

Zeitschrift: Revue internationale de théologie = Internationale theologische Zeitschrift = International theological review
Band: 13 (1905)
Heft: 51

Artikel: Canon Meyrick's "Memories"
Autor: [s.n.]
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-403628>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. [See Legal notice.](#)

Download PDF: 13.05.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

CANON MEYRICK'S "MEMORIES".

A book has just been published in England which ought to be of special interest to the readers of the *Revue internationale de Théologie*. It is written by Canon Meyrick, who has been an attendant at several of the Old Catholic Congresses and for twenty years edited the *Foreign Church Chronicle*, the main purpose of which was to keep up communications between the Old Catholics and the Anglican Church. It is called "Memories of life at Oxford, and experiences in Italy, Greece, Turkey, Germany, Spain and elsewhere", and is published by John Murray, London. There are two subjects with which it deals at greater length than others. These are the later phases of what is known as the Oxford movement, and the origin and growth of the Old Catholic reform movement. The method adopted by the writer is that of giving sketches of the persons with whom he was brought into contact, whether in England or on the Continent. Accordingly we find here a condensed account of Newman, Keble, Pusey, Wilberforce, Harold Browne, Christopher Wordsworth, Archbishop Benson, Bishop Lightfoot, Bishop Cleveland Coxe, Archbishop Plunket, Cardinal Manning, and also of Dollinger, Reinkens, Herzog, Archbishop Lycurgus, Archpriest Janyscheff, General Kiréeff &c.

The purpose of this paper is not to criticise the book, but to give a résumé of such of its contents as are likely to be most interesting to the readers of the *Revue*. The following is the account given of Dr Newman:—

"It is an entire mistake to suppose that the religious movement in Oxford of the last century owes its origin to Newman, or required his help for its success. It would have taken place had Newman not existed, though the fire would not have blazed up so rapidly nor so fiercely if he had not been there to feed it.

But a steadily burning flame is in the end more useful and more effective than the furious and evanescent upshooting of blazing tongues of fire; and though the Oxford revival would have been less picturesque without Newman, it would have been more beneficial. It would then have been under the direction of Keble, Pusey, Palmer, Sewell, Rose, and others, who would have kept it in its proper course. As soon as he had joined it, Newman could not but be the controlling power. He was one of those men who must be first, and must stamp his own personality on others without making concession in turn to them. From the first he was the disquieting element in the body of associates; when Palmer tried to restrain his individuality by giving a revising power to a committee, he broke away from the shackles which would have been thus cast around him. The result was that he made himself master of the situation, and led his followers full upon the rocks, on which they were broken to pieces, like a wave when it dashes against a cliff. The Tractarian movement, as a concerted movement, failed, and turned out a fiasco, because Newman led it. Keen as was his intellect, Newman was never guided by his reason, but always by his emotions; and a man so constituted cannot lead a host to victory, though he may stir up in them the enthusiasm which, if directed aright, insures success.

It is interesting to see the employment to which Newman put his intellect. It was not the directing force within him, but it was a faculty of extraordinary power which he used, like a powerful slave to which he gave his orders for reconciling to his own conscience any course that his will and affections had previously determined upon. It was so subtle that it beguiled him, and easily persuaded him that anything that he chose to do or to say was right. His mind was naturally sceptical, like his brother's; but his affections forced him to resolve by an act of will to be a believer, and his intellect was then called on to justify his resolution to himself and to the world. The more that this process went on—and it grew upon him with his years—belief lost the true character of belief, and became acceptance. Whether he gave an inward assent to a tenet or whether he did not, he would accept it if it came from a quarter to which he was inclined to pay defe-

rence. We know that in his heart he regarded the doctrine of the Pope's Infallibility the work of 'an insolent and aggressive faction'; nevertheless, as soon as it was declared, he accepted it, not with what we understand by belief, but with assent. So with the dogma of the Immaculate Conception: he accepted it when declared, and condescended to justify it by arguing in its favour from a known misreading in Irenæus, the true character of which he ignored until he was compelled to acknowledge it.

In argument he was not a scrupulous combatant, as was seen, in his controversy with Kingsley, by his framing the whole of his defence of Liguori's theory of truthfulness on the assumption that by the expression 'on just cause' Liguori meant 'in an extreme case', and, after he had framed the defence, withdrawing the assumption in an appendix, without withdrawing the argument founded on it. His method of putting on an innocent face and passing off some fallacy as an undoubted axiom—*e.g.*, that it is the world, the flesh, and the devil, not celibacy, which has caused and causes immoral life in a celibate clergy (as though no one had ever heard of the distinction between a cause and an occasion)—becomes provoking and monotonous when it has been noticed more than a certain number of times, and observed to be habitual.

