Cardinal Vaughan.[1]

By the Rev. ARTHUR GALTON, M.A.,
Vicar of Edenham.

SIXTY years have gone by since a new Roman Catholic hierarchy was established in England by Pius IX., and that event was commemorated this year, with swelling joy, when the Westminster Cathedral was consecrated. Wiseman, the first Archbishop of Westminster, and the first Cardinal stationed in England since the reign of Mary Tudor, began his episcopate in a tumult of unpopularity, caused chiefly by the territorial names which Pius gave to the new Bishops. As is usual in England, the clamour was more about names than things. This may be due, perhaps, to the demoralizing and pernicious effect of party politics; but, whatever the cause, Englishmen are more prone than any other nation to pay or cheat themselves with words, in Pascal's phrase; and this is most true in their dealing with Roman Catholic affairs. A great fuss was made about empty titles, which meant nothing real, as they conveyed absolutely nothing to their owners; but no steps of any kind were taken by our Government, or suggested by the vociferous crowd, for the regulation and control of the Religious Orders: a matter in which every wise and firm Catholic Government has always insisted upon having the ultimate decision. The titles of a few Bishops matter nothing. The two questions on which the State and the English Romanists must fight, sooner or later, are the Religious Orders and the Schools; and in the meanwhile the State is giving every advantage to the inevitable foe.

Wiseman's Cardinalate was received with suspicion and fear, and with an abuse little worthy of a strong nation, which professes to be sensible and civilized. Manning's Cardinalate was accepted coolly: Newman's was acclaimed and welcomed as an international honour to one of whom his own nation was proud; indeed, it was more welcome to most Englishmen than to many Roman Catholics: Vaughan's was received with complete indifference by the general public; and if ever the Red Hat be conferred on Archbishop Bourne, it will be described as a recognition well earned by the tact and skill with which he has occupied his position. In itself, it will be taken as a matter of course, and as due to the See of Westminster; more than ever due now it can boast of so magnificent a Cathedral. The only surprise will be caused by its long and mysterious delay.

These various phases or changes in our national attitude towards Roman Catholicism are worth noticing, because many different conclusions may be drawn from them. One conclusion is that we are less insular and narrow than we were fifty years ago. We have realized what the Empire means, and of what elements it is composed. Instead of describing the white element in it by the tautological and inadequate phrase "Anglo-Saxon," we

[1] "The Life of Cardinal Vaughan," by J. G. Snead-Cox. London: Herbert and Daniel. Two vols. 21s. net.

speak more truly now of His Majesty's Anglo-Celtic subjects and dominions. And we have gone on to realize, in consequence, that the Roman Catholic question is an Imperial matter, and cannot be regarded as though it were merely insular and parochial. This enlarged view is chiefly responsible, no doubt, for the way in which the King's Declaration was handled by the Government, and voted by overwhelming majorities in both Houses of Parliament. The change of temper is due, also, to a waning interest in theology, and to a growing dislike for sectarian quarrels. It may be owned at once that theology is not religion, and that quarrelling never can be religious; so far as this, we welcome broader and more charitable views. No man should be abused or scolded for his theological beliefs and practices. That is never the way to help him. Education is the only solvent for error; and *coups de liberté*, according to M. Briand's fine expression, are the only lawful and effective weapons to use against obscurantism and oppression. But it should never be forgotten that the Papacy is not only or chiefly a theological system; it may be that in theory, but in practice it is a social and political institution; and though we are willing that the theological susceptibilities of our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects should be spread in every possible way, we still think that the logical consequences which flow from the Papal theories of jurisdiction and of universal predominance should not have been wholly overlooked, or omitted from the new form. Catholic States have always distinguished between the spiritual functions of the Papacy and the temporal claims of the Roman Court; and the liberties of Roman Catholics themselves are protected best, as our own are, when the indispensable sovereignty of the State is both asserted and maintained against even the shadow of encroachment. It is a pity that English Liberalism is always in a hurry, and is so incurably illogical.

These, at any rate, are not the faults of the Papal system, which is infinitely patient, is careful of the minutest detail, and shrinks from no logical conclusions to its premises. These qualities are all evident in the history of the See of Westminster. Since 1850 it has had four Archbishops, and we now have the biographies of three. They were all remarkable men, and they have all been fortunate in their biographers. Cardinal Wiseman was a solid and extensive scholar, of a kind now obsolete. His business was to reorganize and consolidate, and, as he kept to it, he never came very prominently before the public. He laid his foundations deep and quietly; and his unostentatious work has been well described by Mr. Wilfrid Ward.

