of England," he said, and with a hand on Gladstone's shoulder. "Come!" Mr. Gladstone remained. The day before he was received, Manning wrote (April 5, 1851): "Bear me in mind in your prayers to-morrow. And may God be with you always." But Gladstone felt as though he had "murdered my mother!" and never forgave. In vain Manning pleaded ten years later (October 14, 1861): "When I laid down all that I had, including your friendship, precious to me beyond wealth or prosperity, it was that I might cast the last weight I had into the scale of positive truth—that is my whole life and soul, with all its past and with all its future."

However, Manning was not alone, and he turned for companionship to James Hope, "the glory and boast of Scotland and Peel's next Lord Advocate," according to Disraeli. They visited Cardinal Wiseman on the Eve of Passion Sunday, and were received by Father Brownbill of the Jesuits the next day. Father Brownbill moves silently out of the ranks to perform his one historic action, and returns, never to be heard of again. His manner, said Lady Georgiana Fullerton, "was enough to teach them that they could bring to the Church nothing, and were to receive from her everything." To Miss Maurice, Manning wrote (April 10, 1851): "It was all most private on Sunday. I had especial desire to fix it for Passion Sunday. The process was Confession, conditional Baptism, profession of

The Road to Rome

Faith, made by my desire, and Absolution. Then I went to the High Mass, which to me, even when outside, has been the divinest act of worship upon earth. What it was then I cannot say." "Now my career is ended," Manning said to Hope as they walked together on the Saturday. A year later he noted in Rome, with his wistful love of anniversaries, "This day at 11 o'clock Hope and I went to Father Brownbill. Passion Sunday. About this moment this Sunday last year Hope came into my room in Queen Street, having just been received—2 $\frac{3}{4}$ or 3 o'clock."

Hope's brilliant career at the Bar was unbroken, but he despised every effort Gladstone made to flatter him into politics, chiefly because he disapproved of those around Gladstone, to use Manning's phrase, "like adjectives round a substantive." To the end of his life Gladstone regarded him with awe, and occasionally puzzled his free-thinking satellites by appeals to what "Jim" Hope had laid down in old days. At Hope's Requiem Manning presided and Newman preached.

To Hope, Gladstone wrote: "The pain, the wonder, the mystery is this, that you should have refused the higher vocation you had before you. The same words I should use of Manning too." Manning could add: "When I became a Catholic, Gladstone said to the person who told me that he felt as if I had murdered his mother. The Duke of Newcastle's letter in April is more natural." The Duke wrote (April 11, 1851): "I mourn over what I must think the great error of a pure and noble mind seeking the true light, but I cannot cease to love and admire the man who makes the sacrifices (which I know you have) in obedience to what he believes to be right."

Manning gave others equal credit for their intentions. When Cardinal Gasquet reported from Oxford that Liddon was insincere, he said: "Do not say that. They used to say the same of me." Gladstone, he thought, was hindered from becoming a Catholic, not by

Henry Edward Manning

ignorance, but by invincible obstinacy. Only of two dying Anglicans did he leave a note of anxious regret—the Duke of Newcastle and Bishop Hamilton. Of the Duke he wrote: “Dr. Kingsly, who attended his death-bed, told Lady Herbert, from whom I had it, that he would see no Protestant clergyman, that his desire was to see me, but those about him hindered it.”

Of Walter Hamilton Manning wrote: “I found him as near to the Catholic Church as I was. In some things in which I had still remaining difficulties he had none. He told me that he would not again accept anything in the Church of England. In the April after, I submitted to the Church. Soon after Bishop Denison of Salisbury died (1854) Gladstone appointed Hamilton, and, as I was told, he and Sidney Herbert overcame and made him accept the bishopric.”

Herbert felt it was better they should not meet (April 16, 1851):

“As politics part men, how much more that to which politics are nothing! There is a great subject forbidden between us. Our objects are not only different, but opposite. I fear what you hope, and resist what you will endeavour to forward. We are in adverse camps. God bless you, my dear Manning; may you find all the peace and happiness you hope for!”

Other letters were not so gentle. His brother Frederick demanded with indignation: “How does this not make you keep your oath sacred? That should be first considered before you take another to persecute even your very family, composed of persons who have never done you any wrong.” They never met again, except by chance at Rugby Station. His brother-in-law Samuel he met again by hazard in St. Alban’s Cathedral. The Bishop wrote:

“However, I can only now say, God’s Will be done. Oh, do not let us ever act in open opposition in the land of England. If we must be parted, cannot you found a

The Road to Rome

Church in some distant land?" And Manning replied: "Beloved brother, with all pain there will yet be a long-tried love which has bound us together in deepest sorrows, and this by God's Grace will bind us still. My prayer and whole endeavour shall be never to pain you by a conscious word."

Newman sent his "inexpressible joy," and Pusey forwarded the saddest farewell (April 9, 1851):

"I only opened your letter in the train. I knew it was the close of many a heartache. I reproached myself, too, when I recollected how I had spoken to you of Purgatory in connection with the vision of St. Perpetua, when I since know St. Augustine sets its authority aside. It was a strange comfort to me when you told me the then barriers between you and Rome which I had broken down."

Manning received a succession of Sacraments from the delighted Cardinal Wiseman. On April 13 he was confirmed with Hope and Badeley. The latter, called "the Stormy Petrel" of the Oxford Movement, had come to Peter. Within ten weeks the Cardinal elevated Manning to the priesthood. Coached by Father Faber, he had already appeared as Deacon and Sub-Deacon at the Oratory. Father Ravignan, the French Jesuit, was at his side to help his first Mass in Farm Street. Richard Doyle the artist, having just resigned from *Punch* for conscience' sake, was at leisure to sketch the memorable scene. *Punch*, after some anti-Papal profanity, admitted by Thackeray's pen that Manning's conversion entailed defeat. Later Thackeray breakfasted with Manning in Rome, and noted, "He has just been doctored by His Holiness." Before he acquired his Doctorate it was necessary to pass some time of study in Rome. Though Newman offered him the Vice-Rectorship of the Catholic University in Dublin, Manning, with his keen eye for vocation, declined, and preferred to sit at a student's desk in Rome, whither he went after a last visit to Lavington.

Henry Edward Manning

“I had the sort of happiness and sadness which I suppose I should have if I had died and come back again!” The *Tablet*, the organ of the startled Catholics, announced his Ordination and intention to go to Rome “for the purpose of commencing his ecclesiastical studies.”



CARDINAL MANNING SAYING HIS FIRST MASS AT FARM STREET,
JUNE 16, 1851.

A Sketch by 'Dicky' Doyle.

CHAPTER IX: FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE AND OTHERS

“The dealing with souls is dangerous, disappointing, transient, invisible.”
—*Cardinal Manning's Notebook.*

MANNING'S career, so far from being over, had now begun. It hinged on the vivid, pliant, susceptible, but magnanimous new Cardinal of Westminster. In a letter to Archbishop Bayley of Baltimore Newman sketched Wiseman as “too busy to be strenuous about anything. He was a man of large views and full of resource and suggestion, but he lived for the day, and every fresh event seemed to wipe out from his mind those which preceded it.” In the day of enthusiasm he ordained Manning *pour encourager les autres*. “Can it be true,” Mgr. Talbot, his Roman henchman, wrote, “that you are going to ordain Manning priest on Trinity Sunday? If you do they will open their eyes in Rome.” Talbot was a convert. The old Catholic view appears in a letter from the Franciscan Archbishop Nicholson to Ullathorne, Bishop of Birmingham (May 8, 1851):

“Tho' there is no ground for apprehending that Manning will retrace his steps, yet there has been a sad example in the person of Sibthorpe. It would be well to add that Manning prefers not being ordained so soon and that he wished to pass a year previously at Rome. Now Manning is advised not to become a Religious, but a Secular Priest, that he may convert by his sermons. Where has he learnt our Theology to be able to preach Catholic Doctrine? Speak strongly to Propaganda. I am pained to find the Cardinal talking to some of the Lay Converts of the necessity of Religious Bodies carrying out their rules.”

Manning made converts by conversation or, as Ruskin said, “by fascination.” On July 3 he received Gilbert

Henry Edward Manning

Talbot, his first convert. In the same months he received six others. Before he left for Rome he received Sir Vere and Lady de Vere and Lady Newry. At Avignon, on the way to Rome, he received Aubrey de Vere. November 29 found him at the knees of Pius, who desired him to enter the Academia. A few days later he noted (December 14, 1851): "What memories of Lavington! 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 eternity. I used always to feel a self-reproach. Something always broke my peace. As I used to walk up and down that room and hear music, 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."

"I am now living as a sort of supercargo in a college of priests," he wrote to Miss Stanley, sister of the Dean, through whom he kept in touch with the Anglican world. "I am much amused by the people who believe me to be in a pair of theological winkers." The wildest rumours were prevalent in England—that the Pope had imprisoned him for insubordination, that he had sunk into an Italian farm, that he had been seen with a hunting-crop in the Corso! The steady stream of letters to inquiring friends never ceased. To Miss Stanley:

"What is the force of arguments drawn from the wickedness of priests or the immorality of Spain? Was Caiaphas a saint or Jerusalem a moral city? What can Mr. Bennett say of Rome that Hosea and Malachi did not say of Jerusalem? Surely the question is not how man has marred the Church, but what God made it. No sin of man can destroy what is indestructible, and no human purity can make a human society to be God's Church. I am convinced there is more difference between the Angels and the Critics than between the Angels and Catholics. Oh, if souls would but know and

Florence Nightingale and Others

love the Sacred Heart, we might beat our spears into reaping-hooks!"

Meantime the spears of controversy flashed by word or letter. Manning was engaged in a fierce duel for the soul of Archdeacon Robert Wilberforce against Gladstone and Bishop Samuel. They strove like Greek and Trojan over the body of an Anglican Patroclus. For a time there was a Minerva in the contest. Robert wrote to Manning: "If I remain where I am it is with a great feeling of uncertainty, which cripples my exertions. On the other hand, I see my poor wife in a state which convinces me that if I took a forward step it would be fatal to her reason or her life. . . . I can't say or see how it is to end, and it is a time of bitter grief to me, because I have a bursting secret in my heart which I cannot communicate to anyone. I am like Bellerophon."

Manning relied on his logical, Bishop Samuel on his domestic sense. Samuel wrote: "Great love to Jane. I trust to her to keep you from being led away by Manning's subtleties." He thought him too good a man to be snared by "that Roman Jezebel."

Jane apparently lay in wait for Manning's letters to Robert, who wrote: "Don't send me anything which you don't wish to be seen, as my wife opens my letters when I am out."

On his return from Rome in 1852, Manning preached to the Bishops in Synod at Oscott: "I seem to see the England of History rise up before me from St. Augustine and St. Bede." He visited Ireland, but Jane would not let him approach Burton Agnes, though he suggested Robert should meet him "on some island or boat in a neutral river, as great powers are wont to meet." Robert could only admit: "You demonstrate to me that Socrates' Basket hangs safely. I cannot gainsay your arguments, but here I am upon earth, and I cannot bring myself to step into it."

Before he returned to Rome Manning had received

Henry Edward Manning

seventeen into the Church, but Henry Bowden and not Robert Wilberforce. Early in 1853 Jane died. She went down with her Protestant flag flying before the inscrutable, way-making will of Providence. Robert immediately published his book on the Eucharist, hoping to be thrown out of the Church like Newman. Manning insisted, however, that people must reach the Truth "not as footballs, but as agents." Samuel decided that the book was really in Roman eyes "the most dangerous denial of Transubstantiation ever put forth"; and as Manning appeared in the offing, he drew Robert to Lavington, where any old influences were abated by the special presence of Gladstone, the last court of appeal to shaky Anglicans. Few prominent converts of that period had not to endure a farewell interview with Pusey or Gladstone. "There is no parity or balance between Gladstone, Keble, or Pusey, and the Divine Tradition of the Church," wrote Manning in disappointment from Paris. Robert showed symptoms of reaching the last stage in the next year, when he fell back upon objections to St. Alphonsus. "Every word of St. Alphonsus may be justified by Jeremy Taylor," was Manning's reply. It was not till September, 1854, that Robert surrendered, in spite of Gladstone, who as a last resource drew a parallelism between him and Augustine and Athanasius. But Robert was as deaf as Hope to his flattery. Bishop Samuel attributed his conversion to his great humility and Manning's great subtlety of intellect, adding: "You did not tell me that Manning was at Burton Agnes trying to land his prey." Robert answered: "As to Manning's coming here, he had written to offer to meet me or see me before he knew of the steps which I had taken." To Miss Stanley Manning wrote: "I was with him for four days. He was packing his books, and it brought back to me my last days at Lavington, a time a man can only live once."

In November a second Archdeacon had left the Church

Florence Nightingale and Others

of England. Gladstone wrote grimly (October 25, 1854): "You will see Manning soon. Pray give him my affectionate regards. I hope he knows that my feeling towards him can never alter." Yet he had treated Manning's approaches a little icily the previous year (August 7, 1853): "Never can I in this world see or think of you, or you of me, but this must be the point on which all our points must turn. That I think you know well, and when you speak of the wide field of intercourse still left free to choice as between us two, you speak what is to me a riddle." However, he allowed that "your intercession can have no ingredient of harm for me."

The human sadness which crept into Manning's letters was not slaked except by periods of work in London. To Miss Maurice he wrote: "I feel a yearning greater than any I ever knew towards all I love. I feel, as dying men do, a peculiar tenderness towards those I have loved." And recalling her perennial sick-room, "It seemed to me to give you the outer world as your own, and the most majestic and divine parts of it by day and by night, the sea and the stars. It was almost as if you were on the waters. And with that room I must have many associations, for I have said things there which I never said elsewhere." He became sensitive to attacks: "I never understood many parts of the Psalms as I do now, especially those which relate to accusation, falsehood, and sharp razors. 'They laid to my charge things that I knew not.' The calmness of these last words is very blessed." And to Miss Stanley: "The best of them seem to drink down detraction like water, and not to know that it is a sin." To convert Mary Stanley and her friend Florence Nightingale he wrote endlessly, believing "the school you have been in is one which turns from the peril of our own soul to think of others. This is blessed when we have made sure of our own eternity!" He wrote (July 15, 1853): "Birthdays bring

Henry Edward Manning

strange unhomelike thoughts now, but all the better, for this is now our rest. Grace has called you to the substance, not the shadow; to the imperishable reality, not the shortlived imitation. Florence Nightingale will either decline to a level lower than herself and unworthy of her, or she will be rebuked and chastened by failure into the path which she already knows full well. How wonderful you so long off, she so long at the door!" His belief now was that "nothing but a civil war can prevent the Catholic Church from becoming in England what it is becoming every day in the United States." Of his position he wrote to Miss Maurice: "What I add is for yourself alone. My going and coming between England and Rome is my own free act. The Cardinal's will has been that I should return sooner. My stay and my return is by the will of the Pope personally spoken to me."

Friendship with Miss Nightingale had developed since the Roman winter of 1847. He was one of the few to encourage her in the vocation she sought under almost insuperable difficulty. To rescue the fallen or nurse the sick was considered methodistical and unladylike. A letter of hers in the summer of 1852 reads of a joint venture:

"I found the poor child at Kensington bent upon going. I staid till half-past six, hoping that there might be a change and that you might come. But unless you were more successful than I was, after I went, the poor thing is lost. I have seen legs cut off and horrible operations, but that was nothing to this." And again: "There is no time to be lost. It is a miserable child of fourteen. If I fail, do you think you could, do you think you would undertake it yourself? It seems a great deal to ask, but she would not resist you. God bless you for your tender mercy to this poor child."

Manning carried away the child to the Convent of the Good Shepherd. *O Felix Culpa!* one can hardly forbear to say of the fault, done in childish ignorance, which

Florence Nightingale and Others

brought two such twin spirits as Henry Manning and Florence Nightingale to seek that which was lost! All this time she was torn between her vocations to serve God as a nun or to seek out sick humanity as a nurse. Her soul was torn between the Church of her home and that of Rome, which she confessed she loved. She poured forth her sorrows to Manning, when her relations seemed "like children playing on the shore of the eighteenth century. Oh, don't laugh! For it is like seeing people jesting among the mangled bodies of their kind. So we play through life among the mangled souls of those we love."

"I dislike and despise the Church of England," she cried (June 30, 1852). "She received me into her bosom. But what has she ever done for me? She never gave me work to do for her, nor training to do it, if I found it for myself. You think it would be a sacrifice to me to join the Catholic Church, a temptation to remain where I am. If you knew what a home the Catholic Church would be to me! All that I want I should find in her. All my difficulties would be removed. I have laboriously to pick up here and there crumbs by which to live. She would give me daily bread. The daughters of St. Vincent would open their arms to me. They have already done so, and what should I find there? My work already laid out for me, instead of seeking it to and fro and finding none; my home; sympathy, human and divine. No one asked last night, Is it well with the child?"

Her agony of soul she had "never said to human being." To him she revealed wounds that were beyond even her skill. "The wound is too deep for the Church of England to heal. I belong as little to the Church of England as to that of Rome, or rather my heart belongs as much to the Catholic Church as to that of England—oh, how much more!"

One wonders how near Florence Nightingale came to the Catholic Church. "Empirically but not scientifically, I believe in her; she has no more fervent disciple than I.

Henry Edward Manning

I believe in her as the early Chaldæans believed in the return of eclipses, which they could ascertain by observation but could not account for." All that year her strong wings beat on the bars of Manning's confessional. "I have a precipice behind me. If I do not reach the Church of the Catholics, I have no Church!" And again: "I think it most probable you have found me out. I know what you would say. Do not spare me." She begged Manning to send her to the French Sisters or to the Irish Sisters of St. Vincent: "I have obligations to him." She had to act without her family's consent. "I really believe it would give my dear people less pain for me to become a Roman Catholic and marry than for me to become a Sister of Charity. I think the persecution of the Emperor Domitian must be easy to bear, but there is a persecution from those we love, as I dare say you know, which grinds one's very heart out, especially if one is not quite sure one is right!" Her letters are full of little tragic asides, of which, perhaps, only a woman would think. "I wonder at myself for telling these things. I have never done so before." Manning would not receive her unless she gave him her will as well as her heart. In vain she pleaded: "Why cannot I join the Catholic Church at once as the best form of truth I have known, and as cutting the Gordian knot I cannot untie?" When Manning gave her his reasons for entering the Church she pronounced they were of the Oxford historical school, and preferred the course of the mathematical and Cambridge men, who examine each doctrine "whether they can believe in it," rather than "whether they can believe in her." However, she thought, "I could believe the same things as to Creation as St. Thomas Aquinas." She insisted on presenting religion scientifically:

"The historic made Schlegel, as you say, a Catholic. But the English have never been historians. Instead of Saints they have had great Civil Engineers, instead of

Florence Nightingale and Others

Sisters of Charity they have had Political Economists. The Church of England could not have stood in any country but England, because she is such a poor historian. I have always thought that the great theological fight has yet to be fought out in England between Catholicism and Protestantism. In Germany it was fought out 300 years ago. They know why they are Protestants. I never knew an Englishman who did, and if he inquires, he becomes a Catholic!"

From her spiritual desert she cried: "I like your *Jesu dulcis memoria*. With us God is dead. He has been dead nearly 2,000 years. He wrote the Bible about 1,800 years ago, and since then He has not been heard of." Manning thought it about time for her to pay a visit to Ireland. Unfortunately she went to Belfast instead of Dublin, and wrote (August 20, 1852): "Of all places that the eye of me would not have visited I think Belfast is the one. Imagine a new commercial, Orange Presbyterian town, a cross between Geneva and Manchester, inhabited by that anomalous animal, an Irish Protestant, with Infirmarys, Poorhouses, all on the model of London. I have had moments of intense discouragement in my life, but never anything like this." And a plaintive note followed Manning to Rome: "I thank you for the hope set before me. But I am wearing out. I am afraid my heart is broken. It is a coward's speech, one which St. Ignatius would not have admitted for a moment. I hope if he hears it he will punish me for it. But I'm afraid it's true."

Manning was not too happy himself in his yearning for work and place, but he registered a determination to "not seek it by the lifting of a finger or the speaking of a word." Strangely, the same event brought it to him and Florence Nightingale. From the East dawned war, and with war splendid opportunity. The prospect of peace among the holy places of Rome was exchanged for the prospects opened by a war originating in the holy places of Jerusalem. The Crimean War inspired

Henry Edward Manning

Manning to find chaplains and Miss Nightingale nurses for the British Army. The entanglement of Greek and Latin and the rivalry of French and Russian Emperors brought Catholic Sisters into the army. Manning immediately brought and kept Wiseman and Archbishop Cullen of Dublin in touch with the authorities, writing to Cullen (July 10, 1854):

“The Cardinal has forwarded to me a letter from a Priest stationed on the Bosphorus. The troops are divided in four places, and the two chaplains are obliged to abandon the care of two of the divisions. The writer says that he has been called on by Admiral Dundas to visit the Naval Hospital at Bosforo, but he has been called on to go also to the Military Hospital at Scutari, where at the date of his letter he had arrived only in time to bury three soldiers who had died without Sacraments. Mr. Monsell will lay the letter before Mr. Sidney Herbert to-day.”

Sidney Herbert was Secretary of War, and through him Manning was able to increase the number of chaplains at the front from eleven to fifteen. The news that the wounded lacked medical aid caused more emotion at home than that the dying lacked Sacraments. Amid indignant cries for better things, Manning passed a brilliant idea to Miss Stanley: “I have written to the Bishop of Southwark to see if any Sisters can be found for the East. Why will not Florence Nightingale give herself to this great work?” Miss Nightingale was accepted by the War Office, while Mrs. Herbert and Miss Stanley vainly scoured London for nurses. Manning seized the chance to mobilise the convents. “I can report five nuns, three from Ireland, of whom two have been in hospitals. Two at Chelsea, of whom one was four years in the hospital at Australia.” From Bermondsey came five Sisters of Mercy and five more from Norwood. Such was the bulwark of Miss Nightingale’s historic expedition, of which Herbert wrote cheerfully that “thirty-eight nurses on their way to Scutari

Florence Nightingale and Others

are truer successors of the Apostle wrecked at Malta than an equal number of Cardinals!" But it required all Manning's tact with Cardinals to keep the party afloat. Dr. Cullen wrote from Rome that Miss Nightingale could not have jurisdiction over nuns. "The Pope thinks such a thing ought not to be agreed to." Manning arranged that they should have their own Superior in addition. To Newman in Dublin he wrote: "The Mission of the Sisters is not from their Government, but from their ecclesiastical and religious Superior."

After Miss Nightingale the most anxious watcher of the party was Manning, but the value of his Sisters was soon proven when some of the less religious nurses married sergeants. He wrote to the Superior at home (December 21, 1854):

"I received a letter from Miss Nightingale giving a most pleasing testimony to the great value your Mother Mary Clare and her Sisters are to her, and also saying that M. Mary Clare says that she thinks three more may be spared from Bermondsey. Miss Nightingale asks to have their assistance very earnestly. You have seen Sister Mary Gonzaga's letter in *The Times*. A few such things will do more for us than all the books of controversy in the world."

A second party was collected under Miss Stanley, with Mother Francis Bridgman of Kinsale as religious chief. To the former Manning wrote (November 27, 1854):

"If Mr. Herbert in his official character cannot publicly sanction a Chaplain going with the Sisters, I hope he will not feel bound to forbid his going at the same time and by the same public conveyances. The responsibility of sending for twenty is wholly mine, and mine alone. That more will be wanted I conceive to be certain; for, assigning ten wounded to one nurse, which would be the hospital proportion, or ought to be, the wounded after the Battle of the Alma at Scutari would have required 200 nurses. What is the number of wounded now, and what will it probably be in three weeks?"

Henry Edward Manning

Manning collected the expenses of the outfit, and sent a chaplain, Father Ronan, who was required to travel at an official distance from the Sisters. "He fully entered into it, and said, 'I give you my word, it shall not be. I am altogether convinced that when conscience allows, we ought to do as the Government desires.' You will like and trust him." So much so, that he received Miss Stanley into the Church before their return to England. Gladstone made his inevitable appearance, and before her departure Manning had written (November 15, 1854):

"By all means hear Gladstone. I could put down what he will say, and could almost weep over him. I have loved and honoured him. But the last three years have been a grief to me. I need not say, 'Promise no one anything.' I saw Gladstone's letter to Robert Wilberforce. Could you believe that he referred to Milman as proof? To this and lower than this that humanly great mind will go, unless through Grace he becomes as a little child to enter the Kingdom of Heaven. Florence Nightingale knows your state of mind perfectly. She said to me two years ago, when you were ill: 'Convert Mary Stanley quickly, or there will be no Mary Stanley to convert.'"

Miss Stanley did make a promise, however, for Manning wrote: "In promising not to see me you have done right in every way. But what a poverty of mind does the request imply! I say, 'Go, and God be with you.' I need not add St. Paul's words, 'Be not brought under bondage to any man.'" And he wrote in kindly farewell (November 30, 1854):

"It is by humility that we command obedience. I have had some experience in this matter, and I have never failed, except when I deserved to fail. I believe, too, that generosity, self-denial, blindness to faults, taking burdens on ourselves, requesting instead of ordering, thanking even for acts of duty, being the first to do things with our own hands, silence under provoca-

Florence Nightingale and Others

tion, evenness of temper and of voice, are little things, which are the fruits of great grace. And when a Superior has these, with an inflexible will in all matters of principle, I believe everything will be done by those that are subject out of zeal and love. You have wisdom enough never to find a fault before a third person. In dealing with the Sisters you will not fail to remember the difference which race, circumstances, opposite sympathies, prejudices and antecedents may have introduced. Few English understand the Irish, and the reverse. We have this as priests. If you and Florence Nightingale fail in your work with these Sisters, you will both fall in my estimate of you. Tell her this with my blessing. If you succeed God only knows what a work is before you both, a work greater than perhaps either of you have faith to perceive. But I am sure of it, though I am no Prophet nor a Prophet's son."

Manning sent Cullen an account of the arrangements made with the War Office (December 6, 1854): "They now go giving themselves without reward for the love of God, and I believe that this visibly disinterested conduct has already produced and will yet produce still more effect upon this country." Their expenses were paid privately, "that a marked distinction should be maintained between our religious and stipendiary nurses." They were "free to introduce the subject of religion with all Catholics." Unfortunately, the High Church character of some roused feeling at home, and the Editor of the *Record* was hot on the trail of Miss Stanley, incurring a quick retort, "My sister shall a ministering angel be when thou liest howling," from her brother the Dean. Miss Nightingale had already to fight doctors as well as disease, and the theological odium was too much for her nerves. She declined and disowned Miss Stanley's party. The situation was saved by Mother Mary Clare crossing the Bosphorus in an open boat during a snow-storm and effecting peace. Manning's disappointment was intense, and he wrote to Miss Stanley (January 1, 1855): "Mrs. Herbert wrote me word that Miss Nightin-

Henry Edward Manning

gale has written to say that she had not desired a second set of nurses. Nevertheless, I cannot conceive that with 4,000 or 5,000 wounded, sick, helpless, and convalescent, there can be lack of service required far beyond the numbers hitherto sent. Whatever is done, let nothing be done in haste. An undertaking so public and conspicuous, so gainsayed and so good, must not fail or even show weakness. I trust to Florence Nightingale's power of drill to make them all of use." Holding the intangible threads between the two Archbishops and the War Office, and not least between the two Mother Superiors and the two parties in the field, Manning exerted his fine diplomacy to the utmost. He asked Dr. Cullen to recall Father Cuffe, who had been too indignant at the refusal of the nuns by Miss Nightingale, which he compared to the "driving of the Blessed Virgin through the desert by Herod." The introduction of Catholic Sisters and reforms at the same time were more than some minds could stand. Manning wrote to Cullen: "Great difficulties have arisen in the hospitals from the steady opposition made to the employment of the nurses and Sisters, and to the introduction of reforms into the hospitals. The medical officers seem so tenacious of the old system that it is impossible to advance more quickly."

Manning refused to criticise anybody at the front. Of Miss Nightingale he wrote to Bishop Grant: "I am sure that she acted as she believed for the best towards them in doing what she did." The nurses were then limited to fifty, which excluded some of the Irish Sisters, "and the Superior and Miss Nightingale cannot accord as to the arrangement to be made." In the end twenty were taken, and Manning wrote to Miss Stanley (February 8, 1855):

"The return of any of them would be a most mischievous and serious event. We cannot be too cautious, and I doubt if Florence Nightingale, certainly not the Herberts, knows how sensitive the Catholic Church is,

Florence Nightingale and Others

from the Holy Father to the wounded Catholic soldier, as to the respect due, not to the persons so much as to the character of a Religious. As to Mother Bridgman, my words to Mrs. Herbert were the same I wrote to Florence Nightingale. I stated that I thought her an ardent, high-tempered, and at first somewhat difficult person, but truly good, devoted, and trustworthy. Now I have not written to you while your difficulties were pending. Because I did not know enough to judge, and because I feared that your course might be ascribed to my advice, I wished you to act alone. Paul and Barnabas had a sharp contention—why not Mother Francis and Mother Clare? Remember that it is a mistake for a head to make itself into a pair of hands. Directing is working in the highest degree.”

The same day he wrote to Cullen :

“ I am happy to be able to contradict the unfavourable statements respecting the position and work of the Sisters at Scutari. Last night I received letters from Mrs. Bridgman, Miss Nightingale, and Miss Stanley. Ten are employed in nursing in the General Hospital at Scutari. The remaining ten are forming a new hospital at Kululi.”

Dr. Cullen sent Mrs. Bridgman a Papal Blessing from Rome, with orders to “ hold your ground until you shall be sent away by force.” She was Irish enough to obey, and the triumph of the second party was largely due to her. Hard work occupied all parties that year, while religious bickerings were left to those at home. The Sisters were accused of consoling the Protestant wounded. “ I repeatedly assured Miss Nightingale,” said Mrs. Bridgman, “ that we should consider it a sin against God and a disgrace before man to violate the contract we had distinctly and deliberately made.” On the other hand, was she expected to reply to Catholics? “ I may not speak to you on religious subjects, even though we are both Catholics. The Government in whose service you have sacrificed the vigour of your life forbids it.”

Henry Edward Manning

Upon Manning fell all the rumours, and he begged Miss Stanley for information : " Have any of the Irish Sisters disobeyed hospital regulations? Have they refused to work with seculars? Have they interfered with the religion of Protestants?" Mr. Hamilton, the Protestant authority at Koulalee, was able to assure Miss Stanley : " I am not aware that any of the Sisters of Mercy have interfered with the Protestant patients regarding their religion, but I have seen the greatest kindness and attention shown by them to Protestant patients." But the work continued in good report and bad. Miss Nightingale resigned the Balaclava Hospital, which Mrs. Bridgman accepted from Sir John Hall, no admirer of Miss Nightingale. Between October, 1855, and February, 1856, the Irish Sisters nursed 1,358 wounded. Manning was content to watch the experiment succeed through the sheer devotion and personality of the rival Mothers, whose Faith always filled the cracks which rent secular nursedom. To Miss Stanley he wrote : " I have looked on in silence and amazement at many things. But I do not know enough to judge. One thing I see. Unless Providence avert it, we shall have a great breakdown, not in nursedom only, but something more vital." The medical breakdown was averted by Miss Nightingale, who was a great enough woman to write to the Mother of the Bermondsey Nuns : " I do not presume to express praise or gratitude to you, because it would look as if I thought you had done the work, not unto God, but unto me. You were far above me in fitness both in worldly talents of administration and far more in the spiritual qualifications, which God values in a Superior. My being placed over you was my misfortune and not my fault." She added : " I would be glad that the Bishop of Southwark should know, and Dr. Manning (though my recommendation is not likely to be of value to you, but the contrary), that you were valued here as you deserved, and that the gratitude of the army is yours."

Florence Nightingale and Others

By her last words Manning's hope had been fulfilled. Henceforth the Catholic Sisters could walk abroad in their habit through Merry England and no one molest them. Unexpectedly they came to the Crimea, and suddenly they returned. From the hush of convents they passed to the groans of Scutari and Balaclava. Manning had bidden them "make the hospital a cloister and their heart a choir," and they had done so. Two of the Sisters had served to the death, and amid the Crimean graveyards lie the virginal bones of Sisters Mary Elizabeth Butler and Winifred Spry. When the war was over they took up their slight belongings and were gone—so swiftly and silently that no historian recorded their names, no assembly offered them eulogy, and no ruler sent decorations. They were quite forgotten, which was perhaps what they had desired.

Of the thousands who have heard of Florence Nightingale, not one has heard of Mary Stanley. Yet she had accomplished as much as the other, though she failed of the accidental fame which made Miss Nightingale one of the leading personages in Europe. She received her reward spiritually. While Miss Nightingale was being decorated by the Sultan, Miss Stanley was bringing herself to announce her Catholic Baptism from Constantinople. Manning wrote (April 14, 1853): "I see no obligation to publish the fact at Constantinople at the moment. The moment for declaring will be when you meet your family, after the first hours of arrival are over. One thing I am clear about as the day. Eight-and-forty hours must not elapse after your return without the two nearest to you knowing. I write this as if I were in the Confessional or upon my death-bed."

Trials and difficulties pursued her, as a long and minute spiritual conference with Manning shows. "God will justly judge me if I ever break a bruised reed," was his tenor. When in after-years she was disturbed by

Henry Edward Manning

Mrs. Froude's death in unbelieving peace, Manning wrote calmly (May 15, 1860):

"Your account of Mrs. Froude shocked me much. She is gone to the only Judge who knows the heart, and therefore we may say nothing of her. The Church does not judge of individuals in this matter, but prays and hopes even against hope. Her case presents to me no difficulty. If she knew no better and through mispersuasion and the influence of others was in error, but in good faith, God would have mercy on her. If so, her peace was a true peace. If she was not in good faith, which God forbid, her peace was a false peace, and that is a common state. Blanco White died professing to be in peace. And Hume died peacefully talking about Charon."

Manning guided her until 1879, when her brother, the Dean of Westminster, asked the Archbishop of Westminster, as he had become, to bring her the last Sacraments. "Thank God all that was vital was done and well done. She was most anxious to do all that was right."

With Archbishop Manning Miss Nightingale's relations were less pleasant. After the Crimean War she set aside her Catholic yearnings, though Manning visited her in sickness. Her letters were no longer signed "Your weary penitent," and ran after this manner, "Dear Sir, or dear Friend, whichever I may call you," and "*Nunc Dimittis* is the only prayer I can make now as far as regards myself." When he proposed to move her beloved Sisters she wrote like a real woman to their Mother: "I have cried to all the authorities on earth and all the Saints in Heaven against Dr. Manning. The fact is that he is, as the Catholics themselves call him, a deucedly clever fellow, and somehow or other, by foul more than by fair means, gets all things his own way!"

The Crimean War over, Manning settled down, and told Miss Stanley, "Such as I am you know, such I must ever be. I desire to live for nothing but to save

Florence Nightingale and Others

my own soul and others by plain unbending truth." At Wiseman's wish he petitioned Wiseman to allow him to bring the Oblates of St. Charles into London. He wrote to Hope: "They would be in fact the Jesuits of London. And I proposed that they should be simple priests, because such a body might be replenished so long as needed and go out when not, without diminishing what the 'Flaminian Gate' would call the lights of the Ecclesiastical Firmament." The Flaminian Gate was an allusion to Wiseman, into whose dreams he began to enter with power and promise of fulfilment. On St. Charles's Day he collected a few around him in Bayswater, and they signed fealty as follows:

Henricus Eduardus Manning.

Herbertus Vaughan pro se et Thoma MacDonnell.

Gulielmus Iohannes Roberts.

Gulielmus Burke.

Carolus Ioannes Laprimaudaye.

Pro Henrico Arturo Rawes, H. E. Manning.

Providence was watching the locality, for Newman had written in 1848: "We have a prospect of being settled at Bayswater." Mgr. Talbot was grieved to find Catholics "calling Manning's Institute the Widowers' House." Indeed, parsons, providentially left single, undertaking the general care of the Church, seemed ludicrous to old Catholics, until Manning even became an actual object of offence and hostility.

He went to Milan to study the rule of St. Charles, with which, amended to Bayswater use, and with relics of his blood, he returned. On Whit-Sunday Manning and his companions met in a hired house. The next day the Congregation began, and at midnight they elected their predestined Superior. Of the three original founders, Manning alone had survived. Robert Wilberforce died while studying in Rome, and Laprimaudaye after nursing a student sick of smallpox. Laprimaudaye's tall wraith was permitted to appear in Bayswater the day he

Henry Edward Manning

died. Manning noted with a Superior's pride: "The Oblates ought to be a picked body of men, not a piece-meal of failures and instabilities. St. Charles wants nobody." The money of the widowers was available to build churches in Bayswater and Notting Hill. Seven schools shot up. A college was placed under Willie Manning and another nephew, "the Piccanniny" of Manning's Oxford letters, William Anderdon, returned from Rome, where Talbot reported he was "studying hard, but requires a good deal of Puseyistic manner to be driven out of him. They say he is another Manning." So in strange ways the firm of Manning and Anderdon was reconstituted.

Manning's activities were endless. He was building a church in Westminster, scouring Belgium for Poor Clares, planning a "greater Seminary according to the Council of Trent." The Oblates rose to twenty, and the quiet country lanes of Bayswater humming with controversy. Manning was often pelted with mud, but enjoyed it all. They were the happiest eight years of his life. Among the novices he became a boy again, and used to spar in recreation, "letting out with his long arms at his nephew," or playing with the marionettes of memory and telling stories of old Dr. Jenkyns and Anglican Archbishops till the rafters shook. He wrote (August 24, 1857): "In addition to ordinary work I have had to go to the trial of a poor fellow who has stabbed a man, since dead, and am going again this morning. Lady Granville has been to the workhouse and found no difficulty. Next week I hope to go to Belgium for the Poor Clares, and perhaps to Fulda to see the Professor of Theology I hope I have secured."

All manner of folk came to him. At one time the Cantors at Vespers concealed under their cassocks a Colonial Chief Justice (Sir J. Marshall) and an Editor of *Punch* (Sir Francis Burnand). The Duchess of Buccleuch came and was converted. She was followed

Florence Nightingale and Others

by the Duchess of Argyll. Manning had written to Hope: "What you say of the Duchess coming over to Mass is a great comfort. Who knows what may be the end of your Highland Paraguay? I may be Parish Priest of it one day if London grows too hot." The duel with Pusey was fierce and incessant. "She no sooner reached Scotland than Dr. Pusey came for eight days of perpetual argument. She never wavered. What a homage is this to the only Divine authority which men fear and before which they quail!" he wrote to the Duchess of Buccleuch. "I told her that it would be time enough to thank Dr. Pusey for his past kindness when she had done her duty to God first. I have had in my hand the letter she wrote to me under Dr. Pusey's persuasion, and the letter he substituted for it in his own rough copy, varying in important points from her own letter. I confess myself to be unable to reconcile all this with truth." He came to the conclusion, "Michael the Archangel could not so abjure Protestantism as to please Protestants. He would be but a dull, slow, cowardly, dingy angel after all!" Unworthy proselytisers he disliked as "*lèse-majesté* against the Truth." He told Pusey there were two kinds of proselytism—"the Jews whom Our Lord condemned. There are also the Apostles whom He sent into all the world." Manning sought converts by letter and Apostolic visit. He must have posted a complete commentary on the Creed every week. He used a peculiar knock of four raps, and sealed his letters to seekers with the motto *qui patitur vincit*. "I promise you to become a Catholic when I am twenty-one," said a young lady. "But can you promise to live as long?" was the reply. Confession he called "fishing with a single line." Between 1851 and 1865 he kept a list of his converts in a locked book. They numbered 346, and though the titled names seem to justify his nickname as "Apostle to the Genteels," there were poets and parsons, and also the poor and the pariah.

Henry Edward Manning

He could take as much trouble for a poor girl as to record a case at length :

“ On January 3, 1863, C. G. came and told me that a girl of fourteen had been betrayed by a man. She said that she often came to the church, that she was distracted with fear. I told her to bring her to me. She came Wednesday night. I was kneeling in S. M. Magdalen's Chapel by my confessional. I saw a young, slender girl first kneel behind the second pillar of the choir aisle. I led her into the Confessional. She wept so audibly that I thought she must be overheard. She accused herself with great simplicity and sorrow, almost without hope of forgiveness. She said : ‘ Oh, Dr. Manning, I have always cared for you. If only I had been a Catholic this would not have happened. But there is no help in our Church. When all this is over may I be a Catholic ? ’ I then prevailed on her to give me leave to tell her parents (‘ Dr. Manning, I will do all you tell me ’), and she did all to the letter. Then I made her repeat a full Act of Contrition, promise me to say all her prayers as of old, and to add two I would give her. I told her I would cut them out of a Catholic book. I cut out the Acts of Charity and Contrition, gave her the promise of a future Absolution and a Benediction. As I gave them I pressed her fingers, and she held my hand a moment, sobbing as if her heart would break. Next day, Epiphany, as I went out after High Mass, I saw her, as I thought, kneeling against the last pillar in her little grey coat and round straw hat and black veil. That evening C. G. came and told me she was ill and hysterical, that all was discovered, and bringing me two notes in pencil : ‘ Dear Dr. Manning, I feel I am dying ; pray for me. God bless you for your kindness to a miserable sinner. ’ Thursday morning I woke at five, and lay awake praying for her, and all the Fathers said Mass for her. At 9 C. G. came and told me that at 5.30 she died holding the two prayers in her hand. She was conscious for a short time, and said : ‘ Tell Dr. Manning if I am saved it is through him. ’ ”

As she had only received Baptism by desire, Manning wrote out twelve theological reasons for believing she was certainly saved. Then he locked all in his book.

Florence Nightingale and Others

Mrs. Charles Bagot recorded: "He never attempted to convert us. He wrote he would have liked to have come the last night of my husband's life, but thought his doing so might be misunderstood." He was unable to reach Count Streletski, of whom he had written to Lady Herbert: "He is an old fox. But his faith is in him, and he will die with the Last Sacraments." Lady Herbert he converted after a long duel with Liddon, of which many pages testify. He wrote to her, insisting that her boys should be brought up according to their father's will: "You have done well in writing openly to your brother. The opener and the bolder, the safer, and more peaceful your path will be. It will make all charges of concealment impossible, and they will respect you for your fidelity and uprightness."

He insisted on converts telling their friends before they took the final step. George Lane-Fox, the eldest son of the Squire of Bramham, asked him for reception. In spite of pressure from Sir Charles Wood and Mr. Monsell through the Bishop of Southwark, he would only postpone receiving him at once, but he sent him home to tell his father, informing the Bishop: "Last night he endeavoured to find his father if still in London by my advice, and failing this he was to go by the night train to Yorkshire to see his parents, and to assure them that he desires to show them all filial love and obedience in everything which does not violate his duty towards God. He is at this moment in Yorkshire. I am very glad that this matter has come into your hands, as you will know the duties, often painful and always inevitable, which lie upon us in such cases." When Manning, a Captain of Harrow, received Lane-Fox, an Eton Captain of the Boats, the Catholic revival reached a sporting zenith.

Of his pastoral days there arose a legend. He used to tell of telling a woman in St. George's Hospital of Mary Magdalen's spikenard, when a voice from the next bed informed him that "that beautiful story of the bag

Henry Edward Manning

of spike-nails made me wish to become a Catholic too !” When the angry father of a convert assailed him in the sacristy he had the presence of mind to turn and meet him with such an alarming rebuke of the sin of addressing God’s minister while disrobing in the Holy Place that his assailant fled in horror. When a convert-Duchess offered him a cheque for a thousand pounds he handed it back, remarking, “Perhaps to cover a gallipot,” for he would not be patronised. An insight is afforded by a letter from his disciple Herbert Vaughan : “Dr. Goss remarked the other day upon your wonderful power of conciliation. I fancy that the use of it was in great measure the reason of the great success and influence you exercised between 1850 and 1860 over those without. You piped and many did dance, though not all. If I may say so, I think you became a little impatient sometimes, and said things so severe that people were inclined to shrink back. I always feel that the English people are more easily led than driven, and that St. Jerome even would reform his tone if he lived in London !”

CHAPTER X: THE WARS OF WESTMINSTER

“One idea has governed me. I believe, in fact, I learned it from Carlyle. I mean that mechanism without dynamics is dead.”—*Cardinal Manning's Notebook.*

SAUL among the prophets, Florence Nightingale among the army doctors, were not stranger wine amid old bottles than Manning among the old broken remnant of English Catholics. He could not help feeling “as if I had got into St. James’s Palace in 1687. The Catholics of England seem to me to be in their politics like the Seven Sleepers. If anything, they are Charles I. Royalists. But there is no Charles I. left.” One recalls the English Catholics whom Borrow found in Lisbon, who “with ludicrous inconsistency cherished national prejudices almost extinct in the motherland, even to the disparagement of their own darling faith,” slating O’Connell and referring to Charles I. as “the unfortunate martyr.” Manning wrote to Gladstone in 1890 of Wiseman as “a Tory without Irish sympathies, though himself an Irishman. But he knew nothing of politics. He came into the ring of the old Catholic families, and never went beyond them. They, as you know and see, are nine-times English.” And later in Home Rule days he used to reiterate: “They are loud but few. I can count them on my ten fingers.” They clashed with the converts (“when we spoke English they did not understand us”), and concentrated their influence against Manning, who with marvellous power and pliancy took away their own leader to the side of the converts. They struck at him, but they struck the air. They tried to subvert his plans and policies, but they only crowned his success. They wished to reduce him to the dust, but

Henry Edward Manning

they only made him their own chief. And his strength was that he never struck them, for he remembered that whatever the converts could give the Church, they had not given martyrs. If the old Catholics were broken-kneed in public, it was because upon a *via dolorosa* they had come. If they were blind to the politics of the day, their eyes had been blindfolded for the kingdom of heaven's sake. If they made no showing in the counsels of the nation, it was because they had been as sheep dumb before their accusers.

Wiseman's policy to the converts was Manning's, and he delighted in Manning's schemes until they seemed to him his own. In a famous letter to Faber on the Religious Orders Wiseman wrote: "Mr. Manning, I think, understands my wishes and feelings and is ready to assist me; several will, I hope, join him." Ten years later, after many a struggle, many a sorrow, he found his first draft and sent it to Manning (January 19, 1862).

"I have not touched it, and I have no doubt I copied the last part myself that Mgr. Searle might not see it. It is the only copy, so keep it carefully, for I think it may be interesting hereafter, and serve to prove consistency and perseverance in our common work. I did not remember that I had mentioned you in the letter. If not a prophecy, it was at any rate a presentiment."

Searle represented the old Catholic in Wiseman's Cabinet, but his influence sank before Manning's. The Cardinal found himself at war with Bishop Grant of Southwark, which was a thorn in the side of Westminster. He could only write to Grant *homo pacis meæ* (January 14, 1853): "Although your Lordship compares yourself to St. Wilfred and me to his oppressor, I can assure you that not St. Wilfred himself was more sincerely submissive to the Holy See and more glad than I am that any difference between us should be referred to that supreme tribunal." Wiseman sought for relief from mental worry in Manning's friendship and in the co-

The Wars of Westminster

adjutorship of Archbishop Errington. In the end he had to sacrifice one to the other.

George Errington, Archbishop of Trebizond, was an old Catholic to the marrow. Wiseman asked and secured his right of succession to Westminster. Forgetfulness of old disagreements brought unforgettable sorrow and strife. A Bishop's coadjutor (*cum iure successionis*) is like the Celtic office of tanist, an heir-apparent elected during the King's lifetime. If the King changes his mind there can only be trouble. But it was Errington who declared hostilities. An iron administrator with a strong dislike of improvements and a determination to apply Canon Law in its length without its breadth, his "hawk-like expression as he looked through his blue spectacles" became particularly hawk-like as he studied the Rule of Manning's Oblates. The copy left among his papers shows traces of stern comparison between Milan and Bayswater use. In eleven instances the Archbishop noted that the episcopal power had been transferred to the Superior, and, he noted, "*therefore absolute.*" Manning had guarded against an Archbishop who knew not Joseph, or, as he put it, was "not aware of the intention of St. Charles." It was objected that Manning's Rule tied the Archbishop's hands in Manning's favour. "No one is justified in supposing a sustained pertinacity of sinful opposition," replied Manning. But this was exactly what Errington supposed, and Errington's see on the Euxine was appropriate, for the Euxine was named in euphemism of the rough welcome accorded to strangers, and what Ward called "the Trebizondian aspect" was not more hospitable to converts. As a convert, Mgr. Talbot confided to Wiseman: "I fear for his future administration in London. He has a great deal of Episcopalianism—that is, thinking that a Bishop ought to interfere with everything in his diocese. He also is ultraparochial in his views. He has a great antipathy and lack of confidence in converts. I

Henry Edward Manning

am afraid he is too inquisitorial, which certainly is not the Roman spirit, but belongs more to the hard school of Bishops. The Roman spirit is to give as much liberty as possible to priests who are zealous." Errington's view as set forth to the Holy See was that "new powers and new energies are good, but powers unconsolidated and energies uncontrolled are bad." Now, Manning seemed an uncontrolled energy.

Meantime the more discerning Pope had made Manning Provost of the Westminster Chapter. Manning was in Rome, and wrote to Wiseman (April 8, 1857): "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." Manning had advised Maguire's appointment, but in vain, for Talbot had reason to write to Wiseman (April 9, 1857): "Immediately I received your note I went to the Holy Father and implored him to name Dr. Manning Provost, which he has willingly done. It would have been difficult for you to pass over Dr. Maguire, but he is the greatest Gallican in London." Manning returned to face a suspicious and hostile Chapter. According to the Chapter Book, Maguire inquired as to "a design in contemplation to transfer the government of St. Edmund's College from the President's hands to those of some congregation or society." Further, he asked, were some of the professors subject to the Provost "and removable by the Provost"? It was true Manning's zeal had extended to the Diocesan Seminary. The irony was that he was in the Chapter chair. However, "the V.R. Provost, hitherto silent, said he would be happy to explain what he could." Explanations did not satisfy the Canons, who later proceeded to run the Oblates of St. Charles to earth. "The V.R. Provost stated that the examination of the rules of St. Charles ought not to be proceeded with capitularly." A fortnight later Manning

The Wars of Westminster

was tried and cross-examined by his own Chapter, as he wrote to the Pope, "to show that the Congregation was independent of episcopal jurisdiction, to involve the Cardinal and myself in contradictions." The trouble was that the Vice-President of St. Edmund's was an Oblate, and apparently under Manning. Finally, Searle invited Manning to leave the room. But the V.R. Provost remained silent and dignified. It was the Chapter who left the room.

Manning forwarded his protest to Wiseman, with the request that if he had exceeded his duties his "protest in question may be expunged." The Chapter were acting on a rumour and they were attacking one of the works of their own Bishop, but they only saw the person of Manning, and they plunged to their doom. Wiseman annulled their proceedings, and they appealed to Rome *renitente Præposito*, for Manning would not sign. He threw them a fine mesh :

"Your objections are either from misapprehension or not.

1. If so, I wish them cleared.
2. If not, I wish them removed or defined.
3. If when defined they are immovable I shall ask leave to go to Rome."

Wiseman went himself to Rome, but not till after a startling development. When the Chapter appealed on a matter of Canon Law, Errington placed his peculiar gifts at their service. The Cardinal challenged him (December 9, 1858): "It is of great moment to me to know whether you have assisted by your advice my Chapter in the course that body has lately been pursuing in my regard." Errington betrayed the grim truth: "Were clergymen actually contending at Rome against my own views, I should certainly see no reason against assisting them to present their views." Errington's object was not to attack the Cardinal, but the Oblates. He wished to rouse "the lion" so that "he will put his

Henry Edward Manning

paw on them and crush them." But little as Wiseman wished to play the leonine part, it was not the Oblates whom he crushed.

The case was one of Canon Law, but Talbot's indiscretions made it personal. His letters afford a comical lining to the ecclesiastical dossiers of the period. His amazing simplicity, childish zeal, and naïve outspokenness, made him a favourite of the Pope, who amid the subtleties and difficulties of his reign found satisfaction in the guilelessness of this ex-parson. Talbot wrote to Searle comparing Wiseman to Gregory VII., deserted by his friends after battle, and accused Errington and "the Anglo-Gallican retrograde spirit in the old clergy of London" of making "an *entente cordiale* to undo all the Cardinal has done during the last eleven years." Searle needlessly showed the letter to Errington, who wrote to Talbot furiously (February 15, 1859): "These very serious accusations (calumnies if untrue) are contradicted by the bias of my education, by the practical testimony of my life, and by my express declaration of their untruth." Talbot returned to the charge. He accused Errington of not acting "quite in a straightforward way towards the Cardinal" (February 23, 1859). "Perhaps he and the Pope are the only men on earth of whom you are afraid." The indictment concluded: "All the converts are snubbed. Every institution is discouraged merely because it is new. All the nuns are *trembling* at your very name. Now, my dear Dr. Errington, are not these signs of a radical anti-Roman spirit?"

Talbot was the unwitting cause of the Errington Case, for, had he not attacked his orthodoxy, Errington would have resigned of his free will. In 1855 he had suggested his own removal to Talbot: "My coadjutorship will not work well, and, like so many others, probably be the source of much more evil than good." Now that Wiseman was anxious to be rid of Errington, it was in vain

The Wars of Westminster

that Talbot proposed a West Indian see with "a fine cathedral and a salary of £1,000 a year to do what you like with"! Errington did not feel he was "just cut out for Trinidad," and rightly declined. He stood his ground on the security of Canon Law. Talbot, who used to convert infidels by simply telling them they were dying, now threatened Errington with "more vigorous measures," and with parsonic wrath exclaimed: "I cannot help seeing that the Oratorians and even Dr. Manning are doing a great work in London. Woe to the man who checks the work of God!" He implored Errington "not to cut your own throat." Errington dryly thanked him for "the continued interest you are taking in my welfare"! Talbot gave him the information that Wiseman was seeking his dismissal, and a scene occurred in London of which Wiseman wrote (May 10, 1859): "I owe it to my position as a Member of the Sacred College, as Metropolitan and as Ordinary, not to allow so gross an insult in my own house and at my own table and to my face to pass over. The Holy See can be the only judge between us, and to it alone I can and, I fear, I must appeal."

Rome, always puzzled by English quarrels, which she attributed to native character rather than to sustained lack of charity, referred the Chapter to a Synod, where Errington and Grant carried a decree on the Colleges against their broken-hearted Metropolitan. Talbot thought this so flagrant "that now the Holy Father will have no difficulty to desire him to retire when he comes to Rome, and to offer him Trinidad or Calcutta." The two Archbishops had parted for ever without farewell. That winter they repaired to Rome. The Pope heard Errington on December 23, 1859. Their colloquy survives in Errington's handwriting, *George v. Pius*.

"G. *Standing*. P. *Dry manner*.

"P. You have come for your affairs? G. Yes.—
P. What dispositions do you bring? G. doubts meaning

Henry Edward Manning

and looks up.—P. Are you ready to do the best, what the interests of the Church require? G. Yes, of course.—P. I don't blame your motives, but you cannot get on. This systematic opposition to the Cardinal is incompatible with the continuance of the good going on in England, and I hope you will make the sacrifice and retire, as one must of the two. G. There is no systematic opposition. I hope you will see how erroneous are the representations which have been made when you come to read my written statement.—P. You may make it, but I have the authority of five or six English Bishops that one must retire. You have exceeded your faculties, you have spoken in opposition to the Cardinal in Synod without any right to speak, and after you had yourself inquired into the subject you have put up the Chapter against the Cardinal. I hope you will make the sacrifice. You may think awhile about it. G. I am ready to obey, as I have already said in my letter to Propaganda, but when incorrect accusations have been made against me and those who think with me on the state of England, I can't do anything direct nor confirm the accusation by resignation.—P. You may write, and, as you will probably be remaining fifteen or twenty days, you will have time to explain all. I will speak to Barnabo."

The case was fought on the merits or demerits of Manning, who wrote to Wiseman: "It was enough to be evil spoken of there, for since I lost all that can be called home in England the Holy See has been my home and consolation." Talbot wrote (January 29, 1860): "I think that your personal character is being attacked. You have, however, here a very powerful defender in Cardinal Wiseman, who is advocating your cause, though he has to contend against a heartless and ungenerous antagonist. Rome is properly called the Eternal City, because they never decide a question before they have heard all the pros and cons. There is no place in the world where they are more impartial." Manning had lifted his cause to a higher plane,

"whether or no the Church in England shall content and confine itself to a better administration of Sacra-

The Wars of Westminster

ments to the small communion of Catholic sojourners in England or shall mingle itself in the life of the English people, act upon its intelligence by a mature Catholic culture, upon its will by a larger and more vigorous exercise of the powers which are set in motion by the restoration of the Hierarchy."

Wiseman recounted Manning's services to Propaganda, the schools and churches he had built, but thought it best to summon him to Rome, where Manning pleaded :

" Holy Father, suffer me to add that I have found the work of beginning a Congregation is no light or easy task. It is no wonder that there should appear to the Archbishop of Trebizond some things to censure. But it is easier to censure than establish such a work. I might at least have looked for some clemency of judgment, some kindly forbearance, a little charitable patience, but I found none. (As for Errington) he proceeded first by alienating a priest of the Congregation, next by organising, sustaining, and directing an opposition of the whole Chapter, first against me and then against the Cardinal."

On March 6 Bishop Roskell wrote home : " I fancy they will send Dr. Errington on a mission to Hayti." But the Pope allowed him another say. This time " their voices were raised and heard," while the imperturbable Archbishop took down the Pope's words in a notebook, which survives :

" Kindly received, but kept standing. His Holiness asked when the papers would be ready. I answered that the matter had grown, especially on the chief point, the Oblates. H.H. asked if now that all were sympathising with him in his troubles I could not do so also by doing him the favour of resigning. I answered that when he had read the papers he would think differently. He said the papers would make no difference, as his reasons were our incompatibility. That one of us must go. That it would kill the Cardinal. (Would you like to see him die? Would you like me to tell him to go?)

Henry Edward Manning

I said that my own honour and that of my friends would not allow me to sign my own condemnation. H.H. said that I was not to mind the point of honour, about which I was too solicitous; that I must meditate upon it at the foot of the Cross, where Christ had sacrificed His honour. The Pope grew severe and energetic, and asked me how he could allow me to be at Westminster after the Cardinal's time with this obstinate character."

Errington asked for a Commission of Cardinals, which the Pope granted, with orders to exchange papers. Wiseman sent in a hundred pages of foolscap and fell ill. The Propaganda suspended the interchange, upon which Errington refused to send his statement to the Pope. The months passed, and Manning wrote: "The history of this case is to me fearful." At the end of June, 1860, the Cardinals advised Errington's removal, though Reisach was against and Marini for Errington, while Barnabo was doubtful. Errington withdrew his case, and on July 5 the Pope asked him to resign. Errington sent Propaganda word that he preferred to suffer judgment, but as he had not offended against Canon Law he could not be judged. The Pope wished to dismiss a stubborn servant without taking away his character, but Errington insisted on the Courts. But the Pope is above the Courts, and by his supreme authority removed Errington from the right to succeed to Westminster. "Invariably faithful to my declared principles, I will obey without reservation," Errington wrote. He believed he had been judged outside of Canon Law. "I acknowledged the receipt of the Decree, and declared my submission, expressing the grief I felt at having been deprived of the only means of clearing myself." Manning wrote to Ullathorne (November 20, 1860):

"Now, I was in Rome through the whole of that painful time, living under the same roof and in the most open and perfect confidence with the Cardinal, and employed by him and by Propaganda during his

The Wars of Westminster

dangerous illness in the most minute and confidential details of all these questions. I am therefore able to state with evidence that Dr. Errington's removal was made under the judgment of the first Canonists of Rome, and by a process certainly un-English, but eminently Catholic. That the Cardinal has never by so much as a single word to my knowledge used any such expression as that ascribed to him about dealing as he pleased with the other Bishops. But this I know, these words were written from England to Propaganda by some Bishop or Bishops, not as said by the Cardinal, but as their own argument that no Bishop would be safe. I confess that when I heard it I said to myself that no Bishop who does as Dr. Errington did ought to be safe—that is, from the censure of the Holy See."

Such was the Errington Case, one of the most famous in Church history. Errington behaved as nobly after as he had been stubborn before. He only desired to fall by Canon Law, and by Canon Law he fell, for in Canon Law the Pope can do no wrong. The account of the works of the Oblates appealed to the authorities. Manning's defence was that he sought the salvation of England, and the supreme end of the Roman Papacy, with all its delays and faults, is saving the souls of men. It was Manning's novitiate in the sublime strife of ecclesiasts, and he suffered great depression. A haggard look, the hawk-like look of his antagonist, came into his own features. He could not understand the opposition of the old Catholics to him, and when a convert remarked that he had expected them to have wings, Manning "smiled an exceeding bitter smile, and, as it were in spite of himself, let fall the words under his breath, 'Wings with claws!'"

As Errington had not been removed for any canonical offence, the Bishops were anxious to have him employed. Talbot wrote to Wiseman: "I proposed him as a fit person to send to Goa, and he would be a fit person to remove the bad Portuguese priests. If he would consent to go to the United States or any of the English Colonies

Henry Edward Manning

you would make no difficulty." But no, Errington decided to wait in England until the subject of his alleged incompatibility was removed. He moved through England like "a troubled spirit," and, as Talbot remarked, "if Dr. Errington was a bad man there would be no necessity to do anything, but he is a good man, and therefore is doubly dangerous." Cardinal Barnabo suggested Wiseman should send his name in for Trinidad, but the English Bishops who were assisting Wiseman sent in every name except Errington's. And Wiseman was too ill to overrule the Bishops as he used to. The pupils were lined against their old master, who leaned now with all his weight on his new disciple. Lady Eastlake sketched them at the Royal Institution. "Wiseman appeared, preceded by sundry very demure-looking ecclesiastics, among whom the palest and thinnest imaginable was our late Archdeacon Manning. No man can look more miserable than he. The Cardinal is portly, with a feeble, sweet voice and most beautiful hands, which were always in movement" (January 31, 1863).

The Errington Case strengthened Manning and Talbot in their respective positions. It meant the triumph of the converts. Talbot wrote to Wiseman (September 8, 1860): "Is it true that you have made Manning a third Vicar-General in London? No more Coadjutors. We have had enough of them. I have seen almost all your friends turn against you, but I have not for a day wavered. When put to the test what were they worth? I think your Eminence commences a new era." It was true. The reign of Manning began in 1860, as Wiseman, an invalid, gradually slipped the helm into his rigid hands. Talbot became the Roman agent of the coming man. His petulance against the old Catholics was redeemed by his passionate service of great men. Bad news at Rome was always broken to Pius by *mio buono Giorgio*, whose letters to Wiseman were sometimes

The Wars of Westminster

finished with Papal postscripts in Pius's hand. Talbot was an unwise but not an unjust steward, and he served Manning with indiscreet love.

At home Searle thwarted Manning until they came into conflict. They accused each other, but Manning kept his temper sufficiently to record their words :

“M. For two years I have considered your conduct in circumventing and undermining me both in the Chapter and out of it as not straightforward. S. You ought to have spoken first to me.—M. I owe you no relations. I have a duty to the Cardinal and none to you. S. Do you consider that you have a right to judge of questions between Bishops?—M. Certainly I do, 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.”

There was “a rally of the opposition,” and Manning was compelled to withdraw the Oblates from St. Edmund's in order to give the Cardinal peace with the Old Edmundians, who felt as though an ancestral hall had been surrendered to a parvenu. “One step back in 1861 might be followed by two steps forward in 1862,” noted Manning. Wiseman was sick, and the Bishops brought up the Colleges and Trusts at Rome, sending Bishop Clifford into the lists; but the Cardinal sent Manning, who met Lord Brougham at Avignon and spent a morning with him at Cannes. No doubt Manning took a little law from him on the Trusts, as he did later in Rome from another Lord Chancellor (December 21, 1861): “I am just going to see Lord Chelmsford, and I mean to make sure of my law without giving him any light in return.” In 1854, owing to the Law of Mortmain, Manning and Hope had advised keeping Trusts secret, and he asked now, “How can the Bishops submit their Trusts to the Commission if they thereby recognise the *altum dominium* in the State?” The Bishops watched uneasily, while Manning

Henry Edward Manning

won his case. "It is reported that Mgr. Manning has been quite successful in his past efforts about the Trusts," wrote Grant to Ullathorne, upon whom Manning began to act with a view to peace-making. Ullathorne wrote to Wiseman (March 7, 1862):

"I join you in the desire and even in the thirst for peace and union of spirit. But in a long conversation which Mgr. Manning introduced on that subject I could not but express my own impression that it would take a little time to heal the wounds that have been opened in our Hierarchy, and to this sentiment he gave a reluctant acquiescence. Your Eminence will be happy to know that Dr. Manning is materially improved in health, and that he is following his important mission to the Protestants congregated in Rome with considerable prospects of success."

In the summer Wiseman came to Rome for the Canonisation of the Japanese martyrs, and touched his zenith, in Manning's words, "surrounded by half the Bishops of the world, of every language and of every land, chosen by them as their chief to fashion their words in declaring to the Sovereign Pontiff their filial obedience to the Spiritual and Temporal Power." Wiseman's triumph after an interview with the Emperor Napoleon was such that Talbot thought it was time to choose another Coadjutor. Writing of Errington (November 11, 1862): "I should like to see him out of England, where he continues to be a kind of *cheval de bataille* against your Eminence. I am afraid of mischief in England if he is again brought into contact with Manning and others who are heading the Catholic movement." That winter Talbot suggested to the Pope a name that was agreeable to Manning, for he wrote to Wiseman (January 2, 1863):

"Manning has shown me a letter from your Eminence from which it appears that you have misunderstood a letter which I wrote to you by order of the Holy Father. I mentioned that it was his wish that you should consent

The Wars of Westminster

to the nomination of Dr. Ullathorne as your coadjutor. This the Pope desired me to say to your Eminence in order to prevent a scandal, which would certainly take place in England in case, *quod avertat Deus*, you were suddenly taken from us to a better world. The Pope desired me to express this wish, as he said to Herbert Vaughan, that before his own death he was determined to secure the succession of Westminster. From your letter to Mgr. Manning it appears that you will immediately assent to this plan as soon as you are certain that it is the expressed wish of the Holy Father. I can declare to you that such is the case, and Mgr. Manning is a witness."

Though Talbot insisted that such a wish was a command, Wiseman hesitated. He only wished peace with the Bishops, and a second Coadjutor meant a second war. Manning was sent back to Rome to preach the Lent and maintain the *status quo*, writing an affectionate line to Ullathorne: "We had indeed a trying time last year, but great good has come out of it, and still more, I believe, will come hereafter. It has always seemed to me that the firmest public oppositions need make no personal or private variances, if only men will be just in word and deed."

Cardinal Barnabo met him with "two great hugs!" and all was smooth at Rome until Bishop Clifford telegraphed he was coming. "I suppose, therefore, I shall have a duel," wrote Manning. They were about to conflict on the College question when Manning offered terms, as he wrote to Ullathorne (May 27, 1863):

"Dr. Clifford and I had three *congressi* after the manner of last year. We summed the College question up into three points, and on two we were agreed. We agreed to urge that the Colleges should be preserved in their integrity. That the rights of the Ordinaries should be preserved inviolate as to all spiritual jurisdiction, as to the nomination of Rector and Professors, as to discipline and internal administration. These two points seem to me to cover all that you were anxious about."

Henry Edward Manning

But the Decree went against Wiseman, who could not be comforted by Manning's interpretation (July 30, 1863): "The great battle has ended in ensuring Diocesan Seminaries. Another vast gain of the long contest is the winnowing of principles." Manning's few defeats were always moral victories. But poor Wiseman was dying, and no hints from Rome would stir him to take another Coadjutor. He had made up his mind that the war of succession should follow and not precede his own death. This summer Talbot made the first suggestion of what was at the back of Wiseman's own mind (May 11, 1863):

"Cardinal Barnabo has advised me to write a friendly letter to your Eminence in perfect confidence to suggest the only means that could avert so grievous a scandal as Dr. Errington asserting his right to Westminster, which he evidently intends to do. He wishes you to ask for a Coadjutor. In the Episcopal body I do not see anyone to sympathise with you, and who would not be inclined to undo the work you have been doing. Mgr. Manning has come out nobly this year in Rome. He has gained immensely in the opinion of the Pope, and I may say of all the Cardinals. They are open-mouthed about him. He is looked upon by all as a first-rate man, especially since his discourse at the *Trinità*. He is certainly immensely improved, and as different from what he was ten years ago as possible. He is much more *sciolto* and open. Everyone sees that he is called to do great things in England (and he sent a *Reservata*—May 29, 1863): I suppose Manning has been in London some time. He is very much admired here, and the Cardinals say he ought to be a Bishop. More than one wish him to be your successor in the See of Westminster. Cardinal Barnabo is so naturally timid and afraid of the Bishops that he would dread such a measure. I should not at all."

Wiseman shared Barnabo's timidity, for he drew his pen through the note. As Manning wrote the next month: "Some who are near the Cardinal I suspect intimidate him. And Searle is Searle."

The Wars of Westminster

Errington having refused Trinidad, the Governor of the Island refused to recognise a naturalised subject as Archbishop. Here was a case for Manning's gifts, and he wrote to Wiseman (July 27, 1863): "I have been to the Colonial Office, and have ascertained that in the Civil Service of the Colonies naturalised subjects are not excluded. I am therefore going to write and ask that the question be raised with the Governor and Legislature in Trinidad whether they intended to make the ecclesiastical services more exclusive than the civil. I will write to the Duke of Newcastle to-night and to Cardinal Bò. to-morrow." The Governor was a nephew of the Eton Head-master Keate, and, as an old Etonian, Talbot chimed in: "I have told the Holy Father and Cardinal Bò. all you have done, and they quite approve of your having written to the Governor of Trinidad, although I am not very sanguine about the result of our letters."

Errington remained, and Manning wrote: "If King Stork comes the frogs must look sharp." He could have had no idea that his name was being mooted, for it was to Wiseman Talbot wrote (November 3, 1863): "It is impossible for many reasons that they should think of naming Manning your Coadjutor, with future succession. The only Bishop at all equal to such a position is Dr. Ullathorne. He has many faults, but with them all he is a good Bishop and will not undo your work. The plan would be to name him Coadjutor with orders to remain as Bishop of Birmingham as long as you live. The second part of the plan, *not matured yet*, would be to make Mgr. Manning a Bishop in *partibus* to help you in London. It has also been suggested that he should succeed to Birmingham. What you must do is simply to write to the Pope to ask for a Coadjutor, as the Holy Father, with great delicacy, says that asking one must come from your Eminence, and he wished you to do so."

Wiseman was wringing his hands and heart in mental misery. A pathetic exchange occurred between him and

Henry Edward Manning

Manning that autumn. "Of course I am lonely," wrote the Cardinal, "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 feel 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." Manning replied: "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." In the winter Manning went to Rome, and as the only way out of the difficulty proposed Ullathorne's name to the Pope, with Barnabo's sanction (December 7, 1863). He immediately informed Ullathorne of his converse with Barnabo, in which

"I replied that the necessity was very urgent for it, for the sake of the Holy See, for the sake of the Episcopate, and to prevent uncertainty, anxiety, etc., to avoid suspicions and sedition among the clergy. That the person most fitting to meet the case would be Mgr. Ullathorne, being the second in point of seniority, the most capable, the recognised interpreter of Wiseman. Cardinal Bò. has encouraged me to repeat these words of mine to your lordship."

But Wiseman did not approve the diplomatic coup arranged by Manning and Barnabo, writing (December 26, 1863): "The sore Birmingham business weighs heavily upon me by a graver sense of responsibility than I have ever felt, by the struggle between conscience and compliance. With Dr. Ullathorne Bò. has corresponded directly, and priests of this diocese know question and answer, and from them I have learnt them. Am I so little party to the matter that I should be the last to hear of it?" In vain Manning tried to fill the vacancy he was destined to fill himself, pointing out that Ullathorne would give the Chapter "neither victory nor defeat, but

The Wars of Westminster

a master." At Wiseman's entreaty the Pope allowed the matter to lapse, and Talbot wrote sadly to Wiseman (February 19, 1864):

"I have made up my mind to wash my hands entirely of the affair. All I have done I did under obedience to the Holy Father and Cardinal Barnabo. I understand now that, although Barnabo originated the whole idea, and three distinct times desired me to write to your Eminence, he has made a catspaw of me, and when the row comes has abandoned me."

Though Manning was now a Protonotary, he was wearied by the wars of Westminster, and wrote to Ullathorne, now his friend among the Bishops. To a Benedictine he confided his desire to retire to a Benedictine cell (February 18, 1864):

"You were very malicious against Protonotaries, and three walks by the Tiber would hardly cure you. However, if I had any personal secrets, there are few I would sooner tell them to than to you. But there are none. I have been much mortified by the folly of the newspapers. But the only *altiora* before me are, I hope, St. Benedict's twelve steps and the rest which remains for us. I do not believe, monk as you call yourself, that you desire this more than I do. And I have every year a stronger wish to be released from the active life which I have had for more than thirty years, and not to make it heavier."

The indignation which Manning excited in some circles appears in a letter from Dr. Neve of the English College to Bishop Clifford (February 13, 1864):

"Manning and his people are the offenders and meddlers in everything. I told Vaughan that I thought it was not his business to interfere. He, however, maintained his views, and thought that Manning or Ullathorne ought to be named Coadjutor. There will be no peace as long as Manning is here. He is always scheming. He has schemed for me a complete change in the management of this college. He has schemed an English University in Rome, to which the Pope says that there

Henry Edward Manning

is only one objection, that no one will come to it. Stonor is to be the head of it."

Manning's schemes were at least not selfish—a University for Stonor, an Archbishopric for Ullathorne, a Benedictine cowl for himself! He returned to London, where Fr. Butler received back Sibthorpe, whose Anglican apostasy had once anguished him and Gladstone. On the occasion of his Catholic apostasy Wiseman had taken to his bed, from which he now rose to hear the prodigal say Mass once more. Talbot tried to restore the sick Cardinal: "I am your friend heart and soul, and I pooh-pooh all the stupid things people say against you. I look upon you as the greatest prelate in the Church, and I tell everyone so in Rome, from the Pope downwards. I think they are all convinced of it." Manning was publicly fighting Pusey and privately converting Lady Herbert, to whom he wrote (December 10, 1864):

"The truth, beauty, sweetness, self-evidence of the Catholic Church is beyond all I ever dreamed before I entered it. I wonder when those who enter it grumble and complain, and doubt whether they have souls or at least hearts. Certainly, without ceasing to be an Englishman I have got Nationalism out of my soul, and I think it is going out of yours."

The next month the dying Cardinal sent him to Rome for the last time. "When we parted he was standing on the threshold of his room in the full height of his stature, as if once more in health. And with his benediction and embrace he dismissed me, to see him no more."

Manning's mind was troubled with the Liberalism of the day, with Garibaldi's visit, with the outcry against the Pope's Syllabus, and Gladstone's attack on the Naples prisons. From Dover he wrote to the latter (January 11, 1865):

"I doubt if you have any idea of the delicate and difficult position in which in these last fourteen years I

The Wars of Westminster

have been placed. You may perhaps judge of it by what you have had to meet from men with whom you once acted in politics, from whom you were afterwards separated. But the *odium politicum* is a mild disease, a mere chicken-pox, after all, compared with other maladies, and now we shall have many nuts to crack, I imagine, in these eighty Propositions, which I suppose you think monstrous and mediæval." [And from Rome] "I have long wished to say to you that there is one act in your public life which has given me a profound sense of injustice. I mean your pamphlet on the prisons of Naples. I believe there was much to be said against those prisons, but I believe that your statements were exaggerated beyond measure. Now, we both know that the state of our prisons was as bad as anything in Naples. And I remember giving you, when you were at the Colonial Office, a report of Norfolk Island, which for murder, poisoning, and crime exceeded anything I have ever read except the 'Cities of the Plain.' Do not be offended at me. I believe you were then and are now used by those who are driving on their own purposes, in great part the least you would willingly promote" (February 3, 1865). [And two days later] "Do not break with the tradition of men in policy which you have grown up in. As I told you, I think you in the balance more than any man of our day. You have a great career before you if you at this time maintain order at home and abroad. But your suffrage speech and Garibaldi's visit contain the germs of a home and foreign policy, popular for a moment, but I believe fatal to your future and to the welfare of two countries."

In his weariness of ecclesiastical strife, Manning turned to world-politics to the extent of writing to Gladstone, little thinking that his own career was about to open or that in ten days he and Gladstone would meet in the antechamber of the dying Wiseman. Manning was suddenly recalled by telegram, and travelled night and day. "I believe he knew me, but we could not be sure." On February 15 the Cardinal was dead. By Wiseman's desire, the only hint given by the dead as to

Henry Edward Manning

the succession, Manning preached at the Requiem. It was on the text of Nehemias, "Who raised up for us our walls that were cast down, who rebuilt our houses." For the first time Manning broke into gestures from the pulpit as he recalled their common work and the far-off day when the Rector of Lavington had watched the Rector of the English College tending the sick and dying in Rome thirty years before.

Before he died, Wiseman forgave his Chapter, and bade them choose "that name that you consider most fit and worthy to fill this high office." They chose Errington!

CHAPTER XI: ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER

“I always heard a voice saying, ‘Put him there, put him there.’”—
Pius IX. to Manning, 1865.

PROVOST MANNING enjoyed the honour of presiding over the Chapter which sent the names of Errington, Clifford, and Grant to Rome, “a sort of prism with three sides of one name.” He knew that he was countersigning the warrant for his fall, and Talbot was already shivering for his “poor Oblates.” The election was followed with intense and anxious interest. From Rome Neve wrote to Clifford (March 2, 1865): “Six of the Chapter will act as one man, and so, of course, will carry the election. Morris is entirely devoted to Manning, and Drinkwater writes long letters here in the same sense.” The six were not devoted to Manning, and Searle consulted Errington (February 28, 1865): “There is an idea about that the Holy See would consider it an insult if your name were sent in by the Chapter. Can you give me an opinion or intimate a wish?” Errington, who had retreated to Ireland, replied in a luckless moment (March 3, 1865): “There cannot be supposed any insult to it in sending my name in the ordinary form, when the reason no longer exists for which the Holy See did not judge it expedient that I should be at Westminster.” The Chapter hesitated, and was advised by Grant not to send Errington’s name without consulting Rome. Rome, however, always bides her counsel since she speaks last, allowing the human element full play first. Threatening letters arrived from Talbot that if a certain name was on the list they would get a Bishop they would not like. Canon Oakeley replied that they could not dislike any

Henry Edward Manning

choice of the Pope, and with Maguire he insisted on Errington at the top of the *terna* (March 14, 1865). Of the other two, Grant wrote to Clifford the next day, "You and I can help Dr. Errington more than anyone," and he proposed they should withdraw in favour of their old master.

On February 24 Manning wrote to Talbot deprecating Errington and Clifford, but adding that Ullathorne was not among the three he had chosen, "whom I believe in the sight of God to be the most attached to Rome and to have the most love of souls." His choice has remained a mystery, since the world was told that between February 24 and March 18 "either no letters were interchanged or the correspondence has not been preserved" with Talbot. As a matter of fact, Manning wrote (February 26, 1865) :

"I have heard that Maguire and Oakeley are busy with O'Neal, that it is rumoured that the postponement of the election is to give time to sound people and Propaganda as to their feeling about Errington. I remember that it was Grant among the Bishops who proposed the postponement, and I am inclined to believe that it is not without concert. I am inclined, therefore, to think that they may try to put Dr. E. forward. Now, this would be a simple overthrow of the Cardinal's policy and a direct censure on his memory. It would be fatal to the work in England if this spirit comes once more into the ascendant. It would also be a stultifying of the Holy See. You must be firm and outspoken, for here we can do little. There are only four of us against six, and the majority carries all before it. The present crisis is not one of men, but of policy, of the whole of the Cardinal's mission and life. It is going onward or backward, Anglicanism or Rome. The old party and spirit have now their chance. And if the Holy See is timid or wavering we shall have the old times back like a flood. I repeat deliberately that I had rather have Errington than Clifford. Clifford is Errington and water, and under the influence of the old worldly family English tradition which makes the Catholic Church in England an aristocratic close borough."

Archbishop of Westminster

He wrote again (March 6, 1865):

“I have reason to know that the Jesuits are working about the See of Westminster. Dr. Clifford's name, I am persuaded, has been put forward by them. Oakeley is in their hands. The sectional personal influence of Farm Street has grown in the last five years. If this be not checked, the work of the Diocese will be dangerously impoverished and impeded. Now, I implore you to use your influence, outspoken and unceasing, to prevent this calamity. One man who could check it and also quiet the Bishops would be Dr. Ullathorne. He well knows all I have told you. A second would be Dr. Cornthwaite, who would be more personally liked. Urge the one or the other with all your power. You may use what I write with Cardinal Bò., if you see fit. If anyone wishes to see England deluged by a worldly Catholicism and the real work of the conversion of souls at all crosses and costs thrown back, let him yield to the present uprising of the old party.”

It is not generally known that the British Government supported Clifford, or that Newman (not Manning) was one of the proposed. Neve wrote to Clifford (March 25, 1865): “*Private*. As I expected would be the case, Odo Russell has been instructed to promote your nomination; I lament that you are so misrepresented as a Liberal.” Manning let Talbot know (March 10, 1865): “I will telegraph as you desire on Tuesday. But to avoid names I shall put only numbers, of which I here give the key: (1) Ullathorne, (2) Clifford, (3) Cornthwaite, (4) Brown of Shrewsbury, (5) Newman, (6) Grant, (7) Errington. I do not think any other names will appear in the Chapter.”

But Talbot waited in vain for the telegram. Manning's scruples had overcome him (March 14, 1865):

“In Chapter to-day we had a discussion as to the oath of secrecy, and it has left me under the belief that we are all bound not to anticipate the report of the Bishops to Rome. Even the Chapter does not write to Rome, except

Henry Edward Manning

through the Bishops. This I feel to bind me, or I should telegraph as you wished. I said the Mass of the Holy Ghost, and in making thanksgiving I resolved that I would not express my mind as to our state until the Holy See shall have named the Archbishop. After that I shall look upon him as named by Our Lord, and shall never express an opinion. But may God guide you all! I said once before, if the Holy See hesitates we shall be in great peril of losing half the ground the Cardinal has won for the Church in England. I could not help looking at the majority of the Chapter to-day and asking myself what one thing have these men done for the Church in all these years. And when have they not crossed everything the Cardinal has done? And he has gone to his grave without a word from Rome. And they are masters of the situation. I am sorry not to do as you wished, but I feel bound in conscience."

