

University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindor

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

1-1-1958

The restoration of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in England 1850: A Catholic position.

Eddi Chittaro
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

Recommended Citation

Chittaro, Eddi, "The restoration of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in England 1850: A Catholic position." (1958). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 6283.
<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/6283>

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

THE RESTORATION OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC HIERARCHY IN ENGLAND

1850

276
A CATHOLIC POSITION

Submitted to the Department of History
of Assumption University of Windsor
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree
of Master of Arts.

by

Eddi Chittaro, B.A.

Faculty of Graduate Studies

1958

UMI Number: EC52462

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform EC52462

Copyright 2008 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 E. Eisenhower Parkway
PO Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Approved by D. J. Marshall C.R.B.
Col. J. J. Swann
Mr. J. J. Swann

A B S T R A C T

This thesis is a study of a reaction to a particular episode in the religious history of nineteenth century England. This reaction was presented by the Dublin Review and by Cardinal Wiseman's pamphlet "An Appeal to the English People" which answered the arguments of the opposition concerning the restoration of the hierarchy.

The first chapter, entitled The Scene, outlines the historical sequence of events which gave rise to the incident. With the Elizabethan Settlement of Religion the historic Roman hierarchy in England ceased to exist. In the seventeenth century this situation was partially rectified by the selection of Vicars-Apostolic. By the nineteenth century many Catholics were anxious to have once again Bishops in Ordinary. In 1848 the Pope was approached by certain Englishmen concerning this matter but, owing to his exile from Rome, the Bull of Restoration creating the hierarchy was not issued until September 29th, 1850, soon after his return. The publication of the Papal Bull and Cardinal Wiseman's Pastoral 'From Without the Flaminian Gate' aroused the opposition. The arguments of the opponents of the Restoration are presented in Chapter II, which has been designated The Opposition.

Many Protestants and some Catholics considered the restoration of Bishops in Ordinary to be a usurpation of the Crown's rights. Lord John Russell, the Prime Minister, while corresponding with the Bishop

of Durham called the Pope's work 'insidious and invidious'. Similarly, the Times accused Pius IX of 'papal aggression'. Public feeling was so aroused that in 1851 the Ecclesiastical Titles Act, designed to prevent the Restoration, was passed in parliament.

When opposition developed the Dublin Review and Cardinal Wiseman's 'Appeal' came to the defence of the Restoration. The third chapter is concerned with their support of the Pope's action. This influential lay periodical and the pamphlet verbally assailed those who opposed the Restoration. They were firmly convinced that the re-establishment was needed and since it was not contrary to any law, was above reproach. The final chapter presents the combined rebuttal and an analysis of it.

T H E P R O B L E M

Many English Roman Catholics in the first half of the nineteenth century considered their ecclesiastical government, which consisted of eight Vicars-Apostolic, to be inadequate and desired the re-establishment of the hierarchy. In 1850, Pius IX, by issuing the Bull of Restoration, re-established the hierarchy.

With the announcement of the Bull, opposition arose among many non-Catholics. This opposition considered the Pope's action to be offensive to the Queen and to her subjects; they denounced the Restoration as 'papal aggression', and took steps to prevent it from being realized.

This non-Catholic reaction caused the leading Catholic periodical, the Dublin Review, and the leader of the English Catholics, Cardinal Wiseman, in a pamphlet entitled "An Appeal to the English People", to defend the Restoration and attack strongly the arguments of the opposition. It is this attitude of the Dublin Review and the 'Appeal' which I intend to present and clarify in this thesis.

The first two chapters present the historical background and the nature of the opposition to the Restoration. The final chapter presents the combined rebuttal and an analysis of it.

My thesis then is a clarification of an incident in the religious history of nineteenth century England as seen in the pages of the leading Catholic review of the period and the main pamphlet issued by the Catholic side.

A C K N O W L E D G M E N T S

I am indebted, in particular, to the Reverend D. J. Mulvihill, C.S.B., Ph.D., Head of the Department of History who directed this thesis; and also to Dr. C. M. J. F. Swan, Ph.D., Assistant Professor in that same department. Both have been generous with their time, constructive criticism and encouragement.

Many librarians have been more than helpful in my work, indeed, too many to list all of them. However, I should be remiss not to mention the following: Mrs. Robert Haddow, B.A., B.L.S., University Librarian; Mr. W. F. Dollar, M.A., the Reverend J. B. J. Janisse, C.S.B., B.A., B.L.S., and Mr. E. J. Kanyasi, B.Sc., A.M.L.S., all of this University; Mrs. M. A. Fraser of the Legislative Library of Ontario; Miss G. M. MacMillan of the Public Reference Library, Toronto; and Mr. R. A. Ulveling, B.A., B.A.L.S., of the Public Library of Detroit.

I should like to acknowledge the kindness of the Reverend R. Armitage, M.C., D.D., Principal of Wycliffe College, Toronto, for his hospitality; and also that of the Venerable Archdeacon K. C. Bolton for his advice in gathering material.

To my sister Norma, Miss Barbara Hebert, and Mrs. R. J. Schifferli, I am much indebted for many hours of typing as I am, further, to Mr. Peter Fillman, B.A., for reading the various drafts of this monograph.

I am, of course, solely responsible for the content and style of this thesis.

C O N T E N T S

ABSTRACT	iii
THE PROBLEM	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
I. THE SCENE	1
II. THE OPPOSITION	19
III. THE <u>DUBLIN REVIEW</u> AND CARDINAL WISEMAN'S 'APPEAL': A CATHOLIC VIEW ON THE RESTORATION	32
BIBLIOGRAPHY	54
VITA AUCTORIS	61

I

THE SCENE

Until the sixteenth century the episcopal government of the Roman Catholic Church in England consisted of two archiepiscopal sees, Canterbury and York, and twelve episcopal sees. This form of administration was initiated by Pope St. Gregory the Great, who commanded St. Augustine to carry it through in the sixth century. It continued until Henry VIII began the process which led to the final break with the Roman Catholic Church. The temporary decision, which this ruler introduced in 1534, was reversed in October 1553 upon the succession of Queen Mary I. The nation was received back into Communion with the Holy See in November, 1554.¹ However, with the succession of Queen Elizabeth I, the policy of Mary was reversed, England once more broke from Rome, and under the Acts of Supremacy and of Uniformity the break was made permanent.² With the passage of these

¹Philip Hughes, The Reformation in England (London: Hollis and Carter, 1953), II, 225.

²Act of Supremacy - I. Elizabeth, C.I. - 1559. An oath was required from all clergy, judges and other civil officials denying the supremacy of the Pope in ecclesiastical or temporal affairs in England. Anyone who refused to take the 'Oath' was dismissed from his position. Act of Uniformity. I Elizabeth. C.2. - 1559 regulated the form of worship to be followed in all churches. J. B. Black, Reign of Elizabeth (1558-1603) (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949), 13-15.

Acts, England was without Roman Catholic Bishops.³ Even though similar Acts also applied to Ireland, the Papacy continued to supply that country with Bishops, a contradiction of the situation in England. Through the years 1598-1623, the Catholics of England were ruled by three archpriests.⁴ However, between 1623-1683, a Vicar-Apostolic, with duties similar to those of a Bishop but without the powers of a Bishop, acted as the senior prelate of the Catholic Church in England.⁵ The first vicar-apostolic, Dr. William Bishop,⁶ held office for one year. His successor, Dr. Richard Smith, left England in 1631 never to return, with the result that there was no vicar-apostolic resident in England until the selection of John Leybourne in 1685.⁷ By 1688 four

³The last Roman Catholic Bishop in Queen Elizabeth's reign was Bishop Watson.

⁴The three archpriests were George Blackwell, George Birkhead and Dr. William Harrison. An archpriest is a priest who is placed above a number of secular clergy in a certain region. His function is not permanent. He merely governs where there are no Bishops or Vicars-Apostolic to do so. However, he does not have the powers of either. J. P. Kirsch, "Archpriest", Catholic Encyclopedia, I, (1907), 697-698.

⁵J. B. Milburn, "The Restoration of the Hierarchy", Dublin Review (hereafter cited as DR.), (4th ser.), CXVII (October, 1895), 348.

⁶His other title was the Bishop of Chalcedon. Dr. Smith's departure from England was due to trouble with his clergy. Also, Urban VII requested that some of his writings be suspended. This occurrence influenced him to go to France. He promised to resign but later refused. Cardinal Richelieu provided him with lodgings during most of his stay in France. J. G. A[iger], "Smith, Richard (1566-1655)", Dictionary of National Biography (hereafter cited as DNB.), XVIII, (1921), 510-511.

⁷James II, a Roman Catholic, came to the throne in 1685. The enforcement of the penal legislation concerning Roman Catholics was accordingly suspended.

vicariates-apostolic were established and this number remained intact until 1840 when the four were increased to eight.⁸

Unsuccessful attempts were made in 1838 and also in 1840 by clergy and laity to re-establish the Catholic hierarchy.⁹ Another attempt to restore this hierarchy was made in 1847, when the Vicar-Apostolic of the Midland District, Dr. Ullathorne,¹⁰ and the former secretary to Cardinal Acton, Dr. Grant,¹¹ were sent to Rome to discuss the return of the hierarchy in England. The desire for this restoration was due in great part to the changed position of the Roman Catholics in England.¹² Milburn wrote that there were four important

⁸Midland, Northern, Western, and London Districts; London, Western, Welsh, Lancashire, Yorkshire, Eastern, Central, and Northern.

⁹Even earlier in 1792 the Cisalpine Club, a Roman Catholic laymen group, attempted to abolish vicariates and restore Bishops in Ordinary but to no avail. Cardinal Wiseman, "The Catholic Hierarchy", DR., (orig. ser.), XXX (March, 1851), 181. See below, pp. 34-35.

¹⁰Ullathorne became first Bishop of Birmingham in 1850 when the hierarchy was re-established. He was also responsible for establishing the hierarchy in Australia. Fitzgerald states "that he was an originator, and most energetic supporter of the hierarchy" - P. N. Fitzgerald, Fifty Years of Roman Catholic Life and Social Progress (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1901), I, 59.

¹¹Grant became first Bishop of Southwark. Cardinal Acton, whom he had worked for, was residing in Rome at the time, even though his Cardinalship was over England. The Cardinal was one Catholic prelate who was opposed to the re-establishment. Denis Gwynn, One Hundred Years of Roman Catholic Emancipation (1829-1929), (London, Longmans Green and Co., 1929), p. 72. See also, Thomson Cooper, "Grant, Thomas D.D. 1816-1870", DNB., VIII, (1921), 403-404.

¹²According to Mr. O'Connor, conversions, Roman Catholic population growth, and Irish immigration had increased the Roman Catholic population to over 300,000, in an eleven year period (1829-1840). J. J. O'Connor, The Catholic Revival in England (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1942), p. 38.

reasons for the improved conditions of the Roman Catholics in England: the migration of Roman Catholics from Ireland which increased the Catholic population; the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829; the Oxford Movement, which had been instrumental in influencing ideas concerning doctrine and practice in the Church of England; and lastly, the increase in converts who had entered the Church because of the Oxford Movement.¹³

The proposal for restoring the Catholic hierarchy was by no means novel or unique, but rather was the same plan which St. Gregory the Great had suggested centuries previous. The English Catholic representatives for ten weeks discussed the re-establishment of the hierarchy with Pius IX and other Church officials. The project was practically completed when in 1848 Count Rossi, the Prime Minister of the Papal States, was assassinated. This event and the subsequent revolution caused the Pope to flee from the Vatican to Gaeta on October 24, 1848. The Bull of Restoration, owing to these events, could not be promulgated at that time.¹⁴ Pius IX remained in exile until April 12, 1850, after which French troops secured his stay in Rome. Moreover, the original proposal for re-establishing the hierarchy could not be set in motion as first intended, because of the

¹³Milburn, DR., (4th ser.), CXVII, 347.

