

## CHAPTER IX.

### THE ROMEWARD MOVEMENT.

Corporate Reunion with Rome desired—Not individual Secession—The reason for this policy—How to "Catholicise" the Church of England—Protestantism a hindrance to Reunion—Reunion with Rome the ultimate object of the Oxford Movement—Newman and Froude visit Wiseman at Rome—They inquire for terms of admission to the Church of Rome—Secret Receptions into the Church of Rome—Growth of Newman's love for Rome—Newman wants "more Vestments and decorations in worship"—William George Ward: "The Jesuits were his favourite reading"—Publication of Tract XC.—Mr. Dalgairns' letter to the *Univers*—Secret negotiations with Dr. Wiseman—"Only through the English Church can you (Rome) act on the English nation"—Keble hopes that yearning after Rome "will be allowed to gain strength"—Mr. Gladstone on the Romeward Movement—He hopes those "excellent persons" who love all Roman doctrine will "abide in the Church"—"The Ideal of a Christian Church"—Dr. Pusey's eulogy of the Jesuits censured by Dr. Hook—Mr. Gladstone's article in the *Quarterly Review*—Pusey hopes "Rome and England will be united in one"—Pusey asks for "more love for Rome"—He praises the "superiority" of Roman teaching—Pusey believes in Purgatory and Invocation of Saints—He "forbids" his penitents to invoke the Saints—Manning's remarkable letter to Pusey—Manning's visit to Rome in 1848—Kneels in the street before the Pope—His double dealing in the Church of England—The Roman Catholic *Rambler* on the Oxford Movement.

THE great object of the Ritualistic Movement from its very birth, in 1833, was that of *Corporate* Reunion with the Church of Rome. The wirepullers have always been opposed to *individual* secession, not so much on the ground that it was a thing evil in itself, but because its tendency was to prevent the realization of their larger schemes. As far back as 1867 a leading quarterly of the advanced Ritualists declared that, instead of seceding to Rome, "it would be much better for us to remain working where we are—for what would become of England if we

[Ritualists] were to leave her Church? She would be simply lost to Catholicism. . . Depend upon it, it is only through the English Church itself that England can be Catholicised."<sup>1</sup> The same article, referring to this corporate and visible unity with the Church of Rome, declared:—

“Here you have *the real heart and soul of the present Movement; this is the centre from which its pulsations vibrate, and from which its life-blood flows.*”<sup>2</sup>

As far back as June 13th, 1882, at the annual meeting of the English Church Union, Lord Halifax, its President, declared that corporate reunion “is the crown and completion of that great Movement which has transformed the Church of England”;<sup>3</sup> and he has repeated the assertion many times since. But in order to the realization of such a reunion it is first of all necessary to make the Church of England look as much like the Church of Rome as possible. “A Colonial Priest” of the Ritualistic party, writing to the *Church Review*, of September 21st, 1888, remarked:—

“It seems to me utterly premature to consider reunion, especially with the great Patriarchal See of the West [Rome] as within even distant probability, until the Anglican Communion as a whole is Catholicised. *There lies our work . . .* Therefore, let every one, while praying daily for reunion, remember that the surest way to accomplish it is by working towards *the purification of our own branch of the Catholic Church.*”

According to the opinion of some of these gentlemen the Reformed Church of England is not sufficiently respectable, at present, for the Pope to have her, even as a present. She first needs “purification” from Protestantism. In a volume, with an Introductory Essay by Dr. Pusey, one of the writers very frankly declared that—

“The first great hindrance that is before us arises from the Protestantism of England. Till this is removed, the Reunion of our

<sup>1</sup> *Union Review*, Volume for 1867, p. 410.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 398.

<sup>3</sup> See official report of this speech, published by the E. C. U., p. 13.

Church, as the Church of England, with either the Greek, or *Latin* Churches, is absolutely hopeless.”<sup>4</sup>

May God grant that this “great hindrance” may ever remain to repel the machinations of the traitors to our spiritual liberties!

The reunion schemes of the Tractarians were at first kept a profound secret from all but the initiated. In this, as in so many other matters, the leaders cleverly practised their doctrine of “Reserve.” So well was the secret kept that for several years their proceedings were a great puzzle even to many Roman priests. The Hon. and Rev. George Spencer, a prominent priest, and son of an English peer, was one of these puzzled ones for a time; but at last he became enlightened. In a letter to the Roman Catholic *Univers*, of Paris, in 1841, he wrote:—

“Indeed, quite lately I still held to the idea, that, in a short time, we should see them [the Tractarians] prepared to quit their Church in considerable numbers, and unite with us in labouring to effect the conversion of their brethren; but the nearer the approaches they make to Catholic sentiments, the more resolved they appear to be to rectify their position—not by quitting the vessel [the Church of England], as if they despaired of its safety, *but by guiding it together with themselves into the harbour of safety*” [that is, into the Church of Rome].<sup>5</sup>

This leavening of the Church of England with so-called “Catholic” principles and practices—in other words, the infusion into her system of more or less of Popery—commenced with the Tractarian Movement, in 1833, and has been going on ever since. Yet, even now, it appears that we are not, as a Church, decent enough for the Pope to accept us as a present. At the Norwich Church Congress, October, 1895, a Ritualistic clergyman said:—“The Church of England is *not fit* for communion with either the Eastern Church or the Church of Rome. *We are not good enough for them.*”<sup>6</sup> In

<sup>4</sup> *Essay on Reunion*, p. 89.

<sup>5</sup> Quoted in Bricknell's *Judgment of the Bishops upon Tractarian Theology*, p. 681.

<sup>6</sup> *English Churchman*, October 17th, 1895, p. 706.

this leavening process, as well as in the carrying out of the ultimate object of the Movement, great "Reserve in communicating Religious Knowledge" was observed.

Much of that which in the early history of Tractarianism was kept a profound secret, has since been made public through the biographies of some of the principal actors. In the "Lives" of these men are now to be read their most confidential communications one with the other, in which their love of Popish doctrines, and their desire for Corporate Reunion with Rome, appear in the clearest possible light. By the aid of this light it may be useful to trace the gradual progress of this Romeward Movement.

The late Cardinal Newman stated that he ever considered the 14th of July "as the start of the religious Movement of 1833." A few months before that date, Newman, in company with his friend, Richard Hurrell Froude, while travelling on the Continent, had visited Monsignor (subsequently Cardinal) Wiseman at Rome. "We got introduced to him," wrote Froude, "to find out whether they would take us in [*i.e.*, to the Church of Rome] on any terms to which we could twist our consciences, and we found to our dismay that not one step could be gained without swallowing the Council of Trent as a whole."<sup>7</sup> While on this journey Newman fell seriously ill with a fever. On his recovery he decided to return at once to England. While in a weak condition, and before starting, he tells us: "I sat down on my bed, and began to sob violently. My servant, who had acted as my nurse, asked what ailed me. I could only answer him:—'*I have a work to do in England.*'"<sup>8</sup> What that work was we now know full well. It was that of Romanizing the Church of England.

With reference to this remarkable visit to Rome, the Rev. William Palmer, who for ten years was one of the foremost leaders of the Tractarian Movement (but subsequently

<sup>7</sup> *Froude's Remains*, Vol. I., p. 306.

<sup>8</sup> Newman's *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, p. 35. Edition, 1889.

retired from it on account of its Romanizing tendencies), and who was the intimate friend of Newman and Hurrell Froude, tells us that "Froude had with Newman been anxious to ascertain the terms upon which they could be admitted to Communion by the Roman Church, *supposing that some dispensation might be granted which would enable them to communicate with Rome without violation of conscience.*"<sup>9</sup> Mr. Palmer adds that this visit to Rome was unknown to the friends of Newman, and that if he (Mr. Palmer) had known about these circumstances, it is a question "whether he should have been able to co-operate cordially with him." "Nay," writes Mr. Palmer, "if I had supposed him willing to forsake the Church of England, I should have said that I could in that case have held no communion with him."<sup>10</sup> It must be admitted that there was something very suspicious in thus keeping secret from even their most intimate friends such a very important visit.

Mr. Palmer further states that "Newman and Froude had consulted at Rome (with Dr. Wiseman) upon the feasibility of being received as English Churchmen into the Papal Communion, retaining their doctrines."<sup>11</sup> This statement, however, was denied by Cardinal Newman, in a note dated October 11th, 1883, attached to his *Via Media*, Vol. II., p. 433. Edition 1891. Newman therein says that:—"If this means that Hurrell Froude and I thought of being received into the Catholic Church while we still remained outwardly professing the doctrine and the communion of the Church of England, I utterly deny and protest against so calumnious a statement. Such an idea never entered into our heads. I can speak for myself, and, as far as one man can speak for another, I can answer for my dear friend also." Now this statement of Newman's in the case of any ordinary man of position would be considered as conclusive, but in his case it is not so, and for this reason:—In his note on "Lying

<sup>9</sup> Palmer's *Narrative of Events Connected with the Tracts for the Times*, p. 40. Edition, 1883.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 40.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 73.

and Equivocation," attached to his *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, Newman writes:—"For myself, I can fancy myself thinking it was allowable in extreme cases for me to lie, but never to equivocate."<sup>13</sup> And again he writes in the same note:—"A secret is a more difficult case. Supposing something has been confided to me *in the strictest secrecy*, which could not be revealed without great disadvantage to another, what am I to do? If I am a lawyer, I am protected by my profession. I have a right to treat with extreme indignation any question which trenches on the inviolability of my position; *but, supposing I was driven up into a corner* [as Newman certainly was by Palmer's statement], *I think I should have a right to say an untruth.*"<sup>13</sup> If such a thing happened as that which Mr. Palmer relates, then it would certainly be "a great disadvantage" to the memory of Hurrell Froude, as well as to himself, if Newman "revealed" the truth about such an underhand proceeding; and therefore, in such a case (assuming it only to exist), Newman would feel that he had "a right to say an untruth" when "driven into a corner." It is evident, therefore, that Newman's denial does *not* settle this important question.

Lord Teignmouth, in his *Reminiscences*, mentions a remarkable case of a dispensation, given with Episcopal sanction, to a pervert to Popery. He says:—

"*I saw the conditions* on which a lady, nearly related to an intimate friend of mine, a Scotch Baronet, had been received into the Romish allegiance by a priest of Amiens, whom she had consulted, *as sanctioned by the Bishop of the Diocese*. They were as follows:—that she should not be required to censure the Church of England, to forego the use of the authorized version of the Holy Scriptures, to abstain from the domestic worship of Protestants, or to acquiesce in any form of Mariolatry."<sup>14</sup>

Fa Di Bruno's *Catholic Belief* has had a very large circu-

<sup>13</sup> *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, p. 360. Edition, 1889.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 361.