Manning behaved with conscientious propriety. His only chance was negative, and could be annihilated by a single false step. He was in his rights in urging Ullathorne, as Talbot was in privately urging Manning himself. The Government urged Clifford, and the Jesuits Clifford or Grant. The laity urged Errington, because he could fight the Government. Manning wrote (March 23, 1865): "As to fighting the Government, nothing can be more fatal to us. This Dr. Errington did and forced the Cardinal to do about the Trusts, and we saw the result. We want no more fighting within or without, but high principle, high practice." The same day the Bishops considered the names, and Ullathorne told Manning (April 1, 1865): "Our meeting was free, pleasant, and harmonious, and as fraternal as they used to be in old times. As to the names, we had nothing to do in the way of judgment, but simply to forward them." Less pleasant was the reception of the names by the Pope. Neve wrote to Clifford:

"He rose from his chair, said it would be an insult to him, said then *so faccio Pio nono*, and that he would disregard the paper." And again (April 4, 1865): "The

Archbishop of Westminster

Pope is very much disturbed, and there is very great emotion among the Cardinals. Official people feel that perhaps their lives and property depend on the next act and very words of the Pope, and they have really been quite frightened by his excited manner. Barnabo was quite frightened, and on leaving the Pope he sought immediately for some Cardinals to calm him. I am relating facts, not accounting for them. You are quite safe now at Clifton."

Meanwhile Errington heard from his brother Michael in Rome through Father Fisher in Liverpool. Michael tackled Talbot, and asked what he meant by calling his brother incompatible when the object of incompatibility was gone. "He was gentle and guileless throughout. If half be true of what is said of Roman duplicity, he is not fit for Rome." Extracts are curious from subsequent bulletins sent to Errington :

April 6, 1865 : " To-day is a black day, so black that I can see nothing but discomfiture. The moment that the Pope saw your Grace's name at the head of the list he struck his breast three times and exclaimed, '*Questa e un offensa!*' "

April 10, 1865 : " The list being presented, the Pope is said to have observed with respect to Grant that he was an excellent man, but in his judgment hardly equal to the weight of such a charge. With respect to Clifford that his friends were Odo Russell and the Fathers of the Society. With respect to Errington, '*Questi Inglesi non sanno il catechismo!*' "

April 24, 1865 : " The blackest day has now dawned. The Pope has written to the Bishops complaining that they did not mark their disapprobation of your election by the Chapter, as *he* had already signified that you could not succeed to Westminster."

On the previous day it was known that Archbishop Cullen had written in Errington's favour, but as Ullathorne wrote to Manning (April 23, 1865) :

" Of course you know that the Pope has given the Bishops a grave rebuke under his own hand on the score

Henry Edward Manning

of your Chapter's handiwork passing through our hands without notice. Of course you know that Grant and Clifford both wrote declining, and the Pope intimates that he consequently prays to be enlightened."

Grant sent Clifford word that the Pope said of their withdrawal that "they, though speaking with humility, presented as alone and qualified the man of whom I explained my belief that he was not qualified for Westminster." In the storm of counsels, cliques, monitions, and diplomacies which filled Rome the Pope withdrew to pray, reserving the election to himself. Talbot, perceiving "this is a tremendous moment," followed him to press his views. With a weary smile the Pope, we imagine, suggested Talbot himself, for the Errington faction had wind of it on the "black day" of April 6, and by April 11 Manning wrote: "I trust you will be sent to us. It will be my happiness to work with you and for you." Of his own election Manning thought it was neither "probable, reasonable, or imaginable." Nor was it, until the other candidates eliminated themselves, and Michael Errington wrote (April 27, 1865): "Nardi says that Birmingham and Manning are the favourable names, that Antonelli backs Manning and the Pope Birmingham. If Clifford does not go to Westminster, would not Ullathorne to Westminster and Manning to Birmingham be a tolerable compromise?" Grant wrote to Clifford (April 29, 1865): "Mgr. Virtue has just come from Rome. The election was reserved to His Holiness. H.H. said he would put Dr. Errington in any other see, but not in Westminster; that you and I would not be chosen. Talbot fancied Ullathorne would be chosen. Cardinal Barnabo said, '*Sarebbe con passo forte l' elezione di Manning.*'"

Clifford also had a curious letter from Neve (April 29, 1865):

"People in high station ask if I really think the English Bishops will rebel! They ask, 'Do they speak

Archbishop of Westminster

of the Pope as many of the English do here?' This alludes to the following. On April 24, 1864, the Pope pronounced an allocution against the Emperor of Russia, which caused the Russian Ambassador to leave Rome. The Pope said, 'Does this great Potentate expect to escape the judgment of God?' On April 24, 1865, almost, perhaps, precisely at the same hour of the day the eldest son of the Emperor dies. Romans speak of this with awe. The English say, 'Well, the Prince must have died some day.' Michael Errington, a most mild and quiet man, complains at Propaganda that E. should be reported as having been pronounced *non idoneum*. Propaganda replies to him, 'He was not said to be *non idoneum in genere*, but clearly as *non idoneum* for Westminster.' "

Here we have the Errington case in a nutshell. From the ends of the world men wondered and watched. The enterprising Herbert Vaughan wrote from Rio Janeiro (May 24, 1865), little dreaming that a future Archbishop of Westminster was writing to an elected one :

" I am sure you must be in a severe position just now and have much to suffer. *Pati aut mori*, that's for you to the end. You cannot do the work Our Lord requires of you in England but by much patience and long-suffering. I rejoice in your sufferings and in your witnessing for what is good and true and honourable. I hope you are not at all sharp or severe with those who are against you, or rather I should say *coldly* reserved and *ominously* civil. When you are that, it stirs up all their bile; they hardly know the cause themselves, but it is in my two adverbs."

As an old Catholic, Vaughan spent much time trying to cure Manning's parsonic manners, but he was prophetic when he added: "I feel that I have only you left to look to and to love, as I did him. His mantle, like Elias, falls upon you. Would that it should please God that his office as well as his spirit should descend upon you too!" It had. After all the human motives and agencies had exhausted themselves for and against the

Henry Edward Manning

candidates, Rome smiled her eternal smile and chose Manning.

When he visited Rome in September to receive the Pallium, Manning learnt what had affected the Pope amid the dissension and division :

“ The Holy Father looked away from me and looked upwards, and went on speaking as if thinking aloud, saying, ‘ I believed I always heard a voice saying to me, “ Put him there, put him there.” ’ ”

Manning also had intimations : “ I remember how I was struck in Mattins reading the second nocturn of Bernardine of Siena. I was at that moment Archbishop of Westminster, but I did not know it. The will of the Holy Father was on its way.” On May 8 he received the letter, and went to kneel before the Blessed Sacrament.

The news was a thunderclap. *Punch* could only point out that instead of an “ erring tone,” it was obvious that “ the bark of Peter needs Manning.” *The Times*, with official bias, described him as “ an aspiring refugee,” whereas Clifford would have been a “ legitimate and hereditary ruler.” To Mary Wilberforce Manning wrote : “ The old Catholics of England have shown me a charity which shows how little *The Times* knows us.” To Samuel he had cause to write (May 17, 1865) :

“ I thank you for your affectionate letter at this moment which you truly call a great crisis in my life. Our life has indeed been a common one, and it is now drawing to its close. I feel this to be the last reach in the river to me. The burden which has been laid upon me is one under which I could not live if it were not imposed upon me with circumstances of unusual deliberation by the highest will on earth, and if I were not supported by the charity and prayers of those who are committed to me in a way which surpasses all I could ever venture to hope.”

To Aubrey de Vere he wrote, “ It all seems so like an illusion,” and he rather startled Rome by replying : “ I am astonished, and feel I had gone mad.” He was

Archbishop of Westminster

affected by the loyalty of the old Catholics. The blade, which had been bent and strained, leaped to rectitude in his hand. If the penal rust stiffened it, it was still the trusty sword of Peter. Neither Bishops nor priests revolted. True to the rock out of which they were digged, the old Seminary priests stood to the salute.

Manning immediately secured their affection, of which he had failed as Provost. He confirmed O'Neal as Vicar-General. He visited the dying Maguire daily till the latter confessed, "Your footsteps on the stair are like music to my ear." He seemed not to wish the memory of their warfare to be carried into the next world. To the lay ear the strife of ecclesiasts is strange and inscrutable, a mundane echo of "there was war in Heaven." But even when fighting for principles, it is a principle with the clergy to forgive at the last, for forgiveness is also their *métier*. Manning arranged for Searle's financial comfort, so that twenty years later Searle wrote: "I wish to say that in opposing you I endeavoured to oppose you honestly, and, as far as human frailty would permit, to oppose you without violating Christian charity. How far I failed is known to God alone, but for what I failed in, I beg pardon from God and from your Eminence." What was of more importance at the moment was his confession: "I owe it in reparation to Dr. Manning to tell that his letters to the Cardinal prove that all he did was done in obedience to the Cardinal."

To add to Manning's content, Lady Herbert was received in Rome. "You will find her a most active and able coadjutrix in London," wrote the irrepressible Talbot, who, much to the Pope's amusement, claimed the credit of Manning's election. "What a diplomatist you are to make what you wished come to pass!" said *Pio*, and, like Manning, was too kind to suggest other possible reasons. Lady Herbert wrote (May 21, 1865):

"I have been like a bee collecting all the honey I can here about you, and thank God there is more than of

Henry Edward Manning

vinegar. The Borghese family and, of course, dear Cardinal Reisach are delighted at your appointment, and Cardinal Antonelli, now that it is done! One opinion seems universal among those who really love you, and that is that you should be consecrated in England and then come straight here for the Pallium. The Pope spoke of it to me, but I did not dare say anything in reply."

Manning's desire was consecration from the Pope, but on Ullathorne's advice he received it from his suffragans in order to unite them. Talbot chimed in (May 20, 1865): "The act must appear as emanating from yourself, and you had better not even mention my name, as half England already thinks that I have made you Archbishop—not that I care, but that this impression confirms what Dr. E. used to say, that it was not the Holy Ghost that governs the Church, but Mgr. Talbot. The Bishops have lately had lessons enough without being made to think that they cannot even consecrate a Bishop!"

Manning's next step was to conciliate the Bishops. He had no difficulty with Ullathorne, who wrote (May 10, 1865):

"Why did you not drop me one line with the news? I did not think what it was best to do before the event, that was the Pope's business. But since the fact I think, under all circumstances, he could not have done much better. When I read the announcement I broke into a little laugh, and suddenly found a sort of lightening and expansion of the breast, which proved to me that I had been for some days under an unconscious pressure of care. I never yet congratulated a Bishop or Archbishop on his nomination, and I do not do so now. I only congratulate the Archdiocese. Your thoughts are too gravely occupied at this moment to spare me a smile at my congratulating myself in getting rid of the Protanotary. But as Archbishop I hope you will believe me your faithful and obedient Suffragan."

Archbishop of Westminster

Manning replied (May 11, 1865):

“ I had so fully expected you to be put over us, or if not you Mgr. Talbot, that when I read Rinaldini’s letter, for two days I thought it was an error. Until my letter of last night came from Rome I never ceased to doubt. And now, my dear lord, I feel altogether sad; not that I misgive the pity and power of Our Lord to help me, but because I can see nothing but my own unworthiness. I know you will always let me turn to you, speak with you, as I have in times past. One desire I have above all, and for that I would lay down not only this trust, but hope still more: I mean the true and perfect union of heart among all those to whom I am now, contrary to all my demerits, the most closely united in the world—I mean yourself and your colleagues. Though I do feel, as you say, in no mood for merriment, yet I cannot help laughing at your joy in having got rid of the protonotarial gadfly.”

To Clifford he threw a polite feeler: “ With you, my dear lord, the recollection of our *congressetti* in Rome gives me an assurance that we shall not have difficulty, unless I create it, which I pray God I never may.” But the Errington party were far from friendly feelings. Canon Oakeley, though a convert and an opponent in the Chapter, wrote (May 11, 1865):

“ I own to having been fretted almost to exasperation under a sense of the injustice of which I believed him to be the victim. I could allow for your natural feelings in defence of your own Congregation. Well, Dr. Errington was removed, and I have never doubted that the Holy See acted for the best. But I could not feel towards you as I wished. Still, I wished to believe I was mistaken as late as last Friday, when one of the English Bishops told me that he went to Cardinal Barnabo and said, ‘ Can nothing be done in Dr. Errington’s case?’ He told me the Cardinal replied, ‘ What can I do so long as Manning, Patterson, and Allies are pouring into the Pope’s ear drop by drop all kinds of charges against Errington?’ ”

Henry Edward Manning

As this is the version of Manning's conduct which has been since popularised, it is interesting to publish Manning's answer (May 17, 1865) :

“ No change of relations between us will limit the freedom with which I will hear all you wish to say, and with which I will show you the proofs that in the points referred to in your letter, especially in the statement alleged to be made by Cardinal Barnabo, you have been misled into a belief, not perhaps unnatural, but contrary to fact. To do this it will be necessary to show you papers which are in my possession, and I shall be happy to do so. I also have been the subject of this ‘ drop by drop ’ treatment. And the consciousness of its injustice imposed on me the duty to be silent until fairly appealed to, as you have done. We have passed through years which would never have been saddened if events of which I had no knowledge till they inflicted themselves on me in pain and opposition had not been caused by others.”

Errington's attitude was in keeping with his stern and noble character. He wrote to O'Neal : “ The decision of Rome being to us the manifestation of the will of God, we have the best grounds to trust that the welfare of the see has been most effectually provided for.” He had allowed his name to be pressed “ after Talbot's threatening letter to the Chapter.” To Grant he wrote (May 24, 1865) : “ I cannot doubt that you and Dr. Clifford sacrificed yourselves to further my restoration. Though extremely sorry for the result, I must say that I never felt so deeply any act of kindness.” And he added grimly : “ I have no books, or should like to get up the Canon Law and penalties for intimidating elections !” Not without honour Errington passes from the scene to which he would never allow Manning to recall him. He fell back into the ranks which Manning was to command, and found his Elba, if not in Trinidad, in the Isle of Man, where he ministered as a simple priest. The discipline which he had given to others he now applied to himself, and until the hour of his death twenty years

Archbishop of Westminster

later he uttered no word of resentment or complaint. There was no criticism or conspiracy against the new ruler. Rome had spoken, and Archbishop Errington was silent.

Manning an Archbishop, people wondered if his brother-in-law could properly be promoted to the same title. On the only occasion they met, Bishop Samuel said, "I believe you are now an Archbishop." Manning, who used to tell the story, nodded his humble assent. "And is that gentleman also an Archbishop?" continued Samuel, pointing to Manning's chaplain as though to emphasise how very much easier it was to become a Roman than an Anglican Archbishop.

Condemned to pastoral servitude for life, Manning prepared himself by retreat with the Passionists. Unto Highgate he lifted up his eyes for help. During a week he filled a book with recollections of the past and vivid anticipations of the future. He looked back into all his life from the beginning, and steadied his soul to meet the avalanche of hopes and fears, resolutions and intentions, with which he was beset. It is only possible to comb that vivid and tangled skein.

"*May 29, 1865: First Day.*—It has impressed itself vividly upon me that God has predestinated me to Eternal Life, but that the way is by conformity to His Son. . . . His Image is the *Volto Sagro* which hangs over my bed at St. Mary's, the Sacred countenance wounded and darkened by sorrow and suffering. Now, if I were an Angel I should not fulfil this predestination. . . . When I remember my childhood, boyhood, and youth, the companions who are now dead or, worse still, twice dead, it is a miracle of love and grace that I am alive. . . . When I was nineteen God converted me to Himself. I remember great fear of judgment when I was three and about nine. Again when I was confirmed. I remember then that God drew me by a sense of sweetness which was soon lost. But at nineteen or twenty I changed my life, and, with little change, have never gone back. But

Henry Edward Manning

God held me when I did not know it. He then called me out of politics and the world on which I was bent. He called me, as I then believed, to be a Pastor. He then called me to serve Him at the cost of all things as a Catholic. He then called me to be a priest. He then called me to be an Oblate. He has now called me to the greatest Cross of my life and to the greatest separation from the world. These are six separations, six *ascensiones in corde*. . . . Above all, this last act of His Vicar, contrary to all human agencies, prejudices, oppositions, influences, out of all order and overpassing all the fixed conditions. . . . Finally, it was done on *Pastor Bonus* Sunday, and at the very hour that I was preaching to my poor flock on the Good Shepherd. . . . I feel thankful that this has not come upon me sooner, for if I were ten years younger I should be ten years foolisher. I hope to make fewer mistakes. . . . I feel the shortness of life almost to suspend my power of beginning new works. I don't think any pleasure or society or worldly honour have hold over me. I have been so long unpopular and disliked and misrepresented that I hope I have expiated the flood of popularity I had before I was in the truth and healed of the temptation for the future. But I must watch over this, and if at any time I cease to find pleasure in the lowest and hardest works of the Pastoral care, or if I ever soften down the truth or am silent when I ought to speak out, I shall have a sign that the world is still in me.

“*May 30, 1865: Second Day.*—Such a life as mine, so long, so full of events, so full of precipitation and activity, of great graces and responsibilities, must be full of temptations, illusions, and sins. I can well believe that with many of the gifts and excellencies of Satan, in the sight of God and His Saints I may be as hateful as Satan. It is a mean friendship which avoids only a final breach, but all day long goes to the verge of it. . . . And I know that there is often only the difference of a degree between venial and mortal sin, and that therefore I am with my eyes open on the verge of mortal sin. Only a plank between me and eternal death. And with all my graces, what a damnation, like Balaam and Judas and Caiaphas! Every day for the last twenty years I have

Archbishop of Westminster

prayed God to deliver me from the blood of souls. . . . Since I have been a priest I fear I have never been what a priest ought to be. And now that I am bid to go before that flock, when every eye will be turned upon me both within and without the fold, both friendly and hostile, how can I escape? . . . I use daily a form of prayer, very brief, which I made about twenty years ago for myself and out of my actual experience. Sometimes I go through it at once, sometimes I dwell on it and can make it of any length, but I should feel as if I had left my prayers unsaid if I did not use it daily. I find I can pray better walking or sitting than kneeling . . . the chief prayer I make in the day is by talking to Our Lord of what I am doing or suffering or intending or fearing. I feel that if I am not directly thinking of God, He is the background of thoughts or the atmosphere or the light in which I am thinking. But I feel this to be a low state, yet it is a safe one, I trust, being the twilight way of faith, in which I trust there are fewer illusions.

“*May 31, 1865: Third Day.*— . . . There is in me a great turn for sloth, and this is the more to be watched because it is masked by a great natural activity of body and mind. Whatsoever pleases me or serves my ends I labour for with an intensity and decision which looks like fervour. It is true, indeed, that the Grace of God has turned me away from the pursuit of honour in the world, from indulgence in luxuries, and the like. Since I was twenty I turned from most of them. Since I was twenty-four from all of them. I remember when I was twenty-five to twenty-seven I used to say, ‘I have not a particle of earth ambition.’ . . . Then all manner of temptations to ambition came upon me . . . flatteries, great friendships, political relations, the Court, the secret certainty of a future. I was conscious of a sweetness in all this, both as present and as to come. But two things I can say: I loved work more than all, and I was perpetually crossing all my future by following unpopular truths in the face of unpopular opinion. People were expecting and predicting all things for me, and I was making them impossible. . . . Since I came into the Truth I hardly dare to judge for myself. . . . I cannot say that I have deliberately acted on my ambitious intention. I was no

Henry Edward Manning

sooner in the Church than my name came in the newspapers for Southwark, then as Coadjutor, then for Nottingham, then for Clifton, then I was elected for Northampton. God knows, before Whom I write, that no word or deed of mine provoked this. . . . O my God, if in this there has been ambition, make me to see it as Thou seest it, lest I go down to the pit deceiving myself. And let not this be the end of more than thirty years of natural activity. Let me not hear the sentence, 'Verily thou hast thy reward.' Rather than lose Thee, not only hereafter, but now in this life, I would lay down all in the world and live and die out of sight and out of mind, if only Thou remember me and forget all my sins. Let me not climb up here unbidden or 'by another way,' nor let me offer myself uncalled, or fill this place by my own will or by the will of man. . . . And now that life is ending, what have I done for my own soul or for others? what will go with me into the next world? I desire for what remains to me to live by an orarium, and to make a conscience of time.

"June 1, 1865: Fourth Day.—I have always had a great fear of death. But I fear still more the first meeting with God. I cannot conceive my standing before Him and being saved. . . . When I begin to analyse any one action of my life I am self-condemned, and I hide myself from myself. But I cannot hide myself from God. . . . I know that I shall die as I live. What I am now I shall be then, and death works no miracles. As I die I shall be judged. . . . If I cannot answer for my own soul, how shall I answer for the flock? . . . My only hope is in the Precious Blood. Yet I know that in 1848, when I thought I might be dying, I was overwhelmed with fear, and in 1860 when I thought myself to be in danger at sea. And I believe I should be so again. I feel very deeply the danger of losing my soul by this elevation. . . . I feel as if Our Lord had called me by name and touched me with His hand. The letter of the Holy Father which came to-day is more like the voice of Our Lord encouraging me directly than any event in my life. But Saul was specially chosen. . . . My natural activity has made me use time, my spiritual sloth has made me lose grace.

Archbishop of Westminster

“*June 2, 1865: Fifth Day.*—I have preached for years to others about conversion to God, but am I converted myself? I trust that I am in no habit of conscious variance with the Will of God. At times I am carried away, but it is as the lurches of a ship at sea which rights again. . . . One thing consoles me. He has suffered me to try to convert souls to Him, which seems to imply that He has first converted my own. I remember the time when some simple soul asked me why I spoke so seldom of the Holy Spirit. I found it was true, and I resolved from that time to make every day an act of reparation to the Holy Ghost. . . . I do not think I have ever omitted this for one day in all these years. My mind began to turn to the Third Person of the Holy Trinity. I searched for books upon it. I made notes to write about it. I began twice a book upon it . . . the Holy Father for a month asks the light of the Holy Spirit, and then, overpassing all usage and precedents, says, ‘I am inspired to name M.’ And letters from the most diverse and unlikely persons all recognise and explicitly ascribe this event to Him. I do not know how to interpret all this except one way, or how to doubt the only conclusion. Now, all this may be no more than carrying me up to the pinnacle of the Temple that my pride or infidelity to Grace may the more signally destroy me.

“*June 3, 1865: Sixth Day.*—But being set upon such a height, I feel a fear which no words can express. If the Holy Ghost is so near me, so, I believe, is the Spirit of Evil. I feel as if the whole atmosphere round me were alive and astir with the enemies of my soul. It is certain that I shall be assailed more than any man. . . . And my fall would be as when a standard-bearer falleth. I feel this fear so great that I could almost desire to take sanctuary for life within the shelter of some Religious House. . . . I resolve to endeavour to rest upon the surface of the love of God, which lifts me as the flood lifted the ark, and so to go upon the face of the waters, carried onward by the Spirit, *ubi vult*. It is want of this Spirit that has made me anxious and careful. It is the little I have of it which has made me sleep soundly and quietly in all these years. If I had had more, I should

Henry Edward Manning

have been stronger and happier; if I had had less, I should have worn out and died. . . . I desire to hold inviolate the doctrines and laws of the Church without compromise, and I resolve by the Pallium of St. Thomas so to do. My purpose is to nominate a council of persons to advise me on all matters except those strictly of the Bishop's own conscience. (1883: This resolution came to nothing, from need of prompt decisions, from difficulty in finding men, from the risks of discussion.) . . . Somebody said to me when the election was known, 'Now you will never hear the Truth again.' Everybody in high place stands in a room full of mirrors and sees himself multiplied without end by a servile reflection. My desire is to live the most retired life I can consistently with the government of the Diocese . . . to give four days a week, from 10 to 1, for receiving priests and laymen on business. (1883: I have given every day.) As to mixing in the world, my wish would be to decline all dining out. . . . I wish never to be seen except at work or on occasions of legitimate recreation, such as the Royal Academy. . . . If I were to undertake souls one by one, I should neglect them by thousands. . . . For twenty years I have been out of society. Since 1857 my life at Bayswater has been as much out of sight as if I had been in Australia.

"June 4, 1865: *Seventh Day*.— . . . By nature I am very irascible, and till the Grace of God converted me I was proud, cold, and repulsive. Since then I hope less so, but I have always been cold and distant except to those whom I personally loved. It is on second thoughts that I dislike anyone. . . . When I became a Catholic I broke all these bonds. Then they did not spare me. And I had to defend myself and strike. Then afterwards I had to pass through an austere time. When I entered the Church I had much to suffer, less from Protestants than from Catholics, less from old Catholics than from converts, excepting only the Chapter affair. In these fourteen years I have been, with all my strength put out sometimes, warding off blows, sometimes rowing at the oar, and I know that both in word and in will my character has changed from the passive state under the fig-tree to an attitude of hard toil, sometimes also of warfare. In one sense I have become less charitable, and

Archbishop of Westminster

I know I have become, or at least have been accused of imperiousness, presumptiveness, sharpness, suddenness, and the like. But this has been inevitable. When I was in a system of compromise I tried to meditate, reconcile, and unite together those who differed. When I entered a system, which, being Divine, is definite and uncompromising, I threw myself with my whole soul and strength into its mind, will, and action. So it must be to the end. Less definite, positive, uncompromising, aggressive, I can never be. God forbid! But I will try to do it *charitate formatus*. It is a blessed novitiate to have gone through the unpopularity of the last eight years. . . . I do not expect this calm to be unbroken. When I begin to speak, breezes will come, not storms. . . . When I look down upon London from this garden and know that there are before me nearly three millions of men of whom only 200,000 are nominally in the Faith; that hundreds and thousands are living and dying without baptism, in all sins of the flesh and spirit, in all that Nineveh and the Cities of the Plain and Imperial Rome ever committed; that it is the capital of the most anti-Christian power of the nominally Christian world and the head of its anti-Christian spirit; that in a moment it might be set afire with fury against the Catholic and Roman Church, I confess I feel that we are walking on the waters, and that nothing but the word and the presence of Jesus makes this great calm. . . . They will be my Chalice more than ever. To labour and to suffer for souls who will not be redeemed. To go down into the fire and into the water to save souls, and to be wounded by them—all this I look for. And I look to be chiefly wounded, as Jesus was, by my own brethren. All these osannas are but for a time, a sort of holiday of the kind hearts here and there. The great deep remains ready to lift itself up when the time comes. As soon as I begin, the wind will shift and blow shrill and sharp another way. . . . I propose to keep before me always St. Charles's devotion to the Burial of Jesus. I suppose he loved it because it was the most perfect humiliation of God incarnate, to be taken down from the Cross, wound in linen, and hid out of sight in the earth which he had made. I cannot escape many things which will demand

Henry Edward Manning

of me a heroic patience and self-control. In this end I will try to remember the Winding-Sheet and the Sepulchre.

“June 5, 1865: Eighth Day.—. . . I feel to have weighed anchor for the last time for a short run home. In the last years I have suffered much. It has saddened and sharpened me. I see it in my face. . . . ‘Behold, we bring you good tidings of great joy.’ I desire to spend my last days in this spirit. I especially desire to be thus to the priests, who have sadnesses and cares enough of their own, and ought to find in me a *Filius Consolationis*. In 1851 I was making my retreat with the Passionists. During that retreat I received a letter that the Holy Father had sent me, a Cameo of Our Lord’s Profile. In fourteen years I am again at Whitsuntide making my retreat, and in the midst of it came a letter from the Holy Father telling me that, after many prayers to the Father of Light, he had *quam libentissime* committed the Church of Westminster to me. He then gave me injunctions to maintain the discipline of the clergy against the world and against our own relaxations, to raise the education of the clergy, to leave nothing untried to bring up souls out of the shadow of death. That I may do so the Holy Father promises to pray that I may have ever with me the Wisdom which assists at the Throne of God. I feel this to be my Viaticum for the years and days that remain, with all their trials and works.

“Walking on the terrace and looking down upon London in this broad sunlight has been very moving to me. The Son of God would have wept over it. What beautiful souls are in it, made in the likeness of God, with all the capacities of eternal life, but outcast, disinherited, darkened, stained, poisoned, distorted, disfigured, twice dead!”

Similar thoughts were occupying the mind of a minister at the other end of London, William Booth, who commenced his mission in this same month. This is not the place to point out that, had Manning not been a Catholic, he would have joined the Salvation Army. However, with one last vignette he was away to his consecration.

Archbishop of Westminster

“The sight of St. Paul’s yesterday evening as the sun went down, the dome clear as a pencil would make it, with all its lines of pilasters and the long nave where St. Erconwald once lay; and Westminster, where St. Edward rests still—all this seemed to cry to me, ‘Come over and help us.’”

Ullathorne advised him to read Abelley’s *Manual for a New Bishop in Retreat*, adding: “I had lent my copy to so many suckling Bishops that it got lost among them.” As the day of consecration approached rumour spread of unwilling guests. Ullathorne consented to angle, being especially anxious “that the coldness between you and Dr. Newman should be at an end.” May 30, 1865: “I verily and honestly believe that the Pope has done the right thing. I would by all means write to Dr. Newman, and if your letter is dated from your retreat it will be sure to say the right thing.” Manning effusively asked “the happiness and consolation of your being with me,” but Newman answered stiffly. He must “escape dinner,” and there was one condition which he would state. He was not to be pressed for a bishopric himself! “So far well. I will content him, and try what you suggested a week ago.” Ullathorne wrote (June 2, 1865): “I am glad Dr. N. comes. That is important. I know he has dread of dinners. I think he is quite right in not wishing for a mitre without its office. I have had a letter from the Bishop of Newport, thinking it will be awkward for him to be present without some office. It is merely his character; he always does this sort of thing. I will angle him, and should he drop off the hook all will understand it.” Manning answered in glee (June 3, 1865): “Pray catch Newport. Treat him as Walton says of putting hooks in frogs, as if you loved him, but hook him nevertheless.” The delicate question was whether he should invite Errington. Ullathorne replied (June 4, 1865), “I think it would be a little too much to write to Archbishop Errington in that sense so soon,” and advised waiting

Henry Edward Manning

for the *mollia tempora*. However, the two other candidates, Clifford and Grant, assisted Ullathorne to consecrate Manning in the Pro-Cathedral at Moorfields on June 8, the anniversary of his presentation to Lavington. Sibthorpe noted: "He looked like Lazarus come out of the tomb in cope and mitre, a richly vested corpse, but very dignified and placid. Dr. Newman was seen in the sacristy on his knees before the Archbishop, who hastened to raise him up and embrace him." With marked gentleness, he gave the vanquished Canons the kiss of peace.

His episcopal honeymoon was spent in France. In the book at *Notre Dame des Victoires* in Paris he commended "the poor children deprived of Christian education in London." At Annecy he said Mass at the Shrine of Francis de Sales, and in Poitiers he carried the Host through the streets. Before the year was at an end he had written three Pastorals.

CHAPTER XII: THE DAY'S BURDEN

“This place is a true Purgatory, and I hope may shorten mine.”—*Manning to Ullathorne, 1865.*

FOR twenty-five years to come Manning's Pastorals were to be a stimulant and a standard to Catholic London. It was the one branch of literature in which he excelled. The perfect Pastoral combines the form of a letter and the subject of a sermon with the authority of a proclamation. Yet he was careful to submit what he wrote to expert advice. Ullathorne, who became his faithful but privileged Achates, writes to suggest a Pastoral be shown to Dr. Murray of Maynooth (September 8, 1867): “I certainly should not put it out, were its responsibility on me, without modifications. And in so formal a document as a Pastoral I should carefully mark the distinction between what is defined truth and what is theological exposition.” September 15, 1867: “Thanking you for a sight of Dr. Murray's letter, I congratulate you on obtaining his suffrage to your theological accuracy. Theological accuracy, however, is one thing; the *tempus omnia loquendi* is another.”

Manning had succeeded to an archbishopric without a cathedral, to a priesthood without a Tridentine Seminary, and to a laity without schools. He was unwilling to do more than buy the cathedral site. “Could I leave 20,000 children without education and drain my friends to pile up stones and bricks?” He saw “London is travelling westward,” just as Archbishop Hughes foresaw the trend of New York in choosing the site of his cathedral. Manning was inclined to discourage arches of triumph before the battle was won, and though “silent and censured,” he refused to appeal for building. “I have been content with my Old Sarum and my Selsey. The

Henry Edward Manning

days of Salisbury and Chichester are to come," he said in parable. He never saw the Byzantine pile in which he and Wiseman now sleep their last sleep, apart from the Canons, with Death for coadjutor. To commemorate the first Archbishop of Westminster the site was bought by the second, built over by a third, and consecrated by a fourth, awaiting the Augustan touch of others to leave marble where they find brick.

Manning would not hear poor Talbot's cries to help him build an English church to St. Thomas in Rome, though for a year his budget was swelled with them (January 12, 1866):

"The subscription list will make an impression, I think. It will be headed by the Pope, Cardinal Antonelli, and all the English Bishops; then will come the laity, headed by the King and Queen of Naples. The Pope has announced his intention to lay the first stone himself as a compliment to English Catholics, during Carnival. (January 26) It is creating a great sensation in Rome. The Cardinals are full of it. (February 1) The Pope is preparing himself to preach a sermon on the occasion. The whole thing will make a great impression all over Europe. (February 10) 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 among the English. Lord Northesk and Lord Sinclair begged for tickets. Sinclair is a descendant of one of the murderers of St. Thomas. (February 24, 1865) The Pope is most anxious to see it finished, as one of the glories of his Pontificate."

But, alas! by October it was abandoned. "I have to bear the humiliation of making this solemn fiasco. It has done me more good than if I had built the church. It is better for the soul to be humbled than exalted."

Manning had immediately declared war on the London Guardians. A child's soul was of more value to him than thrones and baldachinos. To rescue the Irish children who were brought up Protestants in the workhouses he

The Day's Burden

fortified himself by recommending the saying of a thousand Masses. In 1865 he attacked the Strand Union, and twenty-one years later a sarcastic Pastoral brought to line the Guardians of St. George's, who were the last to hold out. "This Board represents the most educated parish in London. It now stands alone for this unjust and ignoble oppression of the poor." It was a steady, unrelenting fight. "The Guardians throughout England will soon be up against us," he wrote to Cullen, "but if we can have the voice of Ireland with us, we shall be able to meet them." When he tackled the Marylebone Guardians he was answered in Parliament; but Gladstone came to his rescue, and never hesitated to help him recover his lost sheep in workhouse or prison. Typical of the influence he was able to exert on Gladstone was his writing (July 12, 1872):

"Out of 125 prisons, only 16 have appointed Catholic Chaplains. I am told and taunted that, whereas we are only one-fifteenth of the population, we have one-fifth of the prisoners; that our prisoners are reconvicted again and again, if they are not reformed; and how shall they be reformed if they are deprived of the helps of their clergy and their Faith? This is hard-hearted and cruel as well as unjust. I do not ask for stipends. Let the clause be struck out of the Bill, but let us be allowed freely to bring the Sacraments to these poor souls."

Education was Manning's besetting care for fifty years. He had written to Gladstone (May 9, 1843): "I believe the State never will and never can educate the country. It may make a universal scheme of secular instruction compulsory. Educate it never can. The religious differences of England are too strong and irreconcilable." A quarter of a century later the State met him in the person of Gladstone. As he wrote to Cullen in 1869, "A year ago I saw it coming, and tried without success to move the Bishops." The Bill of 1870 he met with a divided episcopacy and an epigram, calling it "the

Henry Edward Manning

endowment of the party of disendowment!" He had appealed for Irish help from Cullen (April 18, 1869):

"If only the six million Catholics of these countries could act together, there is no just demand we should not obtain. I have, indeed, in the last ten days warned the Government that the Scotch Bill and the Endowed Schools Bill will compel us to raise a decisive opposition. The Scotch Bill is simple tyranny, and in two years would extinguish every Catholic school in Scotland. The Duke of Argyll has consented to postpone it for a month. But it will come on unless the Irish members give notice to the Government of their intention to oppose it."

August 15, 1869: "I have (between two sermons) drawn a rough draft. Your Eminence will see at once that it is a *political* declaration. I have carefully avoided giving to it a prominently Catholic character. Christian education as the *genus* and denominational as the *species* will cover all we want. And if we are to rally the Anglicans and Nonconformists, we must, I fear, use a language intelligible to them rather than our own."

Manning and his Bishops were in Rome when Mr. W. E. Forster brought in his Bill, who wrote to Manning: "I wish you could have heard Gladstone's speech. It was curious to see how his love of dogma peeped out." Manning plied Gladstone (March 7, 1870): "I am very anxious. I see that the Bill is conservative and provides for the moment. But I fear the lean kine will eat up the fat kine. In America the Bishops have formed their own schools to avoid the common school system. We in our poverty should be forced to do the same." And he suggested what has become the only policy (March 20, 1870): "I do not see why the school rate should not be granted in proportion to private efforts by enactment of Parliament. In the last three years we have opened in London thirty new schools, and have gathered out of the streets 3,000 children. Give me time and just proportionate help, and there will not be one of our children without a school."

The Day's Burden

Forster explained that it filled the gaps in the voluntary system. The orthodox ark was to be patched with School Boards, and as the Bishops generally approved, Manning adopted the Bill. He was bitterly blamed for accepting secularism, but he wrote to Ullathorne (October 7, 1870): "My meaning is the reverse. The Boards may destroy our lesser schools at once by reporting them to be insufficient or inefficient. The effect of this in London would be to destroy one half of our schools. By opening relations with the Board, as I have with the Privy Council, I hope to save these. By standing aloof from the Boards we should be exposed to the danger of their hostility." As compared with mixed education, "such a system as the less of two evils might *salva conscientia* be accepted." He also dragged a private fear out of Gladstone, that the "doubtful point" in Liberalism was "its disposition to extremes in the matter of unsectarianism." In a year Manning was alarmed, and tried to alarm Gladstone, with the Paris Commune (September 25, 1871):

"I believe the state of France and of Paris to be traceable in chief to a godless education. The education of England is still Christian. The tradition is unbroken. We are tormented and harassed by a clique of doctrinaires who, believing nothing, trumpet secular education. My friend Huxley is at the head of them. I am very glad to see Forster attacked as playing into the hand of the clergy. The worst disaster that could befall us would be an Imperial education." October 28, 1871: "Do not fail to read Huxley's speech. We shall have an Imperial Parliament of little Britain if this goes on. I thank him for dropping the mask, but I am afraid he has made trouble for us all." [And to return the trouble he wrote the same day to Cullen]: "*Private*. May I ask your Eminence to lend a hand by desiring some prudent person to call attention in the Irish papers to Huxley's insolent speech? He has attacked us all, and tried to damage also the education in Ireland."

Manning asked for fair play. The School Board had the cunning of Æsop's fox in offering the crane a feast

Henry Edward Manning

“in platters and bottles where we cannot touch it.” He called on Gladstone (November 1, 1871): “Let us all start fair on this race. Let every sect even to the Huxleyites have their grant, if they fulfil the conditions. The school-rate conscience is a mongrel imitation of Quakerism. If we hear more of it we also shall be compelled to have tender consciences. We are willing to recognise Parliament, but we must not be asked to accept the legislation of Atheists and women.”

Manning tackled Forster, to whose Quakerism he was perhaps referring. He liked Quakers as a rule, distinguishing them from dissenting quacks. He told Ullathorne (February 27, 1873): “I saw Mr. Forster, and have written him a letter to be read in the House of Commons if he is attacked about our books. But I was obliged to promise that I would bring before the Bishops the revision of our books.” He had to compete with the Board by a Crisis Fund, “zeal against hire.” The Board was secular even to a sectarianism, but the English people do not know when they are enjoying a secular or a religious education. Only vigilance and sacrifice to the end of his life kept the Catholic school alive. He was too optimistic in writing to Cullen (May 30, 1873): “It is the field on which I should most wish to fight a general action. A large part of the English would be with us or would not fight against us.”

A curious matter to be dealt with was the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom, to which Wiseman had afforded discreet encouragement. Phillips De Lisle (the Eustace Lyle of Disraeli's novel *Coningsby*) had urged High Churchmen to enter the Catholic Church after explanations rather than retractations. In 1841 the Archdeacon of Chichester had written to Gladstone: “I send you confidentially a curious letter of Phillips to a priest of the English Church. If he is sincere and not economising and liming his twigs, it is very instructive.” The A.P.U.C., or, as it was called, a Plaster for Unquiet

The Day's Burden

Consciences, flourished mysteriously during the reign of Wiseman, and in 1857 voted a gold chalice to Cardinal Barnabo. This compromising gift, accompanied by a hint that ten Anglican Bishops favoured Reunion, was through Manning's action declined. By 1864 the Holy and Universal Inquisition was induced to condemn the "branch" theory of the Reunionists. De Lisle informed Wiseman that Lee and Littledale, the High Church leaders, were willing to disclose names on condition they did not reach Dr. Manning or the Bishop of Birmingham! Unfortunately, Dr. Manning not only drafted Wiseman's reply, but became Archbishop, and to him De Lisle gave the information that 3,000 Anglican clergy were in the A.P.U.C., of whom 200 had dispatched a letter to the Holy Inquisition. Manning wrote to Ullathorne (August 24, 1865):

"De Lisle has, I fear, some letters of the Cardinal's which imply more tolerance of the Union than could be wished, but Mr. Lee's statements are obviously untrue. Meanwhile a letter is preparing in Rome to their rejoinder." September 8, 1865: "Canon Morris will send you some letters about Brother Ignatius. There must have been some want of caution at least. The Bishop of Southwark tells me that the Unionists went on board the French Fleet as priests, and deceived the officers so fully that the Catholic priest could hardly undeceive them with the rescript in his hand. They are boasting also that the Catholics go to Confession to them."

Manning decided to "cut down to the bone." As Talbot found it "almost impossible to make Italians understand the Anglican mind," Manning expounded the mysteries of Anglo-Catholicism in person to Rome that autumn, when he was unexpectedly aided by the arrival of the aforesaid Brother Ignatius, a parson wearing a Benedictine habit and accompanied by a "Sister" of the same Order, whom the Pope would have received more seriously if they had not brought a Benedictine

Henry Edward Manning

baby, a child called "the infant Samuel," whom they had innocently adopted. In November a condemnation was issued of the A.P.U.C., and that winter divines waxed hot. Manning wrote to Ullathorne (March 15, 1866): "I see Dr. Pusey is again writing an answer to me about explanations. What can explanation do for a man who does not believe the voice of the explainer to be Divine? He may agree with the explanation, but that is not faith." In his notes he analysed Pusey into adjectives as "intellectually contradictory, obscene, suicidal; morally *scholios*, bitter, *pertinax*; ecclesiastically unlawful, foolish." Bishop Wilberforce wrote of Puseyism as "the nauseous Romanising peculiarities of mowing apes," while Manning was fairer in terming Ritualism "Private Judgment in gorgeous raiment." He respected the Protestant, but he could not forgive the school of Littledale, who insisted he had procured condemnation by misrepresentation. "I am afraid, as Lord Thurlow said, the rogue lies, and he knows he lies," wrote Manning, and would not encourage them to come to Rome on false pretences. As he wrote to De Lisle: "I fully agree that any haste or driving would be dangerous. It is the wrong end of the Shepherd's crook. I think haste dangerous unless they see the jurisdiction of the Divine Voice. Then delay would be dangerous, not haste." Manning's policy drove the advanced Reunionists to take an amazing step. Driven to choose between the Fisherman and the deep sea, they actually embarked on the latter. Dr. Lee, accompanied by two other Anglican clergymen, Mossman and Seccombe, took ship from Venice in 1877, and to avoid trespassing on any diocese they received valid Orders as Greek Bishops on the high seas. They returned to England, and in an old studio at Lambeth Bishop Lee reordained a number of hesitating clergymen. After a short and subterraneous existence their society dissolved. Mrs. Lee became a Catholic, and found herself in the distress-

The Day's Burden

ing position of being married to an irregular Bishop. Lee and Mossman died in communion with Rome. Bishop Mossman wrote to Manning (December 14, 1883): "I am walking on a path which is as sharp as a razor's edge. But I also feel that so far I am upheld by the prayers of our Immaculate Mother. I know not how to express my gratitude to the Holy Father for sending me his special blessing." The curious document in which he, an Anglican Rector, surrendered as a Greek Bishop to a Roman Cardinal survives :

"I wish in my character of a Catholic Bishop, by which I mean as possessing true episcopal orders, to make to you as the Head of the Catholic Church in this land an unrestricted and unconditional submission as to the exercise of the episcopal office for the time to come. The extent of what I have done in the way of Orders you know. With regard to the Sacrament of Confirmation, it has been my chief pleasure. If you tell me to discontinue this, I will of course do so."

But the wandering Bishop whom Manning was most anxious to place was Errington. He conceived the brilliant plan of setting him at the head of a restored Scotch Hierarchy. An exchange of letters took place, Manning writing (February 26, 1868) :

"*Confidential.* Letters from Rome which reached me to-day direct me to communicate with your Grace upon a subject in which the Holy See requires your intervention. I write, therefore, to ask in what way it would be most convenient for you to give me an opportunity of meeting and laying the subject before you. Would it be convenient to you to meet me at Liverpool or any other place, as you may prefer? I shall be happy to come wheresoever you may fix. It would, however, be more easy for me if the place were somewhere short of the Isle of Man. I need not say what joy it would give me if you should decide to come to London and to make any use you will of this house."

Henry Edward Manning

Jacob could not have written more pleasantly to Esau, and Errington replied (March 3, 1868) :

“ I was very much gratified by the receipt of your very kind letter, and immediately turned my mind to consider the best method of carrying out its object. The weather at present is so annually stormy that it is difficult to make an appointment for a given day, without renouncing all care about the sea, in Liverpool. I feel very grateful for your kind invitation to York Place, and should have had great pleasure in asking you to visit our Island, if it had not been for the present storms and the very reasonable wish you express that our meeting should be somewhere short of the *infames scopuli*.”

Manning then broke the news (March 5, 1868) :

“ *Private*. The Holy Father has decided to restore the Hierarchy to Scotland, and directs that your willingness should be ascertained to go as Apostolic Administrator to carry out this great purpose.”

On April 29 the two Archbishops met, and Manning urged the proposal of Propaganda that Errington should become Archbishop of Edinburgh, if he would first carry out the restoration of the Hierarchy as delegate. It was a home see which would not involve the honourable banishment of Trinidad ; but at the advice of friends, who regarded it as effrontery on Manning's part, he declined. Bishop Turner of Salford wrote to him : “ You are relentless, and won't give in to Barnabo, or rather to Manning and Talbot. There is humbug in what Barnabo says, and there is also humbug in the reasons which you assign for not going. I think you should invite Talbot, and then you might appoint the Monsignor *Delegato Apostolico per la Scozia!*” Clifford wrote : “ In plain English, the Holy See has got into a mess, and we make an appeal to you to help us out.” Manning reluctantly accepted his refusal : “ I do not feel that I ought in any way to contest it. I am too well assured that you have fully weighed and appreciated all the motives on either

The Day's Burden

side. I will therefore obey your wish in making that decision known to the Holy See."

Except for Ullathorne and Cornthwaite, Manning was not on cordial relations with the Bishops. Suffragans can be difficult at the best of times, and Manning found that the only united Hierarchy was one he nominated himself. The first vacancy was caused by the death of Dr. Hogarth of Hexham. Manning wrote the *terna* to Talbot (March 4, 1866): "Platt, Chadwick, Knight. The first and third are impossible, the second is good. In all questions he is on the higher side." Chadwick was made Bishop. Manning's advice was almost always taken concerning the *ternas*. He perhaps wished to introduce Herbert Vaughan into Grant's place at Southwark, but he was responsible for making him Bishop of Salford when Turner died. The old Hierarchy died off, with the exception of Ullathorne, of whom Manning stood in some respect and fear, especially when Ullathorne used to inform him that he was a Catholic Bishop when a certain Mr. Manning was learning his catechism! Rarely did Manning use his Metropolitan right to scold a Bishop. How tactfully he could do so appears in the following letter to a Bishop who had burst into the papers:

"If it were possible for you to put off your character as a Bishop I should not venture to express the regret I feel. But as we are so identified with our office that our personality is subordinate, and as whatsoever touches one member of the Episcopate touches all and the Episcopate itself, I feel very deeply that there is no little danger lest the writers in newspapers should recognise only the person and forget the office he bears. We are in days when we cannot venture to expose our office to any slight."

Manning felt that the education of the clergy was deficient, and proceeded to a series of moves on the chess-board which upset the other Bishops. He placed an Irish Oblate, O'Callaghan, over the English College in Rome;

Henry Edward Manning

he set up a Tridentine Seminary in Hammersmith, and moved the Divinity School from St. Edmund's, Ware, overnight. According to Talbot, the English College supported more Italians than students, and failed to attract the converts, who "went sight-seeing or became Jesuits." The Pope requested the English Bishops to stop sending their *Scarto* to Rome. The upward turn in the College came with Mr. Giles, who edified Rome by "working like a horse." Manning suppressed play-acting, and decided to break up the "fatal notion that Englishmen must be treated differently" from less favoured nationalities. When O'Callaghan was placed in the Rector's chair, Bishop Goss of Liverpool wrote to Ullathorne: "*Private*. The treatment of Dr. Neve is infamous. We are little better than Vicars-General, and we shall soon be something less." Bishop Brown added: "Unless we take due notice of these doings, we may as well have Talbot Pope and Stonor Prefect of Propaganda. Surely no one of us except the Archbishop will employ O'Callaghan as agent. Why not continue Dr. Neve?"

Neve behaved very well, attributing his dismissal to Talbot, not to Manning. "Talbot never said a word of his reasons for dismissing me, so I asked him. He replied that I was so fresh from Eton and Oxford that I did not understand Catholic young men. I remarked that he was fresher from both places." Henceforth Manning ruled the College and Bishops until Clifford complained in 1870: "Humble pie is a very good thing in its way now and then, but we may get too much of it even in Lent!" But Manning had long realised the value of autocracy. Ullathorne described Wiseman's meetings as "useless and ridiculous," as the minority always disputed the majority, and the old Cardinal argued with each Bishop in detail. Manning found episcopal peace depended on restricting episcopal discussion to Low Week.

Manning had attempted a seminary at Chichester, and

The Day's Burden

just as Lavington texts often flowered into Westminster Pastorals, he built his long-dreamed Seminary at Hammersmith. He found there an old convent where Miss Bedingfeld used to take her mistress, Queen Adelaide, until King William IV.'s curiosity was aroused, and it was arranged that he should see what a nun looked like. At a given hour the King drove to Hampton Court, while a nun stood up in the window-seat in religious garb. The King laughed heartily, but sent a chest of tea annually to the convent. Here, amid the old tradition and within the suburban roar of London, he hoped to raise up a Tridentine Seminary. The students of St. Edmund's were transferred, with Weathers as President, and before 1881 the sum of £27,000 was spent. The seminary endured only while Manning lived. With his Catholic University in Kensington it must be accounted a distinct failure. He had to suffer as a pioneer much as Archbishop Cullen, who for similar reasons founded his seminary at Clonliff, near Dublin, finding Maynooth, as Manning found St. Edmund's, not sufficiently Ultramontane. Cullen essayed a University in Dublin, which failed in spite of Newman. Manning erected one in London, which failed perhaps because Newman was not involved.

Manning, having decided that Oxford was "a fool's Paradise" and forbidden Catholics to attend, felt bound to proffer a University of his own. He thought Catholic parents wished to send their sons for social reasons. "To connive at the conduct of the rich in sending their sons to Oxford and to forbid the poor to send their children to Board Schools would be a visible partiality and injustice which the poor would be quick to see and prompt to resent." The old Catholics were as anxious to go to the Universities as into the Services. Only the Ultramontane converts, who had cut Oxford and Cambridge out of their hearts, were unwilling that their sons should grope among the stepping-stones of their own

Henry Edward Manning

dead selves. Manning felt a pride rather than a principle in blocking every attempt to send Catholics to Oxford. When he translated it into principle the Holy See supported him as readily as she allowed his successor, on a wiser showing, to reverse his policy. Manning was hard-pressed to find statistics that Catholics lost their faith at the University. He applied to Cullen, whose policy was to keep Catholics from Trinity, Dublin. Cullen gravely gave two instances in penal days, when one became a Dean and the other a Bishop in the Establishment. Provost Mahaffy is authority for the statement that conversion at Trinity has been five to one in favour of Rome. At Oxford it was a hundred to one. But Manning held out against his laity and even against Ullathorne, who would have welcomed Newman back at Oxford. A note of Manning's reads: "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 B.'s general confession.'"

Dr. Jenkyns, who had discovered Ward, afterwards discovered Jowett. Manning did not fear Newman at Oxford so much as Jowett. Gallicans he fought in the Church, but Germanisers he dreaded more. German thought had made Balliol a Doubting Castle. Jowett discovered Plato, and led a counter-movement to Pusey and the Catholic Revival. Manning thought it derogatory for Catholics to sit under either. Rome proved more tolerant than Manning, who wrote, however, to Ullathorne (April 26, 1866): "We are quite content that things should remain as they are, that Catholics should be discouraged without being forbidden. For our purpose ten Catholics are as good as a hundred."

The Oxford question widened the breach with Newman, who desired to found an Oratory there, but how he could do so without attracting Catholics was the difficulty. The Bishops met to discuss it, and Ullathorne

The Day's Burden

wrote to Manning (March 18, 1867): "I have thought it my duty as Dr. Newman's Bishop and natural protector to request your Grace so to provide that in the name of the Bishops Dr. Newman be invited to be in London on the occasion." Manning agreed (March 19, 1867): "A few words from you or from him, distinguishing the Oxford Oratory from the other question, will, I hope, suffice to satisfy a large number of those who are full of respect and regard to Dr. Newman, and enable them to feel glad of anything which gives him a work in Oxford." Newman's reply to Manning's query was sent to Ullathorne (April 22, 1867): "I have never put in writing an answer to the question of the Archbishop's, so I answer it now. Do I go to Oxford with an intention of bringing young Catholics there? The answer is plain. I have no such intention in going there, nor ever had. But the answer will be as fallacious as the question is ensnaring, unless I add my going will in fact attract Catholics there." This Manning had realised, and he wrote so firmly to Rome that Newman was forbidden to go. Manning found it necessary to soothe Ullathorne (April 6, 1867):

"The knowledge that Dr. Newman has been led to regard me as opposed to him will not hinder my doing the amplest justice to him. And now, my dear Lord, I thank you for your openness towards me. I should lament also anything which should cause reserve between us, and on my part nothing shall be left undone to avert it. You will, I think, be surprised when you know the limits of my intervention in the question. Viewed as a question of a better Church and a more vigorous Mission, you have the sympathy of everyone. It is, moreover, simply Diocesan. But it is impossible so to isolate the subject. And in this respect the whole Church in England is affected."

Ullathorne not only defended Newman, but gave Manning a piece of his mind. Newman was being attacked for receiving as a pupil a New Zealander *en*

Henry Edward Manning

route for Oxford. Manning wrote to Ullathorne frankly (May 3, 1867):

“ I did not misunderstand you. My own meaning was not that you had ‘sacrificed anything in your course of conduct,’ but that you had so stated your case as to lay yourself open to protect Dr. Newman. I was able to concur in your letter to Rome, and I was resolved not to raise needless questions, but I felt that it was an understatement. I believe both Weld Blundell and Redington have received grave harm *citra jacturam fidei*. As to the nationality of the men, I felt no care except as showing that the attraction had spread to New Zealand, which greatly confirms my objections.”

Lynx eyes followed Redington’s trip to Rome as a test of Oxford influence. At the tombs of the Apostles he expressed an archæological doubt, but the situation was saved by the Irish Dominican, Father Burke, who forthwith ordered him to kneel and say his prayers. Manning was inexorable in keeping the Universities under ban. By 1872 only eight Catholics dared his displeasure, but they were reported to Ullathorne as “models of goodness and piety,” though there was a Siamese at Balliol “who ought to be a Catholic, but is an infidel,” reported the Jesuits, who took charge of the Oxford Mission. A decade later there were only four English among the ten Catholics at Oxford, but they all came to the Sacraments. Manning was implacable. “There is abundant mischief short of losing faith, such as losing humility, modesty, respect for authority, and, in a word, the *sentire cum ecclesia*.”

Meantime Catholics, deprived of Newman at Oxford, were invited to study under Mgr. Capel at Kensington. Rome was never decisive on the University Question, and Manning wrote to Ullathorne: “The College decision is very obscure, and I have no *lettera di compagna*, and know nothing further. It is rather good wishes than directions.” He proposed a board of

The Day's Burden

examiners, created out of all the existing Colleges. There was a nominal committee of five Bishops, but Clifford was "afraid that we are striving for an impossibility." Manning kept his course with heroic tenacity. By the time he had produced "a House of Higher Studies in London," all the Bishops forsook him and fled, partly for reasons of financial prudence. The paradox was that the University of London was the only one Catholics were allowed to frequent. Manning queried Ullathorne (November 29, 1873):

"Would it be safe to attempt to hinder our youth, intended for law or medicine, to get a legal degree? If we exclude the London University, should we not be co-operating with those who are still endeavouring to get our youth to Oxford?" June 24, 1874: "I hope on reflection you will say that fruit must be immature till the tree is planted. Cheap criticism is busy everywhere, above all with those who wish us not to succeed. I am not discouraged. We shall be almost at death's door, but I believe we shall not die."

Manning was criticised for not inviting Newman or the Jesuits, but Newman wrote of his first idea: "His plan is simply a Jesuit one." A good staff was collected. Paley, the convert grandson of Paley of the *Evidences*, left Cambridge. Barff taught chemistry, and Mivart, a Harrow convert, kept up a running fire on Darwin, which for long excluded Mivart from the Athenæum Club. At the head was Mgr. Capel, a popular preacher, whom Disraeli drew as Mgr. Catesby in *Lothair*. At one time there were as many as sixteen pupils. It was squall and squabble to the end, when Manning was compelled to suspend Capel. The Bishops kept aloof, and even Ullathorne was angered by Capel offering the post of Pro-Vice-Rector to Mgr. Croke Robinson: "You have attempted to turn Mr. Robinson from his ecclesiastical allegiance." Manning poured oil on the troubled waters (March 5, 1876):

Henry Edward Manning

“Father Robinson, who is ill, has sent me your lordship’s *epistola ipsismet saxis durior*. How can I soften your inexorable heart? If I were Orpheus or could even play on fiddle, I would try. But perhaps the sound of the jews’ harp may draw tears. What if we were to swop? If I cannot soften the *cor adamantinum* to give Father Robinson to this work which the Holy Father has blessed, will you take in exchange a student of the English College who may be ordained priest at once? By all the penitential austerities of Lent, I adjure you to be generous as you are strong.”

But the University was never more than an academical expression. There was a Senate on paper, one of whom once inquired his duties as Governor. “To govern,” replied Manning. “But supposing we differed from your Eminence, what could we do?” “A great deal; you could resign!” Another layman made an objection, and learnt that in the Catholic Church “there is no House of Commons.” Manning was courageous to the last. His final order of retreat was to Wilfrid Meynell (February 15, 1882): “Please to say in the next *Weekly Register*, the Catholic University College has been removed from Cromwell Road and united to St. Charles’ College. A new wing to contain the library and museum is building, and a chemical laboratory will be added hereafter.” He was never more splendid than in defeat. But no college was in vain that produced a Wilfrid Ward.

As Archbishop in the sixties, Manning could but have a Roman policy. The Temporal Power was then at stake, and far removed from antiquarian or academical discussion. It was a fact, as vivid and controverted in the world as the Irish or Alsace questions since. Manning made it a mystical touchstone to modern politics. As a preacher he claimed it was “a law of the conscience, an axiom of the reason.” When he raised it to “a theological certainty,” Lord Acton took him to task. When he prophesied Anti-Christ would come to

The Day's Burden

Rome, Talbot sent warning that he was inopportune. The idea displeased the authorities as much as Mgr. Benson's *Lord of the World* on a similar theme. He gave his lectures to Gladstone, who sighed, "Alas! it shows me how far we are now from one another," and sent in return a public reference to Rome "which would not, I think, have been offensive to Dante or Savonarola." Later he invoked Passaglia: "I now find myself invoking the child of Loyola against the child of Oxford." Manning answered (October 26, 1861):

"In the train yesterday I read the *Child of Calvin*, and I think the three paternities would disown their sons. Passaglia I have known intimately these ten years. He is a very child in whose mouth Latin is mother-tongue, with great book-learning, and as long as he was in the Society of Jesus out of scrapes. Since, he has behaved like a baby. But this would not alter the truth *ex ore infantium*, if he has got it, as I think not. But Guizot writes like a man."

Garibaldi's triumph in England was a sore trial to Manning, though aware of the national weakness for all revolutionaries except Irish. He dedicated an unpublished letter of biting comment to Mr. Cardwell, one of the few ministers who remained aloof. "Was the Duke of Sutherland aware that he was inviting the principles of '89 to Stafford House?" And of Government seizures of English supplies in Turin he asked bitterly: "What image and superscription may be upon the money, and what brands upon the rifles?" Gladstone saw Manning's drift, and promised (August 1, 1864): "If the day ever comes when the Temporal Power has to be abandoned, and when I can be of the smallest use so far as the policy of this country is concerned in assisting to secure whatever belongs to the dignity, safety, and independence of the Sovereign Pontiff, you will, I hope, find me not unready." The day came and the promise was kept.

Henry Edward Manning

Manning wrote in his best style of mystical politics (October 24, 1864):

“ You will smile when I say that I believe the Temporal Power to be the nexus between the revelation of God’s truth and law and the civil society of the world. Time is fighting for them and against us, and Our Lord and St. Paul have foretold that it should be so. But time is neither truth nor right, but the time-spirit or dominant tide of the human will. When was it ever otherwise? Time has been fighting us these 1,800 years in various forms and with lulls and truces, but always and irreconcilably opposed. You do not suspect me of contending for modes of administration or class interests, or the Divine right of Dukes or Kings to govern badly. You know me too well for that. What I contend for is the great providential order of Christian Europe. And I believe that the cry for Rome is not only for its traditions of Empire, but because it is the key of an order of politics, which keeps Anti-Christ under the feet of truth and grace. But I am getting away from the order of politics into the order of prophecy. And yet prophecy is the future of those laws and principles which, though not to be found in Bentham, govern the world, and will govern it until we leave off to date our letters *anno Salutis*.”

When Gladstone assured him, “ I am very glad to see by a letter from Garibaldi that he is not coming here. Am I not now a good boy?” Manning answered: “ I do not wish you even remotely allied to Bright in home policy or Garibaldi in foreign. They are both factions, not governments. I acknowledge that you are a very good boy about our friend G.” But stiff they remained with each other to the end, only putting their elasticity into occasional controversial catapulting. When Gladstone lost his Oxford seat Manning attempted consolation: “ This crisis is for you politically what a certain date was for me religiously,” he wrote, but Gladstone groaned: “ It seemed meant in the kindest sense, but that the man is gone out and has left nothing but the

The Day's Burden

priest. No shirt-collar ever took such a quantity of starch." At the same time Manning wrote to Lady Herbert: "I have just seen Gladstone. We are most open with each other. But his obstinate narrowness of mind is phenomenal." And, after arranging Gladstone's visit to Rome (September 11, 1866): "He appears to understand the question far more clearly and completely than he did. I trust he will open his mind to Cardinal Antonelli. If his visit to Rome passes happily, much good may come of it." Gladstone told Acton: "My impression is that he speaks to me after having sought and received his cue from Rome." Pius received four English statesmen that autumn. Gladstone he liked, but did not understand. Cardwell he understood without liking. Clarendon he liked and understood. The Duke of Argyll he could be excused for neither understanding nor liking. Clarendon's son-in-law was Odo Russell, the unofficial but very busy British representative to the Vatican.

Manning believed in the Temporal Power, because "a subject Pope is no Pope" and "a national Pope a nuisance to all"; because Christendom and not Italy had the right to Rome; because "law and order are at stake for all the world," including the British Empire. He also held the deposing power. "The Pope had the Power *de jure*," and he pointed out that in 1,800 years the Popes have deposed seven Kings, whereas the English, according to Lord Mansfield, have deposed seven and murdered six. "Protestants place it in the people. Catholics in Pope and people." He felt prophetically certain that if the keystone of Temporal Power fell out of the European arch the break-up of Europe would commence. It fell out in 1870. Was he right as a prophet, though wrong as a statesman? It was a breach of the same international law which led to England's entry into the world-war of 1914.

CHAPTER XIII: IRELAND

“It is evident that upon the future of Ireland hangs the future of the British Empire.”—*Manning to Earl Grey, 1868.*

To be an Archbishop or Premier in Westminster is to face the Irish Question. Like most Englishmen of culture, Manning had never felt the need of animosity toward the country his had most deeply wronged. At Lavington he had denounced rich living “while thousands of our fellow-citizens in Ireland are dying on seaweed,” though in regard to “the persecuted Church in Ireland” he felt some Anglican nervousness, writing to Bishop Wilberforce: “I do not believe the Irish Established Church can stand long, and that will set going wedges, pulleys, wheels, and levers which will heave the English Church off its point of rest.” After the Famine and the Diaspora of the Irish race the Irish Ghetto became a spiritual fact in England. As a Catholic Manning found himself “working for the Irish occupation of England.” But as Archbishop he saw wider, writing to Talbot: “The thing which will save us from low views about the Mother of God and the Vicar of Our Lord is the million Irish in England.” He found under him Irish priests, who, like a spiritual Swiss Guard in an alien land, were faithful to the ancient English Faith. Manning’s policy was to combine the Irish invaders with the hereditary Catholic garrison they had relieved, reinforced, and emancipated. His first step was to enter into alliance with the Irish Hierarchy: “It is difficult, but I think it can be done.” “They were suspicious of Manning, but they had been afraid of Wiseman,” reflected Talbot. McHale was “a good man, but unmanageable”; Dr. Cullen “anti-English, but thoroughly Roman.” With the pious but formidable personality of the latter Manning broached alliance.

Ireland

The last word has not been written of Paul Cardinal Cullen, who for a quarter-century ruled the Irish Bishops (save one), and bridled Ireland. As Archbishop of Dublin he was Primate of Ireland, but not of all Ireland. He also found McHale "unmanageable." His piety and his politics were of the Roman school. He had retained his Rector's robe as an Archbishop, and treated the Bench of Bishops like collegians, who signed and registered his decrees, until the day when the young Archbishop Croke dared to move an amendment and demand a ballot. The breathless tension was only broken by the gigantic Bishop of Waterford, "Long John," seconding Cashel. The amendment was carried. Without a word the old Cardinal picked up his papers and passed out of the sight of those present for ever. No Irishman was more fiercely attacked by both Irish and English. The pen of every man turned against this solitary ecclesiast, who, however, was probably the only English-speaking theologian to have influenced the thought of Rome. He warred incessantly against Dublin Castle, Archbishop Whately, the Fenians, and sometimes Dr. McHale. McHale wished to keep English influence out of the Catholic University as much as Cullen wished to avoid Irish Nationalism. The Irish University Question and Protestant Disestablishment became the two subjects of active and offensive alliance between the Irish and English Primates. Manning found in Cullen a colleague very different from the Cullen of legend, as reported in Archbishop Benson's *Life*—"a cruel man sent here by Cardinal Wiseman to put an end to the Gallican clergy!" or as shuddering Englishmen like Lord Russell wrote, looking across the water: "Think of a country divided between Archbishop Cullen and Lord Roden, both very strong and both quite rabid!" In the lurid lights of Ireland he grew strangely blurred, but to the Government he was an unaccountable force. They feared him as they did not fear his brother of

Henry Edward Manning

Westminster. Under Manning's robes lay Oxford and Anglicanism, layers which afforded points of calculation and conciliation, but Cullen seemed to spell the mysterious and unappeasable domination of Rome.

Manning immediately wrote to Cullen (January 19, 1866) of "an identity of principles" needing only "a fuller and more personal knowledge of each other to renew the union which once partially existed." He referred to a visit Cullen paid him that winter to discuss the Disestablishment Cullen yearned for and the Episcopal Union Manning hoped for, writing (December 8, 1865) that the English Bishops would require two points of the Government—"a cessation of the anti-Roman policy in Italy; justice to Catholics in the full sense, especially in education and the treatment of our prisons and poor." Manning's dream of union and quiet-sailing was disturbed by the outbreak of Fenianism, which Bishops took steps to make a reserved sin. Every effort was made to rid the Church of her compromising though devoted sons, who Manning feared "would sooner turn upon priests than Protestants." Their disinterestedness was not understood by the theologians. Yet many Fenians were to die in Papal armies or become priests and missionaries. It was the Fenians who brought the Holy Mass into English prisons. Manning informed Cullen (February 5, 1866): "Your Grace will be happy to know that the Fenian prisoners in Pentonville have asked for Mass, and the Government has granted it. This is a strange victory, on which I make no comment except 'Thank God!' But it will console your Grace for the poor men." However, Cullen consoled himself further by denunciation, which Manning felt bound to follow. Much as he disliked an anti-Irish policy, he felt it "exhibited the Church in its true light as the source of public order. I have never known a more propitious moment to make the Government feel that they cannot do without us." To Ullathorne he wrote: "We have

Ireland

an opportunity for showing that Mazzinianism and Fenianism are one in principle, and that our Government is reaping as it has sown." Manning literally preached to the spirits in prison when he addressed the Fenians in Millbank, not far from the site of Westminster Cathedral. Boyle O'Reilly never forgot the beauty of his words on the Prodigal Son, whereat the Fenians wept.

Ullathorne had written (December 30, 1866): "We have had a good haul here from Pollock's church. He taught his *élite* to say the Rosary, and then attacked it as Popish. We have a nest of Fenians here who are giving us some trouble. They have used the pretext of my last Pastoral to try to alienate the people from me, and to put me in the same box with you, so at last we are fellows in misfortune. I hope to do without publicly noticing these men, whose persons and movements are known pretty well, as I do not want to feed their importance. But if I see the need arise, I shall come out sharply and mark them off."

Manning went down to Birmingham and cried untruly in the Town Hall: "Show me an Irishman who has lost the Faith, and I will show you a Fenian." He wrote on return (January 31, 1867): "The four days at Birmingham did me much good. I little thought what you were letting me into in the Town Hall. The Fenians of Glasgow and Connaught have pounded me most amusingly. I am a true English Liberal after all. However, it has done no harm, and *The Times* of to-day has found out that I am no Liberal!" On his journey he added to his repertory of droll stories. At Birmingham an Anglican Bishop entered with his wife. As the train started a clergyman handed him a piece of Fenian literature distributed in the Catholic churches, with "Depend upon it, Manning is at the bottom of it." The Bishop, who promised to make it hot for the aforesaid when he reached London, was startled by a solemn voice from the opposite corner: "If you will give me that I

Henry Edward Manning

will see that it is not given out at any Catholic church in future; I am Manning!" After the next stop Manning was alone!

Meantime Cullen had been Cardinalised. Manning was delighted "for the sake of Ireland, which would receive a token of the Holy Father's love and also a glory in the sight of the world. We are in stormy days, and at any moment may be *ludibrium ventis*." They certainly were buffeted by the Fenian winds as they blew in the *Connaught Patriot*. "I had the honour of being there named and denounced with your Eminence. We were described as driving Fenians from their faith," wrote Manning to Cullen (February 10, 1867). Cardinal Cullen, whose litany, deducible from his letters, was "From Whatelyism, Fenianism, and *cholera morbus*, deliver us!" answered (February 13, 1867):

"We have great reports to-day about a Fenian movement in Chester. I have heard it stated on good authority that the great rising was nothing more or less than a crowd of unarmed workmen who were going to witness a prize-fight, and who were obliged to travel some distance to avoid the police. I suppose before night the truth will be known. Anyhow, I think Ireland will take no part in such a foolish movement. Indeed, it appears that our Fenians are now getting more common sense. The only evil effect we have now to apprehend is the neglect of the Sacraments. However, I must say that there were never so many penitents at the confessional and so many communicants in our churches as at present, notwithstanding all the Fenian agitation."

The good Cardinal had not realised cause and effect. It is because men expect to be called to die for their country that they fill the confessional. Manning scribbled in his notebook: "My heart bleeds for those who are deceived by their higher and nobler affections. They believe themselves to be serving in a sacred and holy war for their country and religion." But he enjoyed the discomfiture of the Government: "I have warned those

Ireland

who have praised, flattered, fostered, abetted, justified, glorified the Italian Revolution that the same principles would recoil upon themselves. They have *come!* The Church condemns them both in Italy and in Ireland." He wrote a Pastoral, which he sent to Gladstone and Disraeli (April 13, 1867): "I should not trouble you with the enclosed if Lady Gainsborough had not expressed the wish that you may know how we express ourselves about Fenianism. I cannot overstate my anxiety on this subject. Nothing will lessen it but a large and adequate policy for Ireland." Cardinal Cullen offered an amendment (April 8, 1867):

"on a passage of your beautiful Pastoral where you state that if Ireland continue to progress for twenty years to come as she has in the last twenty she will be like the province of the Rhine or like Belgium. Unfortunately, the last twenty years have pressed very heavily on Ireland. Now, if things be as I think they are, and were they to continue their downward course for another quarter of a century, I fear the country would be more like Algiers or Palestine."

His remedy for Fenianism was Disestablishment, a hint which Manning passed to Gladstone. Two years previously he had hinted: "We were once united on the basis of your book on Church and State. You have departed, if not from that basis, at least from the application. Your whole policy is to separation of Church and State."

During the battle for Disestablishment Gladstone, through Manning, kept in touch with Cullen. The latter was statesman enough to desire ecclesiastical equality rather than financial spoils (August 17, 1867):

"In my opinion the proposed division of the property of the Church would contribute to uphold Protestantism in Ireland. Probably, too, the poor Catholics, now so generous, would withdraw their oblations on seeing us accept a portion of the Church property which they abhor, so that in a short time we might be reduced to the condition of the poor priests in Italy. Finally, if Parliament

Henry Edward Manning

undertakes to divide the spoils of the Establishment, I am sure they would not give us anything worth accepting."

A very shrewd note. Manning wrote (May 15, 1868): "Late events have placed me in a difficulty as regards Mr. Disraeli, and I have not liked to communicate with him. I will take care that your Eminence's suggestion as to the Irish Church Endowments shall reach Mr. Gladstone. Great progress has been made, which cannot be wholly lost. We shall have a hard fight." December 8, 1868: "Everything I can do by word or by letter for Ireland will be done with all my heart and strength." He wrote to Disraeli (May 21, 1868):

"I remember your saying that if there could be a mesmeric understanding between the chiefs of the two sides of the House much might be done.

"I am able to say of my own knowledge that any favourable proposal from the Government on the subject of the Catholic University would not only encounter no opposition, but would be assisted. I believe I may say this includes the granting of a charter. What I write is not from second hand. I can add that the Chief I conferred with is in the front, and he fully recognises the need of removing the Catholic education of Ireland from the turbulent region of politics."

The moment his work for Ireland required the sacrifice of his friendship with Disraeli, Manning wrote (December 2, 1868):

"I have felt that a ravine, I will not say a gulf, opened between us when the Resolutions on the Irish Church were laid upon the table of the House. I regretted this, as I had hoped to see the scheme of the Catholic University happily matured; but with my inevitable conviction as to the Irish Church I felt that I ought not to trespass upon your kindness, which I can assure you I shall remember with much pleasure."

When consulted, Rome sent word through Odo Russell to Lord Clarendon that he could not do better

Ireland

than consult Manning on the Irish Church Question (February 5, 1869): "Cardinal Antonelli had quite recently discussed the Irish Church Question with Dr. Manning, and he could not sufficiently repeat how much impressed he had been by the Archbishop's knowledge, opinions, sentiments, views and arguments, and how entirely he subscribed to them."

Manning flung himself into the fray with intense feeling. The true reasons for Disestablishment he noted to himself were—

"Because it is not a Church; it is an anti-Catholic religion; it perverts the action of the civil power; it has persecuted the Catholic Faith; it insults it now by lording over it; it poisons and embitters all social life; it is a badge of ascendancy."

To Gladstone he was writing in the tone of (March 24, 1868):

"It is no question of religion, but of political justice. Anyone who believes the Protestant Church in Ireland to be the true religion must desire to see it disembarrassed of an injustice to a whole people, which would turn their hearts even from the twelve Apostles. It is the most Imperial question of our times and the necessary preparation for a new civil order." And a few days later: "If this wrong were righted everything else would be easier. I don't think it a leap in the dark, but a step onward into the light."

Earl Grey sent Manning his pamphlet to beg its way with the Irish Bishops, being "persuaded that it is only by some such compromise that a most bitter contest can be averted, with all the evils it would bring in Ireland and on the Empire." Manning sent it cautiously and confidentially to Cullen (April 2, 1868): "There is no reason why some scheme, not Lord Grey's, but like Mr. Bright's, may not be modified and accepted, and in the accepting purified of all inconsistency, State dependence, and apparent self-interest." He felt like Cullen that "the unity, trust, and affection of the people is of a higher

Henry Edward Manning

order and more precious than all the world." But Disestablishment was the great thing, "pulling down of one whole wing of the Royal Supremacy." He was able to write to Gladstone (April 8, 1868):

"You will be glad to know that the Cardinal writes from Dublin, 'The victory was great indeed, but it is necessary that the supporters of the Resolutions should follow it up and turn it to practical purposes.' The Cardinal goes on to say, 'I think all the Bishops are persuaded that were we to consent to a share of the spoils of the Establishment our doing so would contribute to prevent any legislation. Our best policy is to adhere to the recommendation in our Resolutions that the rights of the poor should be attended to in disposing the property of the Establishment.'"

Manning knew where to ply a weak point in Gladstone (April 17, 1868):

"What a course Disraeli has taken! It must weaken him and his party." May 8, 1868: "Let the endowments be put overboard halfway between Galway and New York rather than mix them up with the question of your Resolutions."

The campaign which followed was of exceeding bitterness. At least one Protestant Archdeacon threatened gunpowder, and there was a symbolic attempt "to kick the Queen's Crown into the Boyne," which prevented the Queen visiting Ulster for thirty years. Though State patronage placed Archbishops like Whately and Trench at Dublin, it led to a state equally distressing to Low and High Churchmen. Samuel Wilberforce visited Ireland in the sixties, and brought back a woeful account of the Irish Episcopate, which may be quoted to show how indirectly Gladstone was benefiting the Church more than Churchmen witted. It was curious to note that such sees as did not fall to the Beresford family were largely filled by Irish names. The time had passed when the able O'Sullivan lost his mitre because of a brogue. Samuel noted from Dr. Todd of Trinity College:

Ireland

“The Primate [Beresford] not a Churchman, but a mere gentleman, and under influences.

“Knox [of Down] very foolish, without learning, piety, judgment, conduct or sense, appointed by a job, that his uncle should resign Limerick.

“The Bishop of Derry [Higgin], the richest see, sells all his [livings]—perhaps the best, but a weak, unread man.

“Ossory [O'Brien], the most indolent man, very strong, solifidian views.

“Cork [Fitzgerald], a man of ability; strong leaning to Arian or semi-Arian—a mere Whatelyian; but a strong will, and overbearing.

“Limerick [Griffin], clever, quite unread, no taste for Episcopate; was scarcely persuaded to become a Bishop. His living—the best in Ireland—was wanted, and so he was quite pressed into accepting. Not a devout man at all.

“Kilmore [Beresford], gentle and pleasing, not learned, and no backbone to lead.

“Meath [Singer], nothing but a popular preacher, now worn out.

“Cashel [Daly], very fond of money, and simply a low party man.”

By the end of the year Gladstone was Premier, and Manning wrote (December 4, 1868):

“I fully recognise the prudence of our not meeting now. All is changed since I wrote. Had you then been what you are, I should not have written. And so you are at the end men live for, but not, I believe, the end for which you have lived. It is strange so to salute you, but very pleasant. I take much consolation from the fact that what has made you so is a cause in which my whole heart can go with you.”

This was not the case with some Catholic hearts. Hope wrote to Manning that he had told Gladstone he would not vote for him, “since the destruction of an Establishment is to many more attractive than justice to Ireland.” And Cardinal Cullen wrote in alarm of a

Henry Edward Manning

Catholic Peer, Lord Gormanston, who intended using the liberty of the faithful to vote against their cherished hope : " His Lordship is a very good man. It is difficult to understand how he can make up his mind to support the Irish Establishment. It would be a great charity to keep him right."

The Bill passed the Lords and returned to the Commons on July 12, when Manning wrote to Cullen : " I write one line to thank your Eminence for your letter of last week, of which Mr. Gladstone is by this time well informed. Every day I am pressed to say whether you would accept glebes." But Cullen was resolute against concurrent endowment : " It will be a means of setting priest against Bishop and people against priest." Meantime glebes were voted to three denominations, which Gladstone regarded as violation of pledges, writing to Manning (July 13, 1869) : " *Private*. On Thursday at a quarter-past five I shall move, please God, to restore to the Preamble the words of our solemn compact with the people. I have no doubt of the thorough soundness of the body of your coreligionaries, but I think you will share my hope that with a view to unbroken moral force there shall be no defections." He asked Manning to apply " a little confirmation " to three members of the House—Moore, Blake, and Blennerhassett. After that he trusted " to knock down the rest of the house of cards." Manning went to the House, and found most of the Irish members wanted the glebes. In this case the Churchmen were wiser than the laity. Manning told Gladstone (July 14, 1869) : " The old endowments cannot be applied to religious purposes without breaking peace, wounding charity, and hindering religion. In good men like Lord Harrowby it is a mistaken piety, in Aubrey de Vere it is a poetry to wish for their application to religious uses." Before the end of July the victory had been won. Gladstone wrote (July 24, 1869) :

Ireland

“Your last note was of much value, and showed me at once with what an accurate eye you had measured the situation. But I cannot thank you for it alone. I am much indebted to you on behalf of the Government for the firm, constant, and discriminating support which you have afforded to our Bill during the arduous conflict, now happily concluded. Should you happen to write to Cardinal Cullen, pray be kind enough to ask him to accept a similar tribute of acknowledgment from me.”

To the Cardinal, Manning wrote the next day: “Let me give you and Ireland joy at this event. I feel it as a common joy in which I share. May God as greatly console Ireland as England has greatly afflicted it.” It was a triumph to which went the oratory of Bright, the statesmanship of Gladstone, the prayers of Spurgeon, and the vigilant wisdom of the Archbishops. It was more a victory for Liberalism than religion, though the normal view was that of the Pope, who, reported Dr. Grant, “was overjoyed and spread his delight to the Cardinals around him. He saw in the vote the overthrow of heresy.” It was also part of the Liberal advance which he so dreaded, and the following year was to show how temporary the alliance between Manning and Gladstone must be. They were to enter acrimonious contest at the very threshold of Peter.