¹⁴"Pius IX and the 'Civiltà Catholica'", DR., (new ser.), VII (October, 1866), 414. See also, "The Change From Vicars-Apostolic To A Regular Hierarchy in England", Tablet (hereafter cited as Tab.), (new ser.), VI (December 2, 1871), 714.

death of Dr. Walsh, who, from the outset, was thought to be the logical first Archbishop of Westminster.¹⁵ In the summer of 1850, Dr. Wiseman, who had become Pro-Vicar-Apostolic for the District of London, was to be elevated to the Cardinalate. Thus, the Papacy at this time was concerned with two different innovations for England: the elevation of Wiseman to the 'red hat', and the restoration of the hierarchy. There was no necessary link between the two. Pius IX realized the importance of Wiseman to the Catholic populace of England, but also realized that as a Cardinal he could not be sent back to England until the hierarchy was restored. Possibly, then, the appointment of Wiseman to the Cardinalate had the effect of hurrying along the re-establishment. Thus, Pius IX after four days of deliberation decided to restore the hierarchy to England. Since the original choice as first Archbishop of Westminster, Dr. Walsh, had died, the newly invested Cardinal was selected as his replacement. On September 29th, the restoration of the Roman Catholic hierarchy was formally disclosed in Consistory. The announcement of the Promulgation of the Papal Bull to restore the hierarchy, and of the creation of Dr. Wiseman as a Cardinal, was greeted in England with bitter outbursts of "No Popery".¹⁶ As the Tablet wrote,

¹⁵E. E. Y. Hales, Pio Nonno. A Study in European Politics and Religion in the Nineteenth Century (New York: P. J. Kennedy and Sons, 1954), 140. See also, David Mathew, Catholicism in England 1535-1935 (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1936), pp. 74-97.

¹⁶Hales, p. 141.

. . . The Papal Bull for the establishment of a hierarchy in England which did not come into collision with either the laws or the constitutions of the country, and was designed and carried into effect without the smallest idea of offending, exasperating, or thwarting the government produced . . . the utmost alarm, the fiercest opposition, and the enactment of an adverse, offensive, stupid, and impotent law. "It re-established in the Kingdom of England and according to the common laws of the Church, a hierarchy of Bishops deriving their titles from their own sees."¹⁷

Pius IX along with other Roman Catholic authorities was surprised at the reaction to the Bull in non-Catholic and some Roman Catholic circles in England.¹⁸ The statements made by Lord John Russell, the Prime Minister, five years earlier during the debates on the Catholic Relief Bills of July, 1845, and February, 1846, seemed to place no obstacles in the way of a re-establishment policy. In his remarks in the debate of 1845, he inferred that the laws, which prevented a Roman Catholic Bishop from adopting titles which were held by Bishops in the Church of England, should be abolished, while in the debate of 1846, he stated that to hinder the use of certain priestly titles would be foolish.¹⁹

¹⁷Tab., (new ser.), VI, 713.

¹⁸Besides Cardinal Acton, other personages were opposed to the Pope's action. Among these were Lord Beaumont and the Duke of Norfolk, the former believing that Lord John Russell was right in doing what he did because he clearly showed himself to be the custodian of the British Constitution. He said this "ill-advised measure [the restoration] forced Catholics into the alternative of breaking with Rome or of violating their allegiance to the constitution of these realms." L. E. Elliot-Binns, Religion in the Victorian Era (London: Luttworth Press, 1936), p. 125. See also, Gwynn, pp. 93-94.

¹⁹Tab., (new ser.), VI, 713.

Those who were instrumental in bringing about the restoration believed that what they were undertaking was generally known in England. This notion was not unfounded, for Lord Minto, plenipotentiary to Rome for Great Britain in 1847, was told of the proposed re-establishment by Pius IX.²⁰ Lord John Russell, upon hearing of this from his representative in Rome, seemed unconcerned and indifferent to the whole affair for he made no attempt at opposition. All those who were closely connected with the re-establishment believed not only that no opposition would be forthcoming, but also that all would be realized without immediate repercussions.²¹ The Tablet wrote,

. . . On the 7th [February 1851] the Premier admitted that the Pope had shown the document regarding the English Hierarchy to Lord Minto but added that the envoy did not look at the paper, or make any observations on the subject. If this were the case the fault was surely Lord Minto's and His Holiness could not be accused of acting covertly, or without due respect to the representatives of the British Government.²²

The Times on October 26, 1847, said that Vicars-Apostolic would be replaced by Bishops whose titles would refer to particular dioceses. Moreover, it was reported that Pius IX was going to expand

²⁰According to the Times Minto did not know of the restoration of the hierarchy. "Leeds", The Times, No. 20636 (November 2, 1850), 8b. See also, Hales, pp. 141-142; Gwynn, p. 80; Wilfred Ward, Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman (London: Longmans and Co., 1912), I, pp. 545-546.

²¹Gwynn, p. 80. See also, Hales, p. 141; "Cardinal Wiseman and the 'Papal Aggression'", Tab., (new ser.), VI (December 9, 1871), 746.

²²"Cardinal Wiseman and the Prime Minister", Tab., (new ser.), VI (December 16, 1871), 778.

the number of Bishops and dioceses in England whenever and wherever it was necessary.²³

A week following the publication of the Papal Bull, Cardinal Wiseman wrote his now famous Pastoral entitled 'From Without the Flaminian Gate'. A part of this letter follows:

The great work, then, is complete; what you have long desired and prayed for is granted. Your beloved country has received a place among the fair churches, which, normally constituted, form the splendid aggregate of the Catholic communion; Catholic England has been restored to its orbit in the ecclesiastical firmament, from which its light had vanished, and begins now anew its course of regularly adjusted action round the centre of unity, the source of jurisdiction of light and vigour.

..... ; ;
 Then, truly is this day to us a day of joy and exaltation of spirit, the crowning day of long hopes, and the opening day of bright prospects. How must the Saints of our country whether Roman or British, Saxon, or Normans, look down from their seats of bliss, with beaming glance upon this new evidence of the faith and Church which led them to glory, sympathising with those who have faithfully adhered to them through centuries of ill repute for truth's sake, and now reap the fruit of their patience and long suffering.²⁴

The letter was greeted as the Papal Bull had been with a great amount of clamor and verbal opposition. Wiseman stated that the Pope was only restoring to England what now existed all over Europe. The Cardinal was overjoyed at the Pope's consent to re-create a hierarchy. His elation carried over into his writing with the result that

²³"The Famine of 1847-"Papal Aggression" at Hand-Smith O'Brien and The Irish Confederation", Tab., (new ser.), VI (November 18, 1871), 648-649.

²⁴English Historical Documents, 1833-1874, ed. G. M. Young and W. D. Handcock (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1956), XII, 364-369.

a Protestant reading the Pastoral would easily become infuriated. The Times wrote, "The Romish priests have not yet learnt to speak to Englishmen and there is a taint of impunity in the very expressions they employ to emit the decrees of their outlandish authority."²⁵ Cardinal Wiseman wrote the letter in Rome where the atmosphere and environment elicited quite different reactions than in England where many people had opposite views. When Dr. Witty, Vicar-General of the London District, received the Pastoral on October 16th or 17th, he thought of suspending its announcement and of changing the wording and thought. He felt that Cardinal Wiseman, being elated by the restoration, had overlooked the irritating effect its contents and style would have on many non-Catholics.²⁶ Moreover, besides the contents, the title of the Pastoral 'From Without the Flaminian Gate' gave the impression of superiority.²⁷

This Pastoral and Cardinal Wiseman's appointment to the archiepiscopal see of Westminster further increased the opposition.²⁸ As the Church wrote, "we can only regard it as one of the grossest

²⁵"Editorial", Times, No. 20,637 (November 4, 1850), 4e.

²⁶Ward, pp. 540-541.

²⁷The Tablet stated that the Pope only had the right to date his Pastoral from the city of Rome. However, Cardinal Wiseman was the letter writer and not the Pope. Tab., (new ser.), VI, 778.

²⁸Cardinal Wiseman's jurisdiction extended over the three counties which made up Westminster-Middlesex, Hertford and Essex, and the episcopal see of Southwark.

acts of folly and impertinence which the Court of Rome has ventured to commit, since the Crown and the people of England threw off its yoke."²⁹ The Pastoral was read, by October 27th, in all churches of the archdiocese of Westminster and Southwark. The Archdeacon of London in an address to his clergy called it an "invasion of our Church and country by a foreign Prince. . . an attack upon the Queen's authority, as the supreme governor over all persons, and in all causes ecclesiastical as well as temporal within her dominions".³⁰ Public outcries of "No Popery" and demonstrations ensued.³¹ Mr. Dawson has written, "It was a tragedy, and an unnecessary tragedy, that the restoration of the hierarchy should have been accompanied by this violent outburst of popular fanaticism. It could easily have been avoided by a little . . . diplomacy."³² Meanwhile, Cardinal Wiseman was returning to England unaware of the feelings engendered by the Pastoral. Eventually Dr. Witty informed him of the agitation which the 'Flaminian Gate' letter had created.³³ The Cardinal on hearing

²⁹"The Encroachments of Popery", Church, No. 15 (November 7, 1850), 117.

³⁰"The Archbishopric of Westminster", Times, No. 20,634 (October 31, 1850), 5d.

³¹Actual reports of incidents can be seen in Ward, pp. 551-52. Reporters of the day wrote that the Pope, Cardinal Wiseman, and the twelve Bishops were burned in effigy, and processions marched through towns with blazing torches yelling "Down with the Pope".

³²Christopher Dawson, "The English Catholics 1850-1950", DR., CCXXIV (4th Quarter, 1950), 5-6. See also, Gwynn, p. 83.

³³Gwynn, p. 82.

of these accusations was disturbed and wrote a letter on November 3rd to Lord John Russell. In it he claimed that the newspaper and populace were mistaken as to what the re-establishment of the hierarchy entailed, or signified. The Cardinal claimed that what had been undertaken at Rome was disclosed to Lord Minto, the Prime Minister's father-in-law, three years previous, when he had had an audience with Pius IX. He explained also that his new position and jurisdiction in England were concerned with the spiritual and not with the temporal or civil life of his 'flock'.³⁴

On November 4th³⁵ Lord John Russell wrote to the Bishop of Durham in reply to an earlier letter of his concerning the restoration.³⁶ The Prime Minister in this "Durham Letter" accused the Pope of being "insolent and insidious".³⁷ When the country was informed of its contents, further coal was added to the fire of agitation, especially owing to the fact that it appeared on Guy Fawke's day. The "Durham Letter" according to the Tablet, was the Prime Minister's own thought and action. It was not government policy, but the independent

³⁴Tab., (new ser.), VI, 746.

³⁵The Tablet stated it was dated October 4, 1850. Tab., (new ser.), VI, 778.