<sup>14</sup> *Reminiscences of Many Years*, by Lord Teignmouth, Vol. II., p. 291. Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1878.

lation in England. In a published letter to the author, dated May 2nd, 1884, Cardinal Manning terms it "one of the most complete and useful Manuals of Doctrine, Devotion, and Elementary information for the instruction of those who are seeking the truth." In this book is contained the following question and answer, which seem to me to have a very direct bearing on the possibility of a secret reception of Dr. Newman into the Church of Rome, in 1833:—

"*Question.*—Nicodemus was a disciple of Christ, though secretly; cannot I in like manner be a *Catholic* in heart and *in secret*?"

"*Answer.*—Nicodemus was a disciple of Jesus Christ in secret; but he presented himself to our Lord. Begin therefore by presenting yourself to the Catholic priest, to be instructed and received into the Church. After being received into the Church *privately*, if weighty reasons in the judgment of your spiritual director justify it, such as loss of home, or property, or employment, *and so long as those weighty reasons last, you need not make your Catholicity public*, but may attend to your Catholic duties privately."<sup>16</sup>

The Tractarian Movement had only been in existence a very short time when people began to suspect it as being in reality a Romeward Movement. Within a month or two after its birth some were calling Newman a "Papist" to his face. On December 22nd, 1833, he wrote to Miss Giberne:—"Mr. Terrington called on me yesterday. He was very kind, and said he intended to sign the Address to the Archbishop, and *did not call me a Papist to my face, as some other persons have.*"<sup>16</sup> As early as May, 1834, Keble asserted privately that "Protestantism, though allowable three centuries since, is dangerous now."<sup>17</sup> As is well known, the publication of *Tracts for the Times* was one of the earliest works undertaken by the party. Directly after their birth they were denounced as containing Popish doctrines. On December 7th, 1833, a clergyman wrote lamenting the

<sup>16</sup> *Catholic Belief*, by the Very Rev. Joseph Faà Di Bruno, D.D., p. 230. Fifth edition.

<sup>16</sup> *Newman's Letters*, Vol. II., p. 10.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 41.

insertion in one of the Tracts of such expressions as "conveying the sacrifice to the people," "intrusted with the keys of heaven and hell," and "intrusted with the awful and mysterious gift of making the bread and wine Christ's body and blood"; and, in view of such expressions, he closed his letter with the wise and much-needed, but sadly neglected warning:—"We must take care how we aid the cause of Popery."<sup>18</sup> On June 5th, 1834, Newman complained to his friend Froude:—"My Tracts were abused as Popish, as for other things, so especially for expressions about the Eucharist."<sup>19</sup> The Tracts, as they continued to appear, from time to time, until the last, in 1841, grew more and more Romish in their character; and they were supplemented by a flood of other publications written by various members of the party, of even a more Romanizing character. The work of "Catholicising" the Church of England was, by these means, pushed rapidly forward. In July, 1834, Newman repudiated the word "Protestant";<sup>20</sup> and even six months before that time Hurrell Froude had the audacity to declare:—"I am every day becoming a less and less loyal son of the Reformation. It appears to me plain that in all matters that seem to us indifferent or even doubtful, we should conform our practices to those of the Church which has preserved its traditionary practices unbroken. We cannot know about any seemingly indifferent practice of the Church of Rome that it is not a development of the Apostolic *ethos*."<sup>21</sup> Already Rome was the model for the Tractarians to follow. On November 5th of this year Newman did a kind act for Popery, which he has recorded in his Journal:—"November 5th.—Did not read the special Gunpowder Plot service." The celebrated M. Bunsen, 1835, declared that, in his opinion, the Tractarians were "introducing Popery without authority."<sup>22</sup> In 1836 people asserted that the Tractarians

<sup>18</sup> Palmer's *Narrative*, p. 226.

<sup>19</sup> Newman's *Letters*, Vol. II., p. 47.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 59.

<sup>21</sup> Froude's *Remains*, Vol. I., p. 336.

<sup>22</sup> Newman's *Letters*, Vol. II., p. 143.

were secretly Romanists. Newman wrote on this subject to Keble, and told him that people were under "the impression that we are Crypto-Papists."<sup>23</sup>

In this year Newman began to use the "Breviary" of the Church of Rome. Of course the Thirty-nine Articles were in the way of the success of the conspirator's plans. "I am no great friend of them," wrote Newman to Perceval, January 11th, 1836, "and should *rejoice* to be able to substitute the Creeds for them."<sup>24</sup> It is, indeed, something to be thankful for that even down to the present time the Ritualists have laboured in vain to remove these "forty stripes save one"—as they have been termed—from off their backs.

It was at about this time that Newman discovered, very much to his astonishment, that the early Fathers of the Church looked upon the Bible as the only Rule of Faith, as all good Protestants do in this nineteenth century. There are several allusions to this unwelcome discovery in Newman's *Letters*. On August 9th, 1835, he wrote to Froude:—"By the bye, I am surprised more and more to see how the Fathers insist on the Scriptures as the Rule of Faith, even in proving the most subtle parts of the doctrine of the Incarnation."<sup>25</sup> Again, on August 23rd, 1835, he wrote:—"The more I read of Athanasius, Theodoret, &c., the more I see that the ancients *did make the Scriptures the basis of their belief*. . . . I believe it would be extremely difficult to show that Tradition is *ever* considered by them (in matters of faith) more than interpretative of Scripture. . . . Again, when they met together in Council they brought the witness of Tradition as a matter of fact, but when they discussed the matter in Council, cleared their views, &c., proved their power, they always went to *Scripture alone*."<sup>26</sup> Two years later Newman wrote to Mr. Rogers:—"The Fathers do appeal in all their controversies to Scriptures as a *final authority*. When this occurs once only it

<sup>23</sup> Newman's *Letters*, p. 153.

<sup>24</sup> *Life of Dr. Pusey*, Vol. I., p. 301.

<sup>25</sup> Newman's *Letters*, Vol. II., p. 124.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 126.

may be an accident. When it occurs again and again uniformly, it does invest Scripture with the character of an *exclusive* Rule of Faith." It is, indeed, a pity that Newman and his followers did not imitate the excellent example of the Fathers. We have to thank him, however, for his very candid acknowledgments on this gravely important subject. They prove that the Fathers were thorough Protestants on the question of the Rule of Faith.

Dr. Pusey's biographer states that in September, 1836, Newman informed Pusey that he believed in the Sacrifice of the Mass, as taught by the Council of Trent. "As to the sacrificial view of the Eucharist," he wrote, "I do not see that you can find fault with the formal wording of the Tridentine Decree,"<sup>27</sup> which, as every student knows, teaches the Sacrifice of the Mass. At this time, says his biographer, "Pusey also acquiesced in the formal wording of the Council of Trent on the subject, except so far as its words were modified by the doctrines of Transubstantiation and Purgatory."<sup>28</sup>

For three years Newman and the band of followers who had gathered round him, including Dr. Pusey and the Rev. J. Keble, had been diligently sowing Popish tares in the Church of England, and the harvest was about to commence. By this time Newman had "learned to have tender *feelings*" towards the Church of Rome, as he tells us; but his "*Judgment* was against her." It "went against my feelings," he says, "to protest against the Church of Rome."<sup>29</sup> He had become an adept in the art of mystifying people. "I used irony in conversation," he wrote, "when matter-of-fact men would not see what I meant. This kind of behaviour was *a sort of habit with me.*"<sup>30</sup> "Irony" is defined in our dictionaries as "a mode of speech in which the meaning is contrary to the words," and as "dissimula-

<sup>27</sup> *Life of Dr. Pusey*, Vol. II., p. 33.

<sup>28</sup> *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, pp. 127, 128. First edition.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 115.

tion" for the purposes of ridicule. But surely, when those to whom this irony was addressed, as in this instance, did "not see" the irony, but took the falsehood for truth, they were nothing better than wilfully and shamefully deceived by Newman! Of course, for a few years, the ultimate object of the Movement was not much talked about. Its chief promoter had, as he tells us, come back from Rome, early in 1833, fully convinced that Protestant "Reformation principles were powerless to rescue" the Church of England from her existing condition; and that "there was need of a second Reformation."<sup>31</sup> Three years of that "second Reformation" had now passed by, and its results were highly satisfactory to Newman.

"It was," he wrote, "through friends, younger, for the most part, than myself, that my principles were spreading. They heard what I said in conversation, and told it to others. Undergraduates in due time took their degree, and became private tutors themselves. In this new *status*, in turn, they preached the opinions which they had already learned themselves. Others went down to the country, and became curates of parishes. Then they had down from London parcels of the Tracts, and other publications. They placed them in the shops of local booksellers, got them into newspapers, introduced them to clerical meetings, and converted more or less their Rectors and their brother curates."<sup>32</sup>

From 1836 the Tractarian march to Rome was much more rapid than before, and that under cover of an attack upon Popery. In 1839 it was proposed to erect the Protestant Martyrs' Memorial at Oxford. Pusey did not like it at all. He spoke strongly against it, "as unkind to the Church of Rome," towards which his sympathies were already being drawn out. The erection of a Monastery was contemplated, and plans were being laid for the establishment of Sisterhoods. The Rev. John Keble, another of the leaders, had begun to hate the reformers. "Anything," he wrote to Pusey, January 18th, 1839, "which separates the present

<sup>31</sup> *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, p. 95. First edition.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 133.

Church from the Reformers I should hail as a great good." <sup>33</sup> In Keble's opinion, at this time, the Reformers "were not as a party to be trusted on ecclesiastical and theological questions." <sup>34</sup> Long before this period the news of the work going on at Oxford had reached Rome, and had greatly rejoiced the heart of the Pope. The then Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Bagot) heard about these Papal rejoicings, and became greatly alarmed. He wrote to Pusey about it:—

"There are now," he said, "friends of mine staying at Rome—sensible men, too, and without *gossip*—and I am assured that the language of the Pope (as I am informed in one instance), and that of all the English Roman Catholics of rank residing there, is that of joy and congratulation at the advances which are being made in Oxford towards a return to the doctrines of the 'true Church.'" <sup>35</sup>

Newman became Editor of the *British Critic*, and soon after regretted that he had allowed in its pages "an article against the Jesuits," of which he "did not like the tone"; <sup>36</sup> which is certainly not to be wondered at, for a fellow feeling makes us wondrous kind towards those whose tactics we may adopt. The Rev. Isaac Williams, author of two of the *Tracts for the Times*, in his *Autobiography* writes:—"I have lately heard it stated from one of Newman's oldest friends, Dr. Jelf, that *his mind was always essentially Jesuitical*." <sup>37</sup>

In 1839 the "second Reformation" had proceeded so far that one of its disciples, the Rev. J. B. Morris, preaching before Oxford University, had the audacity to teach the full doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and to declare that every one was an unbeliever and carnal who did not believe it. <sup>38</sup>

Early in 1840 Newman became afraid of the mischief he

<sup>33</sup> *Life of Dr. Pusey*, Vol. II., p. 71.