Manning had found in Ireland a foil to the feelings of Garibaldian Englishmen. As he wrote to Ullathorne: “We have an opportunity for showing that Mazzinianism and Fenianism are one in principle, and that our Government is reaping as it has sown.” He twitted Gladstone with England’s hold on Ireland, drawing an answer (February 17, 1865): “I do not admit that the Queen holds it by coercion. Ireland has 105 representatives in the Commons. Will the Pope stand a like criterion and let his people speak by a representative assembly? I should deny that the coercion of one part of the country, politically constituted for six hundred years by the general

Henry Edward Manning

force and will of that country, was the same thing as the coercion of a country by foreign bayonets." Manning fired back (February 24, 1865):

"I am convinced that we hold Ireland by force, not only against the will of the majority, but in violation of all rights, natural and supernatural—that is, of political justice and of religious conscience. Moreover, that our bayonets there are as truly foreign bayonets as the French in Rome. Against a status of six hundred years I put one of a thousand. *Explicit controversarum Liber!*"

Manning felt as he wrote Ullathorne (April 4, 1866): "I have so strong a feeling that we are being compromised in the public opinion of England by the Fenian Movement. I have endeavoured to express it so as to be a protest in the face of public opinion on three points: The duty of loyalty. The sympathy due to Ireland. The Rights of the Holy See." But wherever he could serve Ireland without his official hand knowing, he did so. He applied to Cullen for literature: "I am very anxious to read them, as I have opportunity to press the subject *on both sides*: and my whole heart is with you and Ireland."

Cullen sent him a pamphlet by Isaac Butt which converted him to Home Rule. He immediately set about converting English statesmen, including Gladstone. He wrote a superbly reasoned letter to Earl Grey, which showed the way to English legislation for half a century. He protested against "the cynical sarcastic disdain" meted out by English writers to "that noble-hearted people." He asked if Fenian animosity had nothing to do "with the three confiscations of almost every acre of land in Ireland, and the folly of striving for three hundred years to force Protestantism on a Catholic people?"

In answer to Ullathorne's approval, Manning wrote (March 20, 1868):

"I thank you much for your kind words about my pamphlet. I was induced to write it for many reasons, especially by the desire of expressing a strong sympathy

Ireland

with our Irish brethren and people; and this was strengthened by the vexation of hearing some of our English leading Catholics talk in a very senseless and heartless way about 'sentimental grievances' and the like."

And in sending Gladstone a copy (March 11, 1868):

"It gives expression to feelings and convictions which powerfully govern the great mass of our people, who desire to see Great Britain and Ireland strong and peaceful. Believe me, the only hope of restoring Ireland to social order and peace is to give free course to the only powers of Christianity which control it. Weaken these in the upper classes, as they have been by various causes weakened in the lower, and you will have to deal with '98 over again. A true, full, unimpeded Catholic education is the only hope I know of keeping Ireland from American anarchy. For I know you do not wish either for the Duke of Cumberland with 24,000 men or with *The Times* for an Indian Mutiny or a Jamaica Massacre."

The turn of events often showed Gladstone fulfilling Manning as a prophet. Manning had been a quarter of a century ahead of him on Disestablishment. He had written to him from Lavington (April 29, 1845): "You may go on calling it the Irish Church and the Established Church, but it is a mere phrase. The work of the sixteenth century is undone in Ireland. It is a question of first principles. So much for Ireland!" But Ireland was yet to count much in Manning's life. He was to be land reformer and Home Ruler before Gladstone. In 1868 his letter to Earl Grey touched the constitutional demand of Ireland at high-water mark. He demanded "Religious Equality and an equitable Land System."

When the Land Bill of 1870 was put upon the Parliamentary stage, Manning wrote privately to Gladstone demanding fixity of tenure and judicial rents. But it needed ten years of agitation and a fighting Irish party to make such proposals practicable. As it was, the first wedge was inserted by the Land Bill of 1870, which

Henry Edward Manning

Gladstone explained to Manning as one "to prevent the landlord from using the terrible weapon of undue and unjust eviction by so framing the handle that it shall cut his hands with the sharp edge of pecuniary damages."

Manning could congratulate him (May 19, 1871):

"Yesterday I had a long conversation with two very advanced Irish politicians. They assured me that three years ago the desire for separation from England was greatly in the ascendant. That now the desire is equally strong for the integrity of the Empire. They ascribed this to a revived confidence in Parliament, and that to your two chief Irish measures. You have fairly earned this, which no English statesman has yet deserved."

When Home Rule appeared Manning wrote to Cullen that he was "fully prepared," but sought counsel. "If the programme be violated, I should oppose that violation and not Home Rule." But Cullen would have none of it (October 13, 1871): "The principal leaders in the movement here are professors of Trinity College and Orangemen, who are still worse. Their object appears to be to put out the present Ministry and get Disraeli into power." Manning acquiesced, writing: "The obvious fear is the International. All rivers run into the sea."

However, when Isaac Butt came into prominence, with a small, respectable party pledged to moral force, Manning challenged Gladstone (August 23, 1872):

"I am altogether unable to maintain the justice of our holding Ireland if the Pope had not a just sovereignty over Rome. My belief is that the action of Italy upon Rome is like the action of America upon Ireland. If you wish to know the will of Ireland, ask the Irish in our Colonies and in the United States. You will never get it in Ireland with 30,000 English and Scotch bayonets. Let the next election be taken in the presence of 200,000 American troops. Do not believe me if you like. But do not disregard me. Steer your course as if the rocks I have laid down in the chart were as certain as you may perhaps think them to be moonshine."

Ireland

Gladstone was nettled to reply that the American influence was nearly dead, that the bayonets in Ireland were Irish as well as English and Scotch, "but I know of no influence which they do or can exercise on the free expression of opinion." When Manning wrote a public letter to the Archbishop of Armagh, demanding "local self-government" and calling on "so-called Liberals" to "repent of their sympathy with the German penal laws," Gladstone sadly noted: "There is a sad air of unreality; it is on stilts all through."

But time brought reality, when famine and eviction precipitated Irish misery and English action. The eviction of the starving went up as a cry to Heaven, and as a blast upon the earth. It whistled through the lobbies of Westminster and afar in the corridors of the Vatican. Strife and revolution returned in their circuit to Ireland. Those who had foresight both for England's and Ireland's good grasped the idea of Home Rule. Manning was perhaps the first Prelate in the world to welcome it, writing to Ullathorne (March 2, 1873): "I see that Father Sherlock took the chair at a Home Rule meeting in Birmingham. My observation here is that Home Rule has divided the Irishmen and reclaimed many Fenians. Without in any way committing myself to it, I have been very tolerant about it, believing it to be like vaccination to smallpox."

Ullathorne replied (March 2, 1873): "The Vicar has just told me that he authorised Father Sherlock's presiding to prevent matters getting into unsafe hands. Had I known this, I scarcely think I should have approved, as it is not good for the clergy to take an open lead in these burning political questions. It would confirm the notion, which the Press is quite willing to work, that the Church is going in for democratic politics."

Manning was straining toward Home Rule against the pricks both of Cullen and Gladstone. Manning had sent Gladstone a copy of his letter to Lord Grey (March 11,

Henry Edward Manning

1868): "In one point I fear we may diverge, I mean education. I have just read Lord Mayo's scheme for the Catholic University. It will need treatment before it is accepted in Ireland, but it is capable of treatment." The Catholic University of Lord Mayo and Disraeli had failed, leaving bad blood between Manning and Disraeli. Short notes mark their first dealings and interviews. From Disraeli (December 8, 1867): "*Private*. We are not going to leave town, as my wife is still a prisoner in her room; therefore I am at your service on any day convenient." December 27, 1867: "The Fenians give me so much trouble and take up so much time that I fear I have seemed to neglect your letter. Would to-morrow suit your Grace?" Manning had heard from Cullen that he was "in favour of a Catholic University with an independent charter and under Catholic control," and that Dr. Moriarty was the only Irish Bishop antithetic. With the New Year he wrote (January 14, 1868): "The day I received the last and the copy of Lord Derby's letter, I wrote to Mr. Disraeli. Yesterday I saw him for a moment. He told me that he had acted on my letter." Cullen had invited Manning's view, which was that the Irish Bishops should accept a charter without endowment. "Would it not be best to accept it? Would not endowment come by force of events?" Manning found his exquisite tact strained to the utmost by the invisible negotiations between an Irish Cardinal and a Jewish Premier. "I should like to know what you would answer," he asked Cullen, and the next day (February 21, 1868): "*Private*. For reasons which I am not able to state I think it of urgent importance that the Archbishop of Cashel and the Bishop of Ferns ["Clonfert," corrects Cullen] should come over to London, if possible, next week." They came, and fell under the influence of Mr. Monsell, who "wished only his own party to settle the question." Manning wrote that he could not concur with Archbishop Leahy that "a Charter without endow-

Ireland

ment ought to be refused," but in vain. Desperately Manning tried to counteract the friction between Tory and Liberal. To Cullen he wrote: "The hope of a Charter from the Liberal party is not to be counted on," while he tried to square Gladstone at the same time. "I have written to-day strongly to Mr. Gladstone, begging him not to obstruct the Charter."

However, Monsell was winning his Liberal Peerage, and Manning had to inform the startled Cullen that he was a Radical himself. "I say this because I fancy the Archbishop of Cashel may suppose me a party politician." Disraeli still expected Manning to win the Irish Bishops, and Manning wrote to him (March 16, 1868): "If Government can content the Irish Bishops, they will not hinder the passing of the Charter. If they oppose the endowment I hope the Charter will still be given." As a last resource he threw the Bishops into touch with the Government, for Disraeli wrote (March 16, 1868): "*Confidential*. Thank you for your letters. The morning after his statement in the House of Commons Lord Mayo communicated with the two Prelates you mention and invited their views." The Irish Bishops became involved in "a correspondence not conciliatory." Cullen adopted their view, and there was a breakdown. But for a moment Manning snatched at success, writing to Cullen (March 14, 1868): "*Confidential*. I have just now had an interview with Mr. Disraeli. I feel no doubt that he sincerely intends to carry his proposal. But his hope of carrying it is satisfying the Irish Bishops. Mr. Fortescue last night declared that if the Catholics in Ireland accepted the plan he would not hinder it. I think I can say that will be Mr. Gladstone's line. If, therefore, your Eminence and the other Irish Bishops could examine and pronounce upon the plan, this would decide the question, *the House permitting*."

Unfortunately, neither the Irish Bishops nor the House permitted. Disraeli accused Manning of stabbing

Henry Edward Manning

him in the back, and Manning wrote to Gladstone in 1874: "I have had no dealings with Mr. Disraeli since he so far forgot himself as to say of me what was not true fact, nor could I unless he explains himself." However, Gladstone, watching his opportunity, came forward with Disestablishment the day after poor Lord Mayo wrote (March 15, 1868): "Are we to continue this struggle for ever? I am absolutely in despair about Ireland. If a Catholic says Yes, the Protestant says No!"

A letter from Cashel Hoey to Lord Mayo in 1870 relieves Manning of the burden he bore for many a day:

"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. From various sources I happened to know exactly how the case stood. The Irish Bishops charged with the negotiations 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."

Manning's attitude was: "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." Lord Mayo was made Indian Viceroy, and in the Andaman Islands met that disaster which dogs all who have touched fateful Ireland.

Disraeli's Government fell, and before the end of the year Gladstone was in power. After the triumph of Disestablishment he approached the old rock. Manning threw a feeler to Cullen: "To ask for endowment was five years ago hopeless and dangerous. To ask for it now would be still more so. I remember that your Eminence would have accepted a Charter without endowment. And I hope that the next scheme proposed may not be lost by demanding endowment." To Gladstone

Ireland

(February 14, 1873): "I thought your statement last night complete and unassailable as it could be. What my transmarine brethren may think of your plan I do not know, but hope to hear. I do not know how the Opposition can attack it without adopting the German tyranny"; and the next day: "*Confidential*. I wrote yesterday to Cardinal Cullen strongly urging to accept the Bill. I am fully prepared for objections. I saw Disraeli and Stafford Northcote exchanging signals at the exclusion of Mental Philosophy and Modern History. This they will attack, but it is easy of defence." To Cullen he wrote, "in sight of the storm signals," a cautious recommendation (February 14, 1873): "The only side of the question I can judge of is the English and political side, and on this I venture to say that I think it would be our best prudence to make as much noise as will lead our enemies to believe that we do not like it, but to hold fast by the plan." Cullen was alarmed at the plan, especially as "it is reported that Mr. Gladstone intends giving professorships to distinguished Germans and Frenchmen, who will bring Hegelism and infidelity with them, as Mr. Vesicour, a nephew of Guizot, did to the Cork College." Manning sent the Cardinal's objections to Gladstone, and suggested tactics (February 26, 1873): "If it were thought that the Catholic Bishops were not opposed to the Bill, an anti-Catholic noise would be got up. I cannot but repeat that I think it most expedient to raise a loud opposition on the endowment injustice. I write this with submission, and more as a politician or a watch at the masthead."

The Irish Bishops met and resolved against the Bill, the Bishop of Limerick alone defending. Gladstone sent word that this "is really war to the knife. How is it possible that this should not have been perceived?" Of endowment Manning wrote to Cullen (March 1, 1873): "They could not give it if they would, and they would not if they could. I will believe them when they try a

Henry Edward Manning

division on it, not before. The tyrannous Liberalism of this country can be cured by nothing short of a public disaster, which may God avert!" Meanwhile Cullen had made an amusing descent on the Viceroy (March 2, 1873):

"I told my mind most fully. He assured me that great care would be taken in appointing the new professors, and that Catholics would be perfectly safe. I replied that we got similar assurances regarding the Queen's Colleges, and that the first appointment was that of an infidel to the Chair of History in Cork, and the last was that of an immoral poet, a Mr. Armstrong, to the Class of English Literature. I had this poet's work in my pocket, and I showed to His Excellency a wicked poem against the Confessional. Lord Spencer admitted that he had made this appointment himself!"

The Irish members helped to throw out the Bill by three votes, though Mr. Housman attacked it as "a vote of confidence in Cardinal Cullen." Manning wrote to the defeated Premier (March 7, 1873): "Lord Lyttelton told me to-day at the Athenæum that you are well and in good courage. Worse things might befall you than Housman's bitter levity. You will not, I hope, take to heart the opposition of the Bishops in Ireland. Treat it as an earthquake."

Being in a tumbling majority, Gladstone could hardly have seen it otherwise. From a pinnacle of the House of God Manning could proffer optimism:

"I cannot conceal from myself that there may be a providence of God in this check. The division of last night may give you back a liberty which the Nonconformists have heavily oppressed. The Disestablishment drew about you the sons of Eldad and Medad, and I wish you were free from their embrace. My belief is that you will yet settle the University Question. After that, if you wish to go up to Mount Tabor, I may be more willing to listen."

Ireland

For Gladstone had written (March 13, 1873) : “ *Private*. You give no heed to the wailings and pleas of my old age, but I do, and the future in politics hardly exists for me. Your Irish brethren have received in the late vote of Parliament the most extravagant compliment ever paid them. They have destroyed the measure, which otherwise was safe enough.”

The General Election returned Disraeli to power, and with the persistence of a Job’s comforter Manning comforted Gladstone (February 5, 1874) :

“ You have exhausted the mission you undertook. Say what you like, you will have another. I do not confide in the ethical character of the Nonconformists. They have each one swallowed a Pope, and I have no chance with legions of Infallibilists. And I like still less the Philosophical Radicals and Oriental Despots of the Pall Mall type, and still less the strong-minded women. Only, do not be sharpened or soured or saddened. There are three words for you ! If I go on you will burn me !”

Gladstone promptly used his leisure to roast Vaticanism. Manning had proved the Ariel who had enticed both Gladstone and Disraeli upon the Irish rocks, with the same result. And he noted : “ It is curious the one should have written *Lothair* and the other *Rome’s New Fashions*. Disraeli kept his head, but not his temper. Gladstone lost both !”

CHAPTER XIV : THE VATICAN COUNCIL

“The Roman Infallibility will do dreadful havoc.”—*Manning to Gladstone*, 1845.

“ART thou infallible?” asked the mocking Nineteenth Century. “Thou hast said it,” answered *Pio Nono*. The definition of a new dogma is an event rarer and more curious than the discovery of a new planet, and Manning was fortunate to be at the defining of one, which had been always in the theological heavens, but now required the wisdom of Christendom to chart. Cæsarism and Ultramontanism, the absolute Church and the absolute State, arose out of the French Revolution. Both ideas ripened in 1870, and remained dominant for a half-century, until one was taken and one was left. Manning knew that the principle of Ultramontanism was eternal. He therefore had no misgiving in pressing Infallibility upon the Church. The honour of the Holy Ghost and the personality of Pius led him to take a greater part than any Englishman before in a Church Council.

In 1867, five hundred Bishops being in Rome to celebrate St. Peter's martyrdom, the Pope announced the Council. A committee including Manning and Dupanloup prepared the reply. In his account of the Council, Emile Ollivier stated that Manning wished at this moment to introduce the Infallibility, but that the Hungarian Bishop Haynald rejected it. Manning wrote a long, unpublished narrative to Ollivier, concluding (May 5, 1879):

“Mgr. Haynald never opposed either the doctrine or the word. It was he who wrote the word and, as he has told me, had always taught the doctrine. I did not press

The Vatican Council

for the insertion of the doctrine, but I resisted the exclusion of the word, unless the Florentine Decree were inserted in the Address."

This was a Decree declaring the Pope Father and Teacher of all Christians. The future Cardinal Haynald slipped in the word "infallible"! Dupanloup proposed the Address should be revised by Franchi, who left the word out. Manning then insisted on the word or the Decree. Dupanloup opposed. What followed was typical of Manning :

"At our fourth session the Address was read again, but the Decree had not been inserted. I had foreseen that this might happen, and I had brought with me a transcript of the Decree which I gave to Mgr. Franchi. At our fifth session I found that still the Decree had not been inserted. And as I had again a prevision that this might happen, I had brought with me a second copy of the Decree, which was then incorporated in the Address."

Meanwhile Christendom drew into camps. Manning was opposed by his older clergy, and his chief ally was a layman, "Ultramontane" Ward, whose alleged desire for a new Bull with his morning *Times* made him a "theocrat at the breakfast-table." His French, though humourless, counterpart was Veuillot, just as Acton was a more learned and less able Montalembert. "It was no time for rose-water," declared Manning, and when Ward attacked Newman and Manning's nephew, Father Ryder, defended the latter, he wrote to Ullathorne (May 11, 1867) :

"I have read Father Ryder's pamphlet with much regret, and agree in the remark that it is inopportune. I fear it will gravely complicate matters, which were tangled enough already. Mr. Ward will reply to it at once, disengaging, he tells me, the one point of importance from all the personal matter, which enters too largely. We are entering upon a time which will need all our watchfulness over ourselves."

Henry Edward Manning

Newman, though invited to the Council, declined, writing to Ullathorne with irritating modesty: "I am not fitted either by my talents or by my attainments. No one would gain by my being there, and I am not at all sure I should not lose my life." Manning brought a disunited Hierarchy from England, Bishop Brown writing to Ullathorne: "I have taken occasion to object to one of the conclusions in his Pastoral. I don't see why the whole Episcopate is to be made a mere empty speaking-trumpet of." To champion Infallibility Manning had to lose what little favour he had re-won with Gladstone and Newman, but Newman's Bishop wrote him farewell: "*Bon voyage*, and take care you don't turn that red-lined cap inside out when you get to the end of it!" Gladstone wrote sternly (November 16, 1869):

"My first recollection of difference from you was in 1835. My second went deeper, and left a strong mark in my memory. You sent me a proof-sheet about the Infallibility of the Church. I thought it by much too absolute. Lord Macaulay covered me with not ill-natured yet unqualified and glittering ridicule because in my imperfect way I had professed my allegiance to two principles, which in religion he appeared to regard as incompatible, freedom and authority. After some thirty years of the blasts of life I remain rooted in regard for authority, and even more than before in the value I set upon freedom."

The Vatican Council was not without full freedom of speech in the struggle to set a stake of authority which the years were not to remove. On the way to the Council Manning interviewed Thiers and Guizot. Both were in favour of the Temporal Power. Guizot said of the Council: "It is the last great moral power, and may restore the peace of Europe." At Florence Manning learnt that Dupanloup of Orleans had attacked "*le pieux et eloquent Mgr. Manning*" in his Pastoral for placing

The Vatican Council

Infallibility outside the body of Bishops. Gallican in thought and Gallic in temper, Dupanloup was criticised as "a French Samuel Wilberforce." Manning had previously met him: "He is a vigorous man, and the more I see of him the more I like him. He has the heart of a Pastor." Amid the old and the prudent and timid, they made vivid antagonists. Odo Russell informed Clarendon: "It is confidently expected by the French that the Opposition, led by Dupanloup, will triumphantly carry the fallibility of the Pope!" Two days later the Pope opened the Council (December 8, 1869). Bishops of all races and rites, bringing a Pentecost of tongues and a League of Nations with them, poured into Rome. The American Spalding, in "white blouse and wide-awake," jostled the Hungarian Cardinal Simor, with his royal retinue. Latin Bishops of Oriental rite accompanied orientals of Latin rite, one of whom wore his pigtail. The profane said one Bishop carried his ring in his nose. The streets witnessed so much purple and fine linen that Manning remarked he had given up preaching on Dives and Lazarus. Some had come by caravan, and some even had died on the road.

The Council was placed under five Cardinal Legates, not unlike Speakers in the Commons. The Infallibility came under the Commission of Faith, to which Manning was elected. It was a victory for those who thought the Dogma opportune, for the only inopportunist elected was Cardinal Simor. The Opposition, or Inopportunist or Gallicans, as they were called, showed their humour by writing ironical messages on the voting-papers. Later they founded an International under Dupanloup and Haynald. Manning wrote: "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."

Though the disputation did not compare with the warfare of early Church Councils, it was considerable,

Henry Edward Manning

chiefly because, as Antonelli informed Odo Russell, "the liberty of speech has been so great that even heretical opinions have been expounded without interference from the Legates!" Russell reported an interview with the Pope (January 13, 1870) in which Pius complained of the indiscretion of the French Bishops and of the unending orations, but he could not say anything, or they would complain of lack of independence. Pius laughed when he suggested empty benches as a remedy, and said the Bishops themselves were impatient when *certi chiacchieroni* spoke too long. He hoped that Queen Victoria would come to Rome that he might greet a colleague. A pontifical joke followed. "As Head of the Church of England, His Holiness explained, Her Majesty is my Colleague. *Io sono Papa Re ma da vostra Sovrane Regina e Papessa in Inghilterra!*"

Meantime Manning had organised the Petition to bring the Definition before the Council. Manning kept a list of those who signed or would not at this anxious moment, in the same clear script that once registered communicants and dissenters at Lavington.

			Sub.		Non-sub.
Papal States	45	...	10
Subalpine	5	...	15
Neapolitan	41	...	4
Lombardy Venetia	5	...	0
Etruria	6	...	0

Neither the Irish nor English Bishops would come into line. Of the former, seven were noted as non-subscribing (Tuam, Derry, Dromore, Raphoe, Kerry, Ferns, Clonfert); Cornthwaite of Beverley and Manning were the only English Bishops to sign, while Clifford and Errington actually signed the Anti-Infallibility Petition, as did the Irish Bishops Moriarty and Leahy. As for this precious document, Russell sent Manning word: "It was to have been presented to His Holiness by four Archbishops, but each of them declared that three would be sufficient!"

The Vatican Council

In the end 418 petitioned for Infallibility and 136 to the contrary. Supported by Franchi and Cullen, Manning recommended the first Petition to the Pope. "Out of twenty-five, all but two or three voted to recommend the Holy Father that the Definition should be proposed to the Council. This was the first great step in advance."

It also left Manning, if not leader, at least Chief Whip to his party. Granderath's History of the Council gives an insight of Manning as "working day and night with a willingness that nothing could shake and an ardour that nothing could slacken in order to bring a happy issue." The words are drawn from the notes of an unnamed Bishop, probably Senestrey of Ratisbon, for the notes are endorsed by the cipher of his ally, the Archbishop of Westminster, "*Ita esse testor et fidem facio H.E.C.A.W. Romae, 31 Die Martii, 1875.*"

This was his cipher as a Cardinal, but the animosities he roused at the Council prevented the red hat reaching his devoted head for five years to come. The Church makes the Cardinalial office a pennon of peace rather than a gonfalon of party. The feelings of Cardinals, Patriarchs, and old-fashioned Bishops may be imagined as the English ex-Archdeacon took a relentless lead. What could French Gallicans and courtly Bonapartists do against the freelance from Westminster? What could Cardinal Rauscher, the old Emperor Francis Joseph's older tutor, do against the Fellow of Merton? What could the Gallicans of Ireland and America do against the eloquence of Oxford? Sitting close to the youngest Bishop in Council, Gibbons from South Carolina, Manning bared his arm to him and remarked it was tanned by the blows of his adversaries! Ollivier left a sketch of him at the Council: "The love of domination is about him, and when his thin lips smile, it seems to be out of pure condescension. He is certainly pious and sincere, wrapped in God, but he is not the emaciated monk he looks. Under his seraphic beatitude he retains a

Henry Edward Manning

wheedling and energetic policy." So much so that he was nicknamed by adversaries "*Diabolo del Concilio*," who were no less active and influential. There was Döllinger skirmishing as *Janus* and Acton writing as *Quirinus* from Rome itself. Acton represented Gladstone, who had persuaded Clarendon, his Foreign Secretary, to telegraph to Russell: "Please tell Lord Acton he may use the strongest language he thinks fit respecting my opinion." The opinion of the English Cabinet was with the Inopportunist, though what exactly was its business with a Church Council has never been explained. Acton was a thorn in the zeal of Manning, who could only counteract his letters to Gladstone by priming Odo Russell on the other side. It was interesting that two Englishmen should have taken such mighty parts, for Acton was to the Opposition what Manning was to the Ultramontanes. Acton's part was played behind the scenes, but it was correctly estimated in a secret memorandum of Russell to his Government (June 18, 1870): "Without his personal intervention the Bishops of the Opposition could scarcely have known each other. Without his knowledge of language and of theology the theologians of the various nations could not have understood each other, and without his virtues they could not have accepted and followed the lead of a layman so much younger than any of the Fathers of the Church."

But to Pius Acton seemed almost to play an unfilial part, and the Pope was reported to deny his blessing to Acton's children playing on the Pincio. Acton, Catholic at heart, spent the next night in anguish under Odo Russell's roof. No layman ever played such a part in Church matters, and no Catholic more narrowly missed excommunication. Manning never forgave his hostility, for some Bishops inclined to Acton rather than to their Metropolitan. On a sad day Russell sent Manning word: "Ullathorne has joined the ranks of the Opposition." As a matter of fact, he was in the middle party,

The Vatican Council

for which both Acton and Manning were bidding. On hearing the rumour, Ullathorne demanded audience of the Pope, and indignantly cleared his theological character, with which, he recorded, "His Holiness expressed himself well satisfied." *Pio Nono* was so amused by Ullathorne's bluff outburst that he punctuated it with delighted "Bravoes!" But Ullathorne's troubles were not over. Newman wrote him a most confidential letter (though he did not mark it private), deploring the "aggressive, insolent faction" who were working in the Council. It was a famous and fastidious letter, and copies passed among the Opposition. Russell showed one to Manning, who took no action on so private a paper. Meanwhile a cloud of journalists settled like flies on the waste-paper baskets and gossip corners of Rome. On March 14 Newman's letter was published in the *London Standard*. It could only be supposed that the Roman correspondent of the *Standard*, the future Laureate, Alfred Austin, had lost his discretion. Wilfrid Ward, in his *Life of Newman*, says, "How the extracts became public is not known." A letter of Ullathorne to Provost Bagnall sheds some light (May 19, 1870):

"I think it well to remark that the letter was private and intended to be private, and that neither Dr. Newman nor myself had the slightest intention of making it public. That publication was occasioned through the unguardedness of another Bishop, to whom it was shown by me under specific conditions, and I very much regret it. Dr. Newman communicated to me his personal conviction of the Infallibility. This, in the private way in which it was done, was a legitimate proceeding."

Clifford was said to be the Bishop.

The English Press took enormous and mischievous interest in what was passing. Manning set Herbert Vaughan to edit the *Vatican* in London. Vaughan wrote: "The *Pall Mall* described you speaking in the Council against Gastaldi. But I hear nothing direct.

Henry Edward Manning

Did you?" An exchange of chaff between two Bishops was magnified by *The Times* into fisticuffs! In irony Manning said, when asked what was happening: "Well, we meet, and we look at one another, and then we talk a little, but when we want to know what we have been doing we read *The Times*!"

The political element disturbed the Council in their labours. Archbishop Darboy of Paris had written to the French Emperor hinting regrettable possibilities. Manning saw in him an adversary, as the Almoner of Cæsarism. Acton was working with him, for he asked Russell to telegraph to the British Foreign Office his fear lest Infallibility would be passed by acclamation if the French Government did not support the Opposition. On February 10 the Bill *De Ecclesia*, though a pontifical secret, was published surreptitiously in the German Press! Russell wrote to Manning the next day: "The publication in the *Augsburg Gazette* has been of the greatest use to the Opposition, who are founding their demand for moral support from foreign Governments on it. The French Government 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 through the Archbishop of Algiers." This was Lavigerie, who brought word from the French Emperor that the Dogma would endanger the Concordat. "We were told that if the Council persevered with the Definition," recalled Manning, "the French troops would be withdrawn. That is to say, that the Garibaldians would be let in to make short work of the Definition. It was said that the presence of the troops was an undue pressure. There was a grim irony, amounting to humour, in this solicitude for the liberty of the Council."

Odo Russell was playing a double game. On February 15 he asked the Foreign Office to suggest to the Austrian Premier to communicate with Russia and Bavaria in support of the German Bishops, and he wrote to Manning

The Vatican Council

(March 2, 1870): "The opposition are gradually rousing the Catholic Powers to action, and the Church will soon find all the States and part of the Episcopacy arrayed against her; and the battle may be a fierce one, as I notice that time decidedly strengthens the cause of the opposing Bishops by adding to their lay adherents." He was shrewd enough to inform the Foreign Office that the manner in which the French Government were supporting the French Bishops was more likely to weaken than strengthen their cause, and he alluded to Döllinger as the Inopportunist's "Anti-Pope, in whom they recognise the Infallibility they deny to Pius IX." So dilatory were the Opposition that the Pope granted a new procedure in Council, and Manning noted: "February 22: *Nova Methodus* distributed to-day. Adversaries furious with it. We rejoice. The Bishop of Rhodes shed tears of joy when he welcomed it." Russell reported: "The Decree of February 20 is the death-warrant of the Opposition."

But the political influence never abated. All the statecraft of Europe was directed against the Definition. Russell telegraphed to the Foreign Office (March 1, 1870):

"Lord Acton is anxious the French Government should know that further loss of time will be fatal to the Bishops of the Opposition."

March 15, 1870: "The Austrian Ambassador has been instructed to support the policy of the French Government in Rome."

At the same time he laid down the important diplomatic axiom that "an Italian priest can always in the long-run get the better of a French statesman." The Opposition used their liberty to the full. Cardinal Schwartzburg criticised the new procedure, and Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis the frequency of the word "anathema." Finally, Strossmayer, the Father of Slavdom, caused an angry scene. Russell telegraphed (March 23, 1870):

Henry Edward Manning

“Acton wishes the French Government to know that Strossmayer declared that no dogma could be proclaimed without moral unanimity among the Bishops, for which he was called to order.” The English interference in the Vatican Council, due entirely to Gladstone’s theological excitement, was tempered owing to Russell’s discretion; but it was a fact, and Mr. Childers of the Admiralty appeared in person in Rome. Dupanloup immediately called on him. Manning discovered this, and “seeing my arch-enemy’s card in Mr. Childers’ rack, I tempered it with my own.” Gladstone could not help trying to alarm Manning on Education prospects during his absence (March 28, 1870): “*Private*. I am sorry to say I cannot hold out expectations on either of the points you mention. I need not say that the R.C. position in relation to all such demands is much damaged by the impressions here of what is going on at Rome.” Later he telegraphed that he had not been able to reverse the vote on Convents. “This message is clearly intended for your Grace,” wrote Russell. Manning sent Gladstone warning (April 7, 1870):

“I can conceive it possible that under an instigation from the Opposition here, some attempt may be made to prevent certain acts on the part of the Council in matters purely doctrinal. I feel it in every way a duty towards you to pray you to consider that such an attempt could have no result; that it would be a violation of the liberty of the Council; that it would make it our duty, at any imaginable risk and cost, to exercise that liberty to its fullest extent.”

Gladstone would not be deterred, replying: “If asked, we cannot withhold, perhaps, the expression of our conviction, but we have not been promoters.” In a later letter to Manning, Sir Hubert Jerningham recalled that in April, 1870, Gladstone questioned him on the Dogma:

“Having read the dispatch Gladstone had inspired, I replied, ‘You have passed it!’ Said Gladstone, ‘How?’

The Vatican Council

‘ By pressing a foreign Government into a contest against a purely clerical body, who, unable to resist strength by force of arms, will show its independence by proclaiming what they could have delayed.’ Gladstone was frantic, and roughly dismissed me.”

Russell informed the Foreign Office that some of the French Bishops had applied to the Prussian representative in Rome, and that Bismarck had sent an envoy to Paris to press their views on Daru. Daru sent a note to Cardinal Antonelli, which it was hoped would defer the Definition. Russell warned his Government not to support the note, but he was compelled on April 12 to inform Antonelli verbally that the British Government shared French apprehension lest the Bill *De Ecclesia* should cause conflict between the civil and religious powers. Gladstone had moved! Russell smoothed matters by explaining to Antonelli that the British Government only desired to promote goodwill among men. “The new Daru note will defeat its own object,” he wrote to Manning. *Qui mange du Pape en meurt*, says the proverb, and Daru fell from office. The Pope declined to communicate the French note to the Council, and Antonelli informed Russell, “with a smile” expressive of goodwill to all men, that he expected French interference would cease. These interferences never pierced the Veil of the Temple, behind which the Council sat. “The means taken to prevent the Definition made the Definition inevitable,” wrote Manning. When the intrigue failed, the Bavarian Minister went out of his way to say in Manning’s presence: “It shall not be proclaimed in my august master’s dominions.” “It shall not be proclaimed in my scullery!” quoth the Archbishop of Westminster.

Meanwhile the Dogma was reaching shape. Manning had early proposed to add to the Bill *De Ecclesia* in the fourteenth Canon the words: “If anyone deny that the Primacy of jurisdiction or the principate of spiritual

Henry Edward Manning

power over the whole Church has not been conferred on Peter alone and on his successors, let him be anathema !” During Holy Week, the last kept by Papal Rome, the actual formula was discussed in Manning’s rooms. Ratisbon found the Cardinal Legate Bilio terrified at the idea of proposing a question which Christians would have to accept or reject. Only two of the five Legates favoured its introduction, and Manning and Ratisbon appealed to the Pope. Their petition received 150 signatures, and on April 27 Bilio gave notice of the debate. Seventy-one Fathers protested in the Council, but the majority forwarded their gratitude to the Pope. After the Bill *De Ecclesia* had received 667 *Placets* in Council, the Commission on Faith discussed the Infallibility. The desire to conciliate the minority brought critical days for Manning and Ratisbon. On May 5 Bilio opposed, “overborne by Malines and Paderborn,” wrote Manning, “and a fear of French Bishops, who beset him in private.” Bilio wished to confine Infallibility to revealed truth. Manning and Ratisbon misunderstood his application to dogma, and the session, we are told, broke up in tumult. The next day Bilio brought the Jesuit theologians Franzelin and Perrone to recommend the limited formula, but Manning and Ratisbon were obdurate. The valiant twain held out, and when Bilio said they were dealing with the expression, not the substance of the formula, they continued to protest. Bilio lost self-control and cried out, “*Non ita sunt tractandæ res ecclesiæ!*” They remained silent, and Bilio’s amendment was sent to Council. But Manning did not forget, and years later, when Bilio misjudged the Capel case, Manning thundered his words back in his face, “*Non ita sunt tractandæ res ecclesiæ!*”

The general debate took place between May 13 and June 3. The Opposition made a large use of their liberty, while the Infallibilists mildly expostulated. Cullen lucidly defended the test case of Pope Honorius. The

The Vatican Council

Patriarch of Jerusalem attacked Gallicanism, and Bravard of Coutances retorted that in that case he should lower the French flag in Jerusalem. Manning noted :

“ Bravard spoke against Martin of Paderborn an *éloge* of France, climax, that to France the Holy See owed its existence. Bad Latin of the kitchen.

“ Strossmayer spoke only to waste time. At the end we asked ourselves, ‘ What did he say ? ’ Nothing, only he said it in excellent Latin and as a born orator.”

Then Ketteler of Mayence, his face scarred by a duel, protested against absolutism in the Church, and Verot of Savannah, “ the *enfant terrible* of the Council,” caused a welcome ripple of mirth by describing certain journalists as “ *maximæ bestiæ*,” and the Archbishop of Paris made a grave and moderate speech for the Opposition. He asked if the Infallibility would raise the African Churches from the dead? Would it convert Protestant or Schismatic? At this point Manning rose (May 25, 1870), and asserted that it had converted him, and that Catholic progress in England was hindered by indecision. He translated extracts from the English Press to show that Protestants regarded the Ultramontanes and not the Gallicans as the real Catholics. He asked the Council to do what the Council of Trent had done, and ratify the Decree of Florence. The Definition would unite the Church in face of a crumbling Protestantism. He spoke for an hour and fifty minutes. It was the great effort of his life. “ 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. Cardinal Bilio told me since that the two speeches he liked best were Cardinal Cullen’s and mine.” Ollivier records that some of the Opposition cried out, “ Would to God that he was on our side ! ” Kenrick of St. Louis compared

Henry Edward Manning

him to the Normans in Ireland, who became more Irish than the Irish themselves. A convert had become more Catholic than the Catholics. "I recall as if it were but yesterday his memorable speech, which, though in a foreign tongue and the longest one made at the Council, held us spellbound by its beautiful diction," writes Cardinal Gibbons after nearly fifty years.

Clifford was among the Bishops who replied to Manning. Grant died in Rome before the discussion was ended. Manning was anxious that his place should not be filled by a vote hostile to the Dogma. Russell reported to the Government that Southwark might be absorbed into Westminster, and later (June 6, 1870): "Archbishop Manning is said to have recommended Herbert Vaughan. The Propaganda are favourable to Father Coffin, and the Chapter will probably elect Dr. Errington." By June 11 Acton knew he was beaten, and left Rome. The Definition became a certainty, and the only question was the exact formula. Manning and Ratisbon wished a more extended Infallibility than Bilio, even to such matters as canonisations and minor censures. Bilio read two formulas to the Commission, one worded by Manning and Franchi, the other a more elastic proposal by Cullen. The latter was selected and sent to Council. The session was closed on July 4, but by July 11 the Commission agreed on Cullen's proposal, with the addition of the famous words *cum ex cathedra loquitur*. Russell wrote to Manning from the rival camp (July 12, 1870): "My friends have settled, notwithstanding what they call their triumph of yesterday, that if they cannot command eighty votes they will abstain from attending the public session, where they would only have fifteen men courageous enough to say no. I reckon on a unanimous *Placet*. The loss of Cardinal Guidi has been a severe blow." Guidi, the Dominican Cardinal, had spoken for the Opposition. When he explained to the Pope that his speech was traditionary, Pius is said to

The Vatican Council

have uttered the famous word, "I am the tradition"! At the preparatory vote of July 13 the *Placets* in favour of the Infallibility numbered 481. Manning was the only English Bishop of their number. Vaughan of Plymouth and Clifford joined the 88 *non-Placets*, and Ullathorne and Chadwick voted conditionally, or *juxta modum*. The dissentient Cardinals, according to *Pomponio Leto*, drew their scarlet hats over their eyes and remained silent. At the last hour Russell sent word (July 14, 1870):

"Flushed with their success, my friends have determined to remain and to win over 40 of the *juxta modums*, so as to ensure at least 120 *non-Placets*. Ketteler and some others announce concessions which will enable them to give their *Placet*."

And again :

"Darboy, who now takes the credit of the minority vote to himself, was going to Cardinal Bilio to dictate his terms. He tells us 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. I saw my colleagues, who all agree that the triumph of victory is at fever heat among the 88."

As a matter of fact, they were on the verge of rout and dissolution. In vain they begged the Pope to add a saving clause to enable them to vote for the Definition. The Pope ironically referred them back to the Council, which they themselves had insisted was not below the Pope. Haynald and Hefele proposed they should vote *non-Placet*, but the majority of the minority declared for abstention, and, addressing a humble letter to the Pope, they left Rome. Manning's sixty-second birthday was one of calm triumph. The script of the Infallibility was in the hands of the Secretary of the Council, and the weary majority slept the sleep of the justified. The storm which had ushered Manning's birth was repeated. On

Henry Edward Manning

the night of July 17 the thunder rolled amid the domes of the city, and the lightning flashed like living anathemas from the great statues which threaten the outside world from the roof of the Lateran Basilica. In the grey of the morning the Fathers made their way for the last time to the Council. The Definition was solemnly read, declaring the Pope infallible and his definitions irreformable of themselves and not in virtue of the Church's consent, *non autem ex consensu ecclesiæ*. This, even, was a milder version of the three words *sine consensu ecclesiæ* by which it was sought to crush Gallicanism for ever. No less than 535 Bishops voted *Placet*. Amid peals of thunder the Fathers gave their vote in turn. Only two, Riccio of Cajazzo and Fitzgerald of Little Rock, voted *non-Placet*, in order to make their subsequent submission the more striking. As the Pope read the figures with the aid of a taper, the lightning burst forth afresh, as though Heaven, some said, were displeased at the action of man. "They forgot Sinai and the Ten Commandments," was Manning's reply. But the roughness of the weather could hardly defer what the diplomacy of the world had tried to undermine in vain. *Fiat Dogma ruat Cælum!*

On Manning's table that morning the Jesuits placed a portrait of St. Charles labelled "*Sessionis IV. concilii Vaticani mnemosynon.*"

As evening fell, the Apostolic bill-poster placarded Basilicas with that Definition compared to which all the thrones and powers of Cæsar were as dust. On the next day war broke out between Germany and France. The Empire which had threatened the Council was swept away, and, indeed, before the last survivor of the Council had died, the Empire of Germany which was erected on its ruins had also passed away. And the Papacy remained.

Friend and foe gave Manning his due. "If any single man were able to ascribe to himself the honour of this

The Vatican Council

victory, it would be the Archbishop of Westminster," wrote Nielson, the Scandinavian Protestant Bishop.

The aftermath of the Council was sharp, and unnoticed by the world in arms. The Cardinals of the Opposition submitted with royal dignity. One by one the absent Bishops sent their allegiance to the Decrees. Clifford accepted the Infallibility "as the voice of the Church, and as such undoubtedly true." Errington characteristically objected to the words "retraction or submission," preferring on canonical grounds to give his "adhesion." Manning returned, and was glad to smooth the way of the faithful in accepting the Dogma. To Aubrey de Vere he wrote: "The Infallibility is defined, but not its extent." And to Maskell (October 20, 1871): "The extension of his Infallibility is matter of theology. The Council intended not to touch the extension of his Infallibility. You are therefore free, *debita reverentia*, to regard this as matter of theology."

Döllinger refused his submission and passed out of the living Church. People began to wonder what would befall Acton. "They had the inflation of German professors and the ruthless talk of undergraduates," wrote Manning of the school of "scientific historians." "The Vatican Council was fatal to them. During the whole course they ridiculed and maligned it. When it was suspended, they tried to evade it." Acton, however, had no intention of leaving a Church, communion with which, he wrote in *The Times* while attacking it, was dearer to him than life. Manning had resented his doings with Gladstone, to whom he wrote: "The shadow of Lord Acton between you and the Catholics of Great Britain would do what I could never undo." Gladstone answered (November 12, 1870): "I regard his character and admire his abilities and attainments, but I have never supposed him to be a man representative of the general body of English Roman Catholics. You will not be surprised at my adding that I wish he were such. For though I

Henry Edward Manning

have noticed a great circumspection among his gifts, I have never seen anything that bore the slightest resemblance to a fraudulent reserve. Meanwhile you need not assure me as to your motives, as one-twentieth of the time I have known you would have sufficed to show how absolutely incapable you were of any spiteful act." As the report spread that Acton had not accepted the Decrees, and Acton was writing painfully in *The Times*, Manning challenged him, but was referred to his Bishop, Brown of Shrewsbury, who extended canonical protection. Manning wrote to Ullathorne (November 27, 1874): "I hope you will carefully examine Lord Acton's letter, and say what course ought to be taken. He has been in and since the Council a conspirator in the dark, and the ruin of Gladstone. His answers to me are obscure and evasive. I am waiting till after Sunday, and shall then send one more final question. We need not fear this outbreak for our people. Some masks will be taken off, to our greater unity." December 7, 1874: "I have had Acton's second letter examined by the most competent person here, and have a long MS. refutation. In my last letter to Acton I have asked him whether his words, 'The acts of the Council I recognise as my Law,' are equivalent to, 'I adhere to the doctrines which it defined.' No answer as yet. I believe him to be evading. I wrote a third time to ask. Here is his answer. Can I in conscience allow him to receive Sacraments in London? His scandal was published there. He has caused there the belief that he does not receive the Definitions of the Church Council. I am also of that belief. And he will make neither reparation nor explanation." January 2, 1875: "My correspondence with Lord Acton is not satisfactory. I did as you suggested with the Bishop. Then I had a conference here with four of my priests. We unanimously decided that the case ought to be sent to Rome, and I am now doing so." January 25, 1875: "As to Lord Acton's history, I have not touched it, nor had any

The Vatican Council

intention of doing so. But I obtained in Rome valuable matter which a month ago I put into the hands of a very competent layman. I gave him also the passages of the Bollandists, for I had seen a letter of Lord Acton saying that they admit the fact, which they do not. The less we deal with such matter the better. Even dust turns to dynamite."

But Acton had submitted privately to his own Bishop in terms which were also communicated to Ullathorne (December 16, 1874): "To your doubt whether I am a real or a pretended Catholic I must reply that, believing all the Catholic Church believes, and seeking to occupy my life with no studies that do not help religion, I am, in spite of sins and errors, a true Catholic, and I protest that I have given you no foundation for your doubt. If you speak of the Council because you supposed that I have separated myself in any degree from the Bishops whose friendship I enjoyed at Rome, who opposed the Decrees during the discussion, but accept them now that it is over, you have entirely misapprehended my position. I have yielded obedience to the Apostolic Constitution which embodied those decrees, and I have not transgressed, and certainly do not consciously transgress, obligations imposed under the supreme sanction of the Church. I do not believe that there is a word in my public or private letters that contradicts any doctrine of the Council; but if there is it is not my meaning, and I wish to blot it out."

Such declarations made the term "Gallican" obsolete, and Ultramontane has as much lost its force as Ghibelline. The dauntless speakers and thinkers on both sides of the Council have passed where there is neither debate nor controversy. The definers of the Dogma are long gathered to Infinity, and its theologians contemplate the *Theos*. "The Day was won and the Truth was safe as it was after the Council of Nicæa," was Manning's last word.

CHAPTER XV: WORLD POLITICS

“The Italians have entered Rome and now begins the Peripateia.”—*Manning to Gladstone, 1870.*

WORLD politics broke in the aftermath of the Council. O’Callaghan, who took Talbot’s place as Manning’s Roman correspondent, wrote :

“There is a good deal of uneasiness as to the chance of treachery to the Pope owing to the alliance between France and Italy. There was some annoyance offered to the Bishops at Florence. Dupanloup and Darboy came in for it, being French. It would be well to request you to secure the protection of the English Government for the British Establishments here, as you did in 1867. Cardinal Bonaparte has used his utmost influence to prevent the betrayal of the Pope, and has refused to join the Emperor at the seat of war, declaring he means to stand by the Pope.”

Manning had seen Gladstone on his return, but on a condition that Gladstone stated (August 2, 1870) : “Forgive me if I suggest that we perhaps had better not talk of what has been going on at Rome. Our opinions on the matter are strong on both sides, and are wide as the poles asunder.” It was not theology, but naval action, Manning wished to urge upon him. Stonor sent anxious word (August 13, 1870) : “Cardinal Antonelli has twice lately hinted to me that it would be most acceptable to the pontifical government if England would place two ships of war at Civita Vecchia to protect the Pope and guarantee the neutrality of the Papal States.” Manning wrote to Gladstone two days later : “It would seem to me that the highest motives might prompt the British Government to direct that a ship of war should be at or

World Politics

off Civita Vecchia, so as to afford safety in case of need. The present sad state of France makes this easier." Rome telegraphed, and he repeated his request to Gladstone, who replied (August 19, 1870): "I have received your note, the subject of which I will consider fully with Lord Granville, and in London with Mr. Childers." Childers was sympathetic, for his duties at the Admiralty had not prevented his being present at the Definition. Manning had met him as he came out of St. Peter's with: "Is it not glorious?" In any case, Gladstone remembered his old promise to Manning, for H.M.S. *Defence* was sent to the mouth of the Tiber with sealed orders (August 22, 1870). "Should the Holy Father request to be taken on board, he is to be received and treated with all respect." Antonelli thanked the Government for their "wise precautionary measure." The matter had to be kept secret, as Manning wrote to Cullen (August 27, 1870):

"*To be burnt.* Your Eminence will be glad to know that Mr. Gladstone, at my request, has ordered the *Defence* frigate to Civita Vecchia, with instructions to protect the personal safety of the Holy Father. The *Defence* is already there, and will remain. Rumours of our ships being there have been in the papers, and it will be safer that we do not let it become known, as its effect upon Italy, France, and Prussia might hinder our aim."

And to Gladstone: "In my letter to the Rector of the English College I carefully limited the subject to the personal safety and liberty of the Pope, excluding all political questions. My letters from Rome become more and more anxious. I am afraid that this duel, as men call it, will extend to more than the seconds." Cullen wrote in September asking for two or three ships: "If the powers could be induced to declare Rome neutral the city might be saved. Perhaps your Grace might have the kindness to speak to Mr. Gladstone." The reply of

Henry Edward Manning

Gladstone was *private and immediate* (September 15, 1870):

“It appears to me that they desire the spiritual independence, but they seek to act from principle as well as policy from Cavour’s world-famous maxim, *libera Chiesa in libero stato*; that they are quite willing to give or leave the Pope a mathematical point of actual sovereignty, by way of special guarantee, with perfect security for his freedom of movement. I learned yesterday by telegram, with pleasure, that the Under-Secretary of State in Rome had requested British mediation. If in any sense, as *amicus curiæ*, I might offer a suggestion, it would be this, to aim at an arrangement with respect to the city of Rome which shall offer conditions of finality. I hope that Italy might not press the point of making it a capital, but I doubt the utility of making it a San Marino. I speak now of the city apart from the Leonine. And I speak personally.”

He was willing that the Pope should be sheltered by a European guarantee. Manning was ready for the minimum of sovereignty (September 16, 1870): “The Pope once had twenty-three patrimonies. He has now only a remnant of one. But, as you say, a mathematical point would suffice if it be really secure.” Two days later the Italians were in Rome.

Manning was deeply distressed, and forwarded his Roman bulletins to Gladstone (September 30, 1870):

“Three thousand Garibaldians and a multitude of women entered Rome with the army. These are the Romans who received the Italians as saviours and the women of whose classic faces and native dignity the papers told us yesterday.”

October 8, 1870: “I hear as follows: Protestant Bibles, bad books and pictures, and a translation of Lothair were sold in the streets some hours after capitulation. This is a glory for the leader of Her Majesty’s Tory Opposition.” October 11, 1870: “My hope now is that out of the ruin of all international law a new order will arise suited to the altered conditions of all nations.

World Politics

There is one point, your mathematical point, which is the centre of the circle and immutable. I seem to see a way to this reconstruction. But the Powers of Europe must lift Rome above mere Italian politics." October 14, 1870: "It appears to me that the British Empire has a powerful motive to treat of the question of Rome. It contains 110 Catholic sees and bishops. And the question of Rome is so vividly and intensely felt throughout the British Empire that its treatment by our Government will powerfully affect our domestic peace."

The same day Gladstone wrote that "the Pope is likely to lose the Leonine city." Manning replied (October 16, 1870):

"As to the Leonine city, I see the advantage in the Italians not pretending to it. But they have driven the question beyond all such arrangements. It is an Italian question for the moment, because Europe is occupied in watching a frightful duel and seeking to save itself from war. When Europe has a moment, the question will cease to be Italian. The movement in Bohemia and Austria, in Munich, Malines, Geneva, and Ireland is beginning and will grow steadily."

He hoped that the pressure of the faithful who had secured the Infallibility would worst the world a second time to save the Infallible. In England public opinion "scares our Catholics," he complained to Cullen, and urged action in Ireland (September 22, 1870):

"*Private.* If the Lord Lieutenant knew this to be the views of your Eminence and the Bishops he would make it known here with good effect. It would be also of much advantage if by meetings or speeches the sense of Ireland were to be unmistakably declared. The Government would then see that the Roman Question is a domestic question also. I have not written a word of sorrow or indignation, for it is needless; and no word would cover what this outrage has excited."

There was talk of a refuge for the Pope. Malta and Jerusalem were suggested. "They want to send him to

Henry Edward Manning

Jericho!" was Manning's comment. But he suggested that Pius should continue the Council at Malines if necessary. Archbishop Deschamps gave an enthusiastic accession. But the Pope remembered he was Bishop of Rome, and in answer to the cry of Christendom, *Domine quo vadis?* he made Peter's reply and stayed in Rome. Manning was anxious that the English Bishops should issue a joint pastoral on Rome, but Clifford objected. Cullen sympathised (November 10, 1870):

"I am sorry to learn that the English Bishops cannot agree in regard to an address about the Pope. Happily all our Bishops were quite unanimous about an address. Dr. McHale and Dr. Moriarty approved of everything, though we addressed him as the *infallibilis magister ecclesiæ*; but I fear that some few lawyers and officials are following the guidance of Lord Acton."

Manning answered (November 22, 1870): "Would to God that we could do the same. But your Eminence knows where we are. The *Defence* was not moved from Civita Vecchia by change of policy. It could not enter the harbour, but it is ready at Naples for any moment. I think a deputation to Mr. Gladstone of Irish members would be useful. But I am afraid of his committing himself against us." Cullen reported (December 4, 1870): "Mr. Gladstone will not be pleased with the feeling manifesting itself in favour of the Pope, but he may avoid all trouble by adopting the policy of Burke or Pitt. I have got no news from Rome, but the Archbishop of Posen writes exhorting us to make strong declarations in favour of the Temporal Power. He expects something from Prussia, and he thinks that the public opinion of this Empire would have great weight with the old king."

Archbishop Spalding of Baltimore sent news from America (December 29, 1870): "I have just received your pastoral and perused every line of it with great interest and pleasure. It is a big gun. In return for it

World Politics

I have only a little pack of light artillery to offer *ad populum*. Imagine at least 80,000 in my own diocese remembering and sympathising with the Pope on the very day of my return, President Grant himself driving as a private citizen in the procession in Washington. It was glorious, not for me, but for the Holy Pontiff."

Failing to unite his Bishops, Manning tried to unite Catholics in Parliament to "neutralise the action of England." Twelve Irish members sat in Manning's house to decide whether a Roman discussion was advisable. They decided to wait until France could declare herself, and Manning wrote to Cullen (February 23, 1871): "Any moral support and countenance from England would greatly encourage the insolence of Italy and embarrass France. We have already got the maximum of our Government. Gladstone will never say more. He may easily be tempted or driven to say less." And he wrote to Gladstone: "The world is changed since we last met. And our last words were about Prussian diplomacy and Prussian policy. I like neither better than I did then. And I believe Europe is on her beam ends under a north-easter which has made wild work more than once in history."

The Prussian policy in forcing the war with France Manning saw clearer than most of his fellow-countrymen. During the Council Bismarck had had his eye on countries, not churches, and bided his time. He became the enemy incarnate to Manning, who wrote sarcastically:

"Bismarck affirmed that the war was forced on the French Emperor by the Pope and the Jesuits. How providentially, then, though altogether fortuitously, no doubt, had Prussia been for three years massing its munitions of war and putting France in the wrong by intrigues in Spain and fables from Ems. Nevertheless, all these things are believed. Prince von Bismarck has said them. But surely they belong to the Arabian Nights."

Henry Edward Manning

During the siege of Paris Manning organised relief from the Mansion House. The sees of his conciliar rivals, Darboy and Dupanloup, had been invested and bombarded. With the outbreak of the Commune, Darboy was arrested as a hostage by the Bolshevists of the day. Manning made an attempt to save his life, even by appeal to Bismarck, who intervened as far as it was possible. Manning wrote gratefully (May 9, 1871) :

“ This worthy act of high justice has awoken a lively sympathy and a profound respect in England. The passing moments are solemn ones for the Christian and civilised order of Europe. The era of 1848 is renewed before our sight, but with a greater force against enfeebled governments to-day. In such a crisis for the social and Christian order of the world eyes are turned upon the stability of Germany and upon your Highness, who have already exhibited the wisdom and the courage which can alone save the principles of authority and right. Other questions still more vital to the tranquillity of Europe and the world await a solution, in which I hope the voice of the German Empire will answer to its high and protective mission of justice and authority.”

Bismarck replied, also in French (May 19, 1871) :

“ I was deeply touched by the letter your Lordship sent to thank me for the steps taken by the Emperor's order on behalf of the Archbishop of Paris and his clergy. The duty of Christian sympathy, which we have fulfilled by these steps, is intimately connected with the great principles of social and Christian order on which Germany, so happily united, has founded her future and the stability of her institutions; and I am happy to find in your Lordship and the English nation so much sympathy for the sentiments with which the Emperor is himself profoundly imbued. I deeply regret that the hope of the immediate deliverance of the Archbishop of Paris, which we were able for a moment to conceive, has not been realised, owing to the sudden change in the persons who hold power in Paris. However, it is allowable to hope that the impression produced by the intercession of the German Government will have the effect of safeguarding

World Politics

the security of the Archbishop of Paris and of his clergy.”

Fine words were of no avail, and, through Mr. Norcott of the Mansion House Fund, Manning wrote to Darboy in prison and received an answer. The Communards offered to exchange Darboy for Blanqui, whom Thiers refused to give up. On May 24 Darboy was shot in La Roquette, being the third Archbishop of Paris to be killed within a century. Manning went afterwards to kneel on the spot where the good Gallican died. Lord Shaftesbury wrote to express his horror, and added (May 31, 1871): “But it is of no use to dwell on this satanical event. Hell is let loose! Can there be no combination among those who differ on many and, indeed, important points to withstand the torrent of blasphemy and crime? You and I have often discussed these things.” Manning responded heartily to the idea of a common effort: “You have truly appreciated the character of the Archbishop of Paris, who has died nobly as a pastor ought, in the midst of his flock.”

In spite of Bismarck's high assurances to Manning, religious persecution broke out in Germany. The first copy of the Falck Laws in England reached Manning through Frank O'Donnell, and the story of the transit of Manning's version to *The Times* appears in a letter to Ullathorne (Christmas, 1873): “I never intended it for publication, but the secretary had, unknown to me, sent a circular to *The Times*, and they sent one of their staff. I wouldn't let him take notes, and he said *The Times* would feel that they had been misled unless I let him abstract the paper. He then asked for the whole, saying that he believed *The Times* would print it entire. After ten minutes' consultation I let it go, and I do not regret it, for I believe it is safe and defensible. At all events it will get into Germany.”

“January 3, 1874.—I had felt the difficulty of giving importance to a newspaper. But I felt also the risk of

Henry Edward Manning

giving the impression of more mischief than really existed by any public act. Thank God it is hardly appreciable! A certain number of minds are incapable of anything but old forms of words and thoughts. After the Council of Nicæa there were good people who were innocently troublesome. We have hardly one who is formally so. I only know of one priest, and he is zero. We might write a circular in Latin to the clergy, signed by all the Bishops, not so much because of any existing tendency as of the effort to create such a belief to shake and disturb the minds of our people. This document might be *non evulgandum*. But this would leave *The Standard* uncontradicted. For this the substance of such a circular could be sent in a private letter. Please to advise on this." Meantime religious orders were expelled from Germany, and Manning wrote to Gladstone (January 15, 1874): "The ecclesiastical legislation at Berlin is what I could most wish to expose, the hypocrisy of German Liberalism, and to separate the precious from the vile in the Catholic Church in Germany. Bismarck will find it easier to overthrow France than to bind the wind in his fists." Manning became an international figure in his defence of right against might and of the Church against Cæsar. The Falck Laws he denounced as Byzantism. The Church in Germany looked to him for an English independence of expression that could not come elsewhere. He received letters from imprisoned Bishops. Cardinal Melchers, Archbishop of Cologne, wrote to him through prison bars: "*Oremus pro invicem X Paulus Archiepus Coloniae in carcere 28 Aprilis 1874.*" Melchers, in exile, retired to the castle at Amerongen! And Martin of Paderborn wrote to commend his exiled nuns to Westminster, signing himself "*captivus in Castello Wesel.*" The Belgian Primate wrote (anniversary of the death of Louis XVI., 1874):

"In writing to the Archbishop of Posen I quoted your Lordship's words about him that his persevering attitude

World Politics

of apostolical courage assures us the victory in Germany. My letter reached Posen—which does not always happen—and Mgr. Ledochowski answers to-day. If you write to London, pray send in my name to our friend of Westminster to congratulate him on his magnificent dissertation on the neo-Cæsarism. The persecution is growing. The German Cæsar is no longer satisfied with the silence of governments. He wishes them to second his war on the Church. He will not retreat. He wishes for the empire of Charles Quint, but paganised. Bismarck has threatened to withdraw his Minister from Brussels if the Bishops, and, above all, the Archbishop, continue to write and speak as they do. This proconsul loses his head. We will not keep silence.”

So wrote Cardinal Mercier’s predecessor at Malines. Manning’s close touch with the Continent enabled him to keep the English-speaking world open to fair play. The first copy of the Falck Laws in England had come, and he had his translation and answer ready for *The Times* before the arrival of the official copy. “I see that *The Times*,” said Pio Nono to Sir Hubert Jerningham, “which is always against me, is not always in favour of M. von. Bismarck.” Nevertheless a great many Englishmen blindly applauded the new German Empire. Fitzjames Stephen supported Bismarck by an attack on the German Catholics which was attributed to Frederic Harrison, whereupon his editor, Knowles, brought the following note from the indignant philosopher to Manning (March 3, 1873):

“In the name of God, or any other Deity that you or he prefer, do assure the Archbishop that I never wrote an article in a newspaper in my life. That I never shall. That I never write a line anywhere except with my name, Frederic Harrison, in full. That I and all my friends reprobate the policy of Bismarck in touching the liberty of the Church. That I have not the smallest sympathy with the No-Popery cry anywhere. That I think the Church in Ireland the only living Church in the world.”

Henry Edward Manning

The Catholic outlook enabled Manning, as it enabled the American Hierarchy in the next decade, to estimate the Prussian danger in advance of the allied world. As a Protestant he had written to Archdeacon Hare: "It would give me great pleasure to be presented to the great and good King of Prussia, towards whom my heart yearns. Visions of a Teutonic dispensation absorbing the Latin used to float before me in Rome." But the *Culturkampf*, and the subconscious instinct that the Latin Church and race can never lie down at peace with the Teuton, drew some remarkable expressions from him as a Catholic Archbishop. He prophesied that "the aberrations of a false philosophy, the inflation of false science, the pride of unbelief, and the contemptuous scorn of those who believe, are preparing Germany for an overthrow or for suicide." And, again, in words which seemed far-fetched and trivial then, but carry significance to-day: "I am no prophet, but I will foretell that, if Germany lifts its iron hand against the Church of the living God, the land of the Mark of Brandenburg will become as the dust of the summer threshing-floor."

With Gladstone he had attempted to keep "a truce of God" by softening the Infallibility to him (May 21, 1872):

"The Revelation, or Word of God, is, by the confession of all, infallible. Nevertheless it does not hinder progress, science, or research. It is the factor or momentum of all progress. No Infallibility of Church or Pope is beyond, or against, or distinct from, but identical with the Word of God. All Governments, Catholic and non-Catholic, have been living at peace with the Infallible Church. The Infallibility of its Head has added nothing in kind, degree, or extent. Governments have no more to fear from an Infallible Pope than from an Infallible Church. The situation is as old as the Christian world."

"The outcry of Bismarck is artificial. It is to me a portent to see a man of Bismarck's great mental powers

World Politics

talking like a child, and, like a child, pulling the house he has built about his ears. The Catholics of Germany would have upheld the German Empire with joy if he had not made it impossible. His great work can now only be held together by oppression, and oppression works its own downfall."

Gladstone begged off answering him until a day of liberty. "But my Pope, so to speak, is Bishop Butler." Italian politics pleased Manning as little as theology from Italy pleased Gladstone, who sent him a despatch from Rome, whereat Manning burst forth (August 15, 1872):

"We are watching the fable of the wolf and the lamb. Sir Augustus Paget writes what he believes, but he believes what Venosta tells him, and Venosta is playing his part. It is clear that all is moving on to the collision. The Government would fall if it did not grow to fill up the whole circle of its rapine. We can only call it by its Christian name. The Prusso-Italian policy will complete itself, and then will come a European convulsion, out of which may God help you to keep England."

Gladstone cried out against what was producing "an impassable chasm between the Christian religion and the thought of man; in fact, exactly what Voltaire would have desired and Bossuet and Pascal would have wept over." "There is One," answered Manning, "Who is weeping over the Christian world and over Bossuet's and Pascal's aberrations." They were sparring, and the public breach could not long be averted between the Premier of Liberalism and the Primate of Ultramontanism. It was not through jealousy, though Manning was in his way a radical and Gladstone a simple sacerdotalist. The Council had wrought on the nerves of both, and Gladstone, thrown out of office over the Irish University, was spoiling for a fight. He took Manning's "Cæsarism and Ultramontanism" as a challenge. Manning made the latter term identical with "perfect Christianity," and the former a disease—elephantiasis,

Henry Edward Manning

in fact. Gladstone wrote (January 22, 1874): "I limp after you as well as I can. If Cæsarism be the same thing as Erastianism, I can look on with comfort or equanimity while you pummel it, but when you get to your heights I am lame, deaf, and blind. My rudimentary perceptions seem to differ from yours. Nature has made a mistake in one or other of us. My only comfort is that a time will come when, if I am a tenth part as good as you are, we shall both know how a higher power solves all these problems for us." Manning gaily replied: "As to your finance, I only look up, as you do to my Ultramontane heights. I wish you trusted me in the one as much as I trust you in the other." In October Gladstone declared the Church had repudiated "modern thought and ancient history," referring presumably to his friends, Döllinger and Acton. In November he attacked the Vatican Decrees in a pamphlet which Manning declared was written to show "that in all conflicts the Christian Church is always wrong and the Civil State always right." Gladstone talked of "moral murder" and railed at "the myrmidons of the Apostolic Chamber," forgetful that divinity is a science nearer to mathematics than to electioneering. He challenged English Catholics on their civil allegiance and rapped Manning's euphemism of the Pope's deposing power that it "taught subjects obedience and princes clemency." Manning stayed the tide with a letter in *The Times*, declaring his allegiance as good as Gladstone's. Gladstone did not write from Protestant pride at being outside so much as from a spiritual sulk at not being inside the Catholic Church. Bismarck, with his usual dullness, mistook it for a purely political pamphlet.

To Father Morris Manning wrote (November 11, 1874):

"It is the greatest public opportunity we have had since 1851. But it is also our greatest public danger. With Germany on fire, Bismarck corrupting our papers,

World Politics

and Gladstone out of office, we might have a great risk. But the papers are only keeping the sea down out of fear of mischief, not out of goodwill to us. We might change the whole face of it by one mistake. I thought of you when reading Acton's scandalous letter. Pray look up St. Pius V.'s assassinations and Fénelon's duplicity and let me know. We must gain immensely, for everybody will now listen and a few understand. But my poor friend is gone."

And to Ullathorne (November 9, 1874): "Is it possible for the Bishop of Shrewsbury and myself to allow Lord Acton's letter in *The Times* of to-day to pass unnoticed?"

December 7, 1874: "The danger is evident. I will not ascribe Gladstone's act to resentment or ambition, but neither is absent. The most mischievous enactment would be a test, and Gladstone, inspired by Döllinger, is the man to try it. But what Government could impose it on Ireland?"

Gladstone's outburst was more upsetting to politicians than theologians. "You will remember, perhaps," wrote Manning to Cullen, "that I said Admiral Fitzroy's signals were up for a storm. So far as I have yet learned, Mr. Gladstone's old colleagues are sorry for his act." Ullathorne was the first to reply to Gladstone, and then Newman wrote his wonderful letter to the Duke of Norfolk. To Ullathorne Manning wrote (January 15, 1875): "I have not yet read Dr. Newman's pamphlet, and I have not done so that I may be clear of seeming in any way to refer to what he has said, if in anything, which I hope is not likely, there were a divergence. I am glad to say this to you, that he also may know it, if even there were need." Manning issued a rattling reply, pointing out that the interference of the Church in the civil sphere was the idea of those who "first prophesied that the Council would interfere, and now write scientific history to prove that it has done so." His most enduring point was that "non-Catholic doctrine is more dangerous to the State than the Catholic." Gladstone replied in a second pamphlet, sending private word: "I offer no

Henry Edward Manning

apology. Apologies in such cases only seem to mock. There is no remedy on this side the grave." He thought Vaticanism foreshadowed "Asian monarchy," and he threw in a cut: "If we had Dr. Newman for Pope we should be tolerably safe, so merciful and genial would be his rule!" Finally he denied Manning's public statement that their friendship had never been overcast. Manning wrote to Ullathorne (February 25, 1875): "Gladstone is out again, as you see, with the animosity of a man in the wrong. But his pamphlet admits our complete unity. I have written to him on the last paragraph. It might mean that he had lent me money and had never been repaid." In the end Gladstone changed it, and Manning wrote: "I can hardly regret that occasion was given for this correspondence, which puts on record that, wide as we are asunder, it is a variance consistent with all that is of fair and good report." But for seven years they exchanged no letters. Both were conscious, as Manning gently stated in 1847, "that we have had a shade hanging, almost diaphanously, between our minds on the subject of Infallibility."

Meantime Rome had seen her faithful champion wrestling now with Bismarck, now with Gladstone, and become the target of the world's attack, and word of sublime dignity was sent him, which he communicated to Ullathorne (March 2, 1875):

"People are annoyed with Gladstone, not for attacking us, but for breaking the peace and making politics impossible. They would be quickly and still more annoyed with us if we kept the controversy alive. They do not think that we are beaten, and they would not endure to think that we had beaten him. Some time ago you congratulated me, when I knew nothing. I do now, and am called at once to Rome. But God knows I feel no congratulation."

Manning was proclaimed Cardinal and added to the very small and distinguished company of Englishmen

World Politics

who have sat in the Senate of the Church. De Grassis once wrote that men said "an English Cardinal ought not to be created lightly because the English behave themselves insolently in their dignity." Certainly the title was unpopular in Merry England. It was not until the nineteenth century that English Cardinals enjoyed an amazing prestige. However unpopular had been Wiseman's elevation, his obsequies had rivalled those of Wellington. Newman now wrote to point out to Manning "the contrast between the circumstances under which you return invested with this special dignity and twenty-five years ago." Manning was the first parson to become a Cardinal, and the High Church felt the compliment. Tenniel published one of his best cartoons in *Punch* representing the Cardinal in his well-known attitude over a roaring fire, contemplating a Papal tiara in the smoke, but whether as the object of his faith or hope the artist left no hint. His international position was now sealed. At speech day at Harrow his honours were proclaimed and his "*miram rerum divinarum peritiam*" publicly mentioned. In his own family he had less honour. Frederick, the head of the family, still ignored him, and Samuel Wilberforce is described by F. Leveson Gower in his *Reminiscences* as devoutly hoping it was right to wish the Pope dead before he made his brother-in-law a Cardinal, "which will be bad for him and bad for other people." From Gladstone came no congratulation. In 1881 Manning set down notes of their friendship. "He was nearer to being a clergyman than I was. He was, as I believe, as fit for it as I was unfit. But God crossed his hands and called him to the life I had chosen and me to the life I had thought of entering." And again: "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

Henry Edward Manning

impossible. I believed that in 1874 a mischief-maker came between us." It was not until the publication of Bishop Wilberforce's *Life* that he identified the mischief-maker and wrote to Lady Herbert (January 8, 1883):

"As to poor Samuel Wilberforce, the world knows now what I have known always, but I was silent. It is the saddest collapse of a name. I have heard nothing but lamentation for the father and indignation for the son. I can now understand the personal alienation of Gladstone's mind toward me. Unconsciously, perhaps, he must have been affected by this unhappy mind. A whisperer separateth chief friends."

Gladstone's outburst on behalf of the Bulgarians was coupled with a suggestion that Manning should save the Pope from a "wretchedly false position." Manning wrote to De Lisle (September 6, 1876):

"I am not aware of any position, 'wretched' or otherwise, taken up by the Pope. It is to me clear as day that to light a fire by declamation against atrocities is the way to make smoke. I can neither help Russian intrigue nor international revolution, by which the poor Bulgarians and Servians have been outraged and slaughtered already." September 8, 1876: "I am prepared to go further than Mr. Gladstone in this Eastern question, and if I could induce the Christian Powers to enter upon a crusade for the liberation of the Christian people of the East I would do it."

Manning visited Rome in the sunset of Pius, and returned filled with gloomy foreboding. He noted at the end of 1876:

"I must believe a light from above fixed my mind upon the one great event, which might come any day and cannot be far off. I mean the Conclave. Now, I found one only belief—that it would be the occasion of all the anti-Christian spirits in the world, and therefore a moment of danger. Some think they can prevent any election. Some that at least they can retard or render any election doubtful. If Italy were engaged in war, Rome

World Politics

would be in the hands of the populace. Humanly speaking, everything converges to great danger. And as such we ought to face it." (And he discussed with himself the chances of martyrdom.) "To die gladly for the See of Peter is assuredly to die for Our Lord. I hardly venture to think that Our Lord would call such as I am to so great a grace. It would be, indeed, to say to a soul in the mire, Come up hither! I have always had a great fear of death. If I were sure of my salvation, I believe I should not fear death except for the certainty of Purgatory. But if to die for Our Lord cancels all *culpa* and all *pœna*, without Purgatory and with instant vision of God, it would change my whole mind. Now, I felt in Rome the natural fear of violent death. For a time it held me fast with all its train of thought, until I looked it straight in the face. St. Thomas of Canterbury knew by a vision of Our Lord that he would be martyred. He appeared to him after Mass on St. Stephen's Day in the Chapel of St. Stephen. Come what may, I wish every day in Holy Mass to offer myself, *Hoc est Corpus meum*. Soldiers and sailors expose their life consciously for duty. If priests or pastors shrink, the very world would cry out."

Towards the close of 1877 he proceeded to Rome, and on its last day received the Red Hat from Pius. He wrote to Cullen (January 1, 1878): "I write to give you a report of the Holy Father. He is still in bed, and his weakness is visible. But he was able to hold the two consistories without suffering. If no new illness supervenes, this state may be indefinitely prolonged. And now, where is Lord Beaconsfield leading us?" But Pius was near his end. On February 6 Manning presented England's Peter's Pence. The next day there was an alarm. "I went into his bedroom. He was motionless, and his face calm and grand. I knelt down and kissed his hand. He said, *Addio carissimo*." At Ave Maria that evening he died. Manning wrote to Lane Fox (February 10, 1878): "I can hardly believe that I shall never again hear the voice. It is to me the loss of a

Henry Edward Manning

father. To Rome and to the Churches it is the loss of one of the greatest Pontiffs who ever reigned. I can give you no notion of what is passing here. But God and Satan are in conflict." The Conclave began on February 18. Before he was shut off from the world, Manning wrote to Lady Herbert :

"The next Pope must draw Italy to him as Pius drew the whole world. And none but an Italian who loves Italy and is loved by Italians can do this. I have myself urged this on all, and I hope we shall be agreed all. But in finding the right person we shall be, I am afraid, some time. I am abused here day after day, and sometimes brutally. Last night, when I kissed his foot in the bier, I laid my pectoral cross on it as a pledge of fidelity and a prayer that I might be kept faithful to the end."

Manning was present at the private gathering in Cardinal Bartolini's room when the latter proposed the Cardinal Camerlengo Pecci, who, during the last pontificate, had been exiled to Perugia. Cardinal Monaco was suggested, but refused. Likewise Cardinal Bilio, who had a probable majority in his favour, but he also refused, and suggested Cardinal Ledochowski, to whom others objected. Manning was then mentioned, and for a glittering moment stood on the step of the Papal throne, the first Englishman since Wolsey three centuries before. He refused on the ground that the first Pope after the loss of the Temporal Power must be an Italian. With true courtesy the Cardinals refused to allow that Manning was a stranger in Rome. Bilio reminded him that there had been foreign Popes, but Manning replied that Catholic unity was then the order of the world. Bilio then went and knelt before Pecci in order to efface his own following in his favour. On the authority of one present, Manning was one of the three who had first supported Pecci. The requisite votes were counted, and one by one the green and purple canopies surmounting

World Politics

the Cardinals' thrones were lowered in the presence of Leo the Thirteenth.

Cardinal Manning's precedence was, to a curious extent, recognised in England. When he served on the Housing Commission, Sir William Harcourt, as Home Secretary, consulted the Prince of Wales, who suggested that the Cardinal's name should follow his own. Accordingly "our trusty and well-beloved Henry Edward" was preferred over the Peerage. Later, Sir Henry Isaacs, as Lord Mayor of London, allowed the Cardinal to precede him on a petition to establish letter-express. *The Times* accused the Mayor of abrogating his position as first citizen, and it was pointed out that "Irish Archbishop" was his proper title in law. As his rank of Prince of the Church hung upon the Pope's Sovereignty, then in abeyance, moderate men were willing he should be docketed as a "deposed Prince," but there were stern Protestants who could only see a self-deposed Arch-deacon. Manning preserved one of the well-meant threats thrown at him on this occasion :

"Sir, if you think you will be allowed to take social precedence of the Protestant nobility, you greatly deceive yourself. Your first attempt is already watched. I allude to your name appearing at the head of the patrons of a proposed cab and cab-horse competition at the Alexandra Palace!"

Questions had been asked in the House, and *The Times* laid down that "with the Prince of Wales it was a matter of courtesy. With Mr. Gladstone it must be reckoned as an official act." The Prince had not been without reasons for wishing to show courtesy. In 1871, when he lay ill beyond hope of recovery, Manning obtained the prayers of the Pope. At ten on the critical night of December 12, Lord Halifax wrote to Manning : "Would it be possible that a telegram should be sent to the Pope asking his prayers for the Prince of Wales now when the Prince's recovery hangs in the balance, and

Henry Edward Manning

that the Queen, to whom I know it would be most grateful, should receive a telegram from Rome assuring her of the Pope's prayers for the recovery of her son?" The Pope's telegram reached Sandringham the next day, and Lord Halifax relates that the Prince placed it under his pillow. Recovery followed in due course, and the Prince, during a visit to the Riviera, found occasion to thank the Pope personally. Ullathorne consulted Manning whether the Catholic should follow the Anglican Bishops in congratulating the Prince. "It is not well for us to be either too forward or to be wanting." Manning consulted Propaganda, and was given the analogous case of Moldavia, where the faithful were allowed to sing *Te Deum* for their heterodox Prince, provided they prayed for his true felicity. The Irish visit of the Prince had left difficulties. The Orangemen had played "Croppies lie down," and the Prince had innocently danced. Cullen wrote (February 15, 1872):

"I forgot to ask your Grace what ought to be done in reference to the thanksgiving of the Prince of Wales. I must add that the Catholics were greatly offended by the proceedings of the Prince last August and his speech. There were complaints in official circles that the people did not show much enthusiasm. How could it be expected when he went out of his way to hurt their religious feelings?" Manning answered (February 16, 1872): "My intention is to order a *Te Deum* in the cathedral and to give permission to all the churches to have Benediction. I feel that the difference is great between Dublin and London. And the unhappy Freemason folly raises a distinct and local difficulty."

After the Housing Commission, on which both served, Cardinal and Prince became decided friends. Their only divergence was over the Bill allowing the marriage with the deceased wife's sister, which the Prince voted for in the Lords. "I have been doing something you disapprove, sir!" he informed the Cardinal. "I know you have, sir!" "But I did what was right, sir!" "I

World Politics

know you think so, sir!" was the Cardinal's uncompromising comment.

They exchanged letters on certain occasions. After the death of Prince Leopold the Prince wrote (April 7, 1884):

"The kind letter that I received from you to-day has touched me deeply, and I beg you to accept my heartfelt thanks for your Eminence's sympathy on the occasion of the sad loss which the Queen and all the members of the Royal Family have sustained. The eulogium which you pass on my lamented brother is very soothing to our hearts, and it is some considerable solace to us to receive such kind sympathy when we are in such grief."

When the Prince's eldest son attained majority the Cardinal wrote (January 10, 1885):

"Sir, I had no privilege to be among the first to approach your Royal Highness in these days of congratulation, but I am not willing to be among the last. May Prince Edward be always, as he is at this day, the joy of your heart and the strength of your right hand for long years to come." The Prince replied: "It has been a great gratification to me to receive your letter to-day, and I beg you to receive my most sincere thanks for your letter and all the kind expressions it contains and the good wishes you express on the occasion of our eldest son attaining his majority. Both he and the Princess are very sensible of your congratulations."

By a tragic coincidence, the young Prince died on the same day as the Cardinal. On another occasion the Prince was anxious that Manning should speak at a dinner for a National Leprosy Fund. Owing to old age, the Cardinal was compelled to refuse. The Prince replied with studied politeness (January 2, 1890):

"I am anxious to express to you without delay how grateful I am to you for your most kind letter. But I quite understand that your health will not admit of the fatigue. I feel deeply flattered by, I fear, the immerited remarks you make about me, but names such as Charles

Henry Edward Manning

Gordon and Father Damien are indeed worthy to be cherished and honoured in the minds of our countrymen."