³⁶Lord John Russell influenced Melbourne in appointing Edward Maltby to the see of Durham in 1836, which was the fourth in rank in the Anglican Hierarchy. The Bishop of Durham was quite "Progressive" in his ideas. H. J. R. Johnson, "Parliament and the Restored Hierarchy", DR., CCXXIV (2nd Quarter, 1950), 5-6. See also, W. F. R[ae], "Russell Lord John 1st Earl Russell (1792-1878)", DNB., XVII, (1921), 460.

³⁷English Historical Documents, XII, 367-369. See also, Gwynn, p. 84; E. S. Purcell, "Episodes in the Life of Cardinal Manning in his Anglican Days", DR., (4th ser.), CX (April 1892), 432.

decision of Lord John Russell.³⁸ Lord Lansdowne, the President of the Council, was quite perturbed with its publication. Benjamin Disraeli also criticised the letter.³⁹ In the letter Lord John Russell adopted an attitude which was in stark contrast to his previous stand on the matter of religious toleration of Catholics as indicated in his support of the Relief Bills of 1845 and 1846. He agreed with the Bishop of Durham when he labelled the Pope's action aggressive. Moreover, Russell stated that documents emanating from Rome had a tendency to assume power and supremacy over the Queen, and the spiritual autonomy of England. However, he intimated that his concern was more for the ministers of the Established Church than against the actions of an alien authority. He believed that certain clergymen were guilty of detrimental behaviour because they were adopting some of the rituals of the Roman Catholic Church. But he was quite sure that those who had such leanings would change. He regarded these "mummeries of superstition" and the current behaviour of Pius IX as contemptible and distasteful.

The excitement was so great that the remaining months of 1850 saw over six thousand meetings convened in order to oppose the restoration.⁴⁰ In Canada, the Globe reported that gatherings were

³⁸Tab., (new ser.), VI, 746. See also, Ward, pp. 554-555.

³⁹According to Gwynn, Roebuck, a political friend of Lord John Russell, accused him of ignoring Liberal principles by writing the "Durham Letter". Tab., (new ser.), VI, 778. See also, Gwynn, p. 95.

⁴⁰Tab., (new ser.), VI, 746.

"being held everywhere."⁴¹ A reflection of the widespread and hostile feelings at this time can be seen in the words of the then Lord Chancellor⁴² who stated,

"Under our feet we'll stamp thy Cardinal's hat
In spite of Pope or dignitaries of Church."⁴³

Following his arrival in London on November 11th, Cardinal Wiseman wrote his "Appeal to the English People".⁴⁴ In this 'Appeal' he accused the Prime Minister and the Lord Chancellor of prolonging and of increasing excitement by their unjust attacks.⁴⁵ Then he turned his writing to the hearts of the English people, stressing the fact that they had always shown justice and fairness in all their dealings, and asked them to grant him and 'his sheep' an unbiased audience.

Cardinal Wiseman in his 'Appeal' cited six points in defence of the hierarchy. One authority has reduced the six points to four main arguments: when the hierarchy was established in the colonies,⁴⁶

⁴¹"England", Globe, (December 7, 1850), 586.

⁴²Lord Lyndhurst was Lord John Russell's Lord Chancellor.

⁴³DR., (4th ser.), CXVII, 347. See also, Ward, p. 558.

⁴⁴"Papal Manifesto", Church, Supplement December 14, 1850. See also, Gwynn, pp. 87-88; Ward, pp. 554-569.

⁴⁵Not only was the "Durham Letter" offensive to Roman Catholics but also to many high churchmen. R[ae], DNB., XVII, 460.

⁴⁶Canada obtained its Roman Catholic hierarchy in 1844.

there was no demonstration and the imperial government even recognized the Irish hierarchy; most representatives of the government were not in favour of Lord John Russell's actions;⁴⁷ since Roman Catholics had been granted religious liberty, they could decide about their own episcopal government; the purpose of Wiseman at Westminster⁴⁸ was to rid the Abbey of its slum areas, and to improve upon the spiritual necessities of the population in these districts.⁴⁹ The 'Appeal' according to this author turned the tide for the Roman Catholics and for Cardinal Wiseman in England, as it was considered a success over those who sought to cripple the restoration.⁵⁰

In January, 1851, the Bishop of Durham, probably inspired by Lord John Russell's earlier letter, again accused the Roman Catholic Church of infringing on the rights of the Church of England. He demanded that retribution be made and suggested that in future, no Papal Bulls should be allowed into the country; that Catholic Bishops should not assume titles which were granted by the Pope; that monastic communities ought to be abolished, and the Jesuits expelled

⁴⁷Besides Roebuck and Disraeli, Gladstone was also opposed to his behaviour.

⁴⁸Cardinal Wiseman becoming Archbishop of Westminster was also protested. Reasons for this feeling can be noted below, Chapter II, n. 17.

⁴⁹Gwynn, pp. 90-92.

⁵⁰Ibid., pp. 88-89.

from England.⁵¹ The Dublin Review stated that three recourses to overcome the Restoration presented themselves. Each of them in essence advocated force. The first was to send ships to Papal ports in order to intimidate the Pope. The second was to order Pius IX to recall Cardinal Wiseman and restore the Vicars-Apostolic, and the third, which was adopted, was a parliamentary Act.⁵² Therefore, six months later on July 4th, 1851, the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill⁵³ in its second reading was passed by a 438 to 95 majority in Parliament. Soon after it passed both the House of Commons and the House of Lords. This legislation forbade the restoration of the hierarchy. However, from the first, it was unworkable and ineffective. It was, as one author stated, "a 'dead letter' not so much from the difficulty of enforcing it, as from the legal complications and confusion which it would have engendered."⁵⁴

The Act stipulated that Bishops were liable to a fine of one hundred pounds sterling. Moreover, they could not hold public meetings, use their priestly robes on the streets, or their titles and jurisdiction over a diocese. It sought not only to curtail the

⁵¹Tab., (new ser.), VI, 778.

⁵²DR., CCXXIV (2nd Quarter), 9.

⁵³14 & 15 Vict. C60 (LOG.4.C.7.S.24). See also, English Historical Documents, XII, 369-370; Tab., (new ser.), VI, 779.

⁵⁴Fitzgerald, p. 65. See also, Hales, p. 142; Tab., (new ser.), VI, 713; Tab., (new ser.), VI, 778.

activities of the hierarchy in England but also in Ireland, which had had this system of ecclesiastical government from the period of St. Patrick.⁵⁵ William Ewart Gladstone opposed the passage of the Bill on the grounds of religious liberty for all.⁵⁶ He realized that enactments of parliament could not bolster the authority and prestige of the Church of England. Even though he was among the minority, he believed that the Act was unjust, and that shortly the populace would be won over also, for it was public opinion which had been instrumental in its passage.⁵⁷ His thoughts are clearly revealed in a letter written to the Reverend Mr. Hook on June 23rd, 1851, in which he remarked:

I know no more clear and few more sacred public duties incumbent on me as a churchman than that of opposing it. I object to it as a public man because it is politically unjust and tends to religious and social disunion; and further because it is a great public imposition palmed upon the people of England . . . I entirely deny that by supporting this miserable Bill I should be leading the battle against our deadly foe.⁵⁸

⁵⁵Tab., (new ser.), VI, 779. See also, John Stoughton, D.D. Religion in England 1800-1850 (London: Hodder and Stoughton), II, 263.

⁵⁶Others who opposed it were Hobhouse, Lawless, Fagan, Sadlier and Grafton. The latter would not agree to it being applied to Ireland. Correspondence on Church and Religion of William Ewart Gladstone, Selected and Arranged D. C. Lathurbury (London: John Murray, 1910), pp. 118-121. See also, "House of Commons-Monday March 24", Globe (April 17, 1851), 182.

⁵⁷N. W. P[earse], and H. W. P[aul], "Gladstone William Ewart (1809-1898)", DNE., XXII, Supplement, (1921), 711. See also, Lathurbury, p. 120; D. C. Somervell, Disraeli and Gladstone (New York: Garden City Publishing Co. Inc., 1926), 78; Tab., (new ser.), VI, 778; Tab., (new ser.), VI, 649.

⁵⁸Lathurbury, p. 122.

Conversely, the Edinburgh Review considered the Act the only worthwhile and concrete step taken. It wrote:

. . . It [the Act] is a measure of self-defence against aggression from without by a foreign Power - a protest by which the nation indicates its right to be the sole dispenser of honours and titles within its own limits: it is simply a repulse of an attack on the sovereignty and independence of the country.⁵⁹

In July, 1852, at Oscott, the first Provincial Synod, called by the Bishops, was held.⁶⁰ Newman said of the synod that it was "the resurrection of the Church".⁶¹ The restoration of the hierarchy was accomplished.

This chapter has described the actual events of the period. The return of Catholic bishops to the English scene in 1850 caused considerable unfavorable comment. The following chapter will consider the details of these attacks. That the opposition was unsuccessful can be judged by the historical fact that approximately twenty years later, during the first premiership of Gladstone, Lord Kimberly introduced into the Upper House a Bill for the Repeal of

⁵⁹"The Anglo-Catholic Theory", Edinburgh Review, XCIV (October, 1851), 529.

⁶⁰Fitzgerald, p. 67. See also, "The Church of Rome, and The Church and State of England", Canadian Churchman (Name changed from Church), Toronto, Canada (old ser.), No. 78 (August 12, 1852), 10.

⁶¹Cardinal Newman, Sermons Preached on Various Occasions (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1921), 176.

the Ecclesiastical Titles Act, which was carried on July 1st, 1871.⁶²

It merely removed the stipulations set forth by the Titles Act of 1851.⁶³

⁶²"Chronicles of the Week - Ecclesiastical Titles Bill", Tab., (new ser.), III (May 28, 1870), 669. See also, Tab., (new ser.), VI, 746; Fitzgerald, p. 66.

⁶³Even to this day Roman Catholic Bishops are not recognized officially by the Church of England.

II

THE OPPOSITION

On September 30, 1850, the Bull of Restoration re-establishing the Roman Catholic hierarchy in England was issued. On October 7th, Cardinal Wiseman's letter "From Without the Flaminian Gate" was published. This letter gave further insight into the changes entailed by the substitution of Bishops in Ordinary for Vicars-Apostolic. These publications, as stated elsewhere, were greeted with vehement opposition.¹ Within a short time, many people were aroused and concerned over this action taken by a foreign prelate. Of course, it would be foolish to assume that all non-Catholics, without exception, were opposed to the restoration, and equally senseless to contend that all Roman Catholics were in favour of their spiritual leaders' recent undertaking.²

Various reasons were given for considering this action by the Pope harmful to the best interests of the Church of England and the country itself. These opinions were enunciated by certain influential publications in England, such as the Times, and the Edinburgh

¹See above, Chapter I, n. 19.

²See above, Chapter I, n. 20.

Review; clergymen of the Church of England, and certain laymen in England; and were reflected in Canada by an Anglican journal, the Church, and the secular newspaper, the Globe. Each of them considered the behaviour of Pius IX despicable and presumptuous. They verbally attacked and assailed the Roman Catholic Church, and its 'Protector' for adopting a policy of aggression and usurpation. With their writings, and statements, the "No Popery" cry was again raised throughout England. Several recurrent arguments were used by those non-Roman Catholics who opposed the Papal decision. This chapter will be concerned with enunciating these arguments

A letter addressed to the Bishop of London by his clergy, quoted in a Canadian Anglican publication, set forth one of the main arguments.³ They claimed that if the Catholics had their own hierarchy, they would show greater allegiance and obedience to it than to the laws and institutions of England. The Times wrote, "It is a maxim of the law of England that every encouragement of the Papal power in this kingdom is a diminution of the authority of the Crown".⁴ Consequently, the Sovereign's authority would be subordinated to, or in any case seriously impaired by, a foreign prelate and his appointees in England. This restoration was considered by these clerics merely as a means to further enhance the power of the Pope, so that he could interfere with affairs exclusively English. They believed that when

³"Popish Presumption", Church, No. 16, Toronto (November 14, 1850), 125.