Few men have been so conspicuous for bringing about that which they specially aimed at resisting as Dr Newman. He organized the forces of Belief against Unbelief, and then, deserting his soldiers in the conflict, he fell back and hurled weapons on them from behind till they lost half their confidence. He was a dogmatist to his marrow, and yet his teaching and example drove man after man of his followers (to whom he gave only the choice of all or nothing) into scepticism. He loved the ecclesiastical character of Oxford, and he destroyed it. He loved the Church of England, and he assailed it with all his force and with envenomed weapons of offence. He loved the party which he led at the University, and he scattered it to the winds. His one object of abhorrence throughout his life was Liberalism, and he became the darling and the cat's-paw of Liberals, while he spread dismay and disorganization through the ranks of their opponents, whom he had betrayed. The old man must have vinced as he sat, with

bowed head, listening to the praises poured upon him by Professor Bryce on his last visit to Oxford. 'Such a scene,' said the Professor, 'could not have taken place till of late. Formerly religious bigotry would not allow any but a member of the Church to receive the honours of the University and the college, but we had changed all that. Now anyone intellectually eminent was welcomed, religious barriers were thrown down, and for that benefit Oxford was grateful to Dr Newman'. This was the principle that Newman had been fighting against all his life, which he hated still with profoundest hatred, and, lo! he was represented as the champion who had caused it to triumph. And the representation was true. When Pusey said to him 'Newman, the Oxford Liberals are playing you like a card against us,' by Liberals he did not mean Liberals in politics, but in theology—men whose object it was to drive all definite religion out of the University. Newman lived long enough to see the very men who would have stoned him as a bigot in his earlier career, build his sepulchre, to the sound of drums and fifes, in honour of one who had done so much to undermine and weaken the institution on which the continuance of religion as a powerful influence in England depends.

The record of Newman's life is a sad one. It is the record of one who, endowed with great powers, warm affections, strong will, high purpose, and a desire to do right, damaged profoundly the cause which he had most at heart, and promoted that which he most abhorred.

On Dr Newman's death he became the object of a hero-worship which was most creditable to the generosity of Englishmen, but in many respects, as I thought, undeserved. Accordingly, I wrote an article in the *Churchman* deprecating this phase of the public mind, and showing how aptly the words of Vincentius Lirinensis respecting Origen and Tertullian applied in a lesser degree to Dr Newman. Tertullian, who had been the champion and hero of the Church, deserted her, and became the ornament of the Montanist sect, which he enriched with the learning that he had brought from the Church; while he assailed the Church with the bitterness he had borrowed from his new allies. Origen, according to Vincentius, was a man of many gifts, rare, singular, and strange, of great in-

dustry and patience, quick of wit, unrivalled in learning, so sweet of speech that honey seemed to drop from his mouth, so forcible in argument that he seemed to be able to make anything easy of acceptance, surrounded by friends and pupils who were ready to err with Origen rather than be right with anyone else. Both of these teachers, according to Vincentius, discrediting their earlier writings by later errors, became a great temptation to many. 'And surely,' continues Vincentius, 'a great temptation it is, when as he whom you think a prophet, a disciple of the prophets, whom you esteem a doctor and maintainer of the truth, whom you have highly revered, and most entirely loved, when he suddenly and privily bringeth in pernicious errors, which neither you can quickly spy, led away with prejudice of your old teacher, nor can easily bring your mind to condemn, hindered with love to your old master.' That was the frame of mind of many of Newman's friend and followers towards him." P. 31.

The following is a letter of Mr Gladstone to the Author, which is of extreme interest as it contains his estimate of Dr Newman's character:

"CARLTON HOUSE TERRACE,
'April 26, 1875.

"DEAR Mr MEYRICK,

'I must not shrink from admitting that I follow with general assent the argument of the tract on my commendation of Dr Newman, which you have so kindly sent me.

'I have, without doubt, spoken freely and largely of his merits, but indirectly and with reserve of his defects.