<sup>34</sup> *John Keble*, by Walter Lock, M.A., p. 96. London, 1893.

<sup>35</sup> *Life of Dr. Pusey*, Vol. II., p. 73.

<sup>36</sup> *Apologia*, p. 135. First edition

<sup>37</sup> *Autobiography of Isaac Williams*, p. 54.

<sup>38</sup> *Newman's Letters*, Vol. II., p. 291.

was working in the Church, though he had no repentance for his wrongdoing. On January 10th he wrote to his friend Bowden:—"Things are progressing steadily; but breakers ahead! The danger of a lapse into Romanism, I think, gets greater daily. I expect to hear of victims. Again, I fear I see more clearly that we are working up to a schism in our Church."<sup>39</sup> The whole tendency of the Movement has been in the direction of schism. It has already effectually broken up the peace of the Church of England, divided her into parties, and may lead to a great schism at any time. Its tendency has also been in the direction of individual secession to Rome on the part of those who have been too impatient to wait for Corporate Reunion. Some of the Ritualistic leaders occasionally boast that they keep men from going over to Rome. It may be that they do keep a few here and there, for a short time, but the general tendency of their work is the other way. Cardinal Manning knew more about secessions to Rome, and their cause, than any man in England, and this is what he said about them in 1867:—

"Every Parish Priest happily knows *how empty and foolish is the boast* they [Ritualists] make of keeping souls from conversion. *The public facts of every day refute it.* . . . Such teachers are, as Fuller quaintly and truly says, like unskilful horsemen. They so open gates as to shut themselves out, but let others through."<sup>40</sup>

Several months later Newman saw clearly enough that the work of the Tractarians was driving men to Rome, and yet neither he nor they ceased their operations on that account. On September 1st, 1839, he wrote to Mr. Manning, the future Cardinal: "I am conscious that we are raising longings and tastes which we are not allowed to supply; and till our Bishops and others give scope to the development of Catholicism externally and wisely, *we do*

<sup>39</sup> Newman's *Letters*, Vol. II., p. 299.

<sup>40</sup> *Essays on Religion*, Second Series, edited by Archbishop Manning, pp. 14, 15.

*tend to make impatient minds seek it where it has ever been, in Rome.*"<sup>41</sup> And what remedy, it may be asked, did Newman propose to Manning for the longings for more Popery which they had created in the minds of their disciples? It was simply that of giving them, in the Church of England, the Popery which they would otherwise go to Rome for, instead of teaching them that they were under a delusion in supposing that Popish poison is the pure "milk of the Word." Ritualists supply Popery in the Church of England as some Irishmen supply whisky—without a *license*.

So Newman, in the letter just quoted, wrote to Manning:—"I think that, whenever the time comes that secession to Rome takes place, for which we must not be unprepared, we must boldly say to the Protestant section of our Church—'You are the cause of this; you must concede; you must conciliate, you must meet the age; you must make the Church. . . more equal to the external. Give us more services, *more vestments and decorations in worship; give us Monasteries.* . . Till then you will have continual secessions to Rome."<sup>42</sup> Did it never, I wonder, occur to Newman that Protestant Churchmen had conscientious objections to granting the Popery which he coveted for himself and his followers? Loyal Churchmen will have nothing to do with Popery, either within or without the Church of England.

But, as we have seen on the authority of Cardinal Manning, the Ritualistic cure for longings for Popery, is, in practice, an utter failure. A few months later Newman's faith in the Church of Rome had greatly increased, for he had come to fear that she was the only body capable of resisting the devil. "I begin," he wrote, "to have serious apprehensions lest any religious body is strong enough to withstand the league of evil but the Roman Church. At the end of the first millenary it withstood the fury of Satan, and now the end of the second is drawing on."<sup>43</sup> By the end of

<sup>41</sup> Purcell's *Life of Manning*, Vol. I., p. 233.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>43</sup> Newman's *Letters*, Vol. II., p. 300.

the year he thought "Rome the centre of unity";<sup>44</sup> and yet for another five years he kept away from that centre. At this period he not only "wished for union between the Anglican Church and Rome," but he also went so far as to do what he could "to gain weekly prayers for that object"; and drew up forms of prayer for union to be used by his disciples.<sup>45</sup> At this time a Roman priest, the Hon. and Rev. George Spencer, was also urging the offering of prayers with the same aim. With this object in view, Mr. Spencer paid a visit to Newman, in 1840. With reference to this visit Newman writes:—"So glad in my heart was I to see him [Spencer] when he came to my rooms, whither Mr. Palmer, of Magdalen, brought him, that I could have laughed for joy; I think I did." Newman, however, thought it best to disguise the joy he felt, and therefore, when Mr. Spencer came he was "very rude to him," and "would not meet him at dinner."<sup>46</sup> The Oxford Tractarians frequently visited the Continent, on holiday tours, and while there cultivated the good opinion of foreign Roman Catholics, and in this they were encouraged by their leaders. In the autumn of 1840 Mr. James R. Hope-Scott was travelling thus abroad, when he received a letter from Dr. Pusey, containing the following paragraph:—"I am very glad that you are seeing so much of the R[oman] C[atholics]. One wishes that they knew more of our Church, and we more of y<sup>e</sup> better among them."<sup>47</sup> At home the Rev. William George Ward, who subsequently succeeded Newman as the leader of the advanced Tractarians, was diligently engaged in the study of Roman Catholic books of theology. He preferred them to the early Fathers. "Both in ascetics and in dogmatics," writes Mr. Ward's son, "the Jesuits were his favourite reading"<sup>48</sup> at this period. We need not wonder

<sup>44</sup> Newman's *Letters*, Vol. II., p. 319.

<sup>45</sup> *Apologia*, pp. 222, 224. First edition.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 224.

<sup>47</sup> *Memoirs of James R. Hope-Scott*, Vol. I., p. 239.

<sup>48</sup> *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement*, p. 146. First edition.

at this now, though at the time it was kept strictly secret. What an excitement it would have caused in 1840, had it been publicly known that the favourite study of one of the leaders of the Tractarians was the writings of the Jesuits! That kind of study is far more common now amongst modern Ritualists than it was fifty-six years since, and the Romeward Movement is now far more under Jesuitical influence than ever it has been hitherto. Mr. James R. Hope-Scott, during the visit to the Continent just mentioned, frequently visited the Jesuits at Rome, and in his now published letters shows how any feeling which he may have entertained against them gradually wore itself away. On March 27th, 1841, he wrote to his brother:—"The General of the Jesuits I continue to visit, and am grown very fond of him."<sup>49</sup>

The most memorable event of the year 1841 was the publication of Newman's celebrated "Tract XC." A large volume might now be written about its contents and its history. It was a plea for the lawfulness of teaching in the Church of England many Roman Catholic doctrines, as taught authoritatively in that Church, on the ground that they were not opposed by the Thirty-nine Articles, and it was at the same time a very daring attempt to "Catholicise" the Church of England in the interests of the great scheme for Corporate Reunion with Rome. The best description of the objects of Tract XC. seems to me to be that given by the four Oxford Tutors, directly after it was published. One of the Tutors was the Rev. A. C. Tait, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury.

"The Tract has," wrote <sup>one of</sup> the Tutors, "in our apprehension, a highly dangerous tendency, from its suggesting that certain very important errors of the Church of Rome are not condemned by the Articles of the Church of England—for instance, that those Articles do not contain any condemnation of the doctrines—

" 1. Of Purgatory.

" 2. Of Pardons.

\* *Memoirs of J. R. Hope-Scott*, Vol. I., p. 266.

“ 3. Of the Worshipping and Adoration of Images and relics.

“ 4. Of the Invocation of Saints.

“ 5. Of the Mass.

“ as they are taught authoritatively by the Church of Rome, but only of certain absurd practices and opinions which intelligent Romanists repudiate as much as we do. It is intimated, moreover, that the Declaration prefixed to the Articles, as far as it has any weight at all, sanctions this mode of interpreting them, as it is one which takes them in their ‘literal and grammatical sense,’ and does not ‘affix any new sense to them.’ The Tract would thus appear to us to have a tendency to mitigate beyond what charity requires, and to the prejudice of the pure truth of the Gospel, the very serious differences which separate the Church of Rome from our own, and to shake the confidence of the less learned members of the Church of England in the Scriptural character of her formularies and her teaching.”<sup>60</sup>

Four days after this Protest had been made by the four Tutors, the Hebdomadal Board of Oxford University condemned the Tract, on the ground that “modes of interpretation, such as are suggested in the said Tract, evading rather than explaining the sense of the Thirty-nine Articles, and reconciling subscription to them with the adoption of errors which they were designed to counteract, defeat the object, and are inconsistent with the due observance of the above mentioned Statutes.”<sup>61</sup>

Archbishop Tait never regretted the part he took in condemning Tract XC. In 1880, he said:—“Were it all to happen again I think I should, in the same position, do exactly as I did then.”<sup>62</sup> Newman’s friend, the Rev. Isaac Williams, says:—“Many have naturally supposed that it was the condemnation of the Tract No. XC., by the Heads of Houses, which gave his [Newman’s] sensitive mind the decided turn to the Church of Rome. But I remember circumstances which indicated that it was not so. He talked to me of writing a Tract on the Thirty-nine Articles, *and at the same time said things in favour of the Church of Rome*

<sup>60</sup> *Life of Archbishop Tait*, Vol. I., pp. 81, 82. First edition.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 84.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 87.

*which quite startled and alarmed me.*”<sup>53</sup> Two pages later on Mr. Williams writes:—“Nothing had as yet impaired our intimacy and friendship, until one evening,<sup>54</sup> when alone in his rooms, he told me *he thought the Church of Rome was right, and we were wrong*, so much so, that *we ought to join it*. To this I said that if our own Church improved, as we hoped, and the Church of Rome also would reform itself, it seemed to hold out the prospect of reunion. And then everything seemed favourably progressing beyond what we could have dared to hope in the awakening of religion, and reformation among ourselves. That mutual repentance must, by God’s blessing, tend to mutual restoration and union. ‘No,’ he said, ‘St. Augustine would not allow of this argument, as regarded the Donatists. *You must come out and be separate.*’”<sup>55</sup> This argument from the conduct of the Donatists was not then for the first time adopted by Newman. In connection with it the essentially Jesuitical and double-dealing tactics of Newman are again clearly revealed. In a “private” letter to the Rev. J. B. Mozley, November 24th, 1843, he wrote:—

“Last summer four years (1839) it came *strongly* upon me, from reading first the Monophysite controversy, and then turning to the

<sup>53</sup> *Autobiography of Isaac Williams*, p. 108.