⁴Times, No. 20,638 (November 5, 1850), 4c.

the proper time presented itself Pius IX would gain complete and absolute spiritual dominance over England. As they state in the letter, "we have reason to believe that this step [the appointment of Cardinal Wiseman as Archbishop of Westminster] is only a preliminary one and that unless it now be checked, it will soon be followed by others of the same tendency".⁵

An earlier edition of the Church, which quoted the Times, stated that the Pope had played his hand, and clearly showed to the people of England his desire to subject the populace to his will.⁶ Also, Pius IX's behaviour clearly exemplified his intolerance towards the country which had always granted his followers absolute tolerance in their religious pursuits. As the Edinburgh Review wrote,

It is because the Roman Catholics find in England not only the fullest toleration, but the most perfect equality of rights, civil, religious, and political . . . that their priesthood ventures on assuming new territorial titles, and their cardinal is seen parading here his new un-English honour. . . .⁷

The Times were firm in the conviction that this action could not go unanswered; that those who were in authority, whether ecclesiastical or civil, had to take immediate steps to prevent the restoration of the hierarchy, and foreign attempts to overrun the

⁵Church (November 14, 1850), 125. See also, Canadian Churchman (August 12, 1852), 10.

⁶Church (November 7, 1850), 117.

⁷"Kings and Popes", Edinburgh Review, XCIII (January, 1851), 181.

realm's institutions.⁸ A number of laymen addressed a letter to the Lord Bishop of London, and in it continued this line of reasoning. They accused the Pope of overlooking the fact that the Reformation had taken place. Moreover, they strongly believed that the Roman Church hoped to re-introduce to England the predominance of a system which would be injurious to the citizenry.⁹ It was also claimed that the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church were bending over backwards, their obedience to the Pope's least command being even greater than the respect they held for the Crown. Therefore, how could these individuals be trusted to keep the best interests of England at heart, when their allegiance lay elsewhere? The uppermost concern in their minds was not to increase the glory of the ruler, but rather to fulfill the wishes of Pius IX, in the hope of increasing his prestige, even though it be to the detriment of the country. Owing to this allegiance of the clergy to the Pope, the re-establishment had to be taken into immediate account by all who believed in maintaining spiritual freedom throughout the land.¹⁰

The reason which was given for the sudden and unwarranted decision on Pius IX's part to restore the hierarchy was not legitimate. It was claimed that numerous conversions were taking place daily from

⁸"Romish Bishops in England", Times, No. 20,633 (October 30, 1850), 4f.

⁹Ibid., 5f.

¹⁰"The Papal Appointments", Church, No. 19 (December 5, 1850), 149. See also, Canadian Churchman (August 12, 1852), 10; Times (October 30, 1850), 5f.

Anglicanism to the supposed true faith of Roman Catholicism.¹¹ As the Edinburgh Review wrote, "Their first step was to misrepresent the English nation as returning into the Roman fold";¹² and again at a later date, "England say the Roman Catholics will inevitably return to her allegiance to Rome, and is rapidly returning even now".¹³ However, the number of converts was quite small in comparison to the total population of England.¹⁴ Merely because a small minority left the Church of England, this was no basis for assuming that England was soon to desert the ideals of the Reformation and be totally converted to the doctrines of Rome.¹⁵ This again clearly exemplified that foreigners lacked understanding of the English mind, and, moreover, that these aliens did not appreciate the religious beliefs of Englishmen.¹⁶

¹¹Among those who were converted in the 1840's were Newman, and Manning.

¹²Edinburgh Review, XCIII, 182.

¹³"Ultramontane Doubts", Edinburgh Review, XCIII (April, 1851), 535.

¹⁴Rev. Canon, J. S. B[essant], "People and Settlements", Encyclopedia Britannica, VII (1957), 463. This encyclopedia places the total population in England at ca. 17,000,000. O'Connor states that the Roman Catholic population at this time in England was ca. 500,000. O'Connor, p. 39.

¹⁵Church (November 7, 1850), 117. See also "The Roman Hierarchy", Church, No. 18 (November 28, 1850), 138.

¹⁶Church (November 28, 1850), 138.

This affront to the English character was further manifested when the Pope created a British resident a Cardinal, and placed him over the city of Westminster.¹⁷ By so acting, he was responsible for a religious division in the country. Moreover, the action was claimed to be 'presumptuous' and 'usurping' since the appointment was also an infringement upon the prerogatives of the ruler, for Pius IX had no jurisdiction in any country other than his Papal States. The Reverend Mr. Hook, Vicar of Leeds, was much concerned over Pius IX's behaviour. He sought to win the support of the clergy so that he could petition the Lord Bishop of the diocese concerning the restoration. In a pamphlet he wrote:

. . . The restoration was an insult offered to the church and state of England by the intolerable pride and tyranny of a foreign prince and potentate, who neither hath, nor ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority ecclesiastical or spiritual within this realm.¹⁸

The exercise of papal power in England was, according to Mr. Hook, a usurpation of Queen Victoria's rights as sovereign. The Papal attempt to assert authority by creating Wiseman Archbishop of Westminster was a denial of the royal supremacy, and was an act which brought dishonour upon the constitution, and upon the Crown. Only the

¹⁷Westminster is one city among the several cities and boroughs which constitute that metropolitan area commonly referred to as London. As the site not only of the meetings of Parliament in the Palace of Westminster, but also of the coronations in Westminster Abbey, it has, naturally, a special place in the affections and associations of Englishmen.

¹⁸Times, No. 20,636 (November 2, 1850), 8b.

Queen, as the 'Defender of the Faith' of the Church of England, had the right to establish dioceses, and to bestow titles within her realms.¹⁹

This portion of the indictment was expanded by those who considered the Restoration unwise and illegal. It was pointed out that if the Pope could bestow the title of Bishop upon a British subject, it would logically follow that the Pope had also the right of creating a Peer whenever he so desired. If he believed this personal right to exist for England, he was impertinent and abusive. For any English citizen to accept such a title would also be a denial of the Sovereign's privileges.²⁰ Thus, Pius IX's creation of the title of Archbishop of Westminster was illegal, meaningless, and without jurisdiction. The Pope's action was an attempt to slander the Crown, the Anglican Church, and her followers.²¹

The aggressive action by the Pope and by Cardinal Wiseman, it was claimed, was responsible for causing further religious rupture in England. Because they initiated the partition by their sudden

¹⁹Ibid., 8b. See also, Church (November 7, 1850), 117; Church (November 14, 1850), 125; "Advance of Popery", Church, No. 20 (December 12, 1850), 154.

²⁰It would be safe to state that a ruler's right can be imposed upon both directly and indirectly. The former by someone assuming he has the right to act in a manner which, in fact, rests with the sovereign alone. The latter through a person accepting a title from someone who does not have the faculties, and therefore is not qualified.

²¹Church (November 7, 1850), 117. See also, Church (November 14, 1850), 125.

action the guilt lay with them. The Roman Catholic Church knew that since there was only one language spoken in England, a province could have but one Metropolitan²² and a see could have but one Bishop. But even though the Pope was familiar with this principle, he ignored it. Therefore, he had to be held accountable for the resultant divisions.²³

The re-establishment of the hierarchy was planned and inaugurated without any consent of the Queen. Could not those in authority have shown this courtesy to, and respect for the sovereign? Nor had the Bull of Restoration made any reference to the Crown. It ignored the Sovereign and her position as Head of the Church of England as if they were non-existent. Moreover, disrespect was shown not only to the Queen but also to the Established Church. The Bull appeared oblivious to the fact that it even existed. The Vatican by assuming this prerogative of supremacy was at the same instance denying it to the Queen and the Anglican clergy whose duty it was to care for the populace.²⁴ The Bishop of London in answering the letter of his clergymen wrote:²⁵

²²A Metropolitan, according to the Catholic Encyclopedia, is "whatever relates to the metropolis, the principal city, or see, of an ecclesiastical province. The word metropolitan, used without any qualificative means the bishop of the metropolitan see, or . . . archbishop." A. Boudinhon, "Metropolitan", Catholic Encyclopedia, X (1911), 244.

²³Church (November 14, 1850), 125. See also, Church (November 28, 1850), 138.

²⁴Church (December 5, 1850), 149.

²⁵See above, n. 3.

The appointment of Bishops to preside over new dioceses in England constituted by a Papal brief is virtually a denial of the legitimate authority of the British sovereign, and of the English episcopate; a denial also of the jurisdiction of our orders, and an assertion of spiritual jurisdiction over the whole Christian people of the realm.²⁶

Acting as he did, Pius IX hindered religious freedom. As the Times claimed, there was an understanding between both Churches that all persons would be allowed freedom of worship; that the two faiths, with each maintaining its respective spiritual supremacy, would exist side by side. The Pope and his believers were not satisfied with equality, but grasped for total control. The present action by the Pope was able to be undertaken only owing to the tolerance granted by the English people. Because of this unjust behaviour, the country would be angered and no compromise would be made with this overdemanding alien power.²⁷

Possibly many Englishmen were under the impression that the Queen was not the Head of the Church of England; that this only belonged to Jesus Christ. However, the majority could visualize a great difference between, on the one hand, an alien prelate, and on the other hand, the Queen holding spiritual dominance in England. For if one of these must be above the other, it would be more

²⁶"Reply of the Bishop of London to the Memorial from the Westminster Clergy", Times, No. 20,632 (October 29, 1850), 5a.

²⁷Times (October 30, 1850), 4f. See also, Globe, No. 148 (December 10, 1850), 590. See above, pp. 20-21.

advantageous if spiritual dominance were in the hands of one's own ruler rather than in the hands of a foreign authority who could not rely on his own states for support but must depend upon the enemy, the French, to maintain his position, without whom, he would again be forced to flee his lands.²⁸

While the re-establishment was, no doubt, carefully planned so that it would not offend directly any laws or the statutes, nevertheless, it still remained an assumption of authority by the Vatican. Such action would undoubtedly arouse public thought. Even Queen Victoria, who was neither consulted by the Pope nor warned by her minister, but acquired the information elsewhere, stated, according to the Church, "I am Queen of England. I will not bear this."²⁹ The Queen's zeal, according to the same periodical, would overcome the "duplicity of a Minto, the subterfuge of a Russell,³⁰ the open audacity of the Papacy, or the craft and subtlety of the Jesuit".³¹

²⁸Church (December 5, 1850), 149. See also, Globe (December 10, 1850), 590.

²⁹"The Papal Aggression-Cardinal Wiseman's Manifesto", Church, No. 21 (December 19, 1850), 164.

³⁰Church (December 5, 1850), 149. The Church criticized Lord John Russell in this matter. They referred to him as a "microscopic statesman" and believed that his letter to the Bishop of Durham was "cowardly and a sneering side blow to the Anglican Church". On the other hand, the Globe considered Lord John Russell's work in opposition to the restoration quite satisfactory, and felt that he did much to improve the prestige of himself and his party by the "Durham Letter". Globe (December 10, 1850), 590.