'To this I was moved by recollection of much kindness: by my belief in his truthfulness of *intention*; by my admiration of the disinterestedness which has marked his life, his content in an outward obscurity, his superiority to vulgar ambitions. I was sure, too, that he had, in dealing with me, repressed thoughts and words of wrath; and finally, as I was at this time in much correspondence with thorough-paced Vaticanists, I saw him shine morally in the contrast with them. Besides a want of robustness of character, I have ventured to glance at an obliquity of intellect. The first he has shown by shrinking from the bold action to which his insight, and many of his

avowals, should have led him, and also in his adopting for some time after his secession too much of the ordinary tone of the Romish controversialist. The latter defect of his mind is too traceable in all his works, and the effect is, for practical purposes, you might as well argue with a Jesuit. His mind seems to be nearly the opposite of Bishop Butler's, whom, nevertheless, he sincerely, but I should say ignorantly, worships, as the Athenians worshipped the unknown God. He constantly reminds me of a very different man, Lord Westbury, in this great point, that he is befooled by the subtlety of his own intellect. I always felt that Westbury, when he was wrong, lost the chance that we ordinary mortals possess of getting right, because we feel a greater difficulty in sustaining untrue propositions; but in Westbury it was the same thing, in point of difficulty, to sustain a sound or unsound argument. So it is with Dr Newman.

‘But I must not pursue further this very curious subject.

‘Believe me,

‘Most faithfully yours

P. 25.

‘W. E. GLADSTONE.’”

In a later part of the book Dr Newman comes again under consideration in his relation to Dr Manning after they had both become members of the Church of Rome:—

“The first sensible clash between the two men was on the subject of the education of Roman Catholics at the English Universities. In 1864 Newman bought a piece of ground in Oxford for building a hall over which he might himself preside. Bishop Ullathorne approved, but by Manning's influence, exerted through Wiseman on the Roman Propaganda, the scheme was forbidden. Two years later Bishop Ullathorne revisited the question by a petition to the Propaganda. Leave was given for the establishment of a hall, but Newman's headship of it was prohibited, and later on the permission was altogether withdrawn for fear of that contingency. The whole affair was a duel between Newman and Manning, and Manning won.

The wounds received in the contest did not heal. In July, 1867, Newman wrote to Oakeley that the cause of the distance between himself and the Archbishop was his want of confidence in him, ‘especially in matters concerning myself.’ A fortnight

later he wrote to Manning himself, acknowledging 'a distressing mistrust which now for some years past I have been unable in prudence to dismiss from my mind,' adding, 'your words, your bearing, and your implications . . . have not served to prepare me for your acts.' Manning at once wrote back that his feeling towards Newman was just what Newman's was towards him: 'I have felt you hard to understand, and that your words have not prepared me for your acts.' This mutual distrust 'was never cured,' says Manning's biographer. 'No attempt was ever hereafter made on either side to restore lost confidence. They never wrote or spoke again in terms of intimacy' (p. 306). Manning still kept up 'professions of friendship for Newman, whilst accusing Newman in private of being an unsound or disloyal Catholic' (p. 311). It must be borne in mind that Manning's 'in private' meant 'in the ear of Pope,' through the channel of Monsignor Talbot, and in his conversations with Roman Catholics in London. The squabble (it cannot be dignified by a higher title) spread from the two parties chiefly interested to their followers, between whom bitter animosities sprang up and were cherished, under cover to the outside world of perfect unity of feeling and peace. And the pettiness of it all! Father Coffin took Cardinal Reisach to see the site which Newman had destined for his hall at Oxford, and Newman petulantly burst out in a letter to Monsignor Patterson with complaints of 'the incomprehensible neglect' thus shown to him. Talbot is sure that Newman is organizing the laity to govern the Church. 'What is the province of the laity?' says the Pope's Chamberlain, writing to Manning. 'To hunt, to shoot, to entertain? These matters they understand, but to meddle with ecclesiastical matters they have no right at all. . . . Dr. Newman is the most dangerous man in England, and you will see that he will make use of the laity against your Grace. You must not be afraid of him.' This, and a great deal more about 'the detestable spirit growing up in England,' which had been repressed by Wiseman, 'who knew how to keep the laity in order' (p. 318). Poor laymen! To hunt, to shoot, to entertain, is all that they are fit for, and they must leave the rest to their priests!

