INTERNATIONAL MARIAN RESEARCH INSTITUTE

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON, OHIO

in affiliation with the

PONTIFICAL THEOLOGICAL FACULTY MARIANUM

ROME, ITALY

By: REV. CHRISTOPHER ROBERTS

ULLATHORNE'S *THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF THE MOTHER OF GOD* (1904): DOCTRINAL ECLECTICISM, PASTORAL IMPLICATIONS

A Thesis submitted
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
Licentiate of Sacred Theology
with specialization in Marian Studies

Director: Dr. Gloria Falcão Dodd

International Marian Research Institute
University of Dayton
300 College Park, Dayton, OH 45469-1390
2020

Vidimus et approbamus: Dr. Gloria F. Dodd, S.T.D. – Director

Dr. Judith Champ, P.H.D. – Revisore 1

Daytonesis (USA), ex aedibus International Marian Research Institute, et

Romae, ex aedibus Pontificiae Facultatis Theologicae Marianum, die 7

Octobris 2020.

Contents

Chapter 1—Introduction

On the 14th day of January 1850, William Bernard Ullathorne, O.S.B. (1806-1889), the Vicar Apostolic of the Central District, penned a Latin epistle to Blessed Pius IX (1846-1878) in response to the request that the pope had made in his 1849 encyclical letter, *Ubi Primum*, that the bishops of the world write letters to the successor of Saint Peter testifying regarding the belief of the faithful relative to the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary. In his message, Ullathorne testified that among the priests and religious in his district, one foreign-born priest excepted, "all, as with one mouth, have borne witness" that Mary had been conceived without any stain of original sin.[1] He went on to recall how he himself had never failed to inculcate this doctrine. In both the apostolic districts over which Ullathorne had presided, he had already petitioned the Holy See for a rescript to place his district under the patronage of the Immaculate Conception[2]. In fact, Ullathorne went on to write a book on the same doctrine, *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God*, which saw publication only months after Pius IX promulgated the dogma on December 8, 1854.[3] The first edition (1855) of the work received praise from his contemporary Saint John Henry Newman, C.O. (1801-1890), as "a work full of instruction and of the first authority."[4]

---

[1] "*Responsa etiam ex omni clero expetii qui omnes, uno ore, testati sunt, uno solo qui ortu alienus est excepto, sensum eis esse, et, ut plures addiderunt, a iuventute fuisse, Beatam Mariam Virginem semper immaculatam fuisse, et ab omni labe peccati praeservatam. Idem pium responsum omnes conventus religiosorum retulerunt, patribus ordinis Praedicatorum nullo modo exceptis.*" *Pareri dell'Episcopato Cattolico sulla Definizione Dogmatica dell' Immacolato Concepimento, Parte Prima, Volume Terzo* (Roma: Civiltá Cattolica, 1851), 29. Google Books, accessed 20 December 2019.

[2] *Pareri dell'Episcopato Cattolico*, 29.

[3] William Bernard Ullathorne, *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God: An Exposition* (London: Richardson, 1855). For the posthumously published, revised version of this second work, see William Bernard Ullathorne, *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God*, ed. Canon Iles (Westminster: Art and Book Co., 1904).

[4] John Henry Newman, *Certain Difficulties Felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching*, vol. II, 2nd ed. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891; London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1900), 127. Citations refer to the second edition.

Two challenges present themselves in evaluating Ullathorne's treatment of the Immaculate Conception. Newman's recommendation points toward one of them, which is Newman's shadow. Despite a more than forty-year tenure as Newman's own bishop in Birmingham and an episcopal career that produced copious pastoral writing as well as wielding political and ecclesiastical influence, the Oxford convert's contemporary fame along with the proliferation of Newman scholarship have usually made Ullathorne a footnote in the life of a saint and intellectual.[5] The other difficulty when analyzing Ullathorne's doctrinal writings on Our Lady is that he was not a theologian but rather a pastor. When he treated theology, he was writing for a popular audience and did not aim at originality or innovation.[6] Even so, Ullathorne's works of popular theology give historical witness to how a prominent Catholic bishop in nineteenth century England used theology while fulfilling his office. The fact that the bishop in question had a relationship that spanned four decades with a great figure like Newman makes that interest even greater.

This thesis proposes to look at Ullathorne's teaching on Mary's Immaculate Conception as a focus of scholarly investigation in its own right. This investigation will focus on the 1904 second edition of William Bernard Ullathorne's *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God*. It will do so by first providing the necessary historical context. The French Revolution had called into question the Christian narrative of salvation history and replaced it with a secular model of history that focused on enlightenment and equality. Ullathorne's manner of proposing the Immaculate Conception recapitulated the older story. It asserted that God's

---

[5] One of Ullathorne's biographers explained this need, "Ullathorne has been overshadowed by his contemporaries in the recounting and interpreting of the history of nineteenth century Catholicism. This does not do him justice…Ullathorne has been treated by historians (apart from Butler) through the prism of other men's lives." Judith Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne, 1806-1889: A Different Kind of Monk* (Leominster: Gracewing, 2006), 508.

[6] Ullathorne had never received a first-class theological training, nor had he ever had the opportunity of acquiring the aroma of scholarship. He was a self-made theologian, a student, widely read in the Fathers and theologians, endowed with a vigorous thoughtful mind, highly intelligent of prodigious industry; and he had the gift of robust, clear, fresh English, often verging on real eloquence." Cuthbert Butler, *The Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne, 1806-1889,* vol. II (London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, Ltd., 1926), 222.

gratuitous self-revelation in the Incarnation by the Blessed Virgin is the point around which all history turns. Christ revealed this story in its essentials to the apostles. The definition of the dogma crystalized what the Church had in some sense always known. This thesis will detail how Ullathorne used theology to make this case and some of the pastoral implications of his arguments.

Specifically, it will examine how Ullathorne presented Mary's place in the divine economy, the nature of original sin, and her exemption from original sin. It will then take each of these elements and demonstrate how Ullathorne's arguments corresponded to pastoral acts as a bishop. It will connect Ullathorne's teaching on Mary's place in the divine economy to what he had to say about La Salette as well as the priesthood. The thesis will also correlate Ullathorne's Marian teaching relative to original sin to his interventions with Newman and the British lay Catholic journal, the *Rambler*, on the same subject. Furthermore, it will connect Ullathorne's approach the fundamentally static nature of the dogmatic formula for the Immaculate Conception to his vision of the teaching authority of the episcopal office. Throughout, this thesis will argue that Ullathorne employed a theologically eclectic approach in order to present the Immaculate Conception as part of the unchanging Christian narrative of salvation history and that the theology that Ullathorne used when writing about the Immaculate Conception found other pastoral applications.

1.1 A Luminary in His Time

Archbishop William Bernard Ullathorne stood as a very consequential figure in nineteenth century English-speaking Catholicism. He served as the first ecclesiastical superior of the Australian Catholic mission, a successful leader of the Catholic mission in Coventry, an indefatigable promoter and defender of active women religious' role in Catholic education, and the first Catholic bishop of Birmingham after the restoration of the English hierarchy. His tenure in Birmingham stretched from 1850 until he retired in 1888. Pope Leo XIII (1878-1903) honored Ullathorne's

distinguished service to the Church by bestowing on him the honorary title of Archbishop of Cabasa *in partibus infidelibus* upon his retirement. This appointment did not involve the assumption of a new episcopal office; rather it involved receiving the title of archbishop in recognition of his distinguished service to the Church by naming Ullathorne to an archepiscopal see in which the Catholic population had disappeared.[7] Ullathorne was also the author of five published books and numerous occasional works. Three of these books presented a theological anthropology for the spiritual life.[8] The longest of these three, *The Endowments of Man,* will be of particular interest in this thesis. Ullathorne sought to provide a grounding for a vision of the nature of the human person and addressed Mary's place in God's eternal plan for creation in this book. The other two more brief works focused on the Blessed Virgin Mary.[9] The first was a travelogue of a pilgrimage to the site of a Marian apparition at La Salette. The second, on the Immaculate Conception, will be the main focus of this thesis. He also wrote two autobiographical manuscripts, both of which saw publication posthumously.[10] Ullathorne lacked the formal training that would have enabled him to write as a professional modern theologian. His doctrinal writings aimed at a general audience provide good

---

[7] During his tenure as Bishop Birmingham, his see had not yet attained metropolitan rank. Butler, *Life and Times,* vol. II, 287.

[8] William Bernard Ullathorne, *Christian Patience: The Strength and Discipline of the Soul* (London: Burns & Oates, 1886); William Bernard Ullathorne, *The Endowments of Man Considered in Their Relations with His Final End; A Course of Lectures* (London: Burns & Oates, 1888); William Bernard Ullathorne, *The Groundwork of the Christian Virtues: A Course of Lectures* (London: Burns and Oates, 1882).

[9] William Bernard Ullathorne, *The Holy Mountain of La Salette* (London: Richardson and Son, 1854); Ullathorne, *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God*, ed. Canon Iles.

[10] Ullathorne produced the second manuscript by editing his first in his last years. Mother Drane of the Dominican community at Stone heavily edited and published the second manuscript after Ullathorne died. William Bernard Ullathorne, *The Autobiography of Archbishop Ullathorne, with Selections from his Letters*, ed. Augusta Drane (London: Burns & Oats, Limited, 1891). In 1941, a version of the first manuscript saw publication. William Bernard Ullathorne, *From Cabin-boy to Archbishop*, ed. Shane Leslie (London: Burns and Oats, 1941). Leo Madigan edited both of these manuscripts and created a single narrative from the two manuscripts that proceeds in chronological order: William Bernard Ullathorne, *The Devil is a Jackass*, ed. Leo Madigan (Leominster: Gracewing, 1995), ix-xii. This thesis will generally favor Madigan's editorial work, except when considering Ullathorne's discussion of his theological and spiritual formation, where Madigan's manuscript omitted several important details preserved in Drane's version.

examples of the genre of popular theology.[11] Two biographers, Cuthbert Butler in 1926 and Judith Champ in 2006, have taken Ullathorne as their subject.[12] There has been little else written focusing directly on Ullathorne. In spite of the available primary source information, scholars have produced relatively little on his Marian teaching, especially the doctrinal rather than devotional and pastoral elements of it.

This thesis proposes to trace Ullathorne's three key elements of his argument for the apostolicity of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception and show how they related other pastoral actions. It will not treat Ullathorne as a Mariologist, for he was not a theologian in the proper sense of the term, but rather as a pastor who employed Marian doctrine for his purposes as a diocesan bishop. Still, Ullathorne's theological case for the apostolic origin of the Immaculate Conception is worthy of study for the ways in which it bears witness to a pastor drawing from theological sources in order to speak to a general audience.

1.2 Ullathorne's Significance

Archbishop William Bernard Ullathorne's ecclesiastical career was very important in the English Church in the nineteenth century. David Matthew observed regarding Ullathorne that "for forty years [Ullathorne was] the standard of reference for the Catholic tradition in England. Few men have filled the pastoral office with such success, unalterable devotion and common sense."[13] Inside and outside the Catholic Church, his contemporaries knew Ullathorne as a solid voice for what it meant to be an English Catholic. What path did Ullathorne walk to gain such a reputation?

---

[11] Butler, *The Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne*, vol. II, 222.
[12] Cuthbert Butler, *The Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne, 1806-1889,* 2 vols. (London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, Ltd., 1926); Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne*.
[13] David Matthew, *Catholicism in England, 1535-1935* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1936), 194.

He began his priesthood in the missions. A year after ordination, Ullathorne went to Australia and played a major role in building the foundations of the Catholic Church in the colony.[14] He served from 1832 to 1836 in Australia as the vicar general for the newly consecrated missionary bishop of Mauritius who resided in South Africa throughout his tenure. Ullathorne took on many of the practical responsibilities of a bishop for Australian Catholics. He remained as vicar general after a resident bishop arrived in Australia in 1836. Despite numerous attempts by the Holy See to make him a bishop in Australia, Ullathorne did not believe that he was able to continue to minister effectively in Australia and therefore refused the miter.[15] His frenetic work in Australia, most especially work with prisoners awaiting the gallows, had led him to what Champ has termed "burnout."[16]

Ullathorne succeeded in returning to Downside and England in 1842. Shortly thereafter he took a post leading the Catholic mission in the English town of Coventry. He collaborated at Coventry in what was very successful mission work with Margaret Mary Hallahan, the foundress of tertiary Dominican teaching sisters. Ullathorne played an important role in supporting this foundation.[17] Ullathorne yielded to insistent Roman appeals and consented to episcopal consecration as Vicar Apostolic of the Western District of England in 1846. Two years later the Holy See transferred him to the Central District, which included Birmingham. His fellow bishops in England trusted Ullathorne's abilities enough to give him the responsibility to press their case in Rome for a restored hierarchy in England. When he succeeded in his campaign, Ullathorne became the ordinary of the newly-established Catholic see in Birmingham in 1850. The historian Philip Hughes named Ullathorne as the most able leader among the English bishops of his day and the *de facto* leader of the English hierarchy, even though he never ascended to the metropolitan see

---

[14] For a detailed account of Ullathorne's contributions in organizing the Church in Australia, specifically the clergy, see Paul Collins, "William Bernard Ullathorne and the Foundation of Australian Catholicism, 1815-1840" (PhD diss., Australian National University, 1989).

[15] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne*, 32-35, 84-85.

[16] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne*, 82

[17] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne,* 86-115.

of Westminster.[18] On his return to England in 1841, he became a prominent promoter of women's active consecrated life within the Church and began a long career of defending it against anti-Catholic sentiment in the British Parliament.[19] The fact that Cuthbert Butler used Ullathorne's letters as the primary source in his history of Vatican I illustrates both Ullathorne's prominence in his nineteenth century context and his abiding value as an historical source for theological debates among bishops.[20]

Ullathorne played a conspicuous role in promoting Marian piety as a pastor. Some of his contemporaries even erroneously credited Ullathorne with playing a key role in reintroducing the widespread recitation of the rosary into England.[21] While these claims exaggerate both the neglect of the rosary in England and Ullathorne's role in its popularization, it is quite likely true that the active women religious that he promoted and defended did much to bring this devotion, and a more ebullient Marian style generally, to greater prominence in England. Ullathorne's focus on Mary reflects an intense Marian moment in the wider ecclesial context in which he worked rather than an abiding primacy in his writings and pastoral leadership for Our Lady. His first two book-length publications focused on her--one on the Marian apparition at La Salette in alpine France, and the other defending the forthcoming dogma. These two saw publication in the same year as Pius IX's dogmatic definition of the Immaculate Conception in 1854.

Ullathorne's significance has to do not only with what he did but also with the fact that, unlike many prominent English churchmen in his century, he was not a convert. As the most prominent non-convert English Catholic churchman in the second half of the nineteenth century, he offers a unique historical witness. Many of the most popular priest-authors and the most eminent

---

[18] Philip Hughes, "English Catholics in 1850," in George Beck, ed., *The English Catholics: 1850-1950* (London: Burns and Oats, 1950), 74.

[19] Rene Kollar, *A Foreign and Wicked Institution? The Campaign against Convents in Victorian England* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 2011), 1-19.

[20] Cuthbert Butler, *The Vatican Council: The Story Told from Inside in Bishop Ullathorne's Letters* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1936).

[21] Francis Raphael Drane, *Life of Mother Mary Hallahan* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1929), 73-75; Bulter, *Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne,* vol. I, 125-126.

churchmen in the Catholic Church were converts who had attended Oxford before their conversions. The founder of the London Oratory, Father Frederick Faber (1814-1863), wrote books on spirituality that enjoyed great popular readership and ecclesiastical endorsement.[22] By his death in 1890, Cardinal Newman enjoyed the esteem of his countrymen both as a profound thinker and a man of conscience.[23] Cardinal Henry Edward Manning (1808-1892) possessed political influence both within the Catholic Church as well as in broader English society.[24] These three are only the most significant examples of Oxford men who went on to play an important role in the Catholic Church during this period. Conversely, Ullathorne came from a very ancient Catholic family on his father's side and boasted no elite university education. He was a particularly trustworthy witness to and point of reference for the authentic tradition of English Catholicism that flowed without interruption from the volatility of the Reformation in England to Ullathorne's own day.[25]

1.3 Scholarship on Mary and England in the Nineteenth Century

The nineteenth century did not produce a large volume of groundbreaking Mariology, particularly in the fifty-four years that came before the publication of Ullathorne's book. As Juan Luis Bastero observed in the Mariological manual, *Mary Mother of the Redeemer*, "[v]irtually no Mariology treatises were published in the nineteenth century. Of those that were, mention must be made of M. Scheeben's *Handbuch der Katholischen Dogmatik* [published in 1882]."[26] Priests and religious provided most of the Church's

---

[22] Melissa Wilkinson, *Frederick William Faber: A Great Servant of God* (Leominster: Gracewing, 2007), 147, 185-229.
[23] Ian Ker, *Newman* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 553-559.
[24] For a lengthy treatment of this topic, see Vincent McClelland, *Cardinal Manning: His Public Life and Influence, 1865-92* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962).
[25] Edward Norman, *The English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), 161
[26] Juan Luis Bastero, *Mary, Mother of the Redeemer: A Mariology Textbook*, trans. Michael Adams (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2011), 50. Mathias Scheeben, *Handbuch der Katholischen Dogmatik* 7 vols. (Freiburg: Herder, 1873-1887).

theological energy at this time. In the late eighteenth century and early nineteenth centuries religious congregations were in decline. The persecution the Church faced as a result of the French Revolution worsened the situation.[27] The main driver for nineteenth century Mariology was not theology but rather Marian apparitions, the most significant of which took place at Lourdes in 1858.[28]

Authors in the 2019 *Oxford Handbook of Mary* generally presented Mary and the Immaculate Conception in the nineteenth-century Church as a cultural-theological sign that the Church lifted up against modernity. Herringer's article in this volume, "Mary as Cultural Symbol in the Nineteenth Century," took a similar approach to Mary that her book-length work, *Victorians and the Virgin Mary,* did. It approached Mary primarily from the perspective of cultural questions of an historical nature rather than theology.[29] In Charlene Spretnak's article, "Mary and Modernity," she described Mariology and Marian devotion in terms of the Church's response to the Enlightenment Rationalism and the emergence of the modern secular state. Spretnak made no reference to Ullathorne.[30] Both of these authors looked at Mariology from outside of the discipline as historians or sociologists of religion. Neither of these scholars referenced Ullathorne.

