

an angel appeared leading in tow yet another philosopher.

'*Hic est Heidegger,*' the angel announced. '*Ubi est Thomas?*'

'*Thomas est hic,*' replied the saint.

And at that point the Professor retired in confusion.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Readers who might hope to join the above recorded debate at some later date might find it helpful to consult the following works. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* 2a2ae 1-7 (Blackfriars edition Vol 31); John Hick, *Faith and Knowledge*, Fontana, 1974; 'Religious Faith as Experience-As' in *Talk of God*, Royal Institute of Philosophy Lectures, Vol 2 1967-1968, Macmillan, 1969; *God and the Universe of Faiths*, Macmillan, 1973; *The Centre of Christianity*, SCM 1977.

There is a thoroughly down to earth discussion of Hick and Aquinas in Terence Penelhum, *Problems of Religious Knowledge*, Macmillan, 1971. In 'The Analysis of Faith in St Thomas Aquinas' (*Religious Studies*, Vol 13, No 2 June 1977). Penelhum offers a critique of Aquinas. Hick is usefully discussed by Paul Helm in *The Varieties of Belief*, London, 1973, Chapter 8. A lively discussion of belief and grounds is provided by Norman Malcolm in *Reason and Religion*, ed. Stuart C. Brown, Cornell University Press, 1977.

## Vatican I And The Papacy

### 3: The Attitude Of The English Bishops

Fergus Kerr O. P.

The idea of holding a general council may be traced to a suggestion made to Pope Pius IX by a curial cardinal as early as 1849. The immediate background may be outlined as follows. In 1799 Pope Pius VI died in exile, a prisoner of the French. In 1813 his successor, Pius VII, a prisoner at Fontainebleau, was forced by Napoleon into signing documents which gave the emperor virtual control over the Church. With the collapse of Napoleon the pope was able to return to Rome to begin to restore his authority. When he died in 1823 the main issue at the long conclave that followed was whether a man could be found who would stand up for the independence of the Church over against the great Catholic princes. The man who was found, Leo XII, set about reorganising the Vatican with great vigour, but his reign lasted little more than five years. His successor, an old sick man who had once been among Napoleon's prisoners, died within two years. It was only in 1831, then, that, with the election of Gregory XVI after a conclave lasting seven weeks (the Spanish government intervened to veto the election of another candidate), the modern ascendancy of the papacy really began. Significantly enough, in the dark days of

1799, when he was still a young monk, he had brought out a book entitled *Il trionfo della Santa Sede e della Chiesa contra gli assalti dai novatori, combattuti e respinti colle stesse loro armi*, which appeared (naturally enough) in a third edition in 1832 and was translated into German in 1838. Dedicated to Pius VI, then of course a prisoner, the book identifies the Church with the juridical structure of its government, insisting that it is monarchical, and goes so far as to say that the Church is infallible because the pope, its head and foundation, is so. A great deal of Gregory's time and energy during his fifteen years as pope (1831-46) went into negotiating with various governments to secure the liberty of the various national churches from state control. On the more immediately doctrinal and theological front he had to cope with the great outburst of conflicting ideas released by the Romantic reaction against the Enlightenment. He initiated a vast expansion of missionary work throughout the non-European world. His condemnation of slavery and the slave trade in 1839, both of course still flourishing and being justified by Catholic apologists, deserves to be mentioned. His conduct in the Papal states, however, was disastrous, and by his death he had become extremely unpopular. He was succeeded, surprisingly, by Giovanni Maria Mastai Ferretti, then aged only fifty-four, who, as Pius IX, or Pio Nono, was to reign for the next twenty-five years.

For some months Pius IX was thought to be "liberal", but the assassination of his (in fact liberal) chief minister and his flight in disguise to Gaeta in 1848 certainly confirmed him, not very surprisingly, in his determination, once a French army had cleared the way for his return to Rome in 1850, to make certain that the papacy would suffer no further humiliations. He was a boy of seven when Pius VI died in custody in France; since he suffered badly from epileptic attacks when he was a boy he owed his ordination as priest to a special dispensation from Pius VII. Although never in the entourage of his immediate predecessor (he was a diocesan bishop until being elected pope), and in no way comparable intellectually, Pius IX could remember how Napoleon had sought to subjugate the Church, and was plainly resolved to do his utmost to secure "the triumph of the Holy See".