Manning himself, as an ecclesiastical statesman, rose above the bitterness of his followers, or, at any rate, above expressing

it. He saw that 'a conflict between him [Newman] and me would be as great a scandal to the Church in England and as great a victory to the Anglicans as could be.' So he held his hand, though Monsignor Talbot continued urging him to 'stand firm' against the 'old school of Catholics,' who would 'rally round Newman in opposition to you and Rome.' Newman's 'spirit must be crushed,' according to the Pope's Chamberlain. What he had written was 'detestable,' 'un-Catholic,' 'un-Christian.' So great was the harmony of soul among the Roman Catholics in England, that Manning looked upon the Irish as his allies in keeping down the English. 'Every Englishman,' says Talbot, 'is naturally anti-Roman,' and 'Dr Newman is more English than the English.' 'The thing that will save us,' replies Manning, 'from low views about the Mother of God and the Vicar of the Lord is the million Irish in England and the sympathy of the Catholics in Ireland' (p. 325). So the English 'laymen' are not only to be kept down by their prelates, but by a phalanx of Irishman—not a happy prospect for men with any sense of an Englishman's liberty and self-respect.

Newman felt, if he did not know, that Manning was intriguing against him, and he could not forgive him. 'The world accuses him [Manning] without provocation of thwarting me, and the *prima facie* proof of this is that his entourage acts with violence against me.' At the end of a long correspondence, suave on Manning's side, tart on Newman's, Newman writes: 'I do not know whether I am on my head or my heels when I have active relations with you,' words 'which made a reply hardly fitting on my part'—wrote Manning. Manning accounts for the 'divergence' between them by the 'well-known morbid sensitiveness' of Newman, which made 'his relations with Faber, the late Cardinal [Wiseman], Father Coffin, and the London Oratory, undergo the same change as his relations to me.' So far from having hindered Newman's being prominent in the Church, he had, he professed, endeavoured to effect it by putting his name forward at Rome for a bishopric in 1859, an endeavour which was defeated by the Bishop of Newport denouncing Newman at the moment before the Propaganda for heresy. Newman's unforgiving mistrust is best accounted for on the hypothesis that he supposed Manning not to have dealt

fairly by him when he professed to recommend him, and perhaps having brought about the denunciation for heresy to counteract his pretended purpose. Afterwards he refused to come to Manning's consecration unless 'he might take it as a pledge on my part that I would not again endeavour to have him consecrated as a Bishop'— a petulant reference to an old grievance. Newman's 'morbid sensitiveness' may have been a factor in this unseemly squabble, but a larger factor was Manning's resolution that a man who might lead a party in opposition to himself and in hostility to the extremest claim of the Papacy should never have the opportunity of doing so as long as he could prevent it.

But when Pius IX. died he could prevent it no longer. The Duke of Norfolk and the Marquis of Ripon insisted on Newman's being recommended to Leo XIII. as a Cardinal, and after a few moments' silence, with bent head, Manning undertook to convey their choice to the Cardinal Secretary at Rome. When Newman heard of the Pope's intention, he was overwhelmed by his 'condescending goodness.' But his letter of acceptance to the Cardinal Secretary was misunderstood by Manning, who took it as a refusal, and announced in the *Times* that the offer was refused, at a time when the offer itself was as yet an ecclesiastical secret. Newman was alarmed and indignant. 'As soon,' he writes to Manning, 'as the Holy Father condescends to make it known to me that he means to confer on me the high dignity of Cardinal, I shall write to Rome to signify my obedience and glad acceptance of the honour without delay.' Manning 'repaired his error' by informing the Pope of the mistake he had made, and the nomination was confirmed. Newman declared himself 'overcome by the Pope's goodness,' and said to his brothers of the Oratory, 'The cloud is lifted from me for ever.' During the remainder of their lives the two Cardinals met but twice—once in 1883, when Newman paid a formal visit to Manning in London; and once in 1884, when Manning returned the visit at Birmingham. In 1890 Newman died. The fear of being dwarfed by his superiority having passed away, Manning made a fervent address 'in which he drew a most touching and pathetic picture of his relations with John Henry Newman, which he described as a friendship of sixty years and more.' 'Cardinal Manning,'

writes his biographer, ‘perhaps not unnaturally forgot his prolonged opposition to Newman in Rome and in England; forgot his avowed hostility and mistrust; forgot that for half a century—from 1840 to 1890—he had not met or spoken to Newman more than half a dozen times. It seems almost a pity to disturb the illusion indulged in by Cardinal Manning, and left as a legacy to future generations, that he and Newman were knit together in the bands of the closest friendship for sixty years and more. . . . Manning’s mind and memory were taken possession of by an overmastering idea, so that in his illusion he saw only the what might have been, and not the things that were. . . . What, then, is the truth? Not more than three or four years before the illusive and fancy picture of 1890, Cardinal Manning avowed and put on record his condemnation of Newman in terms so clear and incisive as to leave no room or foothold for an after-fiction of friendship. . . . Instead of friendship, there was a life-long opposition (p. 754).