Cardinal Manning was different. His best friends have never accused him of hiding his light under a bushel; from Harrow onwards, he took care that it should shine before men; and after his death, under the disguise of a biography, he left behind him one of the strangest and most illuminative autobiographies that has ever been written. It reveals to us, as no modern book has done, the secrets of the Roman Court and the inner working of the Papal system. If Newman's *Apologia* aimed at explaining his progress towards Rome, Manning's, whatever he aimed at, conveys to us the impression that he discovered his extreme Vaticanism was a mistake, and that he wished his confession of error to be public. It is impossible, reading between the lines, to draw any other inference. Manning's biographer, no doubt, was a dupe utilized by one of the most adroit personages who ever lived.

But whatever we may think of Purcell and his work, autobiography cannot be explained away, and there can be no appeal from personal documents, from a man's own statements, musings, and confessions. Purcell's compilation abides, as the explanation of a disappointed life, the revelation of a tortuous and mischievous bureaucracy.

Cardinal Vaughan's *Life* contains no such surprises and revelations. The great surprise, even for some of his own adherents, if we may believe Mr. W. S. Lilly, was that it should occupy nearly two thousand large octavo pages. "Surely half that number might have sufficed to tell the public all that it wants to know about a prelate who, no doubt, was full of zeal and devotion, but who has left no mark upon the world's history or the world's thought!" So says a most candid and interesting article in the *Nineteenth Century* for August. Mr. Lilly corrected his first thoughts when he had read the *Life*, and we agree entirely that his second thoughts were truer. The *Life* is not too long; it could not have been shortened without many serious losses; and, let us add, without any reservation, that it could not easily have been done better. Mr. Snead-Cox has not, perhaps, added a new classic to our English literature; he is an ex-journalist, not a stylist, a "lord of language"; but he has given us a most successful, interesting, and skilful biography. A mass of details, most of them trivial enough in themselves, are combined into a lucid and coherent portrait, which places the subject before us as a living personage. We know the man, and, what is more, we know his mind. Let us say, quite frankly, that there is a great deal in Cardinal Vaughan's mind which we do not like, that we are opposed uncompromisingly to the chief objects for which he lived, that we abhor the system for which he worked; but, nevertheless, we can admire the zeal and honesty of the man himself. "Fas est et ab hoste doceri": the zeal with which Vaughan threw himself, first into missionary work, and then into social and philanthropic work, is worthy of all praise. The methods which he used for the rescue of children, the spread of education as he conceived it, the crusade against drink, are worthy of both study and imitation. We have had too few great builders in our day, and assuredly Vaughan was one. He has enriched London with one of her most imposing buildings, which, as long as it remains, will be his own monument; but behind his material structure there was always the conception of a spiritual building, melodious, coloured, palpitating, a visible, audible, tangible witness to the unseen. One of the most practical of men, Vaughan was a mystic, with a vision which he was ever striving to realize. He was filled with the romance and chivalry of an earlier time. As much soldier as priest, he was more suited for one of the old military Orders than for the rather sordid and very dubious methods of contemporary clericalism.

In its personal aspect, then, this *Life* is a sound piece of work, and is well worth reading. Though it has no revelations, such as Manning's *Life* had, and as Newman's must have if the documents be published honestly, yet it contains far more that is valuable and important than would be gathered from most of the reviews. "I should have hesitated," says Mr. Lilly again, "to give some of the details which it contains"; and we can well believe it. Such reticence is natural, and Mr. Lilly observes it by not drawing attention to some of the very curious and suggestive revelations

which Mr. Snead-Cox has made so generously. Vaughan's *Life* shows us, first, the very un-English atmosphere in which English Romanists are trained, and from which most of them can never escape wholly; secondly, it reveals, as no modern work has done, the sinister and overpowering influence of the Religious Orders in Rome, and the pitiful condition of a Romanist Bishop who is objectionable to the regular clergy; thirdly, it tells us a great deal that is both interesting and illuminative about the condemnation of Anglican Orders under Leo XIII. In our review of the book we shall keep to these three points.