It seems that, as early as 1849, during his brief exile at Gaeta, the idea of convoking a general council was suggested to Pius IX by one of the curial cardinals. A consultation of fifteen curial cardinals in 1864 showed them to be in favour, thirteen to two, of having a council. A further consultation of thirty-two diocesan bishops showed overwhelming support for a council. Only one out of the fifteen cardinals, and only seven of the thirty-two bishops, suggested that the question of papal infallibility should be on the agenda. All along, and as far as the great majority of the bishops

were concerned when they set out for Rome in 1869, the main purpose of the council was expected to be the overhaul of ecclesiastical arrangements in the light of the post-revolutionary world, and countering the infidelity which the Enlightenment had brought, and the fideism with which many ultra-conservative Catholics were responding to the challenge. The principal work of Vatican I, after all, was extended debates on the relationship between faith and reason, and the production of the Dogmatic Constitution "Dei Filius": an affirmation of the rationality of God-talk in a climate of Romantic fideism.

Among the seven bishops who wanted to have a proclamation of papal infallibility on the agenda was the then archbishop of Westminster, Henry Edward Manning. He had been archbishop for less than six months when he sent off his extremely interesting letter (in Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Collectio*, 49, 170 ff). From the beginning he had apparently no doubt that the purpose of the council was to condemn heresy. In previous centuries the first and second paragraphs of the Creed had been attacked, and there had been the great Trinitarian and Christological controversies. Now, in the middle of the nineteenth century, it was round the Holy Spirit and his temporal mission that heresy turned. All the errors of the so-called Reformation could be reduced to this: once the infallibility of the Church was undermined, which is nothing else but the necessary corollary of the assistance of the Holy Spirit in the Church, everything divine which depends on this falls to the ground. Cut away the tree and the fruit and leaves fall. In England particularly, so Manning continued, the whole idea of the Church as a body endowed with supernatural gifts by being permanently ruled by the Holy Spirit had virtually disappeared from people's minds. Thinking then of England (*patriae meae*), he sought some "declarations" on the temporal mission and the unfailing assistance and supreme infallible authority of the Holy Spirit. On the analogy of the Incarnation, although without hypostatic union, the presence in the Church of the Holy Spirit means that the perpetual and living voice of the Church is infallible, so that to engage in appeals against it is heretical. Appeals to the testimony of the ancient Fathers, or to antiquity (as they say), is essentially rationalism. The pronouncements of the pope on matters of faith, morals, dogmatic facts or truths of faith, and moral questions, are infallible. Against complete rationalists the Church must insist on the possibility and the fact of Christian revelation. Against semi-rationalists, among whom Manning would include Anglicans, the Church must insist on the presence and the perpetual assistance of the Holy Spirit, and his infallible voice acting through the Church. The great need of the day, so Manning concluded, was that the council should proclaim the infallibility of the Church and of the

pope speaking from the chair of St Peter. It is often thought that belief in papal infallibility is incompatible with belief in the working of the Holy Spirit in the Church. It is important to remember that, for Manning at least, there was no such opposition; on the contrary, it was his sense of the Pentecostal mystery of the Church that supported his belief in papal infallibility.

But Manning was not at all representative of the English bishops at Vatican I, as the standard study makes clear (*The English Bishops and the First Vatican Council*, by Frederick J. Cwiekowski, Louvain, 1971). Of the fourteen bishops at the time only three, including Manning, can clearly be said to have favoured the proclamation of papal infallibility. There are two doubtful cases, for lack of evidence. The other nine were in varying degrees unenthusiastic. This was because in the only form in which they had heard the doctrine expounded they did not believe it.

The three who were keen on papal infallibility were the three most recently consecrated bishops. Manning, as we have already noted, was named Archbishop of Westminster in 1865. Four years previously Robert Cornthwaite had been made Bishop of Beverley (later divided and he became Bishop of Leeds). Despite his authentic Lancashire Catholic background and education at Ushaw he clearly fell under the spell of Pius IX when he was sent to Rome in 1851 as Rector of the English College. He was apparently impressed by former Tractarians because it was while he was acting as agent for the English bishops that the egregious George Talbot began to exercise his influence in Rome against the "old" Catholics. In pastoral letters and private correspondence there can be no doubt that, in Talbot's words, Cornthwaite was "thoroughly Roman, which nowadays is a very necessary qualification" (letter of 1861). We shall return to Manning, but the third "infallibilist" among the bishops was James Chadwick, consecrated for Hexham and Newcastle in 1866 and the first of the bishops whose appointment Manning was to recommend. He had been recommended by Wiseman in 1860 as "a real *Roman*". Before becoming a bishop he had spent much of his life as a student and a professor at Ushaw, but he had a short spell "refreshing his knowledge of theology" in Rome in 1850. His father came from a Lancashire family that had migrated to Drogheda and he was the only one among the bishops who had been born in Ireland. His letters home from the Council apparently show that he was bored, but he stayed to the end, voted with Manning, and was the only English bishop to go to the party at the Irish College on the night that the text on infallibility was passed (the majority of the Irish bishops were strongly ultramontane). There can be little doubt that these three became bishops because of their "Roman" outlook; it is significant for the future that they include the only former Anglican and the only