<sup>54</sup> The editor of the *Autobiography* says that “this conversation took place after the publication of Tract No. XC.”; but I venture to assert that, but for this note, no reader of the *Autobiography* would think otherwise than that the speech was made before the publication of Tract XC. The editor, writing long after the death of Williams, makes an assertion, but omits to give any proof of it. On the other hand there is clear evidence that Williams’s interview with Newman must have taken place somewhere about this date. Tract XC. was published February 27th, 1841; and Newman withdrew to Littlemore in February, 1842. Now Williams states:—“When he[Newman] shut himself up in his Monastery at Littlemore, and previously during the latter part of his stay at Oxford, I was able to withdraw myself from him.” The interview referred to must have therefore taken place some time before Newman left Oxford, and therefore in the year 1841. In either case it makes little, or no difference in Newman’s essentially dishonest and dishonourable position at that time. An honest man, holding the opinions Newman then expressed to Williams, would at once have seceded to Rome, and not wait till 1845.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 110, 111.

Donatist, that we were external to the Catholic Church. I have never got over this. I did not, however, yield to it at all, but wrote an article in the *British Critic* on the Catholicity of the English Church, which had the effect of quieting me for two years. Since this time two years the feeling has revived and gradually strengthened. I have all along gone against it, and think I ought to do so still. I am now publishing sermons, which speak more confidently about our position than I inwardly feel; but I think it right, and do not care for seeming inconsistent."<sup>56</sup>

This "inconsistency," or double-dealing, or Jesuitism, or whatever it may be called, was only a part and parcel of his ordinary conduct at this time. His friend Isaac Williams says that "the feelings and thoughts he [Newman] would express to one person or at one time, differed very much in consequence from what he might express to another or on another occasion"; and he adds that it "was long before it was publicly known what Newman's thoughts really were, and he was for some time accused by some of dishonesty and duplicity."<sup>57</sup> He was working in the dark, yet actively carrying on the secret underground conspiracy to bring back the Church of England to Rome. In his pamphlet entitled a *Letter to the Bishop of Oxford on Occasion of Tract XC.*, dated March 29th, 1841, Newman wrote of:—"The inestimable privileges I feel in being a member of that Church over which your lordship, with others, presides" (p. 33); "the Church which your lordship rules is a *Divinely ordained* channel of supernatural grace to the souls of her members" (p. 34); and "I consider the Church over which your lordship presides to be the Catholic Church in this country" (p. 34). And yet, for two years before writing this he had come, as we have just seen, to hold the opinion that those who were inside the Church of England "were external to the Catholic Church"! In this same *Letter to the Bishop of Oxford*, Newman further asserted that "it is very plain that the English Church is at present on God's

<sup>56</sup> Newman's *Letters*, Vol. II., p. 430.

<sup>57</sup> Williams's *Autobiography*, pp. 112, 113.

side" (p. 39); and that, "Did God visit us with large measures of His grace, and the Roman Catholics also, they would be drawn to us, and would acknowledge our Church as the Catholic Church in this country" (p. 44). It is hard, yea, impossible, I venture to submit, to reconcile such statements as these, with those Newman had already made in writing to his confidential friends. Soon after the publication of the pamphlet just cited, the Rev. W. G. Ward wrote to Dr. Pusey as follows:—"I have heard Newman say that it is, to say the least, doubtful whether there can be said to be a valid Sacrament administered unless the priest adds mentally what our Eucharistic Service omits."<sup>58</sup> On reading this, I cannot help asking myself whether we have in it a key to the fact that in almost all our advanced Ritualistic Churches private prayers are said, by the officiating clergyman, during the Communion Service, which are not required by the Book of Common Prayer. Are they intended to make a doubtful consecration certainly valid, by adding "mentally what our Eucharistic Service omits"?

Very advanced Romanizing doctrines were at this time secretly held by many of the Tractarians, who, it may be remarked in passing, were then becoming known as Puseyites. Even as early as July, 1841, Mr. Ward, writing to Dr. Pusey, stated that:—

"There are *many* persons who, on the one hand, do not accuse the Reformers of disingenuousness, and yet, on the other, consider the following doctrines and practices allowed by the Articles:— (1) Invocation of Saints; (2) Veneration of Images and Relics; (3) An intermediate state of purification with pain;<sup>59</sup> (4) The Reservation of the Host; (5) The Elevation of the Host; (6) The Infallibility of some General Councils; (7) The doctrine of desert by congruity, in the received Roman sense; (8) The doctrine that the Church ought to enforce Celibacy on the clergy."<sup>60</sup>

<sup>58</sup> *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement*, p. 177.

<sup>59</sup> That is, a Purgatory.

<sup>60</sup> *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement*, p. 176.

If only the majority of the Church of England could have been induced to accept the views of these advanced Romanizers, she would soon have been sufficiently "Catholicised" for reunion with the Papacy. Nothing would have delighted Ward more than such a result. "Restoration of active communion with the Roman Church is," he wrote to a friend, in 1841, "the most enchanting earthly prospect on which my imagination can dwell."<sup>61</sup> The Romanizers evidently thought they were, even then, within a measurable distance of the realization of their hopes. So full of expectation were they that they could not keep the good news to themselves. Their Roman Catholic brethren on the continent must be let into the secret. So an anonymous letter was sent soon after Tract XC. appeared, for publication to the Roman Catholic *Univers* of Paris. The author's name was suppressed for obvious reasons, but it is now known that the author was the Rev. W. G. Ward, and that it was translated for him into French by Mr. J. D. Dalgairns, of Exeter College, Oxford. From this very remarkable and thoroughly Jesuitical letter, I give the following extracts:—

"You see, then, sir, that humility, the first condition of every sound reform, is not wanting in us. *We are little satisfied with our position.* We groan at the sins committed by our ancestors in separating from the Catholic world. We experience a burning desire to be reunited to our brethren. *We love with unfeigned affection the Apostolic See, which we acknowledge to be the head of Christendom;* and the more so because the Church of Rome is our mother, which sent from her bosom the blessed St. Augustine, to bring us her immovable faith. We admit also, that it is not our formularies, nor even the Council of Trent, which prevent our union. After all these concessions, you may ask me, why, then, do you not rejoin us? What is it that prevents you? . . .

"There are at this moment, in the Anglican Church, a crowd of persons who balance between Protestantism and Catholicism, and who, nevertheless, would reject with horror the very idea of a union with Rome. The Protestant prejudices, which, for three hundred

<sup>61</sup> *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement*, p. 142.

years, have infected our Church, are unhappily too deeply rooted there to be extirpated *without a great deal of address*. [Did he not really mean *sly cunning* ?] We must, then, offer in sacrifice to God this ardent desire which devours us of seeing once more the perfect unity of the Church of Christ. We must still bear the terrible void which the isolation of our Church creates in our hearts, and remain still till it pleases God to convert the hearts of our Anglican *confrères*, especially of our holy fathers, the bishops. *We are destined, I am persuaded, to bring back many wandering sheep to the knowledge of the truth*. In fact, the progress of Catholic opinions in England, for the last seven years, is so inconceivable that no hope should appear extravagant. *Let us, then, remain quiet for some years, TILL, BY GOD'S BLESSING, THE EARS OF ENGLISHMEN ARE BECOME ACCUSTOMED TO HEAR THE NAME OF ROME PRONOUNCED WITH REVERENCE*. At the end of this term you will soon see the fruits of our patience."<sup>62</sup>

The publication of this traitorous letter very naturally created a great deal of public excitement. It was translated into German and Italian, and widely circulated on the continent, where it produced great joy in the Roman camp. A Mr. Hamilton Gray of Magdalene College, Oxford, wrote to the *Univers* to say that the letter was not written by any member of the Tractarian party, but by either a Low Churchman or a Romanist. Its authorship is now, however, placed beyond question by the publication of Mr. Ward's life by his son, who tells us that "the fact remained that its sentiments were not disclaimed by the representatives of the 'extreme' party, and a programme far more bold and outspoken than anything in Tract XC. was thus practically known to be in contemplation for moving the Anglican Church in a Romeward direction."<sup>63</sup>

Secret negotiations were entered into with Dr. Wiseman, and the conditions of Corporate Reunion with Rome were discussed with him, at Oscott College. One of the plans then discussed was a secret affiliation of the advanced Tractarians with the Roman Catholic Fathers of Charity,

<sup>62</sup> *Catholic Magazine*, March, 1841, as quoted in Bricknell's *Judgment of the Bishops*, pp. 678-80.

<sup>63</sup> *W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement*, p. 190.

the Tractarians, apparently, to remain all the while in communion with the Church of England. Mr. Wilfrid Ward tells us that "Mr. Phillipps [a prominent Roman Catholic] had urged that the Fathers of Charity, the Order of the great Italian Reformer Antonio Rosmini, then represented in England by the excellent and pious Father Gentili, *should open their Order AT ONCE to the Oxford school*, and adapt its rules to their position and antecedents."<sup>64</sup> The scheme came to nothing, so far as the public are aware, and it is asserted by Mr. Wilfrid Ward that it "met with no encouragement from Newman or from any responsible members of the party." But that it should be seriously discussed at all is in itself sufficiently startling, and proves how far gone in deception those were who desired such a secret affiliation with a Roman Catholic Order.

Dr. Pusey's Romeward tendencies were rapidly developing. In this year he visited several Roman Catholic Convents in Ireland, with a view to starting Anglican Convents in England. One of his disciples, the Rev. E. Churton, sent him an indignant letter of protest on his attitude towards the advanced Romanizers. "Instead of controlling the ebullitions of the young wrong-heads, you have suffered yourselves to be inoculated with their frenzies. . . . You have let them get ahead of you and drag you after them. Hence your proposal of reviving Monastic Life, and your very unfortunate appearance at Dublin [to visit Romish Convents], which has so deeply perplexed our best allies there. . . . As for yourselves, that which has compelled me, most unwillingly, to forsake that entire union with you in which I found so much comfort, has been that you have seemed to treat these excesses as if they were providential indications for your guidance, and thought it a kind of 'quenching the Spirit' to keep them within rule and order."<sup>65</sup> In reply to this

<sup>64</sup> *W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement*, p. 190.

