
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE

CHURCHMAN

AUGUST, 1896.

ART. I.—CARDINAL MANNING.[1]

NO biography ought to have been more satisfactory to its subject than that of Henry Edward Manning. Every preparation was made by him for it. Careful diaries were kept throughout his life, and in later years they were carefully revised. Such parts of them as might not seem likely to conduce to the reputation of the writer were removed and new "notes" were substituted. Further "notes" were written for the avowed use of the author of the Life. The author of the Life was himself selected and primed with such information as the Cardinal thought would be useful to him in his task. From all this we might have expected an autobiography written in the third person. But the result is not probably what Cardinal Manning would have expected or desired.

The choice of the biographer was made with Manning's usual skilfulness. He recognised in Mr. Purcell a singular capacity of biographical writing, and appropriated that capacity to his own use, authorizing Mr. Purcell to write his biography, and ordering that all the materials necessary for the purpose should be supplied him, in spite of any opposition that might be made after his own death. Except as a biographer Mr. Purcell is unknown to us. He is not an Oxford or Cambridge man. Except where he is led by Manning's hand, he shows no knowledge of University men and things, and so falls into mistakes, such as confounding James and Thomas Mozley, describing Archdeacon Hare as "an Evangelical of the Evangelicals," and so on.[2] He is no scholar. Whenever he

[1] "Life of Cardinal Manning, Archbishop of Westminster." By Edmund Sheridan Purcell, Member of the Roman Academy of Letters. In two volumes. Macmillan and Co., 1896. Pp. 702 and 832.

[2] Mr. Purcell's depreciation of Dean (J. H.) Hook, "who represented the high-and-dry Anglicans, and pleased no one; he offended popular Protestantism, and perhaps still more by his shallowness, his

has to introduce Latin quotations he makes mistakes which would shock a lower-form schoolboy.[1] How much his title of "Member of the Roman Academy of Letters" implies, we cannot tell; but his knowledge of Italian and of Church history is certainly not proved by his writing *Laboro* instead of *Labaro*, and introducing us to a Melchior Camus. However, there is no doubt, from the specimen before us, that Mr. Purcell can write a biography—whether to the satisfaction or not of the subject of the biography we do not say. The motto that he has selected—"*Πολλὰ τὰ δεινὰ κοὐδὲν ἀνθρώπου δεινότερον πέλει*"—is singular, but not unjust. *Δεινότης* here attributed to Manning is not wisdom, but cleverness verging on cunning.

Henry Edward Manning, born in 1807, went to Harrow in 1822, and in due course to Balliol. At the University he read hard, but had the vanity to conceal the fact that he did so, partly in order that he might be prominent in other pursuits, such as athletics, and in society, and at the Union Debating Society—partly that it might be said that Manning got his First without reading. The list of First Classmen of 1830 is interesting—Anstice, Hamilton (Bishop of Salisbury), Manning, William Palmer (of Magdalen), Walker, Henry Wilberforce. Flushed with his success in the schools and at the Union, Manning gave up the idea of Holy Orders, for which his father had destined him, and resolved on a political career. As soon as he had formed the resolution, the means of carrying it out were destroyed by his father's bankruptcy. Parliament was closed to a penniless man, and after enduring a clerkship for a year at the Colonial Office, and finding there no hopes of rising, he threw himself sullenly back on the idea of the clerical profession, and was ordained without, according to his biographer, a "vocation to ecclesiastic life; the Church, like the bar, or the army or navy, was one of the recognised professions to which, on leaving the University, a young man, even though of no great promise, has a right to look as a convenient opening into active life" (p. 85). Perhaps this entrance into Holy Orders may explain much in Manning's career. Except during the short—perhaps the happiest and

half-heartedness, and time-serving spirit, the Tractarian party" (p. 130), does not probably arise solely from ignorance, but in part from *odium theologicum*. In like manner Samuel Wilberforce and "Ker" Hamilton are calumniated, not only by Mr. Purcell, but still more unpardonably by Manning.