Irish-born bishop.

The two whose theological views are hardest to discern are Thomas Grant (Southwark) and Richard Roskell (Nottingham). In Grant's case the evidence points in contrary directions. Born of Irish parents in France in 1816, where his father was in the British army of occupation, he seems to have been English in outlook. After Ushaw he was sent to Rome where he acquired a good knowledge of the workings of the Roman system. He was described by Ullathorne as "our best theologian", but that seems very doubtful. He was (rather) a skilled negotiator, with the British government as well as with the Roman curia; indeed, in 1865, Grant would have been acceptable to the government as archbishop of Westminster. Only Grant and Cornthwaite joined Manning in signing the famous "monster petition" in favour of defining papal infallibility, once the Council had assembled. He was by then a very sick man, dying of the cancer which killed him before the fateful vote. According again to Ullathorne, Grant had no doubt about papal infallibility but would have been "moderate". That may mean that Grant had a much less grandiose notion of papal infallibility than Manning had. Certainly Wiseman regarded Grant as an obstinate member of the "old party" (i.e. anti-"Roman"), while Monsignor Talbot hated him ("the sworn enemy of all the converts who are active and zealous", "the great supporter of the Old high and dry school", in a letter of 1859). Roskell, whose views are completely mysterious, was Liverpool-Irish by birth and educated at Ushaw and in Rome where he became fluent in Italian and got to know Wiseman well. He was often the only bishop to side with Wiseman in his great battles with his auxiliaries, and particularly with Errington. Roskell, made a bishop when he was only thirty-six, was only fifty-three in 1870. He was certainly still in Rome in January, but he seems to have gone home by May. Perhaps his health had already begun to fail; he resigned his see in 1874 because of bad health. It is at any rate not safe to conclude that he had so little interest in papal infallibility that he had gone home.

Now we come to the nine bishops who were, in varying ways, unhappy about papal infallibility. The senior bishop, who did not go to the Council at all, was Thomas Joseph Brown (Newport and Menevia), an aging monk of Downside who had been taught there by the last of the suppressed Maurists. Patristic scholarship was not, however, to be his course; by the time he had turned forty he was bishop in charge of Wales, which meant that he had to deal with the immense pastoral problems created by the arrival of waves of migrant workers from Ireland in search of work in Cardiff and Swansea. His suspicion of former Anglicans led him in 1859 to delate Newman's essay "On consulting the faithful" to

the authorities in Rome, an extremely unhappy episode in Newman's life. Within three or four years we find Brown an enthusiastic supporter of Newman, having discovered no doubt that, unlike most Tractarian "converts", Newman was no "Romanist". He approved of Newman's *Letter to Pusey* of 1865, in which he rejected the ultramontanistism of Ward and Faber; he supported the project that Newman should open a house in Oxford, and he was so keen to get Newman to go to the Council that he finally even offered to go with him himself—but, in a somewhat feline letter, reminding him of the delation ten years previously, Newman refused. On the other hand, when consulted in a roundabout way by the French opposition to the infallibilists, Newman mentioned Brown as one of the English bishops who "fret", one who was not an "echo of the Archbishop" (i.e. Manning), and we know that Manning distrusted Brown.