Herbert Vaughan was born in Gloucester in 1832. His father, Colonel Vaughan, of Courtfield in Herefordshire, represented a family which has always been Romanist, and of which the origin is lost in the fables of Welsh antiquity. His mother, a convert, was a Rolls of the Hendre. Now, the English Romanists are proud, and justly, of their old families; but their writers inveigh unjustly, and even absurdly, against the Penal Laws. Those laws were certainly justifiable. The Papacy declared war against Queen Elizabeth, and carried it on without any restraining scruple. Its adherents had to take the consequences of a state of war, and the Papacy itself is chiefly responsible for the fate of the victims whom it now canonizes, thus profiting by two worlds and two standards of morality. The Penal Laws may certainly be explained and very largely excused. We may lament their necessity, but we hold that no apology is required. Moreover, the laws were never pressed harshly against quiet and peaceable individuals. If they had been, not a single Roman Catholic landed family could have survived. They would have been taxed and worried out of existence. But, as we know, many did survive, and with considerable wealth. A score of great families witness, conclusively and solidly, against the perversion of our history in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by modern Papal controversialists. Mr. Lilly points out that the Vaughans adhered to the Stuarts from Charles I. to Culloden; and the owner of Courtfield, which he held in spite of his Romanism and Royalism, followed Charles Edward into exile, taking service with the King of Spain, still our great hereditary foe. In spite of all this, his son "found his way back to England, and was allowed to resume the family estates." Could there be a better confutation of the usual Romanist exaggerations about the Penal Laws and the "persecution" of Catholics, or a finer witness to the humanity and toleration of the English Government? If a family like the Vaughans had been French Huguenots or Protestants of any kind in Spain and Italy, the fate of themselves and of their properties would have been very different. The Roman Catholics can't have it both ways. Either they must explain away the continuance and prosperity of their numerous old families, or they must admit that the current accounts of their "persecutions" are mythical. And Englishmen should be ashamed of so slandering their country in the interests of a foreign power, or even for theological purposes.

On the father's side, Herbert Vaughan belonged to those old English Catholics who differed in no respect from the Gallicans of the eighteenth century, and hardly at all from the English High Churchmen of those days. By his convert mother, he was imbued with those more extravagant Italian and ultramontane fashions which were introduced among the English

Romanists, to their surprise and mistrust, in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, and which were spread so rapidly among them by recruits from the Oxford Movement. The Romanism of Faber was no more the Romanism of Lingard and of Alban Butler than of Lord Acton. From this early training Vaughan derived his passion for the comparatively new devotion to St. Joseph, and his exaggerated reverence for images. We read of his putting the brief of his episcopate into the hands, or at the feet, of several statues; and when he was trying to procure a house from an unwilling owner, he secreted a little image of St. Joseph in a cupboard. To this early atmosphere, again, he owed his entire and exclusive devotion to the Papacy. "His easy test of Catholic loyalty was always, and under all circumstances, to stand on the side of Rome. Instinctively in any controversy he would be for the Pope against all comers. To uphold and strengthen the authority of the Vicar of Christ was one of the guiding motives of his life." For these purposes, while he was Bishop of Salford, he acquired the *Tablet*, and he used it unscrupulously to support Manning and the definition of Papal infallibility. We say "unscrupulously," because "Vaughan deliberately set himself to strangle and suppress any and every utterance in favour of the Inopportunist Party." Newman, Bishops Ullathorne and Clifford, Acton, and the sober, moderate elements in English Romanism, had no chance of a fair hearing. So it was all over Europe, and thus the definition was carried. It is worth noticing that Catholic Emancipation was only granted in 1827 because the Irish hierarchy and the leading English Romanists declared officially that Papal infallibility was no part of the Catholic faith, but was merely a Protestant fable. It may be added that the encroaching and ever-centralizing Vaticanism which has followed the definition has lowered and weakened the episcopate, and is fast destroying Roman Catholicism itself. It is a cause of weakness, and not of strength, as all arbitrary government must be in the long-run. The older Catholic Press had been "distinguished for its tact, reticence, and conciliatory language." Under Vaughan's predecessor the *Tablet* became "one of the most offensive and virulent newspapers in Europe"; and Vaughan himself was not faithless to this evil tradition. His campaign for Papal infallibility was mere journalism, mostly scurrilous. Certainly theology and history were not on the ultramontane side. And of all the present "wounds of the Church," in Rosmini's phrase, numerous and mortal as they are, the clerical Press is undoubtedly the worst, and is assuredly the most disgraceful.

With regard to our second point, the relations between the Religious Orders and the Bishops, this *Life* contains a great deal of most important and unedifying information. The Orders are all-powerful at Rome, through their wealth and their international diffusion. The Jesuits boast that they always have the support of Rome, not only because they are the special militia of the Papacy, but because they have "been employed by the Popes all over the world for three hundred years to contend against and control Bishops who were troublesome to the Holy See." "The Holy See feels that their co-operation is necessary"; and so they had privileges and powers, of unknown extent, granted to them privately by individual Popes. Against this hidden and active influence Vaughan had to contend in an educational matter, which affected the finances of his diocese. He won his case, after

persistent efforts, and in spite of innumerable intrigues. Into the merits of the case we need not enter. It is sufficient to point out that no system can be healthy or permanent which is managed by such principles as are exposed in the whole affair. But we recommend more especially to the attention of those who may be interested the policy, actions, and correspondence of Father Gallwey, who was then the Jesuit Provincial in England. The matter is contained in pages 277 to 303 of the first volume. As examples of unctuous cunning Father Gallwey's letters would be hard to beat, and his actions certainly justify the traditional conception of what is meant by Jesuitism.