[1] *E.g.*, "Rex denique regium" (p. 82); "Nil ego contuleri me" (p. 501); "Barbam vellem mortuo leoni" (vol. ii., p. 34); "Malum intrinseci" (p. 39); "Sic volo, sic jubes" (p. 43); "Quotquot hujusque Catholicorum noverim" (p. 456): "Rem acu titigisti" (p. 477); "Fasciculus myrrhæ delectus meus mihi" (p. 541); "Fiat voluntus tua" (p. 742).

best—period of his life, when he spent four years of married bliss and ministerial work at Lavington, forgetting all ambitious hopes, he was rather the ecclesiastical politician than the Anglican clergyman—rather a wire-puller and intriguant than a simple Roman priest or prelate.

It was a quiet, pious life that Manning led as Rector of Lavington, and he did much good work as Archdeacon of Chichester. When Newman betrayed the cause of which he was a leader, Manning came forward as a champion of the Anglican Church, and we need not doubt that he meant what he said in his Fifth of November Sermon, in his Charge after Newman's conversion, and in many other utterances. He made it his task to bind up the breaches caused by the desertion of Newman and his immediate followers; nor need we suppose that any sinister and selfish motive made him denounce Rome and hold up the Anglican Church for admiration. It is the opinion of his biographer that he deliberately dissociated himself from the Tractarian party on the score of their unpopularity; and this motive may no doubt have partially actuated him, as personal ambition seems never to have been absent from him except during those four years at Lavington. "Dissociated from an unpopular party and a losing cause—as Tractarianism was regarded on Newman's retirement to Littlemore—prospects of a great ecclesiastical and public career were opened up to the Archdeacon of Chichester. The ambitions of his undergraduate days were revived. It was not now a seat in the House of Commons which he aspired to, but a seat as a spiritual peer in the House of Lords" (p. 261).

But his hopes and aspirations were destined to be thwarted. Do what he would he was too much tainted, in the public estimation, with the views of the party that Newman had discredited to be promoted to an Anglican See. "After the full effect of Newman's secession was felt," said Mr. Gladstone, in reference to Manning's promotion—"after the Papal Aggression outcry—both we and Disraeli had made up our mind not to give the mitre to anyone connected with the 'unholy thing'" (p. 261). There was an obstacle in still higher quarters, as was said at the time and has always been believed. Prince Albert is reputed to have firmly opposed the recommendation of Manning made by Bishop Wilberforce; and, at a later time, to have pointed out that Manning's secession justified the distrust of him that he had entertained. Whatever was the cause, Manning learnt in 1847 that his hopes of a bishopric in the Church of England were at an end.

He had failed twice. He was not to be a member of the House of Commons or of a Ministry; he was not to be a member of the House of Lords or of the Episcopal Bench. But

Manning was not to be cowed into despair. There were other worlds and "pastures new." *Cras ingens iterabimus æquor.*

But for the moment he was beaten to the ground. Sickness supervened, and he had to leave England. He took up his quarters at Rome, and Rome put on a new appearance to him as English prospects faded. He gave himself up sedulously to attendance on all the gorgeous ceremonies of the Roman Church, and soon he was found on his knees in the crowded Piazza to receive the Pope's blessing as he passed by. It was the beginning of the end. But Manning had still a great deal to go through. He had to divest himself of many of his beliefs, and of most of his principles. How was he to do it? He took the shortest course. He convinced himself of the infallibility of the existing Church, and identified the Roman communion with the existing Church, and behold, everything was accomplished! He had only to accept whatever the infallible Church taught him, and if she was infallible, how could he do otherwise? Bible history, the primitive faith, Christian morals, must all go, sacrificed in one hecatomb—let us call it *Sacrificio dell' intelletto.* While the process of consummating the sacrifice was going on, Manning was in a difficult position. He had not quite given up his English hopes, and therefore in his public capacity, and in his correspondence with Mr. Gladstone, the potential giver away of mitres, he was still the firm believer in the soundness of the Anglican position. But in his private correspondence with Robert Isaac Wilberforce, *sub sigillo,* he acknowledged that he had lost all faith in it and in the Anglican Church. Already Manning acted on the principles of Liguori, which he afterwards defended with his pen. His biographer writes:

> What I grant is a curious difficulty, almost startling at first, is to find Manning speaking concurrently for years with a double voice. One voice proclaims in public, in sermons, charges, and tracts, and in a tone still more absolute to those who sought his advice in confession, his profound and unswerving belief in the Church of England as the Divine witness to the truth, appointed by Christ and guided by the Holy Spirit. The other voice, as the following confession and documents under his own handwriting bear ample witness, speaks in almost heart-broken accents of despair at being no longer able in conscience to defend the teaching and position of the Church of England; whilst acknowledging at the same time, if not in his confession to Laprimaudaye, at any rate in his letters to Robert Wilberforce, the drawing he felt toward the infallible teaching of the Church of Rome (p. 463).
>
> What to us now, and henceforward to the end, are the Archdeacon of Chichester's sermons and speeches, or his conferences with Bishops or statesmen, or his public acts? All this is the mere outside show of things—a system of self-defence against what he considered premature suspicions or anticipations injurious to his personal or public influence (p. 501).
>
> In his letters to Mr. Gladstone, contemporary with those to Robert Wilberforce, Manning did not feel called upon to make like confessions

(of his repudiation of Anglicanism). There were two sides to the shield—one the inner or private, the other the outer or public side. One side, for good and sufficient reasons, as I have already shown, was turned to Robert Wilberforce, the other to Mr. Gladstone (p. 568).

At the moment that he was "repudiating Anglicanism as a religious system, as a theology, as a church" to Robert Wilberforce, he was telling Mr. Gladstone that he "had an absolute assurance in heart and soul, solemn beyond expression, that the English Church was a living portion of the Church of Christ." A short time before his death the Cardinal took pains to recover his letters from Mr. Gladstone's possession and destroy them, Mr. Gladstone being perfectly unaware of the reason why he had asked them to be returned to him, and being made extremely indignant when he learnt what had been done.

In April, 1851, Manning was admitted into the Church of Rome, and ten weeks later was re-ordained priest by Cardinal Wiseman. After a period of relaxation in England he went to Rome and was admitted into the Accademia Ecclesiastica, in which he did not enjoy "the bib-and-tucker, pap and high stool state of pupillage" to which he was subjected. But he had already secured a patron in Cardinal Wiseman. Wiseman brought him back to London, and employed him as an intermediary to hold conference with Lord Panmure, and obtain some privileges for Roman Catholic army chaplains. Manning began to breathe again. He felt in his element once more when he could play the diplomat with statesmen. He was "conscious of a desire," he had written in his diary, "to be in such a position as he had held in time past." And this seemed to be the beginning of the fulfilment of his desire. He was successful in his negotiations with Lord Panmure, and showed the utmost tact and skill in not giving offence to Wiseman by seeming to take too much upon himself. Wiseman "had a high sense of his own rights and authority," and Manning "was most punctilious in showing due deference to the Cardinal-Archbishop," whereby he gained his "complete confidence." He was also a favourite with Pius IX., whom he invariably treated with an adulation wherein intensity was only rivalled by skilfulness. In 1857 he was at Rome, and Pius nominated him "Provost of the Chapter of Westminster," "which opened up to Manning prospects of elevation and ecclesiastical preferment" (vol. ii., p. 75). "In the Provostship of Westminster he enjoyed an office of influence equivalent to that of Chichester" (p. 80). Manning had not been contented with the Archdeaconry of Chichester, and he was not going to rest satisfied with the Provostship of Westminster, while there was something higher to be got.

The position of things was such as would have made a man

of less tenacious purpose despair. Two years before Manning's nomination as Provost, the Pope had appointed Dr. Errington, titular Bishop of Plymouth, coadjutor in the See of Westminster with the right of succession, by Cardinal Wiseman's express desire, creating him at the same time Archbishop of Trebizond. After the appointment had been made, Wiseman and Errington could not agree, but it did not enter into Wiseman's head to seek to deprive his coadjutor of his rights.