The best remembered of the bishops, apart from Manning, is William Bernard Ullathorne, another monk of Downside, who had by 1869 become a close friend of Newman. Having volunteered to go to Australia as soon as he was ordained he found himself before he was thirty pastorally responsible for thousands of Irish Catholic criminals (criminals by the standards of 1830) who had been deported there. He wrote one of the first major exposures of the transportation system; his report proved so unwelcome to the authorities that he could not continue his work in Australia. He was soon established in Coventry, a fast-growing industrial centre with appalling pastoral and social problems created by recent migrants from Ireland. In 1846, at the age of forty, he became a bishop, and from then until he retired, forty years later, he was the leading spokesman among the bishops, often their representative, always steering the middle course. He sought to find the good in all parties. Since it is from his letters that Butler's classical account of Vatican I was composed he emerges as the man in the middle, a moderate. Newman's assessment in 1869 is sharp: "being a monk, he has the instinct of obedience so strong that he would never go against the Pope's private wishes. I think him in his own heart opposed to any doctrinal definition—he has clear and good views—very angry with Ward—not at all partial to Manning—but I expect nothing from him ... I think he has no spirit, when it comes to the point" (Letters XXIV, 326). He had been a strong candidate to succeed Wiseman at Westminster in 1865; he was apparently Manning's own candidate; but as Manning probably either knew or guessed, the British government had let it be known in Rome that it would not be happy with Ullathorne: "a very injudicious man, rough, violent, ill-mannered, and prejudiced and likely to endanger the Peace H. M. Government so much desired the Roman Catholic Church to enjoy in England etc etc"

(the British agent's report to the Foreign Secretary of what he had said to the Pope's Secretary of State, cf. Cwiekowski, p. 31). In other words, Ullathorne was the best man for the job. It is impossible not to quote what was said to Antonelli on the same occasion about Manning's candidature: "As a convert and a zealot his appointment would displease the English Catholics (sic), he was not popular amongst them and did not inspire them with confidence ... but he was an honourable man and had lived in the best English Society and was personally known of Her Majesty's Government and although by nature obstinate his manners were pleasing and refined", etc etc. What could Antonelli and his infallible pope do against the blandishments of the British Foreign Office? (Does this kind of thing still happen?)

William Turner (Salford), of Lancashire Catholic stock, had enough to do in Manchester in the 1860s without worrying about the Council, but in fact we know that he was anxious to avoid extreme interpretations of papal infallibility, he was close to Errington (and therefore Manning's enemy), and he was among those who left Rome before the final vote. James Brown (Shrewsbury), very much in the "old" Catholic tradition, suspicious of former Anglicans, did not want the doctrine promulgated and went home before the voting took place.

Alexander Goss (Liverpool), perhaps the most opposed of all the English bishops to the doctrine of papal infallibility, fell ill on the way (the journey in those days took three weeks) and had to sit out the Council in a hotel in Cannes. Of Lancashire recusant stock he had the conventional education at Ushaw and in Rome. He was made coadjutor in Liverpool in 1853, when he was thirty-nine, but since the bishop would not give him anything to do he went to Rome on a visit that lasted nearly three years. It seems improbable that he spent all the time in Rome, but he presumably saw enough there to create, or confirm, his profound hostility to papalism. In 1863 Wiseman was lamenting "the *Anglican* stiff, unRoman spirit *boastfully* maintained" by Goss and his Vicar General (his italics). Manning spoke a few years earlier of "Goss with his usual rough violence". Goss had a very strong sense that it was the duty of a bishop at an ecumenical council to bear witness to the tradition of his own diocese, he thus had a real sense of the local church; and he was certain that the doctrine of papal infallibility was no part of the tradition of his church. In 1868 the English bishops were asked to nominate a consultor to represent them on the preparatory commissions in Rome. Talbot, who had been in Rome since 1849, had been appointed to represent England, although he was removed to a mental home a few months later, where he spent the rest of his life. Manning was trying to prevent the English bishops from sending Newman, and of course succeed-