It is a miserable picture—a petty personal squabble between the two leading English Roman Catholic ecclesiastics lasting for forty years. Who could have believed that the Newman and the Manning that we knew in the Anglican Church could have been kept in permanent hostility to each other by jealousy, spitefulness, and unforgiving tempers, which continued to operate until death closed the career of one of them? Had they both remained in the Anglican Church, and had Manning become Archbishop of Canterbury, can we imagine his whispering, intriguing, plotting to keep Newman shut up at Littlemore, lest he should rival him in influence? And had he done so, can we imagine Newman irritated beyond endurance by such treatment, and refusing all advances towards friendship or social intercourse with him? There is something more wholesome in the wider, larger, fresher atmosphere of the Church of England than in the confined air of the Roman Catholic body in England.” P. 213.

It is well known on the Continent what an active part Dr Manning took in bringing about the decree of Papal Infallibility, but it is not so well known that a protestant diplomatist, Mr Odo Russell, co-operated with him in bringing the intrigue to a successful issue. On this point we read as follows:

„Mr Odo Russell had been living for twelve years in Rome in the society of Cardinals and Papal courtiers, and was anxious to strengthen the Papal throne against the seditious spirit with which he knew the city to be honeycombed. He thought that the only way of saving the Papal monarchy was by hedging it round with a prestige derived from superstition, and consequently, when Mr Gladstone proposed that England should join in the Bavarian protest against the declaration of the dogma, Mr Odo Russell, making himself the mouthpiece of Manning and the Vaticanist party, so represented the case to the Foreign Secretary, Lord Clarendon, that he opposed Mr Gladstone's design, and defeated him in his own Cabinet. 'Dr Döllinger,' writes Mr Purcell, who was a *persona grata* to the King of Bavaria, suggested to King Louis II. that a coalition should be formed of the various States, whose Catholic subjects would be deprived, as he pretended, of their civil liberties by the setting up of the Pope's Infallibility, a dogma incompatible with their civil allegiance. Bavaria was to take the first step, and to propose to the English Government to issue in due form and order an invitation to France, Prussia, Austria, Bavaria, and Belgium, to make a common stand against the Vatican Council, and to present to the Sovereign Pontiff, through their respective representatives at the Holy See, a common declaration that the definition of Papal Infallibility was against public policy, and that the promulgation of any such dogma by the Council would be prohibited by international enactments. . . . On the occasion of the presentation by Prince Hohenlohe, the President of the Bavarian Ministry, of a formal proposal that the English Government should invite the Powers of Europe to intervene at the Vatican for the protection of the civil and religious liberty of their Catholic subjects, there was a prolonged and hot discussion in the cabinet. In giving this information, Cardinal Manning said: 'The Prime Minister, Mr Gladstone, supported the Bavarian proposal on the grounds and by the arguments supplied to him by Acton; but Lord Clarendon, better informed by Odo Russell, exposed one by one the fallacious statements and wilful distortions of fact. Finally, after a hot discussion, Mr Gladstone was defeated in the Cabinet, the Bavarian proposal was rejected, and the Vatican Council was left in peace to do God's work'. . . . Had

Dr Döllinger's plan succeeded, and the Powers of Europe taken common action against the Pope and the Council, the moral influence of the Opposition would have become almost irresistible, and the united action of the majority of the Fathers of the Council have been broken, or so weakened as to have rendered them helpless to resist the final demand, insisted upon by the Opposition, of proroguing the Council. '... Had the Council been prorogued,' continued Manning, 'according to the designs of the Opposition, owing to events—the Franco-German War, the seizure of Rome, the persecution of Catholics in Germany by Bismarck—it would have been prorogued *sine die*. The Council, with the Pope a prisoner in the Vatican, could not have met again, and the Pope's Infallibility would have been undefined even to this day' (*Life of Manning*, XVI, pp. 432-436). It is singular that the definition of the Pope's Infallibility should have been brought about by a coalition of the General of the Jesuits, an English convert, and a Protestant diplomatist." P. 60.