He knew, none better, that no Bishop can be removed from his See except he be proved guilty of a canonical offence. To moot even such a question in Rome as Errington's removal called for the exercise of the highest art of diplomatic skill. To carry it into effect required something beyond skill—audacity. Wiseman possessed neither diplomatic skill nor audacity. Moreover, he was too loyal to his colleague in the administration of the diocese to attempt to undermine his position by such acts (vol. ii., p. 83).

What Wiseman shrank from, Manning resolved to do. On the other hand, Monsignor Searle, one of the "Canons of Westminster," exerted himself to frustrate "Manning's intrigue." Bishop Grant of Southwark and Bishop Ullathorne of Birmingham took part with Canon Searle, and for six years the ecclesiastical war raged. But Manning had an ally, by means of whom he proved himself too powerful for Errington and his party.

Manning made his first journey to Rome, after he had become a Roman Catholic, with the Hon. and Rev. Monsignor Talbot, one of the Malahide family, who was himself a recent convert. The acquaintanceship formed with Monsignor Talbot was of the utmost moment to Manning. For Talbot held the post of Chamberlain to Pius IX., and had the ear of that good-natured, talkative old gentleman, to whom he became an intimate friend and constant attendant.

That alone gave Mgr. Talbot singular influence in Rome, which was neither warranted by any special strength of character nor of intellect. For a long series of years, until indeed his mind gave way, the report of Catholic affairs in England reached the Pope's ear through this channel. During the whole of that period Manning supplied in a series of letters to Talbot the whole history, from his own point of view, of the Church in England; of the difficulties it encountered from the opposition of "malcontent bishops, insubordinate chapters"; from the action of the Jesuits; from the influence of Newman, the illustrious Oratorian; from the spirit of Gallicanism, or of a low order of English Catholicism in clergy and laity—all this and more, year after year, through Mgr. Talbot reached the Pope's ear. . . . It did not require much time or trouble on the part of a man of such infinite tact and skill as Manning to gain supreme influence over Mgr. Talbot. If Mgr. Talbot had the ear of the Pope, the tongue that spoke in whispers was not Talbot's (p. 86).

When, therefore, the Errington question arose, Manning had only to represent to Talbot that Errington was a Gallican, and not prepared to go all lengths in submission to the Pope,

"anti-papal" as he termed it, and that representation was passed on to Pius IX. as Talbot's own opinion and assurance. The result was, that when at length the Propaganda, whose office it was to pass judgment in the case, decided that there was no reason for quashing Errington's appointment, the Pope, though he was not yet infallible, took the matter into his own hands, and ordered Errington to resign. What could he do? He had refused the Archbishopric of Port-of-Spain, offered him if he would give up his claim, and he had declined to resign his rights of his own free will; but he could not resist the Pope's command: he obeyed; and so, by what Pius IX. called "a *coup d'état* of the Lord God," Errington was removed from his office in June, 1862.

But this was not the end of the struggle. Wiseman would not nominate or accept another coadjutor with right of succession, and if this were not done, Manning saw that the Chapter would still elect Errington as Wiseman's successor, and that the English Roman Catholic Bishops would support the election. This he resolved should not be. For Talbot had reported to him that, in that case, probably Rome would yield, and then, "*povero voi!*" "Without loss of time, he set out for Rome to open fresh negotiations at headquarters" (p. 172). Being asked by Pius IX. whom he would recommend in Errington's place, Manning suggested Ullathorne, titular Bishop of Birmingham, but he was the most *ingrata persona* of all the English Bishops both to Wiseman and to the Pope, so it was hardly likely that the suggestion would be accepted. "Dr. Ullathorne was the last man whom Wiseman would have chosen as his successor" (p. 186). He refused to nominate him, but neither did he nominate Manning. He died in 1865. Nine days after his death Manning wrote to Talbot, that is, to the Pope, deprecating the appointment of any of the three Bishops that the Chapter would be likely to elect, and expressing his wish "that the Holy Father would reserve the Archbishopric in perpetuity to the Roman See." Three weeks later the Chapter elected Clifford, Errington and Grant, and the Bishops sanctioned the choice. Pius IX. regarded the selection of Errington as an *insulto al Papa*, and "beat his breast thrice with indignation" at the news. Talbot reported "that the Holy Father and all the Cardinals of the Congregation of Propaganda were furious against the Chapter." The decision rested in the first instance with the Cardinals of the Congregation of Propaganda, but the displeasure of Propaganda with the Chapter of Westminster was, in Father Coffin's judgment, "providential," for "it left his Holiness perfectly free." The Pope again took matters into his own hands, out of those of the Congregation, and nominated Manning. He afterwards told Manning that he heard a voice