ed (fuss about nothing, because presumably Newman would not have gone anyway). But it is significant that Goss very much wanted Newman to be sent. Later on, in a long and colourful letter to Newman, dated March 28th, 1870, from Hotel Beau Séjour, Cannes, (cf. Cwiekowski, p. 169), Goss concluded by inviting Newman to write a pastoral letter for him, protesting against the folly of passing the doctrine of papal infallibility. This letter is interesting for several reasons. Goss writes initially to congratulate Newman on his stand against the methods of Manning and company at the Council (“an aggressive and insolent faction”). He goes on to criticize Manning: “his testimony is opposed to the teaching of English Catholics”, and recalls that Errington, not Manning, should have been leader of the English bishops at the Council, and that “poor Mgr Talbot has much to answer for in that wrong doing” (see below). He mentions his own experience of Rome: “Nothing ever wounded the simplicity of my faith so much as the trickery with which I became acquainted on official intercourse with the Curia”. Thinking no doubt of reports of the pope’s insulting treatment of the aged patriarch of the Chaldean Church, Goss fears the alienation of these Eastern Christians (thus showing an “ecumenical” spirit uncommon at the time). But his main fears concern Pius IX himself: “My own opinion is that the Pope believes, feels himself now to be personally inspired and knows no argument can deflect him from an opinion: he has made his own the Wesleyan principle of conscious justification, only applying it to inspiration. For years no one has dared to contradict him and Antonelli manages him by seeming to oppose him and getting some other cardinal to propose what he really wants in opposition to what he seemingly wants. The Pope is amiable and hence has now a sort of hysterical affection from ladies and young priests and he has unfortunately believed that he would be able to exercise the same fascination over the Bishops”. This diagnosis of the pope’s character, which few would question today any more than many would have done at the time (hagiography in the meantime being another story), shows the anxiety that Goss had about granting extraordinary prerogatives to a man who might not be quite right in the head. The great taboo question, at Vatican I was precisely how to reconcile the doctrine of papal primacy and infallibility with the possibility of a pope who might go mad, become senile, or lapse into heresy. Everybody seems to have pretended that it could never happen; but the Great Schism of the Western Church started in 1378 partly because the cardinals discovered that they had elected a madman. For that matter, the famous outbursts of tantrum by Pius IX, who was seventy-eight years of age in 1870, must have made people wonder how stable and responsible he was.



What the doctrine of papal primacy and infallibility meant to Goss comes out very clearly. In this letter to Newman he writes as follows: "The present Council ... will change the patriarchal sceptre into a dictator's truncheon, and the Bishops who went to Rome as princes of the household to confer with their august Father will return like satraps dispatched to their provinces where they may find awaiting them for obedience the very decrees which they had refused to sanction in Council". For Goss, in other words, who clearly had a strong sense of the pope as patriarch in a communion of local churches, the doctrine of Vatican I was in fact designed to destroy the Church. And in a letter to Clifford (cf Cwiekowski, p. 293), written on August 8th, 1870, but of course before the bishops knew that the Council had not just dispersed for the summer but would have to be abandoned altogether, we find Goss saying that, by declaring the popes to be infallible, the Council "makes this claim of universal dominion, in temporals as well as in spirituals, to be infallible and of faith, and as much to be believed as the mystery of the Trinity". He is thinking here of the claim of Boniface VIII in the bull "Unam Sanctam" of 1302 to be "above all sovereigns, with power to absolve subjects from their allegiance and to transfer empires from one ruler to another ... Popes have claimed this power in documents addressed to the whole Church as much as any truths ever are addressed to it". Thus, by refusing to accept the doctrine of papal infallibility, Goss understood himself to be rejecting a doctrine according to which such papal claims as sovereignty over State as well as Church must be regarded as infallible and binding. That (Goss knew) could not be true.

Of the four remaining bishops Francis Kerrill Amherst (Northampton), of a hereditary Catholic family, had studied engineering in Belgium and tried his vocation with the Dominicans at Woodchester. At the Council he was, as they say, an "inopportunist"; he had a version of papal infallibility which he could accept but he saw no reason for the Council to make a pronouncement on the matter. William Vaughan (Bristol), with a background among comfortably off Catholic landed gentry (his mother was a Weld of Lulworth and he built the presbytery and schools in his first parish at his own expense), could not have been more distant in his theology of the papacy than his private correspondence shows him to be from the neo-ultramontane cant of his nephew, the much more famous Herbert Vaughan, then owner and editor of *The Tablet*, and the friend and disciple of Manning who was to inherit the archbishopric of Westminster on Manning's death in 1892. As Vaughan wrote (cf Cwiekowski, p. 291): "To define—is to *limit*". His difficulties were not about "the *doctrine* finally set forth", but with "the *form* of its embodiment". He acknowledged that many interpreted the text to mean that the pope could act inde-

pendently of the Church, but he clearly did not think that was the *only* interpretation, and he clung to the fact that “the canons that imply the power, even of deposition of a Pope who in his *private* capacity falls into heresy still remain untouched”.