The fall of Rome burdened Europe with a perilous and perennial problem, and Manning was no optimist, as he told Gladstone (February 7, 1872): "I could say nothing which has not been said, weighed, and decided already at the Vatican. The state of Rome is one impossible, perhaps, for the European Governments to touch, but impossible for us to recognise by the remotest act." When the English College was threatened, Gladstone informed him "all intention of confiscating the English College is somewhat indignantly denied on the part of the Italian Government." "I am thankful," answered Manning, "that the declaration of the Italian Government is deposited in the hands of the British Government. I wish to be sincere. I do not believe a word that comes out of their mouth." But his own Government proved more unfriendly still, for three years later he wrote to Cullen (February 18, 1875): "I have just received a copy of as hostile a letter as could be from Sir A. Paget, saying that our Government repudiates the so-called English College and regards it as an Italian institution. There is no help in Princes." There was nothing to be done but to approach Disraeli, who was probably solaced by Gladstone's Irish failure for his own. Manning sent a note on the Roman Question, through Sir John Pope-Hennessy, pointing out to the Cabinet (May 20, 1875): "It is the fear of armed intervention on the part of France that throws the Italian Government upon Berlin for protection. 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." His pith was that "Italy alone can solve the Roman Question," and its solution would keep her out of the German toils—a very far-sighted view. Of the note he afterwards wrote: "It was read in a Cabinet Council. M. d'Harcourt,

World Politics

French Ambassador, had a copy and sent it to Duc Decazes in Paris. He to M. de Courcelles in Rome. M. de Courcelles misrepresented it all over Rome as a *Conciliazione*." Together with Nardi, the French Ambassador made a mare's nest of it. Manning's elastic mind had taken a turn on the Temporal Power which put him in advance of his fellow-Cardinals, most of whom awaited a miracle. Two years later he wrote to Clifford: "I will not deny that I have been sensitive upon the point of fidelity to the highest interests in our conflict with the Italian Government. And the Rector will tell you how poor Mgr. Nardi went to and fro sowing mischief. I know Rome so well that I know some of its dangers." A few such experiences in Rome, even before Pius died, threw him into a sadness out of which grew, not sour old age, but rejuvenation on new fields. Peoples and democracies took the place that councils and dogmas had held in his mind. He was disappointed at the quietism with which the Cardinals bowed under the Italian storm. As he wrote to Lane Fox (November 29, 1876): "This is not my place. If there is any use in me it is out in the field with the sheep and the wolves. Things here are not to be written about. In nothing are they better, and in almost all things they are worse. The mass of the people is gone." And he queried, "Are we to shut ourselves in like Noe and wait?" The recovery of the world was not possible "by leaving it in its corruption till it returns by itself to soundness! Surely this is contrary to the parable of the lost sheep?" The era following the victory of Germany was anti-clerical, and he found constant work in saving colleges and Church property. He wrote (May 14, 1880): "As to Douai, I have written to Lord Lyons to ask him to represent to the French Government that the college is English and for the English."

By 1878 Manning had brought himself to revisit Disraeli, who noted him with pleasure as "a fervent

Henry Edward Manning

supporter." But Disraeli was to help him protect property in Rome. Manning wrote to him during the next year (January 29, 1879) :

"I hope you may have full health and strength to carry the country with you in a firm and solid compactness which, with the Continent before me, I believe to be vital to the safety of the British Empire." February 6, 1879: "This afternoon I begin my journey. I shall hope in Paris to have some reassuring information. But all looks steadily to a collision, I fear. The meeting of Parliament will soon, I do not think, be brisk enough for the A.B.C.D.'s, still less for Liberals generally." April 1, 1879: "As I fear that my return to England may still be delayed, I write on a subject on which I had rather speak more fully. In the year 1870 the French Government, consciously or not I cannot say, threw the Armenian Catholics at Constantinople into a false position, which ended in a schism. The consequence of this was a loss of influence to France and a gain of influence to Russia. On my return from Rome to England in 1870 I made this known at the Foreign Office, with no result that I know. This Armenian schism is now happily breaking up. The head of it, Mgr. Kupellian, has made his submission; and the Porte either has recognised, or will recognise once more, Mgr. Hassoun, the Armenian Patriarch. France and England have now again the opportunity of regaining their influence over the Armenians. Although at Constantinople they may not be more than 70,000, they have much weight for cultivation and position as bankers and merchants. They are also in close relation with their own people in Armenia; and to regain their confidence cannot be without its beneficial effect in Asia Minor. To this I may add that in Cyprus there are Maronites, Armenians, Catholics of European races, and a population antiently Catholics but absorbed by Islamism. There is now a Maronite Archbishop in Cyprus; but it will be necessary to have a Bishop of the Latin Rite for the European, especially the British and Irish Catholics, who will increase in number by reason of trade and of our soldiers and sailors who are Catholic. It seems to me that in this there is an

World Politics

opening for good in many ways. In passing through Paris Count Mar Latrie, head of the Geographical Department, came to me to speak on the subject of the English occupation of Cyprus, which he regarded in a very friendly way. He has been much in Cyprus, and has written a work upon the island. He urged the planting of a Bishop of the Latin Rite there, and requested me to lay it before Leo XIII., which I have done. The Pope is willing to entertain the proposal. No one among our statesmen knows better than you of how great importance the religious influences are in the East; and it seems to me that at Constantinople and Cyprus much may be done. I hope before long to have an opportunity of saying what comes to me from Austrian sources, and some nearer here, on the subject of the foreign policy of our Government. It cannot fail to be acceptable to you and to Lord Salisbury as I believe."

December 30, 1879: "I cannot help writing to say how I have shared in the anxieties you and the Government must have had in the last fortnight, and how thankful I am for the relief brought by the tidings of yesterday. I have watched with dismay the violence of passion and speech with which everything over which Englishmen ought to have been silent and firm has been hailed and greeted. If any disaster had befallen us it would, I believe, have been an Imperial danger. It is strange that Frenchmen, Germans, and Austrians can see what some Englishmen and Scotchmen cannot. I am no politician, but it is clear to me that, having an Empire, we must either give it up or keep it up. To give it up would be our extinction as a power in the world; to keep it up seems to me to demand, and even to dictate, the policy you have pursued. And Englishmen must give up trembling at dangers and puling about taxes. There is nothing Imperial in such conduct. I wish you a happy New Year, which, as you said, after seventy is a new gift."

This drew an exuberant reply from the melancholy Minister (December 31, 1879):

"In the dark and disturbing days on which we have fallen, so fierce with faction even among the most

Henry Edward Manning

responsible, the voice of patriotism from one so eminent as yourself will animate the faltering and add courage even to the brave." January 28, 1880: "*Private*. Our Cabinets are over except the last one, which precedes always the meeting of Parliament. You will find me at your service to-morrow morning at noon or at three o'clock the same day if more convenient to you. A roughish letter, for I am on the sofa with a little gout, but I hope you are free from that friend and I shall be soon."

Herbert Vaughan wrote on behalf of Propaganda, which, during a previous revolution, was protected by the American flag (February 23, 1880):

"The Italian ministry is anxious to convert the property of Propaganda. The King is opposed to doing so, partly because he respects his father's wish that Propaganda should not be touched, and partly because he does not wish to injure the Church. He has said he wants to be backed by the foreign, and especially by the English, Ambassador. Paget is well disposed, and told me to write him a letter. I put into it these facts: That Propaganda has endowments made by the Cardinal Duke of York and other Englishmen for British interests. The Scotch Bishops receive a portion of the interest every year. Propaganda helps us financially in many ways—*e.g.*, I received the full travelling expenses (£400) last year for four chaplains to the British Army in Afghanistan. One hundred and twenty-five Bishops scattered throughout the British Empire would regard an injury done to Propaganda as done to themselves. Paget has written to the Foreign Office. He wants instructions to act officiously. To-day one of the attachés has come to me privately to suggest that you be accompanied to Lord Beaconsfield by the Duke or other laymen, and that this should be done without delay. The King is very anxious to get support against his own ministry. The French and Austrian Ambassadors have promised to act, but the King says England's weight will be the greatest as a Protestant and impartial power."

Manning wrote to Disraeli, and received a last note from that mocking pen (February 27, 1880):

World Politics

“*Private.* I am quite aware of the business to which your letter refers. I am giving my attention to it, and I do not think at present it will be necessary to trouble you to call on yours sincerely, Beaconsfield.” Manning sent a letter of Cardinal Simeoni the next day (February 28, 1880): “By to-day’s post I have received the two inclosed papers from the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda, and I venture to send them to you. I need hardly say that the Propaganda is like ‘the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts,’ and that it has many missionaries serving in British India. Last autumn it helped us to send missionaries to the North-West Frontier, with the duty also of ministering to our troops in Afghanistan. The Propaganda is an international society with a college of a hundred students. Excuse my troubling you again in a matter external to politics but vital to us.”

In the next month Gladstone turned the electoral scales, and Disraeli was swept from power for ever. Though Disraeli caricatured Manning as Cardinal Grandison (the Bedingfeld title) in his novel *Lothair*, they were never antipathetic. They were both unique in Victorian life, and had reason to be interested in each other’s careers. In *Vivian Grey* Disraeli said he would fancy the part of Wolsey but for the chances against; but they cannot have been less than those which lay between Lavington Rectory and the Sacred College. Each represented a picturesque but foreign element in English public life. Each carved out a career, not by leading the radical forces each was attracted to, but by reanimating an old-fashioned cause. It is doubtful if the old Catholics approved of Manning’s leadership more than the old Tories of Disraeli’s. Each was personally and deeply devoted to the respective Sovereigns, who advanced them to the highest places in their gift. By a curious coincidence, Disraeli had procured the title of Empress for the Queen with the same imaginative devotion that inspired

Henry Edward Manning

Manning to set the prerogative of Pius on a pinnacle. And they were the two public men of whom Gladstone stood in respect. One could worst him in debate and the other in controversy, though in the public view the volubility of Gladstone seemed to prevail. Foils, friends or foes, they stand out against the billowy background of Gladstone's life.

Disraeli dead, Manning turned again to his rival to explain (February 19, 1884): "The Propaganda has a twofold character. It is the chief Missionary College of the Church, but it is also to the Holy See what the Colonial Office is to the Home Government. The Propaganda is the channel through which the British Empire communicates in matters purely spiritual with the Holy See." To the end of his life Manning found it necessary to safeguard property in Rome through the British envoys, one of whom, Lord Dufferin, wrote to him (September 6, 1890):

"When I came to Rome, perhaps my most vivid association with the place was a walk with your Eminence some thirty-five years ago along the banks of the Tiber, and your great kindness to me. We have been already doing our best under the directions of Archbishop Stonor to protect your interests, nor will I cease my efforts in the direction you desire, though I find this is a very difficult Government to deal with, when the interests of ecclesiastics are concerned."

New leaders showed on the horizon, and of these Manning became sincerely attached to Sir Charles Dilke, who noted in his diary (July 15, 1880):

"I saw Cardinal Manning, who had returned to England on the previous night. He talked freely of his views about the Italian Kingdom, and said that for his part he was quite willing to support the Italian monarchy, but that the Italian Cardinals still wanted to upset it. He thought that the clericals should accept the monarchy and take part in the elections, but the Vatican was so

World Politics

badly advised that it would one day let the monarchy be upset by the revolutionary party in the hope that something good might come of the disturbance, and he knew that the result would only be the setting up of an anti-clerical republic."

In 1883 Manning paid his last official visit to the city with which the triumphs and trials of his life were largely associated. It was agreeable to find that his views on democracy were not unpleasant to the new Pope, who himself had begun to look to peoples and republics. The old Cardinals were dead, and Manning perceived a change :

"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."

"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."

And he wrote to Aubrey de Vere (April 9, 1885): "I am watching with anxiety what is passing in Italy, being fully convinced that Rome can only return to the Pope by the will of the Italian people, and armed intervention or diplomatic pressure will only revive and harden the opposition of the Italian people." But the recurring fear in all he wrote was that Italy was being taught "to hang on Berlin for safety." The Church policy, which was losing the Italian people by failure to appreciate new remedies, he described as "like the Peculiar People refusing medicines." In the end he concluded that the Italians were in Rome as a Divine chastisement. And he dreamed of the Church conquering the Italian and all governments through the peoples.

Henry Edward Manning

To his own country Manning was intensely and sensitively loyal. "The better the Catholic, the better the Englishman," he insisted. Without curtailing his loyalty, he opposed the State in spirituals; without foregoing his birthright of liberty, he protested against free thought, as it tended to licence; and without overthrowing the doctrine that an Englishman's house is his castle, he attacked the fallacy that men of property had the right to do what they wished with their own. To the Empire, "which, like the daughter of Pericles, governs the world," he became particularly attached. The stronger the Englishry in him, the more tolerant he was of other peoples. He saw and sympathised with the Irish case before Gladstone. He realised also that the British flag was good swaddling cloth for young Catholic missions abroad. It was, therefore, with particular zest that he shared in ridding British India of Portuguese Church patronage. When Leo XIII. gave the superannuated Primacy of Goa notice, Sir George Errington, acting for Gladstone in Rome, communicated with Granville at the Foreign Office, who answered that British Catholics were best assured of liberty under a hierarchy of their own. The Government at this moment fell, and Cardinal Jacobini wrote to Manning in August, 1885 :

"It cannot escape your Eminence's penetration that the counter-proposals of Portugal are extreme, and I have therefore not failed to acquaint the Government of that country with the reasons and circumstances on account of which the Holy See is not in a position to receive them favourably. At the same time I have invited the Marquis di Thomar to a conference in order to give explanations and elucidations of the above-mentioned proposals of the Holy See. And accordingly I informed the Portuguese Government that England had formally declared to me that it would oppose any project involving the constitution of Portuguese Bishops on English territory, thus to facilitate in some degree a pacific solution, upon the bases proposed by the Holy See, it would be of

World Politics

the highest importance that the new Ministry should follow in this matter the course of the Gladstone Cabinet."

Manning put the matter to the new Premier, Lord Salisbury, who gave him an interview at the Cardinal's house. While making assurance of Government neutrality in religious matters, Salisbury said he could not regard indifferently the Portuguese Government appointing Bishops in British territory. This was just what Manning wished him to feel, as it gave a lever for the Holy See to apply to Portugal. He then wrote to Salisbury (August 21, 1885):

"In the interview which your Lordship was so good as to give me some weeks ago, I laid before you verbally a communication from Rome, intrusted to me, on the subject of the Ecclesiastical Patronage over the territory of British India, claimed by the Portuguese Government.

"Great and serious evils have arisen during the last half-century from this claim on the part of Portugal. It has imported into British India a conflict of ecclesiastical jurisdictions, followed by much religious dissension. It has hindered the spiritual offices of the Church among the Goanese populations scattered in part through British India, whose religious condition stands in need of much correction and elevation. It has introduced among them many ecclesiastics, of whom, to say the least, the conduct is unsatisfactory, and, I must add, unworthy. To put an end to these both permanent and ever-recurring evils, the Holy See has informed the Government of Portugal of its intention to regulate the ecclesiastical state in the Archbishopric of Goa, with its suffragans, and in British India, upon the following bases . . .

". . . From this your Lordship will observe that the above proposals may all be reduced to two points :

"1. The exclusion of the Portuguese claims and jurisdiction in British India.

"2. The completion of the spiritual order of the Church by the erection of dioceses.

"It is to these two points that I am instructed to ask the assent of Her Majesty's Government."

Henry Edward Manning

Friendship with Cardinal Lavigerie brought Manning into African questions. "He and I live out in the desert," wrote Manning to J. E. C. Bodley, "for we are neither of us hampered by local traditions. He can support the Republic and I can attack the Capitalists. It is a mad world and very sick." Lavigerie came to London to hold an anti-slavery meeting, and Manning induced Granville to take the chair. To Lavigerie he wrote afterwards (August 9, 1888) :

"I must thank you for your visit to London, which was too short, and for the momentum you have given our efforts on behalf of the poor slaves. This is how we stand : *The Times* is open to us, and we will be able to publish all your communications in the future. I will always be the faithful intermediary of your information. Important persons show themselves disposed to take an energetic part, and even to go to Africa. I hope to organise the crusade in the United Kingdom. On Sunday I wrote the happy result of your mission to the Holy Father. I hope you are pleased with my fellow-countrymen, Catholic or not. They are good folk. A good hundred of my priests listened to your speech."

Cardinal Lavigerie wrote (April 29, 1891) :

"Your Eminence is aware that under Pius IX., and after the first journey of Stanley to Victoria Nyanza, I sent missionaries from Algiers into Uganda. This Apostolate was blessed by God, and a great number, amounting to nearly 20,000 blacks, joined them and received baptism. At the same time Anglican missionaries arrived in the same kingdom and received, doubtless, a less favourable welcome, but one fruitful in results, and formed a Protestant flock amounting to a half of ours. The Anglican ministers naturally bethought themselves of making their spiritual conquest of profit to the English Government, and created a powerful political party, which has induced Mwanga, the King of Uganda, to accept English Protectorate for two years. Our French missionaries, with an Alsatian Bishop at their head and an English Catholic in their number, so far from oppos-

World Politics

ing a British Protectorate, would even rally to its support, if they received suitable religious guarantees. I encourage them in this course, and will give any sureties that Lord Salisbury's Government think necessary. Our missionaries only ask that the Protectorate may be confided to an English Catholic to avoid all friction. I would be very pleased, as I desire to show my old and sincere sympathy for England in matters political. This I can do without inconvenience, as the French Government informed me some years ago that they had no kind of pretension to any Protectorate in Central or East Africa. I confide this to your wisdom, charity, and zeal for religion. It is, no doubt, delicate, but experience had taught me that the most delicate matters are won in advance when in your venerable hands."

Manning wrote to Lord Salisbury (June 3, 1891) :

"I have some hesitation to add to the multiplicity of your daily and anxious cares, but I hope the subject of this note will not sensibly do so. My first intention was to make an abstract of the inclosed letter, but, on reflection, I have thought it better to ask you to take the trouble to read it. It is from Cardinal Lavigerie. The tone of it arises from the fact that we have been friends for nearly forty years, and of late very intimately. What he asks is that his missionaries in Uganda may share in the protection of England, which already exists for the English missionaries. No abstract would sufficiently convey his mind. Pray excuse this trouble, which can await your leisure."

And again (June 25, 1891) :

"I have to thank your Lordship for the reply you have been so good as to give to the application of Cardinal Lavigerie, that his missionaries in Uganda may share in the British protection. This assurance will be most satisfactory to him; and from correspondence I have before me, I am convinced that the Cardinal will enforce with all vigilance the duty of abstaining from all political action, and of cultivating the most peaceful relations with all other missionaries and Christians. I will take care to convey this injunction to Cardinal Lavigerie."

Henry Edward Manning

Such cases, coming to him from the ends of the earth, the protection of African missionaries, the growth of an English-speaking episcopate in the Antipodes, the question of a Cardinal for Canada, the exclusion of Portuguese hieratic influence in India, tended to advance the Imperial idea in his mind. Between the Universal Church and the Universal Empire he saw the possibility of common appreciation and understanding. He asked for perfect neutrality, and, where the State benefited, for protection. He had once bitterly deplored the inability of the Empire to convert or spiritualise its possessions. He felt now that an Empire that was neutral could be simultaneously a great Protestant Power officially, but also a great Catholic one. But he insisted that the connection between Empire and Church must be on a spiritual basis and through Bishops. Diplomatic relations between the Foreign Office and the Holy See he combated as long as he lived. There is some reason for believing that Dilke's accusation that he was something of a Jingo was true. At any rate, he declared at the Mansion House that, as the Empire was a link in the world's civilisation, it was a duty on every man to be Imperial.

CHAPTER XVI: THE CASE OF DR. NEWMAN

“What does Manning mean by telling you that there is a deep gulf between him and me, while he tells all Catholics that he is already quite one with them?”—*Newman to Henry Wilberforce*, 1848.

As Anglicans, Manning and Newman disagreed to the extent that Manning remained outside the Oxford Movement. As Archdeacon, he did not approve of the Oxford Tracts, and never regarded Newman's Tract Ninety as straightforward. Far back in the thirties Manning wrote to Samuel Wilberforce (March 8, 1837):

“I am afraid, between our Presbyterial selves, that Newman did not like my joking letter. He answered rather edgily and defensively, or Raikily. So I wrote a very soft demiss rejoinder. He said he did not understand me to be fixed and that I was ‘wandering.’ I suppose Henry's bolt has shaken his confidence in married priests, at least of this kin. I suppose we bumpkins grow *bomolochoi*, and ought not to take liberties.”

His criticism of Newman's *Sermons* was made three years previously (December 15, 1834):

“I feel that it is the hardest book to criticise I ever met with, because it contains so much truth, and because its fault is rather defect than disease. Without being able to say why, I feel something in the complexion of his views very unsatisfactory. Of course, it is a packed volume, and pointed at particular errors. It exhibits religion most fully and pointedly as a system of requisitions, but seems to cramp the attractive, encouraging, and cheering spirit of our better hope. And the omission of the agency of the Holy Spirit as a Person continually present, helping, teaching, strengthening, guiding, and enabling us is especially unfortunate.”

To Gladstone Manning wrote in 1842: “In some things I thoroughly agree with Newman, in some things

Henry Edward Manning

partially, in some not at all." Differences never ceased during the next half-century, but the Church was not to blame, since she *creates* Cardinals only in a secondary sense. They were born to differ, and reborn in the Catholic Church to agree on what alone they could agree—her Divinity! Their very approach was different, Newman withdrawing out of sight to wrestle with his elusive heart, Manning going up to the Metropolis to make his test upon a public controversy. For a moment the lost leader and the ex-Archdeacon sat together at the feet of Wiseman at the Synod of Oscott. It was typical of their gifts that, while the Crimean War set Manning at plans for sending chaplains and nuns to the Front, Newman was lecturing on the *Turk in Europe*. A volume of sermons he dedicated to Manning, who wrote (Oct. 20, 1857): "Few things would be more grateful to me than to be owned by you *in facie ecclesiæ* as a friend of thirty years. It is with me as with you. Old memories are sweet beyond words, and I do not readily form new friendships. The old is better. And ours, if not always close, has never had a jar." This could be so until Manning was Archbishop, with policies on the Temporal Power, the Infallibility, and the Oxford Question, while "on all three Newman was not in accordance with the Holy See. I am nobody, but I spoke as the Holy See spoke." Pius justified Manning on the Infallibility, and Leo justified Newman on the question of allowing Catholics to Oxford. Manning himself went back on the Temporal Power except as a mathematical point of sovereignty. Their differences were exaggerated by a horde of Protestant journalists, Catholic busybodies, and excitable converts. As Manning wrote to Lady Herbert (January 15, 1866): "It is strange what efforts they make to believe that we are divided—above all, Dr. Newman and myself. I should be ready to let him write down my faith, and I would sign it without reading it. So would he." They had a right to differ on the drink question,

The Case of Dr. Newman

as Newman wrote to his brother Francis: "As to what you tell me of Archbishop Manning, I have heard that some of our Irish Bishops think that too many drinkshops are licensed. As for me, I do not know whether we have too many or too few."

Out of their rivalry and suffering the strength and progress of the Church was moulded in England. Newman had to bear the balking of his schemes, and Manning had to endure to read on every brick thrown at him by critics the sacred initials J. H. N. He could not refrain from writing toward the end:

"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 despise 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 that 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, and warm friendship. I always regarded him as so far above me in gifts and culture of every kind that I have 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 had 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 am unconscious in word or deed of having wounded him. I never referred to him

Henry Edward Manning

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.

"We met again in 1859. I was at Oscott at the Third 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 to renew the subject at Rome. I went there that winter and opened the matter to Cardinal Barnabo. 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.

"At the 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 would take his name off the Academia. From that day a divergence began between us. 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. The internal evidence led others as well as myself to believe it was his."

The Rambler was condemned, and Newman wrote a letter of submission. Manning wrote to Ullathorne (October 28, 1862):

"I believe the Rambler School to be small, but it is highly mischievous. The Cardinal has shown me the copy of Newman's letter, which I read with great thankfulness; not that I doubted what he would say, but I feared that he would not say it. He has a sort of sensitiveness about standing by friends, even when in the wrong, which is very honourable to his generosity."

Newman was probably not less sensitive than Manning himself. Manning mistook Newman's sensitiveness for

The Case of Dr. Newman

irritation. "Do you know what ruined that man?" he said in old age to Wilfrid Ward. "Temper, temper!" Temperament he should have said. Newman was less a bundle of nerves than of exquisite and fine-strung strings, not less so than his own delicate violin. But Paul Cullen and John McHale were like country fiddlers tuning a Stradivarius when Newman fell under their hand. Talbot and Manning had not the softness of touch which Ullathorne used under his episcopal roughness. But he was born of the Faith. It was the converts who accentuated the friction, having apparently only brought over with them that cryptic question which heads the Anglican catechism, "What is your name? Answer N. or M." For each was Newmanite or Manningite, far more so than the objects of their hero-worship.

A few weeks before Manning became Archbishop, Newman sighed: "Faber, being taken away, Ward and Manning take his place. Through them, especially Manning, acting on the poor Cardinal, the Oxford Scheme has been thwarted." Manning had made the University Question a matter of principle, and, dear as was Newman, ecclesiastical principle was dearer. Newman's friends found the Question at Rome regarded as "a piece of English Vendetta," while the uncornerable Barnabo remarked, "I know Manning best, but I love Newman!" In the duel between Newman and Pusey in 1866 the latter dwelt on the Ultramontanism of Faber and Manning. Newman was left in the dilemma of defending or throwing over the Ultramontanes, but, skilfully as he caught Pusey's arrows, he could not help a spent barb of his own reaching the Ultramontanes. He insisted Manning was out of the battle. "I put aside the Archbishop, of course, because of his office."

Ullathorne saw Newman, and wrote (February 14, 1866):

Private. I am sure you will be pleased to read the enclosed. I said that I had found most of the clergy—

Henry Edward Manning

thoughtful men whom he knew I respected—hesitating about something in the description of original sin. That this set me on examining the passage carefully. That though, when the words were pondered carefully and with discrimination, the essence of original sin came out orthodox, yet men did not generally ponder words and their relations with theological care. That two terms were salient and imprinted themselves on the mind—‘imputation’ and ‘not propagated.’ That though ‘imputation of Adam’s sin’ was Bellarmine’s, *vide*, not in Moeller’s Symbolic, yet it was unusual, and as imputation of righteousness was an heterodox phrase implying absence of inherent or subjective righteousness, and that in this country imputation would be construed as implying absence of inherent or propagated sin, even though the second clause of the sentence explained it to be the state of Adam’s children. That though it was true that there was not ‘a poison internally corrupting the soul and propagated from father to son’ nothing positive, yet readers would catch hold of the negation of propagation with the strong expression ‘We hold nothing of the kind,’ and associate it with the italicised *imputation*, and so get stumbled or misled. Hence the correction of which Dr. N. speaks. I know that they are much pleased with a little note you have sent; and I know that since your elevation they have been thoroughly loyal to you.”

February 12, 1866: “*Private*. I have given N. a hint of want of clearness on original sin.”

Manning wrote to Ullathorne (February 14, 1866): “I wrote to thank him for the patristic part about Our Lady, which is very well done and will do much good among Anglicans, I hope. Dr. Newman’s answer to my note was the driest possible, and left any impression that you say.” Ward wished to attack Newman in the *Dublin Review*, but for the peace of Jerusalem the unseen hand of the Archbishop interposed, writing to Ullathorne (March 24, 1866):

“I think it will be a satisfaction to you to know that the article on Dr. Newman will not appear in the next

The Case of Dr. Newman

number of the *Dublin*. In justice to Mr. Ward I ought to add that the original article had been examined and was considered to be calm and moderate and to contain nothing which ought not to be published. It is not published because of my desire, with which Mr. Ward complied most promptly and with a true Catholic yielding of his own will and judgment. You will easily understand my reasons. Any internal variance would be sure to be seized and used by the public opinion of this country and the Protestants as a division in the Church. This ought to be averted at any personal cost. And I am most anxious that Dr. Newman should be spared all pain."

Ullathorne answered (March 26, 1866) :

"I am very glad indeed you have induced Mr. Ward to forego his article, and that for two reasons : first for the reason which you mention, and which was a very strong one, and secondly because it is a violation of a fundamental canon for a layman to pronounce judgment on the doctrine of a priest, and Dr. Newman would have had his appeal to you against Mr. Ward. As I had occasion to see Dr. Newman yesterday on special business, I told Dr. N. what you had done, and read to him that part of your letter which I felt would be satisfactory to him. Knowing, also, from other sources that a great deal of talk and excitement prevailed in London about the forthcoming article, a good deal of apprehension about what a writer to me designates as a 'Ward and Newman row'; knowing, also, that there were not wanting 'good-natured friends' to write everything to Dr. N., I thought it best to say to him that you had advised Mr. W. to submit his article to me, and that though I had declined on official grounds, yet it was under clear impression that your one object was to give me the opportunity of checking anything that might happen to be unfair or unpleasant. Under ordinary circumstances this would look like betraying Mr. Ward's correspondence, but I verily believe that, from one quarter or another, everything that passes reaches Dr. N., so I thought it prudent to put the transaction in a few words in its fair light. Unfortunately, rightly

Henry Edward Manning

or wrongly, very strong expressions are reported about as having dropped from Mr. W. which might have embittered the interpretation of his article. I thank God, and I thank you, that the article is withdrawn. It made me feel light-hearted all yesterday." May 9, 1866: "Between ourselves, I am deeply convinced that the *Dublin's* extreme line tends to conjure up reaction. I know it does, and I should care less for that if people did not persist in making you the sponsor of Mr. W. People say that if he had been a confessor he would not be in a hurry to make mortal sins out of theological inferences. The object of checking the mischief and staying reaction explains my two letters on Newman. Of course, they have brought me letters and remarks which show how the tide was running. When I began this letter I had no intention of teasing you with these latter remarks, but where there is confidence in one's correspondent, and affection behind confidence, things will out. Maskell's remark about our newspapers is not well borne out when the very note of your V.G. was refused insertion and seems to have been the text of the insults which he addresses to you. He is just the kind of man whom the natural man in me would like to have the handling of, for though I reached my sixtieth year two days ago, I fear there is still a lingering fondness for putting down insolence left from the days of bluejackets and handspikes of forty-five years ago. I have recently read your work on the Holy Ghost with great pleasure. The Bishop of Kerry tells me he found Dr. Pusey engaged upon replying to Dr. Newman. I am sorry that Dr. Newman accepted Oxenham's dedication of Döllinger's *History*. I don't like this particular association of names."

Manning went further, and suppressed his book on the Blessed Virgin for fear of collision with Newman. Newman himself must have felt his way was being left clear, for he mentioned to Pusey: "It has surprised me so much that I said to myself, Is it possible that Manning himself has changed? He is so close that no one can know." But disappointments preyed on Newman's brooding mind, and he no longer trusted the Archbishop,

The Case of Dr. Newman

as he wrote to Ullathorne, the patient medium of their counter-complaints (January 8, 1867):

“I will say to your Lordship frankly that I cannot trust the Archbishop. It seems to me that he never wishes to see a man except for his own ends. Last spring he wrote to me flattering letters upon my letter to Dr. Pusey, and he followed them up by privately sending to your Lordship for approval an article intended for the *Dublin Review*, in which I was severely handled for certain passages in it. I know other instances of such unsatisfactory conduct.”

Newman did not realise that Manning had at least suppressed it, or he would not have added: “I think that, as a matter of prudence, I never shall trust him till he has gone through Purgatory and has no infirmities upon him.” Manning took this situation to heart, and wrote to Ullathorne: “I am sure that all intervention on your part in this sad affair has done good. Nothing will be wanting in my power to bring it to a just and peaceful settlement”; but Newman would only write: “Kind words from him, and accolades on each side of the cheek, will not effect it, but fairness, frankness, and a determination never to do things behind one’s back.” Ullathorne advised a direct attempt at reconciliation, with results described by Manning:

“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.”

The letters of 1867 concluded with an edifying exchange of Masses for each other’s intentions. But two years later commenced the Council. Manning was still steering to avoid collision, as he wrote to Ullathorne (July 30, 1869):

“I forgot to say the other day that my care not to write even apparently against Dr. Newman is the reason

Henry Edward Manning

why I have never published what I had begun about Our Lady. I know it would have been used by enemies in that sense. *Blackwood* printed two long columns of his and mine in direct opposition. Mine were printed before his were out. The Protestants get up these things, and Catholics repeat them, and I fear Dr. Newman believes them."

It was unfortunate that the headstrong and not less intellectually strong Mr. Ward was looked upon as the Archbishop's second. Newman recognised that, as Archbishop, Manning "must emphatically put truth in the first place and charity in the second," and he could have answered Ward as piquantly as he answered Kingsley, but he forbore because it would have involved the Archbishop. Ullathorne saw the position when he reminded Manning that for a layman to criticise a priest was uncanonical. Manning's encouragement of Ward was not divinely prudent, for in the end the Vatican Council showed Ward to have been less inspired than most English converts have taken themselves to be. Ward was the well-meaning origin of much of their misunderstanding. He was untiring in making chaff, both of Newman's theology and person, which he compared to Mrs. Tennyson at tea-time. Newman had realised that Manning "seems to be stern, when really he is but faithful to his trust." This was in 1866. Three years later the crisis came. A certain Mr. Ffoulkes, compared by Newman to "a blue-bottle fly" in controversy, accused Manning of having suppressed the letter Newman wrote to Wiseman clearing himself in 1862. This letter Wiseman had absent-mindedly laid aside among his papers, where it was afterwards found by Canon Morris. Manning indignantly wrote to Ullathorne (October 31, 1869):

"I have just heard that the following statement has been made, both in England and Rome: That Dr. Newman, some years ago, wrote and sent to the Cardinal

The Case of Dr. Newman

a letter which would have cleared him in respect to his article on the Infallibility in *The Rambler*, and that I intercepted it, or suppressed the letter, either during the Cardinal's life or after his death. As I never heard this or of any such letter till to-night, I conceive you know as little as I on the subject; but as no one can so easily know the facts, I would ask you to let me know whether you have ever heard such a statement."

As Ffoulkes's pamphlet was anonymous, Manning begged both Ullathorne and Newman to assist him unveil the libel as a public danger to their peace, but Newman was weary, or wary, and simply informed Manning that when he had relations with him he did not know whether he was on his head or on his heels! Manning found it unfitting to reply, and there the Vatican Council found both the Catholic protagonists of England. Manning was cut to the quick, and rumours of conflict spread. Gladstone was not the least uninterested and a little inquisitive. Manning explained to him (November 8, 1869):

"Mr. Ffoulkes insinuates against me the charge of some intrigue by which Dr. Newman has been consigned to obscurity. I remember when you were in office many years ago you told me that you were charged in the House of Commons with something which you could refute at once if you were not restrained by a higher duty. I am in the same position. And I wish you to know it. Meanwhile I must bear it in silence." November 21, 1869: "I have in many ways through all these years endeavoured to see him where he ought to be. My constant effort, unknown to him, has been to draw him from the obscurity to which influences which are not good and an oversensitive mind, not unnaturally pained by events I know, have induced him to withdraw."

The publication of Newman's letter during the Council relieved the obscurity for a time. Upon that letter Manning made no comment, though the complaint that, owing to "an aggressive and insolent faction," truest

Henry Edward Manning

minds were being driven until they did not know where to rest their feet, may have recalled to Manning the words by which Newman had recently closed down their correspondence. They both accepted the Vatican Decrees. If Manning struck the full diapason of dogma, Newman's reach was as wide but his notes were subtler. It was Newman's terrible gift to be able to enter unscathed into the minds of those outside the Holy Pale. Where Newman would heal unbelief with sweet and unembittered herbs, Manning preferred to summon a celestial surgeon, and in the Infallibility he saw a knife sharp enough to cut the diseases of the century.

The years passed, and Newman helped to answer Gladstone's attack on Vaticanism and the Civil Allegiance by his letter to the Duke of Norfolk. The force and subtlety of the letter lost in translation, and Propaganda called on Manning to invite Newman to make certain corrections. On the same day (February 5, 1875) that Newman wrote congratulating himself on the "Jesuits, Dominicans, and various clergy who with one voice concurred in what I have written," Cardinal Franchi wrote to Ullathorne concerning the passages which had been brought to Manning's notice, passages *quæ non mediocre detrimentum fidelibus inferre possent*. Ullathorne informed Rome that the happy result of the *Controversia Gladstoniana* had been that Ward had praised Newman in the *Dublin*. Ward he described as *vir super omnia dogmaticus*, or a Manningite. In this we may trace Manning's hand, for Ward wrote to Ullathorne (March 4, 1875): "*Private and confidential*. I have written a short article for the *Dublin* on Father Newman's new pamphlet. The Archbishop is extremely anxious—though, indeed, not more than I am myself—that there may be nothing in it which can possibly be taken to imply disrespect or can cause any exasperation of feeling." At the same time Manning had come to the conclusion that Newman was being ungenerously treated,

The Case of Dr. Newman

and he sent a spirited defence of the illustrious Oratorian to Cardinal Franchi (February 9, 1875) :

“ I warmly implore your Eminence to take no public steps as regards Father Newman’s pamphlet, for the following reasons : The heart of Father Newman is as straight and Catholic as it ever was. His pamphlet has a most powerful influence over the non-Catholics of this country. It makes a wholesome impression, especially on various Catholics of a difficult nature and of unsatisfied ideas. The aforesaid Father has never, up to the present, so openly defended the prerogatives and infallible authority of the Roman Pontiff, though he has always believed and preached this truth. The substance of the recent pamphlet is wholesome, but it is impossible not to notice certain propositions and a certain method of reasoning which is not in accord with the accepted mode of expression. These faults are not manifest to non-Catholics, and therefore do not impede the healthy effect of the pamphlet. On intelligent, instructed Catholics it has no influence. For the above reasons, I believe that one can abstain with all security from all public notice. On the other hand, I see a grave danger if there should be a shade of public censure. It would seem to create a semblance of divisions between Catholics in the face of our enemies and of our non-Catholic friends. It would excite a domestic controversy which once raged but by the grace of God is now calmed. It would introduce among ourselves every malignant spirit of hate, jealousy, and personal feeling. A Papal Bull would not be sufficient to destroy the belief that the Holy See had been inspired by the Ultramontanes of England. I can assure you in all fidelity that Catholic Truth and the Authority of the Holy See will not be diminished by the pamphlet mentioned, and that even to-day it helps to forward the unity of Catholics and the Infallibility of the Vicar of Christ in England. Under the circumstances, I warmly implore you to leave what is well alone. It is not only the petition of a true friendship and old, but the counsel of prudence.”

This letter largely righted Newman in the eyes of the Holy See, whose favour, culminating in the Cardinalate,

Henry Edward Manning

began three years before the accession of Leo and when Manning's influence was still paramount. With the election of Leo, Manning recorded in a note :

“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 alone undertook to do so, and wrote the letter of which a copy is with the other correspondence. The Duke and Lord Ripon and Lord Petre all saw the letter and approved it. Lord Petre said that I had even said too much. Cardinal Howard told me at first there was no disposition to do so. But that my letter worked a change.”

Manning wrote to Rome a letter in which he went so far as to say :

“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.”

Three weeks after his letter was received the affair was fixed. The Duke of Norfolk had brought the matter before the Pope, but the Pope inquired for Manning's opinion, which was forthcoming in the Cardinal's unhesitating letter of approval. Cardinal Howard presented it to Cardinal Nina. At the beginning of February, 1879, Manning was able to inform Newman through Ullathorne that he was at the door of the Sacred College. Newman was anxious to be a Cardinal, but feared that it involved living in Rome, and refused. He wrote : “I pray and entreat His Holiness, in compassion of my diffidence of mind, in consideration of my life from my youth, my ignorance of foreign languages, and my lack of experience in business, to let me die where I have so long lived. Since I know now and henceforth that His Holiness thinks kindly of me, what more can I desire?” Then occurred a singular mistake. Like most

The Case of Dr. Newman

matter-of-fact persons, Manning construed this into a natural refusal, and set out to Rome. Meantime *The Times* announced, as a matter of common report, that Newman had declined the purple. As Manning wrote afterwards :

“ 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 the Bishop of Birmingham.”

On March 2 he telegraphed the Pope's leave for Newman to reside in Birmingham. He wrote to Ullathorne (March 8, 1879) : “ Your letter and Dr. Newman's came last night. This morning I carried it to the Holy Father. By this post I have written to Dr. Newman conveying the Pope's message to him. The formal letter will be sent in due course. The Holy Father said that he desired to give a testimony to Dr. Newman's virtues and learning, and to do an act pleasing to the Catholics of England.” To Newman he wrote : “ I remember, in 1854 I think, writing from Rome to wish you joy on another event. I have still greater happiness in conveying to you this greater completion of your many labours.” That was when he had pressed Newman for a Bishopric.

Manning had written to the Duchess of Buccleuch in 1869 : “ As to Dr. Newman, I believe if you knew the truth you would exactly reverse your present thoughts. I am supposed to have crossed him. I have done all in my power for nine or ten years, both in England and Rome, to set right many things caused by himself or his friends which have stood in his way. Finally, I have his letter binding me to desist from the endeavour I was making that he should be consecrated a Bishop. All this cannot be stated. Meanwhile the direct reverse of the truth is put about.”

Henry Edward Manning

As Cardinals they were studious in each other's reverence. They met seldom, save on occasions such as the funeral of the Duchess of Norfolk, when Manning kissed Newman on the Oratory steps, somewhat to his surprise; but it was the ceremonial kiss required between Cardinals. It was noticed how watchfully Manning avoided taking the least precedence as they passed from the altar in procession. Peace and reconciliation had begun. Newman even consulted Manning through Clifford on points of theology. Clifford had written a famous article on Genesis, from the point of view of a geologist. We find Newman writing to Clifford (January 7, 1883):

“I believe we are not bound to consider that St. Paul wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews, though of course the writer, whoever he was, was inspired. The Council of Trent altered, I think, the title, The Psalms of David, into the vaguer form *Psalterium Davidicum*. Is it necessary to hold that Solomon wrote Ecclesiastes? I am not proposing to you to answer all these questions, but can you refer me to any theologian who treats of them?”

Clifford referred him to Manning, with the result that Newman wrote (January 20, 1883):

“Thank the Archbishop for me. I sent at once for the book he recommended. It rejoices me to see in the *Dublin* the account given of the criticisms passed on your late article on Gen. i. It shows you have succeeded in opening the door, tho' the critics do not like the particular way in which you avow that you have opened it. We need not seek to shake ourselves free from science any longer, since you have suggested an interpretation which ignores science altogether.”

After submitting a paper on Inspiration to Manning, Newman wrote to Clifford (October 13, 1883):

“I prefer sending my best thanks to the Archbishop through you instead of writing to him myself, lest I

The Case of Dr. Newman

should adopt the tone of a controversialist, though, as you will see, I have in fact altered every passage to which he has kindly called my attention. I feel a great relief now that it has been under your and his eyes, though of course I have not and shall not make this known. The Archbishop says, 'Opinions condemned under some other terms used in qualifying opinions could not be maintained without a sin against faith.' Certainly; but I have not said maintained. I have spoken of a Catholic investigator's private opinions—*e.g.*, whether Adam lived 930 years, which I suppose is not dogma."

It was given to Manning to outlive his gracious rival and to pronounce the oration at his Requiem in the London Oratory. It was the greatest valedictory he ever pronounced. "We have lost our greatest witness for the Faith," he solemnly stated. He spoke of their "affectionate friendship of more than sixty years," which to many seemed hypocritical. He did not mention their past differences nor allude to the letter he wrote in Newman's defence in 1875. What his left hand accomplished his right forgot. Newman passed to his grave without suspecting the cause that turned the Papal sunlight on his path. Manning's eulogium was gladly received by the Newmanites. Bishop Wilkinson of Hexham wrote (August 21, 1890): "What can I say to your Eminence in the attempt to thank you for your glorious words at the Oratory yesterday? I am powerless. You have taken my breath away. I have come here to witness the end of him to whom I owe the Faith which, through him, was granted in 1846." And Lord Charles Thynne, a son-in-law of the Anglican Bishop, who had ordained Manning: "How rarely has it been heard for one great man to speak of another great man as you have spoken of Cardinal Newman. May a priest bless a Cardinal? If he may, I say God bless you!"

Of Newman and Manning English religious history will ever treat. That two wills so strong, two minds so choice, and yet so diverse, should have united on the

Henry Edward Manning

one Creed remains a matter of pride rather than distress to Catholics. All comparisons are in vain. It is not sufficient to be told that Newman was the Platonist and dreamy master-mind, while Manning was the Aristotelian and practical master-man, or that they conflicted because one was subjective and the other objective. George Russell's epigram, taken from the title of one of Miss Austen's novels, *Sense and Sensibility*, does not afford a truer result than the title of *Pride and Prejudice*, simply because both were insuperably complex. It was, perhaps, true to say that Manning was most formidable as an enemy, while Newman was most damaging as a friend. Father Dudley Ryder, who was at once Manning's nephew and Newman's henchman, called their differences psychological and not theological, and compared them to "the sea and the rocks confronting it." They might, while the storm lasted, combine against a hostile armada, but their eventual condition was one of settled opposition, of sentiment, method, aspiration.

They were the two greatest converts Rome has ever drawn out of English Christianity. The same age and the same country could hardly contain them together, and the clash was inevitable and doubtless providential. They were the great anti-Rationalists of their time, and their very intellectual force tended to give Rationalism arguments—of a kind. Huxley said he could write an agnostic catechism out of Newman's writings. Manning's afforded little play to paradox, for they were written with a yea and a nay. Where Newman loved to awake in men's minds a slight suspicion that Catholicism might be true, Manning preferred to overwhelm with sonorous phrase and magnificent emphasis. To Manning's stark and dogmatic statements there was seldom any answer except the lie direct, which the writers of the day freely gave. Their arrows rattled on his shield. But when Kingsley called Newman a liar he found himself involved in the folds of an insoluble and intangible net. Out of

The Case of Dr. Newman

his writhings Newman built his Apologia. But Manning held that Archbishops should never apologise. He made no apology for his Faith to the English people or for his policy to Newman, who was the most considerable sufferer. Only as Cardinals were they at unison, for in the Cardinalate there is a higher and sacred unity which is never broken. Manning was content that the Church in England should fly Newman's pennon from the mast-head, while he continued to hold the tiller.

CHAPTER XVII : THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS

“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.”—*Cardinal Manning's Notebook.*

IF the mills of God grind slow and small, they must sometimes grind and grate against each other. Now, in the Catholic economy, the upper and the nether millstones are the secular and the religious clergy. The sublime feud of the Middle Ages was between the clergy of the dioceses and of the Religious Orders. This zealous strife has led more to the perfecting of the Orders than their own rules of perfection. Much as they have influenced the parish clergy, the clergy have, by criticism and rivalry, kept them up to their mark. Criticism of the monks and friars is the prerogative of the Church, through the divinely founded Order of the Episcopate. If Orders of men claim special rules and rites, special clothing and privileges, special perfections and exemptions, the Church, after due test, and with her own precautions, permits them; but woe to them if they fall behind their own rules or hinder rather than co-operate with the Bishops. In view of the absurdities and malignancies of Protestant criticism, criticism of the Religious Orders is avoided by the laity. But with Bishops and the Bishop of all Bishops it is a duty. Manning was an unsparing critic, but, as he criticised from within and with authority, he was able to affect the status of the religious all over the world.

At the time of his Provincial Council we find him writing to Ullathorne (May 18, 1873): “Many thanks for your note about the Consecrated Virgins. I hope that we shall take some firm and united action on this and other subjects; otherwise we shall have our anti-quarianism, Ritualism, and inobedience to authority.

The Religious Orders

I saw your delicacy when I asked you to prepare the chapter *De monialibus*. But you have already done it by the request of the Bishops. If you would kindly do it in time to let *Menevensis* make his comments before the second week in July it would be in time. I think we can easily have all ready beforehand. I cannot conceive that the Chapter may do what the Bishop may not do. It seems to me that we are getting into Ritualism again. Surely these things belong to Canon Law, not to Masters of Ceremonies."

It is not necessary to agree with his strictures on the Jesuits, which he left in writing as a legacy to his successors. Needless to say, the Jesuits no more procured the suppression of this paper than he wished to suppress the society itself. He criticised them historically as an English Archbishop, and his hand lay heavy upon them as an administrator. He had official and proper reasons, but there was a human element entering into his feelings which it is right to point out.

Historically the Jesuits had reached a great place in England. They were the *franc-tireurs*, who kept alive the Faith in the absence of Bishops. When the Bishops of the line were restored it was natural Jesuits should not fall in with the new régime at once. Wiseman was disappointed by all the Religious Orders, who preferred their traditions to the missions he enthusiastically planned for them. Both Wiseman and Manning wished to convert England through a parish clergy, and they mourned converts who disappeared into monasteries, and were indignant when their diocesan clergy left them for the Jesuits. Manning humorously complained of Franciscans carrying gold watch-chains and Discalced Carmelites wearing patent-leather boots, but the Jesuits lost his favour because their success and devotion seemed to put his beloved parish clergy into the shade. Their colleges outshone his, and it galled him to see a body recruited from the best old blood and newest convert brains work-

Henry Edward Manning

ing under his eye but not under his hand. Yet the greatness of Jesuitry he never denied, and he invoked Ignatius every day of his Catholic life. His historical view was :

“The true reasons why the Church in England ceased to exist for three hundred years, why the people of England have been lost to the Faith, I believe, are these : (1) Because the restoration of the Hierarchy was opposed in Rome by the deliberate action of the Jesuits ; (2) because the policy of Rome under their guidance was the policy of Spanish intervention. Now, before I go further, I think it right to give reasons to show that my judgment in this matter is not only impartial, but that I have come to it in spite of every motive that would bias me the other way. First, the books and the personal relations which helped to bring me to the Catholic Church were largely of the Society. I was received by a Jesuit, and for the first five years of my priesthood I worked in England or studied in Rome among the Jesuits. My chief friends were Jesuits. My whole mind was friendly to the Society ; I pleaded for them in the time of my predecessor, and I did all I could to encourage the first Bishop of Salford to call them into Manchester. I may add that during the controversies about the Temporal Power and the Infallibility I was in close co-operation with them ; and P. Liberatore was my theologian in the Vatican Council.

“Three things have compelled me to examine carefully the condition of the Catholic Church in England. First, the historical documents, such as Dodd’s *History*, with Tierney’s notes and appendix ; the history of the reign of James II. ; Panzani’s *Mission* ; certain manuscripts in our archives and in the archives of the English College in Rome ; and now more recently Law’s volume and appendix, with account of the controversies in Elizabeth’s reign, and other miscellaneous volumes of the seventeenth century. These all show, in my judgment, that the action of the Society in England was to divide and to discredit the so-called secular clergy, and in Rome to hinder the restoration of Bishops to England. I am anxious to judge justly, and I will therefore say that the motives

The Religious Orders

of the Society may have been a mistrust of the clergy in England, on the ground that the Bishops in Henry VIII.'s or Edward's time were wanting in fidelity to the Holy See and that the lives of many priests in the time of Elizabeth were not good; also that many were ready to take oaths of allegiance which Rome condemned; and there was a nationalist or anti-Roman spirit among them. To this the answer is not far to seek. The martyrs of the secular clergy under Elizabeth, both for number and heroic fidelity to the Holy See, are a complete refutation of these charges. And next, it was the threat of Spanish intervention, encouraged by the Society, that aroused the English or national spirit. Moreover, the Deputations sent to Rome by the English clergy were thwarted and even imprisoned, their veracity slandered, and their prayer for audience of the Holy Father refused under the influence of the Society and of the Spanish Ambassador. If it had not been for the French Ambassador the audience would not have been granted at all. It will, no doubt, be said that the Church may invoke the aid of Catholic Powers to deliver a Catholic people from the dominion of infidels or heretics—for instance, the Crusades, the Catholic policy of Spain, which has kept Spain Catholic to this day, and of France, which has preserved France down to the first French Revolution. But to this again the answer is ready: As for the Crusades, the tree is known by its fruits. They all failed. They that took the sword perished by the sword. The infidel holds the Holy Sepulchre to this day.

“As for Spain and France, there was no foreign intervention. Spain did not invade France, nor France Spain, to protect the religion of the people. The two Governments protected themselves, or rather the people protected themselves. There is no parity here. A foreign invasion rouses a people to the first law of Nature, which is self-defence. It is no longer a question of religion, but of hearth and home, of wives and children. Booted apostles never yet converted nations.

“The Armada failed as the Crusades failed, and even more signally. And the consequence has been to set the English people for three hundred years against Rome, and to create the hideous oaths of allegiance which in

Henry Edward Manning

England existed to a few years ago. What can be more fatal to the spread of the Catholic Faith? The English people have been lost to the Faith by a double cause—the one privative, the loss of their pastors; the other positive, the attempt to restore Catholicism by foreign and armed intervention. If the *objectum doni pietatis* be *parentes et patria*, it would seem to me that this Spanish policy was not of the Holy Ghost. It is reasonably to be doubted whether the persecution to blood would have prevailed, or prevailed for long, if this Spanish policy had not scared the Queen and her advisers. Fine, imprisonment, confiscation, and exile there might have been; but death and the rack for treason might not have been inflicted for saying Mass. The confusion of temporal and spiritual things did not arise in England. This was turned to the reproach of the English clergy. They and the faithful purged away the accusation with their blood. But the Spanish policy seemed to justify the accusation; and from that day to this we have been accused of disloyalty. Gladstone the other day tried to put us again in the pillory. From this cause arises the present temper of the English people. They have come to tolerate the Catholic religion as religion in the spiritual sphere; but the slightest contact of the Catholic Church in matter of politics rouses suspicion and opposition. So long as we are upon the common law with all our fellow-subjects we are safe, and our rights are respected. But if we were in any way separated from the common political interests of the country, we should be marked out for opposition. Now, nobody can attack us in political matters without attacking everybody.”

As an Anglican in Rome in 1848, Manning witnessed the expulsion of the Jesuits, and noted :

“The opposition to the Jesuits seems to me to arise from the facts : (1) That they incorporate the doctrine of the Canonists upon the Pope’s absolute sovereignty, opposing constitutional liberty; (2) that they are the aristocratic and conservative clergy (as with us); (3) that the other regulars and seculars are jealous of them, as our clergy are of active and successful men; (4) that they

The Religious Orders

are now allied with the old régime; (5) that they labour under suspicion, reasonable, historical, and preternatural."

When he became head of the secular clergy of England he shared the jealousy which an energetic Bishop ought to feel for his diocese. His suspicion was, perhaps, historical rather than "reasonable." He had advised the Cardinal against the Charity of the Immaculate Conception, which the Jesuits had started in London, because "I felt that it was incompatible with the order and development of the diocese;" but Canon Oakeley tasked him boldly :

"I think the Charity perhaps the most beautiful ever made in London. Father Gallwey was its sole author, and his severance from it has been its ruin. I know you were not the only, nor, perhaps, the principal opponent of this Charity, but I regret that you advised the Cardinal as he told me you did. Father Gallwey never made to me any complaint of your conduct in this matter. But he told me that in another instance you had thwarted a work of the Society in an indirect way." Manning replied: "I do not yield to you in love and veneration, to either the Society, or to the members of it known to me. What has, to my great sorrow, come between me and, not the Society, but certain—and those only a few—members of it, you will, I believe, when you hereafter see the facts before you, remove from your mind, some things altogether and extensively modify what may remain."

However, Manning gave Oakeley little active cause to modify his opinion. He steadily opposed the Jesuits in London for the same reason that Archbishop Errington had found fault with the Oblates of St. Charles—because they were not amenable to the Archbishop's control. There were other reasons, as Manning wrote to Talbot: "They have been shilly-shally on every question. Many of them were for a college in Oxford. They have taken up Newman's book in concert with Oakeley and Maguire.

Henry Edward Manning

It is stated that Father Gallwey says that the book has been examined at the Roman College and pronounced free from all error." Manning was consistent, and would not allow them to open a school. Father Gallwey comes into the list of his opponents, for, while Provincial, he strove to lift the ban. Father Gallwey was an Irishman in Mayfair, pious and headstrong, and determined to fight the battles of the Society, whether the Society wished it or not. But it was no use fighting Manning in his own diocese. Manning's box was filled with Gallwey's pleas and petitions: "Will your Grace authorise us to open a grammar school at a safe distance from St. Charles's College, say not nearer than three miles?" and again, "to thank your Eminence for the very kind words which you spoke concerning the Society. I wish that your Eminence would perfect the work thus begun. No one else has the power." He even apologised for increasing the Jesuits at Farm Street. They were engaged with business, two were "quite *hors de combat*," and "Father Vaughan is wholly taken up with chemistry, does no Church work." Whether Manning snuffed a gunpowder plot or not, he remained obdurate. In vain Father Gallwey asked if the nuns of the Sacred Heart could take charge of a poor school, for Manning associated the nuns with the Society, and would not allow them to occupy a house they had purchased in Dorset Street. They had to pass into Southwark territory, to return after his death and take possession of his dismantled seminary and his beloved college of St. Charles. Such are the revenges of obedience and prayer. But Father Gallwey was impatient, and he struck a blow which was to reverberate through Christendom.

In 1876 Manning wrote—but never sent—a long letter to Gallwey, in which he pointed out that "a diocese cannot go upon crutches," that the English Hierarchy could be helped but could not be made dependent on Religious Orders, "dependent as English statesmen have

The Religious Orders

tried to cripple Ireland by keeping it dependent upon England." The Orders took men from the dioceses. "A compact, solid, self-sustaining, self-cultivated clergy does not as yet exist." In later years Manning drew up a stronger statement, as follows :

"I will try to put down what my experience and observation have taught me about the Jesuits in the last nine-and-thirty years.

"They say truly that St. Ignatius governs them to this day. It is so. He was a Spaniard, a noble, a monarchist, and a soldier. The Society is St. Ignatius in perpetuity, Spanish, aristocratic, absolute, and military. It was exactly what was wanted at the time to counteract the revolt of the sixteenth century. The revolt was disobedience and disorder in the most aggressive form. The Society was obedience and order in the most solid compactness. It may be said, with historical truth, that the Jesuits charged, threw back, and defeated the Lutheran revolt. They also won back souls by their preaching and spiritual guidance. They preached 'Jesus Christ and Him crucified.' This has been their central message, and by it they have deserved and won the confidence and obedience of souls. They have produced books of theology and of devotion in profusion. Thus far my whole sympathy goes with them. And such they were for their first years.

"Nevertheless, they were soon a cause of trouble, as with the Bishops in Spain and with St. Charles in Milan. It seems inseparable from their essence, which develops both assumption and presumption. They are Papal by their vow, but in their spirit they are less Papal than anti-episcopal. The claim of special dependence on the Pope breeds everywhere a spirit of independence of local authority. This is a grave danger to them, and few of them escape it. The anti-episcopal spirit shows itself in their treatment of their own men when they become Bishops. They are like the Low Church Evangelicals in the Anglican Church, who look upon their Bishops as 'enemies of vital godliness.' This is history. There is only a plank between them and Presbyterianism. Until lately their theologians have taught that the Episcopate

Henry Edward Manning

is only the Pope's Vicariate. When a Jesuit is made Bishop they put him out and butt him to death. See F. Galli on the Jesuit Vicars Apostolic in India. This unhappy spirit has never been cast out. Even St. Charles had to strive with it. If a Bishop will give in to them they will recommend him on the next vacancy to an Archbishopric. If he hold his own, let him look out. Shakespere brings in 'rumour painted full of tongues.' There is no greater gossip-shop than a Gesù.

"I cannot fix the time when the Society became political. In its first days it was not so. It is said to date from its third General, the first Italian, Aquaviva. At first on a small scale, but inevitably, as the Society spread, it mixed and meddled in the politics of every Court in Europe. The first example is the Spanish policy, which lost England, next the French under Louis XIV. The Jesuit Province of Paris defended the four Gallican Articles; and so on, as Theiner shows in his *Clement XIV.*; and, as I believe, now in Rome the policy is theirs which is losing the people of Italy. Absolutism is gone. The Jerusalem from above is free and the mother of all freedom. The axiom *Sicut baculus in manu ambulantis* is good for a regiment in warfare and for the Society, but not for mankind nor for the Universal Church. Cardinal Nina used to say, *hanno una falsa ascetica*.

"I will not speak of other countries, but of England only. There can be no doubt that the Jesuits, from R. Parsons downwards, have hindered the restoration of the Church in England. From Elizabeth [till] to-day [it] has been the policy of Diotrophes. They became the chaplains of the surviving Catholic families. All houses of wealth and importance were in their hands. At the date of their suppression they had, as one of them told me, about four hundred priests in England. The number of Catholics in all England in 1773 cannot have been more than a few thousands. Burke, in 1780, put it at 36,000. The Roman Seminary, the Roman College, the English College, and more in Rome were in their hands. So again Lisbon and Valladolid. In England the Vicars Apostolic had no college, so far as I know. They sent their ecclesiastical students abroad, and the laymen

The Religious Orders

shifted for themselves. After 1793 St. Edmund's and Ushaw were founded; then, in 1827 or 1828, Oscott. At that date the Society was restored. It is doubtful whether Ushaw, St. Edmund's, and Oscott would ever have arisen but for the suppression. So in Rome, the English College, after three hundred years, returned to the hands that founded it. This reared Nicholas Wiseman, and he carried through the restoration of the Hierarchy, which, but for the suppression, would probably never have come to this day. With these facts before me, I must believe that a fatal false policy, for which the Spanish spirit of the Society is chiefly responsible, has lost the English people. The exclusive, narrow, military, aristocratic character of the Society shown in the time of James I., with the arch-priest figment and the continual thwarting of the English clergy down to good Father Lythgoe, whom I just remember, seems to me to be a mysterious permission of God for the chastisement of England. Of the action of the Society since the Hierarchy I do not care to say much. It has again been a cause of dissension, until it brought on a two years' conflict at Rome. I have no will to record the pettinesses, which nevertheless do great harm. One of their Provincials, asking me to sanction a scheme ruinous to the diocese, said: 'We hold that whatever is good for the Society is good for the diocese.' I thought to myself, *Omne majus continet minus*—'Whatever is good for the diocese is good for the Society.' If half a dozen dukes left their money to the Society and not to the diocese, or if all the good and zealous priests were to leave the diocese and become Jesuits, I think the verdict would be with me."

What weighed on Manning personally was the number of priests who left his service for the Jesuits. As Provost Whitty had left Wiseman, so Manning's secretary, the beloved Morris, joined the Society. Sadly Manning bade him complete the desertion by taking his butler, Newman, as a lay brother. Morris wrote: "I cannot rest without telling you how grateful I am to you. What it has cost me to say what I have said, or what it will cost me to leave you, is more than I dare think upon. I am

Henry Edward Manning

unstable as water, but God is very good. I see before me exactly the help I want, and what I owe your Grace will only be known when Eternity begins." Manning told John Vaughan he might as well join a club as the Jesuits, and to Bernard: "You are thrown away!" When Father William Anderdon, his nephew, and Father Humphrey, an Oblate, decided to leave him for the Society, Manning remonstrated in vain, and though he hardened his heart he let his nephew go. From the high ecclesiastical sin of nepotism Manning was flecklessly clear. When nephews crossed his policy he cut them away for ever. He felt very deeply the deserters who joined the Jesuits. Morris was the exception. In vain Father Gallwey wrote: "Instead of preaching for us on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, your Eminence will be, I am told, in Rome plotting some mischief against us poor regulars. I hope your Eminence will not be unwilling that Father Humphrey should preach for us on the day. He cannot do much harm by one sermon." But treason to the diocese was never forgiven, and an adjoining diocese which received stragglers from Westminster was referred to as "Botany Bay." Relations with Anderdon were never resumed. Appeals to "dear Uncle Henry" met with no response, even when, at the close of his novitiate, he wrote begging for a kindly word (August 15, 1882): "This day I have taken my last vows, and there is now no change nor event before me except death itself. We are both travelling the same road, and myself faster than your Eminence." But the firm of Manning and Anderdon had been closed on this earth. By a curious chance, Anderdon resembled the Cardinal in handwriting and features. Looking downstairs into a mirror, Manning once said: "I saw my nephew waiting at the bottom." Manning did not need a double. Anderdon had made an injudicious effort to ply "Uncle Henry" which could not be passed over. Brooding over injustices to the Society, he pre-

The Religious Orders

pared a letter, to be sent after his own death to the Archbishop, but impatiently sent before the time (Whit-Sunday, 1875):

“If you came to see me on my deathbed, or if I sent you my intended death-letter, what I should wish to say would be couched somewhat thus: Has your Eminence sufficiently considered it as the great misfortune of your life that you have never practically had a superior? that you have always been in the way of making your own views and opinions, and so stereotyping them as being your own? Is not A Kempis right in saying, *Nemo secure præest nisi qui libenter subest?* Has your Eminence ever really been in that condition, *subesse?* I do not mean to external ecclesiastical subordination, but to submission of the will and judgment to another? Some years ago you answered that you had once, at least, acknowledged yourself wrong by submitting to the Catholic Church. And now I place myself physically on my knees and open my Bible to look for words which have often come painfully—I may say terribly—into my mind. The words are (Wisd. vi. 7-9): “For mercy shall soon pardon the meanest, but mighty men shall be mightily tormented.” I do not know how I can write them or refer to them, but there they are. May they never apply or go near it. I ask myself, Why is anyone to be tempted to look forward to the termination of a few years as marking the dawn of a more wholesome state of things in God’s Church here in England? When we have all passed before the Tribunal it will be seen how His work has been crippled by a preconceived theory.”

On receipt of this letter the Cardinal also threw himself on a supposititious deathbed, and, gathering his Confessors, made an examination of his conscience. It proved less disturbing than Father Anderdon would have supposed, and the Cardinal replied mildly (May 15, 1875):

“I have carefully read your letter, and thank you with all my heart for the motive which prompted it. Your object in writing is so full of charity that I refrain from

Henry Edward Manning

any thought or word but one. Among the disappointments of my last years have been the consolations that we lived under the same roof, but that was nearly all. The fault may have been mine, as your letter would imply. I will not now ask whether it was so, and I wish to assume it that I may derive from your letter all the good you desire. May God bless you, my dear William."

Anderdon returned to the charge the next year :

"My affection for you, even with all the radical differences which sever us, makes me at times burn with indignation to see the line and the view which you have—unhappily, if I may say it—adopted, travestied and vulgarised by other minds, to the diminution of God's glory and the detriment, if not the loss, of souls. I wish we could ask St. Chrysostom whether he only referred to temporal rulers in saying, I wonder if any ruler is saved? I place myself at your Eminence's feet for saying this."

This was a little too much, and the Cardinal turned to bay (July 24, 1876) :

"When I received the letter written, as you supposed, from your deathbed, I refrained from all reply except to thank you and to derive from it all the good you desired for me. I therefore placed it in the hands of two priests, who know me as Confessors and in the most intimate details of my life. By their help I made an examination of myself, as if I also were on my deathbed. I hope, therefore, that I did not fail to do my best, and that I did not trust to my own lights. Having said this, I will write what my fear of giving you pain hindered my writing then. When you entered the Society I foresaw that certain faults of your mind would be intensified. I mean a conscious criticism of other men and an unconsciousness of your own state. Next after my own soul, my dear William, I know none for whom I have more fear in this sense than for you. The censoriousness of your mind is, in your mind, identified with duty and sheltered under the idea of representing the lights of some about you in the narrow circle of your life. In your former letter you told me that it was a lamentable thing

The Religious Orders

that people should be awaiting my death that the Catholic Church in England should have its legitimate development. In your present letter you tell me of the radical differences which sever us. My dear William, did you weigh those words? You go on to say that 'you burn with indignation.' These words have no sense if they are not a censure pronounced by you upon me in the office I bear and other Bishops of the Catholic Church in England. If I were to lay them before the General of the Society I think he would read you better than you know yourself. If I were to lay them before the Holy See, one more light would be cast upon the dissensions which at this moment are afflicting the Church in England. But you go further. You warn me of the Day of Judgment. So far as this account, I hope in God's mercy I am not unprepared. Be on your guard, dear William; the lines are longer and the field is wider than you see, and felt by both religious and laity, not of the Pale in which you live, but in the Church throughout England. You tell me that you place yourself at my feet. What do these words mean? Language such as this is one of the faults I foresaw would be intensified. By the love I have ever borne to you, I pray you, my dear William, to write in some page of your office book the words *Domine da mihi ut videam.*"

Anderdon replied, not without a last shaft (July 27, 1876): "I daresay the constant opportunities which I have for gaining some knowledge of myself have failed to do their full work. If, however, a great and too well grounded fear of death and judgment may afford any token that I am not wholly blinded, I may have some hope. I often think of the words of a prelate when he heard of Richelieu's deathbed: That excessive security terrifies me." Hereafter Manning passed over Anderdon's script unread.

Such being the relations of Manning with members of the Society, he was not particularly pleased when Father Gallwey carried out a striking surprise by opening a school in Manchester in the diocese of Salford without

Henry Edward Manning

the leave of the Bishop, Herbert Vaughan. He relied on a privilege accorded by Paul III. to the Jesuits to found colleges without the leave of any; in Manning's words, "that is to say, that the jurisdiction of all Ordinaries is thereby suspended." Yet Father Gallwey had recently asked "to discuss the relations of the Hierarchy and the Society." Manning told Ullathorne: "He has written to say he wishes for peace, and his Father General too." Manning happened to be in Rome when the school started, and he immediately informed Cardinal Franchi that the Jesuits must withdraw, and that he wished to extend the question of the Jesuits and the Bishops to the whole Church. "I am now convinced," he wrote (March 25, 1875), "that I am right, and I propose to go through the whole work or warfare which has now been begun for their sakes as well as for ours." Vaughan brought his test case to Rome, whence he reported to Manning later in the year (May 15, 1875):

"S.J. have brought up all their artillery. The present is a crisis on which all depends. The only hope is in Pius IX. and Cardinal Franchi. The Pope allowed me nearly half an hour to explain the whole case to him. A few days after he said, *Quell, affare dei Gesuiti e una vera porcheria*. The Pope sent for the General to come from Florence, and the only question was as to the mode of desiring them to close the colleges."

May 18, 1875: "I read my letter to the General, corrected or softened by Franchi, to Cardinal Cullen and the Redemptorist General. They all thought it would do very well, and considered it a good piece of gilding for the bitter pill. I saw the General S.J. yesterday. Was very open about Gallwey and Weld, and he did not defend them. He wished not to close the Manchester school till the midsummer holidays. This I refused absolutely to allow. He said he would consult Weld, and I went off at once to the Vatican. The Pope, meeting me, asked, *Tutto e finito?* and said, *Deo Gratias mi da piacinto di vestre foglio*. I replied, *Benche non mettino un indagio*. When he was sitting down in the library

The Religious Orders

he called me up to him and asked me the meaning of the *indagio*. I told him fully, and said it would be keeping the wound open for two or three months. He seemed displeased at it, and I have asked Cardinal Cullen to put in a word for me. I have announced that I don't return till the school is closed. I shall remain here till the Day of Judgment if need be, and the heat begins to suggest that that day is approaching." May 25, 1875: "Yesterday the General and I had a long *abboccamento* in the presence of Cardinal Franchi. He complained that the Pope had told him to *combinare* with me and that I would not enter into that view. Both of them proposed that the motive for closing should be for the sake of peace. Against this I strongly protested, inasmuch as justice was the real ground for closing, and that the motive of peace would perfectly well accord with the title of Bismarck, which the Jesuit party has applied to me. Franchi saw this." June 5, 1875: "Having received a telegram to announce officially the close of the S.J. school, I set my horses' heads towards England. I am surprised—we are all surprised—to find how completely beaten the S.J. is in Rome."

Vaughan returned, and, after the strange manner of the Catholic religion, went into retreat under the roof of his late opponents. But the S.J. were not beaten yet.

Manning found Vaughan prostrate, and wrote to Ullathorne (October 15, 1875): "*Private*. I was at Salford and saw the Bishop. He has overtaxed himself for ten years, and since he went to Salford very severely. This last wretched contest has been the last strain. An interval of rest will, I believe, restore him. Now, I would suggest the following course: The Italian Government are now attacking the English College in Rome. There is property at Seville in danger of being lost. Nobody but Mgr. Searle knows the state of our foreign colleges. If he was to die we should be in confusion." He suggested Vaughan should go abroad. But it was to be the Religious Orders rather than the irreligious Governments which were to keep Vaughan years outside his diocese.

Henry Edward Manning

After a further exchange with Father Gallwey, Manning wrote to Ullathorne (January 18, 1876): "Many thanks for your letter, the matter of which will come into my second to F. Gallwey. You will see that I have treated the matter as a *constitutional* question only. Next it will become personal in the sense of your letter, and lastly it will become inevitably personal to himself. I shall send my letters to Propaganda, and therefore am anxious to make them safe."

The English Bishops had been stirred by a number of personal incidents. Clifford brought word that Father Gallwey openly charged them with hostility. Ullathorne, who was a Benedictine himself, was annoyed by an abess who insisted on carrying her crosier in his diocese, "an old woman's plaything," he commented. In April, 1877, the Hierarchy decided that Clifford and Ullathorne, at Manning's proposal, should draw up a petition to Rome. Twelve *dubia*, or questions, were committed to writing. The issue was knitted in Rome between the Bishops and Jesuits immediately. Between the noble-minded contestants came those patient officials who have ever been trained to conceal truthfully the minimum of promise within the maximum of plausibility. Vaughan was joined by Clifford and Southwark in Rome, and Manning wrote to Ullathorne (May 9, 1877):

"It is well that they have raised the full issue, and I hope it may be once for all declared what is the will of the Holy See. I cannot believe it ever intended to create such an anarchy. This whole subject is to me unspeakably painful. Either I have no spiritual discernment or certain bodies are not guided by the light of perfection." May 10, 1877: "It is neither just, true, nor charitable to accuse the Bishops of aggression. It is truly Prussian." May 21, 1877: "If we make no mistake we are, I think, safe. Rinaldini, in answering a letter of mine, said: It requires a Pontifical Act to vary or modify the relations which actually exist in England between the Hierarchy and the Regulars. I wrote at once: The Bishops have

The Religious Orders

never asked for the modification of relations actually existing. They ask to be told what those relations actually are. We ask for solution of doubt, definition, and declaration."

To Clifford Manning wrote (May 10, 1877): "You seem to me to have stated the case most clearly and forcibly, and to have judged with great prudence against all conferences or patchings-up. Nothing will suffice but a final *Norma* in form of a Constitution." He wished Ullathorne to go to Rome, but the latter was useful at home, writing (June 8, 1877): "I have just got hold of the key to the Jesuit position, but cannot tell my authority. The canonical ground taken up by them in claim of the territory of their missions is the *jus patronatus*, the additional church upon the same territory goes under the same *patronatus*." In November Manning himself set out to Rome with two suffragans. The Jesuits had confided their case to Ballerini, who had settled down to writing endless folios. "Ballerini has given up his classes to be wholly given to it. You must expect that he will use all the arts of persuasion, and all the colours, to make the picture horrible," wrote Vaughan.

Then the Pope died, and a year passed, but Ballerini was still writing his folio reply to the Bishops. The new Pope would not move without Manning. Vaughan wrote to Ullathorne (December 25, 1878):

"Cardinal Manning has answered by making difficulties as to leaving England. It seems to me extremely important he should be there, for the Pope has made up his mind to have these questions settled, and we have no one with so much influence or so able to heal the matter. Moreover, some of them would not be unwilling to lay upon him some of their responsibility in deciding, if he were there. One of his difficulties, though he does not say so, is his poverty. But ought we not to meet that in part if he goes?"

Henry Edward Manning

Ullathorne appealed to Manning (January 1, 1879) :

“I hear that you are hesitating on the question of going. This you cannot do in conscience if your health permits. For only consider, the policy adopted will affect one half the Church directly, and the other half indirectly, but effectually. All things in the Church are gradually reverting to that legal condition in which they stood before the intimate relations were established between the Church and the Empire. Feudality is gone, tithes are gone, benefices are gone, Bishops and clergy, as in earlier ages, are devoted to souls without the incumbrance of secular pomps. The position of the Regular Orders is utterly changed. Formerly established and upheld by the sovereigns or landowners, and having their own work apart, they are now everywhere the co-operators with the Bishops. They are always more or less in danger of expulsion by the temporal powers. How important it is, first, that the Bishops should have a strong body of clergy of their own, on which they can rely in the emergency of losing the Regulars.”

Manning agreed that they had reached “a new state of the Catholic world, which is the old state revived.” Manning and Clifford reached Rome to find that Cardinals, who were Regulars, were holding out for an agreement, and, as weariness is the mother of compromise, they were nigh succeeding. But the Bishops would not weary in well-doing. Manning wrote home to Ullathorne (March 8, 1879) :

“I hope that we have made one great step in our affair pending here. The Pope has consented to call the affair to himself and to appoint a special Commission of nine Cardinals to treat it, and he will frame a constitution. This lifts the whole question out of the contentions of Propaganda.” March 25, 1879 : “We are advised that it is better for us to remain here until our affairs are beyond risk of obstruction. This will almost certainly render the Low Week meeting impossible for us.” April 9, 1879 : “They need reform, everyone except the

The Religious Orders

Redemptorists, who are in England and here observant, humble, and laborious. It is not an enemy, nor even a Bishop, but the Council of Trent that says, *Habitus non facit monachum.*” From Florence he wrote to Clifford (April 19, 1879): “In my audience with the Holy Father I asked what I might say to our Bishops. He said you may say that I have taken the matter out of Propaganda and shall have it treated by nine Cardinals, and I hope they will receive the result with acquiescence.” June 16, 1879: “I have great fear of a decision in July unless you can make sure that the case will be really known by the Cardinals. The traditional prejudice and fear of S.J. is such that I am afraid of anything but a deliberate and stand-up fight.”

Slowly the *cause célèbre* of the Church dragged on, while the English Bishops took shifts at Rome and Ballerini wrote folios and folios. “We have now reached November,” wrote Clifford, “and unless pressure is used Ballerini will gain his point and tide over Christmas without sending in his reply.” Anxious as Manning was, he could not help writing to Father Gallwey (December 23, 1879): “A happy Christmas to you all, and next, as the Pope will not as yet let me bring all the property of the Regulars under the See of Westminster, let me wish you your last turkey for dinner.” Father Gallwey replied with an amusing parody of a Bishops’ meeting in the best vein of Farm Street humour, at which the “Bishops of Burning’em, Pottingham, and Vexum” discussed the canonical seizure of the turkeys belonging to the English Regulars.

The next year the struggle was renewed, and Cardinal Howard sent word that Manning must reappear, who sent Clifford to the front (January 1, 1880): “Ballerini is a firebrand. No diocesan work can weigh against this call for the whole Church in England.” Vaughan was writing (January 3, 1880):

“Nina promises to *stringere* if the S.J. do not send in their *ponenza* this month. The Pope gave me fifty

Henry Edward Manning

minutes. He says the matter must be settled this year. We must be prepared with a full statement on S.J., but the contrast will be a happy one if we are impersonal and they are personal. When will the Bishop of Clifton come out?" January 5, 1880: "Everyone is expecting you. Nearly all the Cardinals whom I have spoken to asked, When is he coming? Among other things, you must meet this statement (but on no account let it be known that the statement will be made) that it is a notorious fact that nine-tenths of the conversions are made by the Regulars in England."

Manning was able to give the Westminster figures for ten years, giving 2,433 converts to the Regulars and 3,747 to the Seculars. Vaughan continued (January 15, 1880): "I know that Ballerini has said that the case is very important because of America, that it is easier to fight the English Bishops than the Americans, who are more numerous, violent, and of Irish origin and character. I have told this to Nina, who has passed it on, and it is understood. Nina wants to finish the affair by March. Simeoni tells me it must be done quickly, and that the Cardinals won't read folio volumes which Ballerini is writing, and that he has told him so. But S.J. has made out a very learned and clever case." Manning replied, feeling it was his last fight: "God knows I would take thirty-three vows if it were His will or would raise the Episcopate or the Priesthood. I look to you to take the active work off me. I feel my time to be so short now that I can begin nothing new." His lieutenants kept up the fight. "You are the diplomat," wrote Vaughan, "Clifford the lawyer, and I the Devil, so they say!" The Generals of the Religious Orders were nominally on the Jesuit side, but Vaughan won the Franciscan chiefs. February 10, 1880: "I saw General of the Passionists. He said his Provincial had written that they had no grievance against the English Bishops, and that your Eminence has always been their friend." "It is wonderful," wrote Clifford, "the dread they all have

The Religious Orders

of the Society. The General of the Redemptorists has almost made up his mind." February 10, 1880: "I spent the morning with Cardinal Sacconi, when he spoke to me of the danger there was of the Regulars leaving England. I rather astonished him by smiling (as the Bishop of Clifton smiles). I told him to be under no apprehension under that head, like Issachar, *invenit terram bonam et accubuit.*"

Vaughan's notes fell like snow (February 27, 1880): "The Pope yesterday was very feeble. He could not put on his own spectacles, and Macchi did it for him. S.J. counts upon death to help them, and this is now pretty well known." March 15, 1880: "Weld is come to Rome upon African business, but I hear he is engaged on Manchester 'blacks' quite as intently. There are about three hundred Jesuits in Rome, and they are everywhere."

At his next audience the Pope assured him: "*Il Papa non dorme, state tranquillo, il Papa non dorme.*" It was true. Cardinal Nina had sent an ultimatum to the Jesuit General giving him until mid-April to reply. Clifford wrote attributing "this good result to St. Joseph. We had been making a Novena to him to get the day fixed, and Cardinal Nina's letter was written just at the close of the Novena." On April 5 Manning arrived in Rome, and told Cardinal Simeoni "that the jurisdiction of Bishops is *jure divino regere Ecclesiam Dei*. The privileges of Regulars are *jure humano*. And, therefore, when they clash, the privileges must give way." Logic is the mistress of theology, and therefore of Rome. Only delay could impede a logician like Manning. May came, and Cardinal Howard brought anxious news that the Jesuit papers were not printed yet. Clifford thought "the Jesuits will get it brought on in the heat of summer, to prevent your being here." Manning was roused, and was ready to defy General "Juillet." His old Jesuit friend, Liberatore, who had fought beside him at the

Henry Edward Manning

Council, visited him, but two visits convinced him that Manning still set principle above friendship. He did not return. Manning wrote to Ullathorne (May 2, 1880): "The Regulars in England may be divided into those who more or less observe their rule—*e.g.*, Franciscans, Capucini, Passionists, and Redemptorists. And these four Generals in Rome would fain withdraw from the case if they were not afraid of S.J. And secondly, those who do not observe their rule—*e.g.*, S.J. and the Benedictines; and these league and are maintaining the contest. The delay of three years has been clear gain, for the matter is now understood. We are in full understanding with the four Generals above named." Clifford noted in his diary (May 5):

"Cardinal Manning had audience of the Pope this morning. The Pope said he was *gravemente degustato* with Ballerini's conduct and delay. Has told Nina to write again to the General of the Jesuits. The Pope spoke of the importance of the education of the clergy being in the hands of the secular priests, and illustrated this by the opposition he had made to the Jesuits opening a college at Namur to compete with Louvain, also by his own conduct at Perugia, where he found Regulars teaching in the seminary and replaced them by Seculars. A few days ago the Bishop of Todi told him he had placed Jesuits in his seminary, and the Pope told him he had done wrong. We must fly with our own wings, he said. Cardinal Manning then saw Cretoni. Ballerini had been with him yesterday. Cretoni says he looks for three chances. Cardinal Manning's leaving Rome. The Pope's death. The chapter of accidents."