While both of these chapters situated Mary within a cultural-sociological context, Sarah Jane Boss' article, "Original Holiness: The Blessed Virgin Mary in the Catholic Theology of Nineteenth-Century Europe," sounded a more theological tone. Boss traced two different theological approaches to Mariology in the nineteenth century, that of historical theology and Neo-Scholasticism. Boss, however, located the most important theological element of nineteenth-century Mariology, not in the different methods, but in the emergence of a theological consensus around the primary motivation of the Incarnation being divinization of the human race

---

[27] David Blackbourn, "The Catholic Church in Europe since the French Revolution," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 33, no. 4 (1991): 78.1
[28] Graef, *Mary*, 343-361. Bastero, *Mary, Mother of the Redeemer*, 53.
[29] Carol Engelhardt Herringer, *Victorians and the Virgin Mary: Religion and Gender in England, 1830-1885* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008). Carol Engelhardt Herringer, "Mary as Cultural Symbol in the Nineteenth Century," in Chris Maunder, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Mary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 503-515.
[30] Charlene Spretnak, "Mary and Modernity," in Maunder, *Oxford Handbook of Mary*, 531-545.

rather than salvation from sin. In Boss' analysis, this trend paved the way for the definition of the Immaculate Conception by giving a theological basis for Mary's role in God's plan for humanity from eternity regardless of whether or not Adam and Eve sinned.[31] Boss did not mention Ullathorne in her article but rather looked at writings on the Immaculate Conception in languages other than English.

One of the byproducts of Newman's contribution in English-speaking Catholicism is that scholarship addressing Marian doctrine and devotion during the Victorian period has had a penchant to situate Catholic writers during this period in relation to Newman. Thus, in works such as Derrick Holmes' *More Roman than Rome*, Carol Henninger's *Victorians and the Virgin Mary*, and Edward Norman's *The English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century*, one observes a tendency to make generalizations about "old Catholics," converts, and Irish immigrants. According to the above-mentioned scholars, these Catholics were less enthusiastic about adopting the effusive style of devotion to saints more common in continental Europe and the adversarial stance of nineteenth century Roman pontiffs to the modern world. On the other hand, converts and immigrants from Ireland were in large part supporters of this style of Catholicism. This story focuses on ways in which Newman took courageous positions that broke the mold, and how the famous Oxford convert oftentimes showed more sympathy for established Catholics than for the occasionally imprudent zeal of converts.[32]

Mary Heimann has challenged this standard taxonomy of approaching nineteenth century Catholicism in her book *Catholic Devotion in Victorian England.* She argued that conflating the causes for and motivations of Marian enthusiasm and papal maximalism oversimplifies matters. Heimann's research showed that devotions like the rosary and Benediction of the Blessed

---

[31] Sarah Jane Boss, "Original Holiness: The Blessed Virgin Mary in the Catholic Theology of Nineteenth-Century Europe," in Maunder, *Oxford Handbook of Mary*, 487-502.

[32] Herringer, *Victorians and the Virgin Mary*; Derrick Holmes, *More Roman than Rome: English Catholicism in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Burns and Oates, 1978). "[T]he traditional worship of the 'Old Catholics,' with its rejection of 'continental' devotional practices—a rejection which extended to images of the Virgin, votive candles, precessions, and so forth—was like Anglican worship at the start of the nineteenth century, extremely plain and subdued in tone." Norman, *English Catholic Church*, 9.

Sacrament often attributed to convert or immigrant enthusiasts were not throwback practices from the Middle Ages limited mainly to devotees of the pope in Rome and his anti-modernism. They had been well within the mainstream of Catholic practice all over England for centuries.[33]

1.4 Scholars on Mary and Ullathorne

Consultation of standard reference works illustrates there has not been scholarly attention to Ullathorne's two Marian works from a theological point of view. Three different editions of the *Catholic Encyclopedia* spread over nearly a century addressed the bishop's historical significance, yet these entries give very little attention to Ullathorne's works on Our Lady.[34] These reference works did not acknowledge Ullathorne's pioneering role in promoting La Salette in the Anglophone world or the praise he received from his contemporaries on account of his book on the Immaculate Conception. For a figure of such prominence, this omission points to the possibility for further investigation.

In fact, Marian scholars have given scant attention to him. In Bessuti-Toniolo-Danieli's *Biliografia Mariana* from 1948-2008, there are no works that contain his name in the title.[35] Moreover, none of his works are included in Gambero's *Testi Mariani.*[36] One will search in vain for any titles with his name in them included in the International Marian Research Institute's Marian Bibliographies from 2006-2017.[37] O'Carroll's theological dictionary of Mary,

---

[33] Heimann, *Catholic Devotion in Victorian England*, 1-37.

[34] Bernard Ward, "William Bernard Ullathorne," in *The Catholic Encyclopedia,* vol. 15 (New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1912), 121-122. V.A. McClelland, "William Bernard Ullathorne," in *The New Catholic Encyclopedia,* vol. 14 (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979), 377-378. Also in *The New Catholic Encyclopedia, 2nd ed.*, vol. 14 (Detroit: Gale, 2003), 281-282.

[35] Giuseppe Bessuti, Ermanno Toniolo, and Silvano Danieli, eds., *Bibliografia Mariana*, 13 vols. (Roma: Marianum, 1948-2008).

[36] Luigi Gambero, ed., *Testi Mariani Del Secondo Millennio* (Roma: Città Nuova Editrice, 1996).

[37] Danielle Peters, "2006 Bibliography," Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton, accessed June 8, 2019, http://ecommons.udayton.edu/imri_bibliographies/8. Danielle Peters, "2007 Bibliography," Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton, accessed June

Theotokos, has no article on him.[38] One can say the same about Stefano De Fiores' three volume work, *Maria: Nuovissimo Dizionario*, as well as De Fiores, Schiefer, and Perrella's *Mariologia*.[39] The almost nine hundred page work, *Mariology: A Guide for Priests, Deacons and Seminarians,* has one reference to Ullathorne in a footnote.[40] Graef-Thompson's classic *Mary: A History of Doctrine and Devotion* makes one reference to Ullathorne in the body of the text and includes his work on the Immaculate Conception in its bibliography.[41] *The Oxford Handbook of Mary* made no mention of Ullathorne.[42]

Previous general works on William Bernard Ullathorne have not given particular focus to Ullathorne's Marian teaching. For

---

8, 2019, http://ecommons.udayton.edu/imri_ bibliographies/ 9. Danielle Peters, "2008 Bibliography," Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton, accessed June 8, 2019, http:// ecommons.udayton.edu/imri_ bibliographies/10. Danielle Peters, "2009 Bibliography," Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton, accessed June 8, 2019, http://ecommons. udayton.edu/imri_bibliographies/ 12. Danielle Peters, "2010 Bibliography," Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton, accessed June 8, 2019, http://ecommons. udayton.edu/imri_bibliographies/ 11. Gloria Falcão Dodd and Johann Roten, "2011 Bibliography," Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton, accessed June 8, 2019, https://ecommons.udayton.edu imri_ bibliographies/1. Gloria Falcão Dodd, "2012 Bibliography," Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton, accessed June 8, 2019, https://ecommons.udayton.edu/ imri_bibliographies/4. Gloria Falcão Dodd, "2013 Bibliography," Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton, accessed June 8, 2019, http://ecommons.udayton.edu/imri_bibliographies/3. Gloria Falcão Dodd, "2014 Bibliography," Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton, accessed June 8, 2019, http://ecommons.udayton.edu/imri_bibliographies/2. Sebastien Abalodo and Gloria Falcão Dodd, "2015 Bibliography," Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton, June 8, 2019, http://ecommons.udayton.edu/imri_ bibliographies/14. Sebastien Abalodo, "2016 Bibliography," Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton, accessed June 8, 2019, https://ecommons.udayton. edu/imri_bibliographies/16. Sebastien Abalodo, "2017 Bibliography," Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton, June 8, 2019 https://ecommons.udayton.edu/imri_bibliographies/15. Danielle Peters, "2006 Bibliography," Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton, accessed June 8, 2019, http://ecommons.udayton.edu/ imri_bibliographies/8 .

[38] Michael O'Carroll, *Theotokos: A Theological Encyclopedia of the Blessed Virgin Mary* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 1982), 298-300, 389

[39] Stefano De Fiores, *Maria: Nuovissimo Dizionario*, 3 vols. (Bologna: EDB, 2006-2008); *Mariologia*, eds., Stefano De Fiores, Valeria Ferrari Schiefer and Salvatore M. Perrella (Milano: San Paolo, 2009).

[40] Peter Damian Fehlner, "The Predestination of the Virgin Mother and Her Immaculate Conception," in Mark Miravalle, ed., *Mariology: A Guide for Priests, Deacons and Seminarians* (Goleta: Queenship Publishing, 2008), 276.

[41] Hilda Graef and Thomas Thompson, *Mary: A History of Doctrine and Devotion* (Notre Dame: Christian Classics, 2009), 343, 550.

[42] Maunder, *Oxford Handbook of Mary*, 487-515, 531-545.

example, in Paul Collins' doctoral dissertation, *William Bernard Ullathorne and the Foundation of Australian Catholicism 1815-1840*, Collins made only one reference to Mary in relation to Ullathorne's ministry in the more than four hundred page monograph.[43] Cuthbert Butler's two volume biography of more than six hundred pages gave little more than a dozen pages to Ullathorne's Marian writings. One page referenced his implementation of a Marian procession during his work as a pastor in Coventry.[44] Another page and a half gave a brief summary of his work on La Salette, focusing mainly on his work as a kind of precursor to the immense popularity of the apparitions in Lourdes.[45] Butler spent another page and half describing the circumstances under which Ullathorne composed his book on the Immaculate Conception and Newman's effusive praise for that work.[46]

Butler's remaining pages regarding Mary described Ullathorne's involvement in Newman's response to E. B. Pusey's (1800-1881) *Eirenicon*. Butler provided insight into Ullathorne's correspondence and how it influenced Newman to revise a passage in his *Letter to Pusey* in order to hold more clearly to Catholic teaching regarding the manner in which original sin is propagated. Butler also summarized Ullathorne's efforts to defend Newman's Marian piety and protect him from condemnation in Catholic periodicals.[47] The only additional allusion to Ullathorne's Marian writings came in a less than one page reference to his career as an author.[48] None of these passages went into depth on the specifics of what Ullathorne taught on the Immaculate Conception and how such teaching related to Ullathorne's actions as a pastor. In fact, Butler did not engage in theological analysis of what Ullathorne wrote on Mary and why he wrote it.

Judith Champ went into more depth on what Ullathorne wrote about Mary, but her work was primarily historical rather than theological. Her biography devoted almost a dozen pages to the two

---

[43] Collins, "William Bernard Ullathorne," 308. The only reference is to Cardinal Castracane's gift of a Guido Reni painting of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary,
[44] Butler, *Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne,* vol. 1*,* 132,
[45] Butler, *Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne,* vol. 1*,* 176-177,
[46] Butler, *Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne,* vol. 1*,* 177-178,
[47] Butler, *Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne,* vol. 1, 360-368.
[48] Butler, *Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne,* vol. 2, 223

books and references in other works that Ullathorne wrote on the matter.[49] Champ noted that one of Ullathorne's first acts when he took charge as bishop of the Central District in England in 1848 was to place his district under the patronage of the Immaculate Conception more than five years before the doctrine received dogmatic definition.[50] His correspondence with a noblewoman on a wide range of subjects that included the rosary and the Immaculate Conception received passing attention.[51] Her treatment of Ullathorne's visit to and book on La Salette was brief, noting that Ullathorne's work was instrumental in encouraging English Catholics to make pilgrimages to La Salette in spite of the criticism it received inside and outside of the Church.[52]

Champ went into some detail as regards the arguments that surrounded Ullathorne's writings on the Immaculate Conception and development of doctrine in her biography. Some of her narrative recapitulated elements of a five page article that she wrote on the pastoral aspects of Ullathorne's monograph on the Immaculate Conception in 1987.[53] The main points that she identified in her biography were that the definition of the doctrine signaled the triumph of the teaching authority of bishops over the subtlety of theologians and that the definition gave witness to the essence of what devout Catholics have always believed. Champ observed that Ullathorne's account of the development of doctrine as regards the Immaculate Conception painted a more neat and linear picture than Newman's complex and nuanced theory of development of doctrine in his *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine.* Ullathorne gloried in the linkage of the newly-dogmatized doctrine to medieval devotion as evidence of the basic continuity of the doctrine through the centuries. Champ also made brief mention of Ullathorne's appeal to the then undefined status of the doctrine of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary as an instructive example when

---

[49] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne*, 149-150, 220-228, 376, 410.
[50] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne*, 149-150.
[51] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne,* 410
[52] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne*, 220-223.
[53] Judith Champ, "Dogma as pastoral necessity: Archbishop Ullathorne and the definition of the Immaculate Conception of Mary," *The Month* 20 (Aug-Sept 1987): 304-308. Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne*, 223-229.

discussing his view of the theoretical limits of papal infallibility at the First Vatican Council.[54]

Those specialized treatments of English Catholic devotion in the nineteenth century have not looked at Ullathorne's writings on Mary from the point of view of the theology he employed. When they mentioned Ullathorne and Our Lady, they did so as historians.[55] Their primary aim entailed situating it within his nineteenth century historical milieu. They did not seek to draw out and identify sources of the doctrinal case that Ullathorne made in his work, *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God* and its relation to other works. These omissions are hardly surprising, as Ullathorne did not write extensively on Our Lady and did not have a reputation as a theologian. At the same time, Ullathorne lived in a time of Marian ferment in the Church and he did address her in some of his writings and from a doctrinal point of view. Although he was not a theologian, how he used theology as a pastor is of scholarly interest because of his status as a contemporary reference point for Catholicism in England. Moreover, he wrote during a between time in the Church's intellectual life—after the devastation of Catholic institutions that came in the wake of the French Revolution, before the programmatic agenda of the Scholastic revival which generally favored Thomism, and in a country where the Catholic Church was in the process of rebuilding institutions after almost three hundred years of living in a kind of neutral zone. This thesis will examine how Ullathorne used theology to recapitulated a Christian vision of history through the Immaculate Conception and connect this use of theology to certain of his pastoral actions.

1.5 An Eclectic Approach with Pastoral Implications

Ullathorne boasted of a pedigree of sober, recusant Catholics who could boast of their own perseverance in the faith through very difficult times. The term "recusant Catholics" refers

---

[54] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne*, 376.
[55] Herringer, *Victorians and the Virgin Mary*; Holmes, *More Roman than Rome*; Norman, *English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century*

to those Catholics who had refused to participate in Anglican liturgies when the law required such participation. He carried this heritage into an era of swelling numbers of converts and immigrants into English Catholicism. Yet Ullathorne does not fit the stereotype of older English Catholicism in much of his Marian teaching. Where one would expect to see a pastor trying to pass on the Church's faith about Mary and devotion to her without giving scandal to his countrymen through perceived exaggerations, one sees a bold and enthusiastic proponent of Marian devotion. He enthusiastically supported widespread use of the rosary and images of Our Lady.[56] Scholars have puzzled over his stubborn devotion to the apparition at La Salette for which Ullathorne faced significant criticism both inside and outside the Church.[57]

This thesis will study Ullathorne's articulation of the underlying rationale for and the doctrinal content of the Immaculate Conception in Ullathorne's book, *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God* along with its pastoral consequences. Rather than provide a detailed summary of all of the arguments that Ullathorne advanced, it will focus on three central elements to the doctrine: the place of Mary in the overall divine economy, the nature of original sin, and exact manner through which God preserved her from original sin. It will argue that Ullathorne combined disparate theological approaches in order to explain the content of this dogma in a predominately non-Catholic Anglophone environment and defend it against charges of innovation. Though he was a pastor and not a trained theologian, Ullathorne's pastoral duties not only influenced the way he employed theology, his theological positions also shaped his pastoral ministry. For example, his method of interpreting scripture as relates to Mary helps to explain his rationale for defending the apparition at La Salette. Furthermore, the understanding of original sin that he articulated in defending the Immaculate Conception led him to correct both Newman and the *Rambler* on this point in a particular way. Finally, his approach to doctrinal development

---

[56] "[Ullathorne] has sometimes been claimed to have reintroduced the rosary to England, so notorious was his attachment to that devotion." Heimann, *Catholic Devotion in Victorian England,* 25; Frederick Cwiekowski, *The English Bishops and the First Vatican Council* (Louvain: Universitaires de Louvain, 1971), 30/

[57] Heimann, *Catholic Devotion in Victorian England*, 25.

makes the most sense when read in the context of his promotion of the episcopacy in the Catholic missions in Australia and in England both before and after the restoration of the Hierarchy.

1.6 Method and Outline of Chapters

This work will analyze Ullathorne's doctrinal teaching on the Immaculate Conception by placing this dogmatic content in its historical and wider theological setting as well as connecting it to his pastoral work as a bishop. In order to do this, it will first be necessary to present basic facts about the state of Catholicism in the nineteenth century generally and the religious environment in the England in which Ullathorne lived and worked. This thesis will accomplish this contextualization by drawing from secondary works and Ullathorne's own writings. An overview of the shape of Ullathorne's spiritual and intellectual formation before writing *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God* will likewise prove helpful. Having established this foundation, it will then be possible to outline and to evaluate what Ullathorne taught in his work on the Immaculate Conception's theological foundations and meaning. In doing so, this thesis will place his teaching in the context of the theological sources from which Ullathorne drew. The background will provide helpful information for making connections between Ullathorne's use of theology and his pastoral practice.