<sup>65</sup> *Life of Dr. Pusey*, Vol. II., p. 269.

very outspoken communication, Dr. Pusey sent a letter to Mr. Churton which must now be considered as far from satisfactory. He mentioned what he termed “the *unnaturalness* of our present insulated state, separated from the rest of the East and West”; but he declared that “there is no wish for a *premature* union; it is only wished and longed and prayed for that we may both become such, that we may safely be united.” “As to Monasticism,” he continued, “I have *long* [how “long” I wonder] strongly thought that we needed something of this sort; it is not Romanish but primitive. . . . I think it would be a great blessing to our Church to have some such institutions.”<sup>66</sup> Dr. Pusey’s judgment was directly opposed to that of the Church of England as to Monastic Orders, as anyone can see for himself who reads her “Homily On Good Works,” Part Third, in which she terms them, in no complimentary language, “superstitious and pharisaical sects, by Antichrist invented.” Early in 1842, the Bishop of Salisbury (Dr. E. Denison), High Churchman though he was, became alarmed at the spread of Romanizing principles in the Church of England, and indignant at the conduct of Dr. Pusey, to whom he wrote on March 9th, 1842:—“Will you also allow me to say how much I regret that you either have not felt disposed or not at liberty to express any strong disapproval of the language about our own Church and that of Rome which has been used in various publications, and has naturally excited a very strong and general sensation.”<sup>67</sup> While labouring for Corporate Reunion with Rome, Pusey bitterly opposed any union between the Church of England and the Lutheran Church.

Newman’s love for Popery was also growing rapidly. He tells us that:—“In spite of my ingrained fears of Rome, and the decision of my reason and conscience against her usages [he does not say her *doctrines*], in spite of my affection for Oxford and Oriel, yet I had a secret longing love of Rome, the

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 271.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 281.

Mother of English Christianity, and I had a true devotion to the Virgin Mary." <sup>68</sup> He considered that the Anglican Church "must have a ceremonial, a ritual, and a fulness of doctrine and devotion, which it had not at present, if it were to compete with the Roman Church with any prospect of success. . . . Such, for instance, would be Confraternities, particular devotions, reverence for the Blessed Virgin, prayers for the dead, beautiful churches, munificent offerings to them and in them, Monastic Houses, *and many other observances* and Institutions, which I used to say belonged to us as much as to Rome." <sup>69</sup> This was a very extensive Ritualistic "Plan of Campaign"; but I fear that I cannot—judging by the evidence which I have already produced—give Newman credit for any very warm desire that the Church of England should "compete with the Roman Church with any prospect of success." He wanted, not competition, but peace and union between the Churches. It is true that he made some efforts to keep people from going over to Rome; but what was his object in doing so? To a Roman Catholic correspondent he wrote, on April 8th, 1841:—"It is my trust, though I must not be too sanguine, that we shall not have individual members of our communion going over to yours." <sup>70</sup> A month later he explained the reason for this opposition to individual secession, in another letter to a Roman Catholic:—"We are keeping people from you," he wrote, "*by supplying their wants in our own Church. We are keeping persons from you: do you wish us to keep them from you for a time or for ever?*" It rests with you to determine. I do not fear that you will succeed among us; you will not supplant our Church in the affections of the English nation; **ONLY THROUGH THE ENGLISH CHURCH CAN YOU ACT UPON THE ENGLISH NATION.** I wish, of course, our Church should be consolidated, *with and through and in your communion*, for its sake, and your sake, and for the sake of unity." <sup>71</sup>

<sup>68</sup> *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, p. 165. Edition, 1889.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 166

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 188.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 191.

So that, after all, Newman did not wish to keep the English people from Rome "for ever," but only "for a time," during which Rome should have a chance to "act upon the English nation" in her own interests! Are not these the sly tactics carried on by the majority of the Ritualists in our own day? In 1843, Newman, as we have already stated, publicly withdrew the denunciations of Rome which during the previous ten years he had uttered, as so many "dirty words." In the same year many of the early friends of the Tractarian Movement began to be alarmed at the rapid progress which their followers were making towards Rome, and some of them withdrew from the party on that account: of these, the most prominent was the Rev. William Palmer, who had worked for the Movement since its commencement in 1833. He published the reasons for his withdrawal in a pamphlet entitled, *A Narrative of Events connected with the Publication of the Tracts for the Times, with Reflections on the Existing Tendencies to Romanism*. This pamphlet, with additions, was re-issued by its author, in 1883. In the course of it Mr. Palmer gives ample proof of the Romish tendency of the Movement, as it then existed, by a series of extracts from the writings of its leaders, whose principles, he affirmed, "tend to the restoration of Romanism in its fullest extent, and the total subversion of the Reformation."<sup>73</sup> From these extracts I select the following:—

"We talk of the blessings of 'emancipation from the Papal yoke,' and use other phrases of a like *bold and undutiful tenour*. We trust, of course, that active and visible union with the See of Rome is not of the essence of the Church; at the same time we are deeply conscious that in lacking it, far from asserting a right, *we forego a great privilege*."<sup>73</sup>

"[The Pope is] the earthly representative of her [the Church's] Divine Head."

<sup>73</sup> Palmer's *Narrative*, p. 165. Edition, 1883.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 161.

"The Holy See [is] the proper medium of communion with the Catholic Church."<sup>74</sup>

This tendency to Romanism does not appear to have given any alarm to such well-known members of the party as the Rev. John Keble and Mr. Gladstone. The former, on May 14th, 1843, wrote to Newman:—"Certainly there is a great yearning even after Rome in many parts of the Church, which seems to be accompanied *with so much good that one hopes, if it be right, it will be allowed to gain strength.*"<sup>75</sup> If Keble were at that time a truly loyal son of the Reformed Church of England, would he have rejoiced at this "great yearning even after Rome," and have hoped that it would gain strength? Of course this was written in confidence, and Keble never could have anticipated that it would ever have been made public, or there can be no doubt he would have written with greater caution. In the *Foreign and Colonial Quarterly Review* for October, 1843, Mr. Gladstone wrote an article on "The Present State of the Church," in which he admitted that there were at that period, within the Church of England—

"Propagators of Catholic tenets and usages, who do not scruple to denounce Protestantism as a principle of unmixed evil; in whom the attraction of the Church's essential Catholicity is sufficient, but only just sufficient, to overcome the repulsive force of the Protestant elements admitted into her institutions; and who do not dissemble that, in their view, Rome, if not a true normal pattern of Christianity, is yet the best existing standard, and one to which we ought to seek to conform. Rome, who is always at our gates as a foe, though in her legitimate sphere she be also an elder sister. With this foe they parley, and in the hearing of the people on the wall. At the same time they relentlessly pursue, with rebuke and invective, the Protestant name."<sup>76</sup>

One would have supposed that Mr. Gladstone would have recommended that such a set of traitors should at once have been turned out of the Church in disgrace. That is what

<sup>74</sup> Palmer's *Narrative*, p. 163.

<sup>75</sup> Lock's *John Keble*, p. 120.

<sup>76</sup> Gladstone's *Gleanings of Past Years*, Vol. V., p. 66.

they richly deserved. But, unfortunately, he heaped up praise on the traitors, and hoped they would not go over to Rome, but remain in the Church of England, and "enlighten it" by their "holy example."

"Although," wrote Mr. Gladstone, "we carefully distinguish this section from the legitimate Catholic development, of which we believe it to be an exaggeration, *we rejoice that these excellent persons abide in the Church, to enlighten it by the holy example of their lives. We rejoice that they feel the awful responsibility of that condemnation, which they would undertake to pronounce against her, by the act of quitting her communion.*"<sup>77</sup>

And what was "the holy example" which these men were showing to the Church? A few weeks after Mr. Gladstone thus held them up for admiration, they were described by Mr. Newman, who knew them better than any man living, as men "who feel they can with a safe conscience remain with us [*i.e.*, in the Church of England], while they are allowed to testify in behalf of Catholicism, and to promote its interests, *i.e.*, as if by such acts they were putting our Church, or at least a portion of it, in which they are included, in the position of Catechumens. *They think they may stay, while they are moving themselves, others, nay, say the whole Church, towards Rome.*"<sup>78</sup>

The publication of Mr. Palmer's pamphlet led to the Rev. William George Ward writing his notorious and Romanizing work entitled, the *Ideal of a Christian Church*, which was avowedly a reply to Mr. Palmer. Mr. Ward, shortly before the time when he wrote the *Ideal*, having heard that the Rev. R. W. Sibthorp had left the Church of Rome, and returned to the Church of England, of which he had at one time been an ordained Minister, was greatly annoyed, and vented his indignation in a letter to Mr. Phillipps, a Roman Catholic, in these terms:—"By this time you have doubtless heard of Mr. Sibthorp's step-

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 70.

<sup>78</sup> *Memoirs of James R. Hope-Scott*, Vol. II., p. 25.

How unspeakably dreadful : it makes one sick to think of it. . . . His reception among us [Tractarians] will be, I fully expect, of the most repulsive character ; I for one shall decline any intercourse with him whatever."<sup>79</sup>

That Romanizing tendencies existed in the Church of England Mr. Ward candidly acknowledged, and even expressed his joy at the fact. In his *Ideal* he quotes, as accurate, the statement of the *Christian Remembrancer*, for November, 1843 (the quarterly organ of the Tractarians), which affirmed that the "tendencies to Rome" were "deeply seated and widely spreading"; and that members of the party were "by hundreds straggling towards Rome."<sup>80</sup> In this same *Ideal* Mr. Ward, referring to the Twelfth of the Thirty-nine Articles, declared :—"I subscribe it myself in a non-natural sense." At page 565 he wrote :—"We find, oh most joyful, most wonderful, most unexpected sight! *we find the whole cycle of Roman doctrine* gradually possessing numbers of English Churchmen." At page 567 he wrote :—"Three years have passed, since I said plainly, that in subscribing the Articles, *I renounce no one Roman doctrine.*"

It is not to be wondered at that disloyal utterances such as these raised a hurricane of indignant opposition in the Church. It would have been a lasting disgrace to her had such statements been allowed to pass unchallenged. On November 10th, 1844, Mr. Ward was summoned to appear before the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford. When he appeared he was asked whether he denied the authorship of the *Ideal of a Christian Church*; and whether he disavowed certain passages in the book? Mr. Ward replied, asking for more time before he answered these questions. This was granted to him. He again appeared before the Vice-Chancellor on December 3rd, when, acting under legal advice, he refused to answer the

<sup>79</sup> *W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement*, pp. 201, 202.