saying to him, "Put him there." How he came to hear such a voice may be gathered from the following letter of Monsignor Talbot:

> My policy throughout was never to propose you *directly* to the Pope, but to make others do so; so that both you and I can always say that it was not I that induced the Holy Father to name you, which would lessen the weight of your appointment. This I say because many have said that your being named was all my doing. I do not say that the Pope did not know that I thought you the only man eligible, as I took care to tell him over and over again what was against all the other candidates, and in consequence he was almost driven into naming you. After he had named you, the Holy Father said to me, "What a diplomatist you are, to make what you wished come to pass!" (p. 220).

This letter shows whence the perplexed old gentleman derived the "inspiration" which he believed had come to him from heaven.

Manning praised his correspondent for his "uprightness" in the matter—a singular word to be used if we did not see that Manning meant by it Talbot's loyalty to himself in procuring him the Archbishopric instead of aiming at it in his own person.

In June, 1865, Manning was consecrated a bishop in London, with the title of Archbishop of Westminster. He at once set himself resolutely to effect the change of mind which he desired to see in English Roman Catholics, that is, to un-Gallicanize, and denationalize, and Papalize the Roman Communion in England, which he had represented would have been prevented by the election of Errington. Backed by the Pope, he had little difficulty in mastering the Chapter of Westminster and the English Roman Catholic bishops. There was only one man whose influence he dreaded, lest it should rival his own and dwarf him in the public estimation. This was Newman. Newman was no Gallican, no Febronianist, but he was regarded as a minimizer, that is, one who was not after all prepared to go all lengths in magnifying the Papacy. It was safest, Manning thought, both for Manning and for the Ultramontane cause to keep Newman shut up in the Oratory in Birmingham, and above all, he must not be allowed to establish a college, as he desired, at Oxford. "I think Propaganda can hardly know the effects of Dr. Newman's going to Oxford. The English national spirit is spreading among Catholics, and we shall have dangers" (p. 300). The relations between Newman and Manning became very strained. It is hardly conceivable by those who knew the two men as Anglicans that they should each "in delicate words" charge the other with lying and attempts at deception. "I have felt that your words have not prepared me for your acts" is the delicate form of words addressed by each to the other. Newman has "a distressing

mistrust which for four years past I have been unable in prudence to dismiss from my mind." Manning acknowledges that "the root of the difficulty is a mutual distrust, and, as you say, this is hard to cure" (p. 306). Manning had the upper hand of Newman, and he kept it. "York Place was for years the centre from which aspersions, more or less open, were directed against Newman's orthodoxy. From York Place through the agency of Mgr. Talbot they passed in due course to the Vatican" (p. 360). Mgr. Talbot was taught to believe that "Dr. Newman is the most dangerous man in England" (p. 318), and "the Bishop of Newport delated him to Rome for heresy." But Manning's political instincts made him feel "that a conflict between him (Newman) and me would be as great a scandal to the Church of England, and as great a victory to the Anglicans as could be" (p. 319). So the squabble was for a time hushed up, but throughout the life of Pius IX. Newman was ostracised through Manning's influence. On the death of Pius IX. the Roman Catholic laity urged Leo XIII. to remove "the cloud" under which Newman had so long been. The Duke of Norfolk and the Marquis of Ripon asked for an interview with Manning, and demanded in the name of the laity that Newman should be recommended as a cardinal. "On hearing this proposal Cardinal Manning bent his head and remained silent for some moments. Recovering his self-possession he rose to the occasion," and embodied the arguments of the Duke of Norfolk and Lord Ripon in a letter to Cardinal Nina. But the alienation between the two men continued to the last. Newman was always to Manning "the centre of those who hold low views about the Holy See, are anti-Roman, cold and silent, to say no more about the Temporal Power, national, English, critical of Catholic devotions, and always on the lower side" (p. 323). More than that, he was the only man capable of being a rival to Manning. Manning, on the other hand, was to Newman an object of distrust—a man whose words did not agree with his deeds, and who was keeping him down.