In 1851 George Errington was appointed as the first bishop of Plymouth in the newly restored hierarchy. We know from his *Four Lectures on the Hierarchy of the Catholic Church*, published in 1850, that he had given some thought to ecclesiastical matters. He displays a sound sense of the place of the bishop in the local church and recognizes that the pope, as “the centre of unity”, has pastoral solicitude with respect to all the churches, “that the danger of schism may be avoided”. While admitting that “a vast majority” suppose that “the decision of the Pope alone, before it has been received by the other Bishops of the Church, is guaranteed by the divine promise” (i.e. of infallibility), he regards the alternative view as tenable. Of hereditary Catholic minor gentry he had become close friends with Wiseman in their student days at Ushaw. After studying in Rome he served as vice-rector of the English College there and then as prefect of studies at Oscott, with Wiseman as his superior on both occasions. From 1840 onwards he seems to have spent some eight years travelling with his brother in France and Spain. Much against his will, and less than four years after becoming bishop of Plymouth, he was moved at Wiseman’s insistence to become coadjutor with the right of succession at Westminster (he was only two years younger than Wiseman). There followed five years of constant friction between the two men, exacerbated by Wiseman’s favouring the rapid ascendancy of such recent “converts” as Manning, Ward and Talbot. In 1860, as Errington refused to resign, the rare step was taken of persuading the Roman Curia to “retire” him (he was fifty-six). This was certainly managed by Manning and Talbot, no doubt on the pretext that Errington was “un-Roman” at heart. Goss invited him to the Isle of Man, where he remained as parish priest until the Council in 1869. He refused the bishopric of Trinidad in 1863, and again refused the job of restoring the hierarchy in Scotland in 1868 when he would in due course have become the first archbishop of Edinburgh. He used to call on Newman whenever he passed by Birmingham and we may suppose that they discussed more than the weather. He was active at the Council, supporting his younger friend and colleague Clifford. After the Council he was invited by Clifford to teach theology at Prior Park, which he did until a few days of his death in 1886.

Had he died as archbishop of Westminster there is no doubt that Errington would have wanted Clifford to succeed him, although it may well be doubtful if Rome would have allowed it. Clifford was sixty-three, and perhaps would have been too old; but

his distant cousin, Herbert Vaughan, was sixty when he went to Westminster in 1892 (the year before Clifford died). It is the greatest "might have been" of modern English Catholic history to wonder what difference it would have made, if Errington and Clifford, and not Manning and Herbert Vaughan, had led the English Catholic community in the second half of the nineteenth century.

In fact even in 1865, when he was only forty-two, Clifford was one of the leading candidates for Westminster. He and Grant were recommended to the Vatican by the British government: "quiet safe men who enjoyed the confidence and respect of their countrymen irrespective of religious conviction and whose appointment would give general satisfaction and inspire general confidence" (cf Cwiekowski, p. 48). In Clifford's case this must be partly attributable to his being "backward about the Temporal Power" (i.e. he saw no reason for any more young men, including English volunteers, to die for the Papal states), and to his having no objections to letting Catholics go to the ancient universities. But Manning's correspondence with Talbot shows that they feared Clifford even more than Errington: "We should be overrun with worldly Catholics and a worldly policy without his meaning or knowing it".

William Joseph Hugh Clifford, born in 1823, was a son of the Devon landowner, Lord Clifford of Chudleigh. His mother was the only daughter of Thomas Weld who became a priest when his wife died and ended his days in Rome as a Cardinal. Clifford's father attended Cardinal Consalvi in the Vatican delegation at the Congress of Vienna. He spent much of his time in Italy and had a villa at Tivoli. Young Clifford received his early schooling at Stonyhurst and Prior Park, but from 1840 onwards he spent ten years as a student in Rome and Louvain. He served Newman's first Mass in Rome in 1848 (he was to preach at Newman's requiem in 1890). Although like Acton, his somewhat younger contemporary, he was barred from the normal education which young men of his class received (Talbot: Eton and Oxford; Manning: Harrow and Oxford), it would be a mistake to underestimate the intellectual formation which such men as Errington and Clifford received, in particular from their years of travelling and their fluency in languages other than their own native tongue. A year or so after ordination Clifford became Errington's secretary; they shared the same house and worked together until the fateful move to Westminster. In 1857, at the age of thirty-four, Clifford was consecrated bishop of Clifton in Rome by Pius IX himself, who regarded the young English nobleman as a personal friend. We shall see when we look at his long speech at the Council on May 25th, 1870, that his own, and his family's, long connections with the Vatican were no bar to his deep-seated distrust of the doctrine of papal infallibility.