³¹Church (December 19, 1850), 164.

The Times wrote that in disputes of this nature, people, unfortunately, became aroused quite easily. However, they were not sorry to see this excitement begun in opposition to their worst adversaries' aggressive actions.³²

Exploration of another facet of the problem was initiated by the Earl of Harrowby in a parliamentary debate in August of 1851.³³ He was concerned with the possibility of the erection of a Protestant Church within the city of Rome. He felt that many Protestants both in England and in Rome were desirous of such a church. The Earl further stated that while a former application to Rome had failed, nevertheless, with changing conditions - in particular the Roman Catholic hierarchy - the Vatican would be more sympathetic to their demands. The Marquis of Lansdowne replied that permission had not been sought from the Court of Rome, but he felt that if British residents in Rome complained of the existing situation, immediate action would be undertaken. He also believed that the Protestant Church, which had been built without the walls of Rome, was quite large enough to accommodate all the parishioners. However, the Earl of Harrowby retorted that,

The question my Lords, is not whether there is any want of accommodation for the worship of our Protestant countrymen at Rome, but whether we, as Protestants, are to enjoy the same liberty at Rome as the Roman Catholics, natives and foreigners, enjoy here?³⁴

³²Times, No. 20,637 (November 4, 1850), 4c.

³³"The Morality of Legislation - The Italian Church", DR., (orig. ser.), XXXI (September, 1851), 228.

³⁴Ibid., 228.

He contended that the church which they now had outside of Rome was part of a barn and not a proper place for religious practices; that he wanted to establish a Protestant Church in Rome, which was merely requesting from Rome what Rome herself had been permitted to do in other countries. The Marquis felt that he would be unsuccessful in this pursuit. The Bishop of London agreed with the Earl. He stated that Roman Catholics had many places of worship, and that they were building a magnificent cathedral in London, which again demonstrated aggressive action. If the Catholic Church had this privilege, the Protestant Church should have it as well. For them to refuse the Protestant minority in Rome this just request, is another act of intolerance and a sign of spiritual supremacy.³⁵

The arguments and points of opposition to the restoration of the Roman Catholic hierarchy as presented by the various periodicals and newspapers can be summarized as follows: the Roman Catholics would have less allegiance to the Crown; the Pope wanted to take over spiritual supremacy in England; the Roman Catholic clergy could not be trusted, for they merely wanted to make Pius IX more powerful; the few conversions in England did not warrant this sudden hierarchial change; the Pope's authority did not encompass England, but his Papal States alone; Pius IX infringed on the prerogatives of the Queen; since there was only one language in England, there could be but one

³⁵DR., (orig. ser.), XXXI, 227-237.

Bishop in a diocese and any action contrary to this would cause divisions; in planning the re-establishment, the Queen and officials of the Church of England were not consulted; the Vatican, by attempting to assert its authority, was destroying religious freedom; supremacy should be entrusted to the Crown rather than to a foreign power; even though the restoration was not against the law, it did nevertheless assume authority; and lastly, Roman Catholic Churches were allowed in England, but the Anglicans were denied the same privilege in Rome.

Such strong objections to the Restoration carried in secular and ecclesiastical publications inevitably demanded answers from the supporters of the Papal action. Answers were immediately to be found in the pages of the Dublin Review and the writings of Cardinal Wiseman.

III

THE DUBLIN REVIEW AND CARDINAL WISEMAN'S 'APPEAL':

A CATHOLIC VIEW ON THE RESTORATION

A most extensive brief for the defence was carried by the Dublin Review, the leading Catholic periodical of England. A further explanation of the Catholic position and policy was presented by Cardinal Wiseman in his pamphlet, "An Appeal to the English People". It should be remembered that Wiseman also wrote many of the important articles on the restoration in the Review. These publications attempted to justify the restoration of the hierarchy by Pius IX, as much as the Times and the Edinburgh Review in Great Britain, and the Church and the Globe in Canada controverted it.

The four factors usually cited as contributing to the demand for the re-establishment were: the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act, 1829; the Oxford Movement; the stream of Irish immigrants; and the number of recent conversions owing to the Oxford Movement.¹ Another reason of equal importance for English Catholics was the fact that the Church in England was governed by inadequate laws laid down in times of persecution. The regulations in force had been drawn up in the mid-eighteenth century under Pope Benedict XIV. At that time,

¹See above, pp. 3-4.

Roman Catholics in England were subject to the sporadic enforcement of severe penal laws; were prevented from having colleges, religious communities or houses; and were constrained to hold clandestine religious functions usually in someone's private chapel.² One hundred years later, in 1850, the regulations were no longer appropriate, with the result that certain changes were sought.³

The Dublin Review, in August 1842, and again in March 1851, claimed that the office of Vicar-Apostolic was merely temporary and that when the time was right, a hierarchy would again be established.⁴

The Tablet wrote,

For nearly three centuries England had been deprived of the glory and strength of her Catholic hierarchy . . . Vicars-Apostolic were without corporate organization, local superior, and power of synodal action.⁵

Not only did the Dublin Review consider the restoration important for Catholics in order that they might improve spiritually,⁶

²An example of the execution of one of these penal laws is found in the Dublin Review, which wrote, "As late as 1769 a vicar-apostolic, the Hon. James Talbot was tried for his life at the Old Bailey, for saying Mass." "The Catholic Hierarchy", DR., (orig. ser.), XXX (March, 1851), 180.

³Ibid., 180. See also, DR., (4th ser.), CXVII, 349; "Works and Wants of the Catholic Church in England", DR., (new ser.), I (July, 1863), 146; Gwynn, p. 70.

⁴"Ecclesiastical Organization", DR., (orig. ser.), XIII (August, 1842), 241. See also, DR., (orig. ser.), XXX, 178.

⁵Tab., (new ser.), VI, 713.

⁶DR., (new ser.), I, 146.

but also judged that, "the substitution of Bishops in Ordinary for Vicars-Apostolic at the beginning of the nineteenth century was deemed the most powerful means of securing and consolidating the fidelity of Catholics to the crown of these realms".⁷

Increasing the vicariates from four to eight in 1840 was the initial step in the re-establishment of Bishops in Ordinary. Since these Vicars-Apostolic were appointed by the Pope, the Review claimed that their establishment was as much aggression as was the erection of Roman dioceses in England; however, the appointment of Vicars-Apostolic had not been considered as either 'usurping' or 'aggressive'.⁸

Previous attempts at restoring the hierarchy never met with any opposition. Many centuries earlier, Pope Gregory the Great established the hierarchy in England without opposition. Thus, if Pope Gregory undertook such a step, why could not Pius IX do likewise? Their powers were identical, and if it was permitted to one, it should also be to the other. According to the Review, the "jurisdiction lies in the office, not in the date".⁹ In 1805 and later in

⁷DR., (orig. ser.), XXX, 176.

⁸Allies, "Testimony of Grotius and Leibnitz to Catholic Doctrine", DR., (orig. ser.), XXIX (December, 1850), 478. See also, O'Connor, p. 38.

⁹Cardinal Wiseman, "The Hierarchy", DR., (orig. ser.), XXIX (December, 1850), 514.

1847, when Ullathorne and Grant¹⁰ sought to restore the hierarchy, there was no secrecy involved. Moreover, the country was informed of the proposed re-establishment in 1847 through the Times.¹¹ Also the policy of Lord John Russell in the Relief Bills of 1845 and 1846¹² gave indication that he would favour the removal of certain limits to which the Catholics were then subject.¹³ In 1845, Dr. Griffiths, the Vicar-Apostolic of the London District, stated that possibly Vicars-Apostolic could be created titular Bishops. Therefore, the accusation that it was a sudden act, and not made known to the government officials, was unfounded. Since no trouble had been experienced in the past, none was expected in 1850. The manner in which the restoration was greeted, therefore, could not have been foretold. There was no indication, according to the Review, that such opposition would be raised, knowing Lord John Russell's earlier policies, and also recalling that former forecasts of a restoration did

¹⁰See above, p. 3.

¹¹According to the Tablet, the Times wrote on October 26, 1847 a statement to the effect "that the hierarchy was a settled thing". Tab., (new ser.), VI, 649; See above, p. 7; O'Connor, p. 51.

¹²See above, p. 6.

¹³DR., (orig. ser.), XXIX, 478. See also, DR., (orig. ser.), XXIX, 512-513; DR., (orig. ser.), XXX, 187-188; Tab., (new ser.), VI, 778; Tab., (new ser.), VI, 713-714; Tab., (new ser.), VI, 746; Elliot-Binns, pp. 124-126; Hales, pp. 138-140; Mathew, p. 197; W. F. Monypenny and G. E. Buckle, The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield (London: John Murray, 1929), I, 1098.

not cause any unrest. Therefore, the blame, if any, belonged with the Prime Minister and his colleagues and not with the Pope.¹⁴

The Tablet of December, 1871¹⁵ wrote that in August 1848, in answer to an inquiry of Sir Robert Inglis,¹⁶ during a discussion on the 'Diplomatic Relations with Rome Bill', Lord John Russell stated that he could not agree with the restoration of the hierarchy, and that he never had agreed to it. Therefore, no agreement was sought, since it was known beforehand that it would be refused. Also in the same discussion, he had stated that the Pope's spiritual power could not be hindered, and any attempt to do so would be nonsensical. The Dublin Review pointed out that even if he so desired, the Prime Minister had neither the power of agreement nor refusal in the re-establishment. The Review had two reasons for adopting this position: the sovereign alone had this prerogative, and the Prime Minister, because he took the oath of allegiance, could not possibly give his consent.¹⁷ The Review inferred that even though he and other

¹⁴DR., (4th ser.), CXVII, 355. See also, O'Connor, p. 44.

¹⁵Tab., (new ser.), VI, 714.

¹⁶Inglis was a "strong churchman with many prejudices". During his career as a politician he seems to have opposed all assistance to Roman Catholics. He was in favour of the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill; however, he considered its stipulations not severe enough. G. F. R. Barker, "Inglis Sir Robert Harry (1786-1855)", DNB., X (1921), 443.

¹⁷DR., (orig. ser.), XXX, 200. Possibly it should be mentioned that following the passage of the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act, 1829, the oath was no longer obligatory for civil offices with the exception of those of Lord Chancellor and of Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland...the Review is a trifle misleading in this argument.

administrators did not wish to co-operate, they could, nevertheless, have treated the request with open-mindedness. When Upper Canada in 1844 received a hierarchy, the British government not only did not object but stated, at the time, that no recognition of the episcopacy was necessary. The same treatment was anticipated by the Review for the realm where the Roman Catholics had complete religious freedom. In restoring the hierarchy, it seemed to the Review that two alternate paths could be pursued, either to obtain permission, or to go ahead without obtaining consent. The former had to be discarded because consent could not be given. Thus, the latter had to be adopted. Moreover, if there was nothing criminal about the re-establishment, agreement was not essential.¹⁸ According to the Review, Pius IX could not submit his office and authority to that of the Queen or to that of Anglican Bishops, for doing so would deny his own spiritual supremacy. Again, since the Pope was not recognized theoretically by the Church of England, his actions should not merit any consideration, for they did not exist. If, on the other hand, the Pope had alluded to the fact that as 'Head of the Universal Church' it was his right to assert his jurisdiction, such an assertion would have been received with indignation. Therefore, Pius IX's manner of restoring the hierarchy was justified, and it was the only road open to him.¹⁹

¹⁸DR., (orig. ser.), XXX, 200. See also, Tab., (new ser.), VI, 714; "Catholics of England and Ireland", Brownson's Quarterly Review, (3rd ser.), I (January, 1853), 126-127; Elliot-Binns, p. 124.