In connection with the same subject the following statement is made concerning Lord Acton:—"He had resided in Rome during the session of the Vatican Council, where he used his influence with the Bishops to prevent the declaration of Infallibility, and kept Mr Gladstone acquainted with the course of the Council's proceedings; as Mr Odo Russell, instructed by Manning, informed Lord Clarendon of them. Since the publication of the dogma, Lord Acton had followed Döllinger's action with the greatest sympathy, having himself been at one time a pupil of Döllinger, and holding the same sentiments with him. There is no doubt that had he lived on the Continent he would have cast in his lot with the Old Catholics; but in England he felt himself hampered. He was not prepared to join the Church of England, chiefly owing to a repulsion that he felt to the school represented by Dean Stanley; and at the same time there seemed to be hardly room for an Old Catholic body between the Church of England and the Papal communion in England. About a fortnight before Christmas Day, he came to me and said that the Roman priest at Torquay had written to him asking for an interview. 'I think,' he said, 'the reason of his doing so is to forbid my Communion at Christmas, and that will be a serious indication to me of what

should be my duty in the future.' But the priest in question was too wise to alienate so influential a personage. The purpose of the interview was not to forbid, but to invite, his presence. Lord Acton told me that he did not believe, and could not believe, the infallibility of the Pope, as defined, any more than Döllinger, who declared that he could as soon believe that two and two made five. He said that he should appoint a private chaplain with the same sentiments as himself, and proceed just as if the Vatican Council had not been held." P. 288.

The three persons of notable positions in England who took the greatest interest in the Old Catholic movement were Mr Gladstone, Bishop Harold Browne und Bishop Christopher Wordsworth. A considerable space in the book before us is devoted to each of them. The notice of Mr Gladstone ends as follows.

„Mr Gladstone was a great statesman: whether in that capacity he did or did not make serious mistakes in South Africa and the Soudan, in Oxford and in Ireland, I am not now inquiring. He was also a great Churchman, superior to most of his contemporaries, whether lay or ecclesiastical. That so true and faithful a Christian (one of his last sayings was, 'All I write, and all I think, and all I hope, is based upon the Divinity of our Lord—the one central hope of our poor wayward race'), so outspoken a defender of the Christian revelation (witness his *Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture*), so firm an opponent of the whole system of Popery (witness his *Vaticanism* and his sympathy with Old Catholic reform), so righteous an enemy af tyranny (witness his early letters to Lord Aberdeen and his efforts in behalf of Bulgaria and Armenia), should have been Prime Minister of England, and *because of* those qualities and of that character should have been honoured in his death, without regard to his political views, as no other man within our memory has been honoured, is a thing of which Englishmen may be proud." P. 245.

The account of Bishop Harold Browne is summed up as follows:—"Harold Browne cannot be regarded as the ablest among his contemporary Bishops—Bishop Wilberforce was that—nor perhaps the most learned—Bishop Christopher Wordsworth may have been that. But he was a singularly wise man, his mind being so well balanced that he leaned too far in no

direction, but gave each principle and each fact its due weight, without allowing it to exclude from view other principles and other facts as true as itself. He was also widely and deeply loved, because he had himself an unfailing fount of sympathy and affection ever springing up within him, which called out a response from all about him and from any that had communication with him. No truer representative of the Church of England's best self could be found. He had in their perfection her faith and clinging to the truth, her moderation in limiting one truth by its equally true counterpart, her simple piety, her learning, her reverence for all that is holy, her respect for primitive Christianity, her shrinking from the inventions of men which boasted to be revelations of God, and from innovations on the once-delivered truth, her firm confidence in the overruling providence of God, however dark might be His ways; and he illustrated in himself no less the calm and equitable temper of the Church of England than her theology. He once said, with a smile, that Oxford was a hill-top where streams of thought rose, which flowed down with foam and clatter, but that, having reached the level ground, they took their course through Cambridge, and came out calmer, and he ventured to think more wholesome, than when they entered it. If that were true, Harold Browne was a Cambridge man in the whole tone and temper of his mind. His chief literary work is his *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, which was based on lectures delivered by him at Lampeter College. When one of our American Episcopal guests was introduced to the Bishop, he stepped back, and said, 'So that is Harold Browne on the Articles! My brother, I don't know how the Church of Christ got along at all without that book,' to the confusion of the Bishop's modesty. It has been said that Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Pearson on the Creed, and Harold Browne on the Articles, contain a résumé of the Anglican theology." P. 224.