The most important act of Manning's episcopate was the part he played at the Vatican Council. His biographer gives us to understand that the success of the pro-Papal party was owing to Manning's diplomatic skill, aided by the zealous co-operation of Mr. Odo Russell, who "although not a Catholic" was on political grounds "an ardent supporter of Papal Infallibility," considering "its definition by the Council to be necessary to the very existence of the Pope's future authority." The bishops attending the Council were bound by an oath of secrecy as to its proceedings, but Manning got a dispensation from the Pope to communicate what went on to Odo Russell, in order

that he might counteract the force of the reports sent to Gladstone by Lord Acton. The Bavarian Government had proposed action on the part of the European Governments to prohibit the admission of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility into their respective countries as incompatible with civil allegiance, and Gladstone supported the proposal. Had it been generally adopted, "had Dr. Döllinger's plan or plot succeeded, and the Powers of Europe taken common action against the Pope and the Council, the moral influence of the opposition (in the Council) would have been almost irresistible." To prevent this "fatal catastrophe" Odo Russell, instructed by Manning, made such representations to Lord Clarendon, the English Foreign Secretary, that he formed and led an opposition to Gladstone in the Cabinet by which "Mr. Gladstone was defeated and the Bavarian proposal was rejected." Manning says that "it was by the Divine Will that the designs of His enemies were frustrated." His biographer dryly adds, "If this be so, it is not too much to say that Archbishop Manning and Mr. Odo Russell were the human instruments in God's hands" (p. 436).

Strange, that it should be to a convert and a Protestant that the dogma of Papal Infallibility should be due!

What would have been the effect if Newman had been present at the Council as a *consultor?* He would have been elected to that office by the English Roman Catholic bishops had it not been reported by Mgr. Talbot that the Pope intended to summon him *proprio motu,* which at the last moment he did not do. Probably Newman, like others, would have yielded his own will and judgment to the desire of the Pope, just as he afterwards accepted the dogma. "*Sentire cum Petro* is always the safest side," observed Mgr. Talbot.

Manning had done good service in making Pius IX. infallible; Pius IX. returned his good acts by making him a Cardinal. "The Cardinalate was bestowed on him by Pope Pius IX. in recognition of his services at the Vatican Council; in recognition of his zeal for religion; of his steadfast faith; of his loyalty and allegiance to the Holy See; in reward of his defence of the rights and privileges, temporal and spiritual, of the Papacy" (p. 532). The first time that he was proposed the Cardinals rejected him. Pope Pius waited till the death of Cardinal Barnabo, Prefect of Propaganda, and then proposed him again. It is not etiquette to reject a Papal nominee twice; Manning, therefore, was admitted to the College of Cardinals. He was now at the height of his ambition—a favourite in Rome and the master of the English Roman Catholics, among whom he had the satisfaction of counting Newman.