It had become a pitched struggle between the General of the Jesuits and Manning, and they prepared to fight to a finish according to the rules of the canonical arena. Rome encourages discussion, and permits delay even to tedium. When good men invoke the Saints against each other, and await Providential deaths in order that they may win a case in canon law, Rome is not shocked, but

The Religious Orders

indulgently affords them full scope and every weapon that prayer or casuistry may suggest. Out of their well-threshed strife she knits her abiding decisions. Rome could not feel as exasperated as Manning, who wrote to Ullathorne (May 14, 1880):

“ I hope that the long-expected answer will be printed off to-morrow. I have thought it best to write little, but we hope to give a full history of a case such as I never knew before and hope I may never again. I know Rome too well to be confident of anything which has not come to pass; but, humanly speaking, I do not think that we shall regret the last three years. As you say, the state of England was unknown. The beliefs here were superstitions. But the long delays have enabled us to compel accurate hearing.” May 27, 1880: “ In truth, under the plea of perfection and exemption, the Government of the Church for these good men is at an end. They will not be governed by us, and the Holy See cannot. The mischiefs are all done before they are known. Add to your two of Erdington and Penzance the Bishop of Southwark’s Benedictines and Carthusians. The former ran in debt more than £110,000, and the latter have built, not a convent, but a city. We are moving slowly but surely, but as yet the Commission has not met. The Cardinals are, however, studying the matter for the last fortnight, and early in June they will, we hope, begin.”

Manning saw the Franciscan, Capuchin, Servite, and Dominican Generals, and they agreed not to sign Ballerini’s paper except with reserves. Cardinal Nina took the reserves to the Pope. June came, and Ballerini convoked a meeting of Generals. “ Cardinal Howard cautioned the General of the Capuchins not to commit himself at the meeting. Cardinal Manning has given the same caution to the General of the Franciscans,” noted Clifford, and again (June 2): “ Cardinal Manning had audience of the Pope, and met Cardinal Nina coming out, and asked if the papers had been distributed. Nina said there was an *impiccio*. Manning went in to the Pope and asked that our papers should be sent to all the

Henry Edward Manning

Generals. The Pope said he always intended it to be so. Manning at once went out to Nina, who said it should be done at once. Manning went in again to the Pope and entered fully into our case." That evening he wrote to Ullathorne: "At last we are fairly under way;" but on June 29: "Our detention here is indefinite." On July 6 he departed "gladly, sick of the heat and the intrigues." General "Juillet" had helped the Jesuits and the chapter of accidents no less. Clifford was called to the deathbed of his brother, Lord Clifford. Vaughan wrote to Ullathorne (July 9, 1880): "I should like to know what impression has been produced in England by the Cardinal's return for the third time *re infecta*. On all the important points the Jesuits are now almost isolated. The chief Orders stand aloof. I shall stay here till the Bishop of Clifton returns. Bark is a good dog, but Holdfast is a better." On his return, Manning wrote to Ullathorne (July 24, 1880): "I send you by post the *Life of Rizzi*, which is worth your reading, but I have marked *Allegato III.*, which is of the highest importance to our case in Rome." July 26, 1880: "It is of great importance that the two new Bishops should thoroughly understand the case. It is no less than this: Who is to form the clergy and educate the laity of England? We have been within a hair's-breadth of losing it. The present state of France is in point. The Bishops have suffered the lay education to be done for them till it has all but passed out of their hands." August 1, 1880: "What you write about the Society is what I have been coming to see in these months. There was a fear upon us all. And it is upon Rome at this hour." The next month Manning wrote to the Pope, and Clifford reported: "He read it aloud all through, and said that all he wrote about would be carefully attended to." Vaughan wrote (October 30, 1880): "I saw the Pope yesterday, but could get no conversation. People say he is very much done down, and his speech the other day shows that he

The Religious Orders

has become *disillusioné*, and that he has joined the Old Testament, and is going to wail for the Messias. The Consultors have finished. I believe they are favourable to us." November 4, 1880: "One of the Cardinals said to me the other day that he had been told that a solemn decision, favourable to the Bishops, might have the effect of encouraging Parliament to attack the Orders in England. I laughed and said I knew the source of those tactics, that, on the contrary, a decision adverse to the Bishops would be interpreted as the subjection of the Pope to the Jesuits." The chapter of accidents continued. Vaughan's next letter was from his father's deathbed at Biarritz (December 4, 1880): "I am returning in half an hour to Rome. My dearest old father lingers on. Both he and I are happy to be able to make another sacrifice such as this of my leaving him at the present moment. 'Did you not know that I must be about my Father's business?' is our consolation and my warning. I feel very much for you in the loss of your brother. God is wonderfully good in detaching us from earth."

The sands were running out of Rome's hourglass, and every day pointed to the logical finish. In vain poor Father Anderdon attempted to thrust a letter into the Press. It fell into Uncle Henry's hands and was suppressed. Vaughan wrote light-heartedly (December 9, 1880):

"Cardinal Ledochowski was very satisfactory. He was much shocked at the Anderdon incident. It is a grace. I do hope you will take great care of yourself. We need you most especially. So hold on and write a novel by way of distraction, or a play, and we will have it acted in Low Week." December 13, 1880: "The Pope has read everything, is displeased with Ballerini. Simeoni was very sympathetic and kind about the attacks on you. A letter to him saying that ecclesiastical authority is at stake, that Presbyterianism must be resisted, would do good." December 30, 1880: "The

Henry Edward Manning

Cardinals are settling our *dubbi* on the grounds of law. Ballerini complains the whole thing has been mismanaged. We have had an eventful year. I hope you will last several more years. There is Lesseps at seventy-five cutting the American Continent in two." January 8, 1881: "*Un triumpho stupendo quasi inaudito* are Masotti's expressions. They have solved nine *dubbi*, all in our favour and almost in our words, and this unanimously. They meet again for the last three doubts, which are nothing. Masotti swears that the *frati* will have no loophole." Even so, Manning bade him hold his post, "until even the smoke is down. Father Parsons will turn over once more in his grave." The Jesuits made a last effort to have the result given in the form of a Decree instead of a Bull, which is of itself Canon Law, but Vaughan wrote (February 1, 1881): "I have pulled it all out of the bog to-day. I said we would start at once upon getting the Bull. Every effort is made to keep the names unknown. Everybody is afraid of being held responsible by the S.J. for their defeat."

In March he could announce: "All is now in the hands of the Pope." For a terrible moment it was believed that the Cardinals Regular would delay the case another two years. Zigliara went to the Pope, but "the creator was very angry with his creation!" In vain the English nobility wrote to the Pope, and in vain "the Jesuits forced their General—poor old man, he is eighty-eight years old—to write highly reprehensible letters to the Pope." On May 15 Vaughan telegraphed the result to Manning, who wrote to Ullathorne that day: "I have just received from the Bishop of Salford, by telegram, these words: Bull published, good. I suppose in Birmingham nothing can be done about the Parliamentary oath. But it is a revolutionary change and anti-social and immoral." It was typical of Manning to switch off from one fight to another. He turned to combat Bradlaugh with the same readiness that Ballerini had immediately turned his broken guns on his old enemy Rosmini.

The Religious Orders

The great Bull *Romanos Pontifices*, with the Dogma of the Infallibility, contained Manning's most lasting mark upon the Church. The whole Catholic world was affected to all time by the dispute of the English Bishops and Jesuits. "We are at last on our way home," wrote Vaughan. "There never was such a fight or such a victory. May we secure a lasting peace." Needless to say that the great Order, who had once borne their suppression without wincing or a word of complaint from a single member, accepted the decision of Leo with such gusto that ten years later, after Vaughan met their General at Fiesole, he could write to Manning (November 16, 1890): "He said that he would not have *Romanos Pontifices* changed in anything, that it was most satisfactory, that it had been applied to all their recent establishments, even in countries where the Bull had not been promulgated. With this most explicit declaration of the General, it is quite unnecessary to pursue this matter further."

CHAPTER XVIII : RATIONALISM AND LITERATURE

“Are not incomprehensible truths the subject of the reason and comprehensible of the understanding? Are not most controversies an attempt to bring under the understanding the subjects of the reason?”—*Manning's Notebook*, 1831.

THE Catholic Movement in England presented some of the old rivalry between Roman and German influences. To a certain extent men chose between Rome and Rationalism, between a revival of Catholicism and a result of Lutheranism. Archdeacon Manning had tried to take the scientific movement under his wing when he proclaimed that, “as there is a science of revelation, so there is a creed of Nature.” Darwin's *Origin of Species* gave the school of Nature a Bible, out of which Huxley and others extracted the doctrines of Darwinism—what Manning grimly called “a theology *de Deo non existente*.” Manning tried to reconcile himself to the man, judging from his notes for a paper :

“Not Darwin, but Darwinism *incredulus odi*.

Greatly conciliated to the man.

Equally confirmed regretting *-ism*.

“My estimate therefore is—

No mathematical precision.

Consecutiveness.

No philosopher.

Observer, accumulator, nomenclator, describer.

“A living microscope. Religious opinions; many fluctuations. Protests of head and heart. Sense of God in forests.”

He was glad when Sir John Lubbock wrote to him :
“The doctrine of Evolution would not surely invalidate

Rationalism and Literature

your primary idea." In criticising Herbert Spencer, he was fond of the oracular statement that "no intellectual equivalent can be found for his terms." He was strong against "the bottomless pit of Positivism," until he learned from Frederic Harrison how much it had borrowed from the Catholic system. Then he alluded to "a noble torso from which the head had been cut," and even said to James Knowles that "Comte's Catholic mother had inscribed on his heart invisible letters which began to reappear in old age." He gave the second Lord Ashbourne, hoping to convert him from Positivism, a book beginning: "I am certain of my own existence," which no Positivist, of course, accepts. After receiving and confirming him years later in the Church, the Cardinal asked with a gleam out of his wrinkled face: "So you exist?" He met other philosophers and systems with a ready phrase rather than deeper thought. A typical letter ran (September 1, 1887): "The must-be philosophy seems to me to make the Creator a *Prometheus Vincit* with Necessity gnawing at him. The controversy between Freedom and Necessity is indeed silly. It is to me like disputing whether we are awake or not." At heart Manning was evangelical (and a philanthropist rather than a philosopher), writing to Mrs. Hamilton King (November 28, 1890): "Though I am glad that theosophy, like the food of Midas (I do not mean you), is turned to gold, I have a scruple in letting you divert it from your home. But if you wish to make it a Deodand, I would propose that it should go in bread and coals or in dinners to our school children." And of the doctrine of heredity: "All you tell me of an evil ancestor is superstition. Long ago God said, It shall no more be said, The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge."

Against Rationalism Manning wished to unite the fragments of Christian England. When Frederic Harrison pointed out how many Rome would gain from

Henry Edward Manning

Disestablishment, he answered: "But you freethinkers would gain the rest." He was roused at Bradlaugh's attempt to enter the Commons. "The Gospel is part and parcel of the laws of England," he insisted, and solemnly quoted Coke and Blackstone as though they were early Fathers. Bradlaugh was the "iconoclast" against whom Wiseman had lectured forcibly twenty years before, but two Cardinals did not temper his blasphemy. Lord Shaftesbury had written to Manning: "Any specific movement against Bradlaugh would, if it assumed an official character, give him all the redolence of a martyr." This is exactly what happened, for Bradlaugh became an official and partisan subject of controversy. Three times Manning fulminated in the *Nineteenth Century*, praying that "a race of sophists" should not be entrusted "with the august and awful powers described by Lord Coke." Bradlaugh retorted with a tract on "a Cardinal's broken oath," while Manning collected signatures and interviewed Ministers. "To abandon the national recognition of a Divine Ruler," wrote Stafford Northcote to him, "is a fearful step, and all the more in face, not of Lucretian Epicureanism, but aggressive infidelity." Bradlaugh wished to take his seat without a Christian oath. Manning and Shaftesbury thought that this was the end of the Constitution. Shaftesbury wrote (April 30, 1881): "You have always taken my part and been on my side. The extension and rapid progress of infidelity, the utter spirit of Lucifer, the discoveries of destructive Science and the thousand other agencies of Satan fill me with terror."

Though Parnell, who believed in stars rather than in Churches, sympathised with Bradlaugh as a fellow-outlaw, Manning, through Frank O'Donnell, turned the Irish vote against him. Manning distrusted Parnell's friendship for Clemenceau. We find Manning writing to Salisbury (May 26, 1883): "I have learned that Lord Randolph Churchill has a motion down which will re-

Rationalism and Literature

open the discussion of the Parliamentary Oath in a form most disadvantageous to us and most advantageous to Mr. Labouchere and his friends. I am assured by some of the Government side that they will not support Lord Randolph Churchill's motion. The same I hear from Irish members, and I am told that others are equally embarrassed." He begged his influence in removing the motion, but Salisbury answered warily (May 27, 1883):

"*Private*. I write just a line to thank you for your letter and to say that the subject matter of it shall have my immediate attention." May 29, 1883: "*Private*. I have communicated with R. Churchill, and have let him know the nature of your opinion upon the proposed motion. I am given to understand that he is sensible to the weight of these considerations, and that matters are likely to take the course which you desire."

A note from Mr. Torrens, M.P., followed: "I congratulate you on the success of your timely words of remonstrance. Churchill has at length consented to abandon his motion, and Labouchere falls to the ground therewith."

It was characteristic that Cardinal Newman should not have felt as Manning on this matter, and while the Westminster clergy were collecting signatures and Manning was petitioning against Bradlaugh, Newman wrote a letter to Father Lockhart, which was forwarded to Manning (September 25, 1881):

"As far as I can see, Catholics cannot, to any good effect, bring out a really strong protest on the subject without being open to the retort, Why, what right have you to speak? You would be nowhere but for the Act of 1829 in your favour, and now you grudge for others what you have got for yourselves. What signatures would suffice to represent the religious element in the country? Where are you to draw the line as to number? Would it do any good to have a few Catholics and many Anglican signatures? or many Catholics and a few Anglicans? Would many—would even a few—Catholics

Henry Edward Manning

join with Anglican Bishops? I ask all these questions not argumentatively, but to show the confusion of mind and distress with which I try to realise the carrying out of a purpose so excellently intended. Your remonstrance, by its wording, seems to answer at least for the constituency. Can it? Can you? Who can? I can't."

On the other hand, Newman was shocked at the idea of his Metropolitan joining the Metaphysical Society and hearing Huxley read a paper on the Resurrection. "Perhaps it is a ruse of the Cardinal to bring the Professor into the clutches of the Inquisition." Mr. Bodley pointed out that Manning could maintain friendly relations with a persuasive doubter, while the Gallican Dupanloup, "whose creed was held insufficient to entitle him to a scarlet hat," wished to keep Littré out of the French Academy. Doubtless the old Vicars Apostolic would have rent their wigs at the idea of sitting with the freethinkers of their day like Gibbon and Bentham, but an ironclad Ultramontane like Manning could face fire. An idea of the Metaphysical at its best appears in a letter of Archbishop Magee (February 13, 1873):

"Archbishop Manning in the chair, flanked by two Protestant Bishops. On my right was Hutton, an Arian; then Dalgairns, a very able R.C. priest; opposite to him Lord A. Russell, a Deist; then two Scotch metaphysical writers; then Ward, looking like a country squire; then Froude the historian, once a deacon in our Church; then Roden Noel, an actual atheist and red republican. Lastly Ruskin, who read a paper on miracles! Nothing could be calmer, fairer, or even on the whole more reverent. In my opinion, we Christians had much the best of it. Dalgairns was very masterly, Manning clear and precise and weighty."

To this Society Manning frequently read papers which trained theologians helped him to prepare. Authority was proven, and not assumed as in a pastoral. He read a paper on the relation of the will to thought, in answer to one by Huxley entitled, "Has a frog a soul, and, if so,

Rationalism and Literature

of what nature?" The audience included Martineau, Lubbock, Sidgwick, Stanley, and Froude ("the enemy of God and man"), as well as the "credulous sceptic," Huxley. Manning was fond of a terse summary of a man, as when he described Whewell at another discussion as "St. Thomas in a Cambridge gown." Ruskin, "the English Rio," took Huxley less seriously than Manning, for he "wanted to change the frog for a toad, and tell the company something about eyes." Thanks to Manning's arguments, the outside world was relieved to learn that "men differ from frogs in that they have a will and a moral consciousness."

The next year Manning read a paper on "Legitimate Authority as an Evidence of Truth," in which he made analogy between the rights of reason and the Papal position. "Within its sphere reason is infallible. If it go beyond its jurisdiction, or if it misuse its evidence, its judgments may go astray; but the fault is not then in the reason but in the agent, who misuses the criterion as a criterion of truth, which in itself is infallible." He proved the existence of God from "the impossibility of an infinite series of finite causes." He wrote to Gladstone afterwards (May 21, 1872): "I was sorry not to see you at our discussion on authority. It is true that I only touched one point. I wanted to lay once more the flagstone under the intellectual certainty of the order of nature, which some of our associates have been pulling up to make way for a despotic scepticism." As chairman in 1873 Manning pleaded for a fixed terminology common to minds "moving in paths so incalculable to one another." Definition was still his delight, and he collected the very few the Society had been able to register in thirty-five sessions:

FAITH

Archbishop Manning: "That rational act of the intellect which, after finding sufficient evidence that a

Henry Edward Manning

thing is revealed—believing it to be true—refuses to doubt it any more.”

Duke of Argyll: “An assured belief or conviction, but with different degrees of assurance.”

Professor Huxley: “The surest and strongest conviction you can have.”

Father Dalgairns: “Reason always makes a reserve—is open to conviction on further evidence. Faith, on the contrary, refuses to make any reserve—no additional evidence can shake it.”

WILL

Archbishop Manning: “A rational appetite.”

Professor Huxley: “The desire of an act of our own.”

Mr. Hutton: “The power we have of increasing or diminishing the force of our own motives.”

Mr. Sidgwick: “The *Ego* conscious of itself or acting.”

Mr. Hodgson: “Sense of effort for a purpose.”

Professor Robertson: “Action for feeling.”

Dr. Carpenter: “Purposive determinative effort.”

Mr. Knowles: “The resultant of motives.”

Mr. Hinton: “Necessity.”

He wrote to Professor Blackie this year: “Your lecture pleased me greatly from its indignant Theism. What are we doing? We are letting a handful of men talk Atheism, and their tongue goeth through the world.”

Manning enjoyed the splash he made among the intellectuals, though he was not without making enmities. Carlyle declared that the same room could not contain them, and forbore to meet. With Carlyle’s disciple, Froude, the feeling was very bitter, and led to friendship with Froude’s rival, Freeman, who wrote to Manning concerning Thomas à Becket (September 8, 1878):

“I am very glad that you are so well satisfied with the little matter of controversy I have had with Mr. Froude. I think I can quite enter into the position both of Henry and of his opponents. It is, in fact, what I have tried to do throughout, and what Froude never seems able to do. The incapacity is nothing wonderful, but to me there is

Rationalism and Literature

something wonderful in the necessity which seems to lie upon him of always telling some different story from the one in the book. It is doubtless often mere partisanship, but it happens also where the charge is purely arbitrary, where the story in the book would have served his purpose just as much. It seems to amount to a physical incapability to tell the truth."

On one occasion Stanley invited the Metaphysicals to meet in the Jerusalem Chamber at Westminster. Manning remarked, as he took the chair, "The last time a Catholic Archbishop sat in this chair it was Cardinal Pole!" In 1877 Manning read a paper to prove that the vital matter of the soul did not die with the sentient life. The soul he defined as "the activity whereby the entity moves itself." Two years later, speaking on "The Objective Certainty of the Immaterial World," he pointed out how difficult it was to affirm Matter, while of Mind so much could be known. "What are atoms, what are force-points, what are forces?" There was more to be said for a conscious Intelligence which "has created the physical sciences, the Iliad, the moral civilisation of mankind," than for Matter. His last paper was on "What is Philosophy?" He decided that natural philosophy testified infallibility to a soul, whereas modern philosophy led to a "terminal morass." From time to time he seems to have added a humorous note to the intense sedateness of the meetings. He summed up the creed of Materialism as "I shall die, every bit of me, and leave nothing behind but my memory and old clothes!" Another time he suggested the nightmare of the scientific mind was "travelling to London on an asymptote!" When he described himself as "a person of a rather sceptical disposition," there was as much amusement as when Tennyson asked Huxley if the rise of sap was not an exception to the law of gravitation. Tennyson noted at one of these meetings: "Archbishop Manning thanked me warmly last night for *Gareth*, and I sat by Father Dalgairns, whom I

Henry Edward Manning

gratified by telling of my wife's approval of his *Essay on God.*" Dalgairns was Manning's right hand in metaphysics, and probably the ablest thinker on the Catholic side. The friendship of Tennyson was pleasing to Manning, who, admiring his *Becket*, showed him Becket's mitre, preserved at Westminster. Huxley and Fitzjames Stephen were inclined to make matters sarcastic for the Cardinal, for a distinguished metaphysician found it necessary to send him a surviving apology: "Fitzjames in religion is a blatant ass.—Yours ever, F. Harrison." This was the type Manning described as "intellectual pollards, stunted trees walking." The Metaphysical Society was a memorable effort of the Titans to entertain the Olympians to tea, but the Rhadamanthine politeness necessary proved too great a strain, and it died because, as Tennyson said, no one could define the word metaphysics. When Frederic Harrison tried to revive it, Manning wrote (July 20, 1889): "I like your plan very much, less two things—the large number at starting and the prominence of Popery. I am afraid the Anglicans would be shy and *ombrosi*. The neutrals and Nonconformists would not be. The ostracism of judges and physicists is as wise as it is personal." The fight against scepticism brought Manning and Gladstone more or less together. The latter had written: "I cheerfully submit myself to be probed by you on all questions of Rationalism and the like in my own words and acts, and for this purpose only I even submit myself to your episcopal authority." When Gladstone clashed with Huxley on *The Dawn of Creation*, Manning wrote:

"Fifty-five years are a long reach of life in which to remember each other. We have twice been parted, but as the path declines, as you say, it narrows, and I am glad that we are again nearing each other as we near our end. If we cannot unite in the realm where 'the morning stars sang together' we should be indeed afar off."

January 6, 1886: "In the meanwhile, are not these

Rationalism and Literature

propositions sound? Holy Scripture is not a book of science (see the 'evening and the morning' before the creation of the sun and moon, and the standing still of the sun, in the Book of Josue). It is throughout written in the language of sense, which we use to this day, not of science. Science is of the natural order, revelation of the supernatural. Holy Scripture treats natural truth by sense, not by science. How can they clash? They are on different planes. The sun 'rises and sets' to this day, in spite of sciences. The truth of Holy Scripture is not touched by science, because in the natural order Scripture is not scientific, and in the supernatural order science knows nothing. It is then answered, As soon as we prove anything by science you give it up. I answer no. I never affirmed it as a scientific truth. But I deny that science can touch no supernatural truth—*e.g.*, the Incarnation. The language of sense was the only language men knew. If Josue had said that the earth stood still, they would have said, It never moves. I am slow to invoke science to confirm the Mosaic cosmogony. It is enough for me to say they are on different planes. And I am very sceptical of the alleged demonstrations of science. Huxley showed me a shell with three layers of incrustations. He said that it was a proof of numberless thousands of years. I said that we had changed places, that his faith rebuked my unbelief."

January 7, 1886: "Huxley's pterodactyls have no weight against your main position, first on my contention of the different planes, and next because of the vast uncertainty of the theories built on the finding of scorpions and reptiles. To my mind they can only reach presumptions and probability. The Theism of the Old Testament compared with the Theism of the Greek and Roman worlds differs, not in degree, but in kind. The Book of Psalms exhibits a relation between God and man not to be found in any other tradition of the world. The cosmogony of Genesis, in like manner, has many parodies but no parallel. There is internal evidence confirming the external tradition that it is what it was believed to be—a Divine record in the language of man—that is, of sense, not of science. You are aware that St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas treat the days as periods. And,

Henry Edward Manning

as you say, the origin, not the whole history, of each successive creation is recorded. There is room enough in such chronology for any number of creatures that are now extinct. All who believe in God will think that your argument is unmoved. All who either do not believe or are agnostic will think that Huxley has slain us all. I cannot treat Darwinism with as much courtesy as you do."

A friendship ripened with Ruskin, for the pre-Raphaelites were a Christian legion. On reading *Fors Clavigera*, Manning wrote (October 21, 1873): "It is like the beating of one's heart in a nightmare. You are crying out of the depths of this material world, and no man will listen. You can now understand what we feel. We cry and cry, but the nineteenth century looks upon us as deaf and impassive as the young Memnon. There are no breaks in the horizon to let us into infinity. We are hedged in by the three per cents., ironclads, secularism, and deified civil powers. The god of this world has got his day for a time." Ruskin answered (October 27, 1873):

"I have kept your gracious letter where, when I was younger and happier, I used to keep my love-letters, till I could thank you for it and answer. The main thing I want to say is that all my *De Profundis* is because you husbandmen don't drain your fields. You have no business to cry; you should cart the slough away, you shepherds. I am a lost sheep and can only bleat. I often growl and fight against the pricks, at the nails of my own *Fors Clavigera*, but have not often been more grieved with her than when I found your card in vain. Why did you not send for the porter's key? You would have seen a Titian and given me some help with your kind face and thoughts." Later, in inimitable style: "It's all very well for people who have got crosses to carry and backs to carry them, but I've got at present neither cross (except of my own carpentering) nor back, but am fast becoming an anatomy! However, I have heart enough in the ribs of it to be very thankful for your kindness, and

Rationalism and Literature

I'm coming soon for a bit of moving work among your books. I want also to see the earliest account of St. Jerome's lion, in whom I am more interested than in any saint—at least, bearded!" April 12, 1887: "I never know now if my mind is safe till to-morrow, with average human safety, nor if at any time it serves me healthily. I do not see why *Præterita* should interest you; it is all passed, and fruitlessly. My present state of wiser sorrow would, perhaps, interest you if I could tell it. What I may yet be spared to tell or feel will, I trust, be no greater cause of sorrow to my friends than the rest of my life has been. Your own writing is beautifully strong and clear. Your powers seem to exalt themselves from day to day."

Manning answered (April 17, 1887): "I am just finishing the second volume of *Præterita* with great increase of interest, for I was in Rome with George Richmond in the year or the year before you were there, and your places and pictures in Italy are all known to me. But I am looking forward to your times at Assisi with St. Francis and elsewhere with B. Angelico—that is, in the world of Christ's folk, and very unlike the folk now growing up under the influence of the three black R's—Renaissance, Reformation, and Revolution. I hope you will be coming to London, for I should like to begin again at our last semi-colon in the carriage by South Kensington." Ruskin replied (April 19, 1887): "But that semi-colon became a semibreve in the Gregorian time. How can we go back to it? I can, God permitting, go forward to Assisi, and the chapter called the 'Sacristan's Cell' will have things in it that will interest you; but I'm not quite sure you will like them. Only this morning I was stopped by the confusion between the Castle of Avallon, where Hugo of Lincoln was born, and the town of Avallon. I am writing shamefully, but I've some things to say about Chartres and the book you gave me and the Black Madonna, which I suppose some people think as pretty as I used to think my pink one." When Watts painted the portrait which

Henry Edward Manning

represents Manning in the National Portrait Gallery, Ruskin wrote: "His portrait of you is coarsely painted and entirely common and valueless, with many gross errors of which the violent square of the bone of the nose is unpardonable. Nothing but the most tender and subtle drawing of the fifteenth-century method could render your head rightly, but Watts has entirely mistreated it. But I know no one who could paint you." Manning's comment was typical when he noticed the reflection of his robes in his features: "Tell Mr. Watts that he has made me a tippler, and I am a teetotaller!" Of others who essayed to reproduce Manning, Menpes etched the wrinkled map of his face, May caught the corpse-like look of his last days, and Oules may be said to have photographed his character. Manning noted: "The papers say that Oules has made me anxious without irritability. I should have thought that I am both, for the work of London is enough to make Job so." Among those who sketched Manning in words was Disraeli. In *Endymion* he appears as Nigel Penruddock, "the prophet who had been ordained in Mayfair," and might have been a Dean if he had not gone over to Rome, whence he emerged as "Archbishop of Tyre." In *Lothair* he was carefully drawn:

"Above the middle height, his stature seemed magnified by the attenuation of his form. It seemed that the soul never had so frail and fragile a tenement. He was dressed in a dark cassock with a red border, and wore scarlet stockings; and over his cassock a purple tippet, and on his breast a small golden cross. His countenance was, naturally, of an extreme pallor, though at this moment slightly flushed with the animation of a deeply interesting conference. His cheeks were hollow, and his grey eyes seemed sunk into his clear and noble brow, but they flashed with irresistible penetration. Such was Cardinal Grandison."

The only mistake was that his eyes were dark brown and not "grey." *Lothair* was the Lord Bute of the day,

Rationalism and Literature

and in the novel Manning and Samuel Wilberforce were represented as contending for his soul, while Mgr. Capel, disguised as Catesby, kept the Anglican chaplains at bay. "Poor Dizzy!" wrote Manning to Lady Herbert. "To end as patron and statesman of the *Rock* and the *Record* is a doom of great ignominy." And of that dying Society which Disraeli staged: "In what a ruin English Society is—the English homes of which we have been so proud and S. Wilberforce has talked so emptily."

Though he enjoyed the society of writers, Manning never became enmeshed in words. He used metaphors as searchlights, not as fireworks, and epithets to underline rather than colour his drift. He incurred wrath or fear by his words, but never misunderstanding. "I am afraid that my words cut like a sharp razor." In his *Anglican Charges* there is Johnsonese, not without occasional bathos, as when he described pews as "a type of the Communion of Saints." Walter Bagehot picked out as "a good sentence on ecclesiastical history" the following: "The world persecuted the Church in the beginning, espoused her in the Middle Ages, is disowning her now." Lord Westbury used to give the palm in verbal distinction to Manning's parishioner who missed her children, but missed them more than she wanted them! Literary power seemed vanity to Manning, except so far as it went into good preaching. "You will not destroy the walls of Jericho by flinging flowers at them," he told Canon Vere. "You have a message. Give it! Never mind the words; they will come. Remember the truth you have to give. Thus saith the Lord." Preaching is, he thought, "like walking, best when least studied." The three maladies of piety were "pulpit oratory, theatrical music, and fancy devotions." In old age he noted: "Pulpit oratory is poison to preacher and hearer. St. Paul says, 'We preach not ourselves but Christ Jesus.' Pulpit orators read this backward." He believed in simplicity and awe. After hearing Bishop

Henry Edward Manning

Fenton read one of his pastorals too rapidly he taught him the secret of his own slow, deliberative, and impressive speech. In old days his tutor, Canon Fisher, had come to hear him, and commented: "I never heard you preach." "But I saw you under the pulpit." "And I saw you, but I never heard you," he replied. Henceforth Manning trained himself to speak by syllables. Newman's, he used to say, fell like snow. His only gesture was a sawlike motion, but he was fond of wearing a mitre (against all rubrics) in the pulpit. "After the first hour uncle takes off the mitre," said Mgr. Willie Manning. John Bright used to say of him: "He is a very good speaker if you don't listen to what he says." The great Orator of Dissent must have heard him, for one of his letters is in the Manning papers (December 26, 1884): "It is true that we are not so young as when I listened to your voice in the church of St. Carlo, and that we have spent busy years since that time. I hope that our work has been done in sincerity, and that some fruit, not wholly worthless, remains."

Even when he probed no depths his edge mowed down superficialities. His force was the force of lava rather than of eruption. He preferred the power of a phrase to many periods. As early as 1834 he wrote to Samuel Wilberforce: "It is easier to walk with God in the storm than in the sunlight." Guilt he finely defined as "our sins multiplied by our mercies," and what could be farther reaching than to say: "A man who loses an only son becomes a Catholic theologian on the spot!" His reason for believing in God was simply, "I am either uncaused or self-caused or caused by a cause." Divorce was "successive polygamy." Fenians were "Garibaldians" and Anglicans "Herodians." "God made your features, but you make the countenance," was one of his oracles. Humour appeared in his three stages of a lawyer: "He gets on, gets honour, gets honest." Paradox he rarely essayed, except in conversation. "If

Rationalism and Literature

"I were an Irish hodman I should be a drunkard!" he said to emphasise his sympathy for sweated workmen. "Your pride has been your salvation," he said to a woman of that legitimate pride which restrains from what is base.

Precision was what he sought. Bacon could have written: "Vanity makes mischief among men, but pride makes havoc. Vanity may commit follies, but pride commits sins. Vanity can be safely laughed at, but pride is to be always feared. By pride angels fell, and by it no man can rise." He much enjoyed a criticism of himself in Sibthorpe's *Life*: "He is thought by many dry, dull, and wearisome. I think him, on the whole, the most profitable preacher I have ever heard. One attraction is the total absence of all apparent attempts to attract. Hence, of course, he will not please young ladies." An exception is recorded among his papers. A mother who heard him at St. Isidore's in Rome wrote what she remembered to her daughter in England, who chanced to be dying and read the letter in time to die with it in her hand. It was her far-sent Viaticum.

He did not appeal *ad populum*. "Poor old gentleman! he did his best," was the verdict of an old lady who had expected emotion. His features and tone were more impressive than sensational—"that unearthly stillness and absorbedness of demeanour, and those tones that used to thrill one as representing a vision of the unseen." The impression deepened in Catholic days. Dr. Page Roberts declared that "the prelates of humanism looked like heathen in the presence of such white austerity." And the Irish sacristan summed him up, when preaching on the Last Day, "It was just Michael Angelo himself come to judgment!"

Manning knew a good sermon when he heard one, as he wrote from Oscott in 1852: "Newman preached an exquisitely beautiful sermon during the Synod. It was a great sight, and gave me a sense of the imperishable

Henry Edward Manning

reality and Divine guidance of the Church I never had before. After centuries the Church took up its work as if it laid it down but yesterday, and resumed it on the morrow as if nothing had happened since Henry VII. and all between were a bad dream." Never was Newman's magic more wonderful than in preaching "the Second Spring," and transforming, by his words, a meeting of Bishops into a celestial counter-march.

Though the two other English Cardinals of his time had written novels, he would not complete the trilogy. "It was not for lack of material," he said. But he hated play-acting, even in innocent fiction. The voice, "What doest thou here, Elias?" which warned him from the drawing-room forbade him to loiter in the library. At Lavington he rejected books for books' sake. "A book can only last till Christ's coming, and will then be burned up. It is, like food and raiment, part of our humiliation. To found an order or to feed a flock is better than to write a library." As for the æsthetes, they were "feeding on ambrosia while death reigns over mortals, like the gods of Epicurus." Yet he was well read, and some of his impressions may be gleaned into a sheaf :

Callista and Fabiola: "Cardinal Newman's story is so coldly intellectual. Wiseman is full of warmth and feeling."

Lord Shaftesbury's Life: "It makes me feel that my life has been wasted."

Macaulay's Life: "I had a haunting feeling that his had been a life of public utility and mine a *vita umbratilis*."

Bede's History: "What a fascination Anglo-Saxon times have for me. They are like the backgrounds of Raphael's early pictures. Landscapes in Paradise. This is an illusion Bede has thrown over me."

Dante: "St. Thomas Aquinas in verse."

Propertius: "My favourite Latinist."

Buckle's History: "Positivism applied to Sociology."

Newman's Apologia: "A voice from the dead."

Macaulay's Essay on Ranke: "Flashy, shallow, and

Rationalism and Literature

irreverent, but there are outlines of truths and ghosts of great principles."

Froude's English in Ireland: "A crime against the Empire."

Wilberforce's Life of Bishop Wilberforce: "The sin of Ham."

Aubrey de Vere's Mary Tudor: "The finest drama since Shakespeare."

Dumas's Dame aux Camélias: "Transfigured profligacy and unchastity in haloes."

Darwin's Origin of Species: "The anthropology of apes."

Works of Dickens: "A complete course of moral theology."

Patmore's Poems: "A green field after the gaudy harlequin diction of modern writers."

Creighton's Papacy: "The fairest history of the Mediæval Church from any hand that is not Catholic."

Holmes's Autocrat of the Breakfast Table: "About the middle it becomes animal and vulgar, and loses all the bright and joyous tone of the former part."

To a poetess he wrote: "The beauty of Catholic Italy and of Catholic Ireland is a world in itself. May God give you the vision of faith to see all this beauty; and what you write, write in blank verse. Metre and rhyme are thumbscrews and little-ease to the brain." He himself indited a hymn to further temperance, and we find him dealing with a hymn of Dryden's (April 6, 1884): "I am at work on the *Veni S.S.* Dryden was a licentious translator, a poet incapable of understanding the *V.S.S.* Nevertheless, for you old Catholics I am keeping as much as possible of the version which has become familiar. Parts of it are intolerable, and the end shows that Dryden forgot whom he was speaking to. The whole is to the Holy Ghost."

On the whole, he came to the conclusion that "the dealing with books either leaves books behind or dies like fruit on the tree." He was really more interested in journalism, of which he understood the power. "An

Henry Edward Manning

editor may be as majestic as *Jupiter Tonans* and as mischievous as a Whitehead torpedo." A newspaper, he said, is "between a voice and a book." Journalese he hated. "It is a style of writing I abhor. At the same time, I wonder at it as a countryman at a mountebank putting ribands of all colours and lengths out of his mouth."

The Vatican Council threw him against *Jupiter Tonans*, as he wrote from Rome (February 12, 1870): "I amuse myself sometimes with the English papers on the Council, which are, of all things I have known, the most pompously foolish, and hardly ever within a mile of the truth. It is what the *Jerusalem Times* would have written about the Apostles."

When he gave the Press credit for launching the equivalent of a Whitehead torpedo, he may have been thinking of the aspersions cast upon him by the *Whitehall Review*, cruelly accusing him of having jilted Mrs. Coventry Patmore. His answer escaped into a letter to Vaughan (February 8, 1881): "Then comes a sensational passage about a 'whispered tradition'—a lady and a poet. This must refer to the Patmores. I need not say that there is not a shadow of truth in it. From the year 1838 my life has been as it is, and never for a moment has my decision wavered. This seems to me brutal. The writer announces his intention of going on about the Bishops and others. And we can only be silent and leave it in the hands of God."

The matter was needlessly made mysterious by the poet writing that when he returned his wife's letters from the Cardinal they were burnt. They survive to show spiritual guidance or an intense regret for Lavington, which never left him (April 25, 1855): "How strangely the shadow of the hill at Lavington has fallen on you, too. It seems as if sorrow were the lot of all who dwell under it; and yet it is sorrow with great sweetness in its sharpest griefs."

Rationalism and Literature

And from Albano (May 10, 1862): "Here we are under the roof of St. Francis; the sun on the stems of the ilexes as it used to be in the broad walk at Lavington, and the sides of the lake full of nightingales. These last months seem like a dream. I can hardly believe them to be true. They seem like a Lavington evening, only that what we then spoke of we have now seen, and yet they are only the prelude and the vestibule." And again (November 7, 1867): "I always think of Lavington at All Hallows. It was very beautiful and peaceful with the drawing in of the year. If only there were the true Fold under the South Downs it would be a beautiful world."

Manning had a large journalistic acquaintance. He used to admire the thoroughness of G. A. Sala: "He knows almost everything well." He was much amused when Mr. à Beckett offered him *The Glow-worm* as a Church organ. "Don't you think there is something incongruous between latest sporting and latest ecclesiastical?" he asked. He was at war with *The Times* all his life. He could only flash out contradiction when it labelled him Separatist for his Irish views, or when *The Globe* announced a Papal telegram congratulating Gladstone on Disestablishment. "I believe *The Times* is largely written by undergraduates," was his conclusion. Reuter's Agency was also an enemy. "A mythical personage, the god Pan of the newspaper world, at once everywhere and nowhere, as changeful as Proteus and as little bound to truth." As for the Catholic Press, *The Tablet* was a wayward child, so disagreeable to Manning that he purchased the *Weekly Register* from Mr. Towle. Vaughan, who owned *The Tablet*, wrote anxiously (October 30, 1880): "I hope you will get your business arrangements settled in black and white. Towle is a saint, but he is also a lawyer and needy. With the best wishes not to injure *The Tablet*, you will not be able to help doing so. In any case, you have gone in for a venture, and the whole Press, except for *The Universe*,

Henry Edward Manning

is now the property of the clergy. This proves that either the Press does not pay the laity or that we priests are the better men. Which is it?" and amusingly protested that the Cardinal was "running a passenger boat for nothing on the Mississippi in order to beat and ruin an established company. With your Eminence as known proprietor it would be: The President of the U.S. aboard our boat! Half-fares! No fares! Breakfast free!" June 23, 1881: "I feel that I cannot be a Bishop and journalist without neglecting one or the other. If *The Tablet* collapse through competition and underselling I must try not to break my heart over it." When *The Tablet* opposed Manning's Irish views, he wrote to Ullathorne: "*The Tablet* is so little pleasing to me that I have thought better not to read it, and therefore not to speak again about it to the Bishop of Salford." Only in the Catholic Church could Bishops run opposing papers and remain devoted friends! Even when another Bishop attacked Manning in *The Tablet*, "I became silent, for I might have seemed to resent it." As he had once written to Ullathorne: "I feel that, when silence and abuse are pitted against each other, abuse has its day, but silence wins." Still, the circumstances were serious. The Cardinal at a temperance meeting had contrasted Mohammedan and Christian doctrine on drink, and the Bishop of Nottingham challenged his words as heretical. *The Register* became his personal organ, and the desk of Wilfrid Meynell, the editor, became littered with hints:

"Come, if you can, with the bats at your usual hour of night. I have just run over your second number. The article on Leo XIII. is far better than mine." "You saw, no doubt, the paragraph in *The Standard* headed 'The Pope and Cardinal Manning.' I need not say that every line is untrue." "Come and give an account of yourself, that I may tie a hundredweight to the tail of your imagination." "Read an article in *The Quarterly*

Rationalism and Literature

and answer it in a pamphlet. I will give you certain points, especially about the Vatican Council." "The hated rival has written to claim the notice, so I must write something for you." "Your tyranny is truly Arabian. They bastinadoed Dr. Wolfe because he did not know how to make gunpowder, which all Franks can do. I am fully dissatisfied with what I made under the lash."

Mr. Meynell also edited *Merry England*, which accounts for the merry note: "I am ashamed of myself, but the enclosed may go, and if your readers only laugh at me it will make Merry England merrier!"

Another close alliance was with Mr. Stead, of the *Pall Mall Gazette*. Manning lent himself to some of Stead's social rashness, but in return he could exert an influence on the secular Press. His notes show his pressure:

"We need a political paper which is independent, Christian, and popular. I have thought that I saw signs of this in the *Pall Mall*. You did not tell me what your line about education would be. My belief is that if we could talk it out we should not differ. I believe that my line would satisfy all but pedants and Gambettists."

"I detect your Cromwellian hand in the *Pall Mall*. Take care. You may yet profess the creed of Pius IV. and die a Papist. None are so near as those who think themselves safest."

"Do not lecture the Pope or recount 'rebuffs,' which, after all, may be like the buffeting of his Master by Divine permission and for a greater good."

"I have seen in the *Pall Mall* the passage about the Pope and others not knowing English. If you prefer your literary summer lightning to the weight and influence of gravity and judgment reject my criticisms."

"I will send you an old book of mine on unity, written before the flood. I feel as Homer would if he could rise from the dead and read Gladstone's thick volumes about him."

Henry Edward Manning

He once wrote to Cardinal Wiseman: "To extract fair words from the *Saturday Review* is like making an energumen recite the Psalter."

Manning's only literary perfection besides writing pastorals was in throwing off letters. As he grew older the handwriting became more finished and exquisite, a great contrast to Ullathorne's sturdy scrawl and Ward's "walking-sticks gone mad," though the zigzag prize went to Cardinal MacCabe. Cardinal Wiseman's was the most beautiful, but Cardinal Newman could write a literary minuscule, while Cardinal Cullen's hand was a looping the loop. Manning wrote to one correspondent he could read character in handwriting. "Beware!" Manning's notes became more precise and humorous than ever. To a correspondent who had named a pet bird after him: "I think it is hard upon me that you do not tell me whether I am an owl or a buzzard, or at least a grey parrot!" To Sir Charles Dilke's invitation he answered: "*O sancta simplicitas!* I told you that I never dine out, but that your dinners are Cabinet dinners and don't break the rule as *potus non frangit jejunium.*"

To Vaughan he loosed himself in private mirth and irony, generally at the expense of the Jesuits. For instance (January 26, 1880): "Their position is that they are the pontifical overseers of the Bishops in faith and morals. That they are by jurisdiction independent of the Ordinary and superior to him. It is a pity that they do not all wear the *Pallium de corpore B. Petri sumptum.*" February 25, 1881: "I am glad you are likely to have Stonyhurst and the Holy Name. I suppose in that case I should have Farm Street. I should at once bring the throne from Kensington. *Quels farceurs!* And there are old women in red who can be frightened at Bottom roaring like a lion."

A typical letter to Chief Justice Coleridge on his peerage ran (November 17, 1873): "I send you two pamphlets, one because you are an editor of *Blosius*, and

Rationalism and Literature

the other because you may not know that I am a heretic. And now let me wish you *multos annos* on your canonisation. I hope you will kneel down and ask your father's blessing, as Sir Thomas More used to do to Mr. Justice More."

In 1890 he sent word to Dr. Gasquet: "I have seen Charles Hawkins. He willingly consents to kill in chief, so that you may stealthily poison with impunity. Therefore I am filled with medicine men for my last days. In your absence I have made progress!" And to one of a thousand appeals: "I am as hard-hearted as the man that would not cry at the funeral sermon because he did not belong to the parish. My poor and my priests leave me little, even for your Sisters of Charity here, but that neither you nor they may call me ill names, I send you a pound."

Among the array of his books the masterpiece was *The Eternal Priesthood*. He tried to idealise his priests instead of leaving perfection to the religious Orders. He had no use for "perfunctory and professional goodness." He called for the heroic. "A blot upon a layman's coat is hardly seen, but a spot upon a priest's alb is an eyesore." He railed at the mission, which becomes a "sleepy hollow," and at the missionary, who is a "harmless lotus-eater." He called upon them to be the Hunters of Jeremiah, the Watchmen of Ezekiel, and the grim Harvesters of Isaias. Their business was the love of souls, "a sixth sense which the few possess and the many cannot comprehend."

A sequel to *The Eternal Priesthood* was long germinating in his mind. It was to endow the clergy with the name Pastoral instead of Secular. It was to reduce the pretensions of the Regulars for ever, but it was to be patristic, canonical, and scriptural. An English Jesuit, whom Manning described as "Father Gallwey without his imprudence," was reported untruly to have described the Bishops as a "set of imbeciles." "I doubt if they

Henry Edward Manning

are predestined to fill the vacant thrones from which somebody fell through pride. Of course, I speak not of the Society, but of *The Month*," Manning wrote to Vaughan. However, on rereading he realised that "*The Month* did not say explicitly that Bishops and Vicars Apostolic are equal." Yet he was on good terms with many religious Orders, and even admired Father Gallwey for his lovable Irish qualities. He was warring against "Presbyterian impertinence," but in one of his mystical moments he flashed: "I believe St. Francis has Lucifer's vacant throne." To Vaughan he wrote freely as usual (February 23, 1880):

"A Passionist said to me an hour ago: 'It is my happiness to work under you as Bishop, and it has always been so.' The Bishops are silent. Our clergy know nothing, but the Regulars and their perpetual talk meet me everywhere. Even the superiors of the Sisters of Charity in Paris were full of it. But the sisters here laughed at them. In the first period of the Church the Bishops and their priests were in the ascendant which Our Lord gave them. In the second period the secularity of the Episcopate depressed it everywhere, and the Regulars became proportionately powerful. There were more mitred Abbots in Parliament than Bishops. In one Lateran Council they outnumbered the Bishops double at least. The Church has come back to its beginnings. I count all the active congregations with ourselves. We work in unity and charity. It is only the remnants of the old Regulars, led by S.J., that strive for predominance. And I believe that the multiplication and elevation of the priesthood of the future depends upon the recalling of S.J. to its limits and to a life of interior perfection. Let them keep their culture, intellectual and spiritual, but learn the humility of the Franciscans and the charity of the Redemptorists."

The name of the new book appeared in a letter (October 12, 1880): "I am fully convinced that England has been lost chiefly by the privation of the 'Pastoral Office,' and that privation was the work of the Society, which could

Rationalism and Literature

neither do the work of Bishops and would not let Bishops do their own." Manning had done some preparative reading, chiefly among St. Charles's letters in the Ambrosian Library, whence he reported: "*Mutatis nominibus* it is to-day; only I think they were worse; but we are weaker than the Episcopate of that time."

There is really no case to be made out against the Jesuits historically, except from the point of view of the Bishops, whose weakness and necessity made the Jesuits' opportunity. But once Jesuits had restored or propped up Catholicism in a threatened quarter it was obvious that Bishops had a right to return to the ascendant. The Pastoral Office was not only Manning's theme. It was the Divine scheme of Christendom. "Groups and handfuls of men," wrote Manning, "good as they may be, can never supersede the *Corpus Pastorum*, any more than the Salford and Clifton Fire Brigades can supersede the Imperial Army." At length the book was finished, and he wrote to Vaughan (January 29, 1883):

"And now, do not read my book hastily, cursorily, or with prejudice. It has cost me much reading, but still more thought. The length of time I have given to it lays you under the duty of patience and thinking at least twice where you doubt or object. I am taking out every passage and every word that can offend. If the affirmative truth displeases the fault is not mine. I wish you specially to note the quotations from Bellarmine, Gregory de V. Vasquez, and Suarez." February 19, 1883: "And now for my book. I had already struck out the whole upon vows and the nonsense of Lainez, who was the author of the whole mischief. After your letter I decided to take off a certain number of copies, but not to publish. I have no literary vanities, and I have no will to end my days in contention. You did just what I bid you—that is, judge whether it would, I believe that 4/5 would, be good for the priesthood. I am willing to do anything if I can get our priests to know their own *gratiæ status*. You have asked me to write a new *gemitus columbæ*. I know of one mourning, lamentation, and woe which is the fountain

Henry Edward Manning

of all others, the depression, the degradation of the Episcopate and the priesthood. This depresses all and every body and the Christian world. Last night I made an outline of a little book on the law of liberty. It is there, I think, you think me exaggerated. If I am, I am wrong; if I am not, we are not faithful to the dispensation of the Holy Spirit."

His admonition to priests in publishing books he obeyed himself by submitting *The Pastoral Office* to Ullathorne, who made drastic corrections. "I think the quotation from St. Bernard will be construed as a covert attack on the religious of this time and country." Manning answered: "I made all your corrections but one, and I struck out St. Bernard, though it was pain and grief to me." Ullathorne was edified, for "it is not a little thing for any man to have a book taken to pieces and yet to take it kindly," he wrote. Finally, Ullathorne advised against publication (March 8, 1883): "I think the book very good as a whole for ecclesiastics, but whether equally so for lay people I will not venture the same opinion. But all this, as the Oratorians say, when ending their cases at dinner before you, *submitto iudicio et decisioni Em. et Rev. Cardinalis nostri.*" Manning replied (March 9, 1883):

"I know there is a *prejudicium* against me, and I will tell you my whole mind. Before I was in the Church all my sympathies were with the Regulars. For the first four years after I was strongly drawn to the Passionists and to the Jesuits. The strong desire for rule and community life took me to Bayswater. But I came to see the Divine institution of the Pastoral Office, and that no Regular Order can meet this. I saw also that the pastoral clergy were at a disadvantage, depressed, and lightly esteemed, but I saw that they were Our Lord's own Order. I came to see that the chief need of the Church everywhere is that they should be what Our Lord intended, and that all religious Orders united cannot fill their place or do their work. This has made

Rationalism and Literature

me work for them. Regulars have authors, friends, preachers, books, prestige, tradition always working for their elevation. The pastoral clergy has none of these things. My book contains hard words about Bishops, but not a hard word about Regulars. It contains the teaching of Our Lord, the Fathers, and theologians as to the state and dignity of the pastoral clergy. I feel that our humble, hard-working, hard-worked, self-denying, unpretending, self-depressing pastoral clergy need and deserve to be encouraged, cheered, and told of their high and happy state. They need what I can say and do for them. I love both and desire the perfection of both."

Manning completed his trilogy by a book on *The Rights and Dignity of the Priesthood*, which never passed out of the manuscript, but which he showed before death to Archbishop Ireland as prospective editor. Unfortunately, while the Archbishop of St. Paul was crossing the Atlantic, the manuscript, which Manning intended him to publish after his death, disappeared.

The theme of *The Pastoral Office* was that the episcopal state was more perfect than that of the religious, and that the pastoral clergy were a limited form of the Episcopate. Owing to the possible feelings of the religious Orders on reading "that Bishops and priests are bound to perfection not so much by the letter of ecclesiastical laws as by an antecedent and primary law issuing from the relation in which they stand to their Divine Master," copies were privately distributed, with an injunction they were not to be lent! To Father Lawless Manning wrote (May 27, 1883): "I wish you not to lend it to anyone. You will see why all priests need not desire to be Bishops—because all priests are in the same state of perfection, with all its *gratiæ status*, less only the responsibilities." He wished the next Council to "define the Divine powers of the Episcopate." Amongst those who received copies was Bishop Charles Wordsworth, who wrote (November 15, 1887):

Henry Edward Manning.

“I was much pleased to know that you approved of what I had written in opposition to Lightfoot and Stanley. Moreover, your book on the Pastoral Office came duly to hand, and I cut it open, but, to tell you the truth, I scarcely ventured further. I have had such sad experience of the disruption of old ties (Gladstone, for instance, what is he coming to?) that it pained me to think what I might find in your pages, as bringing home to me the gulf that is fixed between us.”

Nevertheless, there was a literary bridge across the gulf, Bishop Wordsworth writing in answer to Manning's letter :

“Its youthfulness and vivacity quite charmed both me and my wife; while its handwriting, compared with some specimens which I have preserved of dates so far back as 1829 and 1830, exhibits what all *tutors* rejoice to see in their *pupils*—decided improvement! I am just now rather heavily pressed in bringing out an edition of the historical plays of Shakespeare, and the daily task of correcting proofs is almost too much for my poor head and eyes—at 76! My last-made reference has been to Aristophanes' *Acharn.* (of Pericles) 505, which is *curiously* paralleled by what Cassius says of Cæsar as a man ‘that thunders and lightens in the Capitol.’ None of the editors, I think, has noticed this, but it will, I hope, interest *you*, who have yourself ‘thundered and lightened’ as an orator—and in Latin, too—if not in the Capitol on the Vatican!” And later: “You may like to know that I have done something towards rehabilitating the character of Cardinal Beaufort. I am gratified by your kind promise to become a patron of my *Shakespeare*. It is to be dedicated to the boys, past, present, and to come, of Winchester. Were not you and dear Hamilton and James Hope (all my pupils and all Fellows of Merton) present together at the five hundredth anniversary of that foundation?”

When Wordsworth published his reminiscences, Manning wrote, in the last autumn of his own life (October 8, 1891):

Rationalism and Literature

“Late last night I finished reading your book, and I cannot delay to write to you. I have not been able to lay it down. The first part down to our losing sight of each other is like living over again. The second part tells me your history, which I hardly knew. As to the first part, it brings before me a number of men whose existence, like Maysie and Thomas, I had forgotten. But their names bring before me their form and face as if I saw them. The greater number I have vividly before me; I have seen or known them remotely or intimately in the last forty years of my life in London. This past world had great beauty and sweetness. Boyhood and youth are very real in fact, but in all else visionary—in anticipation, hope, and foretaste. I suppose we shall never see each other again in this world. I shall never make any other journey but the last; and you will perhaps never again be in the *fumum strepitumque* of London. But I hope and pray that we may meet where, above the noises of this world, there is peace.”

Only the month before he died Manning read Lord Rosebery's *Pitt*, and wrote to the author (December 28, 1891):

“When I had begun it I could not lay it down. The two greatest Englishmen in our history are, to me, William Pitt and St. Thomas of Canterbury. Far asunder in circumstantials and accidents, for isolated grandeur they are of one heroic kind. Your book has for me four attractions. First, the biography of Pitt, which Lord Stanhope has brought out with great fulness. Next—what Lord Stanhope has very sparingly given us—the political history in which Pitt's history is embedded, with the characters of the men who surrounded him, opposed him, and betrayed him. Thirdly, an estimate of the events of the time, which not only justified, but demanded, his change of policy—that is, the war and the union of Ireland. In this latter, I go all lengths with your reasons and judgment. I wish Gladstone had in this been less like Burke in vehemence and lopsidedness. Lastly, you have written as a statesman judging of statesmen and affairs of state, and to me with great breadth and truth of appreciation. One thing is to me

Henry Edward Manning

of immense interest, and I have never, so far as I remember, seen it before—that is, Pitt's Poor Law propositions. It is easy to criticise them according to modern political economy, but they are true political wisdom, which, since 1835, we have violated to our own chastisement. Before I die I hope to say what I mean. I remember when I could find nobody to listen. Now I find a multitude saying the same thing without conspiring together, under the intolerable conditions, not only of our paupers, but of our poor."

Manning's interest in Pitt was of long standing. He had written to Wiseman of Pitt's Life (September 1, 1862): "I am reading it with the greatest interest, though my poor godfather does not cut up gloriously, for, as Canning said—

Pitt is to Addington
As London to Paddington.

It is like hearing my father talking. He was contemporary and intimate with all the chief names, and Pitt's friend, Lord Carrington, was his brother-in-law."

The letter to Lord Rosebery must have been the last he wrote, for of the next year only one note survives, written to Mrs. Hamilton King (New Year's Day, 1892):

"All through I have never given up hope. And now that hope is rising, I feel that I was not wrong. Often in the day I say for her, Spare, save, sanctify her; and I have offered my communion in every Mass for her. Our Lord is very near to her. She only knows how near, and she cannot tell you. Take the consolation of His Presence, and have no will but His."

A fortnight later his pen was still for ever.

CHAPTER XIX : THE COMING OF DEMOCRACY

“The course of Europe seems to be towards a development of national life and action by calling up into a political power larger numbers of the people. The middle class are such already—they are an oligarchy, an intelligent, energetic, self-respecting class, but selfish and subjective. Now the Catholic system is self-abolishing and objective.”—*Manning's Diary*, 1839.

IN spite of the Chartist failure shortly after these words were written, the popular cause in England steadily advanced until the Great War summoned Authority everywhere to make terms with Democracy. The Church had long known that it was as necessary to convert as to educate the coming rulers. For half a century political parties tried to offer the new power articulation through their own restricted channels. Nothing is more remarkable in the crossed skein of Manning's life than his prescience of Democracy and his prophecy of its eventual alliance with Catholic forces. “Were I not Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster I would wish to be a great demagogue,” he said frankly. In his political diary of 1831 he exclaimed: “I would fain Mr. Malthus had told us in what manner the right of labour enters as a pervading principle into the present distribution of wealth; how the immeasurable domains in Ireland held by absentee nobles, together with all the like species, possessions: the provisions granted by Crown patents, pensions, places, sinecures, the high nests of Stymphalian birds—how these are to be explained as regulated by right of labour?” Private benevolence he then thought futile, since the poor had a right to claim support of the State. “And sure I am of this, that on him who out of his affluence giveth unwillingly the hand of equalising retribution will lie soon, but on him that giveth not it will fall to his annihilation.” The sects tended to leave the battle-heights of Science for the

Henry Edward Manning

dustier area of Social Reform. Broad Churchmen, like Maurice and Kingsley, were not unwilling to be dubbed "Christian Socialists." With Maurice, Manning was always on respectful terms, though he considered him "an Ishmaelitish spirit," and Maurice in turn thought him too "circular" in his views. To Maurice's sister Manning wrote in the hungry forties: "The thought of our destitute millions and of the hard hand which too often converts charity into chastisement on the poor is enough to make one's heart sicken." Even at that date he believed in a living wage, for he cried out in one of his Archidiaconal Charges: "It is a high sin in the sight of Heaven for a man to wring his wealth out of the thews and sinews of his fellows, and to think that when he has paid them their wages he has paid them all he owes."

But the Chartist went unchaplained, and by the time Christianity reached the slum on the wings of Ritualism or Salvationism it was too late. The Manchester School had ground away Christian England. "Handlooms devour children," had cried the Rector of Lavington.

As Archbishop of Westminster, Manning set out afresh on the task of winning Democracy back to the Church. Assiduously he trod the byways of charity. He delivered speeches between his sermons, gave public admonition as well as private absolution. The civic Commission befitted him as well as the Church Council. As the cries of Labour became articulate, he advanced into the uncertain stream. He took the first plunge at Exeter Hall in 1872, by a motion of sympathy with the agricultural labourers, which caused some sensation among his friends. In answer to Mr. Gladstone, he wrote (December 21, 1872):

"I remember your saying to me many years ago that the next conflict would be between the masters and the workmen. I had been so much out of England then that I did not know how far this reached. I found last week

The Coming of Democracy

that even my Irish hodmen are organised. I have also lately had means of knowing what the agricultural unionists are. As yet they are not political. They do not coalesce with the London men, but the London men will soon make capital of them if others do not interpose. The consequence of this would be disastrous. My belief is that some energetic and sympathetic act on the part of Government would avert great dangers. Could not a Royal Commission be issued to take the evidence of men who are now appealing to public opinion for help? If they have a case, it could be dealt with. If they have none, it would be exposed."

And again, in the same December :

"As to the agricultural affair, the Bishop of Peterborough was as bad as the Bishop of Gloucester. How is it they do not know the day of their visitation? I wish I could be as sure about landed property as about personal. My belief is that the laws must be greatly relaxed. The Poor Law has saved them for a century. But the Poor Law has broken down. Why cannot you do these things for the labourer? Prohibit the labour of children under a certain age. Compel payment of wages in money. Regulate the number of dwellings according to the population of parishes. Establish tribunals of arbitration in counties for questions between labour and land. If our unions were like the guilds, which created the City of London, I should not fear them. But the *soul* is not there."

From Rome wrote Vaughan to Manning (February 10, 1873) :

"I fancy from what I hear that some complaint has been made about your going in with swaddlers, but they seem to understand and to appreciate our position better than formerly. I have dwelt upon the fact that our alliance must be with the people, and they have quite accepted it, and I ventured on the same thought with the Pope the other day."

But the cry "This man goeth with swaddlers" followed Manning to the end of his social action. By

Henry Edward Manning

1874 he was disputing the accepted economy of the time in addressing the Leeds mechanics: "I claim for Labour, and the skill which is always acquired by Labour, the rights of Capital. It is Capital in its 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 he went on to describe trade unions as in accord with the "higher jurisprudence," and to attack the mere "piling up of wealth like mountains." It was lonely work, and his platform was seldom graced by leading laymen. Cardinal Wiseman had found it easier to lecture on Art and Humanism to "select" audiences. Manning preferred discussing Humanity and Labour in the open. From platform to platform and from cause to cause he passed, until the folk seemed to see in him some radiant shadow of the old religion returning to England.

He supported Arch, whom the Bishop of Gloucester, no doubt representing Conservative sentiment, wished to see ducked in a horse-pond. Arch as a pioneer of trade unions left testimony to the Archbishop who "spoke up nobly for us. The testimony at such a time and in such a place of a man so respected was of the greatest value to the Union." Manning told Arch's friends that at a rural vestry in the thirties he had seen the gallon of flour and shilling per head doled out to the working-man for wage. He subscribed to Arch's Union both in 1878 and 1879. Meantime the union of Democracy and Christianity, which had shown the splendid promise of a defeated dawn under Lamennais in France, had collapsed under the withering tutelage of Bonapartism and passed to the freer atmosphere of America. In a letter of Manning to Gladstone as early as 1848 occurred the sentence: "It is wonderful to see the Catholic Church in America distinctly of the progress and popular party."

The Coming of Democracy

In his last days he was destined to come into close touch with that Church, grown large upon the Western horizon. The Vatican Council had put him into touch with the builders of the American Church, a Kenrick and a Spalding. He came to be regarded as the Primate of the English-speaking Catholic Church. His Irish sympathies, his interest in Labour, and his position in the world-politic, gave him a place in America that no English Bishop has ever held. He foresaw that any alliance between America and England must include as a strand the *entente* of the English, American, and Irish Hierarchies. He held the attention and reverence of the American Bishops. Bishop McQuaid of Rochester wrote to Corrigan, later Archbishop of New York (March 29, 1879): "Until I got Cardinal Manning and the English Bishops roused all seemed lost;" and later: "These English Bishops give good lessons which we do not learn."

Manning wrote from Rome to Vaughan (November 14, 1883): "I have seen the American Bishops and talked much with them, especially Baltimore, Boston, and Bishop Ryan, whom I like greatly, as I am sure I shall Bishop Corrigan. They are all substantially of one mind, but the want of knowledge here is appalling. I am pressing the dangerous absurdity of telling us to proceed by a mere judicial process, and upsetting it in appeal by *juridice non probari*."

Archbishop Corrigan wrote to Manning (October 27, 1885):

"I have to thank you sincerely for your letter of sympathy on the death of Cardinal McClosky. He poured oil on the troubled waters, and, bringing peace to this diocese, united both priests and people. This makes the task of ruling in his stead so much easier, but even so, how immense is the responsibility and how heavy the burden! What your Eminence told us in Retreat at the American College a quarter of a century

Henry Edward Manning

ago comes back to memory at this moment with renewed force—namely, that if one hope to do God's work at all, we must, before everything else, be men of prayer. I venture to beg your good prayers that the work of God in this diocese may not be marred by my unworthiness."

Dr. Corrigan appeared too humble and sensitive to rule as an Archbishop. But gentle as a woman to all whom he met in the ordinary course of life, when confronted with a vital issue he could become a lion in defence of the faith. His letters to Manning are those of a diffident child rather than a brother in the purple. With too sensitive a mind to serve a great archdiocese in stormy times, he carried faithfully the yoke which he prayed Rome to allow him to lay down. He ruled at a time when intense division was appearing in the American Episcopate, and when a series of vital questions had fluttered the purple. Cahenslyism, the School Question, the Knights of Labour, and Henry George, were to divide, distract, stimulate, and, in the end, leave the American Church more united than ever. When the teaching of Henry George was adopted by Dr. McGlynn, one of the leading priests in New York, little less than a test-case of Catholic Democracy may be said to have arisen. Labour problems had attacked America on the scale proper to that country. Capital had risen to its maximum, and the trade unions were reaching a corresponding efficiency. It seemed as though the structure of the Republic would be undermined in the collision of opposing forces. The years 1885-86 proved to be of special unrest. Under able leadership a society of unskilled labour, known as the Knights of Labour, had inaugurated and won strikes on the New York street railways. Public opinion approved the lowering of men's hours from sixteen to twelve daily. Feeling was at its acutest when the Mayoralty campaign of 1886 opened in New York. Henry George announced that he would be a candidate if 25,000 workmen invited him to stand by

The Coming of Democracy

postcard. Perhaps the only ecclesiast who knew George personally was Cardinal Manning, who, in the previous year, had discussed with him his proposals to alleviate the world as written in his book, *Progress and Poverty*. On this occasion Mr. George was accompanied by Mr. Meynell, who described this historical meeting afterwards: "They had travelled to the same goal from opposite directions. 'I loved the people,' said Henry George, 'and that love brought me to Christ as their best friend and teacher.' 'And I,' said the Cardinal, 'loved Christ, and so learned to love the people for whom He died.' They faced each other in silence for a moment, a silence more moving than words." "George was neither socialist nor anarchist," writes Rhodes, the conservative historian of America. Manning, by his own record, opened the conversation as follows: "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." This doctrine the Cardinal understood his visitor not to deny, but to be dealing rather with the intolerable evils inherent in an exaggerated law of property. Mr. George went on to speak fully and reverently of Christ as the example in whom rich and poor could find the solution of their strife. The common ground between Manning and George lay in the old saying, *Summum jus summa injuria*. And Manning afterwards wrote in *The Times* that, though he had not read *Progress and Poverty*, yet in *Social Problems* he saw nothing "to censure as unsound." He added: "I cannot end without saying how much I was pleased by the quiet earnestness with which he spoke, and the calmness of his whole bearing."

Henry Edward Manning

Mr. George mistook his pleasant converse for conversion, and in due time communicated his apostolic achievement to the Press. Manning held drastic notions as to ownership of land, but it cannot be said that he accepted Mr. George's social panacea.

Mr. George never met with the enthusiasm of Labour until he appeared as a possible instrument of vengeance upon the parties who were suspected of helping to subdue the strikes. The trade unions then came out in his favour. Mr. George found, too, a splendid ally in the hard-working and popular Dr. McGlynn, and diocesan history began to speed. When he pronounced owners of land to be anathema and anachronism, many Irish Americans remembered old land-wars in Ireland, and rallied to him. It became clear that the election for the Mayoralty of New York would be fought on class and professional lines rather than those of party, and the alarm was sounded. McGlynn had been taken by the Press as a token that the Church was on the side of Mr. George's theories. A fateful letter, signed by a leading merchant, Mr. Donoghue, was written to Mgr. Preston, Corrigan's Vicar-General, inquiring whether George's teaching embodied Catholic doctrine. To prevent misunderstanding, McGlynn was forbidden by Dr. Corrigan to attend a meeting in support of George. His disobedience was followed by ten days' suspension, and later by the loss of his parish. The Catholic camp became divided on the social issue. There were not two more sincere and disinterested men in America than McGlynn and Corrigan, but the bitterness of events threw them into severe conflict. Neither could withdraw from the position he had taken up. The election came and passed, leaving them at war.

In the fierce recriminations which followed, Dr. Corrigan was shouldered with the onus of George's defeat. He defended himself in a Pastoral, and wrote to Cardinal Manning (November 30, 1886):

The Coming of Democracy

“At the recent Mayoralty election in this city Mr. Henry George polled 68,000 votes. Much of his success was due to the untiring zeal, in his behalf, of Dr. McGlynn, rector of the largest Catholic parish in this diocese. To disarm criticism, Dr. McGlynn ventured to quote your Eminence, saying, as reported: ‘And I may quote Cardinal Manning. Surely it will be admitted that he is an authority on doctrine and discipline. Cardinal Manning informed Mr. George that he saw nothing in his views to condemn, and when Mr. George stated that others had condemned them as being morally and theologically wrong, the Cardinal remarked that they were unauthorised and incompetent critics.’

“Mr. George made a similar remark to me, but I paid no attention to it, presuming that he had misunderstood your Eminence. Since then I felt it to be a duty to say something on the subject in a recent Pastoral letter, and as Dr. McGlynn has not submitted, but has even spoken disrespectfully of the Holy Father, it will probably be necessary to transfer him to some other mission where he can do less harm. He is now *ad tempus* under censure. My object in writing is to suggest that it would help the cause of religion if you could find time and would think proper to send me a few words with permission to publish. With the exception of Henry George’s sheet, *The Leader*, the entire secular Press of this country accepted the Pastoral as timely. Some misguided Catholics are quibbling about it. A line from your Eminence would be very opportune.”

But the Press obtained the Cardinal’s opinion first. The Editor of the *World* cabled across the Atlantic to Manning: “Do you apprehend that the Labour movement led by Mr. George will extend to dangerous proportions?” Manning, suspecting an attempt to cause a collision with Corrigan, kept within his own diocese, for Archbishops, like Kings, have to “hang together.” He answered: “I do not as far as England is concerned. The strongest desire of the working-man is to possess a house and garden of his own. When Mr. George was here it was the working-men in the towns who were

Henry Edward Manning

chiefly attracted to him. The working-men in the country said: 'If you denationalise our land, let us have fair play and equalise our wages.'" Manning had been deeply impressed by Mr. George; and, much as he regretted Dr. McGlynn's speeches, he was too interested in the experiment to care to interfere. As, however, he was being quoted in the United States, he took economical advice from Archbishop Walsh of Dublin, whose reputation on such matters stood next to none on the Episcopal Bench. Dr. Walsh replied (December 28, 1886):

"Some time ago, in reference to an interview in which I said that I was for the nationalisation of the land here, but in Michael Davitt's way, not in Henry George's, your Eminence asked me what was Davitt's way. The difference between the two is that George (taking it as a fundamental principle that there can be no private property in land) would transfer the land from the present owners to the State, *giving them no compensation*, but Davitt fully recognises that property of theirs, and *would make compensation to them for it.*"

Meantime Dr. McGlynn founded the Anti-Poverty Society, which would have abolished the evangelical precept to make oneself poor by levelling up even those whose vocation was to enjoy poverty. He seems to have felt less deeply than his Archbishop, whose whole life became saddened by the steps duty compelled him to take. In the trials that beset his diocese in these years he perpetually turned to Cardinal Manning "to unburden my heart." Though Manning was ever ready to sympathise, he wrote to express his own view on Mr. George. The unhappy Dr. Corrigan answered (December 23, 1886):

"*Private.* Your kind letter has just come to hand, and I write to express my many thanks for your courtesy in writing again on the subject of Henry George's theories. At the same time, permit me to observe that Mr. George has a language of his own, and uses words

The Coming of Democracy

in a new sense, so as to deceive the unwary or inexperienced. His theory, stated plainly, is that *all property in land is simply robbery*. 'The truth is, and from this truth there can be no escape, that there is and can be no just title to an *exclusive possession* of the soil, and that private *property in land* is a bold, bare, enormous wrong, like that of chattel slavery' (*Progress and Poverty*, Book VII., chapter iii.). 'Property *in land* is essentially different from property in things. Rob a man of money, and the robbery is finished then and there. Rob people of the land—*i.e.*, by holding it as private property—and the robbery is continuous—a new robbery every year and every day' (*The Land Question*, chapter vii.). 'We must acknowledge the equal and inalienable rights which inhere in them by endowment of the Creator to make *land common property*' (*Social Problems*, chapter xix.). 'If there be anything strange in this, it is merely that habit can *blind one to the most obvious truths*' (*ibidem*). These passages are taken almost at random, and might be multiplied indefinitely. Poor Dr. McGlynn has refused to obey the Holy See. The Propaganda, after learning the facts of the case, cabled '*Alumnus MacGlynn Romam statim proficiscatur.*' After a sullen silence of two weeks and more, he writes that he will neither go nor abandon the theories of Mr. George; that if he could he 'would take away, all the world over, all property in land, without one cent of compensation to the miscalled owners.' *Eheu!*'

The strongest single-taxer could not help feeling for Corrigan, whose severest trials were yet to come. By ambition a recluse and scholar, he had been made by fate the standard-bearer in an odious battle. A year later he wrote to Manning (February 10, 1888):

"I have your sympathetic note of January 27. How strongly it consoles and sustains me! How different these struggles with the spirit of evil from the blessed peace of the Saint of Monte Cassino, whose Feast we celebrate to-day! By this time the main facts of the case, told in fifty pages of sworn testimony, are before the Holy Office. There are so many *adminicula*, so many bits of circumstantial evidence, so many notorious

Henry Edward Manning

facts all pointing the same way, that the testimony must be believed. If the poor man had not so reviled the Holy See and all its officials, there would have been a feeling of tenderness and pity for him; but he has been his own worst enemy. You will see this even from his tirade on last Sunday night. The Holy Father has most kindly taken a personal influence in this case. My secretary writes from Rome that his hand is guiding every movement. An *instructio* of Propaganda approved by Leo XIII. is now on its way to New York. This afternoon the following cable came: '*Hodie ad audientiam receptus solus, dona obtuli, gratias reddit Pontifex. Mihi dabit literas tibi tradendas. Forti animo esto McDonnell.*' The good Bishop of Piazenza has opened an institute for Italian priests willing to aid their countrymen in America, North and South. There are 80,000 Italians in this city, of whom only two per cent. have been in the habit of hearing Mass. Pray for us and our many wants, and give your blessing to one who needs it most of all, to carry on the work for souls."

Following the defection of McGlynn arose a far greater question which was to test the leadership of the young Cardinal Gibbons to the utmost. The Labour trouble had come with a vengeance. The American workingmen, of whom numbers were Catholic, were organising themselves among the Knights of Labour. In self-protection certain means were used to ensure secrecy, and the Knights immediately fell under the ban of the Hierarchy of Canada. Though the Knights of Labour were purely secular, the Cardinal could see far enough into the future to realise that they afforded a temporary solution of the Labour Question. The question had arisen whether the Bishops of the United States would join in the condemnation or not. The head of the Knights of Labour, who was a Catholic, conferred with Cardinal Gibbons, and the Cardinal in turn conferred with President Cleveland, and by letter with Cardinal Manning. As a result, he came to the conclusion that the Canadian policy would be a mistake in the States;

The Coming of Democracy

and, in the end, ten out of the twelve American Archbishops supported this view. But the condemnation of the Knights had actually been prepared at Rome, and it was already a case of reversing a decision. Archbishops Ireland and Spalding urged an offensive; and, though the responsibility fell on him alone, Gibbons signed his famous letter believing that he had compromised his Cardinalial status. When he took the matter to Rome he had the assurance of a defensive and offensive alliance with Manning, whose zeal went out to the Republican Primate, and whose battle he made his own. He saw immediately that this was a bid to retain civilised Labour in the Church, from which it had originally sprung, and without which it was bound to return to some form of degradation.

The opponent of Gibbons, Cardinal Taschereau of Quebec, was largely a creation of Manning. In 1885 Sir John Macdonald, the Canadian Premier, had visited him in London in order to press the elevation of a North American Cardinal. Manning seized the chance to add to the British vote in the Senate of the Church, and wrote to Macdonald (April 3, 1886): "I have reason to hope that my letter to the Holy Father has not been without result, and that in the next Consistory you will find your wishes fulfilled. Let me thank you for giving me the least opportunity of doing the least act in showing my veneration for the Church in Canada." In June Canada acquired her first Cardinal, and Macdonald wrote gratefully (June 12, 1886): "I can assure your Eminence that you have gratified beyond expression some two millions of Catholics by your exertions in this cause. Nothing can exceed the enthusiasm of the French Canadians, and I have not failed to inform Archbishop Taschereau and my French Canadian colleagues in the Government of your kind intervention." It is pleasant to record that Canada owes her permanent red hat to the initiative of Westminster.

Henry Edward Manning

When Cardinal Gibbons set out for Rome, by a coincidence Cardinal Taschereau sailed on the same ship, though his object was to uphold the condemnation of the Knights. Cardinal Taschereau rallied no little feeling for his purpose in antiquated circles in Europe. Only in Westminster or Rome could Gibbons have secured an unprejudiced hearing. But it soon became clear that hard fighting and harder logic were needed if the Knights were to be recognised by the Vatican. Gibbons brought for allies Bishop Keane, then of Richmond, and Mgr. Denis O'Connell, Bishop of Richmond later. Keane had already written imploring Manning to use his influence to have the McGlynn case settled as the case of an individual, and not as the occasion of deciding a large social question (February 10, 1887):

“The labour question and the social question involved in the case of poor McGlynn have given us infinite anxiety and no little work. Hot-headed parties here were urging examinations and condemnations that were utterly unnecessary, that would broaden the case of the disobedient and cranky priest into a question that would be regarded as a Papal intervention in American affairs similar to the one that is now so seriously threatening the union of the Catholics of Germany. If your Eminence agrees in the view we take, you would do a great service to the Church by begging the Holy Father not to order or permit any overt discussion of the American social questions at present, both because they have not ripened yet and taken shape and because the action of the Holy See could hardly fail to be odious to the whole American public and to split up Catholic unity. Things can safely be left to right themselves in our political machine—doctrinal decisions would not help the work.”

A further appeal to Manning to come out immediately in favour of Cardinal Gibbons met with a response. The old cry of “Socialism” had been raised, and the Cardinal had been added to the noble company who have been unjustly delated to Rome. Since the days of the Baptist

The Coming of Democracy

the path of the pathfinder has been difficult. Fortunately, however, Gibbons was to prove a prophet unrejected in his own country. Feeling he had the common sense of America behind him, he delivered his masterly letter to Cardinal Simeoni. It had not been intended for publication, but it was revealed by the happy zeal of a correspondent. Bishop Keane wrote to Manning (February 28, 1887):

“You will see how the utterances which have for ever secured to your Eminence the noble title of ‘Friend of the People’ have done our Cardinal good service in his defence of the rights of the working millions. He had an interview this morning on these subjects with the chief officials of the Holy Office, with most gratifying results. It was easy to see that in his words they felt the weight of the whole Hierarchy, the whole clergy, and the whole people of America, and that his sentiments had already produced among them an evident change of front. A few weeks ago the drift was towards condemnation, regardless of the widespread disastrous consequences that would inevitably have ensued. To-day the keynote was that the convictions of the Bishops of America are the safest guide of the Holy Office in its action on American affairs, and that they will let well enough alone. . . .” March 14, 1887: “It is no small venture to utter such sentiments in an atmosphere like this of Rome; and, to make the situation more trying, the document was somehow gotten hold of by a reporter of the *New York Herald*, and published in full. For a time the Cardinal was very apprehensive; but telegrams, and now newspaper comments, are coming in of a most cheering character, showing that the publication of the document has done great good among the people of America.”

Cardinal Gibbons himself wrote his gratitude to Manning (March 14, 1887):

“Your esteemed and valued favour is received in which your Eminence is graciously pleased to assent to the views submitted to the Propaganda regarding Henry

Henry Edward Manning

George and the Knights of Labour. I cannot sufficiently express to you how much I felt strengthened in my position by being able to refer in the document to your utterances on the claims of the working-man to our sympathy, and how I am cheered beyond measure in receiving from your own pen an endorsement of my sentiments and those of my American colleagues now in Rome. God grant that the Church of America may escape the dire calamity of a condemnation which would be disastrous to the future interests of religion among us ! I shall be exceedingly grateful to your Eminence if you can send me a copy of the Lecture on *The Dignity and Rights of Labour*. We are indebted more than you are aware to the influence of your name in discussing these social questions and in influencing the public mind. We joyfully adopt your Eminence into the ranks of our Knighthood ; you have nobly won your spurs !”

