

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

He will repeat the assurance which He uttered from the lips of His incarnate Divinity: "This is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent."

A. D. MACNAMARA.



#### ART. IV.—CARDINAL MANNING'S ADMISSIONS.

WITH the personal character of Cardinal Manning as it is portrayed in Mr. Purcell's "Life" the following paper is not concerned. But we may be excused if we say that, while it is hardly surprising to find English Roman Catholics in high quarters expressing disapproval of the work, it is matter for some surprise that Cardinal Vaughan should not have preferred the silent contempt, which is always dignified and often astute, to an apology for his predecessor which has betrayed how little there is to be said. In his article, published in the February issue of the *Nineteenth Century*, no attempt is made to explain the unhappy episode of the Errington case, or reconcile the conflicting self-revelations of public utterances and private correspondence. The biographer is attacked; the unwisdom, the lack of good taste, that mark his work, are severely criticised. But no vindication of his subject appears. The Cardinal closes with the hope that a worthier biography may one day be produced; but as he counsels the delay of a quarter of a century as healthy and judicious, unless an unbroken series of editions of the present work can be guaranteed, the tardy vindication of a buried memory will have to include its exhumation.

Our present business is with the contents of the twenty-seventh chapter of the second volume. The title of this chapter is, "Hindrances to the Spread of the Catholic Church in England." It consists of a most interesting series of autobiographical notes, written in the summer of 1890. They are introduced by a sentence the sentiment of which we gladly echo: "The candour and openness with which he does not fear to rebuke his own people, and the just and generous tribute which he offers from his own experience, both as a Catholic priest and an Anglican, to the piety, religious-mindedness, and exemplary lives of so many Anglicans of every rank and condition of life, is a noble legacy which cannot fail to soften antipathies and lessen any lingering prejudices in the hearts of the people of England."

We do not purpose offering a digest of this remarkable chapter. It is to certain instructive admissions and concessions

to be met with in it that attention is here directed. These are found in connection with the handling of two topics: first, the condition of the Roman Catholic clergy, and the religious orders existing among us; and, secondly, the Christian standing of non-Papal communities, with special reference to the Church of England.

I. (1) It would be an ungracious task to dwell at any length upon the admissions that occur under the first head. When a bishop considers himself called upon, in the faithful discharge of his office, openly to animadvert upon the failings of his clergy, the world may take impertinent advantage of his faithfulness. But the Christian will hardly care to join it. And the chuckle is some degrees less refined when the strictures appear in notes which were not intended to see daylight in the lifetime of the writer.

Let it at once be said that these criticisms of the priests and monastic orders at no point touch their honour. Unstinted praise is accorded them on the score of their moral worth, their devotion, and their zeal. No reflection, therefore, which *as men* they might justly resent, is cast upon them in the brief reference to this class of admissions which follows.

In the first place, it is worthy of remark that Cardinal Manning should have broken to the extent he did with the spirit of mediævalism as represented by the religious orders. In this Cardinal Wiseman had led the way. In a pathetic appeal to Father Faber to assist him in missionizing among the poor, he complains that the Jesuits, the Redemptorists, pleaded their "rules" for abstention; the Passionists "have never done him a stroke of work amongst the poor"; the Fathers of St. Philip Neri ought to read their founder's directions in the light of the necessities of the nineteenth century, but they do not.

In these expostulations with mediæval orders, or their more recent imitations, Cardinal Manning goes considerably further than his predecessor. Indeed, his action with regard to them is distinctly unfavourable. He refuses to regard the regulars as in any sense superior to the seculars. For years he declined to employ the latter word to describe the working clergy. The priesthood "is the first religious and regular order." He looks upon all religious orders as of ecclesiastical institution as contrasted with the priesthood, which is of Divine. "It is an axiom that the priesthood is a sign *perfectionis jam adeptæ*. The imperfect enter religious orders *ad perfectionem adquirendam*. The secular priesthood is supposed to be already in moral, intellectual, and spiritual maturity. 'He is only a secular priest' was often heard, and it revealed a whole world of prejudice, depreciation, and mistrust; and the priesthood

accepted the depreciation, which depresses and paralyzes the will." And again: "The bishops are tempted to turn away from their own priests, and to call in regulars to do what they need to be done. The effect of this is to chill and depress the clergy still more, and even to confirm them in their lower state."