¹⁹DR., (orig. ser.), XXIX, 511.

The Review did not consider the issue which centred on the construction of an Italian Catholic Church in London as a potent argument in showing the aggression of the Pope, nevertheless, the periodical dealt at some length with this particular point. It began the defence by pointing out that the idea to build a church in London did not originate with Pius IX as claimed, but rather with certain devout Roman Catholics in that city. The Pope merely consented to its erection. It was not a luxuriant cathedral as was charged, but rather a small simple church. Moreover, when its erection was planned in 1847, no one raised any complaint. Now, three years later, it was labelled aggression, and part of a plan to restore the hierarchy. The Dublin Review claimed that the request for a church preceded the restoration, and to consider it as part of the re-establishment was illogical.

Certain Protestants contended that if the Roman Catholics could build a church in London, they should be allowed the same privilege in Rome. The Review stated that the situation was not the same for a number of reasons. To begin with, most Protestants in Rome were tourists, whereas most Italian Catholics in England were residents. The latter had a need for their Church owing to their increasing numbers, whereas the Protestants had not because the Church they had outside Rome was quite adequate for their limited number.

Since a Roman Catholic in England, the Review wrote, was a temporal subject of the Queen, and not of the Pope, he had certain

rights which he could expect from his sovereign. Similarly, a Protestant had identical rights in England for the same reason. But neither could extend these rights to a foreign country, which was what some Protestants in fact requested when petitioning for one of their churches to be built in Rome. On the other hand, Catholics by erecting a church in London were merely acting in accord with their right as British subjects.

The charge was also made that the present Protestant Church in Rome was in an old granary. True, the church occupied by them was once a granary, but now it was a pleasant comfortable church with the proper atmosphere and quite conducive to religious functions. It was quite similar to most small churches in England. Moreover, the type of building, the Review believed, was not forced upon those who sought a place of worship; it was probably selected for its convenience by those who had the choice. Now it was considered below their dignity to be compelled to hear services there.

Another grievance a number of Protestants had regarding their 'granary' church was that it was situated outside the walls of Rome. The church was located about one hundred yards from the Flaminian Gate. The site was no more forced upon those who sought a church, than was the choice of converting a granary into a church. Before Protestants had a church, they had to attend worship in various places. Possibly, the Review concluded, the reason this particular location had been selected was in order to establish a permanent place of worship which

would make it convenient for all to attend. At the time, it was considered an improvement, but now agitation was aroused because of the location.

It was claimed that Protestants showed toleration towards Catholics while the latter were intolerant of non-Catholics. The Review claimed the reason Roman Catholics had religious toleration could be explained by the fact that there were many religions in England. As the Dublin Review wrote, "toleration is the consequence of dissent, and plurality of religions".²⁰ This toleration enabled them to practice their religion fully. However, Protestants could not ask for the same treatment in Rome because Catholic laws did not give such toleration, the reason being that the Roman Catholic Church considered itself the one true faith. As the Review stated: "the law of Rome does not admit universal toleration, any more than free trade. It gives every facility for freedom of worship; but it does not put other religions on a level with the Catholic".²¹

Moreover, the only reason that Protestants desired a church in Rome was in order to undermine the Roman Catholic Church. The Review felt that the Pope would realize that the intentions of Protestants were to influence and distort Catholic belief, and not to improve the religious conditions of the Protestant population.

²⁰Cardinal Wiseman, "The Moralities of Legislation - The Italian Church", DR., (orig. ser.), XXXI (September, 1851), 245.

²¹Ibid., 246.

Lord Harrowby²² believed that Rome should make concessions to England because of the toleration England granted to her in permitting the restoration of the hierarchy. However, the re-establishment of the hierarchy was not accepted in this fashion, but rather was legislated against. Thus, the Review claimed that Catholics were not granted any concessions, but were harshly treated, and since Catholics were unjustly treated in their desire to have a hierarchy, the Pope would be quite justified in treating non-Catholics in a similar manner.

According to the Review, if one desired to behold the toleration of Catholics towards Protestants, one should not venture to a country which was totally Catholic, and where toleration could not be practiced. It wrote that to see clearly the toleration of Catholics, one merely had to refer to Catholic Belgium where Protestants, even though a minority, were treated with greater kindness than was the Roman Catholic minority in England.

Non-Catholics deemed it necessary to attack the Pope on all occasions, for "Protestants generally appear to have a greater horror. . . for the Pontiff"²³ than almost anything else. Therefore, it would be expecting too much from Pius IX to consent to the building of a church in Rome which would have as one of its objects the denunciation of the Pope and all for which he stood. The Review surmised that he would be inflicting injury upon himself and his Church by so acting.²⁴

²²See above, p. 29.

²³P. MacMahon, M.P. "Arbitrary Power - Popery - Protestantism - I", DR., (orig. ser.), VIII (February 1840), 13.

²⁴DR., (orig. ser.), XXXI, 231-254.

It was contended by the opposition that the restoration had caused religious division in England. However, this claim was unfounded, for the doctrines of the Established Church were not accepted throughout the land. Therefore, said the Review, to blame the Roman Catholics for this division was to argue illogically, for it existed before the re-establishment of the hierarchy, and also in areas where there were no Catholic residents.²⁵

When indignation and bitter feeling arose, Cardinal Wiseman wrote his "An Appeal to the English People".²⁶ The Tablet said that this pamphlet clearly showed that the restoration of the hierarchy did not infringe the rights of the Sovereign, and that its re-establishment was not 'insidious and invidious'.²⁷ As mentioned earlier, the Cardinal asked the populace for a "fair, free and impartial hearing".²⁸

In this 'Manifesto', he distinguished between the King's temporal and spiritual authority. By the Act of Supremacy,²⁹ the Sovereign was supreme in ecclesiastical and civil affairs. His subjects were required to abide by his decisions and commands in both

²⁵DR., (orig. ser.), XXIX, 518-520.

²⁶"Supplement", Church (December 14, 1850). See also, Ward, pp. 557-569.

²⁷Tab., (new ser.), VI, 746.

²⁸"Supplement", December 14, 1850.

²⁹See above, chapter I, n. 2.

matters. However, Catholic belief was such that it considered the Roman Catholic Church the one true Church, a tenet with which state churches were at variance. Roman Catholic doctrine taught that the Pope, as St. Peter's successor, was the Head of the Universal Church. Therefore, Wiseman contended, it was impossible for Catholics to consider the Crown as superior to the Papacy in matters spiritual. He wrote that for Catholics to accept the Sovereign's spiritual supremacy was to refute the Pope's supremacy. By refuting this doctrine, they would be denying an article of their faith.

The Relief Act of 1829 exempted Catholics from recognizing the Sovereign's spiritual supremacy. The Cardinal claimed that other sects, for example, the Established Church of Scotland and the Non-conformists, did not accept the Crown's spiritual supremacy either. The King had no jurisdiction in their ecclesiastical pursuits. Neither they, nor Roman Catholics, acknowledged Bishops who had been appointed by the Sovereign to instruct or speak for them. Therefore, Wiseman believed that the Sovereign's spiritual supremacy was merely over the Church of England, and only those who were part of that Church abided by his decisions. Whenever the ruler elevated a clergyman to be a bishop of a diocese, he had used, to the Catholic mind, two totally different powers: "as Sovereign, and as dispenser of dignities, the King or Queen bestows on the person elected dignity, rank and wealth [which pertains to the temporality]. . . the same Sovereign confers on that person spiritual and ecclesiastical

jurisdiction [which pertains to the spirituality]"³⁰ To the former, the King in his generosity bestowed an honour on an individual. This could be opposed, but no one would deny this privilege to anyone whom the Crown considered deserving. The latter, according to the Cardinal, would only be avowed by members of the Established Church who were subject to such jurisdiction.

Moreover, there was a great difference between the authority of a bishop and that of a civil or military official. For example, one must obey a policeman who was attempting to uphold the law. If one refused, one might be punished by the official who had the authority which accompanied his office. The Cardinal said, however, that in relation to a Bishop, the very opposite held true. A Bishop of the Church of England had no authority to command the Roman Catholic populace because his title and jurisdiction could only be asserted over his own followers. Wiseman stated the difference stemmed from the fact that one proceeded from the civil authority of the Sovereign, which no one may oppose, while the other was derived from the spiritual authority of the ruler which would be denied by all those who had not accepted him as the 'Defender of the Faith'. Newman in one of his sermons in reference to the restoration stated, "she [the Roman Catholic Church] claims, she seeks, she desires, no temporal power, no secular station, she meddles not with Caesar or the things of Caesar; she obeys him in his place but she is independent of him."³¹

³⁰"Supplement", December 14, 1850.

³¹Newman, p. 137.

Wiseman's next point was whether Roman Catholics were given complete spiritual freedom, and the privilege of being governed by a hierarchy. He wrote that since the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act offered Roman Catholics religious liberty, it followed that whatsoever was desired by them to fulfill their religious duties ought to be granted. As Lord Lydhurst stated, "If the law allowed the doctrines and discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, it should be allowed to be carried on perfectly and properly".³²

The Emancipation Act, as was mentioned,³³ prevented titles being used which were already held by the Bishops of the Established Church in both England and Ireland. Thus, the Cardinal considered any titles which did not infringe upon the Established Church to be legal and, therefore, permissible.

Cardinal Wiseman then concluded this second point of the defence: Roman Catholics were permitted by law to be ruled by whichever system they wished; no law insisted they be always controlled by vicars-apostolic; they were free to re-establish bishops so long as the titles were different from those used by the Church of England; finally, since these terms were fulfilled, the restoration of the hierarchy was within the law and justifiable. In summation of this section he stated that even though the hierarchy was re-established, the Church

³²Ward, pp. 561-562.

³³See above, p. 4. See also, Hales, p. 139; Tab., (new ser.), VI, 713.

of England would still be the same as before. It would have neither gained nor lost from the restoration of Roman Bishops in Ordinary.

Wiseman's next point was concerned with the means Catholics had used to obtain a hierarchy. He stated that the only road open to them was through Pius IX. It was the Pope, and he alone, who could make such decisions. For Catholics to adopt any other method would be to deny the Pope his office. The reason for the restoration of the hierarchy in 1850 stemmed from the fact that most Roman Catholics in England, both clergy and laity, not only desired such a change, but also petitioned the Pope to that end.³⁴ They felt that only with a hierarchy could the Roman Catholics improve their spiritual position.

Cardinal Wiseman's next argument was designed to disprove the contention that the hierarchy infringed the rights of the Sovereign. He stated that by the Oath of Supremacy, the Pope had no actual spiritual authority or prerogatives in England. Therefore, how could the Crown's prerogatives be violated when these acts of Pius IX were not recognized? He claimed the complaint was meaningless and, theoretically, could not even be made, because the Pope did not even exist for non-Catholics. But if the restoration was lawful then how could anyone be accused of transgressing upon the Crown's rights?