<sup>80</sup> *Ward's Ideal of a Christian Church*, p. 566. Second edition.

questions. On December 13th, notice was given that at a Convocation to be held on February 13th, 1845, certain propositions would be placed before Convocation, two of which were as follows:—

(1) "That the passages now read from a book entitled the *Ideal of a Christian Church Considered*, are utterly inconsistent with the Articles of Religion of the Church of England, and with the declaration in respect of those Articles made and subscribed by William George Ward previously and in order to his being admitted to the degrees of B.A. and M.A. respectively, and with the good faith of him, the said William George Ward, in respect of such declaration and subscription."

(2) "That the said William George Ward has disintitiled himself to the rights and privileges conveyed by the said degrees, and is hereby degraded from the said degrees of B.A. and M.A. respectively."

The announcement of this proposed action in Convocation created intense excitement throughout the Church of England, and raised the anger of the advanced Tractarians—including Dr. Pusey and Mr. Gladstone—to a boiling state. The attitude of Dr. Hook towards the book was very remarkable. First of all, he declared that Ward had "maligned the English Church for the purpose of eulogizing that of Rome."<sup>81</sup> Dr. Pusey informed him that although he "did not agree with the book," yet that—

"Ward is really very greatly benefiting the Church by his practical suggestions and opening people's eyes to amend things. It is shocking to think of 'degrading' one by whom we are benefiting."<sup>82</sup>

At first Hook decided not to vote at all on the question to be brought before Convocation. Dr. Pusey's publications, more especially his praise of Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the Jesuits, had greatly displeased him.

"I do honestly confess," he wrote to Pusey, "that the publication of *Romish Methodism* by yourself, and your eulogy of the founder of the Jesuits, had some influence upon my mind, and makes me pause as a strong, decided, vehement Anti-Romanist. These publications and the legendary Lives of the Saints will have the

<sup>81</sup> *Life of Dr. Pusey*, Vol. II., p. 415.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 421.

same effect in England as the fanatical movement in France; they will make men decided Infidels."<sup>88</sup>

On February 13th Ward appeared before the Convocation, and made a defence of his book, after which it was condemned by a majority of 391 votes; his degradation was affirmed by a majority of 58 only. At the same meeting of the Convocation a proposal was made to censure Tract XC., and there can be no doubt that it would have been carried were it not that the Proctors rose and vetoed the motion, which consequently had to be abandoned. One of the Proctors afterwards was promoted to the Deanery of St. Paul's (Dr. Church), and even received the offer of the Archbishopric of Canterbury on the death of Dr. Tait.

Dr. Hook and Mr. Gladstone both voted against the condemnation of Mr. Ward's book, and against his degradation. Mr. Gladstone's vote was given after a careful study of the *Ideal of a Christian Church*. In the December, 1844, issue of the *Quarterly Review* he had written a lengthy review of the book, in which, while he criticised many of Mr. Ward's statements, and expressed his dissent from them, he at the same time gave expression to his own views of Mr. Ward's attitude towards Rome in terms which gave great offence to loyal Churchmen.

"We are prepared to contend," wrote Mr. Gladstone, "that even those who may be influenced more or less by the sympathies which Mr. Ward has avowed for Romish opinions, and by his antipathy to the proceedings taken at the Reformation, are in no degree thereby released from their obligation to continue in the communion of the Church. If their private judgment *prefers the religious system of the Church of Rome to their own*, and even holds the union of the English Church with Rome to be necessary to her perfection as a Church, yet, so long as they cannot deny that she is their spiritual parent and guide ordained of God, they owe to her not merely adhesion, but allegiance. . . . The doctrine that such persons ought to quit the pale of the Church,

<sup>88</sup> *Life of Dr. Pusey*, Vol. II., p. 431.

in our view both drives them upon sin, and likewise constitutes an unwarrantable invasion of the liberty which the Church herself has intended for them." <sup>84</sup>

I venture to submit that Mr. Gladstone's argument would not be accepted in the Army. If, in a time of warfare, it were discovered that some of the officers in a citadel preferred the rule of the enemy to that of their own sovereign, and at the same time were actively at work for the purpose of handing over the whole citadel to the enemy, the authorities would soon deal with the traitors in a very different manner from that suggested by Mr. Gladstone for the traitor officers of the Church Militant. It would not be thought "an unwarrantable invasion of the liberty" of those officers to treat them as they deserved; indeed, it would be considered a bounden duty to deprive them at once of their commissions in the army, and turn them out of it in disgrace.

It must not be supposed that Dr. Hook's vote in defence of Ward was the result of any wish on his part to aid in the reunion of the Church of England with the Papacy. Individual or corporate reunion with Rome was ever an abomination to Hook, who, in his later years, fought most vigorously against the more advanced Romanizers. At the close of the year 1844 he viewed with horror the thought that Newman might secede, and rejoiced when he heard a rumour that he would not go over. In this cheerful frame of mind he wrote to Dr. Pusey:—

"I am so glad and thankful that Newman has been saved from this downfall: may he be still preserved from the fangs of Satan. Although I am quite convinced that the number of Romanizers is very small, yet there are several persons who would follow Newman, and I should myself fear that any person going from light to darkness would endanger his salvation. I should fear that it would be scarcely possible for anyone who should apostatize from the only true Church of God in this country to the Popish sect, to escape perdition; having

<sup>84</sup> Gladstone's *Gleanings*, Vol. V., pp. 152, 153.

yielded to Satan in one temptation he will go on sinking deeper and deeper into the bottomless pit."<sup>85</sup>

In this letter Dr. Hook further asserted that Rome is identical with Antichrist, and that "Romanism is preparing the way for infidelity." Dr. Pusey was not at all pleased with this letter. It annoyed him very much to hear from his friend such plain denunciations of the Papal Communion; and therefore he wrote back a letter of protest against Hook's strong language:—

"I am," wrote Pusey, "frightened at your calling Rome Antichrist, or a forerunner of it. I believe Antichrist will be infidel, and arise out of what calls itself Protestantism, *and then Rome and England will be united in one* to oppose it. Protestantism is infidel, or verging towards it, as a whole."<sup>86</sup>

Pusey's hatred of Protestantism here comes out in the strongest light; and his hatred of it was shared by the other leaders of his party. But he could not bear to hear any of his disciples or friends say anything against Rome. Soon after he had written the above letter to Dr. Hook, he was very disappointed with the new Charge of Archdeacon Manning, because of its severe criticism of the Papacy. So he wrote to Manning:—

"Thank you for your Charge. While it is in a cheering tone, *is there quite love enough for the Roman Church? . . . I only desiderate more love for Rome.*"<sup>87</sup>

In the light of Manning's subsequent history it does indeed seem strange to find him thus censured at this period for not loving Rome enough. Manning did not agree with Pusey on this subject. There was more manliness in his reply than could be found in the letter of his leader:—

"One powerful obstruction," he wrote to Pusey, "to the very work in which you are spending yourself arises, I believe, out of the tone you have adopted towards the Church of Rome. Will you forgive me if I say that it seems to me to breathe, not charity, but want of

<sup>85</sup> *Life of Dr. Pusey*, Vol. II., p. 446.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 447.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 454.

decision? . . . Now what are the facts but these? The Church of Rome for three hundred years has desired our extinction. It is now undermining us. Suppose your own brother to believe that he was divinely inspired to destroy you. The highest duties would bind you to decisive, firm, and circumspect precaution. Now a tone of love such as you speak of seems to me to bind you also to speak plainly of the broad and glaring evils of the Roman system. Are you prepared to do this? If not, it seems to me that the most powerful warnings of charity forbid you to use a tone which cannot but lay asleep the consciences of many for whom, by writing and publishing, you make yourself responsible."<sup>88</sup>

Dr. Pusey's biographer acknowledges that his "attitude at this juncture created perplexity in still higher quarters."<sup>89</sup> It seems to have perplexed the Archbishop of Canterbury, whose Chaplain, the Rev. B. Harrison, wrote to Pusey a letter on the subject. Pusey's biographer does not print this letter, but he does print the reply to it, in which Pusey's dislike for unity with Protestants, and his love for much that is Roman, is candidly acknowledged.

"I cannot," wrote Pusey, "any more take the negative ground against Rome; I can only remain neutral. I have indeed for some time left off alleging grounds against Rome, and whether you think it right or wrong, I am sure it is of no use to persons who are really in any risk of leaving us. . . From much reading of Roman books, I am so much impressed with *the superiority of their teaching*; and again, in some respects, I see things in Antiquity which I did not (especially I cannot deny some purifying system in the Intermediate State, nor the lawfulness of some Invocation of Saints) that I dare not speak against things."<sup>90</sup>

Dr. Hook's hopefulfulness as to the state of Newman was without solid foundation. No one can read Newman's *Letters*, or the *Life of Dr. Pusey*, without finding abundant evidence to prove that Newman's heart had been for many years in Rome, and that, to be consistent, he ought to have seceded several years before he actually did leave the Church of England. Some evidence of Newman's love for Rome has already been given above. This may now be

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 455.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 455.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 456, 457.

supplemented by the following extracts from his letters to friends. On September 1st, 1843, he wrote to the Rev. J. B. Mozley:—"The truth then is, I am not a good son enough of the Church of England to feel I can in conscience hold preferment under her. *I love the Church of Rome too well.*"<sup>91</sup> On the 22nd of the same month he wrote to Mrs. J. Mozley:—"You cannot estimate what so many, alas! feel at present, the strange effect produced on the mind when the *conviction* flashes, or rather pours, in upon it that *Rome is the true Church.*"<sup>92</sup> He was here evidently speaking for himself, and of his own "convictions." The claims of Rome seem to have occupied his mind very much at this time. Seven days later he again referred to the subject in a letter to Mrs. Thomas Mozley:—

"I do so despair of the Church of England," wrote Newman, "and am so evidently cast off by her, and, on the other hand, I am so drawn to the Church of Rome, that I think it *safer*, as a matter of honesty, *not* to keep my living. This is a very different thing from having any intention of joining the Church of Rome. *However, to avow generally as much as I have said, would be wrong for ten thousand reasons.*"<sup>93</sup>

So he kept his longings for Rome as a secret within his own breast, and those of a few relatives and near friends whom he could trust. The consequence of this was that he appeared to the public in a character different from that which was really his. A month later he had come to the opinion that the Church of England was "not part of the Catholic Church." He wrote to Dr. Manning, on October 25th, 1843:—

"I must tell you then frankly (but I combat arguments which to me, alas, are shadows) that it is not from disappointment, irritation, or impatience, that I have, whether rightly or wrongly, resigned St. Mary's; but because *I think the Church of Rome the Catholic Church, and ours no part of the Catholic Church, because not in com-*

<sup>91</sup> Newman's *Letters*, Vol. II., p. 423.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 424.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 425.