Two things seem to stand out luminously from these passages indicative of Manning's attitude towards the fraternities modelled on the mediæval pattern. He declines, in the first place, to credit them with embodying the true idea of the higher life, and then he charges them with being more or less out of harmony with the spirit of our age.

(2) In dealing with the subject of the condition of his clergy, the writer of these Notes places among the hindrances to the spread of Catholicism in England two drawbacks, for which the priests are responsible. These are certainly not such as are obvious to outsiders. One is "what, for want of a better name," he must call "sacramentalism." It is perhaps needless to say that the term is used in a specific sense. "Priests," he says, "are in danger of becoming mass-priests or sacrament-mongers. It is easily possible for a priest to neglect his meditation, examination of conscience, and spiritual exercises, and therefore to become unspiritual and dry. Still he administers sacraments exactly and mechanically." He then urges "higher subjective piety."

Now, this is only the line frequently taken in spiritual addresses to the clergy among ourselves; the perils of officialism conductors of clerical quiet days seldom fail to enlarge on. And we would not unduly magnify this peril, as it exists in another community. At the same time, it is not without its instruction for us to listen to an admonitory voice within a fold not our own, attributing much of this danger to the objective character of the worship and the mechanical efficacy of its sacraments. With the tremendous assumptions of the sacerdotal theory, how immensely must the liability be increased to substitute an official piety for a personal. And this is actually admitted in plainest words in the document we have under review: "It is certain that, as the objective is over-valued, the subjective is under-valued." The second drawback to the efficiency of the priests is, we learn, the inefficient state of the seminaries in which they are trained. "We have"—we quote the Notes—"boys from twenty-one to twenty-four. If they are ordained without 'interior spiritual perfection,' who is to blame? Who is responsible? Where is the remedy? With a postulancy of eight years and a novitiate of four, we ought to bring them up to spiritual perfection. And so we should if we ourselves were spiritually perfect. Is it not a want of higher aspiration in ourselves

that depresses the standard of our seminarists? The consequence of this is, that when they grow up and become prefects and professors, *they have no unity of mind, no union of will*, for the college, no zeal *in solidum*, so as to take to heart, not only their own class, but the studies and discipline of the whole house. How can men work together if *they have no community of heart or spirit?*"

We were certainly not altogether prepared to hear this frank avowal of the absence of cohesiveness in the members of these clerical seminaries. It is something of a revelation to us that the absolute surrender to the principle of authority in the intellectual sphere does not invariably nourish the sentiment of *esprit de corps*. A rebel individualism survives even in a postulant.

II. (1) The admissions made in treating the second topic we have named call for a less cursory glance. The allusions to the religious condition and theological position of the Church of England, and the generous tributes to the piety of many of its members, including those of some other bodies, are distributed sporadically through the chapter. The reader shall be spared the citation of the several pages. All the passages quoted lie between pp. 772 and 796.

It is perhaps unwise to lay much stress on the kindly expressions of approval that come from an opponent, and insist that they involve logical modifications of his own dogmatic position. Such a phrase as, "the singular goodness and piety of non-Catholics," such a large-hearted testimony as, "I have intimately known souls living by faith, hope, and charity, and the sanctifying grace with the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, in humility, absolute purity of life and heart, unceasing prayer; in a word, living lives of visible sanctification, *who are out of the Church*," may be read with the caution that friendly rhetoric may not be always pressed into the service of theology.

And here we may digress for a moment, to point to the altogether admirable liberality of mind shown in the recognition of the good work done by Protestants in the cause of philanthropy. In a paragraph such as the following the best side of the writer is seen:

"All the great works of charity in England have had their beginning out of the Church; for instance, the abolition of the slave-trade, and the persevering protest of the Anti-Slavery Society. Not a Catholic name, so far as I know, shared in this. France, Portugal, Brazil, have been secretly or openly slave-trading. So the whole temperance movement. It was a Quaker that made Father Mathew an abstainer. Catholic Ireland and the Catholics of England until now [he is writing in 1890] have done little for temperance. The Anglican and

Dissenting ministers are far more numerous abstainers than our priests. The Act of Parliament to protect animals from cruelty was carried by a non-Catholic Irishman. The Anti-Vivisection Act also. Both are derided, to my knowledge, among Catholics. The Acts to protect children from cruelty were the work of Dissenters.<sup>1</sup> There are endless works, for the protection of shop-assistants, over-worked railway and tram men, women and children ground down by sweaters, and driven by starvation wage upon the streets. Not one of the works in their behalf was started by us; hardly a Catholic name is to be found on their reports. Surely we are in the sacristy."