Yet his disillusion came very swiftly. It was in 1875 that he was appointed Cardinal, and in his very next visit to Italy after his appointment, in 1876, he found the glamour of Rome had passed away. In each of his previous visits he had had an object before him for which he was fighting with all his might and main, "his busy brain and hand ever at work"; but now, to his amazement and despair, he found himself "a looker-on and a bystander, *tota die otiosus;*" nay, he had a shrewd suspicion that the Cardinals were laughing at him behind his back for intriguing to succeed Antonelli as Secretary of State. "What a contrast to the position he held in the days of the Vatican Council!" He wrote in his diary, *Tristis est anima mea usque ad mortem.* But it was still worse for him when his genial old patron, Pius IX., died, and was succeeded by Leo XIII. "He was no longer on the same footing at the Vatican as under the Pontificate of Pius IX. He no longer enjoyed a like exclusive influence in the management and control at Rome of English Catholic affairs. Men were no longer made or marred by his *ipse dixit.* Other voices were listened to; other statements taken into consideration" (p. 576). It is not to be wondered at that Manning paid but one visit to Rome after the death of Pius IX., and that he became "profoundly convinced of the incapacity of the Holy Office in such cases, *and the essential injustice of its procedures and its secrecy!*" (p. 583). "Every case of appeal ought to be to the Archbishop, and not *per saltum* to Rome" (p. 579).

Manning had long since lost the sphere of influence which he most coveted in the national life and political councils of the English people, when he "came from the broad stream of the English Commonwealth into the narrow community of the English Catholics." He had now lost also his influence at Rome, which he had accepted as a sorry substitute for what he had previously lost. But he had too much vigour in him yet to succumb to fortune. Where should he find another sphere? He turned to the English populace. He could not lead them as a Roman Catholic Bishop and Cardinal, but he might as a philanthropist or social reformer, and thus he might not only earn a place in the esteem of the people, but also make them look with less distrust on the cause which he officially represented. He became a member of the Mansion House French Relief Fund, he was an intemperate advocate of Temperance, he was converted to Home Rule, his politics became "popular even to Radicalism," he argued for a "living wage," he took an active part in the Royal Commission for the Housing of the Working Classes, he spoke at the jubilee of the Anti-slavery Society, he wrote on the Rights of Labour, he advocated the cause of the Knights of Labour, he supported

Stead, he fought the battle of the men on strike at the London Docks. Mr. Henry George and Mr. Davitt "found not only a ready access, but a warm welcome." "Mr. John Burns, Mr. Ben Tillett, Mr. Tom Mann, and others of a like kidney, preached their gospel at the Archbishop's house" (p. 652). Manning had found a new kingdom for those that he had lost. *Flectere si nequeo superos, Acheronta movebo.*

His present occupations, which brought him once more in contact with his countrymen, reacted in a healthy way on himself; and the mellowing influences of old age were not without their effects, while the never-ending intrigues within the English Roman Catholic body, carried on both in England and Rome, offended his taste now that he was not himself conducting them. In 1890 he wrote a "Note" so fiercely denouncing and condemning the corporate action of the Jesuits in England and Rome, that even Mr. Purcell, who has published most things, has refrained from publishing it, and on the other hand, "as life began to wane, his heart reverted with a strong yearning to the days of old, to the memories of the past. The closed book of his Anglican life was opened; its pages were perused with a fresh and joyful delight; the dust of the dead years, literally as well as metaphorically, after the lapse of more than half a lifetime, was swept aside" (Preface). This is what Cardinal Vaughan has publicly scorned at as "senility." We may apply a gentler name to it.

Manning died January 13, 1892. We have traced his life as we have been enabled to do by Mr. Purcell's biography. We do not pause formally to criticise it. We see in him a high-minded man, whose character was marred by ambition and the necessity of being first, and by a double-dealing justified to him by the authorised teaching of the Church of his adoption, teaching which must—yes, must surely—be infallibly right, though it staggered Robert Isaac Wilberforce (p. 44). We see him in his earlier days an ecclesiastical politician, afterwards an actor in the petty intrigues of the Roman Catholic body in England and at Rome. At last, when he felt himself lonely in his Archiepiscopal house, distrusted by his co-religionists in England, and looked coldly on at Rome, he threw himself into the work of a Social Reformer, persuading himself that he was now at length once more working "for the people of England" and not only for "the Irish occupation in England." Oh, that those few years of married life at Lavington might have been extended indefinitely! How much happier, how much better a man he might have been, had the spirit of loyalty and disregard of self which then animated him been his throughout his life!

F. MEYRICK.