Chapter two will set the scene by describing Ullathorne's nineteenth-century background and give a general outline of each of the chapters in *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God*. Ullathorne had a powerful spiritual awakening while away from England as an adolescent during a Marian devotion, but the signs of a comprehensive view of Our Lady's place in the mystery of Jesus Christ manifested themselves some decades later. His introduction to theology took place before the scholastic revival of Leo XIII, which meant that his theological reading, while wide, lacked the depth and integration that would have come from a comprehensive formation in a specific theological school. During Ullathorne's lifetime, the wider Church responded to the French Revolution and

anti-Christian currents by focusing more intensely on the papal office. The dogmatic definition of the Immaculate Conception took place in this context. Having established Ullathorne's context for writing his work, it will be fitting to give a brief summary of each chapter in his book on the Marian dogma. This chapter will draw from primary source material from Ullathorne's own hand, much of it autobiographic. Secondary source material will also prove necessary to provide a sense of the Catholic and English setting in which Ullathorne lived.

Chapter three will examine elements of Ullathorne's use of theology in more detailed way, by looking at three pivotal theological elements that he employed. The first involved Mary's place in the divine economy. Drawing both from Dionysius and the French School's appropriation of Scotism, he held that the primary motivation for the Incarnation was not to redeem man from sin but rather to make man a participant in the divine nature and that Mary stood just below Christ at the apex of the celestial hierarchy. He found justification for these positions in his reading of Scripture. He pressed his Dionysian and Scotist Marian insights into service promoting and defending the apparition of Our Lady at La Salette. In fact, Ullathorne's approach helps to explain the inner coherence of his defense of La Salette. He also used this theological vision to provide a Marian account for the nature of the priesthood.

Ullathorne's position on the nature and transmission of original sin will be the focus of the fourth chapter. This chapter will recount how Ullathorne understood original sin in *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God*. It will situate his articulation of the doctrine of original sin in the wider context of later magisterium on original sin from the Council of Trent to the present. His view did not harmonize easily with the Anselmian-Thomistic position that had become standard in Catholic theology that original sin involved a lack of original justice in the soul. This tension forced Ullathorne to postulate a miracle of purification of Mary's corrupted, pre-animate body before the immaculate infusion of her soul. Ullathorne's view of original sin falls on the more pessimistic side of Catholic orthodoxy in terms of the wound it inflicts on those who contract it. This understanding of original sin led Ullathorne to

exercise his episcopal authority in different ways by correcting both Newman and the popular Catholic periodical, the *Rambler*.

Chapter five will move from original sin to Ullathorne's apologetic for the Immaculate Conception. In order to outline this apologetic better, it will be helpful to provide a concise summary of the drafting process for the dogmatic definition of the Immaculate Conception. Ullathorne defended the non-innovative nature of the doctrine through an appeal to Mary's double conception, i.e., the conception of her body first and at some later point her soul, against those who claimed that the doctrine constituted an innovation. This chapter will also point out how Ullathorne argued for the antiquity of the fundamental breakthrough in the development of this dogma, the idea of preservative redemption, by appealing to Dionysius the Areopagite (c. 5th-6th cent.) and Saint Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153). A last-minute change in the formula of the dogmatic definition itself posed challenges for Ullathorne and other advocates of the non-innovative nature of the newly defined doctrine. Ullathorne's preoccupation with the antiquity of the doctrine has an intimate relationship with his insistence on the role of the bishops as guarantors of the preservation of and passing on of the faith once delivered to the saints. This conceptual preoccupation is emblematic of his larger pastoral focus in fostering robust episcopal authority in mission areas just beginning to enjoy the existence of a stable local hierarchy.

In order to begin to explore what Ullathorne taught on the Immaculate Conception and to establish how he was unique among different voices in the century in which he wrote, it will be necessary to establish and explore his context. Ullathorne was a man who simultaneously inhabited several different worlds. He was an English Catholic when Englishness and Catholicism did not harmonize easily. Ullathorne was also a Catholic of the nineteenth century who faced the intellectual challenges of the Enlightenment and the political upheavals of the French Revolution. Ullathorne was a Benedictine monk-priest of Downside Abbey who received a particular spiritual and intellectual formation there. He exercised the office of diocesan bishop at time of great enthusiasm for the exercise of papal authority. These contexts will set the stage for

introducing the content of Ullathorne's book on the Immaculate
Conception in the next chapter.

Chapter 2—Ullathorne's Context and Text

Ullathorne's spiritual and theological influences provide context for evaluating his writings on the Immaculate Conception. He came from an English recusant family, which meant that his family refused to participate in Anglican liturgies. His community fought to hold on to its distinctness from the established Anglican Church. He experienced an awakening of faith that took place in the context of a Marian devotion. His training as a Benedictine monk took place at a time when the Catholic Church in England was in the process of transitioning from having the majority of their educational institutions on the continent to re-founding them in England. His life as a churchman unfolded against the backdrop of the rise of a movement to maximize papal authority in the face of threats to the pope's temporal authority over the Papal States and continuing intellectual challenges in wider European culture. The definition of the Immaculate Conception emerged from this context. It came as a result of papal initiative. While the argument Ullathorne advanced in the book promoting the Immaculate Conception placed significant weight on the role of papacy in the definition of the dogma, his book was more than a series of papal proof texts but rather provided a recapitulation of the Christian narrative with the Blessed Virgin Mary's role in the drama sown into its fabric from before the dawn of creation.

2.1 Ullathorne's English Context

A concise background of the history of Catholicism in England from the Reformation until the gradual relaxation of legal sanctions against Catholics in the early nineteenth century will help to understand the setting in which Ullathorne lived and came to spiritual maturity.

22

England's millennium-long Catholic heritage faced serious threats as a result of Henry VIII's concerns regarding securing a male succession by means of divorcing his queen, Catherine of Aragon (1485-1536), and marrying another. With the Act of Supremacy in 1534, Henry VIII and Parliament established an Anglican Church independent from Rome. At the age of nine his son, Edward VI, succeeded him in 1547. On Edward's untimely death in 1553, the Catholic Mary Tudor rose to the throne and restored Catholicism but died without an heir in 1558. This event left her Protestant half-sister Elizabeth to reign until 1603, leading to what some historians have called the Elizabethan settlement and a firmly Protestant England.[58] A brief hope for Catholic restoration came in 1685, with the accession of the convert James II to the throne, but the Glorious Revolution deposed him in 1688. James and his heir made several armed attempts to regain the crown, but the Catholic support these received only succeeded in providing evidence for the charge that Catholics were disloyal subjects prone to rebellion and political intrigue.[59]

In response to a perceived Catholic threat, Parliament passed laws that excluded Catholics from the royal succession and placed those who clung to the Catholic faith under legal punishments known as the Penal Laws during this period.[60] It was illegal to celebrate Mass.[61] Priests and teachers in Catholic schools working in England faced the prospect of long-term imprisonment. No Catholic could buy or sell land. Even those who possessed religious images, crucifixes, prayer books, or rosaries faced the possibility of severe legal penalties attached to recognition of a foreign power in England.[62] *De iure*, these draconian laws aimed at eliminating Catholicism as a significant part of the body politic in England. *De facto*, the Crown did not enforce them consistently

---

[58] Gerard Culkin, "England," in *The New Catholic Encyclopedia,* vol. 5 (New York: McGraw Hill, 1967), 359-362.

[59] Culkin, "England," 362-363.

[60] Culkin, "England," 363-365.

[61] Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England from Newman to Martineau, 1850-1900* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962), 19.

[62] "Catholics were warned that they incurred the penalties of praemunire [sic, i.e., the crime of recognizing papal jurisdiction in England] for receiving such religious objects as holy pictures and crosses, missals, rosaries, and breviaries." Holmes, *More Roman than Rome*, 49.

enough to achieve this end.[63] For example, Catholic chapels existed in which there were regularly celebrated Masses.[64] The most significant of these were embassy chapels in London, where Catholic liturgical life often existed at a level of significant refinement.[65] Even in cases when Catholics had Masses in public houses, the authorities went to little trouble to police them.[66] At times, however, anti-Catholic sentiment flared up. One such instance occurred in 1780 when the Gordon Riots broke out in response to the Catholic Relief Act of 1778. Among other things, these riots targeted Catholic houses and chapels.[67]

As Ullathorne came of age, the situation for the English Church improved substantially. In the last decade of the eighteenth century and first decades of the nineteenth, Parliament passed several relief acts which improved the legal status of Catholics in Great Britain, granting religious freedom to Catholics within certain parameters. To some extent these laws codified what had become the lax enforcement of the Penal Laws.[68] Catholics could legally build churches and no longer faced penalties for failing to attend the services of the established church. While they still faced considerable social stigma as less than loyal English subjects because of perceived allegiance to a foreign power and other forms of anti-Catholic bigotry, they finally had some breathing room for the first extended period of time in centuries. Even so, English Catholics did not press their new freedoms too aggressively.[69]

---

[63] "Inherent in the anti-Catholic penal laws was the belief that if its leadership could be destroyed then the Church would die out. Self-evidently the eradication of English Catholicism was not realized; indeed by the eighteenth century Catholics had come to enjoy a substantial degree of informal toleration." Leo Gooch, "The Religion for a Gentleman: The Northern Catholic Gentry in the Eighteenth Century," *Recusant History* 23, no. 4 (Oct 1997): 543.

[64] Marie Rowlands, "The Education and Piety of Catholics in Staffordshire in the 18th Century," *Recusant History* 10, no. 2 (Apr 1969): 67.

[65] Roderick O' Donnell, "The Architectural Setting of Challoner's Episcopate," in Eamon Duffy, ed., *Challoner and His Church: A Catholic Bishop in Georgian England* (London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1981), 64-68. Eamon Duffy, "Richard Challoner, 1691-1781: A Memoir," in Duffy, *Challoner and His Church*, 7-9.

[66] J. Anthony Williams, "Change or Decay?: The Provincial Laity, 1691-1781" in Duffy, *Challoner and His Church*, 50-52.

[67] Edward Hubert Burton, "Richard Challoner," in *The Catholic Encyclopedia,* vol. 3, 565.

[68] Leo Gooch, "The Religion for a Gentleman, 543.

[69] Davies, *Worship and Theology in England*, 18-20.

2.2 Ullathorne's Religious Development

Ullathorne came of age in a recusant family before the repeal of the Penal Laws. On his father's side, William came from a Yorkshire recusant Catholic family that boasted direct descent from the Henrician martyr Saint Thomas More. Butler claimed that Ullathorne's family had been part of the Catholic gentry in Yorkshire that lost its lands in the Jacobite rising of 1745 led by Charles Stuart (Bonnie Prince Charlie) that aimed to put his father, James (III) Stuart, on the British throne in place of George III.[70] Champ has expressed doubts about the veracity of this claim.[71] At any rate, William Ullathorne the elder was definitely not part of the landed gentry but rather part of the merchant class. Ullathorne's mother, Hannah Longstaff, converted from Protestantism before marrying the elder William. The couple had ten children; the younger William was the first of these ten.

William's spiritual formation as a youth reflected both the disadvantages of belonging to a persecuted Church and his unique path to greater maturity in personal faith. Sunday observance was a regular part of the Ullathornes' family life, but observing Sunday as the Lord's Day did not always involve the opportunity to assist at Mass due to a shortage of priests coupled with a widely scattered flock in England.[72] Bishop Challoner's (1691-1781) Catholic prayer book, *The Garden of the Soul*, shaped Ullathorne's family's spirituality.[73] This tome included more than just occasional prayers; it was a manual in the spiritual life that included everything from morning prayers to an examination of conscience at the end of the day. Besides giving structure to one's daily spiritual exercises, the primer included sections on Christian doctrine, how to assist at Mass, the rite of Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, Stations of the Cross, devotions to Our Lady (including the rosary), and much

---

[70] Butler, *Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne,* vol. I**,** 1-3.
[71] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne*, 3.
[72] Ullathorne, *The Devil is a Jackass,* 13.
[73] Richard Challoner, *The Garden of the Soul: Or a Manual of Spiritual Exercises and Instructions for Christians Who (Living in the World) Aspire to Devotion* (London: n.p., 1741).

else besides.[74] When he received permission from his father to pursue a career as a sailor at the age of fifteen, *The Garden of the Soul* was among the books packed for him, even if he may not have used it faithfully.[75] Ullathorne went to sea not having received confirmation and first Holy Communion. In fact, Ullathorne broke an appointment to receive these sacraments. He did so on account of a quarrel about his maritime vocation with the priest preparing him.[76]

A dramatic experience of divine grace shook William out of his spiritual stupor. When at the Baltic Sea port of Memel, one of the other Catholic sailors invited Ullathorne to join him for Mass. After fishing his copy of *The Garden of the Soul* out from his trunk, William joined his companion. When the two entered the church, the congregation was in the midst of chanting the Litany of Loreto to simple tones. As Ullathorne told the story years later in his autobiography, the experience hit him like a thunderbolt. He wrote, "[t]he moment I entered I was struck by the simple fervor of the scene: it threw me into a cold shiver; my heart turned inward upon myself; I saw the claims of God on me, and felt a deep reproach within my soul."[77] Within months, Ullathorne decided to abandon his career as a sailor, return to England, and enter Downside Abbey as a novice Benedictine monk in February of 1823.[78]

Ullathorne's first years as a monastic and preparation for the priesthood took place during an extraordinary time in the English Church. Ullathorne took Bernard as his name of monastic profession as a novice. It was not until ten months after entering the novitiate when a bishop came to Downside that Ullathorne even made his first Holy Communion and received the sacrament of confirmation owing to Ullathorne's refusal to receive these sacraments before he went to sea. At this time in England the reception of first Holy Communion often accompanied the reception of confirmation. It was also in the novitiate that he had his first regular experience of Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, despite the rite's inclusion in

---

[74] Davies, *Worship and Theology in England*, 25-27.
[75] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne,* 11.
[76] The priest, George Haydock, edited a Bible commentary wide used among Catholics. Collins, "William Bernard Ullathorne and Foundation of Australian Catholicism," 22.
[77] Butler, *Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne,* vol. 1, 14.
[78] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne,* 16.

The Garden of the Soul.[79] Moreover, the French Revolution and the relaxation of laws that forbade Catholic education in England had created a new situation for the formation of religious and men on the path to the priesthood. Before the revolution, the existence of Catholic kingdoms like France, Portugal, and Spain made it possible for English Catholic families to send their children to monasteries or seminaries on the Continent. As a result of the French Revolution, many of these establishments, most notably the seminary at Douai in Belgium, closed owing to the new political situation. The English had many fewer educational and monastic options abroad. As a result, necessity forced them to begin finding locations for their institutions in England itself.[80]

2.3 Intellectual Horizons

William Bernard Ullathorne began his formation during a time of transition for the English Church, impacting his formation as a Benedictine monk and a priest in noteworthy ways. The Benedictine monastery that Ullathorne joined, Downside Abbey, traced its roots to a monastic community founded in Douai in 1607 composed of monks seeking refuge from the persecution of the Church in the British Isles. The community continued in Douai until the French Revolution expelled it in 1795. After relying on the hospitality of a member of the landed Catholic gentry, the community of monks settled in Somerset in 1814 and began work on establishing the necessary external arrangements for the stability needed for monastic life. When Ullathorne arrived at Downside in 1823, the community there was in the process of building a cloister, an abbey church, and the spiritual and intellectual structures necessary to be a normally functioning monastery.[81] In light of the

---

[79] "[I]t will scarcely be believed that until I went to St. Gregory's I had never been present at Benediction, or heard the Litany [of the Blessed Virgin] sung, except at Memel…such devotions in those days were chiefly limited to the few existing colleges and convents." Ullathorne, *The Devil is a Jackass*, 36.

[80] Guilday, *English Catholic Refugees on the Continent 1558-1795,* vol. 1., 37-40; Viéban, "Seminary, Ecclesiastical," in *The Catholic Encyclopedia,* vol. 13, 694-697.

[81] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne*, 18-27.

geographic instability of the monastic community that he joined, one should not be surprised to discover that Ullathorne's intellectual and spiritual development took place somewhat idiosyncratically.

Bede Polding (1794-1877) played an important role as Ullathorne's novice master at Downside and had a profound influence on Ullathorne's spirituality. Ullathorne received a solid formation in the *Rule of Saint Benedict* and the spiritual life from Polding. The novice master's approach to the monastic life envisioned the coexistence of a missionary and monastic vocation. Polding planted the seeds of Ullathorne's service in the Australian mission through the former's enthusiasm for the idea of working among the relocated convicts of Botany Bay.[82] Indeed, Polding followed Ullathorne to Australia in 1835 as its first resident bishop.[83] Whatever spiritual and missionary gifts Polding possessed, Ullathorne himself admitted that his mentor was not a "deep or persistent thinker."[84] One must look elsewhere to find the main influences on Ullathorne's thinking.

For intellectual formation, Ullathorne looked primarily to books. Collins' research provides important particulars about Ullathorne's reading at Downside that he enumerated in his *Autobiography.* History occupied a prominent place in education there at the time.[85] For spirituality, Bishop Challoner's writings, imbued with the practical devotion of Saint Francis de Sales (1657-1622), held a very prominent place.[86] One can easily explain the popularity of De Sales' works among Catholics in Protestant England by remembering that Saint Francis wrote as a Catholic Reformation bishop of a predominantly Calvinist region. He was a missionary in non-Catholic lands with a Catholic history. The situation in England, while not entirely identical, overlapped

---

[82] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne*, 23-24.
[83] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne*, 59.
[84] Ullathorne, *The Autobiography of Archbishop Ullathorne*, 59.
[85] Collins, "William Bernard Ullathorne and the Foundation of Australian Catholicism," 36-37.
[86] In addition to *The Garden of the* Soul, Ullathorne mentioned two works: Richard Challoner, *Think Well On't; or Reflections on the Great Truths of the Christian Religion for Every Day of the Month* (London: n.p., 1728). Richard Challoner, *The Wonders of God in the Wilderness* (London: Needham, 1755). The former work likely did not list a publisher because of the strength of anti-Catholic sentiment in early eighteenth century England. Collins, "William Bernard Ullathorne and the Foundation of Australian Catholicism," 39-40.

considerably. Protestants dominated English political and religious life, but the memory of a Catholic past remained.