Of Bishop Christopher Wordsworth the author writes:—"Wordsworth was made for a Bishop, and the absolute agreement of his own personal views with the doctrine, tenets, traditions, and sentiments of the Church of England, in their extension and in their limitation, made his position as an English Bishop a singularly happy and fortunate one. He was

loyal, to the innermost core of his heart, to the Church of which he was a chief officer, both in her Catholic and in her Protestant aspect; and he had no difficulty in reconciling these characteristics, but always felt and maintained that the one necessarily involved the other under the conditions of modern Christendom. His diocese claimed and received his first care, but it did not make him forget the claims of the province and of the National Church. Nor, again, did the affairs of the National Church so absorb his attention as to make him careless of the fortunes of the Church Catholic. He shares with Bishop Harold Browne and Mr Gladstone the distinction of having realized how great a thing the Old Catholic Movement might be in respect to the whole of Christendom, by making foreign Christians recognise the difference between true Catholicism and mediævalism. Realizing the evils of the system culminating in Popery, he threw himself into the thick of the battle against Roman claims and doctrines. His *Letters to M. Gondon*, together with the sequel, *On the Destructive Character of the Church of Rome both in Religion and Polity*, are not only a brilliant specimen of controversial polemics, but serve as a repertory, from which antipapal weapons may be drawn for all time. The great literary work of his life was not, however, controversial, being a commentary on the whole of Holy Scripture. His literary and public acts exhibited only one side of his character. His affectionateness was shown, like that of Bishop Harold Browne, in private and family life; the combination of simplicity and elevation of tone exemplified at Riseholme and Farnham gave to those who witnessed it a lesson on the superiority of the system which permits married life to its clergy to that which forbids it, even when the results of the latter are not conspicuous for their evil". P. 248.

It will be especially interesting to the readers of the *Revue* to see the estimation in which the Old Catholic leaders Döllinger, Reinkens, Herzog, and also Lycurgus, Kirceff, Janyscheff, are held by their English collaborateurs. Our space will not admit of an account of each of these, but we cannot omit the following picture of Döllinger:—

"The great man who presided over the Bonn Conference was born in 1799, and till 1863 was counted as a supporter of the Papal constitution of the Church. In that year a conference

was held in which Ultramontanism succeeded in determining that German learning was to be subjected to the authority of the Italian Curia. Döllinger held his peace; he was silent, too, when the dogma of the Immaculate Conception was declared, and when the Syllabus of 1864 was promulgated. But these things led to his being less unwilling to take up the position forced upon him by the Vatican Council of 1870. At that Council Döllinger acted in the capacity of theologian for one of the German Bishops, but when the majority of the council—a majority mainly made up of unlettered Italian Bishops—pronounced in favour of the Papal Infallibility, the minority submitted through fear of creating a schism. The Archbishop of Munich called the German theological Professors to him and proposed that they should give way as he had done himself. ‘Whatever our personal belief may be, we must,’ he said, ‘submit, for Rome has spoken. Ought we not to begin to labour afresh for the Holy Church?’ ‘Yes,’ replied Döllinger, ‘for the old Church.’ ‘There can be no new Church,’ said the Archbishop. ‘But they have made one,’ replied Döllinger dryly. After six months’ hesitation the Archbishop demanded the submission of Döllinger and Friedrich. Döllinger replied by his ‘Declaration to the Archbishop of Munich,’ in which he uncompromisingly refused to accept the new dogma as a Christian, as a theologian, as an historian, and as a citizen. The following month (April, 1871) the Archbishop excommunicated him and Friedrich. Döllinger desisted from the exercise of his priestly functions, but maintained his theological position with the greatest firmness. In the autumn of the same year the first Old Catholic Congress was held, at Munich; in the following year a second was held, at Cologne. After this Döllinger threw himself especially into the work of organizing non-Vaticanized Episcopal Churchmen in opposition to the Papacy, and with this end held the two Conferences of Bonn. At these Conferences Döllinger showed extraordinary powers both of body and mind. At the first of them the correspondent of the *Times*, though not in sympathy with the objects of the meeting, was moved to say:

‘When the noble, benignant-looking old man stood listening to the long, hesitating objections of many present with admirable patience and temper, he perfectly realized what I imagine

to have been the appearance of those who, in the old times of the Church, were ready to suffer death and persecution in defence of what they believed to be the truth.'