As soon as Cardinal Gibbons published his document, Manning issued his corroboration and adhesion in *The Tablet*. Not unhumorously he pressed his views on the Roman authorities, when he pointed out that trade unions originated in the *Collegia* of Rome herself, whence they passed into the Christian Law : “ In the Church of Santa Maria dell’ Orto every chapel belongs to, and is maintained by, some college or *universitas* of various trades.” That such was the case was not lost on the officials. The victory subsequently won in the Propaganda was complete. It was a real red-letter day both in the history of the Church and in that of Labour. Henceforth Cardinal Gibbons and his Knights could go their way *sans peur et sans reproche*. Bishop Keane wrote triumphantly to Manning (March 22, 1887) :

“ The clear, strong, wise words of your Eminence’s letters will be a bulwark to the truth and a rebuke to mischief-makers. The impression produced here seems to be excellent. Nay, our victory is already won. Cardinal Taschereau has gone home with directions from the Holy Office to grant absolution to all the thousands of poor fellows who have been cut off from the Sacraments by

The Coming of Democracy

the condemnation in Canada, and there does not seem to be any danger now of a condemnation for America. *Deo gratias! . . .*" April 23, 1887: "Mgr. Jacobini was in favour of its publication in the *Moniteur*, which I feel sure Cardinal Simeoni would not have authorised. He is the embodiment of timid and suspicious conservatism. I explained to him how an advocacy of popular rights was no friendliness to Socialism, and that our aim was—recognising the inevitable tendency to Democracy—not to leave it to be ruled by the devil, but to hold it in the ways of God. He took it all with his gentle smile, which always seems to mean half consent and half fear. He has a mortal dread of newspapers. We can expect from him only the toleration of our ideas. Cardinal Simeoni, and probably others with him, link together the Labour Movement in America and the Home Rule Movement in Ireland; and the dire colours in which poor Ireland is now being painted cast a glare of suspicion upon us too. The times are certainly critical, but we know we are advancing truth and justice."

On his way home, Cardinal Gibbons paid a visit to London to receive Manning's felicitations. Both had played lonely and difficult parts in laying the foundations of the Church of the future under the cross-fire of both the reactionary and the revolutionary. Both had weighed the standard laws of political economy and found them wanting. Both had sought to exert influence on Democracy, and to be coloured therefrom in turn. Manning declared he was a Radical after the pattern of the Pentateuch; and Gibbons was an American citizen *primus inter pares*, whether among his fellow-citizens or on the Bench of Bishops. It was inevitable that under the attacks of the less enlightened they should have gravitated to a heartfelt understanding. When they met to compare notes, and discuss the championship of the unchampioned, it may be said that the East and the West were meeting in a sense that had not occurred before. Gibbons returned to America to gather for thirty years to come the fruit of his far-sighted action; while Manning, with

Henry Edward Manning

but a few years left of life, was yet to interpose in the great London Dock Strike, and by his action win for himself, in the words of the Press, "the Primacy of England."

Later in 1888, when there was some possibility of Henry George's *Progress and Poverty* being placed on the Index, Cardinal Gibbons appealed to his old ally to prevent what would have had a disastrous effect in America. He felt that any errors in George's theories would be brought out and corrected by the freedom of debate without the need of a special condemnation. Besides, there were many social truths in the book of which both he and Manning were aware. He wrote, therefore, to Manning (March 23, 1888) :

"*Private and Confidential.* While I was in Rome in the spring of '87, I felt it my duty to urge the Congregation of the Index not to condemn Henry George's *Progress and Poverty*. I addressed the letter to Cardinal Simeoni, and my impression is that I sent your Eminence a copy of the letter at the time. I have been informed confidentially, within the last few days, that, yielding to a pressure from a certain quarter in this country, the Congregation was inclined to put the book on the Index, notwithstanding my earnest deprecating letter of last year, whose force is perhaps weakened for want of insistence. The reasons I presented then for withholding a condemnation are stronger to-day, and my anticipations have been verified regarding the effect of Mr. George's book in the public mind. I would deplore an official condemnation of the book for the following reasons among others : (1) The book is now almost forgotten, and to put it on the Index would revive it in the popular mind, would arouse a morbid interest in the work, and would tend to increase its circulation. (2) The author himself has ceased to be a prominent leader in politics, he excites little or no attention, and whatever influence he has politically he promises to exert in favour of the re-election of President Cleveland. (3) The condemnation of his book would awaken sympathy for him. He would be regarded as a martyr to Catholic intolerance

The Coming of Democracy

by many Protestants. (4) It would afford to the ministers and bigots (always anxious to find a weak spot in our armour) an occasion to denounce the Church as the enemy of free discussion. (5) The errors in the book have been amply refuted by able theologians. I write to beg your Eminence to help us in preventing a condemnation, especially as you belong to the Congregation of the Index. It is important not to reveal any knowledge of the threatened condemnation. The letter might be based on the recent surreptitious publication of my letter in the *New York Herald*, and the favourable comments on it, as far as I have seen, on the part of the secular Press. My belief is that with very few, not a half-dozen, exceptions, the Episcopate of this country would deplore a condemnation. Your Eminence's knightly help to me last year prompts me to call on you again."

To Cardinal Manning's assurance that he need have no fear, Cardinal Gibbons replied (May 23, 1888) :

"I am very glad that in your Eminence's opinion there is no danger that Henry George's book will be put on the Index. There is very considerable commotion in this country over the recent Rescript in reference to the Irish Question. It will require all the tact and prudence of the Episcopate of the United States to quiet the public mind and to prevent unfortunate consequences. Tomorrow the corner-stone of the University is to be laid with imposing ceremonies, and we hope that the President and his Cabinet will attend."

The following year the Church in the States celebrated a centenary, and, though pressed to come, Manning would only write a letter with the far-thrown sentence : "In the greatest Commonwealth, and in the greatest Empire of the world, the Church Catholic and Roman, deeply rooted and daily expanding, calls the freed races of mankind to the liberty of Faith, the only true liberty of man."

And later to Cardinal Gibbons (March 31, 1890) : "We little thought when we were writing about the Knights of Labour in Rome, a few years ago, that every

Henry Edward Manning

word would be so soon published to the world by an Emperor and a Pope. This is surely the new world overshadowing the old, and the Church walking like its Master among the people of Christendom. Were we prophets?"

When he saw this letter, Archbishop Ireland wrote to Baltimore: "The words are cheering, and to you who staked your name on the outcome of the problem, then rather obscure, they must have been very gratifying. You were a prophet! The people are the power, and the Church must be with the people. I wish all our own Bishops understood this truth!" As Manning's influence reached the French world through Cardinal Lavigerie, so it was to act for a generation upon the American Church through Archbishops Gibbons and Ireland, who both regarded themselves as his pupils and hero-worshippers. Their recommendations for the Episcopate bore the Manning stamp.

The tide of revolution had overwhelmed Pius. His successor, rather than remain submerged, preferred to hoist the sail of Democracy and float on the ebb. For Manning this opened a new era of activity. Though his personal intimacy with Pius was unrepeatable, his character accorded more closely to that of Leo. They were both aristocrats by birth and training, who were seeking to win popular sympathies to the Church. Manning to Archbishop Ireland seemed Leo's reflection: "Once elsewhere in Europe I was in presence of a mind that seemed an image of Leo's—not resplendent as Leo's mind, but yet an image of it." Of all the Cardinals, Manning seems to have left the greatest impress on Leo and on his writing on social questions. Of the anti-slavery campaign Vaughan wrote (October 17, 1880): "Bilio said only the other day: 'The Pope was telling me that this last Encyclical is Manning's. It was he who put the idea into my head to do something for the slaves. He is a man *di vaste vedute*, and his conversa-

The Coming of Democracy

tion is full of suggestion. I have written this Encyclical in consequence of my conversation with him.'”

Leo's Encyclicals on Labour were prompted by direct action on Manning's part. He had taken up the challenge Mr. Hyndman once sent him (November 26, 1886) : “It has often surprised me that no Catholic in this country has ever striven to emulate the noble work of M. le Play or to take a leaf out of the book of le Comte de Mun. That the fight of the future will be between Catholics and ourselves both sides recognise, but that is surely no reason why each should not recognise the economic truths taught by the eminent men of the opposite camp. It is because something might still be done to stave off the relentless class war which is impending in this England of ours that I venture to write you this letter.”

Manning favoured the strike and the trade union. He noted : “What a man can do for himself the State shall not do for him. And the converse if good. Therefore Self-help under limitation. Self-help is collective. Therefore Union.”

But after “Bloody Sunday” he wrote to Stead (November 20, 1887) : “Trafalgar Square is seriously checking the spread of sympathy with Ireland and the restitution of justice. The combination of Socialists and the outcast population, which is our rebuke, sin, shame, scandal, and will be our scourge, is a misrepresentation of law and liberty and justice. The appeal to physical force is criminal and immoral—venial in men maddened by suffering, but inexcusable in others.” To Mr. Bodley he wrote : “If the landholders, householders, and capitalists will engineer a slope we may avert disastrous collisions. If they will not, I am afraid you will see a rough time.” In the simplicity of his heart he offered the remedy that Capital should open its books and publish “a just rule for profits and salaries.” To Sir Samuel Boulton he wrote : “The only practical scheme

Henry Edward Manning

would be in the apportionment of wages to the employers' profit, subject to periodical revision. Sliding scales and bonus are sure to get out of gear." The refusal of the employers "implied to me fear and suspicion, something to hide—*i.e.*, disproportioned gains." He approved of taking land instead of taxes and reselling it. To relieve unemployment in London he suggested in *The Times* "a light hearth tax." He held that a man had the right to work or eat—"a wild proposition," according to *The Times*, though the Cardinal supported it from Duns Scotus. In reply to Giffen, the solemn statistician, he thundered: "Theories of gradual accumulation of surplus will not feed hungry men, women, and children, and hunger cannot be sent to Jupiter or to Saturn. I would ask, What number of years may be required to raise the level of surplus and employment over the surface of the country?" When Giffen replied, "An infinity of years," Labour may well have preferred to chance the "tremendous cataclysm" Giffen prophesied of Manning's remedy. In spite of an attack from Huxley, Manning stuck to his guns, writing to Ben Tillett: "How can any man hinder or discourage the giving of food or help? Why is the house called a *workhouse*? Because it is for those who cannot work? No, because it was the house to give work or bread. The very name is an argument. I am very sure what our Lord and His Apostles would do if they were in London."

And to Tom Mann: "The public authorities ought to find work for those who want work, or relief for those who cannot." As these two forceful men were responsible for the London Dock Strike of 1889, it is interesting to record their sentiments to the Cardinal, who attained his zenith of social fame by resolving the same strike, the most important in the history of Labour. Mann wrote of Manning: "I shall ever remember him as the finest example of genuine devotion to the down-

The Coming of Democracy

trodden. He was never too busy to be consulted, or too occupied with Church affairs to admit of his giving detailed attention to any group of men, whom kindly influence could help, and he was equally keen to understand any plans of ours to improve the lot of these men." Manning always encouraged Ben Tillett upon the path of true agitatorship, which he believed should include "a cross as well as a crown," and Tillett recorded the effect of the Cardinal's influence—"How it burned and singed my nature and called out of the depths the primitive courage, and so the persistence which helped in the formation of the Gasworkers' Union!"

In August, 1889, the London Dockers revolted under their casual and crushing conditions of labour. They were the hungry men who carried the food of London, and they struck for an additional penny to the fivepence they received per hour. The Directors had made the mistake of dividing one man's work amongst many, and the public, who supported the Dockers, made the mistake of believing that the Directors earned huge dividends. The hungry men who carried the food of London struck for their "tanner," but before they won it troops were mobilised. The strike aroused "sympathy," and set the Thames on fire. There were meetings in the same place where Froissart says Wat Tyler's men met, "in a square called St. Catherine's before the Tower." A no-work manifesto and the approach of starvation to their families brought Manning on the scene. Mr. Champion recorded the three decisive stages of the strike to be—

"The ultimatum of the Directors to hold no further parley.

"The concession of a few wharf-owners to accept the men's terms.

"The intervention of Cardinal Manning."

On Friday, August 30, Miss Harkness brought Manning word from the strikers. "Religion?" asked

Henry Edward Manning

old Newman, the butler, pointing to the chapel. "No, politics." "The Cardinal isn't as young as he was," said Newman thoughtfully. She continued: "Half an hour later I saw Cardinal Manning. Then I went away to fetch a list of the Dock Directors. When I came back he was saying Mass. After that I had the satisfaction of seeing him drive off in his carriage to the City." There was no more perfect and dramatic scene in his whole life than when the Cardinal arose in his ghost hour of anecdote and reminiscence to face the reality of a bitter London strike. A dying man went down to rescue a dead city. "The Archbishop of Tyre" went to render civic first-aid to Tyre's port. He found the Lord Mayor and Home Secretary out of town. He himself never took holidays. He proceeded solemnly to address the Directors at Dock House. He claimed to speak as the brother of a former Dock Chairman, and threatened that a revolution was imminent. He told the Press that he had had good men to talk to, but confided to the strikers that he had never "preached to so impenitent a congregation!" A week later the Mayor returned, and an enthusiastic curate fetched Temple, the Bishop of London. A strong committee of reconciliation could now be formed, and one of them, Lord Buxton, described the Cardinal, how "day after day from ten in the morning till seven or eight at night he spent interviewing, discussing, negotiating, sometimes waiting hour after hour patiently but anxiously at the Mansion House. He never appeared disheartened or cast down. He was always confident that with time, tact, and patience, peace would speedily prevail." A certain rivalry arose between the clergy, which is described by Tillett: "It was interesting to watch the combat of the Churches over the bodies of the Dockers. But the older man was more human and subtle, his diplomacy that of the ages and the Church. He chided the pomp of the Lord Mayor, the harshness of Temple, the pushfulness of Burns."

The Coming of Democracy

The committee met the leaders, and the date for granting the Dockers' "tanner" was discussed. April 1 was offered and rejected as obvious foolery by the men. Then March 1. "I appeal to your Eminence," said Burns—"have the men not behaved with sweet reasonableness?" "My son, they have." "Then I do not think they ought to be asked to wait till March." January 1 was then accepted, and that evening Cardinal, Bishop, and Mayor waited on the Directors, who made a grudging acceptance the next day at four in the afternoon on condition the strikers acceded that evening. The Cardinal waited at the Mansion till ten that night, but no answer came. The strikers had issued a manifesto repudiating all they had agreed to through Burns and Tillett. Directors and Bishop withdrew in disgust, leaving the Cardinal to make the best of it. Manning sent sadly for Tillett, and agreed to make a fresh effort for peace, but forbade the strikers to serenade his house. The men wished the date to be October 1, and November 4 was suggested as a compromise. One Toomey proposed that Manning should meet the men on their own ground. The Mayor left London in despair, and Manning drove down alone to Poplar (September 10, 1889). A conference of three hours took place in the Wade Street School, but all Manning's eloquence could not prevail on the men to accept November 4. For two hours the debate raged without a single ray of hope. Manning analysed and criticised their own arguments, and in turn pleaded or threatened. Then he played his last card. He would call on the Irish Catholics in the Docks, and they would hear his voice. Tom McCarthy was won, and others murmured assent. Finally, Mr. Champion, an English secularist, who used to say, "If the Cardinal told me to cut my hair in a tonsure I should do it," proposed "That this meeting empowers Cardinal Manning to inform the Dock Directors that the men are willing to meet them halfway in the matter of the time at

Henry Edward Manning

which the payment is to begin, and to accept Monday, November 4, as the date." This was carried by 28 to 15, and of the minority all but one eventually acquiesced. "It was a running fight," the Cardinal might have said as he left with the resolution in his pocket, signed by all the leaders. As he drove home with Lord Buxton, he sagely remarked: "This shows the perpetual advantage of acting on that aphorism, If you want a thing done, go; if you want it neglected, send!" He waited for two days before using his powers. When the Directors were beginning to feel uneasy, he went to them as plenipotentiary for the strikers. On September 12 the Directors agreed to consider the terms "if they came through Cardinal Manning," but on condition that the sympathy strike was also ended. This required two days of further persuasion, but on September 14 all sides signed the "Cardinal's Peace." To Father Lawless Manning sent word the same day: "This is a great joy, thank God. I am too weary to come, and shall make to-morrow a day of rest. But give my blessing to your people." And to Lord Buxton next day: "If there were anything to be done I would not fail to be with you, but we have only to rejoice over the happy close. For a month past I have seen the Thames as stagnant as the Dead Sea. To-morrow I hope to see it once more full of life and motion worthy of the Port of London." The Peace was not without its troubles, as the Cardinal wrote again (September 21, 1889): "If the Directors a month ago had met their men face to face until they had come to agreement, the strike would have ended in ten days. Instead of this they tried to go round at the back of the men and to fill their places with men from Greenock, Liverpool, and, it was said, from Antwerp. If they had succeeded we should have had bloodshed. Fifty thousand strangers at work and fifty thousand old hands out in the cold would have ended in an interminable conflict. Their failure in this has saved them. And then they call

The Coming of Democracy

on us to rescue them from the dangers caused by their partial success in a blind policy." Buxton invited the Cardinal to be present at the triumph of November 4, but it was a day belonging to St. Charles, and Manning wrote: "It is impossible. The 4th of November is a day on which for thirty-two years I have been bound to be at our house at Bayswater." When St. Charles's Day was chosen as the compromise date between January and October Manning must have perceived a sign from Heaven, and attributed victory to his dear Saint. But the workmen would not pass him over, and out of their pennies collected £160, with which Manning endowed a bed in the London Hospital. In their Address they said: "When we remember how your Eminence, unasked and unsolicited, under the weight of fourscore and two years, came forward to mediate between master and man; when we remember your prudent and wise counsels not to let any heat of passion or unreasonable view of the position beguile us or lead us away from the fair point of duty to our employers and ourselves; and when, in fine, we recall to mind your venerable figure in our midst for over four hours in the Wade Street School, listening to our complaints and giving us advice in our doubts and difficulties, we seem to see a father in the midst of a loving and well-loved family rather than the ordinary mediator or benefactor in the thick of a trade dispute."

Though Manning's success was resented in Temple's biography, Archbishop Benson noted very gracefully in his diary (September 17, 1889): "Cardinal Manning has done well in London. But why has my dear Bishop of London gone back and left it to him? Are the Dockers on strike Roman Catholics all? Manning in his final little speech says he should have been guilty of dereliction of duty if he had not tried to do what his position demanded. Whatever that may be, he has done it well and with deserved honour."

Henry Edward Manning

In the *New Review* Manning summed up the strike :

“What we may hope will come from this strike is a registration of labourers and an organisation of labour. This will clear the dock gates and the East of London of thousands who year by year flow in from the country without knowledge or skill. They become a floating population of disappointed men—indolent because unemployed, living from hand to mouth, and dangerous because they have nothing to lose : starving in the midst of wealth and prosperity from which they are excluded. Nevertheless, without any blind self-praise, I believe we may say that since the Cotton Famine of the North there has been no nobler example of self-command than we have seen in the last month. And I am bound to bear witness not only to the self-command of the men, but also to the measured language and calm courtesy of the employers.”

The Press admitted that Manning had won the Primacy of England, and *Punch* celebrated the event by suggesting a Privy Councillorship and the new nursery rhyme :

“Dickory, Dickory, Dock !
The Cardinal picked the dead lock.
The men struck. Then
They worked agen,
Dickory, Victory, Dock !”

In the matter of the Cardinal's subscription to the Dockers Lord Randolph Churchill said to a reproving American journalist, “What do you mean by ‘encouraging disorder’? I would gladly give £25 myself if I had it.” Manning had profoundly impressed Church and State. Thenceforward he was able to exert a favourable influence in the world of Labour. He could humorously bind over Tillett to make no wild speeches for a while, and when Tillett, feeling like a guilty school-boy, visited him, he could ask whether he had kept his promise. “Fairly,” answered the leader of thousands. The Cardinal drew a strong speech of his from a drawer and proceeded to read it in a clear voice. Tillett turned

The Coming of Democracy

away crestfallen; but "My dear Benjamin," said the Cardinal, opening the door, "if I were as young as you I should do the same!" Constantly appealed to by both sides, he tried to hold the balance fairly. More than one strike he averted and others he brought to an end. He wisely did not sit in judgment, but brought men together. He knew well that on technical points he would be a fisherman off his waters. Nevertheless, he attempted to theorise in letters. To Lord Buxton he was writing during that winter (November 16, 1889):

"I agree in every word you have written. The men are unreasonable. They will lose their monopoly. If anything ought to be reopened, the half-hour of dinner for the Dockers ought to be. You know, of course, that when Dockers grow grey they stain their hair lest they should be turned off as old men. I am afraid that the Port of London will be like Venice and Gothland." November 17: "I have seen Mr. Toomey. I warned him about the monopoly, and told him to go to the men and say, You have wind and tide with you; do not turn it against you." November 30: "I am afraid that some bad fellows have got among the men, and that some good men are not better for the strike and the Gospel of Hyde Park. I am not sanguine of a quiet subsidence. Winter is come, and the whole Labour Question is up. The Silvertown strikers are coming here to-day. I could not refuse them, but I can do little for them." December 11: "The Lord Mayor has called us here about the coalworkers' case. It is intolerable that London should at any moment be in darkness because a private company is pleased to quarrel with their men. I wish you were in London, for I am out of my depth with gas wages." December 27: "I have been turning over the strike matters, and the more I think the more I am on the side of Labour. Labour and skill are Capital as much as gold and silver. Labour and skill can produce without gold and silver. Gold and silver are dependent on Labour and skill, but Labour and skill are independent *in limine*. The union of the two Capitals demands

Henry Edward Manning

participation in the product. Wages are a minimised money representation of shares in product—that is, in profits. Silvertown gives 15 per cent. to its shareholders and denies halfpence and farthings to its workers. This is more or less the state of the labour market at large. No strike is worth making except for a twofold share in the profits of a twofold Capital. But individualism, selfishness, freedom of contract, and competition, have obliterated the first principles of the Metayer System." January 21, 1890: "A clergyman said last week: The Dockers' Strike succeeded because the police did not do their duty; the Gas Strike has failed because the police did their duty. The freedom of contract is maintained by the truncheon. There is no justice, mercy, or compassion in the Plutocracy. There is my creed."

Sir Samuel Boulton was made Chairman of the Conciliation Board. That he was the owner of the Cardinal's birthplace was not the only reason for the Cardinal's esteem; he wrote to him freely as a representative of enlightened Capital (January 14, 1890): "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 the employed will never be understood. Even the organ-blower is vital to the organist."

The principle of '89, which the Dock Strike established, was that of Arbitration. "The day will come when it will be our safety," wrote the Cardinal. "It is not true that such contests are the private affairs of masters and men. But this theory will not die till it is killed by public catastrophe." To Archbishop Walsh he wrote (March 1, 1890): "We have been under the despotism of Capital. The union of labourers is their only shelter, and the Capitalists have now wisely formed a union of their own. This is altogether legitimate, and it has rendered the intervention of a third party necessary to peace and fair play on both sides."

The Coming of Democracy

He still kept in touch with Gladstone, writing during these controversies (November 8, 1889):

“Will you kindly send me the exact quotation of the words in which you sent Political Economy to Jupiter and Saturn. You never said anything truer. Freedom of Contract is to Political Economy as vaccination is to the practice of medicine. But our later Political Economists have forgotten everything beyond the exchange of values. The Wealth of Nations is not represented by money only or cotton twist.” August 27, 1890: “I find them very reasonable. They want to reform, not to destroy. They both come to me and write to me, and twice last winter they listened, and undid an imprudence which they had done. They are now once more, I fear, near the rocks. *The Times* of to-day has an article which to me is brutal. It claims for Capital the absolute dictatorship of Labour. My belief is that in justice, natural and supernatural, there is a proportion between profit and wages. The Metayer System was founded on it. It ought to be recognised and embodied in all free contracts, subject to periodical revision. Until this is done strikes are inevitable. Do not overtax your time of rest, and remember Apollo’s bow.” October 5, 1890: “The Charity Organisation Society will burn you in effigy. They tell us that four millions are given every year in charity in London, and, as they say, wastefully and unwisely. I rejoice in it. It is the lightning conductor which saves us. And as to the waste and wisdom I am content that many unworthy should share rather than one worthy case be without help. Like the waste of nature. Where should we be if 60 or 70 millions were wisely given every year?—or even given? But, as you say, men do not think and self is never denied. What peace and love there would be if Mr. Carnegie’s gospel were believed and practised! A thousand men with 20 rounds at Chatham, with tugs, steam up to coerce the gas stokers at Becton. Are we under martial law? A Government weak and unpopular rests on police and soldiers. I remember Peterloo and Bristol, and seem to be young again, or at least to be under the old Tory ascendancy.”

Henry Edward Manning

To Canon Girdlestone he wrote (January 22, 1891): "I do not venture to define Socialism, for in truth it has never yet been fixed, and the flux of opinion is always moving. All just legislation must be social that is conservative of human society. But Socialism seems to me to denote an abnormal treatment of social needs and of Society itself. Socialism is to Society what rationalism is to reason. But whether you and I can agree in this academical question, we are heartily agreed in sympathy with the world of labour and poverty."

And to Mrs. Hamilton King (February 28, 1891): "Little progress towards peace is, I fear, made or making. The Masters' Federation seem to me not to wish for it. They seem to be blind." Mrs. King was the poetess of the strike:

"He sat not in the House of Peers,
No tithes to him were told;
But he counted the souls of Londoners
As a rich man counts his gold. . . .
What were the Powers he wrestled with?
We do not know them plain:
But we know that he won the poor man's cause,
And the labourer's lasting gain."

The following year Leo published his Encyclical *Rerum Novarum* on Labour, and heralded its arrival by a personal letter to Manning in Italian (January 17, 1891): "*Signor Cardinale*,—The letter of New Year wishes, which you sent according to your old custom of reverence and piety, was very pleasing. Not more pleasing is the pacified state of public affairs which you mention, and that the nations enjoy the ever-to-be-prayed-for peace and tranquillity. Our foremost desire and prayer to God is that it should come to Ireland, too long given over to unmerited calamities. It is not unknown to you, dear son, how anxious we are made by the fortunes of that race. No less is the care which touches you as to the condition of working-men. We are engaged in the consideration of each matter, and as

The Coming of Democracy

soon as we are able we will take pains that neither our duty nor charity are lacking to either cause. Seek and strive with Divine goodness that our counsels and efforts may prove fruitful. Meantime, dear son, to you and your clergy and people we accord the apostolic benediction.—LEO. PP. XIII.”

Dr. Walsh wrote from Rome (March 24, 1891): “The Holy Father is in wonderful spirits. He spoke at great length to me about the coming Encyclical. He had asked your Eminence to send him a *bravo scrittore* to make the English translation. After a good deal of talk he said that it was to be taken in hand by your Eminence and me. I was glad to find that His Holiness knew of Gladstone’s Bill. The phraseology throughout was Whigs and Tories, not *Liberali* and *Conservatori*. I think I trace your Eminence’s influence in this as in many other things that I have noted here during this visit. How pleasant a contrast from the state of things here in 1888!”

Manning answered (Easter Day, 1891): “Your letter was a true *gaudium Paschale*, for it not only shows that you have the full confidence of Leo XIII., but that the whole policy of the Bishops in Ireland is safe and sure. It is of great importance that you should hereafter write direct. If you can get a copy of the Encyclical some days before the newspapers have it, we may get it well translated.” April 12, 1891: “The Holy Father had accepted the offer of the Bishop of Newport (Benedictine and a very good scholar) to translate it, and he is ready to do so, and we can revise it.” Dr. Walsh brought the advance copy, with another letter from the Pope (May 11, 1891): “You will occupy yourself diligently making the English version with great fidelity and accuracy. We desire you to arrange with Mgr. Walsh for the simultaneous publication of the document in England and Ireland. We sent you word that the English edition is to serve for circulation in America also, and it will be

Henry Edward Manning

therefore necessary to send some thousands of copies to Cardinal Gibbons. We are grateful for the important communications you have periodically made to us upon the affairs of Ireland. From the turn of events we are able to hope that the sustained attitude of the Episcopate will result in the desired success."

The Encyclical was impartially translated, Bishop Hedley taking the conservative and Manning the progressive view. Manning, for instance, insisted on using the word "strike" and not a euphemism. The Encyclical showed signs of being based on the Cardinal's letter to the Congress of Liège the preceding year. The parallel is close in some sentences :

Cardinal Manning.

Political Economy is not a matter of values and exchanges only, but of human life.

To put labour and wages first and human or domestic life second is to invert the order of God and of nature.

In mines and other severe labours a day of eight hours is reasonable.

The right of uniting for mutual protection and support is a natural and legitimate right.

Leo XIII.

Each one has a right to procure what is required in order to live.

It is shameful and inhuman to treat men like chattels to make money by.

Those who work in mines should have shorter hours.

If the State forbids its citizens to form associations it contradicts the very principle of its own existence.

Ben Tillett wrote to the Cardinal (June 9, 1891): "I have just been reading the Pope's letter—a very courageous one indeed, one that will test good Catholics much more effectively than any exhortation to religious worship. As you know, some of us would disagree very strongly with many of the strictures laid upon Socialists. These are minor matters. The Catholic

The Coming of Democracy

sympathy abounds in a generous strength. I hardly think our Protestant prelates would dare utter such wholesome doctrine.”

Catholic Democracy had come at last, and lifted itself upon the wings of the English-speaking Churches. The Holy Church had seemingly failed to turn the movement of 1848 to the progress and strength of the Church, though the young and hopeful *Pio Nono* was at the head. It was for his successor to encourage Manning and the Archbishops of America and Ireland to take a place in the social movement which threatened, unless guided, to sweep away the landmarks of the nineteenth century.

CHAPTER XX: IRELAND AGAIN

"I am Radical and Irish, but always after the manner and measure of St. Gregory VII. Do not fight for me. Let me be beaten. My Radicalism I learned of Moses and of St. Paul, and I may say my politics are summed up in the words, 'I have compassion on the multitude, for they have nothing to eat.' Now, there is a confession for you."—*Manning to the Duchess of Buccleuch*, 1869.

"What I would suggest to you would be that we should follow the same course as the Bishops in Ireland, and that in doing so we should express our union with them and our veneration for the Cardinal. I think we ought not to have any unfraternal sensitiveness about following their lead."—*Manning to Ullathorne*, 1866.

THE Eighties brought back Ireland. As soon as Gladstone won his majority, Manning wrote to Childers (May 1, 1880): "You have been lifted upon the top of the wave which nobody looked for; and you will have to deal with Ireland, and will be better able to deal with it than others. I am very Irish in my sympathies, and I hope for some measure which will be felt in the homes of the poor." Vaughan was at Rome battling the Jesuits, but he wrote (December 16, 1880):

"Of course we must safeguard the rights of landlords to compensation, but while doing this and condemning crime, I think we ought to go in for a generous settlement of this Irish grievance."

Christmas Day, 1880: "We cannot risk the mission to the English nation for the Irish. Were we to take a very radical line just now, we might identify the Church with Radicalism and revolution in the minds of the English. The garrison landlord theory was safe as a hypothesis twenty-five years ago—would it be safe *for us* now? I am sure you will handle the question skillfully."

Manning wrote to Vaughan (December 27, 1880):

"Did Cardinal Simeoni show you my letter to him about Ireland? It was very full and strong." January

Ireland Again

5, 1881: "I hear that Forster urged firmer measures. Bright and Chamberlain threatened resignation. This would have created two tribunes of the people worse than the two foxes with firebrands tied to their tails among the wheat harvest."

February 18, 1881: "The Irish affairs are, I think, playing out. Parnell's Paris expedition is a showing of cards which has damaged him and his works. But the agencies in America are serious. Gladstone has met his Nemesis."

March 23, 1881: "By this time you will have seen Archbishop Croke's letter to the *Tablet*. The article is certainly not wise. It is showy, ineffective, and provoking. But Cashel will burn his fingers and more, I fear. Who inspires the *Aurora*? It seems to me that Catholics have lost their heads, and in politics talk and rave like women. The state of Ireland is more and more grave because of this maddened deafness to reason and fact, and because of the now irresistible and permanent action of American Fenianism."

Manning commended Gladstone's Land Bill to the Irish Bishops. Archbishop MacCabe, who had succeeded to the purple but not to the power of Cullen, wrote (July 24, 1881):

"I feel very thankful for your kind suggestion, and it will give me great pleasure to act on it. But I am not quite sure that the vote of the Bishops in favour of the Bill as it is likely to come out of the House of Commons will be unanimous. Some of them feel that their recommendations were utterly ignored by Mr. Gladstone, and that therefore they should abstain from all commendation of the Bill. This, certainly, is not my view of the case. There was one suggestion made by the Bishops which I always thought very unfortunate, and I fear it cast a shadow over all the others. We all feel that in your Eminence Ireland has a very sincere friend."

Manning urged MacCabe for the Cardinalate, judging from a letter from Dublin (March 11, 1882): "I have reason to believe that your Eminence's kind offices in

Henry Edward Manning

my regard have not been confined to mere words. Whilst deeply sensible of the obligation under which the great kindness of the Holy Father has placed this country by giving her a voice in the Sacred College, I regret that the favour of H.H. did not fall on some Irish prelate less unworthy than I am."

In his unique position Manning acted almost as an Irish adviser to the Government, supplying them with facts and information lost to their agents in Ireland. To Mr. Forster, the Quaker, commissioned to rule Ireland with the sword, he gave advice and warnings. Forster wrote at critical moments (August 10, 1881):

"Thank you very much for letting me see the enclosed. You may rely on my strict secrecy. There was no harm done to the Bill last evening, nor will there be to-day. The Court will be the judge as to whether the improvements have been made and maintained by the landlord, but that claim really comes to nothing." September 26, 1881: "I have come back to very anxious and difficult work. The influences for good and evil are struggling. The Bishops meet this week at Maynooth, and much depends on their action. Would that they could see that the cause of religion and morality is as much at stake as the cause of law and order!"

As for the Irish landlords, Manning had spoken guardedly in 1868, recalling Sir Robert Peel's statement that the repeal of the corn-laws had saved the landlords against their will, and trusting "that the same will be true of the land laws in Ireland." Five years later he delivered a terrible indictment, when he described the Land Question as "a somewhat heartless euphemism" for "hunger, thirst, nakedness, notice to quit, labour in vain, the breaking up of homes, the miseries, sicknesses, deaths of parents, children, wives." None the less, violent agitation never won his sympathy, and he viewed Irish obstruction in the House of Com-

Ireland Again

mons through the eyes of an old-fashioned English gentleman.

To Archbishop Croke he wrote about this time (July 13, 1881):

“ I have carefully noted the line you have taken since your declaration on Mr. Parnell’s policy, and I have rejoiced to see it, believing that the course taken in the House of Commons has unspeakably damaged the cause of Ireland, and that the disastrous events which have surrounded the Land League have made just men regard it with suspicion and hostility. My desire is to see you and the Irish Episcopate leading and uniting the people as in old times, and all the more because we are now not dealing with Ireland in Ireland, but with America in Ireland, as I fear. I hope your hands may be strong to keep the Land League within the lines of right and law.” Croke answered (August 23, 1881): “ I think the Land Bill will do a deal of good, and I believe it will get a fair trial generally throughout the country. There are a few, to be sure, amongst what is known as ‘ the advanced party,’ who do not look on it with favour. There are others who dislike the Government intensely that ‘ picked up ’ Michael Davitt and keeps such men as Father Sheehy in prison. This class is *most* numerous: so much so that I believe there will be no real peace in the country until the prison doors are thrown open. I had a notion of writing something to that effect to Mr. Gladstone. Of course, if I did anything of the kind, my communication would be quite private. I fancy, however, that I shall leave him to gather his information from some other source. There is nothing to be dreaded, I assure your Eminence, from what is called the ‘ French Alliance,’ for the very valid reason that it is an alliance *in nubibus*; nor, indeed, from any other sinister influence, and I think I can safely say that the Irish people were never more reasonably religious than they are to-day, and as a rule so thoroughly devoted to their clergy.”

English Bishops were to give difficulty as well as Irish. Manning wrote humorously to Vaughan of a

Henry Edward Manning

colleague (June 8, 1882): “(Private.) Lord Denbigh and Nottingham are at loggerheads about the Irish letter. N. is like N. N. has written to me, and I to N., and N. writes to defy the world. He ought to be head-stoker in the Phlegethon, for he is red hot already and incombustible.” As the Irish curse came home to Englishmen, Manning wrote (February 12, 1885): “England is being troubled all round for the sins of the sixteenth century and the proud wrongs inflicted by the Venetian oligarchy, as Disraeli called it. I saw that you had been troubled about the dynamiters. The silence in Ireland of Parnell and Co., of the laity, of the Bishops, renders our action useless. We speak as Englishmen and as Catholics, and hitherto the country has in no way attached these outrages to the Catholic religion. It would not be well for us to purge ourselves. It would be to accept the state of suspects.”

The year 1885 proved decisive in Irish history. Parnellism became a power that Popes and Premiers had to reckon with. Nationalism had carried the Church, but priests took the lead rather than be left behind. The Government addressed the spiritual authorities with incessant appeals. Errington was busy in Rome, and it was hoped that Manning would visit Ireland to exert a calming influence. A note from the Liberal Viceroy, Lord Spencer, suggested a visit to headquarters (April 23, 1885): “If you come it will give Lady Spencer and myself great pleasure to receive you here. We are in the Phoenix Park, about twenty minutes’ drive from Dublin.” The Cardinal was wise enough not to step upon the Irish chess-board, where Castle and Bishops appeared to be involved in inextricable opposition. Suddenly an ecclesiastical crisis precipitated itself, and Manning was drawn involuntarily into the game. Cardinal MacCabe, Cullen’s unassuming successor, died in February, and the most vital place in the Hierarchy became vacant on the eve

Ireland Again

of a crisis. During seven years MacCabe had been a moderate man, who could hardly be claimed to favour the Crown or the popular cause. He was certainly opposed to militant Nationalism, and had crossed the path of Dr. Croke. It became a question whether Dr. Croke or the Crown would see the vacancy filled to their satisfaction, for each had made choice. A secret war of succession was fought between Gladstone's Government, which favoured Dr. Moran, and the Irish Episcopate, who favoured Dr. Walsh. The history of the months during which the archbishopric lay open has not yet been written, but it contained some of the elements that had once made Manning's election a triumph of impartial decision in the face of intrigue and pressure. Curiously enough, the name of Errington was no less prominent, but in a subsidiary manner. He was instructed to move against Dr. Walsh. Of Errington's previous mission in 1883 Cardinal Manning left sundry notes :

“Mr. Errington was in the confidence of Government and of Cardinal MacCabe. The Cardinal Secretary and perhaps the Holy Father thought that they had got at last full information about Ireland. I considered it my duty to say, ‘Mr. Errington represents the English Government, but he does not represent Ireland.’”

The Irish people and clergy were aroused by a suspicion of British intrigues at Rome. This they resented bitterly, feeling that they were being disparaged in the house of their friends. Dr. Moran, as it appeared in subsequent years, was at heart a Nationalist, though still under the influence of his uncle, Cardinal Cullen. Dr. Walsh had already written on the popular side from his chair at Maynooth. In consequence his name was anathema to the landlord party, who saw in his consecration the triumph of principles leading to their social downfall. The people, however, had staked their cause on his election. Manning was one of the first to scent

Henry Edward Manning

danger. Sir Charles Dilke, his intimate friend and confidant, kept him in touch with the under-workings of the Cabinet. In April both met to confer, and, not content with expressing himself very strongly in favour of Dr. Walsh, Manning forwarded his reasons to Dilke as follows (April 26, 1885) :

“(Private.) I have thought it best to put in writing what I said on Friday on the subject of the appointment to the See of Dublin. My first and chief anxiety is that the Government shall in no way, either officially or officiously, through Mr. Errington or any other, attempt to influence the election. Already the belief to this effect has been expressed in the Irish papers. Two effects would at once follow. The Archbishop would be ‘suspect’ and his influence for good in the sense of the Government would be paralysed. And next, the influence of Rome in the direction I desire as much as you would be dangerously lessened. So much in general. Next for the three names now before the Holy See. They are all good and safe in every sense. Any one of them may be confided in as holding the opinions and principles of the seven Bishops who were here the other day. But there is one of them beyond compare the ablest—namely, Dr. Walsh, President of Maynooth. He has been tried in governing that vast college, and has been found very able and successful. He has great weight in Ireland, and, as the Bishops unanimously assured me, he would unite the whole Episcopate, for they all confide in him. I have an impression that efforts have been made to represent Dr. Walsh as a Nationalist. He is not more so than I am, and whether that is excessive or obstructive you will judge. That you may better know how far my judgment may be taken, I will here add that I had a special and unusual share in the selection and nomination of the late Cardinal Archbishop. And I believe you know me too well to need that I should say more. I put ‘Private’ on this letter, but you may use it as you see fit.”

Spencer wrote to Dilke to contradict Manning, who wrote to Croke (May 1, 1885) :

Ireland Again

“ Let me hear of our affairs in Rome, for the newspapers make me anxious, especially about Dublin. And let me know whether I can be of any use. Ireland has never been so represented in Rome as at this moment. And I hope greatly.”

Croke answered in a letter describing himself humorously as “ the turbulent Archbishop of Cashel ” (May 5, 1885) :

“ There is no news about Dublin, but there are various reports. One is that Dr. Moran will be recalled and appointed to Dublin. It is *absolutely certain that the Government has made this proposal to the Pope*. I do not and cannot believe that it will be accepted by His Holiness. Dr. Moran is doing well, I hear, where he is, and is wanted there. Anyhow, the setting aside of Dr. Walsh *for anyone* would raise such a storm in Ireland and in the United States that His Holiness should be solemnly warned against doing so. Your Eminence alone can give such a warning, *and I earnestly ask you to give it*. We are very busy at Propaganda.”

Archbishop MacEvilly of Tuam wrote to Manning from Rome (May 5, 1885) :

“ The matter in which we feel the greatest interest is the Dublin affair. This the Holy Father has taken into his own hands. The Holy Father has decided on giving audience to each of the Irish Bishops separately before seeing them collectively.”

Manning decided to intervene. He wrote to the Pope that Granville was the only opponent of Walsh in the Cabinet, and he put pressure on Dilke and Chamberlain. Captain O'Shea, the member for Galway, acted as intermediary. A letter of his to Manning reads (May 5, 1885) :

“ (*Confidential.*) I have had an opportunity of talking the archbishopric question over very carefully this

Henry Edward Manning

evening with Sir Charles Dilke and Chamberlain, and they are disposed to think that the apparent neutrality of Lord Spencer may have been assumed for a purpose. They have both done their best in support of our views, and have been more or less snubbed by Lord Granville, who assures them that Mr. Errington has not supported Dr. Donnelly, a statement which does not convey to my mind the impression that he has not vehemently opposed Dr. Walsh. Lord Spencer called on Mr. Gladstone to-day, and I regret to say that he has not yet come round to the ideas which we hold as to local self-government for Ireland."

Mr. Chamberlain's part in the good game is shown in a letter to Mr. Mulqueeny which passed into Manning's possession (October 6, 1885): "While the late Government was in office I endeavoured, with the assistance of Sir Charles Dilke, to bring to an end the communications which were made at Rome on behalf of the British Government, believing that we had no right to interfere in such a matter, and that there was no ground of opposition to the selection of Archbishop Walsh."

For several weeks matters continued at a high state of tension. O'Shea left word (May 7, 1885): "(Confidential.) May it please your Eminence, I think the business which interests you and me must break up the Cabinet." There was a chance that they would take an early opportunity to resign. Suddenly *United Ireland* published a copy of a letter from Errington to Granville, which was never denied (May 15, 1885):

"The Dublin archbishopric being still undecided, I must continue to keep the Vatican in good humour about you, and keep up communication with them generally as much as possible. I am almost ashamed to trouble you again, when you are so busy, but perhaps on Monday you would allow me to show you the letter I propose to write. This premature report about Dr. Moran will cause increased pressure to be put on the

Ireland Again

Pope and create fresh difficulties. The matter must therefore be most carefully watched, so that the strong pressure I can still command may be used at the right moment and not too soon or unnecessarily; for too much pressure is quite as dangerous as too little. To effect this constant communication with Rome is necessary."

Croke found himself unheeded at the Vatican, and turned to Manning as his only possible ally. Four months after the vacancy occurred he wrote (June 7, 1885):

"Things are looking very threatening here. The people cannot be persuaded that the Pope has not entered into some sort of agreement with the Government, the price paid by His Holiness being the setting aside of the popular candidate for the See of Dublin and the appointment of some cold and colourless ecclesiastic. I dread this myself, for, in point of fact, during our last interview with His Holiness he formally sketched such a plan, and declared that 'he was not the Pope of Ireland alone, but of the Universal Church.' Dangerous indeed it is if it should turn out that English influence proved to be so potent in the Vatican as to cause His Holiness to discredit one of the foremost ecclesiastics of the day, *simply because* he happened not to be a *persona grata* to the Government. This is my sober and solemn judgment as to the situation. I write it to your Eminence as the highest and most influential ecclesiastic within the realm, with the hope that you may have it conveyed to the proper quarter."

Manning replied (June 12, 1885): "I was glad to get your letter. I now write briefly to say that I wrote fully about Dublin, pointing out—

"(1) The supreme danger of ever *seeming* to be swayed from here.

"(2) The united wish of the Bishops.

"(3) The worthiness of the man.

"No adverse or other decision has been yet come to. And you may confide in my leaving nothing undone that I can do. Meanwhile, if you and Mr. Parnell can prevent outrages, a better day is near."

Henry Edward Manning

Dr. Walsh wrote sadly but calmly to Manning (June 9, 1885):

“The times are indeed troublous. The complications that have arisen have sadly embarrassed me, and deprived me of all freedom of action as to my own position. One thing only is clear: my Presidentship is necessarily at an end; the office is not one that could be held even for a day by anyone on whose career an adverse judgment had been pronounced by the Holy See. Personally, I exult at the prospect of getting back to my theological work. But I cannot shut my eyes to the prospect of all that may happen besides.”

In June Gladstone was defeated by the Irish vote, and the Tories, under Lord Salisbury, succeeded to office. But the Dublin succession remained open. The Liberal Government had been paralysed by the confederacy of Dilke and Chamberlain, who made non-interference with the Dublin election one of their two conditions with Gladstone. The new Government appeared likely to carry on the intrigue. Manning seized the opportunity of a departing interview with Lord Carnarvon, the new Viceroy, on June 24, to deprecate such a mistake. Meantime the whole question had reached the Holy Father in all its bearings and siftings. Both Crown and Bishops put their views strongly. Realising the enormous importance of the decision, he spent days in anxious thought. At last his anxiety overcame his peace. In the dead of the night he arose and went down to pray at the tombs of the Apostles Peter and Paul. It was the time of their Feast, when forces invisible and unknown to politicians were abroad—forces that have overturned human calculations more often than historians care to confess. It was not unlike Manning's own nomination. Dr. Walsh was chosen, and Catholic Ireland breathed again. Manning wrote to Vaughan (June 28, 1885): “I thought my last letter to Leo XIII. would have vexed him. We

Ireland Again

have been on the brink of an enormous scandal. Rightly or wrongly, the feeling in Ireland about Dublin was full of danger. I found out that the Cabinet had no part in it, had never discussed it or touched the question. It was the work of about three working outside the Cabinet with Errington. Thank God that is over! How long these men will stand nobody knows." Croke wrote (June 30, 1885): "I thank God that the Irish ecclesiastical crisis has come to a satisfactory ending. I thank your Eminence also." One with God makes a sure majority.

Manning noted: "I know that our Government tried to prevent the nomination of Dr. Walsh to the See of Dublin. Any such misunderstanding, be it only verbal and tacit, between the Holy See and the Government would be in my judgment and belief fatal. Not only or chiefly because many a good nomination would be hindered and many a bad one confirmed, but for a graver reason. No number of such mischiefs are comparable to the danger resulting to the Holy See. So long as the Irish people absolutely trust the Holy See in the nomination of Bishops, the faith and fidelity of the Irish people will be immutable. The day in which they begin to believe that the influence of the Protestant and anti-Catholic Government of England is felt at the Vatican in this most vital point they will be tempted not only to mistrust, but to all manner of spiritual evils."

To return to the last days of Liberal Government, when the Radical wing were hustling Whiggery and Chamberlain was advocating the programme which the Liberal party struggled for twenty years to live up to.

Gladstone was aware that his subordinates were in touch with Manning, who felt that duty and an intelligent curiosity compelled him to take a running part in the politics of the day. There were great principles and religious matters still at stake. Diplomatic relations were in the Premier's mind. Education was unsatisfac-

Henry Edward Manning

tory. Ireland needed an interpreter. Manning had no scruple against keeping an open door to the powers that were. From time to time Parnell or Dilke paid visits, while their intermediary, O'Shea, flitted between. O'Shea was an old Oscott boy whose rôles were various. At one time he was settling an affair of honour between a Whig Minister and a Tory leader, at another running messages for Parnell—now in Chamberlain's office, now at Archbishop's House. He understood that his employers would give him the Irish Secretaryship. Manning nicknamed him "Mercury," as a messenger who passed between the gods of the political Olympus.

Both Chamberlain and Gladstone were seeking fur- tively for a solution of the Irish problem. Chamberlain evolved local government outside "Mr. Gladstone's umbrella," and began to treat with Manning, who was the only neutral ground for English statesmen and Irish Bishops. Chamberlain sent the holograph of his scheme with a confidential letter to Manning (April 25, 1885):

"In compliance with your wish, I have endeavoured to put in some detail and in the form of the memorandum herewith my views on the subject of Irish local government. They are stated on my personal responsibility alone, but if I have reason to believe that they could command the support of the most influential representatives of Irish opinion I should be prepared to press them on the consideration of my colleagues and to take any steps which would be likely to secure their adoption. The notes are necessarily rough and incompleated, but I should be glad to supplement them in any way that may be desired. I shall also be ready at any time to wait on you again, if you think that a personal interview would be advantageous."

He was anxious to obtain some form of approval from Parnell, as well as a *nihil obstat* from the Irish Episcopate. The scheme was soon divulged, and Manning wrote to Dilke (April 26, 1885): "How can the *Standard*

Ireland Again

have got the Irish Scheme? Nothing is secret and nobody is safe. My copy of it is both safe and secret." Manning fulfilled his part, and told Parnell the Bishops would support Chamberlain's scheme. Parnell assented, and Manning wrote to Dilke (April 30, 1885): "I have had an hour's conversation with the person you know. The result is that I strongly advise the prompt introduction of the scheme I have here in writing. It cannot be known too soon. But both on general and on particular reasons I hope that neither you' nor your friend will dream of the act you spoke of. Government are pledged in their first Queen's Speech to County Government in Ireland. Let them redeem their pledge. All the rest will follow. We can speak to-morrow."

Mr. Chamberlain was accorded an interview with Manning, followed by Parnell, on the same day that Gladstone said to Granville (May 6, 1885): "I did not calculate upon Parnell and his friends, nor upon Manning and his Bishops. Nor was I under any obligation to follow or act with Chamberlain."

Manning proceeded to sound the Irish Bishops, but cautiously, for their predecessors had left him stranded on two previous occasions. They appear to have been satisfied, and Manning wrote to Chamberlain (May 10, 1885): "I did not write again to you because I knew that Sir Charles Dilke would communicate the result of my interview last week. It was satisfactory, and as the Irish Bishops are of the same mind, the conditions of acceptance for the scheme appear to be secure. I wish I were as sure of the third nearer home—first, at least, in order of time." The third person referred to was Parnell, from whom Manning had succeeded in securing a guarded assent to Chamberlain's scheme. The day the Cardinal's letter was written the following note from Captain O'Shea was left at Archbishop's House:

Sunday, 10 p.m.: "*Immediate.* May it please your Eminence, I have only just returned to town, else I

Henry Edward Manning

should have given myself the honour of calling earlier. I regret to have to tell you that the Cabinet yesterday rejected the proposal for Irish self-government. Under this circumstance Mr. Chamberlain refuses to allow the re-enactment of the Crimes Act. He will allow a small measure, the change of venue and special juries and the special inquiries. But as to summary jurisdiction, he will not yield; every man is to have the right to appeal to a jury. So the game is set between the Whigs and Liberals."

A General Election was imminent, to say nothing of a rending of the Gladstone umbrella. Two of Manning's letters to Dilke may be quoted (May 17, 1885):

"The General Election is not far off, and I am very anxious to talk with you upon the point which will determine the Catholic vote. I seem to see a safe and open way. But no time must be lost. The Liberalism of England is not yet the aggressive Liberalism of the Continent; but it may become so, and then the breach with us and with Ireland will be irreparable. I am most anxious for all motives that you should avert this. Hitherto you have been safe, and you can keep so."

May 26, 1885: "Mercury has been and told me all about you, and I am more than ever of the mind I had from the beginning. No third party is possible at this moment. Two parties and two parachutes will only make us weak and useless as the French Chamber. The just demands of Ireland are a destiny to which Whig and Tory must give way. But if you and the like of you leave the Whigs they will fall back and unite in resisting you. So long as you are in contact with them they will yield to reason. These are the thoughts of an Old Testament Radical. Walk your own pace, and do not quicken to keep step with anybody."

Election being in prospect, Dilke wrote to Manning (June 24, 1885): "Can you give Chamberlain and myself letters and advice for an Irish tour in August?" Manning, a little nervous as to their effect on Irish audiences, as well as of a possible encounter with the

Ireland Again

Tory Viceroy, who was also travelling under his auspices, answered (June 25, 1885):

“What am I to do? I am afraid of your Midlothian in Ireland. How can I be godfather to Hengist and Horsa? If you were in office, I should still be afraid of leaving the Cross-benches. You know how the relations in which I stand limit my freedom, and how glad I should be to do anything you wish.”

Dilke answered (June 28, 1885):

“I fear I have made myself far from clear. You speak of a Midlothian. I should not have dreamt of asking you for letters had that not been most carefully guarded against. We are not going to make a single speech, or to attend any dinner, meeting, or reception in any part of Ireland. Our journey is private, and our wish is to visit the Catholic Archbishops and Bishops and to find what they want. It has sprung from your own suggestion and from my conversation, held also at your suggestion, with Dr. Walsh. It would not conduce to any possibility of settlement and of future peace if, after proposing at your suggestion to go to men like the Archbishops Croke and Walsh, we should have to state that we renounce our visit as they refuse to receive us. You know what passed as to Dr. Walsh, and you know that if Mr. Gladstone had reformed his Government we had made that matter one of two conditions. Surely that was pretty clear evidence of our desire to act with you in a matter which is certainly above all party. But it is ‘now or never.’ Ever sincerely yours personally, whatever may be the case politically.”

“Hengist and Horsa” were disappointed, as they had expected to find in the Cardinal some measure of partisanship in return for their confidences. Chamberlain was furious, and Manning made his neutrality clear in letters written to Dilke later (October 15, 1885):

“Mr. Chamberlain is right in his conclusion, but not in his premisses. I think with him that we are both too

Henry Edward Manning

independent in our responsibility and too far asunder in our future action to make our meeting useful. So much for the conclusion. Now for the premisses. Mr. Chamberlain was good enough to send me his scheme for local government in Ireland, in which in the main I agreed, and did all in my power to promote its acceptance. The Government went out. And you asked of me to promote what I called a Midlothian in Ireland under the eyes of the new Lord-Lieutenant. Did Mr. Chamberlain understand my agreement in his scheme as carrying any consequences beyond that scheme, or any solidarity in such an aggressive action against any party whatsoever in power? When he speaks of 'concordats' or 'bargains,' I must say that I know of none, and can enter into none. In the matter in which he was courteous enough to make known his scheme to me I have promoted it where and in ways he does not know. But our relation was on the point of a tangent, and it would not be well for us to misunderstand each other again. I will not enter now on what *you* say, but I shall be glad to talk with you about it; for you know that I say, 'A plague on both your houses,' but I will help either in what is fair and just."

October 17, 1885: "It is true you did disclaim a Midlothian, but I told you that I know my Irishmen too well, and believed that even Paul and Barnabas would have been carried away. Moreover, if you had been silent as fishes the moral effect would have been a counter-move. Your humility does not admit this. So you must absolve me for my one word. We are in a dense mist; I hope you see the sun."

Many solutions, indeed, to the Irish difficulty have been generated by English statesmen. Violent mostly have been their ends. Mr. Chamberlain's scheme had the fortune, perhaps, to be still-born. It was shown to the priests, but not to the light. Autographed in the neatest of clerkly hands it reposes embalmed among the writings of Popes and Cardinals. Meanwhile Lord Carnarvon made a piquant change to a Whig Coercionist like Spencer. At an interview (June 24, 1885) Manning

Ireland Again

told him that the Irish Bishops he had seen were in favour of the Union with England and of local self-government in the different provinces, but *not* of a central Parliament. This they feared because it was likely to weaken the influence of the Church by the introduction of an anti-Christian spirit in the elected body and of Protestants in the Peers. He described the past relations between the two countries as of "control or contempt," and urged Lord Carnarvon to see and talk with the four Irish Archbishops. This had never been done before. Its effect would be good.

An exchange of letters followed. Manning wrote (June 29, 1885):

"Confidential. I would ask you to destroy the enclosed after reading it. If the facts of this letter were to become known it would hinder any further confidence. The letter leads me to believe that hereafter, when the Archbishop of Dublin shall be returned from Rome, it might be safe to let me ask the Archbishop of Cashel: 'If I were to ask the Lord-Lieutenant to give you a hearing for the purpose of representing what Ireland wants, would you and your colleagues be willing to meet him anywhere? And if so, where?' I hope you are well in your arduous and anxious charge."

Lord Carnarvon answered (July 4, 1885):

"I will most gladly take advantage of the offer which you are good enough to make me, and shall consider it an advantage to be brought into personal communication with those who are so competent to speak from authority and from knowledge. I ought to add—though doubtless you will hear it from other quarters—that I am to have the pleasure of seeing the new Archbishop of Dublin on Wednesday next, the day after my return to Ireland. It is an informal visit which His Grace will pay me at the Lodge, but one which I hope will tend to bring about those friendly relations which I believe are essential to any right understanding of the large questions at issue."

Henry Edward Manning

Manning sounded the Archbishops, and Croke wrote (June 30, 1885): "I shall be most happy to say and do anything in my power to secure fair play for Lord Carnarvon." Not for many years had the atmosphere been calmer in Ireland than after the new Viceroy's arrival. It was known that he disliked coercion, that he had accepted a period of anxiety without hope of any reward save that of the disinterested. A desire was growing among the ecclesiasts to see the Tories grapple with the Irish problem. The people hailed the advent of another Fitzwilliam. So favourable were the signs that Carnarvon carried out the tour he had laid down for himself in the South and West. Before starting he wrote to Manning (July 26, 1885):

"I contemplate a short expedition by sea round the South and West Coasts of Ireland to enable me to see with my own eyes many things which are now only matter of hearsay. It would greatly add to the use of such an expedition if I could also hear with my own ears what otherwise will never be said to me by many whose opinions would be very valuable. It has occurred to me that through your influence I might see and talk to some of the Bishops or clergy at certain points along the coast with whom, in your opinion, communication might be useful. You were good enough when last we met to say that I might freely communicate with you, and ask your assistance, and so I do not scruple to take advantage of the offer. As far as I can see my way, the points of call will be Waterford, Cork, Limerick, Galway, Killaloe. As yet I have met only with friendliness and a kindly disposition. I earnestly trust they may last; for I feel that they are the first and necessary condition to a better state of things."

The Cardinal replied (July 30, 1885):

"I am writing to the Bishops named in your letter and to Archbishop Croke, asking as from myself that they will not fail to take opportunity of your visit to pay their respects. I have great hopes of succeeding.

Ireland Again

I am most thankful to read what you write of the feeling of kindness and confidence which is springing up. It is like waking out of a nightmare. The discussion on Tuesday and Lord Hartington's speech have not restored any better feeling between the Irish members and the Opposition. I hope you are well and bearing work and anxiety, which is heavier than work, without suffering."

Manning forwarded the letters of Bishops who were delighted with Lord Carnarvon's high motives (August 21, 1885):

"I have refrained from sending the enclosed letters, hearing with much regret of your illness; but now I am glad to see that you are on your progress. The letters are so frank and warm that I take them as evidence of a goodwill which I have never seen before. And the Bishop of Limerick is one of the strongest heads among them."

The Viceroy replied (August 24, 1885):

"I have seen and heard much that no verbal or written communications would have made clear to me; and foremost among the advantages which I have obtained from my little journey are the frank and full conversations which I have had at Galway with Bishop Carr, and at Sligo with Bishop Gillooly. They both impressed me much, and I hope it may be in my power to advance some of the excellent objects which they have at heart. It is impossible for me to exaggerate the admiration that I feel for some of the good work which is being done in the industrial schools in connection with the convents which I visited. It seems to me the very saving and regeneration of the lowest and poorest part of the Irish people."

In the midst of a chapter of conflict and coercion it is pleasant to dwell on the Carnarvon Viceroyalty. Though short in time, it bore appreciable results. He faced the situation, and did not shudder to meet the spiritual and temporal leaders of the race he was called

Henry Edward Manning

to govern. When he resigned rather than adopt coercion, he showed the Irish people the rare and incredible spectacle of a just Englishman.

Manning needed to be wise and vigilant, to keep equally in touch with Catholic Ireland and with the Government of the hour; for he was acting as a special correspondent with the august Chief of Christendom. His letters were written in crisp Italian, and passed to the Vatican without the intermediary of Propaganda. Passages relating to events recorded in this chapter are as follows :

February 17, 1885 : " The Government of Mr. Gladstone has realised what I foresaw and communicated to your Holiness. The Home and Irish policy is sound and wise, the Imperial and diplomatic policy is very uncertain and dangerous.

" An Irish gentleman, whose anti-English views are very pronounced, has declared to me ' that the idea of the separation from England or of dissolving the unity of the Empire does not exist at all amongst those prelates.' If this be admitted in principle, there is only one demand which must be refused, and that is, a Parliament in Dublin. The freest and widest internal and domestic administration can and ought to be granted to Ireland. The liberty which the English and Scotch enjoy must be granted to the Irish as well. The unity of the Empire requires the unity of legislation. The dualism of Austria-Hungary cannot be compared to it or be said to resemble it; moreover, it appears to me to be nothing short of a prelude to separation. Mr. Davitt, who is now in Rome and of whom your Holiness has certainly heard lately, has in one of his books given as his opinion that the concession made to Ireland of a Parliament in Dublin would tend to increase the abuse of power of the Protestants in the midst of the public life of the most Catholic people in Europe. And he goes on to say that, considering such a concession from the point of view of the head of the Catholic Church, the transference of forty or fifty Catholic members from the highest Protestant legislative assembly of the world

Ireland Again

to a Parliament in Dublin cannot be a victory for the cause of the Catholic Church! He says that the presence and vigilance of Catholic M.P.'s are necessary for the defence of the Faith and of the Pontiff. After many such considerations he ends by saying that the Parliament of the British Empire, which counts many Catholic subjects, would remain almost without a single Catholic member; moreover, the extension of the suffrage will admit, without doubt, many followers of Mr. Bradlaugh, an atheist and blasphemer. Mr. Davitt is in favour of the separation, but in the above-mentioned passages he expresses distinctly the conviction, which is, I hope, shared by the Irish Bishops and by ourselves, that the separation of Ireland and the concession of a Parliament, which would inevitably cause dissensions as preludes to separation, might be the cause of infinite evil to the Irish Catholics and to the Catholic Church in the Empire. I say I hope, because though I feel certain as regards the separation of the Kingdom, I fear there may be disagreements as to this question of the Parliament. As for myself, Holy Father, allow me to say that I consider a Parliament in Dublin and a separation to be equivalent to the same thing. Ireland is not a colony like Canada, but it is an integral and vital part of one country, or, as it is often described, of the Mother Country."

Account of an Interview with Archbishops Croke and MacEvilly (April 12, 1885).—"Mgr. Croke asserted in the most explicit terms his own conviction that the Union should be left untouched, and that the whole Irish Episcopate is unanimously of that same opinion. In my last letter I have quoted what Mr. Davitt, an advanced Nationalist, says. Mgr. Croke completely accepted this view, adding to it another most powerful argument—that this Parliament would have two Chambers, and that the large majority of the Irish House of Lords would be composed of those most opposed to the progress of the Catholic Church in Ireland. There would be open conflict between these two houses, causing an inevitable struggle between the Irish and Imperial Parliaments, which would mean an extremely dangerous situation. I have been delighted to see Mgr.

Henry Edward Manning

Croke's complete agreement with my humble opinion, which I lately expressed to your Holiness. The idea of a Parliament does not at all mean excluding altogether the administration or self-government which is known as 'Home Rule,' and I feel sure that the Imperial Parliament will soon grant to Ireland the same liberty and power which is possessed by England and Scotland. I believe that under the fatherly direction and authority of your Holiness, the Irish Episcopate will attain a certain Unity in words and in action. Having once secured the Unity of the Episcopate, the Irish people will have a sound and sure direction in the days of social and political agitation."

Division of Ministers on Coercion (May 24, 1885).—"Gladstone's Government is going through a crisis. Four Ministers are opposing certain measures regarding Ireland. The said four want a Home administration for Ireland in connection with all the local municipal and public interests, excluding, in fact, all Imperial interests, so that, in reality, they want what the Irish Bishops want. I heartily adhere as a Catholic and as an Englishman to all these wishes of theirs. The present state of Ireland is unjust and intolerable. . . . The gravest danger is that England has almost lost the power of assimilating Ireland, and that America exercises always a powerful attraction over the Irish. The English are quite ready to grant to Ireland all the privileges England already enjoys. The obstacles lie in the fact that for fifty years any provision which aims at the welfare of millions has been delayed and ruined through class or individual interests, but this state of things is coming to an end."

Lord Carnarvon (June 24, 1885).—"I have asked the Viceroy to learn the state of Ireland, not only from the official authorities of Dublin Castle, but personally from the Bishops. Your Holiness may have heard that a coercive law introduced by Gladstone's Government at the time of the Dublin outrages and murders will expire in September. This new Government will not propose to Parliament the renewal of such a law.

"This decision of the Marquess of Salisbury will be received with greater pleasure by Ireland compared with

Ireland Again

England, because Ireland in comparison is singularly exempt from ordinary crime. The outrages are the results of agrarian injustice provoked, three years ago, by agitators and rebels, who to-day are quieter and wiser. If the Bishops will unite with certain political men, and exert their authority, there is much hope of peace."

January 4, 1886.—"Mr. Gladstone has allowed one of his sons to publish in the Press extreme opinions in connection with this Irish policy. This act of imprudence has provoked a very strong opposition on the part of Mr. Gladstone's principal colleagues, and has no doubt reawakened in England a determination to do justice to Ireland, but only as far as is consistent with the unity and preservation of the Empire.

"A few days ago I received a letter from Mr. Gladstone in which he says: 'The Irish question predominates, which may cause my political life to be prolonged, while shortening my natural life.' This enables me to foresee the course he will pursue. He will propose a wider and more advanced policy for Ireland than that contained in the present Government proposals, hoping thereby to win to himself the Irish members. I do not think he will succeed—at least, not for the present. In the meantime, as soon as the Bill is drafted, I will humbly lay the result before your Holiness."

And two days before the Tory Government fell (January 24, 1886):

"The imprudent language of some English politicians—among them one of Mr. Gladstone's sons—has created a very strong and almost universal opposition in English public opinion to the demands of the political leaders of the Irish chorus for an Irish Parliament in Dublin. They openly declare themselves in favour of the unity of the two countries, but they affirm also that a Dublin Parliament is compatible with the integrity and union of the two countries—a thing which I cannot believe possible. . . . The first rupture would not break up the dualism of Austro-Hungary, but an Anglo-Irish dualism between nations so divided and so mutually antagonistic cannot last; with the perpetual occurrence

Henry Edward Manning

of conspiracies from the American-Irish, a civil war of the nature of that of the United States would certainly follow. I repeat that the widest form of self-government, with the power of creating laws for this purpose, must be granted—but a Parliament, no! Parliament is an institution which is independent and absolute. Any attempt to bind a Parliament in Dublin would always be a cause of strife. Last year the Irish Bishops perceived these dangers, but the Irish M.P.'s still hanker after a Parliament. The Bishops are in a different position, but they have always tried to carry out with great wisdom and loyalty the wishes of your Holiness. I must mention with especial praise the conduct of Mgr. Croke. Stray words come from the lips of others, which my countrymen are apt to exaggerate. The conditions of Ireland are not really worse than they were, but the nearer the legislative crisis approaches, the more acute appears to be agitation. Pardon me if I repeat that if the four Archbishops act in unison, under the supreme direction of your Holiness, that same direction will successfully guide the rudder."

The letter of Gladstone alluded to by Manning ran: "You see that Ireland again overshadows everything. It has added to my political and possibly may shorten my natural life."

Sir John Lambert sent word to Manning (September 16, 1885): "The secret alluded to—and please keep it—is that G. has already written a manifesto which will be issued almost immediately." Two days later the manifesto appeared, hinting of "enlarged powers" for Ireland.

In October Salisbury apologised for boycotting as a form of excommunication. In November Parnell gave the Irish vote in England to Salisbury. A second Midlothian campaign only gave Gladstone a majority of eighty-five. But Parnell returned with exactly eighty-five followers. Mr. Gladstone retired to Hawarden for meditation, whither Manning wrote (January 6, 1886): "Your words about Ireland make me say that I hope

Ireland Again

no deliberation will be spared to find an extension of the English Constitution to Ireland. No paper schemes, no new Constitutions, no Colonial chambers or Hungarian Parliaments will live a twelvemonth." Gladstone answered: "The Irish question grows bigger and bigger. I have expected it would do so. It cannot be too much weighed and sifted by all."

Manning had dissuaded the Radical malcontents from bursting the frayed cords attaching them to the Gladstonian balloon, and the launching of a "parachute," as he described it, had been delayed for a year. When the time came it contained Chamberlain, but not Dilke, who, alas! had dropped to earth, and the higher firmament of politics knew him no more. Manning sat neutral but fascinated in the Distinguished Strangers' Gallery. He was understood to express a general agreement with Gladstone, but with the first Home Rule Bill he was at variance on vital points.

Manning would not allow Sir Howard Vincent to publish his words, "Bad Home Rule at a cost of a breach in the Empire," lest it should be believed that he was not in favour of good Home Rule. He wrote (May 13, 1886):

"No; my words yesterday, unless they were fully explained, would be fairly misunderstood. I am a firm and large-handed advocate for giving to Ireland a power of self-administration in all matters affecting Ireland alone. And I would give this to Ireland more largely than to Scotland for two reasons: first because England and Ireland are heterogeneous but England and Scotland are homogeneous, and secondly because we have wronged Ireland for three hundred years. We have neither developed its growth or suffered it to develop itself. We owe justice, retribution, and separation, and in this I go as far as these three words can reach. But they all stop short before the integrity of the Imperial Parliament. My criticism on this Bill would sound as if I were not in the largest possible

Henry Edward Manning

sympathy with Ireland. But I must wait my opportunity, not make it. Therefore, keep my words to yourself as a filial godson."

To Vaughan he wrote (June 11, 1886):

"The Dissolution is on one issue. We cannot evade it. We cannot put Education before it. The Irish vote in England would be lost by doing so. We should seem to oppose Ireland. We should hopelessly divide our own people. The Education Question would not be listened to apart from Ireland. We can speak on both, but not on Education alone. I have hitherto been silent, except that vague letter to N. Wales. But now I cannot be silent. I will not make an occasion, but I must take it when made by others. And my words will be, 'The integrity of the Imperial Parliament and a legislative power in Ireland for all home matters not Imperial.' Also, I should desire the same for Scotland and Wales. I feel I cannot longer be silent, but how, when, and where I may say it, I cannot yet decide. Education cannot be helped at this election, nor do I think that it will be hindered. This will need much thought and counsel, but it is inevitable."

When there had been possibilities of agreement—the *pax hominibus bonæ voluntatis*—Manning had willingly lent his name and influence. But when they only sought to destroy one another he stood aloof. Mr. Chamberlain, who, in Parnell's opinion, had killed the Bill, wrote full of ardour (June 22, 1886):

"You have probably seen that in his speech at Edinburgh on June 18 Mr. Gladstone referred to what is known as the plan for a central council in Ireland as Mr. Parnell's plan. In his speech last night Mr. Gladstone recurs to the subject, and says that he has been informed that it was not Mr. Parnell's plan. I venture to appeal to you as able to throw some light on this subject. You will recollect the circumstances of my interview with you in May, 1885. The first idea of a National Council had been broached by me in a letter to a private friend which had been shown to some of

Ireland Again

the Catholic Bishops in Ireland and mentioned to you by them. At a later date Captain O'Shea brought me a complete scheme based on this idea which he told me had been approved by Mr. Parnell. At your request I sent you a paper with an abstract of this scheme, which was prefaced by a statement of my own opinion that, although a separate Parliament could not be wisely conceded to Ireland, there might properly be a wide extension of powers of local government in that country. You kindly undertook to see Mr. Parnell, and to learn from him whether he really accepted this proposal, and on May 4 you wrote me the letter, copy of which I enclose. It is not marked 'Private,' but I should be glad of your authority before making public use of it. If there is any expression or end in it that you think it inexpedient to have published, perhaps you could be good enough to write me another note for the purpose of quotation. What I desire to establish is the fact that in May, 1885, Mr. Parnell approved generally of the plan of National Councils, which he has now repudiated in the view of the larger offers made to him by Mr. Gladstone."

The Cardinal found himself in a position of some delicacy. He was called upon to betray the confidence Mr. Parnell had reposed in him. He answered diplomatically (June 23, 1886):

"Six of the Irish Bishops came to me on their way to Rome. I did not produce the copy of your scheme, but I stated the objections of Michael Davitt to a Parliament. They seemed to accept any real power of self-government which should be effectual and not evasive. This seemed to me to be equivalent to your scheme. After this I saw Mr. Parnell. He was less satisfied: and I understood him to accept the scheme, but not as sufficient or final. His acceptance was very guarded, and I did not take it as more than not opposing it. More than this I could not say; and our interview was under conditions of such reserve that I should not feel justified in making it public. I think that I am justified in saying this to you because it will show that the words I wrote to you were not written without

Henry Edward Manning

sufficient grounds. To the best of my memory, Mr. Parnell desired that his interview at this house should not be known—at least, publicly. I believe I made it known to you and to Sir Charles Dilke. You were both in the Cabinet, and I regarded it as a privileged communication.”

After the elections Manning wrote to Lord Cross (December 9, 1886):

“I am watching with great interest the break-up of the Liberal party. If it had held together it would have become an aggressive Liberalism—Chamberlain an English Gambetta. Gladstone has saved 190 sheep from following Chamberlain; and he will make them Home Rulers, but not *Gambettisti*. I wish you a long life and a strong local government for the three Kingdoms, on common principles, with local adaptations.”

When Gladstone was defeated and his whole political career seemed to end in desertions and disaster, Manning's heart went out to him, as it did to all in distress. They exchanged letters as of yore, Gladstone writing hopefully (September 18, 1887):

“I look upon the end as certain, and on the question of my share in it as a matter wholly secondary.” Manning replied: “In December, 1850, I wrote the enclosed. I had given up all for my faith. You have now given up, I may say, all for justice to Ireland. And you are nearly as isolated now as I was then. You are in the centre I described in my letter. I claim no gift of prophecy for foretelling that two converging lines must intersect even beyond the horizon. You are not at the centre of the Protestantism of England, but of the Empire. The former is provisional and narrow, the latter includes all your political past, and must govern and control all legislation for Ireland.”

Gladstone never enjoyed an allusion to 1850, and answered (September 23, 1887):

“Probably you saw more of my future at that time than I myself saw. You foreshadowed two lines of

Ireland Again

political action, and recommended one of them to me. But have you not yourself, together with the great majority of your Communion (apart from the Irish blood), either professedly or practically followed the other?"

Manning replied (September 25, 1887):

"I was glad to see that Lord Salisbury said in a speech that he did not know to what party I belonged. For fifty years, with a short interval, I have had a vote, and I have only voted once, and then not to bring anyone in, but to keep a mischievous man out. Among my upper-ten-thousand friends I stand alone. They think me past praying for, because I would not denounce Parnell and I would defend Archbishop Walsh. I believe I can say that, laying aside our old grudge of the Temporal Power, I am in politics what you have ever known me, and I have watched your policy, not foreign, but domestic, with large assent. There has been one point on which I have been anxious—I mean Education. I used to tell Forster that the Birmingham League had made use of him. And down to two years ago, while Chamberlain was acting with you and, as I believed, gaining influence under your name, I foresaw that Liberalism was becoming aggressive as the Republic in France has become red. I have therefore seen with satisfaction his separation from you. I am not much afraid of him alone, but plus you he would be able to do mischief in education, which to me is *articulus stantis vel cadentis Angliæ*."

CHAPTER XXI: PERSICO AND PARNELL

"I hope most earnestly that the paternal mind of your Holiness will not admit the fears which some perhaps may permit themselves to suggest. I know the Irish Bishops personally. They are true Christians, true Catholics, true pastors. United to your Holiness and united among themselves, they are the salvation of Catholic Ireland and of the union of our two peoples. Forgive, Holy Father, the liberty of an old man, who speaks of the things which he has seen and which he sees."—*Manning to Leo XIII.*, 1887.

THE correspondence between the two Archbishops was long. Every month, every week, sometimes daily in times of crisis, they exchanged confidences. They discussed every subject within the far-stretching circle of "faith and morals," from "the English Martyrs" to "Kerry moonlighters." It is interesting to follow the moderate but consistent Nationalism of Dr. Walsh, at a time when he was considered little less than a mitred Fenian, and the wise counsel of Manning in days when *The Times* labelled him a Separatist.

When the Pope added certain prayers in the vernacular to Mass, Manning translated one phrase, "Michael, defend us in the hour of battle," but Walsh substituted the words "hour of conflict," explaining it was "safer in militant districts like Belfast!" He also suggested "restraint" rather than "rebuke" to express the Divine anger against Satan. Manning, who was a great judge of words, replied (November 5, 1886): "What we ask is not a transient check, but a continuous restraint. But the word *imperet* does not convey the meaning of *epitimesai*, which is distinctly rebuke, and thereby quell or repulse. I always feel that we have not so much to construe as to translate. Sometimes a translation is nearest to the sense when it is farthest from the words. The Belfast correction is very wise."

Manning dreamed of unity between the Hierarchies of England and Ireland. Both he and Walsh were

Persico and Parnell

statesmen in ecclesiastical harness, and each found that a Bench of Bishops is sometimes as difficult to keep in serried rank as a Cabinet. The sore between English and Irish Catholics was soon located by Walsh, who wrote (December 27, 1885):

“In the first place we have the proposal distinctly made to subordinate the interests of the Irish movement, in support of which the Irish M.P.’s have been returned, to the interests of the English Catholic body in the question of Education. Then we have the most scurrilous attacks made on those same Irish members and on the Irish Bishops for seeking their aid in Parliament on the Irish Education Question, and no public protest is made against these attacks by the English Catholics or their representatives. It is, in fact, generally felt over here that, with the exception of your Eminence and a very few others, our brethren across the water rather sympathise with those attacks than disapprove of them. I write by this post also to the Bishop of Salford.”

Manning was glad to receive Irish news through a more reliable medium than the *Tablet*. He was afraid lest the Irish Bishops should be outstripped in the leadership of the Irish people. He felt it was essential they should preserve their unity as of a “Testudo.” Manning and Vaughan were their own antitheses in many respects, but they stayed the closest of friends till death. On one matter only did a rift occur in the lute. Vaughan disapproved of the Cardinal’s enthusiasm for General Booth. Vaughan thought Manning was condoning heresy *ab intra*. Manning thought he was stimulating Catholicism *ab extra*. Political divergence never undermined their alliance. Only theological shades of opinion could rouse Manning’s mistrust. Of political differences he thought but lightly in the face of the eternities. He took religion, like Englishmen when they become religious, as seriously as Irishmen generally take politics. In Ireland, where theological opinion is stationary, neither medievalism nor

Henry Edward Manning

modernism prevails. Ultramontanism never became prominent because Gallicanism never took root, and appreciation of the differences of debate is concentrated upon politics. Even so, Walsh strove to be fair (February 20, 1886):

“I have always studiously avoided any unfriendly reference to the *Tablet*. I am rather noted over here for fighting its battles. But I really cannot see how I can any longer hold aloof from making common cause in the matter with the Archbishop of Cashel and others of whom it has from time to time written in so unfriendly a spirit.”

Manning wrote (March 29, 1886): “We have Nemesis and Erinyes hanging over us. I am weary of remonstrating, but I will do so again by this post. The Bishop of Salford is not absent.”

The Tories were out, and search was being made for a new Liberal Viceroy. Dr. Walsh wrote (January 29, 1886):

“As I have seen Lord Ripon’s name mentioned in connection with the Irish Viceroyalty, it occurs to me that I ought to write to your Eminence to say to you that in my opinion such an appointment just now would be simply *disastrous*. The great difficulty here is twofold. There is the religious difficulty and that of ‘property.’ As to what is called ‘Home Rule,’ I believe there would be a practically unanimous concurrence of opinion in Ireland in favour of it if the landowners and the Protestants of the country could feel assured that there was no fear of a general confiscation of property on the one hand, and of the establishment of an intolerant Catholic ‘ascendancy’ on the other. Everything that goes to foster either apprehension tends to emphasise and perpetuate the present lines of division in Ireland. The appointment of a Catholic Lord-Lieutenant would plainly have this effect. I paid a farewell visit to Lord Carnarvon on Tuesday. He left Ireland yesterday, and was received with marked respect by the people as he drove through the streets. ‘Poor

Persico and Parnell

gentleman, he did his best at any rate !' was the exclamation of one of the populace, overheard by one of our priests. This represents the unanimous feeling of the citizens. If Mr. Gladstone could induce him to come back to us, all would be well."

However, the choice of the Presbyterian Lord Aberdeen, it was hoped, would soothe the susceptibilities of the North. Walsh reported (February 23, 1886):

"I have not as yet seen our new Lord-Lieutenant. I called at the Viceregal Lodge yesterday, but found he is at the Castle. He sent his private secretary here yesterday. It is generally felt, I believe, by English Catholics that the granting of Home Rule, to whatever extent it may be granted, means to that same extent a weakening of the forces now available for the protection in Parliament of Catholic interests in England. But there is another side to the question. Supposing the Irish difficulty done away with, would not the Parliamentary force of English Catholicity become far more available than it now is, even when aided by the somewhat irregular help given by the Irish M.P.'s in the House of Commons?"

In his answer Manning wrote (February 25, 1886):

"In the time of my predecessor there was a great breach between English and Irish Catholics. For twenty years I have laboured to heal it. It is unhappily again open. But the English Catholics are few. The mass of our people are Irish and united with Ireland. Michael Davitt first suggested to me the risk of losing forty or fifty Catholic members from the Imperial Parliament. It is obvious. It is a Catholic and a world-wide danger. I hope justice will reign in Ireland without this danger."

Walsh later suggested "The claim of the English Catholics to a set of *guarantees* such as are now to be provided for the Irish Protestants."

It was with a view to making Irish and English

Henry Edward Manning

Catholics understand each other better that Manning encouraged Wilfrid Blunt's chivalrous descent into Ireland, from whose diary we quote (February 23, 1886) :

“Lunched with Cardinal Manning, and we discussed Randolph's Belfast speech, which is violent enough, but not quite so violent as I expected. We agreed he was quite hopeless. The Cardinal's view about Ireland is like mine, but he makes some exception to a Parliament at Dublin as not suited to the Irish. He wants them, however, to govern themselves.”