While Ullathorne shared a significant amount of information about the spiritual works that he read at Downside, he had much less to say about dogmatic theology. Ullathorne learned a Gallican ecclesiology that emphasized the role of the national churches and councils. Ullathorne also read monographs authored by early Ultramontane enthusiasts for an ecclesiology that focused primarily on the papacy. Furthermore, he mentioned reading the French theologian Honore de Tournelly (1658-1729), who wrote on the full range of dogmatic topics, as well as the French Jesuit historian of dogma Denis Pétau (1583-1652).[8787] Ullathorne admitted that at the time of his preparation for ordination in England, Thomas Aquinas was "a closed book."[88] Ullathorne only came to know Thomas Aquinas indirectly through footnotes. For morals, Ullathorne read Saint Alphonsus Liguori (1696-1787). Ullathorne grew to love early Christian writers, especially Saint Augustine of Hippo (354-430) and Pseudo-Dionysius (c. 5th-6th cent.).[89] Unfortunately, Ullathorne did "not make clear what texts were used for the courses on the trinity [*sic*], grace and the incarnation."[90]

In his *Autobiography*, Ullathorne detailed his other intellectual influences during his time at Downside. When it came to the monks who influenced his intellectual development, the most significant was Thomas Joseph Brown (1796–1880), who would later become a bishop in Wales. Ullathorne named Brown as the "only person from whose living voice" he had "ever learnt much" on account of the latter's brilliance.[91] Brown espoused a moderately Gallican ecclesiology, which is something worth noting during the

---

[87] Collins, "William Bernard Ullathorne and the Foundation of Australian Catholicism," 48-50.
[88] Ullathorne, *The Autobiography of Archbishop Ullathorne*, 42.
[89] Collins, "William Bernard Ullathorne and the Foundation of Australian Catholicism," 51-53.
[90] Collins, "William Bernard Ullathorne and the Foundation of Australian Catholicism," 48.
[91] Ullathorne, *The Autobiography of Archbishop Ullathorne*, 45. Later in life, Brown's claim to fame lay in the fact that he reported John Henry Newman to Rome for heresy after Newman published his controversial *Rambler* article, "On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine" in 1859. Ker, *Newman*, 487.

raise of Ultramontanism. The exact source of this ecclesiology is not entirely clear, but it would be reasonable to locate it in the multiple French influences that Brown would have known when the England Benedictine Congregation's home base was in the Francophone countries.[92]

2.4 Spiritual Horizons

Even though Ullathorne did not identify a specifically Marian element in his monastic life, it is important to address the relationship between Ullathorne's identity as a monk and his view of Mary. The contributions of monks of the Order of Saint Benedict to the Church's Marian heritage are undeniable. Benedictine monks in England during the Middle Ages stood at the vanguard of the development of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.[93] Marian chants in the proper of the Mass and the Divine Office that emerged during this period translated affective piety for the Mother of God into beautiful liturgical music.[94] On the other hand, as Mary Clare Vincent observed relative to followers of the *Rule of Saint Benedict*, "[m]onastic writers, ancient and modern, have no

---

[92] Ullathorne, *The Autobiography of Archbishop Ullathorne*, 46.

[93] "English Benedictine and Cistercian monks made a number of interesting and sometimes original contributions to Marian theology and spirituality between c. 1050 and 1200. In some cases, the significance of their writings lay in their innovativeness as a result of which, it may be claimed they advanced or at least enriched the Mariology of the western church as a whole." Matthew Mills, "Behold Your Mother: Virgin Mary in English Monasticism, c. 1050-1200" (PhD diss.: Regent's Park College Oxford, 2016)*,* 207.

[94] Vincent Wiseman, "Marian Profile of Classical Orders," *Marian Library Studies* 31 (2013): 96-99. "There is abundant evidence to attest that the Virgin Mary was daily revered, exalted, and invoked by the cathedral monks, and it should be noted that their prayers and praises were always directed to her in her relationship with her Son. The reason why Benedictine piety remained on the whole restrained…was that it was founded upon scriptural and patristic texts. It follows that Marian devotion in the monastic liturgy was expressed in the prayers, hymns, antiphons, and sequences which drew their origin and inspiration from these texts." Joan Greatrex, "Marian Studies and Devotion in the Benedictine Cathedral Priories in Latin medieval England," in R.N. Swanson, ed., *The Church and Mary: Papers Read at the 2001 Summer Meeting and the 2002 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2004), 167.

complete, systematic explanation of Mariology in their tradition."[95] Ullathorne himself made no mention of the relationship between Benedictines and Marian piety, even though the Benedictines at Downside had long observed a tradition of including the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary in their daily cursus of prayer.[96]

One must clarify the structure of Benedictine monastic life at the time. One speaks somewhat imprecisely of a "Benedictine Order" in the sense that one would speak of worldwide orders like the Jesuits or Dominicans during Ullathorne's lifetime. The *Rule of Saint Benedict* gave the locus of Benedictine unity, although other monastic groups like the Cistercians followed the *Rule* who were not Benedictines. Each individual Benedictine monastery had a particular interpretation of it and unique traditions. Most abbeys belonged to supra-abbatial groups known as congregations, usually formed regionally or nationally.[97] The oldest of these was the one to which Downside belonged, the English congregation, formed in 1619.[98] Due to the religious situation in England, the English Benedictines were understandably oriented toward missionary work. Ullathorne himself spent eight years of his life resident at Downside.

The English Benedictine Congregation had a history of promoting devotion to Our Lady. During the reign of Charles II (1660-1685), these monks established a Rosary Confraternity at the chapel of Charles' Catholic queen.[99] Some of the Benedictines active in the chapel also preached a vow of slavery to Our Lady. They would have gained exposure to this vow of Marian servitude when the Archbishop of Cambrai began promoting it in 1626 in the area surrounding Douai. This vow enjoyed popularity in various locations until Gilbert Choiseul, the bishop of Tournay,

---

[95] Mary Clare Vincent, "Mary and Monastics," *Word and Spirit: A Monastic Review* 10 (1988): 81.
[96] Dominic Aidan Bellenger, *Monks with a Mission: Essays in English Benedictine History* (Bath: Downside Abbey Press, 2014), 61.
[97] Cyprian Alston, "Benedictine Order," in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 2, 443-464. A.G. Biggs and R.K. Sealsoltz, "Benedictines," in *The New Catholic Encyclopedia, 2nd Edition*, vol. 2, 267-273.
[98] Alston, "Benedictine Order," 447.
[99] Anne Dillon, " 'To Seek Out Some Comforts and Companions of His Own Kind and Condition': The Benedictine Rosary Confraternity and Chapel of Cardigan House, London," in Lowell Gallagher ed., *Redrawing the Map of Early Modern English Catholicism* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), 272-308.

communicated that Rome had condemned the form that the vow took in 1674. At this point, the English Benedictines ceased preaching Marian slavery.[100] By 1680, the Confraternity had become defunct.[101]

Ullathorne's novice master Polding could be a source of later visible manifestation of Ullathorne's Marian devotion. Polding re-established the English Benedictine Rosary Confraternity in 1827.[102] Polding's revival of the organization took place during Ullathorne's years at Downside between his novitiate and priestly ordination. While Ullathorne still functioned as Polding's vicar general in 1841, Polding dedicated the Australian colony to the Mother of God.[103] Despite these correspondences, Ullathorne did not identify in his written works that the re-establishment of this confraternity or the dedication of Australia to Our Lady were spiritually significant events for him.

2.5 Post-Ordination Developments

It is not easy to discern much about Ullathorne's spiritual life after his ordination, and Mary's place in it, but some glimpses indicate that he showed a growing appreciation for her importance. Ullathorne's first biographer made a correct observation when he

---

[100] "On the 3rd of August [1626] the illustrious Francis Vander Burgh, Archbishop of Cambray, approved the devotion called 'the Bondage of the Blessed Virgin,' (Manicipium B. Virginis Mariae)…the R.R. Benedictines Anselm Crowder and Thomas Vincent Sadler have in their devotions to our Lady given in to the same thing. But the Bishop of Tournay (Gilbert Choiseul) in a choice pastoral letter (of June 7th, 1674, and printed anew in Lisle 1689), declares that by decree of the Congregation of the Holy Office, approved by the Holy See, 'tis severely condemned and whatever has any *rapport* to it. Behold the words of the decree [of the Holy Office]. *'Ut ritum et quodcumque aliud ad mancipatum ejusmodi pertinens statim rejicicunt. Ut novus hic Beatae Virginis mancipatus omnino aboleatur contrarius quibuscumque non obstantibus.'* We are not properly to call ourselves the slaves of any creature not even of the most glorious Mother of God, in taking that word in a natural sense." Dom Benet Weldon, *English Benedictine Congregation: Chronological Notes* (Stanbrook: The Abbey of Our Lady of Consolation, 1881), 156.

[101] Dillon, "The Benedictine Rosary Confraternity," 300.

[102] Frances O'Donoghue, *The Life of John Bede Polding, Australia's First Catholic Archbishop* (London: Angus & Robertson Publishers, 1982), 10.

[103] Ambrose Ryan, *Australia and the Immaculate Conception: 100 Years Ago* (Melbourne: Advocate Press for Australian Truth Society, 1954), 17.

noted that Ullathorne was a typical nineteenth century Englishman insofar as he exercised great reserve when speaking of his personal spirituality and devotions. Moreover, at that time those that spoke of personal religious experience were generally evangelical Protestants. For Catholics, public preoccupation with one's internal religious dispositions did not fit well into a Church that focused on the objectivity of religious truth.[104] Furthermore, Ullathorne was not a convert. For this reason, the novelty of a new system of spirituality that can occasion extended written explanation of new subjective experiences did not apply to him. As far as one can tell, he embraced the best of the spiritual tradition of the faith in which his parents raised him.

Ullathorne's exposure to the Italian religious scene gave him a more expansive vision of Mary's place in Christian spirituality. Ullathorne took special note of works of art that depicted Our Lady by Fra Angelico at San Marco convent in Florence, which he reported made an "ineffable impression" on him during a journey through Italy in his capacity as vicar general of the Australian mission in the 1830s such that he "was captivated by the mystical spirit and soul of painting in the fresco of the Crowning of the Blessed Virgin."[105] During the same trip, he recounted receiving from Cardinal Castracane in Rome a painting by Guido Reini of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, which Ullathorne brought with him to Australia and gave to a convent of the Sisters of Charity. He was not just a passive recipient of this vision of religious imagery. Ullathorne also took advantage of his time in Italy to acquire religious images to decorate church buildings in Australia.[106] The buoyant effulgence of Italian religious art gave a sharp contrast to the limitations on visual religious culture in which Ullathorne grew up in the first decades of his life in Yorkshire. His mention of these experiences deserves particular attention because Ullathorne usually exercised reserve about entering into his subjective religious experience when writing.

---

[104] For a treatment of the dynamics of this Catholic versus Evangelical vision of subjective experience, see Frank Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011).

[105] Ullathorne, *The Devil is a Jackass,* 143.

[106] Ullathorne, *The Devil is a Jackass*, 150.

2.6 Ullathorne's Wider Catholic Context

Ullathorne lived in a time of transition in the global Catholic Church. The old post-Reformation order of Catholic monarchs and state-supported national churches began to unravel with the French Revolution in 1789. French victories in the early years of The Napoleonic Wars (1803-1815) spread the secularizing wave across Europe. In the short-term, the changes that came in the wake of the French Revolution were disastrous for the Church.[107] The Church in France lost its property and its right to public worship. France invaded Rome in 1798, proclaimed a Roman Republic, and took Pope Pius VI (1775-1799) into custody until his death. The situation for the Church improved when the French Emperor, Napoleon Bonaparte (r. 1804-1814) made an uneasy peace with the Church.[108] The Congress of Vienna, which concluded in 1815, redrew the political map of Europe and sought to undo some of the transformation that occurred in the wake of the French Revolution by restoring pre-French Revolution monarchies throughout Europe, including the Papal States in central Italy.[109] Yet in a real sense, the French Revolution had undone Christendom and the Christian order that had come to dominate European history since the Roman Empire's embrace of Christianity under the Emperor Constantine (r. 306-337).[110]

In the face of the revolution and its aftermath, popes and most churchmen took a conservative, even reactionary tone. Pius VII (1800-1823), Leo XII, (1823-1829), Pius VIII (1829-1830), and Gregory XVI (1831-1846) did very little to accommodate the Church to post-Revolution Europe.[111] One example of this approach was Gregory XVI's ban on railroads, which the pontiff

---

[107] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne*, 16, 65, 106.

[108] André Latreille, "French Revolution," in *The New Catholic Encyclopedia,* vol. 6, 186-193.

[109] Frederick Schneid, "Congress of Vienna," in *Europe 1789-1914: Encyclopedia of the Age of Industry and Empire,* vol. 2, 532-535.

[110] Warren Carroll, *The Guillotine and the Cross* (Front Royal: Christendom Press, 1991), 25-65, 125-144. For wider perspective, see Warren Carroll, *Revolution against Christendom: A History of Christendom, Volume 5* (Front Royal: Christendom Press, 2006).

[111] Eamon Duffy, *Saints and Sinners: A History of the Popes* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 195-224.

believed to have a corrupting influence.[112] Pius IX's rise to the Chair of Peter in 1846 led to hopes of a liberal, modern pope. The abortive revolution in Rome of 1848 dashed these hopes, however. The rising forced Pius IX to flee from Rome to Gaeta and soured him considerably on the prospects of any reconciliation between certain aspects of the ideals of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution with the Catholic faith.[113] Throughout the first three-quarters of the nineteenth century, the Church and the general drift of European culture away from historic Christianity were moving at cross purposes.

In the midst of the general tension between modern movements and the Church, there emerged a strong Ultramontane strain in Catholicism that focused on the role of the pope. Ultramontanism here refers to a nineteenth-century movement in the Church that looked over the mountains (*ultra montes*) from countries north of the Alps toward the bishop of Rome for guidance facing issues of the day. One finds a good example of Ultramontanism in Joseph de Maistre's 1819 book, *Du Pape*, which made an apologia for the centrality of the pope both in the Church and the Western world.[114] In the decades that followed de Maistre's book, debate surrounding the nature of the pope's authority ramped up. These disputations did not primarily revolve around arcane theological points about the nature of the Church. They engaged vital questions touching on the relationship between the Church and the political order, as later became very clear in papal documents such as Pius IX's 1864 *Syllabus of Errors*, which condemned eighty propositions current in modern European thought deemed contrary to the Catholic faith.[115]

In his 1849 encyclical, *Ubi Primum*, Blessed Pius IX announced that he had begun to assemble cardinals and theological experts in order to define the dogma of the Immaculate Conception.[116] Scholars have recognized three nineteenth-century

---

[112] John-Peter Pham, *Heirs of the Fisherman: Behind the Scenes of Papal Death and Succession* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 20-21.
[113] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne*, 140-141.
[114] John O'Malley, *Vatican I: The Council and the Making of the Ultramontane Church* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2018), 61-66.
[115] O'Malley, *Vatican I*, 105-107.
[116] O'Carroll, *Theotokos*, 289.

figures as playing an important role in the formulation of the papal bull that defined the Immaculate Conception, *Ineffabilis Deus*. All of these figures had a significance in the Church beyond their contributions on this point. The three figures were Giovanni Perrone (1794-1876), Carlo Passaglia (1812-1887), and Dom Prosper Guéranger (1805-1875). The Jesuit Perrone stood at the fountainhead of what later historians of theology have come to refer to as the Roman School. He exercised significant influence in the papal court during the long pontificate of Pius IX. Perrone's understanding of the Church's role in handing on divine revelation played a critical role in explaining how the Church could define the Immaculate Conception in spite of the doctrine's controverted history.[117] Passaglia, likewise a Jesuit, was a student of Perrone who provided prolix documentation for the antiquity of the doctrine by appealing to ancient sources, if not always with a properly critical sense.[118] Both Perrone and Passaglia served on Pius IX's preparatory commission for the dogmatic definition.[119] So did the Benedictine Guéranger. Unlike Perrone and Passaglia, Guéranger had a close personal acquaintance with his fellow monk Ullathorne.[120] Guéranger wrote a much shorter work than Passaglia's defending the grounds for definition that looked to the textual witnesses to the doctrine, particularly from the Fathers and the liturgy. Pius IX personally read Guéranger's monograph. As Guéranger told the story, the pope indicated that the work was "the best thing he had seen…on the subject."[121]

---

[117] Johann Roten, "Contexte Historique, Theologique et Pastoral de la Définition du Dogme de l'Immaculée Conception et les Apparitions de Lourdes," in Jacques Perrier, ed., *Je Suis L'Immaculée: Colloque Organisé par les Sanctuaires N.-D. de Lourdes avec la Collaboration de la Société Française d'Études Mariales (SFEM)* (Paris: Éditions Parole et Silence, 2006), 105. Cf. Giovanni Perrone, *De Immaculato B.V. Mariae Conceptu An Dogmatico Decreto Definiri Possit Disquisitio Theologica* (Rome: Ioannes Baptista Marini et Bernardus Morini, 1847; Olysipone: Ex typis regiis lusitanis, 1849). All citations will be from the 1849 edition.

[118] Francis Dvornik, "The Byzantine Church and the Immaculate Conception," in Edward O'Connor, ed., *The Dogma of the Immaculate Conception: History and Significance* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1958), 92.

[119] Rene Laurentin, "The Role of the Papal Magisterium in the Development of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception" in O'Connor, *Dogma of the Immaculate Conception,* 309.

[120] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne,* 63.

[121] Laurentin, "Role of the Papal Magisterium," 309-310.

That the definition of the Immaculate Conception in 1854 was a papal act held a significance beyond the point of Mariological doctrine. The manner of promulgation of the dogma also made an implicit assertion of the pope's ability to act apart from a convocation of bishops to define doctrine.[122] On the one hand, the definition provided an opportunity to press the Ultramontane vision of the pope's authority to teach and govern the Church apart from the consent of other bishops and secular authorities. On the other hand, the move provided a spiritual and doctrinal rallying point during a difficult time for the Church. The pope's proposal to define the doctrine came in exile from Rome in Gaeta due to the rising in the Papal States when he faced the real prospect of losing his temporal authority entirely. As the temporal position of Church declined in Europe, however, one way for the Church to move forward was to focus on her spiritual mission.[123]

2.7 Background for The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God

Before moving forward, it is necessary to give some historical background regarding Ullathorne's book, *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God*. Not long after the publication of Pius's 1849 encyclical, William Bernard Ullathorne began work on a book-length treatise sketching the contours of the dogma and defending it against objections. Ullathorne did the majority of the original composition of the book from September to November 1854.[124] Throughout his life Ullathorne continued to revise it. His unpublished revisions, largely but not entirely stylistic in character, came into print in 1904 under the editorship of Canon Iles.[125] This thesis will treat the 1904 version as Ullathorne's

---

[122] O'Malley, *Vatican I*, 101-104.
[123] Duffy, *Saints and Sinners,* 195-244.
[124] Butler, *Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne,* vol. 1, 178.
[125] William Bernard Ullathorne, *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God*, ed. Canon Iles (Westminster: Art and Book Co., 1904).

definitive text while also acknowledging when the 1904 text significantly departs from the 1855 original.