At the second Conference, for four days he stood almost continuously in front of the assembled body of divines, taking up and replying to every speech as soon as it was made, in German or in English, and sometimes addressing the Conference continuously for hours; in the committee he proposed, refuted, argued, receiving on his shield weapons from all sides, and returning them with irresistible force, allowing himself no break or interval except such as was sufficient for a plunge each day in the Rhine. And at the end of those four days he stood up as if he had been a man of thirty-eight instead of seventy-six, and delivered a speech of five hours' length on the disastrous effects that had been wrought on Western Christendom by the Papacy, passing in review, one after another, Germany, France, Spain, Italy, South America, Austria, and handling the affairs of each country with a fulness and exactness which would have been remarkable if he had confined himself to the history of a single nation; and throughout the five hours he riveted by his voice and action the attention of everyone present, and retained their interest hour after hour, though addressing them in a language which to many was so unfamiliar that his meaning was only doubtfully guessed. Archbishop Plunket, recalling the scene, spoke at the Plymouth Church Congress with enthusiasm of "that old man eloquent," with keen and playful smile and busy brain, still all aglow with the quenchless fire of youth.'

According to a common practice of Roman Catholic controversialists, it was reported that Döllinger desired in his lifetime, and accomplished just before his death, a reconciliation with the Church of Rome. The report in both its forms was absolutely false. First it was said that he showed his submission by ceasing to say Mass on his excommunication. But Döllinger was always rather a Professor than a priest, and it was no pain to him to abstain from saying Mass himself, which he could and did attend when said by one of his Old Catholic colleagues. Again, it was said that he objected to the abolition of celibacy, and therefore separated himself from the Old Catholics. He may have thought it better policy to wait

for a time, in order not to give occasion for the slander with which Vaticanists pursue reformers. But after the decision had been come to, he associated himself with Bishop Reinkens, in the most intimate way possible, as his colleague in holding the two Bonn Conferences, and at those Conferences he publicly declared that he spoke for his Old Catholic associates. The false report still continuing, he wrote a letter, for publication, to Dr Nevin, Rector of St. Paul's Church, Rome, in which he said that he desired Dr Nevin to make known his contradiction to the lies that had been spread over Europe respecting his contemplated or consummated submission, as he had neither written nor done anything which could have given occasion to such rumours, which were nothing else but gratuitous inventions. In another letter, addressed to an Old Catholic clergyman, he declared definitely: 'As far as I am concerned, I consider myself to belong by conviction to the Old Catholic Communion.' As soon as he died, Mr H. N. Oxenham boldly declared that he was reconciled on his death-bed to the Roman communion. To refute this statement, I wrote to Professor Friedrich, who had attended him during his last sickness. He replied, denying the charge *in toto*, in a letter which I sent to the *Guardian* newspaper." P. 267.

Of General Kiréeff the writer says:—

"General Kiréeff, Secretary to the Society of the Friends of Spiritual Enlightenment at St. Petersburg, and Aide-de-Camp to the Grand-Duke Constantine is a singular instance of a layman and a soldier equally well instructed in theology with any ecclesiastic. He has shown himself deeply interested in the cause of the Old Catholics, with whom he has desired to see the Eastern Church enter into communion. At the same time he was much attracted by the Anglican Church. For many years a correspondence was kept up between him and myself, as representing the Anglo-Continental Society, on matters of issue between the two Churches; and being in London at the time of the last Lambeth Conference, he was much struck by that gathering of Anglican Bishops from various parts of the world. General Kiréeff has been a constant contributor to the *International Theological Review*, in the pages of which he and I discussed together the subject of the Infallibility of the Church." P. 276.

We must not conclude without noticing that the author recounts the establishment, at the International Congress held at Lucerne in 1892, of “the *International Theological Review*, conducted by Dr Michaud, an able and learned editor, once curate of the Madeleine, Paris, now Old Catholic Professor at Berne” (p. 276).

The volume contains also Reports of interviews with Pope Pius IX., Signor Minghetti, Premier of Italy, Signor Tommasi, Professor at the University of Rome, the Abbé Omer, Professor of Divinity at the theological Seminary at Rouen, Dr Gaffney, Dean of the College of Maynooth, and experiences in Greece, Constantinople, Spain and the West Indies as well as in Ireland.

ANGLICANUS.