The following month Mr. Blunt arrived in Dublin with the Cardinal's certificate that he was “in earnest and complete sympathy with Ireland.”

Walsh was writing to Manning at this time (March 26, 1886) :

“Mr. Wilfrid Blunt called here on Wednesday morning, and I was fortunately able to see him without delay. He will go through the country to see things for himself. I have written to the Bishop of Raphoe to look after him when he goes to Donegal. We are all very anxious over here about the success of Mr. Gladstone's scheme. As to his project of buying out the landlords, it is no doubt very chivalrous of him to embarrass himself for the sake of a class of people who are so bitterly hostile to him and to his projects. They seem quite blind just now. I have no doubt that if some reasonable settlement be not made this time, the people will take the Land Question into their own hands and solve it by a general refusal to pay rent. It will be a sad result, coming on us at a time when everything seemed so hopeful for a thoroughly constitutional settlement of all our difficulties.”

They soon agreed over the Home Rule Question. Manning wrote (April 15, 1886) :

“Your comment on Mr. Gladstone's Bill is altogether my conviction. As I came out after hearing his speech, I found myself in the midst of your members, and I said, ‘You must all stay here.’ I have many reasons for this

Persico and Parnell

opinion, and I shall hold it all the more confidently knowing that you and, I take for granted, your colleagues are of the same mind."

July 14, 1886: "I do not interpret this election as a refusal to Ireland, but as a rejection of the mutilation of the Imperial Parliament by the removal of the representatives of Ireland."

We find Dr. Walsh writing (January 25, 1887):

"You said it was wise of us to avoid the use of the word 'Parliament' and to speak of a legislative body or legislature, in formulating our demands—this on account of the jealousy with which Englishmen naturally regard the establishment of anything that could be regarded as a possible rival to the great Parliament of the Empire. I am, indeed, as I have more than once said to your Eminence, personally in favour of a settlement based on 'federalist' lines. And in such a settlement the 'Parliament' would stand as it is, each nation (or each island) having its own legislative body for its own affairs. Now, why should not the difficulty about the 'executive' be got over in the same way? Possibly great difficulty is caused at present by the idea that our Irish executive would stand on a sort of level with the Imperial executive. Why not clear away this by leaving the affairs of the Army, the Navy, the Colonies, to be dealt with as at present, constructing a system of local executives for England and Scotland as well as for Ireland? Your Eminence may think this worth suggesting in some friendly quarter."

To this Manning replied (February 3, 1887):

"Gladstone's Bill of last year has thrown us somewhat back by its vagueness, which has alarmed many. But it seems to me that Ireland will obtain its own administration, legislation, and executive of its own laws and interests. The words 'Parliament' and 'Executive' to opponents suggest sovereignty, and then all is dark with a cloud of words."

Meantime Archbishop Croke attacked, and the Government were swayed upon the undignified dilemma

Henry Edward Manning

of imprisoning the Archbishop or summoning the Pope to their aid. They fell back upon the latter, and the world of Rome raged with intrigue. Manning felt compromised by Croke, and reproved him gently. The "turbulent" one replied (February 22, 1887):

"I am sincerely sorry that your Eminence has been worried by anything said or done by me. But surely anyone reflecting on the distressing scenes that are being enacted at this moment in various parts of Ireland must be formed of strange clay indeed if he can measure his words while writing about them, or believe that there is a Government here entitled to the respect or obedience of Irishmen. As for me, I wish I were out of the country altogether, or that I had never returned to it from the Colonies."

Manning only just managed to avert steps on the part of the Legislature. He wrote to Lord Cross (March 7, 1887):

"Of the discretion in Archbishop Croke's letter there can be no two opinions. But as to the course to be taken by Government, there can be in my mind only one decision. The furnace of Ireland is hot enough. One element only is wanting to make it inextinguishable. Throw in the religious element and it is done. I hope that the Government will do anything and everything except proceed by law against the Archbishop."

Lord Cross answered (March 7, 1887):

"*Confidential.* I am much obliged to you for your letter. But where are we to look for support to law and order if not to the chief rulers of the Catholic Church? And when may we hope to see some public repudiation in high quarters either at home or abroad of the doctrines contained in the letter to which you allude?"

Dr. Croke also sought the Cardinal's favour at Rome (March 5, 1887):

"I suppose, as the Government have 'reported me to the Vatican,' that I will be severely handled by the

Persico and Parnell

powers that be; and I ask your Eminence to use your kindly offices in this matter, as you have done on similar occasions in the past."

On April 3 Manning wrote to the Pope to disavow the report that the Archbishop of Cashel had wished for a strike against taxes in preference to constitutional means. Manning wrote to Dublin (June 4, 1887): "We shall save the Faith in Ireland and in England as the Apostles spread it in the world, without the world and against the world. Any contact with the world would leave a stain and paralyse our strength. The more the Bishops of Ireland vindicate the law of God against English and Irish wrong-doers, the stronger we shall be."

But the Vatican had renewed relations with the Government. A Papal delegation had been invited to attend the Queen's Jubilee that month, and at the earnest request of English Catholics like the Duke of Norfolk a further mission was arranged to investigate Irish matters.

The Duke of Norfolk held political views similar to those of Vaughan, and was as blunt in their profession as in his creed. But the notion that he was secretly outwitting his Archbishop at Rome may be dissipated in one sentence that he wrote to Manning in May: "The Pope sees that your views and mine about Ireland do not agree, and I am sorry to say that he trusts yours rather than mine."

As to the Cardinal's feelings towards the Papal envoy, we beg to quote from Mr. Blunt's Diary (July 18, 1887):

"Called on Cardinal Manning. He urges me to see Mgr. Persico, and seems quite satisfied with the objects and progress of his mission. I narrated to him my interview with the Pope last winter, and he told me he knew positively beyond question His Holiness's mind about Ireland. 'The Pope,' he said, 'considers that the union of the two countries should be maintained; that there should be one Imperial Parliament, in which the Irish members should sit; but that there should also be

Henry Edward Manning

an assembly in Ireland for their own local affairs.' With regard to the Persico Mission, it has been ludicrously represented that it was despatched in opposition to Manning's wishes and the wishes of the Irish clergy, whereas they really had the whole management of the affair. . . ."

Persico had translated one of Manning's books at the Propaganda soon after his conversion. He was a striking example of the adventurous career which is still vouchsafed in the service of the Church. Commencing as a missionary in India, he founded a paper and college at Bombay, and was imprisoned during the Mutiny by the Sepoys at Agra. He afterwards served the Holy See in South Carolina, in Portugal, and as Apostolic Delegate in Canada. His respect for British Dominion was only tempered by a stay in the United States during the Council of Baltimore. Large as his experience might be, he could not be expected to solve the Irish problem in the course of a holiday. Mr. Blunt sketched him :

" Monsignore Persico is a worthy old Capuchin, a diplomatist of the silent, sleepy school, with an enormous nose." According to Father Healy, he had "the eye of a courting hawk."

The arrival of this ingenuous ecclesiast was awaited with breathless interest. Walsh wrote that he could not disguise the uneasy feeling which prevailed. Fortunately, the walls of Dublin were just then placarded with his posters announcing the collection of Peter's Pence. Walsh's cheerful letter reached the Cardinal's breakfast table on June 27 in company with a copy of *The Times*, which made the serious allegation that between them they had caused the withdrawal of the Mission. Manning sent *The Times* a flat contradiction : "We are neither intriguers nor Separatists."

Before his indignation had cooled, he wrote to Walsh (June 27, 1887) :

Persico and Parnell

“When Mgr. Persico comes let him have the report of Lord Cowper’s Commission to take back to Rome. What you say about Michael Davitt I felt. But I can be surprised at nothing. If I had been at Bodyke I should have been far worse. You have the Irish people in your hands, and everything to my eyes is towards a just and peaceful settlement. The change in this country towards Ireland is very extensive, and I hope there is some change in Ireland towards us. The visit of the envoy here has no bearing upon Ireland. You will do me real kindness and service in keeping me well informed. I sent the testimony of the Judges to the Holy Father three weeks ago.”

Dr. Walsh wrote (June 30, 1887) :

“I cannot attempt to thank your Eminence for your noble letter. All Ireland will thank you for it. It has produced an extraordinary sensation here. Few knew how thoroughly your Eminence has been with us all through this trying time. Your Eminence will, of course, have observed that you have driven *The Times* to confess that what it means by ‘separation’ is Home Rule in the shape of a legislative body.”

Mgr. Persico was not revoked, for Dr. Walsh could report (July 8, 1887) :

“The Mission has arrived. The Holy Father is naturally troubled at the representations so freely made to him as to the state of things here. He has given us the best possible means of letting him know the truth. *Both our visitors are loud in their praise of your Eminence’s letter.* The ‘Separatist’ cry is one that evidently had told in Rome.”

Manning was anxious for Persico to see the next eviction or the ruins of the last. He also inquired whether moonlighters respected wives and daughters. Dr. Walsh assured him on that point, and added (July 12, 1887) :

“As for the Kerry moonlighters, instead of trying to defend them, I should try to collect all possible evidence

Henry Edward Manning

against them. They have no claim upon us for protection or for sympathy of any kind."

Manning wished to take up the defence of those Bishops who were said to have passed over outrages in their dioceses, but Walsh's answer was striking: "There is no defending the Bishops of those few districts where the outrages occur. But do they occur in Dublin, for instance, or in Cashel?"

Perhaps no greater testimony could be adduced to the Christian wisdom of the two most maligned of the Irish Episcopate than the fact that their dioceses were devoid of crime.

Meantime Persico had begun that bewildering series of interviews and experiences which left him favourable to the Irish cause. He stayed with Bishops and with landlords. Manning advised him to pay a visit to the Viceroy, as well as to invite the four Archbishops to consultation. He solemnly collected the affirmations and contradictions that make up all Irish reports. As he and Croke kissed one another at the railway-station at Cashel, the voice of the laity was heard to remark in the crowd that it would be hard "to say which was the greatest skamer!" He appears to have been in love with Ireland the whole time, but he successfully concealed it. A veil of mystery shrouded his intentions and even his locality. Manning wrote to Walsh (October 25, 1887):

"Reuter tells me that Mgr. Persico is in Rome. But that is a reason for believing he is still in Dublin. Still, I should like to know whether he is on the Tiber or the Liffey. Abbate Gualdi's conclusions about Ireland were essentially sound. He read what I have written to the Holy Father, and confirmed it from his own experience. This gives me reason to believe that his witness in Rome will be in the main useful."

Before the end of the year Persico was writing to Manning from the Capuchin Convent in Cork (December 21, 1887) to deny his alliance with the Government:

Persico and Parnell

“Your Eminence understands the Irish Question thoroughly; I wish others in Rome understood it as your Eminence does. As far as I am concerned, I shall not fail to make a proper *exposé* of things.”

Manning wrote (December 29, 1887):

“The English people tolerate the Catholic Church as a spiritual body. The first sign of a political action on the Government would rekindle all the old fears, suspicions, and hostility.”

Persico answered (January 6, 1888):

“It is a great pity that English Catholics do not understand all this! I am sure that His Holiness understands it well, but I share your fears that those about him may harass him with the fickle and vain glory that would accrue to the Holy See by having an accredited representative from England also. I may assure your Eminence, of course, in a most confidential way, that even in my humble position I do not fail to represent my views to the Holy See. Above all, I have informed the Secretary of State of the way in which such a thing would be felt in Ireland.”

January 21, 1888: “I am happy to let your Eminence know that my superiors have received favourably my poor suggestions, and seem to agree with the expediency of the relative proposals. For the present they cannot give much attention to the Irish affairs, but will decide on the mode of treating them the moment they are free from the present celebrations. I know that your Eminence will be pleased to hear this, so I have hastened to confide said news to your Eminence. At the same time I am most anxious that certain disciplinary points should be settled property for the good of religion and the dignity of the priesthood. Of course, I always mean that whatever is to be done must be done with and through the Bishops. It is absolutely necessary that the Bishops of Ireland should be thoroughly persuaded of the necessity of introducing those things, so that by their acceptance the observance may be secured. My love for Ireland and the sacred duty attached to my present mission makes me doubly anxious on this subject.”

Henry Edward Manning

February 9, 1888 : " When I wrote last I had received letters from Rome wherefrom I could gather that they had accepted my proposals and also my views. I have not heard anything since, and the return to Ireland of the Archbishop of Tuam and other Bishops that had gone to Rome makes me believe that no meeting of Bishops is to take place in Rome. This makes me very uneasy, as in my humble opinion, if anything was to be done, it could only be done in that way. It is only by discussing quietly and coming to certain decisions that some practical result may be obtained. I may assure your Eminence that on my part I have done my duty in exposing things and giving my humble opinion. If they deem proper to adopt other ways and to act otherwise I shall have no remorse whatever."

February 12, 1888 : " I am entirely of your Eminence's opinion that the people of Ireland have had no defenders but the priests, and I firmly believe that the clergy in Ireland must be the guides and the protectors of the people. It would be an evil day for Ireland to separate the clergy from the people. I have shown this important fact in my reports to Rome."

To Manning he confided his love of Ireland, and spoke of England as cold-blooded in her relations, and later he prayed : " Oh, how I wish that your Eminence could be entrusted with everything !"

With the New Year Archbishop Walsh proceeded to Rome, and the friends of Ireland breathed again. From Naples he wrote to the Cardinal (January 22, 1888) :

"The Pope now thinks he can settle the Irish Question. All this may mean something practical. But unless I can see my way very clearly into what the Holy Father means, it will, of course, be my duty to tell him of the serious risk that is run by mixing up the Holy See in so uncertain a transaction. If he is prepared, in communicating with the Ministry, to put forward as essential bases of a settlement the two unchangeable requirements of Home Rule and a thoroughly satisfactory reform of our Land System, all may be well. These points are essential. No influence in the world could move our

Persico and Parnell

people, either at home or abroad, to abandon either one or the other. If things are to enter upon a course in which the Holy See may be made to figure as claiming an influence to secure the abandonment of either, we must see that the Holy Father is sufficiently forewarned to have himself to bear the full responsibility of any disaster which may follow."

April 4, 1888 :

"The Holy Father undoubtedly has a strong conviction that he can get something very substantial done for us in Ireland. So he asked the Bishop of Cork and myself to go to him one day and to tell him fully how the whole case stands. It was marvellous to see how he entered into everything; one would think that outside the shores of Ireland there was nothing in the world that he took the smallest interest in. We were with him for nearly two hours, and his sole anxiety at the end seemed to be whether there was anything else we wished him to understand. At the end he charged us to draw up a *relatio* on the whole question of the land. Home Rule he understands fully, and needs no information about it. I went mainly on the question of *arrears*; a reference to the Scotch crofters' case evidently roused his indignation as to the way in which Ireland is treated. Fortunately, I was able to show him a number of the *Illustrated London News*, with a picture of the crofters fighting the military. 'Ah,' said he, '*una vera insurrezione.*' I said, 'Yes, Holy Father, and that answers your question why this Arrears Bill was passed for the Scotch crofters and why no such Bill was passed for us: *our people are too quiet*; but if things are allowed to go on much longer in this way, we shall have *una vera insurrezione* in Ireland too.' The Holy See, judging from the outward peaceableness of the country, could hardly realise that the seventeenth century had not passed away, that the people were still struggling for their religion and their land, and that the permanency of the one depended to no little extent on the possession of the latter. A conscientious regard for the letter of English law in the eighteenth century would have left their fathers without the Faith, as it seemed likely to leave them now without an acre."

Henry Edward Manning

Persico was being forgotten in Ireland, and, indeed, his reports had not reached the Holy See. But the Holy See waiteth at one time, and at another time waiteth not. Inscrutable are her judgments. On April 20, 1888, her Decree was given to the world. It was a bolt from the Italian blue, for it condemned the Plan of Campaign and the practice of boycotting. On the tradition that Limerick always acts for itself, the Bishop of Limerick alone published the Decree. The others found themselves in Dr. Croke's dilemma. He wrote to Manning (April 29, 1888):

"We are placed in a great fix here. What is to be done? Two courses are open to the people—either to ignore the document altogether or to grapple freely and fully with the reasons assigned as a basis for the Decree, and then to show, as may easily be done, that it rests on no solid foundation. The Archbishop of Dublin never heard of the document until after the Pope's approval of it."

Rumours ran mad. Lord Ripon wrote (April 30, 1888):

"I suppose there is no truth in the story in this morning's *Standard* that the Holy Father has ordered the Sacraments to be refused to the members of the National League as such?"

The stranger news that Walsh, who had gone out to Rome, and was actually engaged in writing a report at the Pope's request, had not been consulted before the publication of the Decree was confirmed by his next letter (May 3, 1888):

"If the Holy Father had waited for another week, when my information would have been in his hands, the Decree could not have been issued in its present form. But then I should have felt some responsibility in the matter. As things stand I am quite clear. Now that the Decree has been issued, I see great advantages in what

Persico and Parnell

has been done. The Holy Father, in clearing away from our cause those things that were put forward by our adversaries as reasons for leaving our case undealt with, has done us, I think, an enormous service. He meant all this, and if he is able now to carry out the rest of his programme his Jubilee year may yet bring us a very long way forward in the direction of a satisfactory settlement of all our difficulties. Feeling as I do upon the whole question, I should be sorry to see any move made for an interpretation or explaining away of the Decree. We should leave things as they are. Thus our case is an immensely strong one. If, however, nothing is done for us, and the people are left without help to face another winter, we must give them a free hand."

Manning replied (May 6, 1888) :

"Your letter reached me late last night, and gave me much relief. Our papers have been full of folly, and I could not tell what might be passing. It is strange—but nothing surprises me—that you were not consulted, and that no one verified the reasons alleged for the decision as to rents. Boycotting, I said five years ago, begins in horseplay, but may end in bloodshed. The Plan of Campaign is a true reflex of the whole Irish Question. 'Legal right and moral wrong'—*Summum jus, summa injuria*. I have written these words long ago—you know to whom. For the moment worldly influence has prevailed. My daily fear is that some word or act may exceed the limits of faith or morals. At first I wished that this decision had been sent in private to all you Bishops as private direction. But then I saw that you might have been embarrassed, and the brunt would have fallen on you. Now it comes over your heads from the highest source, and you are all sheltered, and have the pastoral and peaceful office of guiding and guarding your people in submission. But I hope the Plan of Campaign will be fully explained and understood as an abnormal but moral equity. Parliament has recognised this in the arrears of the crofters of Scotland. Try to convince Cardinal Monaco and Cardinal Mazzella. The former is very acute; the latter knows the English and Irish outer world well. If you can gain them, and Mgr. Jacobini of

Henry Edward Manning

Propaganda, they will guide the rest. One thing more. Do not let pain, or uprightness of heart, or any self-renouncement, lead you to offer to leave your post of duty, difficulty, or danger. God has chosen you to fill it, and to stand there till you die."

If the Irish Bishops did nothing, the Irish party, who were especially condemned, could not ignore the matter. Mr. Parnell spoke of "a document from a distant country" which he left to his Catholic lieutenants. They decided to repudiate the Decree, but in terms expressive of loyalty to the Holy See. Such contradictions in terms are always difficult to word, and resource was accordingly had to Cardinal Manning. Mr. Blunt brought their rough draft to Westminster on May 11. Meantime the full onus had fallen on Persico. He informed Manning that Irish hostility prevented him living with his brother Capuchins at Pontypool, and he had retired to the Carthusians at Parkminster. The unhappy Legate could only write (May 9, 1888):

"You are a Cardinal of the Holy Church, and one I deeply esteem and respect; hence I feel that I can speak as I would before the Holy Church and before God Himself. Now, it is known to your Eminence that I did not expect at all the said Decree, and that I was never more surprised in my life as when I received the circular."

Manning accordingly had news for Mr. Blunt when he arrived on behalf of the Irish party. He wrote a letter to be shown to them (May 11, 1888):

"*Confidential.* I hope Mr. O'Brien and the Catholic members will wait before they enunciate any irrevocable matter, and I may add my belief that Monsignor Persico has had no part in this late event. I do not say this lightly."

His advice to the party was not to contest the Pope's general right to interfere in politics. He then dictated to

Persico and Parnell

Mr. Blunt a less disputable expression than had been prepared by the Irish leaders, and added in his own writing :

“ While fully admitting that the breach of a legal contract is an illegal and therefore a censurable act, we affirm that the contracts in question were not freely made by reason of the helpless poverty of the tenants, and were essentially unjust by reason of their exorbitance, which has been already proved by the legal reductions in 100,000 cases. Nevertheless, the payment of such exorbitant rents and arrears is being enforced, and the Land Courts can afford no protection by reason of the inevitable delays in the process of appeal.”

All his experience of the East or of the West availed Persico not when he came to stir the Irish caldron. Those who wish well to Ireland must expect to be sacrificed. It is a general law and not the exception. To keep successfully afloat in those boiling waters required a grimmer calibre than Persico's. But the Church is merciful to the broken reed, and the smoking flax she will not quench. He was passed into the Coptic department at Rome, and consoled by the Supreme Order of Merit in the Cardinalate.

Manning's view was that—

“ The Decree of Leo XIII. was absolutely true, just, and 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. 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.”

And later he set down a situation which survived to the detriment and disgrace of Empire :

“ I will put down what I believe about the Irish Question and of the intervention of the Holy See.

Henry Edward Manning

“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.

“The Government of Ireland is in the hands of officials, English, Scots, 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. 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 Goschen at the Athenæum: ‘If you had held out a ray of hope you might have governed Ireland.’ But no: this Government relies on force.”

Visitors to Ireland gave unending trouble, even when their intentions were of the highest. Wilfrid Blunt, in spite of Manning’s certificate, was landed in Galway Gaol. Dilke, Chamberlain, and Lane-Fox threatened visits, the latter of which the Cardinal personally averted (October 23, 1891):

“I implore you not to go to Ireland. The Catholics who invite you may be good and true, like Hussey Walsh and other Irish Conservatives. But behind them at this time, and in the next General Election, there are and will be anticlerical and Parnellite Catholics of Dublin and Cork—a highly dangerous party, of which lately the Bishop of Ossory told me much. Nothing you can say or do will save you from being followed, cheered, and used by them. And with equal certainty you will find yourself in direct political opposition to the whole Episcopate of Ireland, and therefore to the will of the Holy Father, as I have it direct from himself. Write to me at once, and tell me that you will not be drawn away from your prudent conduct in the past.”

Persico and Parnell

October 29, 1891 : "You may make me responsible for the decision if you will privately and publicly to all the world. I love you too well to let you go astray when I see it." October 29, 1891 : "*The Times* maliciously and scurrilously called me a Separatist. This is the information that blinds and misleads you. My dear George, be on your guard against the prejudice and reckless accusations of anti-Irish Englishmen, and still more of anti-Irish Irishmen."

After an effusion from the former class, the Cardinal wrote :

"I have two Oxford friends—able, cultivated scholars whose hand has been through life against every man. They remind me of the faces Dante saw withered in the ice. But what distortion of eye and intellect !

"The Irish are to be judged in Ireland. Not even the Tyrolese compare with them in chastity, generosity, and faith. Their faults are the demoralisation of an oppressed and persecuted people. The Irish are what the English have made them.

"As to their charity and piety, Mr. Bakewell has no instinct or intuition to perceive it. He is a sample of an intellectual convert—'light without love,' which has no place in God or heaven. It is refreshing to read his denunciation of the English-speaking race. It is far worse than 'the abominable Irish.' But it is not like our Lord weeping over Jerusalem."

There were times when the Cardinal wept tears over Ireland. Canon Arthur Ryan records one such incident :

"Gladstone had just locked up Parnell, and most of our leaders were in prison, and it was on the cards to send Dr. Croke there too. But when dinner was over and the visit to the Blessed Sacrament, the Cardinal drew me into the corridor and said : 'Oh, I fear every link of affection between the two countries is broken.' 'Yes,' I said, 'all but one.' 'What one is that?' said the Cardinal. 'Our love for you,' said I. I shall never forget how he looked me through when he answered : 'Do you mean that?' I said : 'You are the last man in

Henry Edward Manning

England to whom I would say that if I did not believe it to be true.' And the dear old man burst into tears. After a bit, almost under his breath : ' It is what I have prayed for, it is what I have prayed for.' I don't think many men have seen Manning cry.

"I have always felt that he loved Ireland and was jealous too. For when, afterwards, Gladstone brought in his Home Rule Bill, the Cardinal asked me : ' Well, how are things going on in Ireland?' ' Oh,' I said, ' we are all blessing Mr. Gladstone.' He seemed quite nettled and answered : ' But *I* was a friend of Ireland before Mr. Gladstone.' I think that burst of human nature moved me almost more than his tears."

Between the two Home Rule Bills Manning felt that he could reconcile his Imperialism with Mr. Parnell. Walsh wrote (July 9, 1888) :

"Your Eminence, I know, will read with special pleasure Parnell's declaration on the retention of the Irish M.P.'s at Westminster. Although the Holy Father is now so clear on the Home Rule Question, it might be well if your Eminence wrote to him telling him of this important declaration and all the circumstances."

Manning wrote to the Pope to report that Mr. Parnell had accepted one Imperial Parliament. To Walsh he answered :

"I am sure that this is the mind of the brains of the party, not, perhaps, of the passions or of the lungs. And it will greatly advance what we desire."

The alliance with the Irish Hierarchy appears to have been clinched in the following year. The Cardinal wrote his thanks for the support which the Irish party had given him to defeat "a handful of anti-Catholic Radicals." To Dr. Walsh he added (October 4, 1889) :

"If they will support us in the defence of denominational education it will powerfully help Catholic Education in Ireland. You then need not fear either Dissenters or Radicals in England."

Persico and Parnell

Walsh wrote (October 6, 1889):

“ At our last Episcopal meeting, last June, we passed a resolution that the Irish members be asked to sustain the efforts of your Eminence in reference to denominational education. The only opportunity that has arisen was in reference to the Technical Instruction Bill. Your Eminence knows the rest.”

And the Cardinal replied (October 9, 1889):

“ I did not know till I received your last letter that the Bishops of Ireland had been so good as to pass a resolution requesting the Irish members to support our efforts on Education in Parliament. Let me ask you to offer to them my grateful thanks. It is of the highest importance that Catholics should act in complete unity in this matter of Education. If our force is unbroken we are sure of success in guarding our Catholic schools both in Ireland and England.”

Walsh wrote further (October 19, 1889):

“ John Morley turned up here quite unexpectedly on Wednesday. I had Cashel and some other Bishops to dine that evening. He came on a very informal invitation, and seemed quite at home amongst so many Christians!”

Though he spelled God with a small ‘g’ and Gladstone with a capital, the Irish Hierarchy were wise enough to prefer to deal with a non-religious than with a bigoted official.

Manning wrote (March 1, 1889):

“ As to Education. The Irish members did right in closing with Mr. Morley. But it will not come to pass hereafter. We cannot stand on exceptional legislation. Our only safety is a common or equal law. But what your members did has done good and strengthened our hold on the Opposition party. The Catholic papers will do best not to attack them.”

The year 1890 signalled the hopeful and unopposed advance of all that Manning cherished most at heart.

Henry Edward Manning

Education, Ireland, and Rome presented the aspect of subsiding volcanoes. Subterranean activities had all come to the surface. There was a lull and a respite attending the days of his Silver Jubilee.

In Education the Catholic claims showed signs of long-delayed progression. In Ireland Parnell had righted his waning popularity by an astonishing victory over *The Times*. Pigott, an out-of-work journalist, had fooled it into buying a forged letter. Archbishop Walsh, whom he approached three days before its publication in *The Times*, gave him shorter dealing. As Herbert Paul wrote: "If there were more Walshes in the world there would be fewer Pigotts."

Manning wrote to Walsh:

"Without doubt you already know that Pigott has confessed his perjury and forgery to Mr. Labouchere. But I can add that he has also put himself into the hands of my Vicar-General. I hope this downfall of *The Times* will teach it to be just and humbler hereafter. But I have little confidence in its amendment. Let me thank you for your wise and firm letters to this miserable Pigott. They have done us much good."

To Sir Charles Russell, Parnell's counsel, Manning wrote: "What I thought was the chief excellence of your defence was this: You lifted the whole subject to the level of a great national and historical cause."

Parnell's rehabilitation in the House of Commons was followed by that of Dr. Walsh in Roman circles, where he had suffered an undeserved cloud. On St. Patrick's Day Manning, after saying Mass for Ireland, wrote to wish him joy of the new prospect (March 17, 1890):

"Cardinal Rampolla's letter to you is a great joy. I have been fearing that in Rome you may have been for a time clouded, as every Archbishop is from Langton downwards. Is it not possible for you before long to go there? Mere absence brings mistrust. The one condition of your strength is the union of the Bishops. A fortnight ago I wrote to the Holy Father saying: 'I have long

Persico and Parnell

been silent about Ireland, but I can neither change nor modify what I have written in my past letters.' ”

Manning's Irish spirits ran high in spite of “Resolute Government” in Ireland, writing to Walsh (May 27, 1890):

“When will the Government see that the Balfour policy has ruined them? The Smith-Barry affair is as ignoble and impolitic as any statesman is capable of defending. I am finishing William O'Brien's book with delight I cannot express. It will do immense good, provoking great wrath and great love for Ireland!”

And to Gladstone (October 11, 1890):

“Was there ever such a farce and outrage on justice as this Tipperary Court, with a jury of movable judges *ad bene placitum* and ex-policemen on the bench? Surely Englishmen will not bear this, or Parliament. Mr. Balfour has brought back America into Ireland—our worst danger, as I foresaw in 1868.”

With his life's work accomplished, with the peace of Ireland at hand, and the silver echoes of his jubilee ringing through the world, Cardinal Manning must be accounted at this moment among the few who found happiness in their eminence. Then the storm broke! Then a conflict precipitated itself among the Catholic people of Great Britain which brought the Cardinal sorrow and grief upon the brink of his grave.

The wanton destiny of Ireland was at hand to embitter and dash the cup of her unhappy but not unholy people. When he stood at his zenith the Irish leader fell, but not with the fall of a common man.

Two mighty influences, long extinct in Anglo-Saxon communities, were brought to bear on a susceptible people. The clan feeling for a chief clashed with the native obedience to the Catholic Church. Before the end of the year the whole country was divided in an agony of hate and love.

Henry Edward Manning

The turn of events hinged upon the action of the Bishops, and above all on the counsels of the Archbishops of Westminster and Dublin. But the political initiative lay with neither, least of all with Manning, who ecclesiastically disliked Parnell's friendship for Clemenceau, and support for Bradlaugh. They have been severely accused of hanging fire until they could no longer help it. Dr. Walsh waited for the Irish party to act politically, and Manning waited for Dr. Walsh.

November 19, 1890: "This O'Shea case is a supreme disaster. My hope is that Parnell will say: 'I will serve Ireland with redoubled devotion, but I will not bring on you any of the censures which will fall on me. Let three or five of you be elected as a permanent direction of your political action in the House, in close communication with the leaders of the present Opposition—Mr. Sexton, Healy, and Justin M'Carthy; Mr. Dillon and O'Brien could not without risk be left out.' I have a strong feeling—I will say an instinct—that this is higher than all political expediency. I have been urged here to speak on the subject, but have refused. You may depend on my silence. If we keep morally right no harm will come to Ireland."

For the first time in their correspondence the Cardinal wrote twice to Dr. Walsh on the same day. The letter already quoted was despatched in the morning. Before evening he learnt that if the Irish leadership was unchanged the Bishops and priests of Ireland would find themselves seriously affected "in the judgment of English friends or the chief of them." His first letter was accordingly emphasised. Whom he had received word from was obvious, for he was writing to Gladstone at this time (November 21, 1890):

"*Private.* I have written twice since Monday, most urgently, to the Archbishop of Dublin. Mr. Parnell cannot be upheld as leader. No political expediency can outweigh the moral sense. I trust that the Irish people will on reflection see this. The politicians will not, but

Persico and Parnell

I hope the Bishops and priests and the *sanior pars* of the people will. I suggested the appointment of five as the leader in commission. These would represent the extreme and the centre. Mr. Stead tells me to-day that Archbishop Croke is for Parnell's retirement. If Archbishop Walsh agrees, I think it will be done. But it rests more with you than with any man. If you say, 'Do not fetter my freedom of action and take away my strength by putting the cause of Ireland in opposition to the public feeling and instinct of England and my chief supporters,' Mr. Parnell would retire from leadership and still give all aid, as before, to the Irish cause. I have not spoken publicly, for fear of clashing with the Irish Bishops." November 27, 1890: "Gratitude, blind loyalty, and just anger at English influence will make the Irish people refuse to forsake Parnell. I feel for them, and in a sense with them. But I hope their Bishops and priests will bid them be silent. My belief is that when our Parliament meets, and you and the Irish members are face to face, Mr. Parnell will quietly leave you and the Irish members to act together. But to this end you must let the weight of your word be felt."

Two days later Gladstone demanded Parnell's retirement, and Manning wrote (November 27, 1890):

"*Confidential.* Your letter has saved your party, shut the mouth of lions, and saved Home Rule. The enclosed will show where the Bishops of Ireland are. I hear that the Bishop of Cork has spoken in the same sense. It will take time for certain of the Irish members to climb down, but all will end as we desire."

He wrote to Dr. Walsh (November 26, 1890):

"You will have seen Mr. Gladstone's letter. 1. He cannot lead in union with Mr. Parnell. 2. His supporters will not act with the Irish members, if Mr. Parnell represents them. 3. The Irish members will become powerless in the House. 4. There is no one who can propose Home Rule with the faintest hope of being listened to. 5. If there was a Dissolution, our English, Scotch, and Welsh friends would to a great extent be beaten. 6. Foreseeing this, some I know have already

Henry Edward Manning

said that they would not stand. 7. The strong and growing sympathy over here is already checked. 8. Few will come over to you as in time past. And all this for what? My dear Lord, I feel that two virtues of the Irish heart, gratitude and chivalry for a man that is down, have carried the people away from their graces. You know me well enough as a friend of Ireland to bear with my plain speech."

He also wrote to the Pope to explain the position of the Bishops and priests. Dr. Walsh's exact proceedings appear in a letter to Manning (November 28, 1890):

"Under a resolution providentially come to at our October meeting, I am authorised in such cases to call a special meeting of our Episcopal Standing Committee. The time for this will be *after* the M.P.'s have acted. I have called it for next Wednesday. This will exercise a strong influence on Monday's proceedings, and in a form that no politicians can object to. We cause no embarrassment by pressure. But we make it known that after their decisive act we meet to see how it affects us and our priests and people."

The next day Mr. Parnell replied to Gladstone in a manifesto, described by Dr. Croke as "flat and otherwise discreditable." It was a fierce appeal to Irish passion, and it loosed the hounds of war. Manning wrote instantly, urging the Irish Bishops to speak: "This is a supreme moment to convince Rome that you do not put politics before faith and morals;" and he sped Gladstone into the arena the same day (November 29, 1890):

"*Private*. I put 'Private' because the Archbishop does so. But *res ad triarios* and it is time to get upon the housetops. The Bishops in Ireland are in a very difficult strait, but plain and prompt speech is safest. Mr. Parnell's manifesto is highly artful, but it will fail." December 4, 1890: "The Irish Bishops have done their duty well, with great simplicity and truth. If they have been slow to speak, it is fair to consider what might have happened if they had not been supported. Mr. Parnell's

Persico and Parnell

conduct is that of an unsound mind. It has recalled to me Sir Henry Parnell, who made an end of himself, when we were young. If Mr. Parnell goes to Ireland, the issue will be between dangerous politics and the Faith of Ireland. I have heard that Parnell avowed his intention to liberate the Irish people from their priests. No one, as I remember, knows better than you what that means. The line I look for is that he and his friends will try to excite mistrust in you and those with you by saying that you wish to put off an illusory Home Rule upon the people of Ireland. But Lord Salisbury will not outbid you." December 5, 1890: "I hope that your one pledge will be, I will endeavour to frame a scheme of Home Rule which shall be acceptable to the people of Ireland. If they shall refuse to accept it I will relinquish the work to other hands and leave public life. Do not hamper yourself with as much as a cobweb. Who can foresee the state and circumstances even of next year? Excuse my intrusion. I could not be silent."

Dr. Walsh's letters were calm, but decided (December 2, 1890):

"We are still in a state of suspense here; of course, Parnell's opponents will stand firm. Equally of course he will refuse to go. He will then be powerless for good. But his holding on can hardly fail to ruin the Irish party and the Irish cause." December 4, 1890: "The meeting was a full one. The Committee consists of ten; *all* were present, except the Primate, who is in Rome. We were in every respect absolutely unanimous. Popular feeling runs very high just now in Dublin and Cork. We are sure to have many noisy manifestations. It may be of use to some of us to find ourselves, for once, on a really unpopular side! It is plain that Parnell can do great mischief. I see no prospect of our escaping a disruption of the party and the consequent wreck of everything that was of promise."

The same day Manning sent Walsh his (still unpublished) Address to the Irish People. No member of Oxford had so addressed that people since Shelley wrote them a pamphlet bidding them cast off their priests.

Henry Edward Manning

Manning's was in the opposite sense. Neither epistle ever reached those to whom it was directed.

Dr. Walsh was anxious to keep the Cardinal out of the civil war which followed. There are moments which admit of no intervention. Combat was determined, though of the result there could not be a moment's doubt. It was ordained from the moment that the Irish party was cloven like a mill-race, about the two sides of the Episcopal "testudo." Dr. Walsh wrote (December 6, 1890):

"I need not say what an encouragement your Eminence's letter is. Important as it is, I think it advisable (counting on your Eminence's sanction) to hold it back from publication for a day or two."

December 14, 1890: "I have been waiting from day to day to see whether it would be judicious to publish your Eminence's letter. As yet, at all events, it would not, I think, have been right to publish it. Some of the papers here started the cry last week that your Eminence, acting through Arthur O'Connor, was the real author of the revolt of the party against Parnell! This is brought in to prop up the cry that the real issue is between the English and the Irish leader, between Mr. Gladstone and Parnell. So I am satisfied that the more carefully we keep ourselves to the arguments on the Irish side of the case, the better."

No one not actually present in Ireland could realise the bearings of the catastrophe. Manning hoped that out of evil good would come. He wrote to the Pope on November 30 that the deplorable crisis would leave the political henceforward subordinate to the moral.

To Stead Manning sent a characteristic note (December 21, 1890):

"I am hopeful about Ireland. Mr. Parnell will have a time of uproar, but he will not last. He has nothing to rest on in morals or politics. The first were lost in the Divorce Court, the latter in his appeal to 1798. Even Lord Salisbury cannot help him in rebellion. For ten

Persico and Parnell

years Ireland has been dragged by the politicians. It will now, I hope, return to its old guides."

When Parnell was defeated at the by-elections, but fought on, Manning characterised his conduct as "preternatural."

The New Year brought no peace. Manning felt that unless the priests caught the reins the mad course of events must continue. He wrote again to the Pope explaining how necessary it was that they should have a free hand if Ireland was to be saved from violence and revolution.

There was nothing personal in Manning's condemnation of Parnell. Parnellism he described in one phrase—"Tudorism." He had often preached that the Tudors had turned the priests out of their due influence in English life and left the laity in command. This he feared might be the case in Ireland. "Tudorism" comprised all that he had ever warred against. That Tudor was in the name of Parnell's mother was a coincidence that Manning could not have been aware of. But the Parnellite split was a reality. It was as though the elements of creation had risen against their creator. In October Parnell died as he had lived, not unproudly, but he was too proud a man even to be an Irish leader. It was true that he had not sinned more than many who remained unchallenged in English public life. But as his destiny had been to lead the children of Catholic Ireland, a greater penalty had been exacted than the world requires from her own.

CHAPTER XXII : SPIRITUAL POLITICS

“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 to be as neutral as the Holy See. It refuses to be Royalist in Naples, or Carlist in Spain, or Legitimist in France.”—*Manning’s Notebook*.

MANNING’S politics were elastic enough to keep him on terms with both Gladstone and Salisbury. His Radicalism was Biblical, his Imperialism Christian, his Socialism Franciscan, his Home Rule Federal, and he was even a “Fair Free-Trader.” By covering his views with refining words he escaped and chivied the partisan. Nevertheless, Vaughan challenged his Radicalism after the manner of Moses : “I think we must be on our guard against Communism and Revolution ; the Radicalism of Moses was not confirmed in Egypt, if you refer to slaying the Egyptian and the reversion of lands !”

Gladstone was not the only Premier he plied with information. After Horsman’s attack on the Church in the Commons, Manning wrote to Disraeli (March 15, 1868) :

“Every several proposition here is false, and some seem to me simply intended for mischief. The laity asked ‘for higher education.’ Sir R. Peel, without communication with the Bishops, announced the Queen’s Colleges in Parliament. What followed you know. Archbishop Murray was alive and present at the Synod of Thurles, and in person proposed to the Synod the condemnation of the Queen’s Colleges, which was carried, if not unanimously, as I believe, with only the partial dissent of one or two. The ‘majority of one’ was not on their condemnation, but on the point whether or no priests should be forbidden to teach in them under pain of censure. No censure at all, much less refusal of Sacraments and excommunication, has ever been passed on the laity on this subject. They have been warned

Spiritual Politics

and left to their responsibility. We have followed the same course in England as to Oxford and Cambridge. The prosperity of the Queen's Colleges is a matter of opinion. We believe them to be signal evidence of the failure which must smite every attempt to force education without religion upon a Catholic people. If we were not bound down by the iniquity of penal inequalities we should have no fear of the prosperity of any such colleges. To me the most offensive part of Mr. Horsman's speech was the pretence that 'the Catholic laity desire to be protected from their own Bishops.' This will have its effect in Ireland, as all such pretences have, to unite more and more closely the laity and their Bishops. . . . So long as the Catholic laity of Ireland are united to their pastors England will be able to deal with both as with a part of the United Kingdom. Just in so far as they are disunited we shall make the mass of the people American in sympathy and in principles. England has already committed the fatal error of trying to put down the Catholic Church by penal laws; I trust it will not try the still more fatal error of endeavouring to divide and undermine it. What is lost of power by the Church in Ireland is gained, not by England, but by America and by revolution. Why not try at last to make Ireland like the Rhenish provinces—a happy and prosperous Catholic country? Surely this is a policy worthy of a statesman. Mr. Burke saw that it was a policy both wise and just. It is still possible, but every year makes it less likely to be accomplished. I cannot overstate what I know of the alienation of high, good, and upright men from the English rule. I have seen nothing like it in kind or intensity even in Lombardy while under Austria."

Manning kept his fingers in the politics of the day in order to be able to gauge and further the position of the Church. His schemes were generally confided to Ullathorne, as, for instance, when he wrote (July 24, 1867): "Let me suggest that you come here by an earlier train, have some luncheon, and go in the carriage to the House of Commons. We can then talk over the points I put so as to ensure agreement, which is of moment." Or again (December 3, 1872): "When Canon O'Sullivan showed

Henry Edward Manning

me Mr. Gladstone's letter I saw at once that to renew the request would only clinch the refusal. It was so explicit as to make it imprudent for their own sake to ask again. What I suggested was this : that when the Irish members and the Lord Chancellor come over I would try to get them to bring it before Mr. Gladstone. I will then join with them. If you think this course advisable, let the papers be sent to me at the beginning of the session, and I will do my best."

Private notes to Disraeli show Manning's keen discretion.

May 4, 1867: "*Private*. I have a double reluctance to write to you at such a moment as this, both on account of the great pressure of public anxiety upon you and the absence of all claim on my part. But the subject is one of the highest moment to Ireland, and formed a part of the conversation you were so good as to allow me to hold at Lord Gainsborough's. I would beg you, however, to decline without hesitation all further reference to it if you so please. The Rector of the Catholic University in Dublin came to me yesterday, authorised by Cardinal Cullen to treat with Government on the subject of that University. The chief object of desire is obviously a Charter, or, failing this, a fairer and more just recognition of the only Catholic University in Ireland. The Rector asked me if I could obtain for him an interview with any member of the Government. Remembering the conversation I had the pleasure of holding with you, I thought I might venture to ask this favour from you. But I beg you without a moment's hesitation to decline it if any motive of public utility or private convenience should so require."

February 14, 1880: "*Private*. I believe that Lord Beaumont, if taken under wise and kind political guidance, could be made a useful man in public life. It is with this in view that I have urged him to speak to you, and I hope you will not think that I have done amiss. Many of our young men stagnate or waste their life and powers from want of encouragement and a definite aim."

Spiritual Politics

Manning seems to have discussed trades and tariffs with Disraeli. He never could understand why the imports exceeded the exports, as he wrote to Percy Wyndham (February 17, 1888): "I had some conversation with Lord Beaconsfield about it. I have believed in Free Trade all my life, but my fear is that it will not last. I am afraid that neither pasture nor 'our wondrous roots,' as Lord Beaconsfield called them, nor even jam, will restore the value of land." Lord Stanley drew the moral that "your remark on jam shows that you do not any longer mind showing that you differ from Mr. Gladstone." To Manning the political value of jam was to feed the hungry. He only touched politics in order to keep an ecclesiastical oar in the water-floods. He was equally at home with the Primrose League or the Irish party. Parnell and the Irish presented an address at his jubilee. At the approach of what was base in politics he withdrew into the clouds, but "Toby, M.P.," had occasions to sketch him in the lobby, "a medieval saint from the stained windows of a church, standing with pale face and finely sculptured head bent, attentive whilst one of the Harrington *frères* poured into his ears a torrent of voluble invective."

The Cardinal encouraged Catholics like Henry Matthews and Lane-Fox to stand for Parliament. To the former he wrote before the Dungarvan election (September 16, 1868): "Though I refrain by rule from mixing in elections, may I nevertheless say how much I should rejoice to see you in Parliament? Religious equality and denominational education, as you put it in your address, are the two chief points we ought to contend for. I don't know anything of your circumstances in Ireland, so that my good wishes are wholly personal to yourself." And after his defeat later (February 16, 1874): "I regret it for your sake and ours, and for the sake of your legitimate and deserved professional future. I hope, however, that this is only

Henry Edward Manning

stayed. There is too much wind up to have settled weather for some time, and in these changes I hope to see you again soon in Parliament." However, English Catholics too often fall between two seats—the Irish, which does not want an Englishman; and the English, which does not want a Catholic. It was ten years before Henry Matthews could write to the Cardinal in triumph from East Birmingham "that a Catholic can win an important English seat." Much to Protestant indignation, Matthews, who had pleased the Queen by attacking Dilke, became Home Secretary. It became customary to include a Catholic in the Cabinet as a lightning-conductor or stalking-horse. We find Matthews as Home Secretary not only countenancing, but pleading with Manning to permit a Mass celebrating the centenary of the Young Pretender's death. The promoters were harmless people "with a taste for Stuart relics and good Church music." But Manning was obdurate. The Church had suffered enough for the Stuarts, and the requiem had to be sung by the Græco-Episcopal Dr. Lee in an Anglican church, with results not stated to the soul of King Charles III.!

Mr. Fox, failing of Parliament, became Vice-Chancellor of the Primrose League with Manning's blessing (February 14, 1887): "It is a real joy to me that you are fairly launched in work for the English people. Go on with all your strength. We are bound above all men to labour for England in all ways, spiritually, politically, socially, morally. If we have more truth, then we are bound to have more charity than other men. London used to be the most bigoted place, but I never meet it." But there were rocks ahead. Owing to the strain between Salisbury and Randolph Churchill, the Primrose League had to be carried on in secrecy, whereupon the Maltese branch collided with the Holy Inquisition, and the Bishop of Nottingham eagerly denounced it as "a society dangerous and unlawful." An Irish priest denied a member absolution. Manning wrote to Clifford (March 16, 1886):

Spiritual Politics

“You have no doubt seen the Bishop of Nottingham’s circular on the Primrose League. I believe that it cannot be sustained either in Canon Law or in Moral Theology. Every day I have letters from his diocese appealing to me for direction. I have given none, hoping to prevail on the Bishop to withdraw his act. He answers me that he claims his right as Bishop to enforce withdrawal from the Primrose League by privation of Sacraments.”

And to Vaughan (March 23, 1886) :

“I wrote to the Bishop of N., but without effect. The Bishop of B. had two conversations with him at Oscott in vain. I wrote fully to Cardinal Simeoni, and urged him without delay to write to the Bishop of N. enjoining the restoration of faculties to the clergy. I wrote by same post to the Bishop of N. informing him of the fact. He answered he was glad, and would do what Rome directs. On Saturday I wrote again to Cardinal Simeoni, saying *periculum in mora*. The scandal and ridicule and irritation here are immense. From the day the Bishop of N. entered the diocese he has been in contention. The suspicion in Rome is that the Bishops of England are oppressors, and act with exaggerated notions of their rights and powers as independent Bishops. And this will confirm the suspicion. It is all very sad.”

Vaughan sped Romeward to assure the Pope that there were differences between the Fenian and Primrose societies, while Manning applied for information to Lady Dorothy Nevill: “I have been informed that the Primrose League or its habitation or its members circulate anti-Catholic and Protestant flyleaves. I am anxious to refute this, as I have staked my character on your being a League of Innocents!” Thanks to Manning, Catholics were allowed henceforth to tread the primrose way.

Catholic education made it necessary for him to keep in touch with English Liberalism, which he hoped would come under the leadership of Dilke, not Chamberlain.

Henry Edward Manning

Bishop Nulty of Meath sent him a warning (November 19, 1885):

“*Private.* There is a certain Radical lord residing in this neighbourhood named Lord Greville. Chamberlain and Dilke had arranged to make his house their headquarters during their intended visit. Meeting Lord Greville, I reproached him and his Radical leader Chamberlain with the design of destroying Catholic education in voluntary schools. Greville wrote to Chamberlain the substance of his interview with me. In his reply Chamberlain wrote: ‘If ever I visit Ireland I should be very happy to make Dr. Nulty’s acquaintance. But in the meantime you could console him with the assurance that I do not mean to interfere with voluntary schools in Ireland. I leave that to the Irish themselves. But as to voluntary schools in England, that is quite another matter, and sooner or later these must go, certainly.’”

Henceforth Manning hoped Dilke would outweigh Chamberlain. They shared St. Charles as a patron saint, and in return for a Spanish crucifix the Cardinal gave Dilke a miniature of St. Charles for his bedroom. He met Herbert Bismarck at Dilke’s table. Dilke wrote to him: “*Secret.* Would you allow your name to be proposed to the Queen, in the event of the appointment of a Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes, as a member?” The Cardinal answered (February 12, 1884): “Any services of mine, such as they are, will be at Her Majesty’s command, and I thank you for giving me a share in the work you have so well begun.” According to Lord Carrington, the pleasantest part of the Commission was “listening to your suggestions and questions, always full of sympathy with and love for the poor.” Some of Manning’s suggestions appear on a slip he passed to Dilke: “Would it not be advisable to remove out of the streets into the suburbs the following: Prisons, infirmaries, certain hospitals, ironworks, all factories not needed for daily or hourly

Spiritual Politics

work? Would not this give large areas?" Whereupon Dilke commented: "The Cardinal is our greatest revolutionist." Later the Cardinal wrote (February 13, 1885): "I am Radical enough to deny the right of property to the extortionate renting of house jobbers. One ought to annul *ipso facto* an extortionate rent. And some authority might be created to pronounce what is extortionate. The Report has much *sottaqua*, but it is evidently pale from fear." The secretary, Mr. Bodley, wrote: "That Commission was heralded as the opening of a new social era. The future King of England consented to serve upon it. The last leader of the great Tory party left its table to become Prime Minister. The venerable head of the Roman Church in England brought all his love for the suffering poor to bear on its deliberations. The chairman was Mr. Gladstone's ablest colleague in his second Ministry. All these eminent persons died without seeing any of their recommendations carried out."

Later in the year Dilke was involved in a divorce case, concerning which Dilke wrote: "I told him everything—the whole story." The Cardinal certainly believed he was innocent, and rather than be carried away by evidence said that the truth would only be known at the Day of Judgment. Dilke wrote to him after the trial: "*Secret*. I do not think that anyone was ever called to live through a worse few days than I last week, and though there is now your hope that truth may prevail, yet I should fear the charge of hypocrisy if I were to say more of what I think." Manning wrote (August 16, 1885): "I thank you much for your note and tidings of yesterday. They solve one part of the complication of which you told me. God grant that what remains may also be solved or averted. You are continually in my thoughts, and I turn back to old memories which seem as fresh as yesterday." To Lady Dilke he wrote (March 2, 1886):

Henry Edward Manning

“The more I weigh the matter, the more convinced I am that to go away would be taken as flight. Moreover, in trials so great all human efforts fall short. There is One only who can bring truth to light, and if trusted He will. As to the House, it would seem to me that the constituency alone have the privilege of requiring their member’s attendance at the House. But to go or not to go is open to discretion, and so long as the constituency do not require attendance, the safer course seems to me to be even to err on the side of abstaining from public works and acts.”

No wonder that Dilke wrote: “The help of friends like you is the best of all.”

As an instance of his care to yoke statesmen we find the Cardinal writing to Henry Fowler (June 22, 1883):

“*Private.* I send with this a copy (1) of the Memorial of the National Society to Mr. Gladstone; (2) of the draft memorial of the Catholic Poor School Committee; (3) of a private circular of a Committee on Primary Schools appointed by the Catholic Union. When you have sufficiently examined them, I should be glad to receive them back. And I would ask you to regard the draft memorial as confidential, for it has not yet been presented to Mr. Gladstone. Our conversation yesterday was necessarily too large for exact points, but I should much like to go carefully into details. These papers may perhaps afford a groundwork.”

With the balance of power trembling on the Irish vote, Manning pressed on Salisbury as the prospective Premier (November 1, 1885) “that the Act of 1870 was founded on a false basis and carried by false pretences, and that to redress great injustice and to avert great danger the whole ought to be brought under review once more.” Salisbury answered that it “was a clumsy compromise intended rather to give time for the enemies of religious education to gather their strength than to effect any just and permanent settlement.” Manning sent round a pamphlet entitled, “*To amend the Education Act of 1870 (Secret)*,” to a few discreet statesmen.

Spiritual Politics

It was necessary not to alarm the Nonconformists. The elections did not prevent Salisbury answering (December 13, 1885): "I agree very much with what you say about the Act, only differing from you when you say that power is in my hands to protect our Christian and voluntary schools. I have every desire to do so, but, alas! there are strong grounds for being sceptical as to my power." Manning had not agitated in vain, for Lord Cranbrook invited him that winter to serve on an Education Commission. Manning wrote to Clifford (December 28, 1885): "The other members are Mr. Mundella; Dr. Rigg, Wesleyan, but *sound*; Dr. Dale of Birmingham, *unsound* [elsewhere he spoke of him as "a Birmingham rough like his master!"]; Mr. Alderson, *sound*. *Uncertain*, Lord Beauchamp, Lord Harrowby, Bishop Temple. The Denominationalists are in a large majority." Matthew Arnold wrote to him: "I think the new Commission is a strong one, and two names, your's and Temple's, I see with particular pleasure." Manning dominated the Commission, which carried his proposals. After two years he wrote to Beauchamp (October 17, 1887): "If this Commission should end like the Housing Commission, in Blue books and stagnation, we shall have lost our last opportunity. The voluntary schools were never so strong. The Board School system has not reached its strength." Gladstone sent him word: "It seems as if your people were in theory hit both ways. You will, I think, find it difficult to get voluntary schools put upon the rates." But in the end they were. Manning informed Clifford (January 17, 1888): "The Secular School party are already frightened. But what we gain in the Commission we may lose in the House of Commons. There is our danger. And as you truly say, if we appear too visibly we shall raise the old suspicions and cries. You can tell the Holy Father that in the Commission the friends of religious education are completely united." The result, owing to Anglican allies,

Henry Edward Manning

was, as Hutton said, that "the Commission might almost be called his Commission, and its report his report." Later the Anglicans went back, and Manning wrote his *Fifty Reasons* on behalf of the voluntary schools, which *The Times* refused to print anonymously. He wrote to Ullathorne (December 20, 1888):

"Here are fifty stripes for the backs of those cowardly Anglican Bishops for deserting their own principles and showing their uselessness. There is one more than the legal number, but that is *ex abundantia caritatis*. I had hoped the Tories would remain in office to carry the proper measures, but they are in the hands of the Liberal Unionists, and as cowardly as to their adhering to their principles as the Anglican Bishops. Politically what a state we are in! There is nothing for it but downright agitation and teasing the Ministry with endless petitions from all classes. We sadly want a good Catholic leader in the House."

Salisbury promised "careful study." Lord Ripon thought "the wise course for Catholics to pursue is to hold firmly to what they have got, and not to risk that by seeking after more." Rigg the Nonconformist, however, thought it "a masterpiece," and "that henceforth the movement must be towards your goal. The old Secularism is all but dead beat." Manning even persuaded John Morley once to proclaim the rights of the Catholic school in the House. When a friend asked Manning if he were not surprised: "No, no; Mr. Morley spent an hour here the day before." He wrote to Morley (April 19, 1891):

"We have at this time no system of national education, because we have two, of which neither can ever become national or universal. We need now legislation and a higher law taking up the two systems that exist. I believe that the English people ought to educate themselves with such State aid as individuals require. The State did not create our commerce nor the Empire. The intelli-

Spiritual Politics

gence and will of the people did these things. The State did not create our national character. The State is its expression. Jules Simon says that Frenchmen are the edition of the same book in 36,000,000 copies. Heaven save us from this dead level!"

Manning's most striking stand in social politics was on Temperance. He took the pledge in 1872—"and maybe your Reverence needed it?" suggested a staggerer he once accosted in the street. But he seems to have been even earlier delated to Rome for the scheduled heresy of the *Aquatisci* or *Hydropotæ*, for Talbot used to write urging him "to drink more porter and port wine." Temperance was his theory, but Prohibition his practice. Manichæism he rejected in a letter to Basil Wilberforce: "There is no more evil in the intoxicating power of wine than in the explosive power of dynamite." Like Thomas of Canterbury, he allowed others to drink wine at his table, but he would not allow his own life to be prolonged by a stimulant. He was no fanatic. "Temperance is good, but Total Abstinence is better." He did not mind a bottle in the cupboard, but "keep it there and shake your fist at it!" He used to quote Baronius to prove the Apostles were abstainers! A humorous publican replied by exhibiting the Cardinal's emaciated features in his window over the heading "A warning to teetotallers!" Manning remembered that drink had been the curse of West Indian families, and showed it no mercy. As a priest he knew that the doorposts of public-houses were dark with the blood of souls. With a coster's cart for pulpit, he preached Temperance in the streets. At Cambridge his platform was stormed before he could speak. He converted Catholic and Protestant, incidentally Cardinal MacCabe, who wrote that, "although some of my friends foretold that all manner of trouble would follow my act, I thank God that so far I have escaped unharmed!" To Basil Wilberforce Manning wrote his thanks "for having the manhood in the midst

Henry Edward Manning

of this havoc of openly abstaining. Tell your curates that I thank them also. I am ashamed of many among us who sneer and criticise because they have not the self-denial to drink water. Every day tells me that I never did anything better for the saving of souls." And again: "If you have any *crux* to put about the Pope I will try my hand for you because you are a teetotaller!"

Certainly he made St. Patrick's Day sober in England, and he could write to a Father Mathew after an attack from *The Tablet*: "Do not be out of heart. If we were ever on God's side in a battle it is now, when we are using (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." And to Lane-Fox: "Woe is me, for I dwell in the tents of Kedar and have to fight with beasts at Ephesus. I wish I could come and rest, for I am weary. You ought to have been with me at Aldershot to see the 87th turn out and take the pledge." Manning tried a dual system, but, as he told Archbishop Walsh, "I found it impracticable. Not only because of faults in Total Abstainers, but also of faults in the Temperance men. In the end they fell away, and the Total Abstainers alone survived. Since then I have had no others to work with." A huge and painful correspondence accumulated on the drink question, leading the Cardinal to realise more and more that this was almost, perhaps, his greatest work. One letter may be quoted from a Dublin priest: "As soon as one of our Temperance Halls was closed, not only did 600 reformed cases relapse, and hopelessly, but some turned into the Invincible Society. Delany, who was one of the most notorious of the Phoenix Park informers, declared to me in prison: 'I would not be here to-day a murderer and an informer, nor would my accomplices be in the grave, if I and some of them were not shut out from your Temperance Hall.' And he wept most bitterly."

Spiritual Politics

Manning was a Puritan under the purple, and he condemned both saloon and theatre. From grand opera to the penny gaff, they were all links in the evil chain. Even Wagner's *Parsifal* was "a mad and extravagant absurdity." He believed his prayers induced Mary Anderson to leave the stage. He could not reconcile her Catholic piety with theatric triumph. Of the stage he noted :

"Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, were harmless; Aristophanes abominable; Plautus and Terence immoral; the Byzantine stage intolerable. The Church seems to have permitted mysteries and miracle plays in the hope of sanctifying the theatres. With what success others may judge. Their end was their abolition and the rise of the modern theatre. The mind of the Church is sufficiently shown in the fact that *histriones* were held to be *in statu reprobatorum* and deprived of Christian burial. Moreover, even on the English stage, which was perhaps the least gross, the grossness of our earlier dramatists, and even of some of Shakespeare, is revolting. But I believe that people little know what harm it does them. I cannot believe that the excitement, the publicity, the promiscuous intercourse, the emotions, the scenes, the sights, the music, the sympathy, and the animal magnetism of imagination and feeling, can be kept up for hours without danger to the unconscious purity of the senses and of the soul. Some deny this, but more, and they wiser and calmer minds, acknowledge it. All this even when the play is good. I have watched the Divorce Court, and have found that, I may say in a majority of cases, directly or indirectly, the co-respondents are of the theatrical world. The promiscuous consort of men and women behind the scenes, and the dramatic intimacies and embraces on the stage, and the impersonation of lovers and the like, must react upon the emotions and passions, whether men and women will it or no. Furthermore, every theatre is a centre of all kinds of evil. It creates a population which lives by vice. The whole surrounding neighbourhood is tainted. The multitudes that flock there every night are caught as in a whirlpool, and many 'go down live into the pit.'

Henry Edward Manning

And this trade in perishing souls is kept alive both by evil and by innocent people who do not think of the consequences of their actions. 'Am I my brother's keeper?' 'Am I my sister's guardian?' Yes, certainly, if I am a disciple of Jesus Christ. How, then, can I be so insensible to the consequences of my own acts? Every box or every stall I take makes me a partner in this limited liability company of sin and death. The pecuniary liability may be limited, but the moral cannot. I would rather for that reason have neither part nor lot in such a trade. If others choose to use their liberty in going to theatres, let them at least leave me to use my liberty in refusing to go.

"It is strange to me that the nuns should not only encourage theatricals in their convents, but run to excess in them; for instance, in dressing up young girls in men's clothes. I have had to stop this, and I know of a convent, not of mine, in which a young girl or woman was dressed as the Doge of Venice with her legs crossed and exposed up to the knee. Probably the innocence of nuns may throw them off their guard. The innocent plays of convents prepare for *La Dame aux Camélias* and the plays in poor schools for penny gaffs. And then we lament over their demoralisation. There are men and women who from childhood have been false. Nobody can believe them. And they are unconscious of their own unreality. Why stimulate this by dramatic impersonation? What harm would follow if the whole Catholic population of London were to resolve never to set a foot in a theatre? It would save so much money. It would be a strict custody of the senses so far as the stage goes. It would preserve in thousands a greater purity of heart. What harm would it do to anyone? Would anyone upon a death-bed wish that they had never made such a resolution? Then, let us alone in our extreme use of our liberty."

Manning shared rigorous views as to music and the performance of women in churches with Ullathorne, who early influenced his mind, writing (November 3, 1866):

"Through the influence of the Cathedral and certain steps I took, somewhat sternly humorous, years ago, the

Spiritual Politics

singing in the diocese is generally grave in character. But I have not succeeded in excluding females. That would be a very difficult thing to do without stopping all singing, as things are at present. A short time ago a priest advertised a woman's name as singing on a certain occasion in his church, she being also a singer in the concert-rooms, and I took him gravely to account for it. The clergy know there are two things that I am strongly opposed to—flash-singing in churches and advertising church exhibitions in newspapers, and therefore we have not much of either."

Manning issued a private Pastoral to the clergy in 1886, entitled *Æmulamini meliora*, deploring bazaars as a means to charity. "I fear that among the buyers and sellers and the holders of stalls, in the wilderness of wares and of the coats of many colours, the sacred form of Charity with the halo on its head can scarcely be discerned." He was implacable on this point. "A bazaar would bring dry-rot into the timbers of a mission." He forbade the nuns teaching children to play-act. Once as a stern compromise he permitted children to join in a dialogue, but without fancy dress, like the Sabbatarian who allowed his son to run on a Sunday, but not to jump! He seemed hard to many priests, but it was because he wished to lift them out of their depression. "I am afraid some of my clergy look upon me as a special constable, but I want to be a Father;" and he wished them also to call themselves "Father" instead of the "Mister" of penal days. To some he was "the Marble Arch," but to those who were in trouble or who fell adrift he was the Good Shepherd. He would scour the streets to find a strayed priest. He divided them into priests of the Old and the New Testament. If he expected *Lamentations* from one, he required *Acts* from the other. He offered them what Napoleon offered his grenadiers—"fields without bread and campaigns without money," and trusted them to struggle through. "I know I am an unskilful general,"

Henry Edward Manning

he told Canon Vere. "I send out my arms in one vessel and my men in another, but I trust to Providence that all will be well." And rather apologetically once: "I suppose I was in one of my imperious moods. If I had not become a priest I fancy I ought to have commanded an ironclad. St. Charles was meek. I shall never be meek."

He wished ardently to change the name of "secular" clergy to "pastoral." Unfortunately, the latter turned out to be a Jansenist term, and Vaughan wrote from Rome (February 13, 1873): "Cardinal Monaco will examine the date of the introduction of the term 'secular' priest. It has so entered into the use of the Canon Law of the Church that it cannot be changed. As to the term 'pastoral clergy' he raises objections, such as that the Bishops alone are properly pastors." Manning had to explain the word as best as he could: "They are in the wide world, secular, as the Apostles were—that is, in the world for the world's sake; not of it, but at war with it—of all men the least secular." But it was a trying paradox, the more so as his clergy lent themselves to comparison with the religious.

Manning wrote to Ullathorne (April 18, 1875):

"For some time I have been afraid of saying all I think about the state of our clergy. They seem to me cowed, discouraged, depressed, weakened, by a tradition of later ages that they need not be perfect, that they cannot be perfect, and that it is unreal and a sign of opposition to the religious to speak of perfection anywhere out of an Order. The Holy Spirit seems to me to be vindicating His rights and the rights of all souls by the decline of all Orders either in number or in perfection. The reason why our men preach ill is want of English, want of logic, want of theology, but still more want of Holy Writ and the want of the life of God in the soul."

Manning's greatest and most lasting spiritual policy was in bringing the standard of the diocesan clergy to

Spiritual Politics

the level of the Religious Orders, which drew equally on the more aristocratic of the old Catholics and on the more able of the converts. Manning could never understand the convert who is too good to become a parish priest, and he lashed out in the notes that went to his unpublished volumes :

“ It is thought that the state of religion is the state of perfection, and that the state of the priesthood is not. Many are imperfect in the state of perfection, and outside the state of perfection many are perfect, as Suarez says. Therefore the state is distinct from the person. And the stability of the state is distinct from the stability of the person. The Episcopate was the state of perfection in Judas, and the Order of St. Dominic in Achilli. Theology declares that perfection consists in Charity. The three vows are ‘instrumental’ towards perfection. Were there no priests able to perfect the Saints till the three vows were first imposed? It is sometimes said that, with few exceptions, the canonised Saints are religious. I have a great devotion to the uncanonised Saints—the multitude which no man can number, whose names are not in the Calendar, but written in Heaven. Religious Orders can afford to canonise their Saints from time to time. The Church cannot. I love all Orders, but I love most the Order of our Divine Master. I love the books of all Orders, but I love more the Pastoral Theology which can be found in no Order. The Regulars are under the vow of poverty, but we are under the reality.”

Such was the tone of the book which mysteriously disappeared after his death. It was because he wished to lead his priests to the heights that Manning, under the rivalry of the Orders, called on them to be teetotallers and social reformers on the heroic scale. Manning’s feelings on the subject of rescuing the fallen were responsible for his lonely and chivalrous support to Mr. Stead’s campaign against what he called “Satan’s International.” To Stead he wrote (July 6, 1885): “I am reading your revelations with great horror, and will

Henry Edward Manning

work with you with all my strength." Stead furnished the Cardinal with "ample clue to crime most damnable," and when, owing to indiscretion, he was prosecuted himself, the Cardinal, though reproving his excess, stood by him, and subscribed to the Stead Defence Fund, to the fury of many faithful. "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?" He even threatened a Pastoral, and wrote angrily to the protesting editor of *The Tablet*: "Twelve tribes of Pharisees and scribes would not hinder me. What do they take me for? And what do they imagine themselves to be?" The Anglican Archdeacon of Gibraltar at least paid "his tribute of respect and admiration for his courageous action." The Cardinal appeared at Stead's trial, and when he was sentenced on a technicality, wrote a letter that men would have endured worse to receive (November 11, 1885):

"All things work together for good to them that love God. You have served Him with a single eye. And 'the work has been done,' as you wrote on the sentence. No sentence can undo it. You have now the crown upon your work—that is to suffer for errors of judgment and a literal breach of the law which left the moral life of England almost without defence. I have so strongly felt this, and I have so clearly seen through the animosities against you, that I believe what has now befallen you will work some unforeseen and greater good for your consolation. Whatever it may be in my power to do shall be done. May God give you His peace!"

It was not without result, as Manning wrote to Canon Franklin: "I am thankful to you for the fearless way in which you have spoken out on this atrocity. If you are assailed by the wise and prudent and even by good Catholics, do not swerve or be silent. I had plenty to do when I supported Mr. Stead. But we amended our

Spiritual Politics

miserably defective criminal law." And George Meredith burst into sonnet in honour of the Cardinal's conduct :

" It sings, it shines ;
Cries to the Mammonites : Allay, allay
Such misery as by these present signs
Brings vengeance down ; nor them who rouse revile."

Manning's spirituality would not allow him to dine out, but it was part of his policy to make occasional appearances at public feasts, if only to illustrate the rule attributed to him : " I never drink and I never eat !"

He attended the dinner celebrating the Jubilee of the Union at Oxford, though with an apology to Ullathorne for " junketing " in his diocese. The Lord Chancellor Selborne presided, supported by Archbishops Manning and Tait. Manning was given precedence over the Bishop of Oxford, whereat the more unbending Protestants retired murmuring : " If Sam had still been Bishop, this had not been." Manning proposed " the Lords and Commons," and prophesied : " If there should ever arise a conflict between the two Houses, which could not be disentangled before the sun goes down, this would be a disaster indeed." He went on to recount their famous dead, and compared the otherwise festive scene to the first mess after battle. A notable absentee was Gladstone, who was still sore at the loss of the University seat. To him Manning sent tidings (November 11, 1873) : " I am sorry you were not present, not only because you ought to have presided, but because your presence would have averted what the somewhat ' untacty ' manner of Lord Selborne elicited. I am convinced that they would have received you with a Homeric welcome." Gladstone replied moodily : " Shall I say it had a certain resemblance to inviting one before spectators in a show of wild beasts?" Lord Roberts recalled : " I met him once at a dinner of the Inns of Court. John Bright spoke in very severe terms against

Henry Edward Manning

the House of Lords, and I was much struck by the pleasant way in which Cardinal Manning got up and poured oil on the troubled waters." On another occasion he responded with Bishop Temple for the Church at the Jubilee of the Medical Benevolent Fund. With great tact Manning gave London precedence in his own diocese, but, noted the Archbishop of York, "must have grinned inwardly at such a junction." Entertained at the Temple, Manning spoke humorously: "As a layman I confess that I am lost in your new Hierarchy of Courts. A Lord Chancellor is a canonised being who seems now to be dispersed by transmigration into many subordinate divinities. But I am on the verge of sacrilege. *Di me terrent et Jupiter hostis.*"

Manning had a share in canonising a Lord Chancellor, Sir Thomas More. To Father Morris he wrote (December 9, 1886):

"I hope the *Beati* will have their Mass in England at least, or in their respective Orders. I thank God with you to have lived to see this *in diebus nostris*. It is like the resurrection of the witnesses, whose bodies have lain so long in Babylon, and the world sending gifts over their bodies. It will give a great impulse to the faithful to aspire to a higher life, I hope. They seem to me to be coming out of their sepulchres to appear among us. I have long invoked St. Thomas More in secret, and now write him so for the first time."

When Morris wrote the Office of the Newly Beatified, Manning wrote (November 20, 1887): "I like your office very much, but I would be less historical and minute about the *duas uxores*. Does *summus* express high? I doubt it. Does it not mean the highest of many? *Summus Pontifex*. Would not *totius Regni Cancellarius* be nearer?" Manning was a close judge of Latin phrases. When the Brief of the English Martyrs was translated, he insisted on rendering *insula sanctorum* as applied to England, and *a*, not *the* Island of Saints. Dilke was as

Spiritual Politics

interested in the Blessed More as in St. Charles, writing (December 28, 1886) :

“ I have two questions I want to ask you ; the one is only for private curiosity. Is our greatest Chelsea worthy, Sir Thomas More, for whom I have a *cultus* and on whom I have long been collecting material, about to be made, or rather declared, a Saint? The other is as to official representation of England at the Vatican. I am in favour of it as a matter of policy, and always have been. I should be glad to be told if the statement is a lie or a half-lie. The arguments each way I fully understand. All I want is a hint as to probability at this moment. What if it is thought that the thing must be done secretly to be done at all? Then I shall understand also. I do not expect a reply.”

Great hopes and efforts had been expended in the attempt to connect England and the Holy See diplomatically, which Manning continually frustrated. Dilke wrote again (April 18, 1887) : “ Bodley saw the Holy Father on Thursday, and heard from him as to the representation of the Vatican here, that he thought it best to let well alone, but that it should be in the hands of your Eminence.” The desire of England to influence without recognising the Holy See was constant from the days of Pitt. Lord Minto went in the forties. Lord Derby sent Mr. O’Brien, and, as Talbot reported, “ is also trying to intimidate the Holy See by means of Sir Henry Bulwer.” Gladstone sent Sir George Errington. The Government had kept up a running interference in Episcopal elections. There were Government candidates for Westminster in 1865, for Cork in 1884, for Dublin in 1885. Wellington had actually appointed a Catholic Archbishop of Armagh in Curtis. In 1880 Sir Augustus Paget through Cardinal Howard interfered in the See of Gibraltar. A Papal Nunciature in London would have brought such intrigues into the permanent discomfiture of the Episcopate. With a view

Henry Edward Manning

to preventing the "Scarlet Lady" being presented at St. James's, Manning had written to Cullen (July 31, 1878):

"I am afraid some attempt may be made in the direction of Nuncios. A Nuncio between the Episcopate of Ireland and the Castle or the Bishops of England and the Government would probably produce conflict between us and the Government, and greatly relax the close intimacy of the Bishops with the Holy See. In Rome they do not seem to realise that Nuncios belong to the period when Governments and the public laws of Europe were Catholic. At this day the Governments are powerless to help the Holy See. The real Governments are the people and the true Nuncios are the Bishops, who have real power and correct knowledge and are devoted to the Holy See."

And later he tried to impress Vaughan (December 15, 1881):

"You say the Pope need not consult the Bishops as to relations with civil powers. *De potentia absoluta* this is true. But if he does not he exposes himself to two things. He falls into the hands of irresponsible persons who are usually intriguers or incapable, and he loses the immense moral power of the Episcopate and the faithful united to them. This is my judgment and fear at this moment. Three times I have written to Propaganda by their request, saying: 'Your weakness in Ireland is the state of the Bishops. Your strength will be to unite them to yourself. Your first duty is to do it. You alone can do it. By taking any other course you will put them farther from you and increase their mutual repulsions.' I may add, God created the Bishops. Diplomats spring from times, circumstances, and the changing states of the world. When Governments governed, diplomatists had a function. Now that people govern themselves, the only power that can deal with them is that which created both peoples and Governments, the Episcopate and its Head."

He left a strong note on the subject among his papers for the guidance of his successor:

Spiritual Politics

“The matter of such relations can only be political or spiritual. If they are to be political, what could nine Nuncios here or nineteen agents in Rome do for us with our Government that the English Bishops cannot do for ourselves? And any representative of Rome here would be a cipher, a centre of intrigue and of gossip among ourselves, and of senseless but mischievous suspicion among the English people. But if the matter of such relations be the spiritual and internal affairs of the Church in England, I am thankful that I am near my eighty-third year. Look you to it who like it.

“My belief is this: the Church has had two periods and is entering into a third.

“In the first period—down to St. Gregory the Great—the Pontiff had Vicars who were members of the Episcopate in each country.

“The second period—from St. Leo III. to the nineteenth century—has been medieval or dynastic. When the Episcopate in every nation became courtly and national, the Holy See needed Nuncios of its own choice and interest.

“The third period is upon us now. Out of thirty-six Catholic Sovereigns, only nine now remain; and they only in name and personal religion, for their people with their laws and constitutions are Catholic no longer.

“Pius IX. reconciled the whole Episcopate to himself. The Bishops of the whole Church rest no longer upon Sovereigns, but upon the Vicar of our Lord. Any Nuncio would be a *tertia persona inter episcopatum et Sanctam Sedem interposita*, and, as I believe, a wedge of separation, a hindrance to full and perfect mutual knowledge and confidence.

“The true Nuncio in every nation is the Episcopate. Let the Holy See, which names it, trust it and consult it, and control it by letter or by calling it to Rome.

“If the Holy See will govern through the Episcopate, it can do anything. If it endeavour to govern without it, or outside of it, or over its head, let those who advise such a policy be responsible. I apply this to all countries. I have in writing and in words told Leo XIII.: ‘There is one power in Ireland that can govern the Irish people—that is the Irish Bishops; and there is one power upon

Henry Edward Manning

earth that can govern the Irish Bishops, and that is your Holiness.' But this must be through and not outside. If the Holy See will govern with, by, and through the Episcopate, one whole race of men would disappear—the whisperers, intriguers, backbiters, and accusers. The first effect of diplomatic relations would be the interference of Government in the selection of Bishops. When Cardinal MacCabe died Errington was in Rome. Lord Spencer and Lord Granville, as I was informed from a sure source, instructed him to oppose the nomination of Dr. Walsh, chosen by the clergy and recommended by the Bishops. The rest of the Cabinet knew nothing of this. Many of the Cabinet were opposed to Errington's mission altogether. This I had from one of them and from another high official. The Irish people were in fury. The free election of Bishops was one of the points for which St. Thomas was martyred.

“And yet all this may now be treated diplomatically, and the Holy Father be misled.

“It may be said that the Episcopate may be divided in opinion. So much the better. The Holy See will then have both sides before it, whereas an Errington will only give his own opinion, or that of the party Government of the day; and this changes every four or five years. But the Episcopate is never out of office. A Nuncio is an Errington after all. I remember dining with Meglia in Paris. Louis Veuillot was there. It was ‘Monsieur Louis’ all the evening. The good Nuncio was evidently in his pocket. You cannot pocket an Episcopate.

“So long as the medieval period lasted there was a *Sagra Diplomazia* that Franchi taught us in the Accademia. There were down to 1800, Romans who could speak modern languages. Hardly one of our old companions could speak French, none German or English. Rome spoke all tongues when the world was Catholic. It is now shut up in its own walls and speaks Italian, and sometimes unintelligible French. This is a disaster, like the privation of deafness. It cuts men off from the daily knowledge of the outer world. The state and temper of foreign nations can never be safely known without knowing their languages. The old dynastic policy of nations of the Latin race is more intelligible in Rome.

Spiritual Politics

But what is really understood of the political state of England or the United States? And yet the future is with them.

“By the future I understand two things : first the vast extension of the Visible Church as in the United States and in our Colonies, and secondly the rectifying of certain social and political evils which have sprung from the revolt of the last three hundred years ; for instance, divorce, education without religion, indifference and nationalism. As the Church grows in social and political power, these things will be corrected by Christian legislation. But if Catholics were a majority, would they proceed to oppress those who forsake or oppose the Catholic Faith or Church? I think not. The medieval or dynastic period long maintained itself by coercion. Heresy and schism were political crimes punished by the public coercive law. This has been swept away by multiplied heresies and schisms making coercion odious and morally impossible. So far as we can see, the new world will never be mathematically Catholic ; nor will the public law ever again be applied to enforce belief by coercion, or to maintain it when once the religion of the majority is in power. This policy has been tried and found wanting ” (July 6, 1890).

“I know that our Government tried to prevent the nomination of Dr. Walsh to the See of Dublin. Any such understanding, be it only verbal and tacit between the Holy See and the Government, would be in my judgment and belief fatal. Not only or chiefly because many a good nomination would be hindered and many a bad one confirmed, but for a graver reason. No number of such mischiefs are comparable to the danger resulting to the Holy See. So long as the Irish people absolutely trust the Holy See in the nomination of Bishops, the faith and fidelity of the Irish people will be immutable. The day in which they begin to believe that the influence of the Protestant and anti-Catholic Government of England is felt at the Vatican in this most vital point they will be tempted not only to mistrust, but to all manner of spiritual evils.

“The chief danger and disease of the Church from the time of Charlemagne was the regalia and the nationalism

Henry Edward Manning

of the Episcopate. The whole conflict of investitures and of the Great Western Schism sprung from this source, secular influence in the nomination of Bishops. St. Gregory VII. and Leo X. made Concordats to restrain these evils—Concordats are not *bona per se*, but checks and strait-waistcoats on the civil powers. The Church is safe without them. They imply evils, always active. What has the Holy See to gain by any such understanding? What has it to lose? The filial trust of Ireland. The boycotting decree was in a political matter. The nomination of its Bishops contains the whole spiritual life of Ireland. I am thankful that I have not been bid to communicate with our Government in this matter. In the Goa affair I acted without discretion on specific instructions already laid down. I did so without responsibility. I only hope that I may never be commissioned to treat such a matter as this, except that it would give me the occasion of writing fully to the Holy Father. And the effect of this would probably be that my judgment would thenceforward go for little” (July 30, 1890).