Even though Ullathorne did not seek to blaze a new trail in writing this tome, his work has value insofar as it gives an important snapshot of the use of theology by a pastor at the time of the dogmatic definition. Ullathorne wrote for a non-theologian seeking more information about the meaning of the newly-defined dogma.[126] His aim did not involve entering into theological controversy but rather expounding the teaching according to the broad consensus of Catholic theology.[127] In an unpublished draft of a preface for the book, Ullathorne made it clear that he believed that "there is nothing original in the book, except perhaps its method."[128] Even if he did not aim for originality, the method he employed reveals important aspects of the Catholic intellectual life in England and the wider Church. The book saw publication in a wider Catholic theological context before the Thomist Revival of Leo XIII in *Aeterni Patris* (1879). This time in the Church was an epoch in which few theological schools had survived the ravages of the French Revolution intact.[129]

2.8 Precis of Chapters

[126] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne,* 224.

[127] In writing to Frederick Faber on September 16, 1856 after having read his book *The Blessed Sacrament,* Ullathorne explained the reserve that popular writers should have with respect to entering into theological controversy: "I believe it is a maxim laid down for preachers, and by inference for popular writers, that they should as a general rule avoid preaching theological opinions and adhere to doctrine." As cited in Raleigh Addington, ed., *Faber: Poet and Priest: Selected Letters by Frederick William Faber, 1833-1863* (Cowbridge: D. Brown & Sons Ltd., 1974), 275. Frederick Faber, *The Blessed Sacrament, or the Ways and Works of God* (London: Richardson and Son, 1855).

[128] William Bernard Ullathorne, "Manuscript of Bishop Ullathorne's Book on the Immaculate Conception," 1854, Reference Number: R1616 , Hierarchical Number: Z6/2/4/37/2/1, Archdiocese of Birmingham Archives, Birmingham, England.

[129] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua: Being a History of His Religious Opinions* (London: Collins Fontana, 1864; London: Longmans, Green, And Co., 1908), 266-269. Citations refer to the 1908 version. John Henry Newman, *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman,* Volume XX: *Standing firm amid Trials (July 1861 to December 1863)*, Charles Stephen Dessain, ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 391-392.

This thesis proposes to focus on three key elements of Ullathorne's use of theology to defend the Immaculate Conception as coming from the Apostles and their pastoral implications. As such, his teaching on Mary's place in the divine economy, the nature of original sin, and his account of the nature of the Immaculate Conception will receive detailed analysis in following chapters of this work. Still it is essential to trace the broad outlines of the overall structure of the book, chapter by chapter, in order to see how these three points form very important parts of the overall structure. One can place the nineteen chapters in three different groups. The first eight chapters deal principally with salvation history before the fall and Mary's place in it according to the mind of God. The next four chapters look at the mystery of the Immaculate Conception in the context of salvation history from Adam and Eve to Mary. The final seven focus primarily authoritative sources that witness to the doctrine.

The first eight chapters gave an account of how an attentive observer of salvation history can note the ways God has woven the Immaculate Conception into the fabric of salvation history. In chapter one, "The Office and Dignity of the Mother of God," Ullathorne made the case that Mary's place in the preaching of Christianity was very important. The infancy narrative in Luke's Gospel demonstrates that proclamation of Mary always accompanied proclamation of Jesus.[130] He presented John's Gospel as a response to the Ebionite error that Mary conceived Jesus in the natural way.[131] Throughout the rest of the chapter, he illustrated how a variety of early heresies about Jesus, such as Gnosticism, Arianism, Macedonianism, and Nestorianism, all involved Mary.[132] This history aimed to demonstrate that one cannot think correctly about the truths of the faith with thinking correctly about Mary.[133] This fact emboldened Ullathorne to reflect on the great dignity of the Mother of God and her special office as heavenly queen.[134] The second chapter was little more than a *catena* of quotations from

---

[130] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 1-3.

[131] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 3-4.

[132] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception,* 5-6.

[133] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 6.

[134] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 8-12.

Eastern Fathers of the Church that supported Ullathorne's claims in the previous chapter regarding Mary's dignity and office.[135]

Chapters three and four explained how it is possible that there was an exception in the transmission of original sin in Mary's case. In chapter three, he considered the "the law of preparation." In the Old Testament, there is a "striking way in which God prepares [His prophets] for their sacred offices."[136] Throughout the chapter, Ullathorne recalled precedents of ways in which God's grace met important Old Testament figures in advance of their response to grace. Thus were Melchizedek and the three angels for Abraham. Ullathorne also gave examples for Joseph, David, Jeremiah, Isaac, and Samuel. Mary had a role that was much greater than a prophet. Therefore, her purification had to be much greater. He concluded the chapter with a lengthy quotation from Saint John Damascene regarding Mary's purification in the womb. Chapter four proposed the principle that in the universe that God created, the divine will has made provisions for specific exceptions from general laws. Ullathorne proffered the example of Enoch and Elijah's exemption from the law of death as well as Abraham's apparent exemption from the law against human sacrifice in the case of his son Isaac.[137] Thus it is fitting that Mary be exempt from the law of spiritual death that comes with original sin.[138]

The next six chapters form the heart of the book's argument and will receive more extensive treatment in the next three chapters of this thesis. Chapter five introduced the law of gradation of perfection and accumulation of excellence. This law shows why in the order of creation it was most fitting that God prepared Our Lady to be Mother of God by preserving her from original sin.[139] In chapter six, he discussed what the Immaculate Conception meant, being careful to explain that it referred to the second of Mary's conceptions, her passive conception, or the infusion of her soul into her body. This conception was the subject of the dogma rather than her first or active conception, the formation of her body.[140]

---

[135] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 13-24

[136] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception,* 26.

[137] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception,* 34-36.

[138] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception,* 34-41.

[139] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 42-53.

[140] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 54-58.

Chapters seven and eight address Mary's predestination in the divine economy. Chapter seven presented Mary as predestined to be mother of the Incarnate Son. Chapter eight noted that this predestination came even before the sin of the fallen angels.[141] The way that Ullathorne constructed a narrative in which Mary's Immaculate Conception occupied a central role in salvation history provided a counterpoint of sorts to a vision of progress and enlightenment current in the modern world of Ullathorne's day.[142]

Chapters nine through twelve traced salvation history from Adam to the Immaculate Conception, continuing the same essential argument. Ullathorne described the effects of the fall of Adam and Eve for their posterity in chapter nine, which detailed the horrendous effects of original sin and the utter unfittingness that Mary would contract it even for a moment.[143] In chapter ten, oddly titled, "The Fall of Man," Ullathorne drew from Fathers of the Church to provide evidence for the Church's perennial belief in Mary's sinless conception.[144] The next chapter treated early Christian memories of Mary's parents, Joachim and Anne.[145] Ullathorne waxed poetic in chapter twelve, in which he used Old Testament typology to describe Mary's purity and holiness.[146]

Chapters thirteen to nineteen turned from exposition of what the Immaculate Conception meant to invoking authority in favor of the doctrine and its definition. All but chapter fourteen and nineteen will receive deeper attention in the coming chapters of this thesis. Chapter thirteen rehearsed the best patristic evidence for the Immaculate Conception.[147] Ullathorne did something somewhat strange for a nineteenth century Catholic bishop in chapter fourteen when he focused on Martin Luther and the Prophet Mahomet (*sic*), both of whom made statements that indicated that Mary's conception was a holy conception.[148] Chapter fifteen moved on to consider the voice of the medieval divines, in which he considered why medievals like Thomas Aquinas and Bernard of Clairvaux

---

[141] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 59-80.
[142] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 203-206.
[143] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 81-90.
[144] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 91-100.
[145] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 101-106.
[146] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 107-111.
[147] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 112-127.
[148] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception,* 128-134.

denied the Immaculate Conception.[149] In chapter sixteen Ullathorne turned to the liturgy and the belief of the common faithful, which he considered to be far better witness to the faith than the speculations of theologians.[150] The final two authorities that Ullathorne invoked were the teachings of the bishops and of the popes in chapters seventeen and eighteen.[151] Much of his conclusion summarized and recapitulated his arguments in the body of the book. In addition, Ullathorne made the case that at that precise point in the Church's history, it made sense to define a doctrine like the Immaculate Conception, since the doctrine was a kind of summary of the Christian faith because it placed a premium on divine grace and the need for one to cooperate with it. This message ran in an opposite direction of the sense of self-sufficiency that often accompanied modernity.[152] Against the new secular narratives that had become more and more prevalent in the wake of the Enlightenment and French Revolution, the Immaculate Conception told a very different story, with God's action in history rather than man's taking center stage. The next chapter will begin to unfold the fundamental lines of this drama as Ullathorne painted them.

---

[149] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception,* 135-157.
[150] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception,* 58-172.
[151] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception,* 173-191
[152] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 192-216.

Chapter 3: Mary in God's Eternal Design

When Ullathorne wrote on the Immaculate Conception, he did not do so in the academic setting of professional theologians but as a pastor. His pastoral context was that of a Catholic bishop in a predominantly non-Catholic country where Catholics were outsiders. Elements unique to the Catholic faith like the Immaculate Conception seemed to non-Catholic Christians to lack sufficient foundation in the Bible. As a pastor, Ullathorne sought to respond to these concerns by grounding his case for the Immaculate Conception through various apologetic arguments. An overarching theme for these arguments was that far from being a theological proposal of late origin, the Immaculate Conception found its roots deep within the fiber of the eternal plan that God had for the universe. In this sense, the doctrine was more ancient than the Church, indeed older than the Incarnation itself. His vision of Mary rested on two fundamental pillars—Mary's predestination in God's eternal plan and a hierarchical vision of the universe in which Mary stood, after the Blessed Trinity, at the apex. This vision had pastoral consequences when it came to Ullathorne's approach to the priesthood and the apparition of Our Lady at La Salette.

3.1 A Dionysian Outlook

The work of Pseudo-Dionsyius the Aeropagite exercised significant influence on Ullathorne's conception of the spiritual life. The Aeropagite's writings present themselves as being the work of a disciple of the Apostle Paul identified in Acts 17:34. Much of the authority that Dionysius enjoyed through the centuries came from the belief that they were very ancient Christian writings. The advent of textual criticism in the Renaissance raised serious questions about its authorship.

Scholarship published after Ullathorne's death in 1895 established definitively that the Areopagite's corpus could not have possibly come from the pen of a first-century martyr because it drew extensively from fifth-century sources.[153]

Ullathorne leaned toward believing Dionysius to be a first-century writer. Butler's assertion that Ullathorne's "critical historical sense" led Ullathorne to doubt their first-century provenance overstated Butler's case. Butler argued that Ullathorne's use of the phrase "the works attributed to St Denys" to describe the Aeropagite corpus and wrote that "it was a surprise" to Ullathorne that his friend Dom Propser Guéranger maintained the sub-apostolic authenticity of these works.[154] In the index of the 1904 posthumous revision of *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God*, the entry for St Denys added "the Areopagite, converted by St Paul, bp of Athens, m[artyred]. 95."[155] It is unclear as to whether this revision came from Ullathorne or the editor. At the very least, the person who compiled the index thought that Ullathorne considered the Aeropagite a first-century personage. In his *Autobiography*, Ullathorne made it a point when describing Dom Propser Guéranger's deep knowledge of Church history and the Fathers of the Church to observe that the French monk maintained that Dionysius was a disciple of the Apostle Paul and that Guéranger intended to write a book defending this position. One looks in vain in Ullathorne's words for any note of surprise regarding Guéranger's position.[156] On the contrary, it is not likely that Ullathorne would have mentioned Guéranger advocating something that Ullathorne himself thought doubtful while simultaneously heaping praise on Guéranger's prowess as an historian. The best evidence indicates that Ullathorne inclined toward the Aeropagite having lived in the first century.

---

[153] F.X. Murphy, "Pseudo-Dionysius," *The New Catholic Encyclopedia, 2ⁿᵈ ed.*, vol. 11 (Detroit: Gale, 2003), 800-801.

[154] Butler, *Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne*, 1, 23.

[155] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 218.

[156] "At Chalones-sur-Saône I met the celebrated Abbot Guéranger on the steamer…I found the Abbot well versed in the Fathers and Church history…He maintained the authenticity of the works ascribed to St. Dionysius, and spoke of writing on the subject…[his work on the Roman Breviary] prevented [the work on Dionysius] being ever completed. Ullathorne, *Autobiography*, 122-123.

Regardless of what Ullathorne believed about the authorship of these writings, it is undeniable that they shaped his mind considerably by creating a hierarchical vision for spiritual realities. His own words explain the impact that this early Christian writer had:

> [A] book the study of which formed a real epoch in the history of my mind was a collection of the works attributed to St. Denys the Areopagite, which I read when a deacon at Ampleforth. Here I found Theology in its purest form divested of controversy, and written as if by a spirit with a pen of light; explaining also, with wonderful lucidity, both the celestial and the ecclesiastical hierarchies.[157]

The conception of hierarchy that Ullathorne identifies is Pseudo-Dionysius' particular gift to the theological tradition. Scholars point to the Aeropagite as the first one to use the word "hierarchy" (Gk. *hierarchia*).[158] While new words do not necessarily create entirely new concepts, the vision of the hierarchical ordering of the Church and the angelic hosts that Dionysius provided was a significant development in the theological tradition. The word gave Christians a new conceptual hook of sorts.

One must first acknowledge that the Aeropagite did not go into detail about the Blessed Virgin's place in either the ecclesiastical or celestial hierarchies. Mary did not occupy a significant place in Dionysius' hierarchies, as her total absence in the schematic of a recent scholar indicates.[159] This lack has not stopped theologians heavily influenced by Dionysius from doing so. One notable example of this creative appropriation was Pierre Bérulle (1575-1629), one of the fountainheads of the French school of spirituality. The French school of spirituality began in seventeenth-century France and was a living influence in the universal Church into the beginning of the twentieth century,

---

[157] Ullathorne, *Autobiography,* 48.

[158] Adam Cooper, "Hierarchy, Humility, and Holiness: The Meaning of Ecclesial Ranks according to Dionysius the Areopagite," *Nova et Vetera,* 11, No. 3 (2013)*:* 649.

[159] Timothy Knepper "Ranks are Not Bypassed, Rituals are not Negated: The Dionysian Corpus on Return," *Modern Theology* 30, no. 1 (Jan 2014): 69.

including such luminaries as Saint Francis de Sales, Jean-Jacques Olier (1608-1657), and Saint Louis de Montfort (1673-1716).[160] Bérulle's understanding of the spiritual life in terms of a gradual ascent to God under grace led him to propose a vow of slavery to Mary before a vow of slavery to Jesus.[161] The French school had a profound impact on English Catholicism through Saint Francis de Sales and his spirituality that enjoyed tremendous popularity in England.[162]

Ullathorne used the Dionysian vision to provide a canvas on which he could depict Mary's unique place. Drawing from the Aeropagite without quoting him, Ullathorne unfolded a hierarchical vision for the universe by declaring that "God has ordered His creation on a most wonderful scale of ascension."[163] With a view to the Incarnation, this hierarchy included members of the human race.[164] Jesus sums up the excellences of the human race.[165] Ullathorne taught that Mary stands close to her Son in this hierarchy, embodying the "supreme excellence of woman as the type and head of womanhood." She does so in a singular way because she is like unto God insofar as she is Jesus' parent like the Father and the spouse of the Holy Spirit.[166]

Ullathorne found this spiritual superstructure in Scripture. Following Saint Paul in 1 Corinthians 12, Ullathorne noted that under the headship of Christ there were diverse roles and

---

[160] William Thompson, "An Introduction to the French School," in William Thompson, ed*., Berulle and the French School: Selected Writing* (Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1989), 3-96.

[161] "Bérulle was already disposed to this dependency by his adoption of Dionysius' theory of hierarchic mediation. Bérulle united the two ideas, stemming from the confraternities and Dionysius, and spoke of Mary's choir or court. From her court, her devotees moved to the Court of Jesus. In this atmosphere of dependence of consecrated persons on Jesus and Mary his vow of servitude to Mary should take place first; the vow to Jesus and Mary took root. Logically, the vow of servitude to Mary should take place first; the vow to Jesus should come after. In fact Bérulle introduced the two vows about the same time; the first; the first consecration or vow of service was to Mary and then a vow of service to Jesus, to respect the due hierarchy in accord with Dionysian categories." Vincent Vasey, "Mary in the Doctrine of Bérulle on the Mysteries of Christ," *Marian Studies* 36 (1985): 63.

[162] Mary Hardy, "The seventeenth-century English and Scottish reception of Francis de Sales' *An Introduction to a Devout Life*," *British Catholic History* 33, no. 2 (2016): 228-258.

[163] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception,* 42.

[164] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception,* 47.

[165] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 48.