*union with Rome*; and because I feel that I could not honestly be a teacher in it any longer." <sup>94</sup>

The arguments which thus induced Newman to resign the living of St. Mary's, ought to have induced him at once to resign his membership in the Church of England. He had no moral right to remain in a Communion which he was convinced formed "no part of the Catholic Church." Indeed he ought, on his own showing, to have resigned his living several years before he resigned St. Mary's, since, in his letter to Mrs. J. Mozley, on November 24th, 1844, he wrote:—"A *clear conviction* of the substantial identity of Christianity and the Roman system has now been on my mind *for a full three years*" <sup>95</sup>—that is, from 1841. He did not, however, secede to Rome for another year after writing this letter, so that at least for full four years he had acted a double part—*outwardly* a member of the Church of England; *inwardly* a member of the Church of Rome. <sup>96</sup> On November 16th, 1844, Newman wrote to Dr. Manning:—"As far as I know myself, my one paramount reason for contemplating a change is my deep, unvarying conviction that our Church is in schism, and my salvation depends on my joining the Church of Rome." <sup>97</sup>

From his resignation of St. Mary's until his reception into the Church of Rome, Newman made Pusey his confidant. The correspondence which passed between them is painfully interesting, and shows that Pusey wished for more or less of Popery, but would not submit to the Pope until the Church of England had done so in her corporate

<sup>94</sup> Newman's *Apologia*, p. 221. Edition, 1889.

<sup>95</sup> Newman's *Letters*, Vol. II., p. 445.

<sup>96</sup> From a letter to Dr. Pusey, dated February 19th, 1844, we learn that the date of the birth of Newman's conviction that the Church of England was no part of the Catholic Church was the year 1839. "I must say," Newman then wrote, "that *for four years and a half* [that is, from the year 1839] I have had a conviction, weaker or stronger, but on the whole constantly growing, and at present very strong, that we are not part of the Catholic Church." (*Life of Dr. Pusey*, Vol. II., p. 381.)

<sup>97</sup> Purcell's *Life of Cardinal Manning*, Vol. I., p. 258.

capacity ; while Newman had become impatient to depart, and was willing to accept both Pope and Popery, without waiting for the Church of England to set him the example. Pusey wrote that he looked to "a Reunion of the Church as the end" of the Tractarian Movement ; and, meanwhile, his anxiety was to ascertain "on what terms and in what way" the Church of England could "be reunited with the rest of the Western Church."<sup>98</sup> Many persons will be surprised to learn that although, on August 28th, 1844, Newman had written to Pusey boldly declaring his conviction that the Church of England was "not part of the Church," yet on the 14th of the following November Pusey thus wrote to the Rev. Prebendary Henderson :— "You are quite right in thinking that Newman has no feelings drawing him away from us: all his feelings and sympathies have been for our Church."<sup>99</sup> It is difficult to acquit Dr. Pusey of a charge of wilful deception, or at least of equivocation, in writing like this. On October 8th, 1845, Newman was received into the Church of Rome at Littlemore ; and on October 16th a letter from Pusey, on his secession, appeared in the *English Churchman*, in which he remarked :—"He [Newman] seems then to me not so much gone from us, as transplanted into another part of the Vineyard."<sup>100</sup>

Many since then have mourned over the loss of Newman to the Church of England. For my part I conceive it to be a blessing that he went. His heart's affection was with the great enemy of the Church of England ; his place was therefore no longer within her fold. Already he had infected many of his disciples with a love for Romanism.

The month which witnessed the secession of Newman beheld also the appointment of the Rev. Samuel Wilberforce as Bishop of Oxford. The new Bishop, even before his arrival in his Diocese, had fears as to his approaching

<sup>98</sup> *Life of Dr. Pusey*, Vol. II., p. 404.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 406, 445.      <sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 461.

relations to the Regius Professor of Hebrew, which he made known in a letter to Miss L. Noel. To her Dr. Wilberforce expressed the opinion that Pusey was "a very holy man"; but he added:—

"He [Dr. Pusey] has greatly helped, and is helping, to make a party of semi-Romanizers in the Church, to lead some to Rome. . . . He says, for instance, that he does not think himself as an English Churchman at liberty to hold all Roman doctrine; but he does 'not censure any Roman doctrine,' whilst he holds his Canonry at Christ Church, and his position amongst us, on condition of signing Articles, one half of which are taken up in declaring different figments of Rome to be dangerous deceits and blasphemous fables."<sup>101</sup>

Pusey wrote to Dr. Wilberforce on the day of his election to the Oxford Bishopric, and received a reply which seems to have surprised him very much. It was a somewhat severe criticism of his teaching. In his rejoinder to the Bishop-Elect, Pusey once more revealed his love for much that was distinctly Roman:—

"I did not mean," wrote Pusey, "to state anything definitely as to myself, but only to maintain, in the abstract, the tenability of a certain position, in which very many are, of not holding themselves obliged to renounce any doctrine *formally* decreed by the Roman Church."

Pusey proceeded to inform his future Diocesan that he could no longer refuse his "belief to an intermediate state of cleansing, in some cases through pain"; or, in other words, of his belief in the existence of Purgatory. The effect of his acceptance of this belief was, he said, that ever since he had "been wholly silent about Purgatory." He had also come to believe in Invocation of Saints. On this latter point he acted most inconsistently. He told the Bishop-Elect:— "Practically then I dissuade or *forbid* (where I have authority) Invocation of Saints; abstractedly, I see no reason why our Church might not eventually allow it, in the sense of asking for their prayers"; and towards the conclusion of his letter

<sup>101</sup> *Life of Bishop Wilberforce*, Vol. I., p. 311.

he added:—"I cannot but think that Rome and we are not irreconcilably at variance."<sup>103</sup>

It is here seen how rapidly Pusey was marching on the road to Rome, though he seems to have never expected to arrive at the end of the journey. It added much to the difficulties of his position that he had now, in Dr. Wilberforce, a bishop carefully watching his movements, and ready to censure him when necessary. Time went on, and the Romeward Movement with it. By the year 1847, even Archdeacon Manning had discovered its tendency towards Rome, and its illogical position in the Church of England. He wrote to Pusey, on January 23rd of that year:—

"You know how long I have to you openly expressed my conviction that a false position has been taken up in the Church of England. The direct and certain tendency, I believe, of what remains of the original Movement is to the Roman Church. You know the minds of men about us better than I do, and will, therefore, know how strong an impression the claims of Rome have made on them; and how feeble and fragmentary are the reasons on which they have made a sudden stand or halt in the line on which they have been, perhaps insensibly, moving for years. It is also clear that they are 'revising the Reformation'—that the doctrine, ritual, and practice of the Church of England, taken at its best, does not suffice them."<sup>103</sup>

At about the same time Dr. Hook, Tractarian though he was, grew more and more alarmed at the conduct of the Romanizing party. In great trouble he wrote to Manning from his Leeds Vicarage:—

"Those whom I took for Church of England men, and who as such hated Popery, who once, as in the *Tracts for the Times*, openly assailed Popery, I find now to be enamoured of her. I find young men thinking it orthodox to read and study Popish books of devotion, and to imitate Popish priests in their attire; I find Justification by Faith, the doctrine of our Articles, the test of a standing or falling Church, repudiated, and consequently a set of works of supererogation and a feeling in favour of the intercession of those who are supposed to have been more than profitable servants."<sup>104</sup>

<sup>103</sup> *Life of Dr. Pusey*, Vol. III., pp. 43-45.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 135.

<sup>104</sup> *Life of Cardinal Manning*, Vol. I., p. 328.

At this very period the views of Dr. Manning were in a state of transition—his face was turned Romeward. During the summer of 1847, he travelled abroad on the Continent. At Liege he fell in love with the Sacrifice of the Mass, and wrote in his diary:—"I cannot but feel that the practise of Elevation, Exposition, Adoration of the Blessed Eucharist has a powerful effect in sustaining and realizing the doctrine of the Incarnation."<sup>106</sup> In 1848 Archdeacon Manning visited Rome. While there strange things happened, of which the world knew nothing until after his death. One day, while in the Piazza di Spagna, he saw the Papal carriage approaching towards him. As it passed he knelt down in the street before the Pope—and he all the time an Archdeacon in the Reformed Church of England!<sup>106</sup> Mr. Purcell, the future Cardinal's biographer, tells us in the chapter which he devotes to this visit to Rome that—

"In his Diary Archdeacon Manning nowhere says in so many words, that he took a personal part in the veneration of relics which he so often witnessed and described with touching fidelity. Yet from the tone and spirit of his testimony I have no doubt that at St. Philip Neri's Oratory at Florence, for instance, the relics of the Saint were laid on the forehead and pressed to the lips of the Archdeacon of Chichester."<sup>107</sup>

The history of Manning's change of views in favour of the Church of Rome, as related by Mr. Purcell, greatly surprised the English public, when it was first published. It revealed an absence of straightforward conduct on Manning's part for which no really valid excuse has yet been offered. His double dealing is frankly admitted by his Roman Catholic biographer, who 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 unwavering belief in the Church of England as

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 352. <sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. II., p. 456. <sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. I., p. 407, note.

the Divine witness to the Truth, appointed by Christ and guided by the Holy Spirit. The other voice, as the following confessions and documents under his own handwriting bear ample witness, speaks in almost heartbroken 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 Laprimaundaye, at any rate in his letters to Robert Wilberforce, the drawing he felt towards the infallible teaching of the Church of Rome."<sup>108</sup>

It was while in this transition state that Manning published several volumes of his Anglican sermons. In 1865, just before he was consecrated titular "Archbishop of Westminster," Manning consulted a friend as to the wisdom of having them republished. The friend gave as his opinion, that, as a Roman Catholic, Dr. Manning could not conscientiously republish them. Yet in the letter conveying this opinion, his friend (Dr. Bernard Smith) bore testimony to the services rendered to the Church of Rome by these Anglican sermons.

"I confess," wrote Dr. B. Smith, "I was greatly surprised to see how close [that is, in these sermons] you bring the Anglican Confession to the Church of Rome. But what I admired most in the perusal of these volumes was not the many strong Catholic truths I met with, but that almost Catholic unction of a St. Francis of Sales, or of a St. Teresa, that breathes through them all. That the reading of these works must have great influence over the Protestant mind I have no doubt. I also believe that no sincere Protestant can read over these volumes, who sooner or later will not take refuge in the ark"<sup>109</sup> [by which, of course, Dr. Smith meant the Church of Rome].