As to Anglican Orders, a great deal of light is thrown upon the proceedings of 1895 and the following time by these pages. In this matter we agree entirely with all that Mr. Lilly says, especially about Lord Halifax and his party. "Lord Halifax apparently forgot to mention that, although these things (the Romanizing practices of the E.C.U.), were taught *in* the Church of England, they were by no means taught *by* the Church of England, whose articles and formularies, to say nothing of her history, are a standing protest against them." Nothing could be truer or better said. Vaughan himself always spoke out honestly against the impossibility of corporate reunion, of terms or compromises between the Papacy and any dissentient body. By Papal principles there must be complete submission or nothing. Otherwise the Papal authority itself is bartered away. For our own part, we have always held that the Letter of our own Archbishops was a tactical mistake. Instead of arguing as they did, rather vaguely, they should merely have said, if the medieval conception of Orders be taken as the historical standard, then we agree with the Pope that the Anglican Church does not possess them, and does not want them. But, we would also point out, and we appeal to the various Ordinals in proof of it, that the Pope cannot destroy Anglican Orders after the nineteenth century without, by the same process, destroying his own Orders and all others before, say, the eighth or ninth century. He may choose whichever horn of this dilemma he prefers. In other words, the medieval standard and conception of Orders cannot be maintained in the face of history and antiquity; and Roman Orders must go with them, as well as the whole sacramental system which was inaugurated by Innocent III. and completed at Trent.

As to the exterior facts—namely, the wording of the ancient Ordinals—Mr. Snead-Cox agrees. But he still argues about the "intention": that the Anglican Reformers had no "intention" to make *sacerdotes*, sacrificing priests. Clearly they had not, and the reason is obvious; they took the ancient Ordinals for their model, and they found nothing in them about sacrificing and absolving, as these terms came to be understood after 1216. The conclusion is equally obvious. If the old Ordinals contained no forms which expressed these notions, it is clear that the framers of those Ordinals had no such intention either. Their purpose was the same as the purpose of the Anglican Reformers, which is precisely what we should expect. This argument from "intention" fails utterly when it is examined, and the supporters of Leo XIII. have no other. And so we may take leave of Mr. Snead-Cox and his book, congratulating him as a biographer, though not as a theologian. His publishers, we believe, are a comparatively new firm,

and they deserve all praise for producing so large and handsome a book at so reasonable a price.

It might be interesting to speculate about what would have happened if Leo had endorsed Anglican Orders. It is possible that some discontented Romanists in 1899 and 1900 might have drifted into the High Church ranks. Some fear of this was not absent, we believe, from Vaughan's mind. It is possible, as a knowledge of history spreads, that the present theory of Orders and of the Papacy itself will dissolve to a very large extent among intelligent Roman Catholics. The present Pontificate is straining Catholic faith and patience almost more than they will bear. Pius X. and his Secretary of State seem bent now upon repeating their French exploits in Spain. Modernism spreads, and must inevitably spread, in spite of all their efforts. The ever narrowing and more arbitrary centralization of Rome must either kill down all life in the Church, or must provoke the rebellion through which alone it can revive; while to tyranny and intrigue is added that sort of dissimulation which bound to the strictest secrecy all members of the Commission on Anglican Orders, and yet enabled Cardinal Vaughan in London to have daily reports of the proceedings in Rome. A similar story is told about Manning and the Vatican Council; and the procedure of a Papal Conclave is the property of the whole world. No system can survive so scandalous a divergence between theory and practice; and, by a just retribution, perhaps loquacious journalism will finish what an ambitious and unscrupulous despotism has begun.

The Missionary World.

THE financial year of several Missionary Societies closes on March 31. If ever there was a year when an unmistakable mandate to go forward would have been welcome it is this. The world stands open-doored, and the stimulus of the World Missionary Conference grows stronger month by month. Yet society after society, burdened with accumulated deficit of varying weight, or fettered by an inelastic income, is facing prospects indicating need for retrenchment rather than hope for advance. The S.P.G., though its income shows signs of increase, has been appealing for an extra £20,000. Friends of the C.M.S. are urgently appealing for £36,000 to clear off former deficits, whilst the Society itself is taking special steps to evoke prayer that the year's income may cover the year's expenditure. The London Missionary Society is weighted by