[166] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 49.

positions in the Christ's body, the Church. The greatest of these roles is Mother of God.[167] Due to her special place in the Church, Mary was even higher than the angels. Ullathorne found scriptural justification for this Mariological commonplace in Hebrews 1:5. The first chapter of the Letter to the Hebrews seeks to establish that Jesus is higher than the angels by asking, "For to which of the angels hath he said at any time, Thou art my Son, today have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?" Ullathorne applied this verse to Mary by questioning, "[f]or what seraph can say to his Lord and Head, 'Thou art my Son?"[168] For Ullathorne, the exceptional nuptial-like relationship that Mary had with God the Father in order to accomplish the Incarnation of the Son mirrors Esther's with the Persian King in the Book of Esther. Her unique role as Queen enabled her to be exempt from the royal decree that anyone who entered the king's presence unbidden would face death. Just so, because Mary stands at the apex of the created order, the rule of the transmission of original sin does not apply to her as it does to everyone else through what Ullathorne called, "the law of exception."[169]

3.2 The Primacy of the Incarnation and therefore Mary

Another step in giving an account of Ullathorne's theological arguments for the Immaculate Conception will entail explicating his position on the primary motivation for the Incarnation. The point in question here is whether or not one best understands the Incarnation as intended primarily as a means of sharing in the life of the Blessed Trinity with the human race or as a remedy for sin. Saint Thomas Aquinas held the second position. Blessed John Duns Scotus held the first. It is possible to characterize Scotus' position with the counterfactual statement,

---

[167] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 49.
[168] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 50.
[169] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 37-38.

"the Incarnation would have taken place had Adam and Eve not sinned." When stated in this way, the theory can seem like pedantic, scholastic hair-splitting. Properly understood, however, the theory is not a counterfactual but rather a reflection on the ordered logic of the *Logos* taking a human nature.[170] This theory is an alternative to Thomas Aquinas' position that as far as one can know from the scriptural witness, the Word became flesh in order to save the human race as a consequence of the sin of Adam and Eve. It is important to acknowledge that Thomas recognized the divinizing end for the Incarnation as well.[171] Obviously, Aquinas and Scotus were not the only two to hold these positions, but they point to different ways of approaching the question. For the sake of simplicity, this thesis will refer to these two different theories as the Thomistic thesis and the Scotistic thesis. Scholars have listed Ullathorne as siding with the Scotus' thesis.[172]

In chapter eight, which treated the fall of the angels, Ullathorne explained that the angels who fell sinned by failing to adore an anticipated vision of the Incarnation of Christ by the Blessed Virgin Mary depicted in the first part of the twelfth chapter of the Book of Revelation. For Ullathorne, "the 'primacy' of the God incarnate and His glorious reign over angels as over men" had its foundation not in the teaching of a particular scholastic, but rather on Sacred Scripture.[173] In this discussion of the primacy of Jesus Christ in the mystery of the eternal divine plan, Ullathorne cited Saint Thomas Aquinas only once, and that citation was not directly on point.[174] His presentation emphasized the point that "great theologians of very different schools, such as Scotus, John of St Thomas, the celebrated Dominican, and Suarez, and other

---

[170] Dominic Unger, "Franciscan Christology: Absolute and Universal Primacy of Christ," *Franciscan Studies* 22, no. 4 (1942): 428-475.

[171] Cf. Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo* (London: John Henry and James Parker, 1865). Cf. also *Summa Theologiae,* III, Q. 1, Art. 3. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae, Tertia Pars, 1-61, Latin-English Opera Omnia,* trans. Lawrence Shapcote (Lander: Aquinas Institute, 2012), 8-10.

[172] Carol, *Why Jesus Christ?: Thomistic, Scotistic and Conciliatory Perspectives* (Manassas: Trinity Communications*,* 1986), 389; Trent Pomplun, "The Theology of Gerard Manley Hopkins: From John Duns Scotus to the Baroque," *The Journal of Religion* 95, no. 1 (Jan 2015): 5-6.

[173] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 64.

[174] Ullathorne cited *Summa Theologiae,* I, q. 57, art. 5 ad. 3 about the manner through which the angels know the mysteries of grace. Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 64.

divines" all held to a critical tenet of the Scotistic thesis that Satan fell as a result of refusing to worship the Son of God incarnate of the Virgin Mary as revealed to the prince of darkness during his initial test of faithfulness to the Almighty.[175]

In Ullathorne's *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God*, Ephesians 1:3-10 and Colossians 1:15-20 received a typically Scotist reading. He turned to Colossians to support his claim that the Incarnation was predestined even before the fall when he wrote that "at the head of the book of the eternal counsel, stands decreed the Incarnation of the Son of God."[176] In the same breath, he unfolded the latent Marian valences embedded in the logic of this passage by drawing the conclusion that "Mary stands next to Jesus in the divine decree as the chosen medium of the Incarnation."[177] He invoked Ephesians in order to support Mary's pre-election as the mother of God as part of an eternal divine decree to adopt the entire human race in the Incarnate Christ.[178]

Ullathorne interpreted Revelation 12:1-9 as being indicative of an eternal plan for the Incarnation before the sin of Adam and Eve. In order to throw more light on exactly what Ullathorne meant when he briefly alluded to the Scotistic thesis in *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God*, it will be helpful to look at how he presented the theme in his long work on theological anthropology, *The Endowments of Man Considered,* in order to form a more comprehensive vision of his presuppositions that lie in the background of his argument in *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God.* In Ullathorne's reading, the vision of the woman clothed with the Sun of the book of Revelation is, in addition to describing the "historical Incarnation as well as the perpetual combat between Christ in His Church and Satan in the world," also "a literal description of the fall of the angels, following immediately upon the revelation of the Woman giving birth to the Child."[179] It is worth noting that

---

[175] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 67.

[176] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 60.

[177] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 60.

[178] "And, if thus He chose His adopted children in Christ, ere the world was constituted, first and before them all He chose and decreed the existence and the graces of that Mother through whom the Son should come to bring this grace." Ullathorne*, Immaculate Conception,* 61.

[179] Ullathorne, *The Endowments of Man Considered*, 292.

this Marian reading of Revelation 12 was somewhat at odds with a popular English Catholic Bible commentary by George Haydock that explained that the woman of Revelation 12 referred to the Church and could only be applied to Our Lady, "by allusion."[180] After creating the angels, but before He created man, God revealed to all of his angels the mission for which He created them—namely to adore Jesus and serve His adopted brothers and sisters. Satan and one-third of the angel host deemed this mission below their dignity as pure spirits with intellects far superior to the human intellect, which acquires knowledge through the five senses. They rebelled against God. Saint Michael and the faithful angels drove them out from heaven for their disobedience.[181]

Having been expelled from heaven on account of their sin, the devil and his angels then set out to ruin the human race, according to Ullathorne. He did not go so far as to say that the devil mistook Eve for the woman clothed with the sun who was the Mother of God. Mary was not the object of the devil's attack. The motive for Satan's counter-attack against God directed at the human race was simply hatred of God's image in man. This strike came as soon as possible against the first human persons out of pure malice for the plan that God had revealed to make humans His adopted children. The attack initially had its desired effect. Through the sin of Adam and Eve, the human race became "justly subject to Satan."[182]

Despite the disastrous effects of the fall, Ullathorne already saw in the devil's trickery an opening for redemption. As an angel, the devil possessed superior intellectual endowments when compared to human beings. He exploited his superior gifts to deceive Adam and Eve. Due to the deceit that Satan employed, his dominion over humanity was not entirely iron clad. Not only was the devil's prerogative over humanity on shaky ground because of the way in which he attained it, the relationship between God and man remained reparable in itself. This relationship was reparable because "it is not becoming" that God's plan should be defeated

---

[180] George Haydock and F. C. Husenbeth, eds., *The Holy Bible: translated from the Latin Vulgate, diligently compared with the Hebrew, Greek, and other editions in divers languages* (New York, Edward Dunigan and Brother, 1855), 1641.

[181] Ullathorne, *The Endowments of Man Considered*, 292.

[182] Ullathorne, *The Endowments of Man Considered,* 303.

"through the machinations of an adversary when he had been cast out of heaven for his crimes."[183] The real target of the devil's rebellion was not man but God, and Ullathorne maintained that it would be beneath God's dignity to allow the original angelic rebel's sin to frustrate entirely His plan to divinize human persons. Insofar as the sin of Adam and Eve was collateral damage from an attack ultimately aimed at the king, it was fitting that the king should intervene on behalf of those wounded by His enemies. Unlike the sin of the angels, which did not stem from any outside negative influence, original sin came not from within, but from outside of man. Thus, Ullathorne concluded that there is not redemption for the fallen angels but that there is for man.[184] Adam and Eve's sin was less direct and malicious than that of the angels and therefore left room for restoration of the human race in a way that is consistent with God's nature.

This conclusion led Ullathorne to hold for Mary's pre-existence in the mind of God. This pre-existence is not personal in the sense that Mary existed as a human person with an intellect and will before the creation of the universe. Rather, Ullathorne affirmed in his tome on the Immaculate Conception that "[f]rom eternity, then, does God contemplate Jesus as the Son of Mary."[185] Mary existed in the order of divine intention as the Mother of God independent of the contingent event of the fall. Ullathorne went so far as to attribute agency to Mary before even the creation of the human race, although this language is analogical. She who has crushed all false doctrines even defeated Satan's fundamental heresy, the denial of the sovereignty of the divine will, before she came into existence.

The idea of pre-existence goes hand-in-hand for Ullathorne with Mary's joint headship of the human race with Jesus Christ. Both of these bear an affinity to the Scotist school of Mariology.[186] For the bishop, the Virgin "stands forth next to her Divine Son, as the second of creatures in the eternal counsel of God." Just as Christ

---

[183] Ullathorne, *The Endowments of Man Considered*, 296.

[184] Ullathorne, *The Endowments of Man Considered,* 296-.297.

[185] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 62.

[186] Ruggero Rosini, *Mariology of Blessed John Duns Scotus*, ed. Peter Fehlner, trans. Franciscans of the Immaculate (New Bedford: Academy of the Immaculate, 2008), 13-25, 202-206.

is the New Adam, Mary is the New Eve, placed "at the head of women" and "sum[ming] up within her person, eminently and surpassingly, the several excellences to be found in every order of female excellence."[187] Mary's joint headship with her Son over the human race is from grace rather than by nature. Even so, the fact that this headship holds a place in the eternal plan of God and was not contingent on the original sin is definitely noteworthy because it illustrates the powerful conceptual consequences inherent in Ullathorne's interpretation of the Scotistic thesis on the primacy of Jesus and Mary in the eternal divine decree.

3.3 Diverse Strands

Despite teaching the Scotistic thesis on the primary motivation for the Incarnation, Ullathorne did not follow all of the points of emphasis in Scotistic Mariology, especially as taught by Duns Scotus. Two central concepts in this school of Mariology are the predestination of Mary to glory as a foundational Marian principle and the absence of a *debitum peccati*, or debt of sin, for Our Lady. The *debitum peccati* is a theological postulate that because Mary took descent from Adam and Eve, she was bound to contract original sin. According to Fehlner, Franciscan authors refer to the first, the predestination to glory, as the fundamental principle of Scotist Mariology that shapes every other Marian theme in that school. Everything that one says about Mary flows from her eternal predestination, independent of the fall, to be the Mother of God.[188] As regards the *debitum,* Scotists deny that Mary contracted any obligation in the order of fallen nature to contract original sin.[189]

By way of contrast, a typical Thomist approach to Mariology views the divine maternity as the fundamental principle for Mariology and holds firmly to the idea that Mary had a debt as

---

[187] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 48.

[188] Peter Fehlner, "The Franciscan Mariological School and the Co-redemptive Movement," *Marian Studies* 59 (2008): 59-60.

[189] "[W]hen Scotus mentions such [a *debitum*] in connection with Adam and his offspring, it is in terms of an obligation to preserve original justice." Fehlner, "Appendix," in Rosini, *Mariology of Blessed John Duns Scotus,* 256.

a result of the fall that implicated her in contracting original sin, apart from God's special intervention. Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, a scion of the nineteenth-century Thomist revival, explained that according to Thomistic principles, the divine maternity occupies conceptual centrality in the field of Mariology.[190] Garrigou-Lagrange made explicit that God foresaw the divine maternity as a necessity in the divine economy but only as the logical consequence of the fall.[191] With respect to the *debitum peccati*, this position gave Thomists a place to retreat without abandoning the field entirely to the Scotists: Thomas might have been wrong about the Immaculate Conception but one could rescue his Mariology and maintain it within the larger Thomist architectonic structure by arguing that what Thomas claimed about original sin applies, *mutans mutandis,* to the *debitum peccati.[192]*

In fact, Ullathorne drew from non-Franciscan principles on the *debitum peccati* and the centrality of the divine maternity. When it came to the centrality of the divine maternity in Mariology, Ullathorne saw it as the key that explained Mary's fullness of grace. He observed that "as St. Thomas says, through the operation of her maternity, [Mary] touches more nearly on the confines of divinity" and this fact explains how the grace that she received is qualitatively different from the other saints.[193] Ullathorne held this position conscious of a potential scriptural objection. Did not Jesus correct the woman who declared Mary blessed because she was His mother by pointing out that hearing the word of God and keeping it was far more blessed (cf. Lk. 11:27-28)? Ullathorne's reply indicated concordance with Saint Thomas' emphasis on the divine maternity. Mary's obedience that made the divine maternity possible made her far more blessed.[194] With respect to the *debitum peccati*, Ullathorne

---

[190] Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, *The Mother of the Saviour and Our Interior Life*, trans. Bernard Kelly (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1949), 20.

[191] Garrigou-Lagrange, *The Mother of the Saviour*, 20-21.

[192] "Mary though she might be unstained was nevertheless, in the perspective of engracement, 'in debt'…that debt or non-orderedness to grace…is the fulcrum on which a Neo-Thomist theology of the immaculate conception can turn [sic]." Aidan Nichols, *There is No Rose* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015), 63.

[193] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 9.

[194] "She was blessed that she had borne Him; but she was far more blessed that she had received and obeyed that Word by which she had deserved to bear Him." Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 11.

did not avert specifically to the term, but rather employed language strongly evocative of it when he sought to explain the Scotist position of preservative redemption in Thomistic terms—speaking of this redemption as paying "the debt that it may not be incurred."[195] For Ullathorne, Mary had this debt, a *debitum peccati*—an obligation as a member of the post-lapsarian order to contact original sin as a child of Adam and Eve.

3.4 Antecedent Influences

What in Ullathorne's reading would have led to him proposing the primacy of Jesus and Mary as if it were common doctrine? There is little reason to believe that Ullathorne engaged the scholastic debate on this point directly. He admits that in the 1830s at Downside he read Aquinas only superficially and through second-hand references. So little was his direct exposure to the Angelic Doctor that he described Thomas' works as "a closed book." Neither did Ullathorne give evidence of direct engagement with the thought of Duns Scotus. Ullathorne did not even as much as mention studying Scotism when writing about his studies in preparation for priestly ordination. Collins' research and Ullathorne's own memoir provide a long list of theologians and spiritual writers that influenced his thought.[196] Examination of these sources will shed light on likely inspirations for Ullathorne's approach on the primary motive for the Incarnation.

Ullathorne's reading during his time at Downside illustrates that he had familiarity with both the Scotistic thesis as well as its Thomist alternative, even if he did not directly engage the scholastic sources. As noted above, major theological influences on Ullathorne included Saint Francis de Sales, Honore Tournelly, Jacques Bossuet, Saint Bernard of Clairvaux, Saint Alphonsus Ligouri, Dionysius Pétau, Saint Augustine, Pseudo-

---

[195] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 89.
[196] Collins, "William Bernard Ullathorne," 33-53; Ullathorne, *The Autobiography of Archbishop Ullathorne*, 34-48.

Dionysius, and Richard Challoner.[197] Of these names, Juniper Carol included all but the last two in his work, *Why Jesus Christ?,* which detailed the positions of over one thousand theologians from the Fathers of the Church to the twentieth century on the question of the primary motivation of the Incarnation. According to Carol, only one of the theologians that Ullathorne named as major influences adhered firmly to the Scotistic thesis—Saint Francis de Sales.[198] Review of the theologians that Ullathorne listed as formative of his theological mind reveals clearly that he knew of the existence of the two different alternatives on the question of the primary motivation of the Incarnation.

Francis de Sales had a formative influence on Ullathorne's personal spirituality. Immediately after his conversion experience in Memel on the Baltic, Ullathorne began reading a biography of Saint Francis de Sales.[199] Scholarship on English Catholic recusancy has noted the profoundly Salesian character of the spirituality in the Catholic Church in England from the seventeenth century until the first years of Ullathorne's priesthood, which means that Ullathorne's interest in Salesianism was hardly unique in an English setting.[200] A chief conduit through which Salesianism flowed into England was the eighteenth-century English Vicar Apostolic, Bishop Richard Challoner. In Francis De Sales' spiritual doctrine, Challoner found a practical spirituality readily adaptable to the lives both of the lay person in the non-Catholic world and the solitary priest immersed in the mission field.[201]

Francis de Sales held firmly to the Scotistic thesis. In the context of the dour pessimism regarding the effect of the fall on human nature propagated by Jansenism, Francis held to a more optimistic vision of post-lasparian man as radically capable of

---

[197] Ullathorne, *The Autobiography of Archbishop Ullathorne*, 34-48.

[198] Carol, *Why Jesus Christ?* 24-25, 73, 80, 88, 94, 154, 253, 335, 383, 386.

[199] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne*, 15. The specific biography that he read was M. de Marsollier, *The Life of Saint Frances de Sales: Bishop of Geneva, Founder of the Order of the Visitation,* 2 vols., trans. William Henry Coombes (Shepton-Mallet: W.J. Quartley, 1812).

[200] Judith Champ, "English Recusant Spirituality," in Maurice Couve de Murville, ed., *The Unsealed Fountain: Essays on the Christian Tradition* (Oscott: Veritas, 1987), 98. Mary Hardy, "The seventeenth-century English and Scottish reception of Francis de Sales' *An Introduction to a Devout Life*," British Catholic History 33, no. 2 (2016): 228-258.

[201] Eamon Duffy, "Richard Challoner and the English Salesian tradition," *The Clergy Review* 66 (Dec 1981).

receiving grace. The Catholic Genevan doctor held to the Franciscan thesis as a means of focusing on the great dignity for which God created man in His original plan.[202] Two of the most important places where Francis articulated the Franciscan thesis were in his *Treatise on the Love of the God* and his last Christmas sermon. In his *Treatise*, de Sales explained that "[a]ll God's works are ordained to the salvation of men and angels."[203203] In his last Christmas sermon, delivered on Christmas 1622, he declared that "the heavenly Father planned the creation of this world for the Incarnation of His Son. The end of His work was also the beginning."[204204] The Scotistic thesis sounded as the "essential note of St. Francis de Sales' teaching on Mary."[205205] While none of these facts prove definitively that de Sales had decisive influence on Ullathorne's adherence to the Scotistic thesis, it is beyond doubt that a very popular spiritual writer well known by Ullathorne presented the Scotistic thesis to an English audience. By a process of elimination, the most likely remaining candidate for Ullathorne's adoption of a variation on the Scotistic thesis is Francis de Sales.