(2) There are, however, other passages in these Notes of a definitely theologic colouring. They are evidently meant to be taken in a dogmatic sense, as embodying calm and settled convictions. And the greater weight attaches to them as Cardinal Manning is at pains to assure us that he is also the mouthpiece of the general clerical mind on the points raised.

It will be convenient to place these passages together, reserving comment.

"I have found among hereditary Catholics a belief that the English people are without faith, without Christian doctrine, without means of contrition, and that, therefore, the hope of their salvation is most uncertain. This *error* paralyzes their hopefulness."

"I have found not only laymen, but priests, ignore absolutely the fact that the greater part of the English people are baptized, and therefore are in the supernatural state of grace. They take for granted that they have lost their baptismal grace by mortal sin; and that therefore, as they have not the sacrament of penance, they have no means of rising again to the grace of baptism; that for this reason their life is without merit; and their salvation most uncertain."

"I do not believe one of these propositions to be true, and I am convinced that no one ever believes them without being checked in his action and chilled in his charity towards the non-Catholic people of England."

"I understand . . . that to all men, *etiam infidelibus et hæreticis*, is given grace sufficient *ad evitandam mortem*; that the *virtus penitentiae* is universal from the fall of man; that to those to whom the sacrament of penance is physically or morally impossible, the virtue of penance is sufficient; that to those who use the grace they have received an *augmentum atque proportionatum* is given; that to all who seek the truth is given so much as will bring them to the soul of the Church,

<sup>1</sup> This is not quite correct.

if not to its visible body; that no member of the soul dying in union with God can be lost."

"Will anyone affirm that souls born again of water and the Holy Ghost cannot be penitent or cannot love God?"

"Now, a life of forty years out of the Church has taught me what I have written."

"And the experience of a priest's life of nearly forty years has confirmed all I have written."

Proceeding from a Roman Cardinal of the most thorough-paced ultramontane views, the above sentences are very noteworthy. They contain the following concessions to a Christian community not in communion with Rome; and they are, be it remembered, the statements of one more Papal, it might with justice be said, than the Pope. The English people have faith, have Christian doctrine. True repentance is within their reach while in a state of schism. They are truly baptized, and, through the efficacy of that sacrament, their salvation is *not* most uncertain. Heretics may escape eternal death.

Then we have the distinction between "the soul and the body of the Church," and we are told that to all seekers of the truth enough is given to secure membership with the soul. What is this but the Protestant distinction between the visible and the invisible Church between the spiritual family and the external corporation? And the solemn asseveration is made, that no member of this invisible spiritual Church, whether or no a member of the body, can be lost.

Now, these admissions represent an elasticity of thought altogether out of harmony with the teaching and immemorial attitude of the Papal Church. Her whole history, her authoritative treatment of non-Papal religious bodies, her aggressive efforts, are all based upon the axiom, "Extra ecclesiam nulla salus." When Manning seceded, he expressed the conviction that his soul's salvation depended upon this step. This is but an echo of Newman's words when he took the same road. "Our Church is in schism, and my salvation depends upon my joining the Church of Rome."

Here, then, is the validity of Anglican baptism asserted. And as there appears little probability of the Roman authorities recognising the validity of our orders as the result of their present investigations, they will surely find themselves on the horns of this dilemma: Our orders being invalid, all persons baptized in our Church during the past three centuries have been baptized by laymen; and an amazingly wide interpretation will have to be given to the phrase "a case of extreme necessity," which ever since Augustine's day has limited the Western Church's permission for lay baptism. "Extreme necessity" has covered the case of each individual of the scores

of million souls that have been admitted to membership with the "soul of the Church" since corporate union ceased between us and Rome.