These newly selected Roman Catholic Bishops had jurisdiction only over the spiritual life of Roman Catholics. As the Tablet said, "the episcopal titles were not territorial . . . they did not lay hold

³⁴See above, pp. 3-4. See also, DR., (orig. ser.), XXIX, 478.

of the land, but . . . they had reference to diocesan and spiritual jurisdiction only over members of the Catholic Church."³⁵ The Queen could not possibly assume that it was her prerogative to select such Roman Catholic officials merely because it was her right to appoint Anglican Bishops. The Dublin Review argued that the title of a Bishop in the Roman Catholic Church was not a civil one, any more than was that of a priest. Many, however, were under this mistaken impression influenced by the fact that in the Established Church, Bishops had both spiritual and civil duties.³⁶ However, in the Roman Church, a Bishop held ecclesiastical office with no temporal rights. The source and origin of this spiritual authority was the Pope and not the Crown, for it was the successor of Peter, and only he, who had this right of appointing Bishops.³⁷

The fifth argument of Wiseman's 'Appeal' was concerned with the manner in which the hierarchy was erected, whether or not, as Lord John Russell stated, it was 'insidious and invidious'. In this section the Cardinal related four points, three of which were mentioned earlier: that the letter to the Bishop of Durham by Lord John Russell

³⁵Tab., (new ser.), VI, 746.

³⁶The major Bishops of the Church of England have seats 'ipso facto' in the House of Lords. Since they take part in Legislation their duties are both civil and temporal.

³⁷DR., (orig. ser.), XXX, 201-205.

was his own idea; that no disputes were anticipated in view of the fact that Ireland and also the colonies were granted Bishops; that the Prime Minister's past remarks, and Lord Minto's knowledge of proceedings in Rome gave those restoring the hierarchy the impression that most knew of it, and did not concern themselves; and a further argument was that the Queen had appointed Bishops for the Established Church in Jerusalem and Malta without acquiring consent to do so. Wiseman wrote that if the Queen could exercise her prerogative in a foreign land, why could not Pius IX do the same in England? The Cardinal felt that since the plan for the restoration was common knowledge, there was no reason to consider it as an attempt to create ill-will.

The prelate's last point dealt with the designation of Westminster as a Roman Catholic archdiocese. He argued that it was the logical place for the metropolitan to reside. Since Westminster did not have an Anglican Bishop, the Roman Catholic Church could adopt it as one of their archdioceses. It was within the stipulations of the Emancipation Act, thus quite constitutional. Wiseman concluded his 'Appeal' first by stating that, even though he was over the Archdiocese of Westminster, his jurisdiction was spiritual alone and only over those people who lived in the poverty-stricken area of the Abbey where he hoped to bring relief. Finally, the Cardinal claimed that Catholics always treated the clergymen of the Established Church fairly, but in return were treated unjustly.³⁸

³⁸"Supplement", December 14, 1850. See also, Ward, pp. 567-569.

The position of the Dublin Review in defence of the restoration may be summarized as follows: that with the increase of Catholics in England, a hierarchy was needed; that the regulations which controlled Catholic government were outmoded; that Vicars-Apostolic were temporary officials, and their appointment was as much aggression on the Pope's behalf as was the appointment of a Bishop; that earlier attempts to restore the hierarchy were not opposed, and, therefore, no reaction was expected in 1850; that government consent was not sought because of Lord John Russell's statements concerning the Relief Bills of 1845 and 1846, and his comments during the 'Diplomatic Relations with Rome Bill'; that government agreement was not needed since it was not a civil issue, nor could the Pope have asked for agreement because he would be denying his spiritual supremacy; that the building of a Roman Catholic Church for Italians in London was not another form of aggression but rather the action of Catholics exercising their rights as British subjects; that the Protestant 'granary' church outside of Rome was not forced upon non-Catholics, and even though it had been a granary, it had become a pleasant church; that Catholics treated Protestants with tolerance while in return they were accorded harsh treatment; and that religious divisions in England were not caused by the re-establishment of the hierarchy for these divisions existed before 1850.

The arguments of Cardinal Wiseman found within the 'Appeal' may be listed accordingly: that all British subjects had to abide by

the ruler's civil decisions; however, only members of the Church of England were subject to the Sovereign's spiritual regulations; that the Emancipation Act of 1829 allowed to Catholics whatever type of episcopal government they desire; that the titles adopted by Roman Catholic Bishops, since they were not the same as the titles used in the Established Church, were quite legal; that the only means Catholics had to restore the hierarchy was through the authority of the Pope; that Pius IX by using his authority in recreating the hierarchy was not transgressing on the Sovereign's rights; that Catholic Bishops had only spiritual jurisdiction and, thus, were different from Anglican Bishops who had spiritual and temporal authority; that the restoration of the hierarchy was proper and not offensive; and that Cardinal Wiseman, as Archbishop of Westminster, was interested in the spiritual improvement of Westminster, and was not concerned with its temporal aspects.

Three conclusions follow from the position adopted by the Dublin Review and the 'Appeal' concerning the Restoration. The arguments found in the 'Appeal' are discussed in detail in the Review. What is said in the Review is stated in the 'Appeal' with perhaps less force and with a greater awareness for the feelings of the English people. First, the Review constantly stressed the fact that since Roman Catholics were granted religious freedom by the Emancipation Act of 1829, it followed that they had the legal right to establish a hierarchy, and the Restoration was not an assumption of authority. However, that Act did stipulate that Catholic Ordinaries

were not to adopt titles similar to those borne by Anglican Bishops. This law had, in fact, been scrupulously obeyed and, as a consequence, such episcopal titles as had been adopted by the English Roman Catholic hierarchy were impeccable from a legal point of view. Accordingly, it could not be maintained that the papal restoration of the hierarchy was an act either of aggression or of usurpation. The behaviour of the opposition, the Review claimed, was contrary to the Emancipation Act, and was, therefore, prejudicial to the religious freedom of the English Roman Catholics.

The reasons for this opposition are, at times, not always clear. It should be remembered, however, that at no time was the legality of the restoration questioned. A probable explanation for the opposition lies, then, in the changed feelings towards Pius IX which were held by many Englishmen in 1850. In 1847 he had been acclaimed as one sympathetic towards both liberal ideas and national independence; three years later, in 1850, he had, in the popular estimation, undergone a complete volte face and was denounced as an unmitigated reactionary. Had the re-establishment been accomplished in 1847, as originally intended, it is more than probable that it would not have occasioned any serious opposition. However, owing to this new antipathetic, indeed hostile, attitude towards the Pope an imbroglio ensued. Yet again, the Romanizing tendencies of certain circles within the Established Church created, among those who regarded themselves as the guardians of the ideals of the Reformation, an attitude of suspicion towards any actions on the part of the Roman Pontiff.

Second, the approach of the Dublin Review and the 'Appeal' towards this whole problem was apologetic in nature. It was essentially a reflex action in the face of the vociferous opposition to the restoration of the hierarchy. The Review in particular undertook to interpret to the Protestant opposition the precise significance for Catholics of the re-establishment. Moreover, it attempted to answer the various charges put forward by the opposition, and claimed that their assertions were unfounded. Had the opposition not been so strident in their denunciation of the restoration, it is more than probable that the Review would simply have mentioned it en passant, and then only for the immediate concern of the Catholic populace. However, in view of the fact that it was one of the foremost Catholic publications in England, it considered that it had no alternative but to defend, not only the re-establishment, but also those principally responsible, Pope Pius IX and Cardinal Wiseman.

Third and last, one observes that the Dublin Review was, at times, outspoken in its defence of the restoration. None, no matter of what rank or degree, was spared the cutting and indeed sometimes abusive language of the Review. It was convinced, not only of the moral rectitude of the Roman cause, but also of its unimpeachable legality from the point of view of British Statute Law. Indeed, that their religious liberty should be attacked by their compatriots in defiance of an Act of Parliament was for the British Roman Catholics, probably, the most galling aspect of the whole unfortunate argument. Consequently, all whom the Review considered as in any

way responsible for this situation were attacked with all possible vigour.

In conclusion, it would seem to be appropriate to recall a succinct expression of the attitude of the Dublin Review when it declared:

We have ever believed that the Hierarchy was the greatest boon that the Vicar of our Lord could have bestowed upon England; that without it Catholicism would have languished; . . . that if Vicars-Apostolic suffice for a people under penal laws, nothing less than an ordered and perfect Hierarchy will suffice for a Catholic people restored to freedom.³⁹

³⁹DR., (new ser.), I, 146.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

PRIMARY SOURCES

BROWNSON'S QUARTERLY REVIEW (LONDON)

"Catholics of England and Ireland", Brownson's Quarterly Review, 3rd ser., I, No. I (January, 1853), Art. V, 111-129.

THE CHURCH (TORONTO)

"The Encroachments of Popery", Church, Toronto, Canada (November 7, 1850), p. 117.

"Popish Presumption", Church, Toronto, Canada (November 14, 1850), p. 125.

"The Roman Hierarchy", Church, Toronto, Canada (November 28, 1850), p. 138.

"The Papal Appointments", Church, Toronto, Canada (December 5, 1850), p. 149.

"Advance of Popery", Church, Toronto, Canada (December 12, 1850), p. 154.

"Supplement to the Church - Papal Manifesto - Cardinal Wiseman's Manifesto; An Appeal", Church, Toronto, Canada (December 14, 1850).

"Shakespeare and Cardinal Wiseman - The Papal Aggression - Cardinal Wiseman's Manifesto", Church, Toronto, Canada (December 19, 1850), pp. 163-164.

"The Church of Rome and the Church and State of England", Canadian Churchman, Toronto, Canada (August 12, 1852), p. 10.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND QUARTERLY REVIEW (LONDON)

Church of England Quarterly Review. XVI. London: William Edward Painter Strand, 1853.

THE DUBLIN REVIEW

Complete sets of the Dublin Review are scarce; and an index is non-existent. The following pamphlet, its publishers' note, and the author's table may prove helpful to the interested reader.

Pamphlet: The Dublin Review, 1836-1936. Complete list of articles published between May 1836 and April 1936. London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., n.d.

Publishers' Note: (Taken directly from the above-mentioned pamphlet)

The following complete list of contents gives the names of contributors wherever these have been ascertained. The names have been supplied for the earlier articles from the editorial memoranda of Father Matthew Russell, S.J., published in the Irish Monthly, vols. XXI and XXII, collated with the lists preserved in the Oscott Library. Fuller information concerning these researches by the late Bishop Casartelli will be found in the article by him included in the centenary number of April 1936.

Continuous numbering of the issues was not begun until the opening of the Fourth Series, at the beginning of 1892, when the first volume of the new series was number vol. CX and the new issue appeared as No. 220. The total was miscalculated, and it should have been No. 219. To avoid confusion, the former numbering has been left uncorrected in the present volume.

No records have been preserved which could assist in identifying the writers of most of the articles during the later years, before it became the practice for articles to be signed. The discrepancies in spelling and in the titles of writers have been retained as they appeared in the list prepared by Dr. Casartelli, or as they were given in the contents pages of subsequent volumes.

Authors Table:

<u>Series</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Vol. Nos.</u>	<u>Vol. Nos. on binding *</u>
Original	May 1836 - Apr. 1863	I - LII	1 - 52
New	Jul. 1863 - Oct. 1878	I - XXXI	53 - 83
Third	Jan. 1879 - Oct. 1881	XXXII - XXXV	84 - 87
"	Jan. 1881 - Oct. 1891	V** - XXVI	88 - 109
Fourth	Jan. 1892 - Apr. 1936	CX - CXCVIII	110 - 198

* Vols. re-numbered from the beginning of Third Series

** These numbers on the binding pertain only to the volumes of the Review in Assumption University Library: they have not been cited in the footnotes and bibliography.