3.5 Pastoral Implications

Ullathorne's overall vision of Mary's cosmic position in the universe and in the order of willing in the divine economy did not remain hermetically sealed in his book on the Immaculate Conception but rather found its way into Ullathorne's practical pastoral vision as a bishop. Ullathorne's Marian teaching interlocked with his teaching on the priesthood, which was a major preoccupation of his career as a bishop. Moreover, Ullathorne put

---

[202] Eunan McDonnell, *The Concept of Freedom in the Writings of St. Francis De Sales* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2009), 261-275.

[203] Francis de Sales, *Treatise on the Love of God,* trans. Henry Mackey (New York: P. O'Shea, 1861; Blacksburg: Wilder Publications, 2011), 83. Citations refer to the 2011 edition.

[204] Francis de Sales, *The Sermons of St. Francis de Sales for Advent and Christmas,* vol. 4, trans. Nuns of Visitation, ed. Lewis Fiorelli (*Oeuvers,* vols. 8-10, Annecy: Niérat: 1892-1964; abr. ed., Rockford: Tan, 1987), 83. All citations are from the abridged 1987 edition.

[205] Edward Carney, *The Mariology of St. Francis de Sales* (Westminster: Newman Bookshop, 1963), 15.

to pastoral use his placement of the humble maiden of Nazareth at the summit of the eternally-willed blueprint for the structure of the universe in his defense of the controversial apparitions at La Salette. There was a conceptual correlation between Ullathorne's foray into popular theology and some of his pastoral actions as Bishop of Birmingham.

Ullathorne identified a parallel between the manner in which the Virgin brought Christ into the world and how the priest makes Christ present sacramentally. The ministrations of the priest do not only render actual the paschal mystery in the life of the Church, for Ullathorne they also "are reflections of what is accomplished in heaven."[206] Here he refers to the eternal "operations" of the Trinity, namely, generation, being generated, as well as passive and active spiration.[207] In the Incarnation, Mary cooperated with the Trinity in all its eternal operations in an analogical way. Like the Father, she is parent and receives the love of the Son immersed in the Spirit. The priest does the same in his priestly ministry by generating Christ in the soul.[208] Ullathorne drew these comparisons from the spirituality of the French school, acknowledging his debt to Bérulle in a footnote.[209] This point illustrates the extent to which the hierarchical order in which Mary stood at the summit related to Ullathorne's practical approach to leading his diocese day-to-day.

His promotion of the apparition at La Salette provided another concrete pastoral action in which Ullathorne applied this Marian *gestalt.* On September 19, 1846, two young French children claimed to see the Mother of God and to receive a lengthy message from her while they were keeping watch over cows. The message foretold that if the people did not stop breaking the second and third commandments, there were would be a terrible famine. Afterwards, episcopal investigation judged the apparition credible. The fact that many of the crops failed throughout Europe in the coming years,

---

[206] William Bernard Ullathorne, *Ecclesiastical Discourses: Delivered on Special Occasions* (London: Burns and Oats,
1876), 269.
[207] Ullathorne, *Ecclesiastical Discourses*, 268-269.
[208] This is the mystery of sanctification. What God does eternally in heaven, and what Mary did on earth, that the pastors of the Church through the Holy Spirit operates in souls." Ullathorne, *Ecclesiastical Discourses*, 269.
[209] Ullathorne, *Ecclesiastical Discourses,* 270.

explains why the La Salette apparition enjoyed popularity in the years immediately following it, both as a place of pilgrimage and for its message.[210]

For all its popularity, La Salette was not immune from opposition. The children themselves did not go on to live exemplary lives. Theologically speaking, the message of Our Lady presented some difficulties. The visionaries painted a picture of a relationship between Mary and Jesus wherein she restrained His heavy arm of wrath. Mary spoke in the first person in ways that suggested that she was the offended party in sins against the second and third commandments.[211] Moreover, opponents of the apparition, some of whom were believing Catholics, made a vigorous case based on legal documentation that the children had mistaken for the Mother of God an unbalanced local woman who was formerly a nun.[212]

Despite this controversy, Ullathorne supported the apparition and its message. In 1854, he made a pilgrimage to La Salette. This pilgrimage gave Ullathorne an opportunity for a respite from the most pressing aspects of his episcopal duties.[213] His travelogue, punctuated by some spiritual reflections, became a book.[214] When secular journals and even a Catholic periodical called the apparition into question, Ullathorne mounted a vigorous written response to these objections in a series of letters to a prominent English Catholic periodical, the *Tablet*.[215] Even after the apparitions at Lourdes in 1858 overshadowed La Salette in terms of population, Ullathorne remained a devotee of La Salette.[216]

Ullathorne's use of the theology to justify the coherence of the message of La Salette drew from the same understanding of Mary's role in the heavenly court as he articulated in *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God.* Besides questions regarding the facts surrounding the apparition and the visionaries, one of the biggest difficulties with the La Salette apparition is the apparent incongruity between Mary, the humble maiden of Nazareth

---

[210] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne*, 220.
[211] Graef, *Mary*, 356-359.
[212] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne,* 222-223.
[213] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne*, 220.
[214] Ullathorne, *The Holy Mountain of La Salette.*
[215] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne,* 222.
[216] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne*, 223.

depicted in the Gospels, and the heavenly Queen the visionaries described. When addressing objections such as these, Ullathorne justified Mary's exalted position by drawing attention to the fact that Mary is unique among all of the saints because she alone is the mother of all Christians. He punctuated this point by quoting Jesus' own words from the Cross in Saint John's Gospel.[217] La Salette was nothing more than an exercise of Mary's spiritual motherhood.

For Ullathorne the prophetic tone that Mary took by speaking in God's own name made sense considering her place in the created order. Our Lady's role at La Salette was that of a kind of special envoy to speak on behalf of a great king. He explained that:

> As a king exercises his powers through ministries in many grades and orders, gives them power of interceding with him, and makes them the channels of his favour in the degree in which they approach him, and exalts thereby his majesty and power, and gives them a resemblance to Him, not only as He is holy, but also as He is mighty. They are seated on the thrones of His power. But at the right hand of Jesus, Queen of angels, and of saints, is Mary, the fairest, the purest, and the most holy of that mighty host.[218]

Since Mary stood as the created being closest to God, it was especially fitting that God send her as His messenger. When Mary spoke in the first person, she did so as a heavenly queen speaking on behalf of the Great King. While there remained an immense difference between God and Mary, her place in the universe's hierarchical order made her the most exalted created emissary the God could send. Mary's place in the hierarchy of the universe played a key role in holding together the recapitulation of the Christian narrative by means of an account of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception that Ullathorne told. He called into service the cosmic vision of Pseudo-Dionysius and placed Mary at the apex

---

[217] "The saints are our brothers and our sisters, and they love us well, and pray for us much; but they have not the Mother's love for us. Jesus gave thee those maternal rights to exercise for us; Jesus gave us those claims to look as children up to thee, when, with those dying words He said to that one beloved child who stood there for us all: 'Son, *behold thy Mother.*" Ullathorne, *The Holy Mountain of La Salette,* 167.
[218] Ullathorne, *The Holy Mountain of La Salette*, 169.

of the celestial hierarchy. The Scotistic thesis that Mary's predestination to be mother of God is prior to the fall in God's order of intention gave him another narrative device to unfold a story wherein Mary stood as an emblem of God's eternal plan for the human race. Ullathorne applied these foundations of Mary's centrality in the divine plan to pastoral life, finding Marian echoes in the priesthood. He also used a Dionysian-Scotist synthesis of Mary's place in the cosmic order to defend controverted aspects of the Marian apparition at La Salette. How Ullathorne translated these foundations into theological practice when it came to the Immaculate Conception will be the subject of the next two chapters.

Chapter 4—Ullathorne, Original Sin, and Mary's Conception

The dogma of the Immaculate Conception defined that God had preserved Mary immune from original sin. How one understands original sin will dictate the meaning of this privilege. Like many scholastics, Ullathorne held to a theory of progressive ensoulment in order to explain original sin's transmission. When writing on original sin in *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God,* Ullathorne held to a neo-Augustinian, pre-Anselmian understanding of original sin and its transmission. Although there were some advocates of an understanding of original sin similar to Ullathorne who were immaculists, Ullathorne's approach—that corrupted flesh defiled the soul—did not align well with the Anselmian-Thomistic scholastic theories that smoothed the conceptual way for the definition of the doctrine. These scholastic theories viewed original sin as a lack of relationship in the soul. This difficulty forced Ullathorne to posit a divine pre-purification of Mary's body before the immaculate infusion of her soul. Ullathorne's understanding of original sin provided the rationale for him to correct Newman's articulation of original sin in his *Letter to Pusey* as well as the *Rambler* on the same point.

4.1 Original Sin in the Tradition

The first very clear articulation of the doctrine of original came with Saint Augustine of Hippo. Augustine gave definitive shape to the doctrine when he found himself embroiled in controversy with the British monk, Pelagius. Augustine claimed that Pelagius placed too great a priority on the power of the human will in the spiritual life and gave divine grace too small a role. One of the key Scripture passages to which Augustine appealed in this polemic was the fifth chapter of Saint Paul's Letter to the Romans. In Romans 5:12, the Latin version that Augustine employed read "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into this world, and by sin

death; and so death passed upon all men, *in whom* [i.e., Adam, Lat. *in quo*] all have sinned."[219] For Augustine, all human persons were in some way in Adam when he sinned and are therefore implicated in his guilt. The result of sharing in this guilt was the universal extension of sin and death in the human race.[220] Scholastic theologians generally followed Augustine in the position that the penalty of original sin consists not only of a deprivation of supernatural grace or friendship with God but also the wounded nature itself, both body and soul.[221]

Although Augustine made a definitive contribution to the crystallization of the doctrine of the original sin, refinement of theological vocabulary on this point did not cease with him, but continued in subsequent centuries. For this reason, in the Middle Ages, one can speak of a neo-Augustinian approach to the doctrine of original sin that flowed from the initial insights of Augustine without necessarily trying to integrate all of the Doctor of Grace's diverse corpus. Peter Lombard provided one good example of this tradition in his classical medieval textbook on theology, the *Four Books of Sentences.* In it, Lombard described the manner of transmission of original sin in terms of a pure fluid being placed in a dirty vessel. In this analogy, the soul would correspond to the pure fluid and the body, tainted by original sin, would correspond to the dirty vessel.[222] God creates the soul pure, the parents provide a corrupt body through human generation. The corrupted flesh taints the soul.

---

[219] Italics mine. The English translation is from the Challoner revision of the Douay-Rheims, which was not only the official English Catholic version of the Bible in Ullathorne's day but also was direct translation of the underlying Latin from which Augustine drew (even if Augustine drew on a pre-Vulgate Latin translation). The original Greek of the boldface is "*eph' ho*" which is most frequently rendered as "because" (NRSV, NIV, JB, NJB) or something like "and so" or "inasmuch" (RSV, NABRE, ESV) in translations from the original,

[220] Paul Rigby, "Original Sin," in *Augustine through the Ages: An Encyclopedia,* ed. Allan Fitzgerald (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 607-614.

[221] "The consequences of original sin are, following Luke 10:30, summarized by the scholastic theologians, in the axiom: By Adam's sin man is deprived of the supernatural gifts and wounded in his nature (*spoliatus gratuitis, vulneratus in naturalibus*)." Ludwig Ott, *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, ed. James Bastible and Robert Fastiggi, trans. Patrick Lynch (London: Baronius Press, 2018), 123.

[222] Carlo Balic, "The Mediaeval Controversy over the Immaculate Conception," in O'Connor, *Dogma of the Immaculate Conception*, 166.

Another important exponent of the neo-Augustinian tradition that Ullathorne followed on this point was Saint Bernard of Clairvaux. Unlike the theologian Lombard, Bernard approached the issue as a spiritual writer, which meant that he did not address original sin systematically but rather occasionally when treating the dynamics of the spiritual life more generally. It is possible, however, to glean from Bernard's description of the interactions between the body and soul a sense of his position on original sin. One of the verses to which Bernard frequently appealed to describe the interaction between body and soul was Wisdom 9:15, "for the corruptible body is a load upon the soul, and the earthly habitation presseth down the mind that museth upon many things."[223] Bernard invoked this passage no less than a dozen times in his corpus in order to describe the manner in which the concupiscence of the body leads the soul astray.[224] Using this rationale, it is easy to understand the position from which Bernard wrote his letter to the Canons of the Lyons, chiding them for their celebration of the Immaculate Conception. Bernard asked "how could there not be sin when concupiscence was not wanting" in Mary because she had inherited corrupt flesh that remained so until the grace of God sanctified her in the womb of Saint Anne.[225]

When it came to the nexus between the doctrine of original sin and the Immaculate Conception, Saint Anselm gave a key reorientation that opened a way forward for the definition of the doctrine. He laid the foundations for a different approach that "helped his disciples get away from excessively materialist explanations as to how original sin is transmitted."[226] Eadmer (d. 1124) continued to develop this line of thought, laying stress of the distinction between the active conception and the passive conception. Eadmer located the transmission of original sin in the

---

[223] Douay-Rhemis. Original Vulgate, "*corpus enim quod corrumpitur aggravat animam,et terrena inhabitatio deprimit sensum multa cogitantem.*

[224] Bernardus Claraevallensis, *Sancti Bernardi Abbatis Clarae-Vallensis, Opera Omnia*, 2 vols., ed. Joannis Mabillon

(Paris: Gaune Fratres, 1839), vol. 1, part 1: 1155, 1211, 1339, 1393; vol. 1, part 2: 1712, 1808-1809, 1811, 1947, 1984, 1991,

2817, 3167, vol. 2, part 1: 839, 994.

[225] Bernard of Clairvaux, *Some Letters of Saint Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux,* trans. Samuel Eales, ed. Francis Aidan Gasquet (London: John Hodges, 1904), 306

[226] Bastero, *Mary, Mother of the Redeemer,* 188.

passive conception or infusion of the soul in the body. This breakthrough removed the transmission of sin from exclusively material necessity and acknowledged the spiritual aspect of original sin, opening a door to the possibility of God doing something new in a particular instance.[227]

Later scholastics took these insights and deepened them. They argued that human beings come into existence lacking participation in the divine life that is sanctifying grace. As a result of original sin, they also enter into existence lacking original justice, which included the peaceful integration of the powers of the soul that Adam and Eve enjoyed in paradise. Some theologians joined pre-lapsarian original justice with pre-lapsarian supernatural grace. For example, Thomas Aquinas taught that Adam and Eve lost both sanctifying grace and original justice after the fall. For John Duns Scotus, the first parents only lost original justice because they did not yet necessarily possess sanctifying grace in paradise.[228] These speculations would play a key role in later magisterial definition of the Catholic faith as regards the nature of original sin.

The Council of Trent laid down clear dogmatic contours for the doctrine of original sin by reiterating the teaching of local councils and responding to the errors of the day. Large parts of the decree on original sin from the fifth session of the Council of Trent came verbatim from the ancient synods of Carthage and Orange.[229] In that session, the Fathers of Trent decreed that Adam lost the holiness and justice wherein he had been constituted at his creation, incurred the wrath of God, which is death of soul and body, and fell under the dominion of the devil (Canon 1).[230] Adam transmitted this sin to the entire human race, not by imitation but by propagation. The lack of relationship with God and interior weakness are consequences of Adam and Eve's disobedience that

---

[227] Bastero, *Mary, Mother of the Redeemer,* 188.

[228] Richard Cross, *Duns Scotus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 97-99. While Cross argued that Scotus held that Adam and Eve did not possess sanctifying grace before the fall, others insist that Scotus made a conceptual distinction between original justice and sanctifying grace without taking a position regarding prelapsarian history. One example is Fehlner. See Fehlner, "Appendix," in Rosini, *Mariology of Blessed John Duns Scotus,* 266-267.

[229] Ott, *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma,* 119.

[230] At first glance, this canon is difficult to reconcile with the Scotist approach to man's prelapsarian state, i.e., without original justice, but without sanctifying grace.

pass from parents to children with procreation, even before a child reaches the age of reason. These consequences are not the results of imitating the bad example of other sinners and falling from grace. The only way this original sin can be remitted is through the work of Jesus Christ applied in the sacrament of baptism, which may be rightly given even to infants (Canons 2-4). Although baptism removes the stain of original sin, it does not remove the inclination toward sin which is not sin properly speaking but rather concupiscence. Against this concupiscence the baptized must struggle with the help of divine grace (Canon 5).[231]

Magisterial Catholic teaching has substantially continued along the fundamental lines laid at Trent. The Pastoral Constitution on the Church of Vatican II (1962-1965), *Gaudium et Spes*, alluded to the traditional doctrine of original sin twice. Following Saint Augustine, Saint Paul VI's (1963-1978) *Credo of the People of God* (1968) identified the *locus theologicus* of this doctrine as Romans 5:12.[232] In the *Credo*, Paul VI explained that original sin rendered "human nature so fallen, stripped of the grace that clothed it, injured in its own natural powers and subjected to the dominion of death."[233] In the same document, Paul VI took pains to point out that original sin did not involve just the deprivation of sanctifying grace but also a real wounding of the human nature. During the pontificate of Saint John Paul II (1878-2005), in paragraphs 402 to 414, the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* repeated the classical position of Trent as well as recovering something of the patristic emphasis on the Christological finality to which the dogma points[234]

---

[231] Heinrich Denzinger, *Compendium of Creeds, Definitions, and Declarations on Matters of Faith and Morals*, ed. Peter Hunermann, trans. Robert Fastiggi and Anne Englund Nash, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2012), 1546-1547.

[232] I. Hunt, C. J. Peter and K. McMahon, "Original Sin" in *New Catholic Encyclopedia, 2nd ed.,* vol. 10, 670.