What is here said of Manning's Anglican Sermons may, with equal truth, be said of many scores of volumes written by Ritualistic clergymen. These works teach principles which must logically lead to the Church of Rome, even when, as is sometimes the case, they are accompanied with criticisms on some portions of the Roman system. Doubts as to the Church of England entered Manning's mind as early as 1846.

<sup>108</sup> *Life of Cardinal Manning*, Vol. I., p. 463.

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. II., p. 722, *note*.

In his Diary for the August of that year he wrote that, in his opinion, the Church of England was "diseased organically" by its "separation from Church *toto orbe diffusa* and from *Cathedra Petri*"; by its "abolition of penance," and by its "extinction of daily sacrifice."<sup>110</sup> On July 5th, 1846, he wrote in his Diary:—"Something keeps rising and saying, 'you will end in the Roman Church.'" "If the Church of England were away there is nothing in Rome that would repel me with sufficient repulsion to keep me separate, and there is nothing in Protestantism that would attract me. . . I am conscious that I am further from the English Church and nearer Rome than I ever was. . . Yet I have no positive doubts about the Church of England. I have difficulties—but the chief thing is the *drawing* of Rome. It satisfies the *whole* of my intellect, sympathy, sentiment, and nature, in a way proper, and solely belonging to itself."<sup>111</sup> Mr. Purcell adds to the above extracts from Manning's Diary the following significant comments:—

"It is curious to note from these entries that the breakdown of Manning's belief in the English Church took place so early as 1846, two years before Hampden's appointment, and four years before the Gorham Judgment. *In his sermons and charges* there are not the slightest indications of such a misgiving. In his correspondence with Mr. Gladstone at this period, *not a hint or suggestion was conveyed*—not that the Church of England was organically and functionally diseased—but that it had fallen from the high ideal of perfection, which Manning had so fervently and eloquently attributed to it in his public utterances. From the evidence of his own Diary, from his letters to Laprimaudaye and Robert Wilberforce, it seems as clear as daylight that, intellectually Manning had, years before the Gorham Judgment, lost faith in the Church of England."<sup>112</sup>

Notwithstanding his "loss of faith in the Church of England," Manning continued to outwardly profess what in his heart he had ceased to believe in. On February 12th, 1848—three years before he left the Church of England—he wrote from Rome to his intimate friend, Robert Wilberforce:

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. I., p. 483.    <sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 485, 486.    <sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 487, 488.

—"I cannot rest the Church of England and its living witness on anything higher than an intellectual basis. I trust it, because I *think* it to be right, not because I believe it to be right. It is a subject of my reason, and not an object of my faith."<sup>113</sup> The following year he wrote, "under the seal," more strongly:—

"Protestantism is not so much a rival system, which I reject, but no system, a chaos, a wreck of fragments, without idea, principle, or life. It is to me flesh, blood, unbelief, and the will of man. *Anglicanism seems to me to be in essence the same, only elevated, constructed, and adorned by intellect, social and political order, and the fascinations of a national and domestic history. As a theology, still more as the Church or the faith, it has so faded out of my mind that I cannot say I reject it, but I know it no more. I simply do not believe it. I can form no basis, outline, or defence for it.*"<sup>114</sup>

And yet he continued to receive the emoluments of a Church in which he had ceased to have any real faith! Was this honest? Was it not, rather, double dealing, such as looked very much like a case of receiving money under false pretences? In any case it reminds us of those of whom it is recorded that they possessed "a conscience seared with a hot iron"—past any conscientious feeling. For more than a year after this Manning wrote letters to his penitents, having for their object the strengthening of *their* faith in the Church of England. One such letter, dated May 6th, 1850, is printed by his biographer, in which occurs the following assertion:—"Judging by the evidence of the Primitive Church there are many, and they very grave and vital, points on which the Church of England seems more in harmony with Holy Scripture than the Church of Rome."<sup>115</sup> One wonders whether Manning at the time really believed what he thus wrote. I very much doubt it. It seems that this letter was the means of preventing Manning's penitent from going over to Rome. Manning's real views at this time were known only to four or five other persons, his intimate friends,

<sup>113</sup> *Life of Cardinal Manning*, Vol. I., p. 509. <sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 515. <sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 473.

all of whom, like himself, eventually joined the Church of Rome. They were Robert Wilberforce, James Hope, William Dodsworth, Henry Wilberforce, and, perhaps, Laprimaudaye. Mr. Gladstone was an intimate friend, but the secret of his (Manning's) views was carefully kept from that statesman.

"On learning in January last [1895]," writes Mr. Purcell, "the substance of Manning's letters to Robert Wilberforce, Mr. Gladstone was surprised beyond measure. Speaking with evident pain, he said, —'To me this is most startling information, for which I am quite unprepared. In all our correspondence and conversations, during an intimacy which extended over many years, Manning never led me to believe that he had doubts as to the position or Divine authority of the English Church, far less that he had lost faith altogether in Anglicanism. That is to say, up to the Gorham Judgment [in 1850]. The Gorham Judgment, I knew, shook his faith in the Church of England. It was then that Manning expressed to me—and for the first time—his doubts and misgivings.' After a few moments' reflection, Mr. Gladstone added :—' I won't say Manning was insincere, God forbid ! *But he was not simple and straightforward.*" " 116

I venture to submit that the majority of Englishmen will see, in such conduct, clear evidence of insincerity, as well as of a want of "straightforward" conduct. The clearest proof of Manning's ecclesiastical dishonesty—I cannot here use a milder term—is obtained by a comparison of a letter which he wrote to Robert Wilberforce, on June 25th, 1850, with a published letter, which he addressed to the Bishop of Chichester, dated July 2nd, 1850—only a week later. The two letters afford a striking instance of that "double voice" in which he then frequently spoke. In the first of these letters, which was strictly private, Manning wrote :—

"I have not seen Churton's Charge; but the course he and others have taken has helped more than most things to *convince me that the Church of England has no real basis. . . . Logically, I am convinced that the One, Holy, Visible, Infallible Church is that which has its circuit in all the world, and its centre accidentally at Rome. But I mistrust my conclusion. . . . I have made a first draft on the Oath of Supremacy, in a letter to my Bishop. But I have written myself fairly over the border—or Tiber rather.*" 117

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 569.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 558.

In the other letter, to his Bishop, Manning does not write anything which would lead his Diocesan, or the public, to suppose that he had written himself over "the Tiber," or into the Church of Rome. On the contrary, while criticising sharply the relations to the State of the Church of England, and her connection with the Court of Law which had just acquitted Mr. Gorham, he informed his lordship that he had still left a strong faith in the Church of England—though, as a matter of fact, as we have already seen, he had long since ceased to have any faith in her at all.

"We believe," wrote Archdeacon Manning, "*the Church in England, as a member or province of this Divine Kingdom [the Church], possesses, 'in solidum,' by inheritance and participation in the whole Church, the inheritance of the Divine Tradition of Faith, with a share in this full and supreme custody of doctrine and power of discipline, partaking for support and perpetuity, in its measure and sphere, the same guidance as the whole Church at large, of which, by our Baptism, we have been made members.*"

"The Church in England, then, being thus an integral whole, possesses within itself the fountain of doctrine and discipline, *and has no need to go beyond itself for succession, orders, mission, jurisdiction.* . . . But we trust that as, in the period of the great Western schism, the Churches of Spain, France, Germany, and many others, were compelled to fall back within their own limits and to rest upon the full and integral power which, by succession, they possessed for their own internal government, *so the Church in England has continued to be a PERFECT member of this Divine Kingdom, endowed with all that is of necessity to the valid ministry of the Faith and Sacraments of Christ.*"<sup>118</sup>

Who, at that time, would have thought that the writer of this strong eulogy of the Church of England actually considered that in writing it he was "fairly writing himself over the border—or *Tiber*"? If the Church of England was all that Manning asserted, possessed of valid Orders and Sacraments, without going "beyond itself" to outside communions, why had he made up his mind to leave a

<sup>118</sup> *Appellate Jurisdiction of the Crown in Matters Spiritual: A Letter to the Bishop of Chichester, by Henry Edward Manning, Archdeacon of Chichester, pp. 4, 5.*

Church, which he declared was "a PERFECT member of this Divine Kingdom"? In the history of the Romeward Movement in the Church of England there are but few, if any, incidents more deplorable than the double dealing of Dr. Manning during his last years in that Church.

Down to the year 1851, the Romeward Movement in the Church of England had led to the secession to Rome of a large number of prominent clergymen and laymen. The list of distinguished seceders given in Browne's *Annals of the Tractarian Movement* affords ample proof of the services rendered to the Church of Rome by the Oxford Movement. No wonder that Cardinal Wiseman rejoiced at what he saw going on around him, and looked forward with an almost boyish glee to the good time coming, when, as he hoped, England would once more accept Papal supremacy. But the services rendered to Rome by the Movement were by no means confined to supplying her with some of the ablest of her children. A prominent Roman Catholic magazine, the *Rambler*, during the year 1851, devoted several articles to the subject of "The Rise, Progress, and Results of Puseyism," as it was then commonly termed. The tone of these articles was, throughout, one of deep thankfulness for what had been already accomplished.

"From the moment that the Oxford Tracts commenced," said the *Rambler*, "the Catholic Church assumed a position in the country which she had never before attained since the schism of the sixteenth century. With what a depth of indescribable horror of Catholicism the whole mind of England was formerly saturated, few can comprehend who have not personally experienced it. . . . The sons and daughters of Anglicanism were brought up to regard the Catholic Church as the devil's masterpiece. . . . No one read Catholic books, no one entered Catholic churches; no one ever saw Catholic priests; few people even knew that there were any Catholic bishops resident in England. Except in connection with Ireland, the Catholic Church was forgotten.

"See now the change which has come over the English people as a nation. Violently Protestant still, its attitude towards the Catholic

Church is extraordinarily changed. It dislikes her, but it no longer despises her. . . . Crowds attend the services of Catholic and of Puseyite churches ; but while in the latter there is hissing and groaning, in the former a stillness the most profound pays strange homage to the elevation of the most Holy Sacrament. None but fools and fanatics deny some merits to the Church of Rome and her clergy. *Everywhere the change appears. . . . And whatever other causes may have combined to work this wonderful result, to the Movement of 1833 it surely must chiefly be attributed.*"<sup>119</sup>

<sup>119</sup> *The Rambler*, March 1851, pp. 246, 247.