For the distinction between the "soul" and the "body" of the Church, we claim that it is the natural property of Protestant thought. It was the outcome and the intellectual refuge of the reforming spirit. No such distinction is known to the Fathers. It was as the growing corruptions of the West forced thoughtful men into the acceptance of a strengthening individualism, and the great evangelical truth of personal religion pushed through and thrust back the subsidiary, though necessary, tenet of corporate Church life, that the theory of "a Church in a Church" took substance and shape.

That the liberality of the sentiments expressed by Cardinal Manning in his old age is not so fully shared by his fellow-Bishops was evidenced a few months ago, on the occasion of the consecration of a Vicar-Apostolic for Wales. Writing a few days later in the *Catholic Times* and *Catholic Opinion*,<sup>1</sup> Dr. Hedley, Bishop of Newport and Menevia, says, "The Catholic Church in England persists in claiming to be the one true Church, outside of which, *unless there is the excuse of pardonable deficiency of information*, there is no salvation."

The italicized words, read in the light of Dr. Manning's admissions, involve a singular view of the English Reformation. They who have accepted the Reformation without thereby imperilling their salvation pass within the pale of the "invisible" Church under the saving clause of "pardonable deficiency of information." The phrase on which such a stupendous fabric is reared as the salvation of an indefinite number of souls is surely vague enough. If by "information" be meant knowledge of the actual tenets of the Roman Church, is deficiency in this at all pardonable, with such appliances at hand for securing adequate knowledge? And were the Reformers themselves so deficient in this respect, who had been born and trained, and some of them lived half their lives, within the Roman Church? Cardinal Newman, in the brilliant *argumentum ad hominem* of his first lecture on "Catholicism in England," held up to ridicule the ignorance of Catholicism that supplies the sinews of war to the Protestant attack. But we find it hard to believe that his acuteness did not detect the fallacy running through his own racy brochure, did not save him from mistaking his prolix parody for a parallel. Anglicans and Romans alike may enjoy the humour

<sup>1</sup> September 20, 1895. See the Rev. David Jones's article on the Ancient British Church in the *CHURCHMAN* for June last, p. 470.



of the scene in the Moscow Square, but neither can be deceived into admitting the cogency of the application.

The question presses for an answer. Have these "Notes" the *imprimatur*, or at any rate the *nihil obstat*, of his Church? It is difficult to believe it. Her son had breathed for forty years the free airs of a reformed communion, and as, when nearing the end of the journey, men have often acknowledged a strange yearning for their native place, and, seeking it, passed from it to their rest; so it almost seems as if, with a maturity softened and expanded by the philanthropic sympathies of its latest decade, while "the doors were shut in the streets, and they that look out of the windows were darkened," the hard dogmatism of mid-life yielding insensibly to the windless quiet of the eventide, the aged Cardinal had grown broader than the measure of his creed.

And had these admissions been introduced, let us say, into a thesis to be submitted to the Holy Office among the preliminary exercises of the *Accademia Ecclesiastica*, we suspect the neophyte would have had many a week added to the ten of his probation, ere he had been admitted to the priesthood.

For the Church of Rome could never have endorsed them. The Catechism of the Council of Trent gives no uncertain sound. In the eighth question, under chap. x., "Of the Ninth Article, 'I believe in the Holy Catholic Church,'" those who are excluded from the pale of the Church militant are divided into three classes: I. Infidels, *i.e.*, heathen; II. Heretics and schismatics; III. Excommunicated persons. Under the second head the following words occur: "But heretics and schismatics (are excluded), because they cut themselves off from the Church. For they have no more to do with the Church than deserters belong to the army which they have deserted."<sup>1</sup>

From the point of view of a Roman theologian, there can be no question but that we are both a heretical and a schismatic body, and, as such, we have nothing to do with the Church. Is it possible to reconcile with this allegation that of Dr. Manning, that we "are in the supernatural state of grace"? We leave the subject with one remark. In any future biography of the Cardinal which may be produced to correct the mistakes of Mr. Purcell's, the publication of which Cardinal Vaughan denounces as "almost a crime," it will be curious to see how the papal orthodoxy of the opinions enunciated in this deeply interesting chapter will be vindicated.

ALFRED PEARSON.

<sup>1</sup> "Heretici vero atque schismatici, quia ab ecclesia desciverunt. Neque erim illi magis ad ecclesiam spectant, quum transfugæ ad exercitum pertineant a quo defecerunt."