The articles of the Review are listed in chronological order; its title is cited DR.

MacMahon, P., M.P. "Arbitrary Power - Popery - Protestantism - I", DR., orig. ser., VIII, No. XV (February, 1840), Art. I, 1-56.

Wiseman, Doctor. "State and Prospects of Catholicity in England", DR., orig. ser., VIII, No. XV (February, 1840), Art. VIII, 240-271.

--- "Ecclesiastical Organization", DR., orig. ser., XIII, No. XXV (August, 1842), Art. VII, 240-251.

Allies. "Testimony of Grotius and Leibnitz to the Truth of Catholic Doctrine", DR., orig. ser., XXIX, No. LVIII (December, 1850), Art. IX, 476-507.

Wiseman, Cardinal. "The Hierarchy", DR., orig. ser., XXIX, No. LVIII (December, 1850), Art. X, 507-535.

Wiseman, Cardinal. "The Catholic Hierarchy", DR., orig. ser., XXX, No. LIX (March, 1851), Art. VII, 176-207.

Wiseman, Cardinal. "The Morality of Legislation - The Italian Church", DR., orig. ser., XXXI, No. LXI (September, 1851), Art. X, 218-258.

Russell, Dr. G. "Papal Aggression Novels - Cecile", DR., orig. ser., XXXI, No. LXII (December, 1851), Art. VI, 519-529.

Oakeley, Canon. "Cardinal Wiseman's Essays - Periodical Literature", DR., orig. ser., XXXIV, No. LXVIII (June, 1853), Art. VII, 541-566.

Wiseman, Cardinal. "Italy and the Papal States", DR., orig. ser., XXXXI, No. LXXXI (September, 1856), Art. VI, 171-226.

--- "The Work and the Wants of the Catholic Church in England", DR., new ser., I, No. I (July, 1863), Art. V, 139-166.

--- "Memorial", DR., new ser., IV, No. VIII (April, 1865), 267-278.

--- "Pius IX and the 'Civiltà Cattolica'", DR., new ser., VII, No. XIV (October, 1866), Art. V, 414-432.

Purcell, E. S. "Episodes in the Life of Cardinal Manning in his Anglican Days", DR., 4th ser., CX, No. CCXXI (April, 1892), Art. X, 380-436.

Milburn, J. S. "The Restoration of the Hierarchy and the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill", DR., 4th ser., CXVII, No. CCXXXV (October, 1895), Art. VI, 347-372.

Johnson, H. J. T. "Parliament and the Restored Hierarchy. A Centenary and its Lessons", DR., CCXXIV, No. 448 (Second Quarter, 1950), 1-16.

Dawson, Christopher. "The English Catholics 1850-1950", DR., CCXXIV, No. 450 (Fourth Quarter, 1950), 1-12.

THE EDINBURGH REVIEW (LONDON & EDINBURGH)

"Kings and Popes", Edinburgh Review, XCIII (January, 1851), Art. VII, 171-186.

"Ultramontane Doubts", Edinburgh Review, XCIII (April, 1851), Art. IX, 535-578.

"The Anglo-Catholic Theory", Edinburgh Review, XCIV (October, 1851), Art. VIII, 527-557.

THE GLOBE (TORONTO)

"Cardinal Wiseman and the Prayer for the Queen", Globe, Toronto, Canada West (November 28, 1850), p. 570.

"News by the Europa - England", Globe, Toronto, Canada West (December 7, 1850), p. 586.

"The Roman Catholic Bull", Globe, Toronto, Canada West (December 10, 1850), p. 590.

"House of Commons - Monday March 24 - Papal Aggression", Globe, Toronto, Canada West (April 17, 1851), p. 182.

"Papal Aggression Past and Present", Globe, Toronto, Canada West (June 12, 1851), p. 279.

THE TABLET (Tab.) (LONDON)

"Chronicles of the Week - The Ecclesiastical Titles Act - Repeal", Tab., new ser., III, No. 1572 (May 28, 1870), 669 and 690.

"Chronicles of the Week - Ecclesiastical Titles", Tab., new ser., III, No. 1573 (June 4, 1870), 702.

"Chronicles of the Week - Repeal of the Ecclesiastical Titles Act", Tab., new ser., IV, No. 1578 (July 9, 1870), 36.

"The Famine of 1847 - "Papal Aggression" At Hand-Smith O'Brien and the Irish Confederation", Tab., new ser., VI, No. 1649 (November 18, 1871), Art. XLI, 648-649.

"The Change From Vicars-Apostolic to a Regular Hierarchy in England", Tab., new ser., VI, No. 1651 (December 2, 1871), Art. XLIII, 713-714.

"Cardinal Wiseman and the 'Papal Aggression'", Tab., new ser., VI, No. 1652 (December 9, 1871), Art. XLIV, 746-747.

"Cardinal Wiseman and the Prime Minister", Tab., new ser., VI, No. 1653 (December 16, 1871), Art. XLV, 777-779.

"Cardinal Wiseman's Life and Labours - Mr. Turnbull and the State Record Office", Tab., new ser., VII, No. 1656 (January 6, 1872), Art. XLVIII, 8-9.

THE TIMES (LONDON)

"The Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster - Address from the Clergy of Westminster to the Right Rev. Father in God, Charles James, Lord Bishop of London", Times, No. 20,630 (October 26, 1850), p. 3, col. b.

"Reply of the Bishop of London to the Memorial From the Westminster Clergy", Times, No. 20,632 (October 29, 1850), p. 5, col. a.

"Romish Bishops in England - St. Georges Hanover Square - Address of Laymen in Church of England to the Right Rev. Charles James, Lord Bishop of London", Times, No. 20,633 (October 30, 1850), p. 4, col. f; p. 5, col. f.

"The Archbishopric of Westminster - Archdeacon Hale Addresses Clergy of London", Times, No. 20,634 (October 31, 1850), p. 5, col. d.

"The Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster", Times, No. 20,635 (November 1, 1850), p. 5, col. a.

"Leeds", Times, No. 20,636 (November 2, 1850), p. 8, col. b.

Times, No. 20,638 (November 5, 1850), p. 4, col. c.

SECONDARY SOURCES

ARTICLES

Alger, J. G. "Smith, Richard (1566-1655)", DNB., Ed. Sir L. Stephen and Sir S. Lee. XVIII, London: Oxford University Press, 1921, 510-511.

Bezzant, Rev. Canon J. S. "England, Church of", Ency. Brit., Ed.-in-chief Walter Yust. VIII, Chicago: William Benton, [1957], 468-471.

- Boudinon, A. "Metropolitan", Catholic Ency., Ed. C. G. Herbermann, et al. X, New York: Robert Appleton Co., [1911], 244-245.
- Cooper, Thompson. "Grant, Thomas D.D. (1816-1870)", DNB., Ed. Sir L. Stephen and Sir S. Lee. VIII, London: Oxford University Press, 1921, 403-404.
- Kent, Charles. "Wiseman Nicholas Patrick Stephen (1802-1865)", DNB., Ed. Sir L. Stephen and Sir S. Lee. XXI, London: Oxford University Press, 1921, 714-717.
- Kirsch, J. P. "Archpriest", Catholic Ency., Ed. C. G. Herbermann, et al. I, New York: Robert Appleton Co., [1907], 697-698.
- Pearse, H. W., and H. W. Paul. "Gladstone William Ewart (1809-1898)", DNB., Ed. Sir L. Stephen and Sir S. Lee. XXII, Supplement, London: Oxford University Press, 1921, 705-754.
- Rae, W. F. "Russell Lord John, 1st Earl Russell (1792-1878)", DNB., Ed. Sir L. Stephen and Sir S. Lee. XVII, London: Oxford University Press, 1921, 454-464.

Catholic Ency. - Catholic Encyclopedia.
DNB - Dictionary of National Biography.
Ency. Brit. - Encyclopedia Britannica.

MONOGRAPHS

- Ausbel, Herman. The Late Victorians. Ed. L. L. Synder. New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc. [1955].
- Black, J. B. Reign of Elizabeth 1558-1603. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949.
- Briggs, Asa. Victorian Era. London: Odhams Press Limited [1954].
- Elliot-Binns, L. E., D.D. Religion in the Victorian Era. London: Lutteworth Press, 1936.
- Fitzgerald, P. H. Fifty Years of Catholic Life and Social Progress. I. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1901.
- Gwynn, Denis. A Hundred Years of Catholic Emancipation (1829-1929). London: Longman's Green & Co., 1929.
- Hales, E. E. Y. Pio Nonno. A Study in European Politics and Religion in the 19th Century. New York: P. J. Kennedy & Sons, 1954.
- Hughes, Philip. The Roman Catholic Question 1688-1829. London: Sheed and Ward, 1929.

- Rome and the Counter Reformation in England. [London]:
Burns Oates, 1942.
- The Reformation in England. II. London: Hollis & Carter,
1953.
- Correspondence on Church and Religion of William Ewart
Gladstone. Selected and arranged by D. C. Lathurbury. I. London:
John Murray, 1910.
- Mathew, David. Catholicism in England 1535-1935. New York: Longmans,
Green & Co., [1936].
- Catholicism in England. 3rd Edition. London: Eyre and
Spottiswoode, 1955.
- Monypenny, W. F., and G. E. Buckle. The Life of Benjamin Disraeli,
Earl of Beaconsfield. I. London: John Murray, 1929.
- Newman, Cardinal, J. H. Sermons Preached on Various Occasions. London:
Longmans Green & Co., 1921.
- O'Connor, J. J. The Catholic Revival in England. New York: The
Macmillan Co., 1942.
- Shapiro, J. S. Liberalism - Its Meaning and History. Ed. L. L. Snyder.
New York: D. Van Nostrand Co. Inc. [1958].
- Somervell, D. C. Disraeli and Gladstone. New York: Garden City
Publishing Co., Inc., 1926.
- Stoughton, John, D.D., Religion in England 1800-1850. II. London:
Hodder & Stoughton, n.d.
- Strachey, Lytton. Eminent Victorians. New York: Garden City Publishing
Co., Inc., 1918.
- Ward, Wilfred. Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman. 2 Vols. London:
Longmans, Green & Co., 1912.
- English Historical Documents 1833-1874. Ed. G. M. Young
and W. D. Handcock. XII, London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1956,
364-369.

V I T A A U C T O R I S

NAME: Chittaro, Eddi.

BORN: September 3rd, 1933, Windsor, Ontario.

PARENTS: Younger son of Giovanni Batista Chittaro and Maria Domenica Sabadini.

EDUCATION: PRIMARY: 1939-1947 John Campbell Public School,
Windsor, Ontario.

SECONDARY: 1947-1951 Assumption High School,
Windsor, Ontario.

UNIVERSITY: 1951-1955 Registered as an undergraduate at
Assumption College, 1951.
Graduated June, 1955 B.A. (General
Arts). While attending University,
played four years of Intercollegiate
basketball.

1955;1956 Ontario College of Education.
Received Interim High School
Assistants Certificate - Type B,
August, 1956.

1956-1958 Registered as a Post-Graduate student
at the Assumption University of
Windsor, 1956, and as a candidate
for the Degree of Masters of Arts in
History. During the ensuing two years
held also the appointment of assistant
to the head coach in basketball.

PROFESSIONAL CAREER: 1955-1956 Member of the staff of St. Peter's
High School, Peterborough, Ontario.
Taught History, English, Religion,
Physical Education, and coached the
football and basketball teams of the
school.