“The speech of Gladstone at the Wesleyan dinner is a proof of what I have believed and written more than once to the Holy Father. I mean that the least appearance of action of the Holy See in political matter is a great danger to the Catholic religion. The subject was Malta and Sir Lintorn Simmons’s mission to Rome. Gladstone has roused the prejudice, suspicion, and fear which was dormant. The subject was simple, and if done quietly would have been gladly accepted. The Pope has declared that non-Catholic marriages are valid in Malta without the proscriptions of the Council of Trent. A rescript to Mgr. Pace would have done this, and as to the nomination of Bishops, if Rome had said, ‘The Bishop shall always be a British subject,’ all would have been done without Envoys Extraordinary and the *tableaux vivants* of diplomatic relations, which were realities in the Middle Ages, but now, with nations estranged from the Faith, are a mere pageant, intensely provoking to a nation in schism and proud of its independence. The only strength and safety of the Holy See and Church is the same absolute independence. There

Spiritual Politics

ought to be no *do ut des* between us and the British Government. We ought to give all that is right freely and 'as a King' accepting nothing. But I am afraid the fascination of memory is too strong in the Vatican. As the Italian Revolution by a 'delirium of memory' has seized Rome and sits in the Capitol representing the Wolf and the Twins, the Republic and the Consuls, so the medieval Pontiffs and the *Sagra Diplomazia* must be represented still, though its reality is gone" (July 31, 1890).

"The temporal sovereignty of Rome was won by the free-will of all concerned. If it be ever restored, it will be by the same free-will of Italy and of Europe. If it were restored to-morrow by any other means, it could not stand.

"Diplomatic relations presuppose the free-will of the people affected. What free-will is there in the English people, or in the Irish, or in the Irish in England? For spiritual things no diplomatic relations are needed; for political matter they are useless and dangerous. But it needs courage to say this in Rome.

"The public feeling and goodwill of England towards the Catholic Faith and Church is notably changed for the better. Give it another fifty years and any relations with the Vatican will be easily formed. Shock and provoke our public feeling, and the whole tide will turn. Common prudence and common sense bid and bind us to wait in quiet. But to see an English red-coat in the *parco* of the Sixtine is a *gloriola*, and a prophecy of the conversion of England. True; but the conversion is away from the Holy See. Wait and all will ripen without human hands" (August 1, 1890).

"I can never repeat too often that no diplomatic relations can bind such a Government as ours. The Government can do nothing without the popular vote. If the popular will is Catholic or tolerant, no diplomatic relations are needed. If the will is hostile, none are possible. They could not be acted upon. Concordats suppose two contracting parties. They must be bilateral or they are waste paper. And who can guide the popular will? No political Government. In matter of religion the intervention of Government in England, Scotland,

Henry Edward Manning

or Ireland would be fatal. The reign of James II. is a warning for all time.

“I will here ask a question : What is a Bishop to do when he believes that the Holy See is being misled by interested information, or when he is unable to think the acts of the Holy See to be prudent ?

“Is he to volunteer his opinion ? or

“Is he to be silent till he is asked ? or

“If he is bid to do anything which he believes to be imprudent, is he to do it ? or

“Is he honestly and submissively to manifest his conscience to the Holy Father ?

“If he is an assentor, or has anything to gain, or is afraid to speak because *ira Pontificis mors*, he will be silent. But if he has the Holy See and the welfare of the Church at heart more than his own person, he will speak out. Now, I have just had a case in point. Mgr. Mocenni, by the command of Leo XIII., wrote deploring the way in which Parliament and the newspapers had treated the Simmons Mission. He desired me to write a letter which should give a motive for his writing a letter to me for publication.

“I am fully and deliberately convinced that the subject is too small for the intervention of Leo XIII.; that every time he writes on minor political matters a feeling in England is excited against him and us; that there is at this moment no need of such intervention. I therefore answered by giving a narrative of the affair, and then humbly imploring him to send me such a letter *per norma mia, senza il commando di publicarla*.

“This may have given offence, but I am convinced that since Ruffo Scilla’s visit here the question of diplomatic relations has been seriously retarded. Ruffo Scilla is a very light person, and his action in the Vatican I know, and the action of the Government is manifest. They have no will to serve us, but themselves only. I will answer my own question. I believe it was my duty to write openly as in God’s sight for the service of the Holy See. St. Philip forbade Baronius to give the Pope absolution if he did not reconcile the King of France. I am not a saint, but only an unworthy councillor of the Holy Father. When I wrote the above I was

Spiritual Politics

in doubt how the Holy Father would receive my letter, in which I deprecated any published letter from him about Malta. After some weeks came a very kind and compliant answer, leaving me at full liberty to publish or not to publish what he sent to me. My purpose is to wait : if need come to use the matter, but not to expose the Holy Father to attack" (September 25, 1890).

CHAPTER XXIII : TOWARDS EVENING

“The end of man is the glory of God. The end of a Christian is the greater glory of God. The end of a priest is the greatest glory of God.”—
MANNING : *The Eternal Priesthood.*

MANNING'S last years were lit by a singular peace. His battles and controversies were over. All his opponents had passed away, and his memory was peopled by Victorian ghosts. Already his name was turning up in dead men's lives. His name and Gladstone's were the targets for all the scribes of journalism, whom he used to divide into “Bluebottles, Petroleurs, and Professionals.” He used to huddle over the solitary fire for hours, “the only tongues that are silent and tell no fibs,” dipping his red skull-cap from time to time into the warmth, as though to scoop a little heat into his old bones. In his high-screened “armchair Riviera” he sat back and remembered. Ambitions ecclesiastical were all fulfilled; and as for politics, he wrote to George Russell: “As I go to bed I look out and see the light on your clock-tower, and I say to myself: ‘If I had been able to have my own way and to go there, what a rascal I should have been by this time!’” Under the flow of heat he scratched away diligently with his pen. “It is true that I am so old and indolent as to write on my knees, not in profane imitation of sybils and prophets, but because sitting up at a table is wearisome.”


To Jowett he wrote within two years of death (February 28, 1890):

“There are many things I should like to hear from you, for I think that if the North and the South Pole could sit over a good fire they could interchange many things of their long experience. And now as to the Balliol Cricket Ground, as a Balliol man and one of the Harrow eleven, my whole will would be to help the



Walter L. Collo. Sc

Cardinal Manning
in his 85th year.
from the portrait painted for E. C. Bodley.
by A. D. May
1891.



Towards Evening

purchase of land. But I have six parishes without a church and more without a school, and for all such works I have nothing but the gifts and offerings which come in uncertainty and from time to time unlooked for. This is my real state, and I have not the power to give."

From time to time he was in the habit of writing notes or experiences for Vaughan, his chosen successor, to impress him with his University veto or his attitude to the Orders. Yet he seemed to hold a fair balance between Religious and Secular: "I have cut out of Secular Missions the following:

1. Tower Hill, Oblates of Mary.
2. West Brompton, Servites.
3. Stratford, Franciscans.
4. Rosminians, exchange of two Missions for one.

And I have cut no Secular Mission out of a Regular." Yet sometimes he groaned at the superattractions of the Religious: "Our dear Cardinal (Wiseman) covered the diocese with Religious Orders. It saved trouble, and left the Secular Clergy in a depression from which they have been only slowly rising. Farm Street has wrecked Warwick Street and injured Spanish Place seriously. The Carmelites have drained the Cathedral and drawn all rich families from Bayswater. The Italians killed Saffron Hill. The Dominicans are killing Hampstead. The state in which I found St. Edmund's you know. The Secular Clergy are at this time hardly able to maintain their churches. Thank God we have the poor, and that is our Lord's work. I have doubled the number of convents and the houses of teaching brothers."

These lamentations have not been justified, for under ampler times both Religious and Secular houses have thrived together; but there was undoubtedly a phase in which the former were predominant which weighed heavily on the old man's heart.

His dwelling, which could be mistaken for a Dissenting chapel doing duty as a railway waiting-room, was the

Henry Edward Manning

most mournful specimen of Bleak House, with surrounding chimneys instead of trees, and for a park the open yawn in the vista of bricks, devoted to the future Cathedral, which he called his farm. He was a Londoner of Londoners, and a Cardinal to Cockneydom. He confessed once to Cardinal Cullen: "Since we parted in Rome I have only been once out of London for ten days together." But in this cheerless house there were fresh flowers, sent from Lavington daily by Mrs. Wilberforce.

He spared neither himself nor his secretaries. In 1866 he acquired Dr. Johnson, who once went on holiday, but thought better of it before he reached the station. Manning's holidays took the form of occasional Temperance Crusades. When Father Fenton fell ill as secretary, he received word, "*Sub sancta obedientia* I command you to get well," and he did, though he believed at the time he was dying. Manning really liked discomfort for himself and those about him. He wrote to Mrs. Butler: "For once you have caught somebody more wilful than yourself. Since 1838 I have never had curtains or carpets except what you see in my rooms. There is no affectation or mortification in it, but I like it. It does me good. In furnished rooms I am not quiet." He read through his old diaries and letters, destroying and scissoring to his heart's content. The good resolutions he had written before consecration he read over twice, and each time added a note:

"God knows how I have fallen short of my resolutions and of my life. But so far as I know I have not turned back, not turned aside. God, not my will, has kept me out of the world, though working in it and among my priests. I hope I have lived among them and for them. At Christmas I ended fifty years of active work. I feel that the time of the end is come, time to rest and time to make ready, and I feel content, thankful, and without desire, except for a good end and the presence of my good Master" (June 7, 1883).

Towards Evening

“Once more I have read over this book. Last Saturday was the twenty-fifth anniversary of my consecration, and this is my silver jubilee year. My chief if not sole desire is to make a good end. In a month’s time, if I live, I shall enter my eighty-second year. Abide with me. Dwell in me. Pervade me. Cast out of me all that is contrary to Thy holy will” (June 13, 1889).

Like dying Archbishops, he found intercourse with Rome was loosening. He wrote (November 13, 1891): “As to Italy and Rome, I hardly know to whom to turn. My old friends are dying off. Some years ago I tried to get them to understand vivisection; but they were imposed upon by surgeons and empirics.” Teetotalism also made no appeal to Roman circles. And on the Oxford Question Rome was receiving the advice of others. Manning had renewed his private interest in Balliol, sending a copy of Aquinas to his old College. Jowett answered (December 10, 1889): “Accept our best thanks for the splendid volume of St. Thomas Aquinas’s works. We should be much obliged if you would communicate to the Pope our grateful thanks. Are you aware that we have a Saint at Balliol College, St. Richard of Dundalk, a great medieval ecclesiastic about 1300?” He did not add that Father Parsons was once bursar at Balliol! In virtue of a subscription started by Mr. Harold Boulton, a fine portrait of the Cardinal by Anderson was presented to Balliol. To Mr. Boulton the Cardinal wrote: “I hope you are right in saying that our rising manhood has more virility than these modern Anacreons. And I have been anxious about Balliol. It used to create men; I hope it will not end in a race of Mysians.” Manning feared Pater’s influence more than Jowett’s.

After the failure of the Catholic College in Kensington, Manning was hard pressed. Finally the Duke of Norfolk sent his nephew, the son of Hope Scott, to Oxford, with the consent of the Bishop of Southwark. The Duke informed the Cardinal (January 18, 1889):

Henry Edward Manning

Private. I know that in all this we have taken the course prescribed, but I fear, nevertheless, that the result come to is one of which you personally would not approve, and I feel real pain at having felt it right to take so important a step in spite of such a belief. I am anxious, however, that you should know exactly what has passed, and hope you will believe that I have acted as I thought to be right."

Manning was beyond making a fight, and, having collided once with the Duke on the Irish Question, wrote with suppressed feeling (January 19, 1889) :

"I thank you for your kindness in making known to me the decision you have come to in respect to James Hope. The feeling which prompted you to write restrains me also from any expression except to rectify one point. Every personal feeling I have is and always has been powerfully, and perhaps more powerfully than in most men, on the side of sending Catholic youth to Oxford. But every conviction I have as a Catholic and for the Catholic Church in England, confirmed by all I have learned and seen in eight-and-thirty years, compels me to suppress all personal feeling. I say this because in your letter you speak of my personal feeling. But I will add no more."

At the same time he wrote to Vaughan (January 21, 1889) :

"The act of the Duke of Norfolk is a shock to me. He knows what the Holy See has said and what the Bishops for twenty-four years have done. And now we have Denbigh and the Duke openly going against our whole and known action by mere wilfulness. And this when Oxford has become a moral wreck and has admitted women. I thank God that neither you nor I have ever swerved. We have nothing to answer for."

Nevertheless, he allowed Vaughan to go to Rome, whence the latter wrote (November 16, 1890) : "I find from Cardinal Simeoni that the University Question was on the eve of a general discussion. Your old letters had been brought out, and everything looked favourable for

Towards Evening

a solution, when the Pope ordered the subject to be laid aside. The Duke, the Bishop of Southwark, and, I believe, of Clifton, had intervened." December 15, 1890: "I tried the Pope on Oxford and Cambridge, but he would not. His policy is to do nothing that might displease the Powers, and he thinks a decision against the Protestant Universities might, especially as we have no Catholic University and he lets Catholics frequent the Italian University in Rome." A few years later it fell to Vaughan to carry out the reversal of Manning's policy, but Archbishops mercifully neither watch their successors nor read their own biographies.

In old age the Ultramontane Cardinal felt a gentleness toward "the little church under a green hillside, where the morning and evening prayers and the music of the Bible English for seventeen years became a part of my soul." A few weeks before he died he disposed the family Bible through a letter to Mrs. Gasquet (November 8, 1891): "In writing yesterday I forgot to say that Caroline Austen ought to have the Bible for life, then you, and then Willy and I. I do not wish it to go out of our direct line." He had revisited Lavington once after dedicating the Catholic Church at Burton Agnes, and, going into his old church, said to Reginald Wilberforce, as he put his hand on the Scripture, "Times change and men change, but this never changes."

Reginald, as son of Mrs. Samuel Wilberforce, was Squire of Lavington, and Manning was anxious he should follow his sister into the Catholic fold. While Manning rarely would mention conversion to outsiders or even to friends like Lord Brampton, who became a Catholic after his death, he was insistent to his own relatives. "Where would you be if you died to-night?" he asked Reginald, who replied he hoped in the hands of God. To another nephew, Basil Wilberforce, Archdeacon of Westminster, the Archbishop thereof also addressed monitions:

Henry Edward Manning

“It would give me much pleasure to see you all, though you are a sad medley of schism, nationalism, and ambition. By nationalism I mean a Christianity which rests upon human authority, and by schism you know what I mean. There are no knots in one is one. But you will slip like an eel.

“Do not go blindfold. There are but two paths. There is or there is not a Divine teacher in the world. We are either disciples or critics. There is no third path. Make haste and go over the bar, or the Herodians will take away the little faith you and Charlotte have left.

“The Inquisition in Spain was in the hands of Government. No doubt many ecclesiastics were responsible for it. But the Church was not. The cruelties of burning belonged to the Imperial Code before the time of Constantine. And women were burnt in London in 1776 for forging coin. We have all been sinners together. Do not let us be Pharisees. As to the Inquisition in Rome, it was free from cruelties, and Spaniards fled there for protection. As to St. Bartholomew, it was an outrage in time of civil war, like Cromwell’s massacre in Ireland.”

His desire that the Wilberforce name should become wholly Catholic is explained in a letter he wrote a few weeks after conversion. “My belief is that the so-called Evangelical Movement is in spirit of the Catholic Church. Who restored frequent communion? St. Francis de Sales, Fénelon, Henry Venn, and Henry Blunt. And how are they rewarded? Every Evangelical name is now inscribed in the Catholic Church—Wilberforce, Owen, Ryder, Cunningham, Simeon, Woodward, Sargent, and many more. I look on this as the blessing of God upon the children for their father’s sake.”

To the Dean of Westminster, Bradley, Manning had appealed for permission for Catholics to pray at the Shrine of St. Edward in the Abbey. The Dean replied (October 13, 1885):

“I have given orders (which were not really needed) to show all tenderness to those who would do more

Towards Evening

than pass through, but to avoid prolonged or too ostentatious displays of devotion, which cause so much irritation in unsympathising minds. Troutbeck tells me that there was no trouble at all up to 3 p.m. to-day !”

It was the Feast of St. Edward's translation. This recalls the faithful Anglican verger who once reported catching two visitors saying their prayers out of service hours !

Manning refused to consider Protestantism a term for perdition, writing to Miss Stanley : “ The best answer to those who say that if Catholics are honest they must believe all Protestants to be lost, is that the objector is mistaken. It is like saying, If Trinitarians are honest they must believe in three Gods.” At another time he proclaimed : “ The people of England are not heretics.” Deliberately they were not, for heretics chose for themselves, and the English had had their religion chosen for them in the sixteenth century. “ They are not responsible for dying inculpably out of the visible Body of the Church.” He judged sects, not by their level of ritual, but by their love for the Holy Ghost. “ Irvingism is an endeavour to find and to believe in the perpetual Office of the Holy Ghost.” Quakers he liked most : “ Mass has this in common with a Quaker service, that the celebrant need not be noticed or heard.” His tendency to the Salvation Army was very marked.

He disapproved of disestablishing the Church of England. “ Let us replace her in God's good time. Let us not dare to weaken her merely to do the devil's service.” And to a Dissenter like Stead he wrote : “ As to Disestablishment, we will do nothing to mutilate or destroy. Our Lord came to fulfil, and He gave us the work of building up. To pull down is the work of Abaddon, Apollyon, the Destroyer. I shall rejoice to see any work of good in the Anglican system, for I hold the nearer a man is to God the nearer he is to the Council of Trent.” To Canon Jenkins, his privileged

Henry Edward Manning

Anglican friend, he wrote : " While the world is drifting to chaos and suicide I have no will for controversies." They used to correspond in the form of sequences, sometimes humorously, as when the Cardinal wrote :

" My dear Abbot,—Your Metropolitan is no match for a monk, and you seem to have withstood him to the face for not submitting to Peter. The *Papa alterius orbis* is, I see, to hold another Pan-Anglican Synod to which, I fear from your letters, he will not cite me, and yet he is in communion with Reinkens. I look upon you all as the *reliquiæ* of St. Gregory's work, and your Christianity as our tradition mutilated and minimised. I can say from my heart, ' Christ is preached, and therein I rejoice and will rejoice.' Why does not your Primate rejoice in my Christianity ?"

About good Archbishop Benson they both became very mirthful, and the Canon a little malicious. For Archbishop Tait Manning had had a deep respect, and wrote a letter which was read to him on his death-bed, Miss Tait replying : " It was a great pleasure to him to know that you were thinking of him. We are now just waiting." Tait died, and Gladstone had filled the Primacy, not, as he might have hoped forty years before, with Manning, but with Benson, to whom Manning used to refer as his sister of Canterbury ! Benson used to complain very humorously that their relations were of the dog and cat order, as he was frequently compelled to attend public dinners by the threat that if he refused Manning would be asked instead, like the dog who is forced to eat his dinner by the calling of " Puss ! Puss !" The last time they met was at the Prince of Wales's garden-party in 1890. Benson told Manning it was his birthday. " And to-morrow will be mine," said the Cardinal. " The first Vespers of your birthday," replied Benson, " are the second Vespers of mine." A more curious coincidence was that Manning's birthdays, both temporal and spiritual, were the same as Hope Scott's.

Towards Evening

A number of Anglican dignitaries corresponded with Manning, who told Bishop Alexander of Derry that his poetry reminded him "of the Princess who had been a white cat, for now and then the poet bolts over the page very brightly"; and again he wrote: "I believe the old Archdeacon is not dead," and sent him *Religio Viatoris*. The Irish Bishop replied (November 28, 1887): "Truly do you in slender book your vast design unfold. Three of the four corners of your Faith you lay again for me also, with a strength which nothing can shake. Not so as to the fourth. Excuse me if I am to recognise a famous personality in the writer. I follow you with assent through three-fourths of your journey, with interest through the whole, and look with hope for a meeting when the course is over for those who have not travelled together quite the same way." Archbishop Thomson of York used to consult him on points of discipline, when he had trouble with his clergy, writing (June 14, 1888): "I cannot thank you sufficiently for the clearness and minuteness of the information which you have so kindly given me. It answers all my questions and far more. I shall preserve your letter not only for its use as an exposition of the law, but as a remembrance and witness of your kind courtesy." It is curious to find another Anglican Archbishop asking Manning to say Mass for him, and writing later: "At a time of terrible anguish I asked for your special intention for me at the Altar. Relief came to me in a wonderful manner, almost if not quite visibly supernatural. I am now in great anxiety about the circumstances of my family. I would again ask for your remembrance at the Altar."

With the "heretics" of the Anglican Church Manning corresponded freely. Mr. Voysey, the Gorham of his day, whom Archbishop Thomson excluded from communion, was a visitor at Manning's house, and even submitted his theistic sermons to him. In criticism

Henry Edward Manning

Manning wrote (February 26, 1889): "In parts I closely agree; in others I would ask whether you have fully thought out the subject. For instance, your belief that we argue in a circle about the Church and the Scriptures, is it not the fallacy of time? Whately put it, as you remember: 'A hen comes from an egg and an egg from a hen. Therefore,' etc. I said a very old affair and a very light one, but I think it has no circle in it, and it shows that Divine authority is inseparable from Divine truth." The Cardinal exchanged letters with Dean Farrar, whose denial of everlasting punishment made Purgatory or Universalism the logical alternatives. The Dean wrote (April 22, 1889): "There is nothing in what I urged in *Eternal Hope* which would not be entirely satisfied, as far as my own views are concerned, by the general doctrine of Purgatory in the Western Church and that of the Probatory Fire in the Eastern Church. I have always refused to accept Universalism as a doctrine, though I may entertain something resembling it as a hope. Indeed, the doctrine of *refrigeria* ending in the extinction of anguish as advocated by very eminent Western theologians would quite satisfy my view." Manning answered (April 25, 1889): "Universalism is excluded by the separation of those who die impenitent. But the doctrine of Purgatory is as large as your hope, which is short, of Universalism. It must always be remembered that it is only the penitent and saved that enter the state of purification, and they may be only not Saints or only not lost. They are already in union with God, but only not yet crowned. They are the holy souls saved eternally. But their salvation is here in life, not by change from separation to union after death." The Dean answered (April 26, 1889): "I gratefully acknowledge your Eminence's letter, which is full of interest and value. I am not a Universalist because, with the wiser Rabbis, I have learnt to say, 'I do not know.' There may be in the perverted human will a

Towards Evening

power of hardening itself as long as it exists. On the other hand, the Church has never condemned a hope even of Universalism, for Origen never was condemned for this view, but only for speculation about the salvability of the Devil!"

In these days a friend noticed a Salvation text on the Cardinal's walls, and asked if a Salvation lass had been there. "And I wish," said Manning with amused vexation, "that she had, and would persuade Catholics that the Holy Scriptures are not on the Index!"

It seemed to his stricter friends that he had become the friend of all good causes and of cranks as well. On the one hand, he wrote to Waugh, the children's friend: "The crimes of every day show that parental love cannot be trusted, and that children need the guardianship of public laws"; and on the other to Miss Cobbe on Vivisection to say that man owed no duty directly to the brutes, but he owed it to God, whose creatures they are, to treat them mercifully. "The highest counsel is always the safest and best, cost us what it may. We may take the cost as the test of its rectitude. I hope you will go on writing against this inflation of vainglory calling itself Science."

He must need have an aged hand in every reform that was going on, and hold out be it but a dying finger to every sect. But the Anglican Church came back as ever with all the human power of homesickness. Had he not written to Mrs. Coventry Patmore in the first year of his cardinalate (and he felt even more so in the last):

"I often think that the time when I was seeking, and drawing near to, the Divine Reality had in it more *human* solace and support than the present. I say *human* because it was chiefly so. It was a religion in 'the fields at eventide,' and a church without warfare, with the beauties of nature, and with the imaginary world of faith seen at a distance. Nevertheless, it was

Henry Edward Manning

a good training and a school of Divine truth. I never cease to bless God for the old daily service and the steady reading of the Bible through and through. This has been my salvation"?

Especially had he developed a strong sympathy for the Salvation Army, long before it was so generally esteemed. Of General Booth's *Darkest England* he wrote: "Who shall forbid him? If sheep are lost it is the shepherd's fault. He may have been sleeping or dreaming in a fools' paradise, or sounding his pastoral music in a refined life of blameless morality without a shadow of the Cross, or, to come nearest to the reality, he may have inherited a work which the neglect of his forefathers has put beyond his reach." They met in 1890, and the General wrote: "I retain the feelings of pleasure created by our interview. There are several things in which we are both deeply interested, and on which I would much like the benefit of your experience." Manning wrote to him (October 30, 1890):

"You have gone down into the depths. Every living soul cost the Most Precious Blood, and we ought to save it, even the worthless and the worst. After the Trafalgar Square miseries I wrote a *Pleading for the Worthless*, which probably you never saw. It would show you how completely my heart is in your book. No doubt you remember that the Poor Laws of Queen Elizabeth compelled parishes to provide work for the able-bodied unemployed, and to lay in stores of raw material for work."

Booth replied (November 4, 1890):

"I am thankful that you are in sympathy with the scheme I have propounded. I think it should have a fair trial. I did see your *Pleading for the Worthless*, and appreciated it. Something must be done, and that immediately. You cannot reason with starvation. Arguments are thrown away upon despair. I have received very friendly messages from the Prince of Wales, the Bishops, and many more. But these won't float me off."

Towards Evening

Another derided sect whom Manning defended were the Jews, whose Synagogue, he insisted, was the grandmother of the Catholic Church. He wrote to Bishop Wilberforce as far back as 1850: "As to the Jews, my belief is that the Church of Rome is doing more among them than any other body. The Jews of Protestant countries are extensively unbelievers. And I believe the Septuagint has been and will be the mediating canon between the old Hebrew and the New Testament as the Synagogue blended with the Church." His interest remained, and he moved the resolution at the Mansion House protest against the Russian massacres. He envied the Jews their social organisation: "The Jews are taking better care of their working girls in the East End than we are. What are our people doing? Oh, I forgot; they have no time. They are examining their consciences or praying (with dear Mrs. Craven) for success in finding a really satisfactory maid." An ironic humour stiffened his old age: "We are putting up statues to Saints instead of being them." And then he used to suggest a confraternity dedicated to Balaam's ass, or sigh, "There was a time when there was grace."

As for the murder ritual of which the Jews were accused, Manning wrote to Chief Rabbi Adler: "You only do me justice in believing that I have neither sympathy nor credulity for such horrors." The English Jews presented Manning with an address for his jubilee, signed by Lord Mayor Isaacs, Rabbi Adler, and Lord Rothschild. To Sir John Simon Manning later wrote sublime words (December 8, 1890) on behalf of

"a race with a sacred history of nearly four thousand years; at present without a parallel, dispersed in all lands, with an imperishable personal identity, isolated and changeless, greatly afflicted, without home or fatherland; visibly reserved for a future of signal mercy. Into

Henry Edward Manning

this I will not enter further than to say that any man who does not believe in their future must be a careless reader, not only of the old Jewish Scriptures, but even of our own. It is not our duty to add to their afflictions, nor to look on unmoved, and to keep the garments when others stone them.

“If we know the mind of our Master, who prayed for them in His last hour, we owe to them both the justice of the old law and the charity of the new.”

An instance of the care and affection he lavished on a humble seeker in his last years appears in his letters to a certain lady, who had been a friend of Mazzini before she became the convert of Manning, who wrote to her :

October 3, 1889: “I think I can discern and divine much that you will say of yourself. God has been nearer to you than you know.”

October 13, 1889: “I know that an intellectual religion may be only a *fides diabolica*. Light without love is a state of separation from God. And yet the soul must be conformed to God in all its powers, heart, will, interest, and intellect. And it is by the sanctified intellect that the heart and will are conformed to the will, love, and intelligence of God. For this cause He has revealed Himself, and His revelation conforms our intelligence to His. Therefore we are bound to seek a definite knowledge of His revelation; for there can be no knowledge of what is indefinite. Truth has its own outlines, as every substance has its own form. Do not take cares or sorrows too much to heart. Even sorrow for sin is a calm, peaceful, and cheerful sadness.”

October 30, 1889: “Bossuet says ‘the best director is he who soonest makes those whom he directs able to go without him.’ I do not know where you have found your notion of ‘tyranny.’ Faith is an act of free-will. Every moral action has excellence in the measure of its freedom. The Gospel is the law of liberty, and none are really free but those who are guided in the way of faith by the Holy Ghost.”

November 4, 1889: “The head of the Church on

Towards Evening

earth is infallible, but not impeccable. A Divine assistance guards him from misleading the Church in faith and morals. But he is on probation like all other men. I have no care to defend any sin in any Pontiff, because I know that Caiaphas was high-priest, that as such he prophesied, that he crucified the Lord of Glory. No Pope has done worse, and yet his office is of Divine institution. The Divine element in the Church is immutable. The human may corrupt and does corrupt. The Church is not on probation, but is the instrument of probation as Witness, Teacher, and Judge. Think these things out critically, asking for light and a calm discernment."

November 21, 1889: "I fully believe that the Oriental theism is a Divine revelation in its source and tradition in its perpetuity. Nor is there condemnation of anything but falsehood or of anyone but those who are consciously false. The Catholic Church alone teaches the universality of truth and charity. Truth has an authority which demands obedience. It lays a jurisdiction on the reason, conscience, and will, because it is true. Falsehood has no jurisdiction."

December 13, 1889: "I never hinder those who are sincerely seeking the truth in their reading of books which contradict it, as it seems to betray a fear. Therefore, if you will read Littledale's book, I will send you Father Ryder's examination and answer to it, from which you will see how little Dr. Littledale is to be trusted. Would not your difficulty about the limitation of the Divine presence and operation apply to the Incarnation? The sun has a visible disc, but its effluence and influence has no perceptible limit. The widest circle has a centre."

December 31, 1889: "Life goes before symmetry or organism. The life of the Church is the Life-Giver, the Holy Ghost. The fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians draws this out with great precision. On this Cardinal Newman's book on Development is clear to self-evidence. But your letter opens another world, a subjective world. The Hindoos worship the small-pox as the Romans did the fever, out of fear. But the love of God in Jesus Christ casts out fear, because fear

Henry Edward Manning

is torment. Still, a fearful conception of God chills and depresses the soul for life. Is it not strange that we do not realise the love of God as we do the warmth of the sun? Try to forget yourself in the revelation of God."

March 2, 1890: "How is it that the Catholic Church is darkness to you? Is not the darkness on the north side of the wall, where the sun is not seen? Come round to the south side, where it shines all day. There was when God made the world only light and bliss. Sin brought in darkness and sorrow; but sorrow is of two kinds—the sorrow of God working salvation and the sorrow of the world working death. Now, your sorrow is not the sorrow of the world. It is the sorrow of a mother for the son of her love. It is a faint reflection of the sorrow of the Mother of Jesus at the foot of the Cross. In all that your son suffered and in all that you suffer for him remember the Passion of Jesus, and the Compassion—that is, the participation of His passion—of His Mother."

April 1, 1890: "I promised to send you a Rule of life. Now, a Rule of life is only like setting the hands of a watch unless the mainspring is right. It is like Time, which does nothing, but all things are done in Time. A few rules are better than many, for many rules become a net and a burden. They tend to a mechanical practice and then to weariness and laxity. A few rules well kept lead to perfection, as all harmony comes out of eight notes."

August 22, 1890: "There is nothing to hinder your entering the Catholic Church. You have already taken the first and chief step, and have hardly anything to add in confession. What you need is the peace which follows the decision of hesitation and the grace of the Holy Sacraments. I have, as you know, refrained from urging you because I regard your state as in heart and will already united to the Church. The catechumens even before Baptism were of the soul of the Church, though not as yet of the body, and if any of them ceased to live they were buried with the burial of the Church."

It was typical of the interest he took in the most obscure individual. As he wrote another time: "I

Towards Evening

have a great belief in the existence of Saints in secret, and especially among the poor."

There was no end to kind and careful letters written to timid or scrupulous penitents. To one he wrote on the old question (January 23, 1884):

"You hear people ask whether God cannot hinder sin and evil, and if He can, why He does not. God might have made us as machines without knowledge and will, or He might have made us like sheep and oxen, with no power of knowing right from wrong. But in His love and goodness He has made us in His own image and likeness. This is the happiness of a creature, to have a will and to be like its Maker. All good comes from the will of God and all evil from the abuse of our own free-will. It is indeed a great responsibility to be made in the likeness of God, but who would rather be made like an ox or dog, without a moral nature and without a will?"

March 17, 1884: "I well remember the effect of Southey's book on my own mind fifty years ago, and do not wonder at its effect on you. After reading all the follies, superstitions, outrages, and sins swept together by Southey, take and read the New Testament. The Church has never had any share in the sins of its members. It is like the light which falls upon all the rottenness of the earth, but is never tainted by it."

July 18, 1885: "You do not tell me whether you had your communion at Clapham. I was the more anxious that you should because you were going into the Wilderness where there is no Manna. It is not good to get accustomed to having no Mass. The grown people in the time of Queen Elizabeth felt at first the loss of the Holy Sacrament when the altars were thrown down. But the children soon became accustomed to the empty churches. The Blessed Sacrament strongly concentrates the thought and the sense of the Divine Presence. It is the point of contact between the visible and the invisible world. It is to us what the visible form of our Lord was to the Apostles. They saw His Manhood, not His Godhead. We see another form which He has willed to take to Himself.

Henry Edward Manning

“(See what you have done. This came from the Dead Letter Office. H.E.C.A. No doubt they read all about Queen Elizabeth.)”

August 21, 1885: “Never hesitate to write. It does not take up my time. Can you fast so long as to go to L—, for I suppose that to be your nearest church? If so, you may go to Communion at once. Be silent as to Confession. If asked, say, My director has bid me to go to Communion, and answer no more questions. Examine yourself carefully on the Beatitude, ‘Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.’ Anything contrary to this is a bar to the Holy Communion, and this is the point in which many fail. As to wanderings and distractions, do not be afraid or cast down. They are faults only when they are wilful or indulged. They come down when you are in the presence of God as flies do upon honey.”

January 26, 1889: “You may perhaps not be able to go to Mass to-morrow, and I therefore send you a Sunday letter. . . .”

February 1, 1889: “Your letter was full of good news. First that you had been to Mass. You may think of the privations and efforts of our people under the Penal Laws. Give my blessing to the good people who drove you over to O—. Next the good account of yourself. I had full hope that the change and the sights and sounds and suns of the country would do you good. It is the chief sanctuary of God, next to the Blessed Sacrament, and full of all beauty and peace. Keep your whole soul open to its teaching. I often think how I should enjoy the quiet of the country, but then I remember that the post would bring letters from my Vicar-General and a shoal of cares every day. But you have no diocese, and may enjoy the rest and quiet of trees and birds and flowers and fields.”

And out of shoals of chips and scraps these are typical (December 13, 1886): “My dear child, now I know why you looked with an evil eye at my black overcoat, and said the binding was worn out and that I wanted a new one. You wanted it to keep old Hub warm. So I will send it to-morrow with some other things to you.”

Towards Evening

“I will see Sister Teresa to-morrow, and the little waifs shall not be evicted. It is all heart-breaking, and you see a death by starvation in Bethnal Green.”
“Send me the name and address of the poor woman who needs an eye. . . .”

The time came for Manning to close the two most important correspondences of his life—with Gladstone and Ullathorne. Manning’s conquest of Ullathorne, followed by a quarter of a century of frank friendship, was a triumph of tact, and added enormously to the power of his administration. As a simple Protonotary he had fought him in Rome as only the subtle son of Oxford could deal with the stiffest chip off the old Catholic block. Letters of Vaughan to Wiseman from Rome recall the far-away atmosphere of their first bout (February 22, 1862):

“Dr. Manning has been here and told me of his late interviews with Mgr. *Ego Solus*, the Bishop of Birmingham, as someone has named him. He has come out in his true colours, Anglican and Gallican in the strongest way. He has tripped himself up and dropt again and again into the power of the Protonotary, who, though exceeding courteous and amiable, does not in the least object to cutting his legs off, and that operation seems to be in the course of being satisfactorily done. Dr. Manning says he never before had an idea of what you must have had to go through with him in the transaction of business; the sensitiveness and crochetyness of Mgr. *Ego Solus* are beyond anything he was prepared for.”

April 19, 1862: “Dr. Manning has been most active in incensing [*sic*] the Cardinals with your view of the case and with the importance of maintaining the proper relative position of the Metropolitan. How much Dr. Manning has influenced in the right direction I suspect he does not even himself know. I hope you will not delay long to come out here. Dr. Manning has been having a long fight against Dr. Ullathorne and Co., and it is time you came and finished things off. It may be, and I dare say is, that the Bishops are to have things

Henry Edward Manning

said to them which may make it desirable that they should have the *columna veritatis* to lean against if they feel sick and faint."

It was Manning's championship of the Metropolitan See against the English Bishops, like Southwark and Birmingham, which made him so admirable a successor to the fruits of his own labours, and afforded Vaughan and the successors of Vaughan so distinct a primacy to inherit. Ullathorne lived to serve and love the man he could not defeat, and after twenty-five years the last of the old Vicars-Apostolic wrote (June 23, 1887):

"It is a well-known fact that *semel paralyticus semper paralyticus*. It therefore becomes my conscientious duty at once to petition the Holy See for my retirement. Having had great cares upon me ever since the year 1832, when I was sent out a mere youth to be Vicar-General of Australia, where I had no Bishop and great difficulties to encounter beyond what is known, and having to lay the foundation out of which so much prosperity has sprung, having had to take the Western District of England when it was utterly bankrupt, having had to take up the Midland District, when it was in a similar state of financial bankruptcy, I do think that now in my state of prostrate infirmity I am entitled to the compassionate consideration of the Holy Father. What, therefore, I ask your Eminence is that in charity even more than in policy you will kindly second my petition to the Holy See that this diocese may be provided with an efficient ruler."

Manning replied (June 24, 1887):

"I have read your letter with true sorrow. I had hoped that for years to come we should have had the support of your experience and of your mind, which is vigorous as ever. But God's will comes to us one by one, and to each in his turn. I make no comment on what you say, and whatsoever you bid me to do shall be done. Your letter calls up the six-and-thirty years that we have known each other. They have been years of friendship and of confidence, and both have been

Towards Evening

matured and confirmed as we have drawn on towards the end. I have to thank you for many acts of kindness, and especially for those you showed me when I first came among you, as a dead man out of mind to my former life. And it has been my consolation in the last two-and-twenty years to be in such full agreement with the old Vicars-Apostolic, and especially with yourself. I hope that any ailment you may have may be painless."

At Manning's request the Pope elevated Ullathorne to an Archbishopric, and Manning could write (Good Friday, 1888):

"I hope you are enjoying the rest which you have well earned and God has given you. When He gives us rest we have a right to it and may revel in it. You have the great resource of interest in books and in all things. We shall miss you much in Low Week, and we should be glad to see you as a *consiliarius natus*. We are ploughing on at the Education Commission, and on the whole all is well. But the County Bill will, I hope, decentralise education and protect us from a French Gambetta-Chamberlain Government atheism. I have great confidence in the 'live and let live' of the English people. If we are only prudent we shall be safe. Till you have your title I shall treat you as a Dowager!"

And so, as Archbishop of Cabasa, Ullathorne passed out of his life. With Gladstone Manning still kept touch until the end. At the Jubilee of the Colonial Bishops Fund, Gladstone recalled the wonderful eloquence of the Archdeacon, who had bidden the Empire be a beast of burden or evangelise the world, and Manning wrote (June 20, 1891):

"I have just read your words at St. James's Hall. They are to me very touching and generous. I remember as if it were yesterday that we sat side by side, and your kind words. Wonderful that we only should survive. For all my life since I can remember I have said, 'Christ preached every way is cause of joy, and therein I rejoice—yea, and will rejoice.' I am full of faith in the dispensation of the Holy Ghost, and I believe that He has breathed in a special way in these

Henry Edward Manning

days upon England and upon the English-speaking world." June 22, 1891: "Perhaps before we go we may talk over our strangely contrasted sixty years. We have quarrelled twice. Once I became a Catholic, and you quarrelled with me. And once you railed at Pius IX., and I quarrelled with you. Barring these we have never had a personal variance. Public opposition is inevitable, but honourable." Gladstone answered (June 23, 1891): "In bed and well blanketed, I can hardly touch on your very interesting opening words. I do not consider, however, that I have at any time had any quarrel with you. The first of the two occasions you name was not a quarrel, but a death. The second was a solemn judgment by you upon (believe me) a not less solemn act by me, an act which I should hate to repeat, but of which I do not repent. But I must not proceed. I should grow more and more impudent."

This seems to have been Gladstone's last to Manning, who wrote him a *bon voyage*, reminding him of his birthday (November 26, 1891):

"This year, beginning and ending with poor Parnell's tragic fall and death, has transformed Ireland. It is no longer revolutionary, Fenian, sanguinary, and hostile to England. The two peoples have a mutual goodwill. Ever since you began to give Ireland a ray of hope it has turned toward England, and if you will make the County Councils real and effective, the foundation of Home Rule will be laid. I want to know what has been done about the League of Proportionate Almsgiving. We are, I believe, poisoned by bazaars and gipsy tricks to get money without the motive of charity. This is teaching men to give by stimulants, which lowers the motives. But fashion reigns over us. I hope you are well, and that you will keep St. Thomas of Canterbury's day *sub meliore sole*."

A few days after the Feast of St. Thomas, Manning himself was taken with bronchitis. "When you hear I have taken to my bed you can order my coffin, in that I shall be like Lord Beaconsfield," he used to say. On January 9 of the New Year Vaughan arrived and sent him to bed. He passed his last Sunday waiting in

Towards Evening

loneliness. He did not wish to die, believing his tasks unfinished. On the Wednesday he was clad in his scarlet robes for the last time and when Vaughan told him he was a dying man, he made profession of faith. "It is pleasant to have been able to do everything," he observed. In the evening he refused a stimulant emphatically. He had received the Last Sacraments and the Papal Blessing, and had no desire to add a minute's span to his life by such means. During the night Vaughan and Dr. Gasquet watched by the bedside, and heard the last words uttered in the language of the Church: "*Deposui jugum, opus meum consummatum est.*" Dr. Johnson wrote that after passing about three and a half hours in making his preparation for death he lay like a tired child in a quiet sleep.

It was on this day that a curious incident occurred. A girl, who had been previously cured from illness, if not miraculously, certainly at the very moment the Cardinal said the *Angelus* for her, fell ill and died between his death and burial, as soon as his vital thought ceased to uphold her. Canon Vere recorded the incident.

The morning of the last day had dawned, and at eight o'clock, while Herbert Vaughan said the Mass, Cardinal Manning died without agony or sigh. Dr. Johnson gave him Absolution while Dr. Gasquet closed his eyes. Two-and-forty years previously to the very day the dead had written to Miss Stanley (January 14, 1850): "I feel no doubt that when the hour comes I shall have dying grace given me, and that I shall lack nothing, as Suarez (who had a lifelong fear of death) said at the last: 'I knew not that it was so sweet to die.'" Then was the Roman saying fulfilled that the Cardinals die in threes in honour of the Holy Trinity. On the same day died Cardinal Simeoni. And the third in their sublime company was Cardinal Agostini. When word reached Pope Leo he was exceedingly moved, and said: "A great light of the Church has gone out. I feel that my own hour is at hand."

Henry Edward Manning

Cardinal Manning lay in state in the London Oratory. Bishop Clifford, the last of Wiseman's Hierarchy, sang the Mass of Requiem, and Bishop Hedley of Newport preached the sermon (January 21, 1892). His body was carried through the fog-laden streets to Kensal Green, where it remained until it could be translated with the body of Wiseman to Westminster Cathedral. At the head of the grave was a cross of lilies of the valley from the Queen, and near by a wreath from Michael Davitt.

Behind the Bishops of the Church and the Peers of the Realm marched solid lines of the labouring men. Not till late that afternoon did the procession of chanting priests struggle into the cemetery. The greater number of the mourners who followed to the grave were drawn from the class who have lost most by the loss of the old religion, and who will yet decide what the last religion of England shall be.

There was mention of the humble in the proud words with which the Church sealed his tomb :

HENRICO . EDVARDO . MANNING

SS . ANDREÆ . ET . GREGORII . PRESBYTERO . CARDINALI
ARCHIEPISCOPO . WESTMONASTERIENSI
QVI . EX . ALIENO . IN . OVILE . CHRISTI . COOPTATVS
OBSEQVIVM . ERGA . ROMANAM . SEDEM
EXEMPLO . AVCTORITATE . MINISTERIO . AVXIT
PETRI . PRIVILEGIUM . ET . PONTIFICIAM . LIBERTATEM
STRENVVS . ADSERVIT
PARVVLORVM . TENVIORVM . OPIFICVM
MORES . COLVIT . OFFICIA . EDOCVIT . IVRA . VINDICAVIT
PASTORIS . BONI
OPVS . CONSVMMATVM . DEO . OBTVLIT

We may deplore the traces of the personal element in his administration or the intensity of his dislikes, even when justified, or the survivals of Puritan harshness in his character; but it remains to say that he stands well

Towards Evening

and nobly in the distinguished group of Englishmen who have worn the Cardinal's hat, from one of whom Shakespeare's tribute may be reapplied to Henry Edward Manning :

" This Cardinal
Was fashioned to much honour from his cradle.
He was a scholar and a ripe and a good one ;
Exceeding wise, fair spoken, and persuading ;
Lofty and sour to them that loved him not ;
But to those men that sought him sweet as summer."

What seemed to many of his own flock defects really led him towards the greater world policies of the future. His Ultramontanism led him into opposition to Bismarck and Prussianism. His apparent Socialism led him into the policy by which the Church has since struggled to win and influence labour. As his democratic policy has proved the only safeguard against the developments of Bolshevism, so his Irish views, if they had been adopted when they were expressed, would have prevented the British Empire being divided on the Irish rock, and his attempts to initiate union and understanding between the Hierarchies of England, Ireland, and the United States would have supplied that corner-stone, without which there can never be peace or trust in the English-speaking world. Time and perhaps centuries will be needed to estimate his share in the dogmatic history of the Christian Church ; but the present years have shown England how unwise it was to reject a prophet, whether he spoke warningly of Prussia or sympathetically of Ireland. No doubt the middle classes in England and the governing oligarchies rejected him both in religion and politics, but his funeral showed that it was upon the working classes that he had chiefly made his impression. Englishman and Ultramontane, he may not have qualified for the blessing promised to the meek, but by his social and international action at least he earned the Beatitude which is promised to the peacemaker !

APPENDIX

WISEMAN had not been long in making Manning his standard-bearer (July 4, 1855): "In my own name and in that of my brethren the Bishops, I beg to invite you to assist at the approaching Provincial Synod as a theologian and to preach at one of the sessions."

At Wiseman's hest and with Roman approval Manning founded the Oblates of St. Charles. Wiseman wrote (February 17, 1857):

"My other motive for writing is a more pleasing one, that of saying that this morning I have received a letter from Cardinal Barnabo informing me of the Holy Father's approbation of the Institute of Oblates. I trust therefore that our work will now proceed and prosper." February 27: "I congratulate you most sincerely on the satisfactory progress of your affairs. The blessing of the Holy Father is the sanction of heaven." March 21: "I highly approve of all that you have done and feel no uneasiness about results. For it appears to me that every step has been taken prudently, deliberately, and with only one object in view. If the Holy See approve and sanction it, it becomes the Church's work and so is safe."

And at the first occasion possible he pressed promotion (March 6, 1857):

"*Confidential.* I particularly entreat you that should the Holy Father name you Canon *vice* Dr. Whitty you will not decline. There are many reasons for it. It will be the first time the Holy Father will have exercised the prerogative of nomination and I wish the precedent to be given. It will be most gratifying to the Chapter. It will be acceptable to every class of Catholics. It will prove that the Oblates are not a distinct Order, but true

Appendix

secular priests. It will give at once a high position to the Institute in the diocese and stamp it with the strongest seal of approbation both from Rome and here. For everybody will and shall know that I have most fully concurred in the nomination. Indeed, I have told Monsignor Talbot that if the Holy Father should graciously think of naming you he need not wait for my opinion nor refer the matter at all back to me. You may speak freely with Monsignor about it, as I have no secrets for him." April 29, 1857: "Welcome back to England and to your great work. I shall be in London on Saturday morning, when I hope to see you. Your installation must take place at the first capitular meeting."

Manning immediately met stubborn hostility both as an Oblate and as Provost of the Chapter. In an undated letter Wiseman wrote to comfort him :

"My own mind can say, *Haud ignara mali miseris*. An accumulation of trials and sorrows can seldom be the result of natural causes, where there is no natural connection between them. Their combination is a Divine dispensation. You have now St. Philip's test that yours is God's work, that it is sorely tried. If it had been otherwise it would have made one fearful, or at least anxious. Be not, therefore, I entreat you, discouraged or bent down. The clouds will blow over and serene skies will again be over you. You may have to struggle on as yet for some time, but God's face will shine upon you; and you must bear the gloom of its hiding with quiet patience. I know by long experience to have to bear one's sorrows alone, silent and without a counsellor. I therefore wish you to know that there is one at least that sympathises fully in them, reckons them up, and feels them one by one."

When the Oblates were challenged by the Chapter, Manning's attitude was unflinching to his critics but humbly deferential to his superiors. At their word he was ready to annihilate himself and his works. Meantime he intended to carry on the work of God in England. To Wiseman he wrote (March 6, 1858) :

Henry Edward Manning

“I have tried to think of the subject of last night, but I feel that I can do nothing but place myself in your Eminence’s hands. The weighing of the two sides places me in a position from which I shrink : I am afraid of inclining to that which, if I know myself as I ought, I ought to avoid : and I am afraid also of crossing what may be the will of God. There is only one element in the question on which I have little doubt. I mean that the work of the Congregation is brought to a point, both in its material and moral part, that it would go on if I were to die now. For all the rest I wish to leave myself in your hands that whatever comes I may have the clear will of God through Superiors untroubled by any mixture of my own will.” Corpus Christi, 1858 : “Hitherto I can say that the priests of the diocese have manifested anything but kindness. All that I could do to show the priests that we wished to be useful I have endeavoured to do. Your Eminence is aware that Father Rawes and I divide the whole of the preaching here. And yet he has preached through Lent at St. Patrick’s, through May at St. James, and I at St. Mary Moorfields. Last month I preached about thirty-five times. This I have done in order to show from the first that we were *in auxilium proximi*, and had no will to make Bayswater a centre to the detriment of other places.” August 11, 1858 : “After I went home last night I was a long time thinking over our conversation. I only hope it did not break your sleep as it did mine. My chief care is that you should let me take the whole trial of all this on myself. All I wish is direction from you to make sure that I am doing what is for the greater good of the Church. This is the only point in which I wish help and light. For the rest I have had long years of real conflict beyond anything I can ever have again : and it all comes light to me. But it would gravely pain me if I added to your troubles. I have always felt that I owe to you under God the consolidation of my peace and strength in the Catholic Church by the speedy admission you granted me to the grace of the priesthood. I know what an act of generous and courageous confidence it was, and I trust I shall never give you or anyone cause to think it was misplaced. So in the work of the Oblates

Appendix

I wish the whole trial, if such must be, to fall on me. It does not move me or cause me a moment's undue anxiety to be sure of my ground. All the rest I do not mind. But I do care for involving you personally or as my Bishop, and with all that is on you, in any affair of mine. I believe myself by God's help to be able to carry this matter through without any disturbances to others or myself with your kind counsel from step to step."

Later Manning recorded his famous conflict with the Chapter (September 15, 1858):

"Searle then said, 'As this touches the *commodum* of the Provost I request him to retire.' I answered, 'As I am convinced that the term *commodum* has no application to this matter, I must with all respect to the Chapter decline to do so.' I added, 'There are two matters before us. One which touches me personally, the other officially: on the former I have offered every facility and I wish for a full examination of the Oblate Rule; on the latter I feel bound in conscience to offer all the obstruction I can.' Dr. Maguire then said, 'I propose that the Chapter adjourn for an hour to take counsel with the Canons as to the course to be pursued.' They then left the room gradually. . . ."

How identically Manning acted with his chief appeared in a subsequent exchange, Manning writing (December 1, 1858):

"Canon Last has just notified to me the extraordinary session of the Chapter for Friday next. I believe that I rightly understand your Eminence to interdict all further discussion and to confine the Chapter to the simple decision of registering your Eminence's decree; or of spontaneously cancelling all the irregular matter in the Book of Resolutions. I would ask you to oblige me with a single line to confirm or to correct my belief on this point, that I may be guided how to preside at the meeting of Friday."

Wiseman answered (December 3, 1858): "Though I may not see you, I ought to know immediately the resolution taken, as to-morrow is the short post. Every

Henry Edward Manning

rigour required by law must be observed. I will no meeting of Chapter till the end of January. Therefore I suppose no document, unless made fully out to-day, can pass the Chapter seal till then." Manning wrote the same day: "I go to this Chapter with a light heart and with a feeling that nothing can give me pain: for I have felt that all the pain has come upon your Eminence. I wish I knew how I could lighten it. I can only renew what I have said. Your judgment and will shall guide me as in everything. The work is yours. We will do all the labour with our whole strength and heart, and you shall direct. And it will be seen who has at heart the *jura episcopi*. . . . It will give me great consolation to submit the rule to revision in Rome. I have no wish or will of my own about it. And if I have any judgment of my own I submit it gladly and wholly."

Manning's dispositions and ground were so good that attacks even by the Coadjutor-Archbishop Errington and the other English Bishops eventually confirmed him not only in security but in triumph. Wiseman sent him into the Roman lists to defend himself and deliver his chief from the Chapter, the Coadjutor, and the Bishop of Southwark. As he wrote (January 22, 1859): "As to the Southwark question, I had consented (after the principles should have been settled at Rome) to allow the decision, whatever it might be, to be carried out by my Coadjutor and Bishop Grant. But now every thing has shown me and still more shows me that this would be putting matters into the hands of two combined together not in my favour. I should feel no confidence that one represented me or the interests of the diocese."

Manning would not have been human if he had bowed to Errington's attack. The blows against him were intended for his chief, and to defend his chief he moved indirectly against Errington. This appears in letters home to Wiseman. From Marseilles he wrote (December 31, 1858): "I have spent the day with the Bishop,

Appendix

who gave me Cardinal Barnabo's letter. Knowing your respect for the Bishop I went over my affairs with him. He considers that the Congregation has given every possible guarantee, and that it is essentially *la famille de l'Evêque*, but that without this principle of permanence it would possess no guarantee against an adverse mind. This led to other matters in which he was already prepared with some personal knowledge. And he repeated again and again, 'There is but one thing to be done, and it must be done.'"

From Rome he wrote (January 7, 1859):

"The conduct of the Chapter of Westminster is fully appreciated here, and if, as I trust, a thorough and complete remedy is applied to the personal causes which have produced it, it is perhaps better that it should be done without any act beyond the decree which your Eminence ordered to be inserted in the Chapter Book. The less personal conflict, the easier to make a change without leaving wounds to rankle." January 10, 1859: "People of all kinds have been busy and to some extent successful against converts. But I do not think it will last long. If the Church in England does its work it will be a Church of converts, and that will settle the question. I can see that this has been used against your Eminence. And where would England be now if the line taken by others had prevailed?" January 15, 1859: "Thus far I have reason to believe that the Chapter was right in no point, and I do not think I shall find that I was far wrong. And after the Synod your Eminence in person will visit the Chapter and correct all irregularities. But this is distant. Meanwhile the real and only cure must be applied. Friday next is St. Agnes' Day, and I shall say Mass for your intention. The walk twenty-one years ago has a strange ending. It seems always to end *dentro le mura*." January 26, 1859: "With instruments of your own, be they who they may, all must return into its proper channel and into your hands again, and the diocese will come round you. Such a step will be highly approved here, and though it may cost a little personal pain to you, it is the way of peace and of relief

Henry Edward Manning

to the diocese." January 29, 1859: "I will see Cardinal Barnabo immediately about the Southwark question. If it be said that the Vicars Apostolic founded them as seminaries or that the two southern dioceses and the five northern inherit in the person of the Bishop an equal share of the rights of the Vicariates, the answer is plain that, howsoever this may be as to trust funds, as to diocesan government it is impossible. Southwark cannot inherit a share of government in Westminster. Has there been any *sanatio in radice* of the union between Westminster and Southwark? . . . As to the personal part of the question, the Bishop of Marseilles was very strong in his wish that you should apply the only remedy. And I have reason to believe that all things are ripening to such a result. I have not thought this part of the subject entrusted directly to me, and have said little; but looking *ab extra* at the diocese has made me feel that this is the one question for far more than Westminster. . . . I have little expectation that any of the Bishops will be strongly with you except Birmingham and Hexham and perhaps Nottingham. Everywhere I have found but one opinion as to the impossibility of applying the rules of the Council of Trent to the Church as it exists in England. Now and then things come to me which show that the talk about old Catholics and converts is still at work. It did me good to hear Cardinal Marini say: 'We know nothing of these distinctions here, and for my part I will never hear of them.' I am afraid that this evil is working when I did not suspect it. It is a subject odious to me, and makes me wish to ask for my release. It would be a solace *rude donari*, and to get out of the way of those things which I believe to be grievous to the true mind of the Church and of the Spirit of God, who makes the last first and the first last, and sometimes does it to show our littleness and His own sovereignty. I accept all these things very willingly and without any complaining, for I believe that without mortifications and humiliations nothing can prosper and no one is safe. I have no doubt that the first Gentile Christians had enough of the same at Antioch and even at Rome." May 10: "If the old tradition were to prevail, the Church would never

Appendix

expand in England or re-enter the life of the English people. It would run on like a sect under the penal laws, jealous of our successes, and impoverished both spiritually and intellectually, both in itself and in its relation to the English people and the Government."

But Errington had not slept, and Manning wrote on his return to England to Talbot (May 24, 1859) :

"The chief thing I have to say is that Dr. Errington has been actively influencing the Bishops, of whom perhaps four go with him. The Cardinal will have told you of the interview he had with six who came to mediate for Dr. Errington, and of the subsequent acknowledgment of their chief, Dr. Turner, that he saw nothing could be done. At the Synod Dr. Errington will perhaps create difficulty; but I do not think it will have any result beyond the personal discomfort, for Rome has the last hand. The contest of the last year was inevitable; and its result is most beneficial. It has put the Cardinal and his work where it ought to be, above the harping and counteraction of a low party. I use the word low by choice, for so it is. The whole tone, spirit, and way of acting, both sacerdotal and personal, is low. And whatever other good qualities are to be found in Dr. Errington, Searle, the Chapter, their whole influence is low; and if it prevail every free man, who desires to live and work as a priest, would leave the diocese. I have seen my share of men in old days and I have known men act violently and bitterly; but I have never seen what the last year has shown me. When they had done their utmost in the dark to involve the Cardinal and me in misunderstanding and had utterly failed they accused him of falsehood. This was chiefly Searle's part. Finally Dr. Errington tells the Cardinal that his conduct is 'tricky and dishonest.' I understand all this in the mouth of worldly or bad men, but in the mouth of priests, not to say of men of education or of honesty, I have hardly known its like. It seems as if they were incapable of conceiving that any man can act for any motives but such as are low, base, selfish, false, and personal. I can in no way account for this moral insensibility except by what I have said. It is low-minded. And if it gains

Henry Edward Manning

ground among us we shall not only lose influence and power and vigour and generosity, but shall deserve to lose it. Dr. Errington, I hear, has written to Propaganda to ask that he may be called to Rome to defend himself. Who has accused him? And whom has he not accused? For a year he has been doing little else by us. And now because foiled he takes the line of an accused and injured man. I am glad it has come to the Holy See, for there all is right, happen what may. I desire nothing so much as that every act and word of mine should be known and tried at Rome."

Wiseman wrote helplessly to Manning (July 7, 1859) :

"I have just seen the Archbishop. He maintains that the decision at Rome is only negative, being, he thinks, the one of the Cong. Rit. which assigns a place to the Coadjutor but gives no voice, that therefore he will be there as any other Bishop, to whom the Synod can give a definite voice. He believes that anyone can prevent this. I told him that of course if I did this it would commence a discussion *in limine*, for it would be almost scandalous for me to have to oppose my own Coadjutor having a vote. Yet it is clear that in matters affecting my diocese and college, my vote would be neutralised by his counteracting vote; nay, his and Dr. Grant's together would give a most unnatural majority against me. I look forward now with deeper anxiety than ever to the Synod, for it is clear to me that he has made up his mind to have no personal consideration but to work thoroughly in an adverse sense. We must pray, and that is all."

Under the circumstances Manning thought it best to pray the Holy Father as well. He took a typically wider view than his adversaries, and, looking confidently into a future where Rome held the last hand, he wrote to Wiseman (August 7, 1859) :

"A religious said the other day of a person who was very much tired and opposed that he would find himself apparently abandoned by everybody except God only, that then he would thrive. I cannot help thinking that is just what God is doing with your Eminence, and that

Appendix

England, lay Catholics, Gallican Chapter are only the preludes to this last trial, which is to get you and your work in the light of the Holy See, and that before it is appreciated it must be questioned, as gold, before it is acknowledged, must be assayed. And this seems to me the critical and crowning time of your episcopacy and your life. I do not know how I have ventured to write all this except that you have so kindly given me a freedom of speech."

Wiseman himself struggled to Rome and wrote sheafs to his faithful auxiliary (December 19, 1859):

"Barnabo spoke quite kindly of you and the Oblates and did not hint the smallest dissatisfaction or suspicion. He mentioned that he foresaw and, I think, foretold you opposition and dislike from the Archbishop, who came, he said, with your rules *tutte apostillate* when here. He said that in defending his conduct at Synod he showed that the Congregation was the ground of all his quarrel and of his contradiction to me. The Archbishop denied to him that the Chapter had left you and acted acephalously, having only adjourned to study some question. It was clear to me that if the Chapter itself is not acting, the Archbishop is for it, and thus prevents matters being considered as finally settled. This I think unwise. The Pope has said strong things about the assumption of so much by Chapters, which, he says, are only quasi-Chapters having no prebends. The Dutch Chapters to which a similar constitution has been given have also begun to give trouble. . . . I was at the *Capella* yesterday, and had such kind greetings from my brethren. Such a contrast in warmth and affection to what I am accustomed to at home." December 31, 1859: "The Pope received the Archbishop (as he himself told Barnabo) with great sincerity; reproached him strongly with his conduct at the Synod. He said he wished to send in his justification in writing, and the Pope told him to make haste. Barnabo reasoned with him, but he says that he wants to go into the whole case of the Oblates, which B. says is the whole source of his opposition, saying that I see everything through your eyes and that you entirely govern the diocese. B. said, 'And even if it were so,

Henry Edward Manning

how does that justify your leading the Chapter to interfere in matters that are quite out of its competency?' Next day the Archbishop told Ullathorne that he was determined to fight. The Pope told Talbot to tell me to be at ease, as he has determined to take the matter into his own hands, and it should be settled to my satisfaction. To-day closes a year of some pain and anxiety, and the carriage is waiting to take me to the *Te Deum* at the *Gesu*."

The same day Manning wrote from London :

"It would be sacrilege to begin with anything but *buon capo d'anno*, in all its moods and tenses and voices. In my last letter I did not refer to the Archbishop's statement as to the Chapter's act in leaving me. For two whole days they had endeavoured to remove me from the Hall of the Chapter on the plea of the *commodum*. Had they succeeded they would have proceeded 'acephalously.' When they failed they withdrew. It is true that they adjourned, but that was their only way to act without me. In the last analysis it is simply Presbyterianism." January 6, 1860: "No decision can come amiss to me, for either way I shall be more than satisfied. I am glad that Cardinal Barnabo sees so clearly that neither anything on my part nor the Congregation can justify a Coadjutor in opposing the Bishop of the diocese and raising his Chapter against him and misdirecting them as to their powers and duties. Surely this stands by itself. But I have no desire to speak more of it. As to what the Archbishop has said of myself, I have still less desire to speak. I leave it all in your Eminence's hands." January 13: "However, I suppose all will be disposed by a supernatural guidance. If your Eminence approves I should like that Cardinal Barnabo shall see the letter I sent to you at Dover or the substance of it. The Archbishop in taking up the defensive would place me as the aggressor. The fact is the reverse." January 30, 1860: "I hope, too, that you have ceased to be anxious about the main question, for the Holy See has now heard and seen for itself with whom you have had to do, and all seems to me to be ordered providentially."

Appendix

The force of Errington's hostility to Manning brought Manning out of pastoral obscurity into the Roman lime-light, as appears in letters from the weary Wiseman (St. Agnes, 1860):

"The Archbishop has not as yet given up his paper to the Pope. All is therefore at a standstill. Cardinal Barnabo does not like to urge him on because it is a matter with the Pope and not with the Congregation. Nobody knows what line he is taking, except that he is having Talbot's letters translated. I suppose, too, he is going into the Oblate question. In that case it will be necessary that you should come to help me in my part of it, to sustain yourself and the Congregation against direct attacks on its rules, spirit, end, and work. . . . I am in the dark, and I have not got pugilistic strength. The idea of fighting dismays me. The Archbishop, Dr. Goss, and his three delegators, Dr. Grant, the Chapter, the French *Petites Sœurs*, in addition to the Synod, are more than I can get through, and I begin to feel as if it was not God's will that I should recover." January 27, 1860: "Moreover, I think unhappily, the Archbishop seems to have made the cause of the Chapter his, vindicating the conduct of it and himself as a common action. He has thus ripped up the old sore and compelled me to sue for judgment on it. His and the Chapter's conduct is vindicated on the ground that I govern the diocese and see everything through your eyes. Talbot has just called and told me he had seen Barnabo, who had a plan of action. It is a serious act to depose a Bishop without proofs, and the Archbishop asserts he never will resign. It is better to say plainly that the Archbishop is bringing the whole matter of the Oblates before the Holy See in an unfriendly spirit, and that I have thought it best for you to be on the spot to answer my questions and give every explanation. If you wish to wait till I can state the course pursued more definitely I leave it to your own judgment; but decision is often the greatest providence."

It was certainly so in this case, for the Pope with a sublime gesture relieved Archbishop Errington of coadjutorship—"a *coup d'état* of the Lord God," in the papal

Henry Edward Manning

parlance. "After all, *cognoscit suos Sedes Apostolica*," wrote Manning, and, as he reported from Rome the next year (December 2, 1861), "The Holy Father spoke of Dr. Errington exactly in the terms of last year: he said, *Non e cattivo ma di quel posto incapace*, and that he had gone wrong in principles and had condemned himself. He asked what effect had followed his removal. I said that the subject had fallen dead and that the feeling of the diocese was one of thankfulness."

It was Manning's tremendous share in this event that did not permit a Life of Wiseman to be written in Manning's reign; but he never feared that the papers would not one day justify his course. Cardinal Wiseman's papers, published and unpublished, afford an impregnable proof of the acts and dispositions of Manning during the Errington case, which has in their default been used too long to darken his memory. Wiseman wrote to Vaughan (January 21, 1862): "If anyone has insinuated that I have not placed or do not place implicit and the largest confidence in Mgr. Manning (which I hope my correspondence with him shows) he has grossly misrepresented or stupidly misapprehended me. I am sure that when the history of the Oblates from the *Libellus supplex* to my presiding at the Bayswater Conference last Wednesday is published, the finger of God, if not His whole hand, will be seen in it. The letter to Father Faber, when we are both gone off the scene, will show the first germ of the Congregation, the *libellus* being the seed which rotted in the ground, as was necessary for sound vegetation. The grain of mustard-seed has now shot up into a tree, and we must not be surprised if it tastes hot and pungent to some throats in swallowing its fruit. New work is springing up every day, *operarii autem (boni) pauci*."

The Errington case was settled in 1860. Manning continued to battle the Bishops in defence of Wiseman, who wrote (January 25, 1862):

Appendix

“I think you should enter a protest from me against the Bishops holding meetings apart, as if they formed a body corporate without the Metropolitan to discuss or concert affairs of the Province apart. Such meetings as those held at Belmont opening (where Dr. B. expressly said that if I had come, other Bishops would not have done so) or at Dr. Briggs’s funeral, when resolutions adverse to me were formally put and passed, have been most pernicious, injurious to peace, and scandalous.” March 1, 1862: “I fancy the Episcopate is roused to exhibition of its true colours. They have hauled down the Tiara and Keys and displayed their ‘Confederate’ flag, the Gallic cock that crowed against St. Peter. However, I have given up troubling myself much on the matter, but calmly await the decision of the Holy See. I am puzzled with Dr. Ullathorne’s conduct. The Holy Father said his resignation was caused by my written *scrittura*. But surely he must have seen the justice of my being permitted to do what he had asked and obtained leave to do? Then returning to *quiet* the Bishops. How have they shown themselves to be unquiet? Wherefore are they unquiet? If anything can have unquieted them it surely must have been his letters to them, his secret and personal attacks, his resignation, etc. For I have been silent as a mouse and quiet as a dove. . . . Patterson has startled me with the news that Dr. Brown (Salop, I understand) has sent in his resignation. If so I can hardly believe it. The Holy Father must adjure him *in nomine Petri*. Is or can the object be to compel me to retire? Certainly St. John Chrysostom applied to himself the words of Jonas, and I am ready to use them too, if the Steersman of Peter’s bark orders or suggests it.”

Manning wrote from Rome the next month (April 26, 1862):

“Morris tells me how kindly you have vexed yourself about the seven Bishops for my sake. Do not think again about it: I have had and perhaps shall have worse things than this. I can think that they would like to send your Eminence and me to eat lotus. I have been

Henry Edward Manning

trying to remember anything which could justify Dr. Ullathorne's onslaught. I can only remember that in the *Congressi* (which made me joke about the *penetrabile Episcopatus*), after I had borne for days a perpetual repetition of 'We as Bishops'—as much as to say, 'What can you know of our affairs?'—Dr. Ullathorne at last said, 'We Bishops look at this from the light of our episcopal administration, you from the side of the Holy See.' I turned it off by laughing and saying, 'Prototonaries are *creati ad hoc*. The Holy See set us as Bishop-takers.' Dr. Clifford *crassum risit*, as is his wont, and I thought all was sure to be bald play. At another time he said, 'Rome is always more and more limiting the original privileges of the Bishops, and we are anxious to be limited as little as possible, which is *purus fructus Gallicanismi*.' I said, 'I leave to Dr. Clifford to say whether the privileges of Bishops are limitations or concessions of the Holy See.' Can this be more than the pretext? Surely if there were not the will for other reasons this would not suffice. However, as I said before, if they did not think that I had stood between their blows and you they would not have levelled at me. And this contents me seven times."

INDEX

- ACTON, LORD, 188, chap. xiv.
 Adler, Rabbi, 485
 Alexander, Archbishop, 481
 Anderdon, Father, 39, 93, 298 *et seq.*,
 313
 Anderdon, John, 14 *et seq.*, 93
 Antonelli, Cardinal, 154, 158, 198,
 218, 225, 234
 Arch, Mr., 350
 Arnold, M., 451
 Ashbourne, Lord, 317
 Austin, Alfred, 221

 Bagot, Bishop, 38
 Bagot, Mrs. Charles, 125
 Bagshawe, Bishop, 336, 447
 Ballerini, Father, 305 *et seq.*
 Barnabo, Cardinal, 136, 142 *et seq.*,
 273, App.
 Beadon, Bishop, 3
 Benson, Archbishop, 373, 480
 Bevan, Miss, 9, 37, 39 *et seq.*, 54
 Bilio, Cardinal, 226, 252
 Bismarck, 239 *et seq.*
 Blunt, Wilfrid, 416, 420, 428, 430
 Bodley, J. E. C., Preface, 266, 449,
 463
 Booth, General, 168, 413, 484
 Boulton, Sir S., 7, 376
 Bradlaugh, 314, 318
 Bradley, Dean, 478
 Bridgman, Mother, 113 *et seq.*
 Bright, John, 330
 Brougham, Lord, 139
 Brown, Bishop, 216, 232
 Brownbill, Father, 98
 Buccleuch, Duchess of, 122, 283
 Bunsen, 72
 Burke, Father Tom, 186
 Burnand, Sir F., 122
 Burns, John, 371

 Butler, Dr. G., 10 *et seq.*
 Butt, Isaac, 204
 Buxton, Lord, 370 *et seq.*
 Byron, Lord, 10, 27

 Capel, Mgr., 186 *et seq.*, 226, 329
 Cardwell, Mr., 189, 191
 Carnarvon, Lord, 392, 399 *et seq.*, 404
 Chadwick, Bishop, 181, 229
 Chalmers, Dr., 54
 Chamberlain, Mr., 389 *et seq.*, 408
 et seq., 448
 Childers, Mr., 224, 235
 Churchill, Lord R., 319, 374, 416
 Clarendon, Lord, 191, 217, 220
 Clifford, Bishop, 139, chap. xi., 218,
 221, 231, 289, chap. xvii., 496
 Coffin, Bishop, 9, 228
 Coleridge, Lord, 338
 Cornthwaite, Bishop, 56, 151, 218
 Corrigan, Archbishop, 351 *et seq.*
 Croke, Archbishop, 193, 385, 391,
 403, 418
 Cross, Lord, 418
 Cullen, Cardinal, 96, 112 *et seq.*, 153,
 183, chap. xiii., 219, 226, 228, 235

 Dale, Dr., 451
 Dalgairns, Father, 312, 322, 323
 Darboy, Archbishop, 222, 240
 Darwin, 316, 333
 Davitt, Michael, 403, 415, 496
 Deschamps, Cardinal, 238
 Dilke, Sir Charles, 262, 268, 389 *et*
 seq., 448 *et seq.*
 Disraeli, 197, 198, 208 *et seq.*, 257 *et*
 seq., 328, 442, 444
 Dodsworth, Mr., 62, 81, 86, 93
 Döllinger, Dr., 81, 220
 Dufferin, Lord, 262
 Dupanloup, Bishop, 215 *et seq.*

Henry Edward Manning

- Edward VII., 71, 253 *et seq.*
 Edward, Prince, 255
 Errington, Archbishop, Preface, 129,
 chap. xi., 169 *et seq.*, 179, 180,
 218, App.
 Errington, Sir G., 386, 390, 466
 Errington, Michael, 153
 Estcourt, Canon, 19
- Faber, Father, 10, 12, 271, 273
 Farrer, Dean, 482
 Fenton, Bishop, Preface, 474
 Ffoulkes, Mr., 278
 Fisher, Father, 153
 Fisher, Canon W., 19 *et seq.*, 330
 Forster, Mr., 174, 384
 Fox, G. Lane., 125, 430
 Franchi, Cardinal, 215, 219, 280 *et*
seq., 466
 Freeman, Professor, 322
 Froude, 321, 333
 Froude, Mrs., 128
- Gallwey, Father, 294, 301 *et seq.*,
 340
 Gasquet, Dr., 339, 495
 Gasquet, Mrs., 3, 477
 George, Henry, 352 *et seq.*
 Giffen, Mr., 368
 Gibbons, Cardinal, 219, 228, 358 *et*
seq.
 Gladstone, Mr., Preface, 25, 27 *et*
seq., chap. vi., 86, 89 *et seq.*, 98,
 147, 173, 189 *et seq.*, 199 *et seq.*,
 216, 224, chap. xv., 493
 Gorham, 73, 88 *et seq.*
 Gormanston, Lord, 202
 Goss, Bishop, 126, 182
 Grant, Bishop, 56, 125, 128, 133,
 149 *et seq.*, 153, 228
 Granville, Lord, 235, 264, 266, 389,
 466
 Grey, Lord, 199
 Guidi, Cardinal, 228
 Guizot, 216
- Halifax, Lord, 253
 Hamilton, Bishop W., 25, 90
 Hare, Archdeacon, 50, 69 *et seq.*, 98
 Harrison, Frederic, 243, 317, 324
 Haynald, Cardinal, 214, 229
 Hedley, Bishop, 379, 496
 Herbert, Lady, 84, 157
 Herbert, Sidney, 8, 82, 86, 89, 100,
 112
- Hoey, Cashel, 210
 Hope, James, 25, 98 *et seq.*, 139
 Howard, Cardinal, 282, 309, 311
 Humphrey, Father, 295
 Huxley, Professor, 175, 320, 322,
 324 *et seq.*
 Hyndman, Mr., 367
- Ireland, Archbishop, 343, 366
 Isaacs, Sir H., 253, 485
- Jacobini, Cardinal, 264, 363
 Jenkins, Canon, 479
 Jenkyns, Dr., 25, 122
 Jenner, Dr., 7
 Jerningham, Sir H., 224, 243
 Jesuits, General of, 302, 309, 315
 Johnson, Bishop, 474, 495
 Jowett, Dr., 184, 472
- Keane, Archbishop, 360 *et seq.*
 Kenrick, Archbishop, 223, 227
 King, Mrs. H., 317, 378
- Laprimaudaye, Father, 46, 121
 Lavigerie, Cardinal, 222, 266
 Leahy, Archbishop, 208, 218
 Ledochowski, Cardinal, 243, 252,
 313
 Lee, Dr. F. G., 177 *et seq.*, 446
 Leo XIII., 252, 310, 312, 366, 379,
 380, 496
 Lisle, Phillips de, 176 *et seq.*
 Lubbock, Sir J., 316
 Lythgoe, Father, 297
- Macaulay, Lord, 56, 216, 332
 MacCabe, Cardinal, 338, 383, 386,
 453
 Macdonald, Sir J., 359
 MacEvilly, Archbishop, 389
 McGlynn, Dr., 352 *et seq.*
 McHale, Archbishop, 193, 218, 273
 Magee, Archbishop, 320, 462
 Maguire, Canon, 130, 157, 293
 Maltby, Bishop, 39, 68
 Mann, Tom, 368
 Manning, Caroline, 43, 47 *et seq.*, 51
 Manning, Charles, 6
 Manning, Harriet, 19
 Manning, William, 1 *et seq.*, 14
 Mary Clare, Mother, 113 *et seq.*
 Matthews, Henry, 445
 Maurice, Miss, 43, 72, 97, 107

Index

- Mayo, Lord, 208, 210
 Melchers, Cardinal, 342
 Meredith, George, 461
 Merivale, Dean, 14
 Meynell, Wilfrid, 336, 353
 Mivart, Professor, 187
 Moberley, Bishop, 25
 Monaco, Cardinal, 458
 Monsell, Mr., 125, 208
 Moran, Cardinal, 387 *et seq.*
 Moriarty, Bishop, 208, 218, 276
 Morley, Lord, 90, 433, 452
 Morris, Father, 149, 297, 462
 Mossman, Bishop, 178
 Murray, Dr., 171
- Nardi, Mgr., 257
 Neve, Dr., 145, 149, 154, 182
 Nevill, Lady D., 447
 Newcastle, Duke of, 99, 142
 Newman, Cardinal, 64 *et seq.*, 81,
 151, 169, 184 *et seq.*, 216, 247,
 chap. xvi., 319, 332
 Nicholson, Archbishop, 103
 Nightingale, Miss, 82, chap. ix.
 Nina, Cardinal, 282, 309, 311
 Norfolk, Duke of, 280, 282, 419, 475
et seq.
 Northcote, Stafford, 211, 318
- Oakeley, Canon, 149, 293
 O'Brien, William, 435, 436
 O'Callaghan, Bishop, 181, 234
 O'Donnell, F. M., 241, 318
 O'Reilly, Boyle, 195
 O'Shea, Mr., 389, 390, 394, 436
 Ollivier, Emile, 214, 219
 Oxenden, Bishop, 9, 11, 24
- Paget, Sir Augustus, 245, 256, 463
 Parnell, Mr., 318, 395, chap. xxi.
 Patmore, Coventry, 333, 334 *et seq.*
 Pelham, Bishop, 8
 Persico, Cardinal, chap. xxi.
 Phillpotts, Bishop, 72, 88
 Pigott, 434
 Pius IX., 82 *et seq.*, 93, 133, 154,
 191, chap. xiv., 251, 465
 Pollen, John, 38
 Pope-Hennessy, Sir J., 256
 Pusey, Dr., 61, 76, 101, 123, 273,
 276
- Reisach, Cardinal, 136
 Ripon, Lord, 282, 414, 426, 452
- Roberts, Lord, 461
 Robinson, Mgr. Croke, 187
 Ronan, Father, 114
 Rosebery, Lord, 345
 Ruskin, 321, 326 *et seq.*
 Russell, Sir Charles, 434
 Russell, Odo, 153, chap. xiv.
 Ryan, Canon A., 430
 Ryan, Elizabeth, 1
 Ryder, Father Dudley, 215, 286
- Salisbury, Lord, 265 *et seq.*, 450
 Sargent, Mr., 43
 Sargent, Mrs., 49, 69
 Scilla, Ruffo, Mgr., 470
 Searle, Mgr., 128, 139, 142, 157,
 303
 Selwyn, Bishop, 73, 97
 Senestrey, Bishop, 219, 226
 Shaftesbury, Lord, 11, 241, 318, 332
 Shuttleworth, Bishop, 68
 Sibthorpe, Father, 146, 170, 331
 Sidmouth, Lord, 3, 346
 Simeoni, Cardinal, 261, 309, 363,
 495
 Simmons, Sir L., 468
 Simor, Cardinal, 217
 Spalding, Archbishop, 217, 238
 Spencer, Lord, 212, 386
 Stanley, Miss, 104, 107, 112 *et seq.*
 Stead, Mr., 337, 459 *et seq.*
 Stephen, Fitzjames, 243, 324
 Sterling, 59
 Stonor, Archbishop, 146, 234, 262
 Strossmayer, Archbishop, 223, 227
- Tait, Archbishop, 26, 480
 Talbot, Mgr., Preface, 103, 129 *et
 seq.*, chap. xi., 172, App.
 Taschereau, Cardinal, 359
 Temple, Archbishop, 370 *et seq.*, 462
 Tennyson, Lord, 323
 Thackeray, 101
 Thomson, Archbishop, 481
 Tillett, Ben, 369, 374, 380
- Ullathorne, Archbishop, Preface, 143
et seq., 151, 169, 171, chap. xii.,
 195, 221, 273 *et seq.*, chap. xvii.,
 342, 491 *et seq.*
- Vaughan, Cardinal, 121, 126, 155,
 181, 221, 228, 260, chap. xvii.,
 335, 382, 413, 458
 Ventura, Father, 56, 84

Henry Edward Manning

- Vere, Aubrey de, 44, 104, 202, 333
Veuillot, Louis, 215, 466
Victoria, Queen, 74, 96, 218, 446,
496
Vincent, Sir H., 407
Voysey, Mr., 481
- Walsh, Archbishop, 356, 379, 387 *et*
seq., chap. xxi., 497
Ward, Mr., 15, 215, 275, 278, 280,
338
Ward, Wilfrid, 221, 273
Watts, 328
Weld, Cardinal, 56
- Wellton, Bishop, 14
Wellington, Duke of, 5
Wilberforce, Basil, 453, 477
Wilberforce, Robert, 86 *et seq.*, 105 *et*
seq., 121
Wilberforce, Samuel, 26, 43, 49, 74,
100, 156, 161, 200, 249, 250,
333
Wilberforce, William, 5, 19, 34
Wiseman, Cardinal, Preface, 56, 98,
103, 127 *et seq.*, 272, 332, App.
Wordsworth, Bishop Charles, 9, 13,
25, 344
Wordsworth, Bishop Christopher, 12