We shall look at Errington's speech on June 22nd, but in fact it was on May 25th, when Manning and Clifford made lengthy speeches contradicting each other, that the "infallibilist" minority among the English bishops overcame the "inopportunist" majority, and when, symbolically, symptomatically, and premonitorily of a long future, the convert from Anglicanism outmanoeuvred the most representative spokesman of traditional English Catholic ecclesiology. It has taken a century for Catholics to "receive" the decrees of Vatican I, and to realize that, after all, as William Vaughan said, "to define is to limit". But Manning's interpretation prevailed in the meantime.

No doubt nothing could have stopped Manning from becoming archbishop of Westminster in 1865; the decrees of providence at least must be infallible. Errington's early retirement, and dignified acceptance of minor jobs (unless that in itself shows us) prevents us from seeing how capable and energetic he would have been in what was at the time an immensely difficult job. Had he stayed in the Church of England Manning would certainly have been in the running to succeed Longley as archbishop of Canterbury in 1868. He came of a family of merchant-bankers. His father was a Member of Parliament and, after Harrow and Balliol, young Manning had every intention of following a career in politics. Whether or not because of his father's financial collapse he soon tired of a post in the Colonial Office and returned to Oxford to prepare for the priesthood. In 1833 he was established as a curate in Sussex and married to his rector's daughter, whose two elder sisters were already married to two of the Wilberforce brothers. Manning's wife died childless in 1837. He had already contributed to No 78 of "Tracts for the Times", but it is more interesting to read his open letter, *The Principle of the Ecclesiastical Commission examined* (1838), in which, in the context of questions about national but ecclesiastically controlled schools, he showed how utterly repugnant any kind of Erastianism had become to him. The victory for papal supremacy in 1870 was, for Manning, only the end of a campaign that began when he was rural dean of Midhurst.

Manning preached a strongly anti-papal sermon in St Mary's, Oxford, on Guy Fawkes' day 1843, which deeply grieved Newman. When Newman went over to Rome in 1845 Manning was recognised as one of the leaders of the Catholic movement in the Church of England. On a long tour of the continent, and after an audience in 1848 with Pius IX, Manning discovered Roman Catholicism, but there is no reason to think that he would have moved but for the famous Gorham Judgment, when, so it seemed to him, a bishop's refusal to instal a 'heretical' parson was overridden by a decision of a judicial committee of the Privy Council. The ascendancy of the State over the Church in doctrinal matters could not

have been more plainly demonstrated, and the failure of the protests which he helped to organize convinced Manning that the clergy and laity of the Church of England acquiesced in this Erastianism. He resigned as Archdeacon of Chichester and, after some months of anxious thought, was received into the Church of Rome at Farm Street in April 1851. Two months later he was ordained priest by Cardinal Wiseman (who regarded Manning as the first fruits of the restoration of the hierarchy the previous year). That winter he went to Rome, where he spent three years in theological study, frequently meeting Pius IX. A set of four lectures which he brought out in 1852 shows him contrasting Catholic Christianity with rationalism, thus in effect classifying Anglicanism with rationalism in the way he was to do in 1865.

Between mission work in the London slums and frequent missions to preach in Rome Manning's energies were fully occupied. In 1857 the pope made him provost of Westminster Cathedral; in 1865, obedient as he said to an inward voice which overruled all the advice he was given Pius IX appointed him as archbishop of Westminster. He had been in communion with the Roman Church for exactly fourteen years.

Looking round in 1867, in *The Centenary of St Peter and the General Council*, Manning remarked that the liberty of the Church was threatened by the power of the State everywhere. In England there was the Anglican schism, Erastian to the core; in France there was a national episcopatism reminiscent of Gallicanism; in Austria there were the remnants of the Emperor Joseph's policies of curbing ecclesiastical rights; and in Germany there was Febronianism, the theory that Church affairs should be kept as far as possible in local episcopal and civil hands. The only way to save the world was to reaffirm the freedom of the Holy Spirit in the Holy Catholic Church. It seemed to need the vision and the energy of a man who had lived through the Tractarian movement in the Church of England and discovered its helplessness to save that Church from state control to persuade the bishops in communion with the bishop of Rome to make a declaration that would, in proclaiming the infallible authority of the successor of St Peter, demonstrate true faith in the presence of the Holy Spirit in the only true Church.

*(To be continued)*