[233] Paul VI, *Solemni Hac Liturgia (Credo of The People of God)*. Vatican.va, accessed 13 February 2020, http://w2.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/en/motu_proprio/documents/hf_p-vi_motu-proprio_19680630_credo.html.

[234] I. Hunt, C. J. Peter and K. McMahon, "Original Sin," 670-671. *Catechism of the Catholic Church,* 2nd ed. (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 113-117.

4.2 Ullathorne on Original Sin

Ullathorne exposited the nature of original sin in the context both of the ferment surrounding the definition of the Immaculate Conception and wider disputes regarding theological anthropology both inside and outside the Church. Nineteenth-century thinkers in the western world outside the Church focused on the perfectibility of man without the help of divine grace. Part of the pastoral aim of the definition entailed clarifying the imperfectability of man by reiterating that Mary was the only perfect human person and this perfection involved perfect conformity and submission to divine grace. Every other human person in the history of man inherited a nature that was imperfect, and even under the influence of divine grace, subject to concupiscence.[235]

Ullathorne employed a neo-Augustinian approach to the transmission original sin. One finds two sources for his approach to original sin. His book on the Immaculate Conception has a chapter entitled "original sin;" that chapter does not enter into original sin as such but rather limits itself to Mary's preservation from it.[236] In an earlier analysis of what original sin entails, Ullathorne laid the foundation for the later chapter.[237] For Ullathorne, the transmission of original sin takes place when God infuses an immortal soul into the already corrupted body. In Ullathorne's view, the process of an embryo becoming a human person takes place in two acts. The first is the active conception, wherein the body takes shape.[238] Since both parents are sinners and have bodies corrupted by sin, the physical material that they contribute to the conception of new human life is likewise corrupt.[239] Then, at some point later on, God

---

[235] Fulton Sheen," The Assumption and the Modern World" in *The Thomist* 14, no. 1 (Jan 1951): 31-33.

[236] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 81-90.

[237] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 54-56.

[238] "The body is transmitted through the parents, the soul is infused by God. The transmission of the body, whereby we are of the one body of Adam, is called by divines [theologians, for Ullathorne] the active conception; the infusion of the soul, whereby the body receives its animation, is called the passive conception." Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 54.

[239] "[T]he body, before it has received the animating soul, is not the subject, but only the cause of sin. Deriving from its origin the poison of concupiscence, it has disordered energies…" Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 55.

infuses the rational, immortal soul into the body. The body into which God infuses the soul is so corrupt that in the moment of full ensoulment, the body corrupts the soul when the disordered energies of the body become active and the soul "becomes overwhelmed" by them.[240] Ullathorne's description of original sin followed the line of the *Four Books of Sentences* and Saint Bernard of Clairvaux.

The approach that Ullathorne adopted toward original sin raises certain difficulties for the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. Lombard's and Saint Bernard's materialist understanding of the transmission of original sin created a conceptual difficulty for the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. How could flesh conceived by sinners not be corrupt, and then corrupt the soul at its infusion? The possibility that the soul of one conceived by two sinners through sexual intercourse could be exempt from original sin only became possible when theologians came to an understanding of the transmission of original sin as primarily spiritual rather than physical.[241] It is true that in England the contemporary of Saint Bernard, Nicholas of Saint Albans, simultaneously clung to a neo-Augustinian position on original sin and supported the Immaculate Conception, but he was rather unique in doing so.[242] Anachronistically, Ullathorne's approach to original sin corresponded to Peter Lombard's and Saint Bernard's materialist approach in which the corrupted body infects the soul. It is true that after Trent there were some theologians who held to a neo-Augustinian vision of the transmission of original sin and the Immaculate Conception. There were few, however, because Lombard's vision presupposed a direct link between the concupiscence involved in natural generation and the transmission of original sin.[243]

Ullathorne attempted to overcome this difficulty by positing a miraculous, albeit natural, active conception by Saint Anne of Mary's body. He explained how the natural active conception of

---

[240] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 55.

[241] Bastero, *Mary, Mother of the Redeemer,* 188.

[242] Mills, "Behold Your Mother," 61.

[243] One such example is Jean-Jacques Olier (1608-1657). Sarah Jane Boss, *Empress and Handmaid: On Nature and Gender in the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (New York: Cassell, 2000), 137.

Mary's body by two fallen human parents did not lead to corrupted flesh corrupting her soul. He argued that "[i]f the first or active conception of Mary was not immaculate, it was at least miraculous" such that the "body…was not left to the common course of nature" in which a body conceived by sinful parents inherits the parents' corruption.[244] God preserved Mary's body from corruption before the infusion of the soul. This intervention was a distinct miracle that took place before the Immaculate Conception. By making this argument, Ullathorne sought to overcome the difficulties inherent in holding to a neo-Augustinian theory of the transmission for the Immaculate Conception.

Ullathorne's view of the manner in which original sin is transmitted in the relation to the coming into being of the immortal soul corresponds to what theologians call "creationism." This theory has nothing to do with a young earth alternative to Darwinism, but rather attributes efficient causality for the creation of the body to the parents and the efficient causality for the creation of the soul to God Himself in the act of human generation.[245] In western theology, one encounters a good example of creationism in Aquinas' *Commentary on the Sentences*. The Angelic Doctor held that even Christ's human soul was infused at a point posterior to the conception of His body by the Holy Spirit in the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary.[246] Thomas modified this position in the *Summa Theologiae* and taught that Christ's body had a human soul at the moment of his active conception, which made His conception entirely unique.[247] Aquinas continued to hold creationism as the normal process for the ensoulment of human persons.[248] Ullathorne's version of creationism was unlike Aquinas' and Anselm's insofar as Ullathorne gave a role to the parents' flesh corrupted by sin passed on to the child in the transmission of original sin.

The canvas that Ullathorne painted of the effects of original sin lies on the darker end of the continuum of Catholic orthodoxy. When it comes to a vision of human nature, the twentieth-century

---

[244] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception,* 105.

[245] J.E. Royce and E.J. Furton, "Soul, Human, Origin of" in *New Catholic Encyclopedia, 2nd ed.,* vol. 13 (Detroit: Gale, 2003), 553-556.

[246] Aidan Nichols, *There is No Rose,* 38-41.

[247] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae, Tertia Pars, 1-59, Latin-English Opera Omnia,* trans. Lawrence Shapcote (Lander: Aquinas Institute, 2012), 345-349.

[248] Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae, Tertia Pars, 1-59, Latin-English Opera Omnia*, 281-288.

Catholic apologist G.K. Chesterton (1874-1936) correctly observed that within orthodoxy, there was ample room for those who held to a more optimistic or more pessimistic view of post-lapsarian human nature.[249] Without straying beyond Catholic teaching, Ullathorne used extremely pessimistic language to describe the wound to human nature inflicted by the original sin in the baptized:

> Grace may remove the sin, and blot out the culpability, as day removes the darkness of the night; but as, when the night is gone, it leaves effects behind—the cold, the fogs, the frosts, and the keen blasts, so after original sin has departed, there remain debilities, habits, depraved emotions, penalties, and above all, that irreparable loss of original innocence which, like lost virginity, can never be restored. However atoned for, that dishonour rests on the soul like the stain on the escutcheon, which no deeds can succeed in erasing. And what is that stain but that the supernatural image of God had been beforetimes disinherited of life; but that she had been hated of God.[250]

One may summarize the above passage by saying that for Ullathorne the effects of original sin do not efface the image of God in man, but they come close to doing so. It bears repeating that Ullathorne's description of the corruption of human nature just cited included within it newly baptized infants. For him, the effects of original sin were profound and long-lasting even for regenerate infants. This position did not remain in the ether of theological speculation. It had pastoral consequences.

---

[249] "St. Francis, in praising all good, could be a more shouting optimist than Walt Whitman. St. Jerome, in denouncing all evil, could paint the world blacker than Schopenhauer. Both passions were free because both were kept in their place. The optimist could pour out all the praise he liked on the gay music of the march, the golden trumpets, and the purple banners going into battle. But he must not call the fight needless. The pessimist might draw as darkly as he chose the sickening marches or the sanguine wounds. But he must not call the fight hopeless." G.K. Chesterton, *Orthodoxy* (New York: John Lane, 1908), 177.
[250] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception,* 84-85.

4.3 Ullathorne, the *Rambler*, and Original Sin

On November 19, 1863, Bishop Ullathorne wrote a pastoral letter to the priests of his diocese regarding the doctrinal aberrations published in two lay-published Catholic periodicals, the *Rambler* and the *Home and Foreign Review*.[251] In fact, these periodicals were two names for two different instantiations of one periodical. The same editorial leadership founded the latter shortly after closing the former. Ullathorne and other bishops in England took issue with many of the editors' positions through the years—so much so that they succeeded in replacing the lay editor with the trusted cleric John Henry Newman. Even when Newman assumed the editorship in 1859, controversy ensued. Newman resigned the position within months and the periodical returned to its former management.[252] Ullathorne's letter of 1863 to his clergy included criticisms of positions voiced in articles (not written by Newman nor published under his brief editorship) published on original sin that Ullathorne believed were at variance with the teaching of the Council of Trent on the manner of the transmission of original sin and its effects. Ullathorne identified four problematic aspects of works in the *Rambler* and its successor publication, the *Home and Foreign Review* that involved the repudiation of the transmission of original sin by propagation as the Council of Trent dogmatically defined it:

1) Ullathorne identified as unorthodox the view that original sin is a privation that does not exist concretely in human natures, a claim that follows the logic that "a privation cannot be propagated." Original sin is a deprivation of a proper good that has no existence in itself. Since one cannot propagate something that has no existence in itself, original sin cannot be propagated.[253] This position was unorthodox for Ullathorne because it failed to account of the real nature of the wound to human nature that is the result of

---

[251] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne,* 275.

[252] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne*, 248-252..

[253] William Bernard Ullathorne, *On Certain Methods of the Rambler and the Home and Foreign Review: A Second Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of Birmingham* (London: Thomas Richardson and Son, 1863), 10.

original sin. Ullathorne maintained the sin of Adam causes a defect of nature for those who contract the consequences of original

sin. This defect is something more than a simple privation.[254] The stand that Ullathorne took against the *Rambler* corresponds to his very strong articulation of the nature of the wound of original sin on which he wrote in *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God*.

2) Ullathorne attacked the argument that the cause of the diffusion of original sin was not Adam's sin but rather God's merciful will. The article in the *Rambler* that Ullathorne criticized identified the extension of original sin to all human persons with a divine decree. The bishop found the article in the *Rambler*'s claim particularly objectionable because the claim attributed evil to God and therefore smacked of Manicheanism.[255] One understands Ullathorne's position more easily when one remembers that he believed that the propagation of original sin occurred when the corrupted flesh that one inherited from one's parents overwhelmed the soul that God infused, thus tainting it. For Ullathorne, God had nothing to do with the soul lacking relationship with Him. It all had to do with the corrupted flesh that parents contributed to ensoulment.

3) Ullathorne took issue with the claim that if Adam's sin were propagated to later generations, then the same would have to be true of all ancestral sins. Since all ancestral sins do not propagate in later generations, neither can one say that Adam's sin does. The writer that Ullathorne attacked without having named invoked the authority of Saint Augustine in favor of this position. Ullathorne pointed out that the author he criticized took Augustine's statement about God's mercy and ancestral sin out of context and consequently badly misinterpreted it.[256] When read in the proper context, there could be no doubt that "regeneration through baptism is only instituted because generation is vitiated"—*viz*., generation has become impaired in fulfilling its proper function of transmitting

---

[254] Ullathorne, *On Certain Methods*, 10.
[255] Ullathorne, *On Certain Methods*, 10.
[256] Ullathorne, *On Certain Methods*, 10-11

human life in the sense that it also transmits original sin.[257] On this point there is an issue of interpretation of the words of Saint Augustine, but there is also the issue of the template one uses to understand original sin. If original sin rests primarily in the soul, and God is the one who infuses the soul, it would make sense to say that God could in his mercy forebear from transmitting it when he creates the soul.

4) Ullathorne's circular letter identified as a doctrinal deviation the idea that "the nature of the sinful and fallen Adam underwent no change beyond the withdrawal of grace."[258] Ullathorne condemned the theory that when Adam sinned he merely lapsed into a state of nature, to the "animal" state. Instead, Ullathorne insisted that God constituted Adam and Eve in original holiness and that original sin not only forfeited original holiness but also wounded human nature and made man a child of wrath and a subject of the devil.[259] Here the position that writer in the *Rambler* presented is not that far from Saint Anselm's position, of which one scholar wrote, "Strictly speaking, Anselm did not believe in original sin" in the sense of original sin being an entity in itself. Rather, Anselm viewed original sin as a lack.[260] But for Ullathorne, positions like that of the *Rambler* did not make sense because original sin is transmitted by means of the flesh, not the soul. In Ullathorne's schema, original sin was not a lack of relationship but rather a positive corruption. This approach to original sin also placed him at odds with Saint John Henry Newman's attempt to address the nature of Mary's exemption from original sin in Newman's *Letter to Pusey.*

---

[257] "*Ob aliud est instituta regeneratio nisi quia vitiosa est generatio*" in the original Latin. Ullathorne is quoting from Augustine's *Enchiridion,* paragraph 46. Augustinus, "*Enchiridion Ad Laurentium Liber Unus*," Augustinus Hipponensis, accessed 10 October 2019, https://www.augustinus.it/latino/enchiridion/enchiridion.htm. Ullathorne, *On Certain Methods,* 11.

[258] Ullathorne, *On Certain Methods,* 12.

[259] Ullathorne, *On Certain Methods,* 22-23.

[260] Mills, "Behold Your Mother," 71.

4.4 Ullathorne, Newman, and Original Sin

In a private, much less polemical setting, Ullathorne also had occasion in 1866 to correct Saint John Henry Newman's description of original sin in Newman's *Letter to Pusey*.[261] Newman wrote the *Letter* as a defense of Catholic Marian belief and practice against the Oxford professor and Anglican cleric E.B. Pusey's *Eirenicon*, who called into question some aspects of Catholic piety toward the Blessed Virgin.[262262] Addressing Pusey's difficulties with the recently-defined dogma of the Immaculate Conception, Newman referred Pusey to Ullathorne's tome on the topic. Newman also pointed out that Protestants and Catholics have different understandings of what the term "original sin" meant. What Newman wrote on this point drew objections from some of his Catholic co-religionists and elicited a private epistolary response from Ullathorne in order to direct Newman toward a less objectionable way of drawing his distinction between Protestant and Catholic views of original sin. The vision toward which Ullathorne nudged Newman was the same as the vision toward which Ullathorne endeavored to push the *Rambler*—an understanding of original sin that involved both a privation of grace and a real wounding of human nature.

Newman's original text in print gave a less than doctrinally rigorous picture of Catholic teaching on the extent of the wound communicated and the manner of propagation of original sin. The passage in the first edition published at the end of January 1866 read:

> Our doctrine of original sin is not the same as the Protestant doctrine. 'Original sin' with us, cannot be called sin, in the ordinary sense of the word 'sin'; it is a term denoting the imputation of the state to which Adam's sin reduces his children; but by Protestants it is understood to be sin, in the

[261] John Henry Newman, "A Letter to Pusey," in *Certain Difficulties Felt By Anglicans In Catholic Teaching Considered, Volume II.*

[262] Edward Bouviere Pusey, *The Church of England: A Portion of Christ's One Holy Catholic Church, and a Means of Restoring Visible Unity, An Eirenicon* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1866).

same sense as actual sin. Protestants hold that it is a disease, a change of nature, a poison internally corrupting the soul, and propagated from father to son, after the manner of a bad constitution. We hold nothing of the kind.[263]

Ullathorne did not go into great details as to what he found troublesome in this passage. For one familiar with previous Catholic theology and the definition of Trent regarding original sin, there are several turns of phrase that appear imprecise in Newman's text. The first is the word *imputation*. The word itself conjures up a Protestant theory of imputed righteousness, wherein God imputes to the sinner the righteousness of Christ despite the fact that the sinner remains inwardly corrupted.[264] In this theological context, the sense of the word "imputation" gestured toward an external state that depends on a divine decree rather than an ontologically internal consequence of an objective reality.

The next theological difficulty into which Newman placed himself had to do with his use of the word "propagated." By saying that original sin was not "propagated" from father to son, Newman appeared to deny or at least recast significantly what the Council of Trent taught—that man acquires original sin "not through imitation but through propagation."[265] Here one faces the same external versus internal dynamic as with imputation. If original sin transmits through propagation, that is, the process of human generation, it is something that nests itself within the nature of the persons affected. Newman's assertion that original sin is not a disease or a poison in the soul can read very much like a claim that the Catholic understanding of original sin is that it is a lack of original justice and sanctifying grace only and denial of the real wound that original sin inflicts on human nature. Ullathorne believed that this explanation was less than adequate.

---

[263] John Henry Newman, *A Letter to the Rev. E.B. Pusey, D.D., on his recent Eirenicon* (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1866), 50-51.

[264] For a discussion of classical Protestant orthodoxy on justification, see Alister McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification, Second Edition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 226-240.

[265] Council of Trent, Session 5, 17 June 1546: Decree on Original Sin, Canon 3. cf. Denzinger, *Compendium of Creeds,* 1546.

On February 12, Ullathorne wrote Newman pointing out areas for improvement in the above-cited passage. While Ullathorne agreed with Newman that original sin was not "a poison," the bishop explained that some priests were reading into what Newman wrote a denial of the transmission of original sin by propagation, which would constitute a rejection of Trent's dogmatic definition. One cannot be surprised that priests in the Birmingham diocese were doing so because the language that Newman used was similar in some respects to that which Ullathorne condemned only three years previously in his letter denouncing the *Rambler*. Furthermore, although Ullathorne admitted that Bellarmine used a Latin cognate of "imputation"with respect to original sin, Ullathorne was quick to point out that Bellarmine did so writing from within the heart of Catholic Europe, whereas Newman was writing in a country with a deeply-rooted Protestant theological tradition wherein the term has a markedly unorthodox sense.[266] Newman responded on February 13 indicating his willingness to adjust the text in subsequent editions, two of which came out in 1866.[267]

Ullathorne's letter spurred Newman into action. Newman amended the paragraph in question in the definitive version of his *Letter to Pusey* in order to assuage Ullathorne's objections. Newman's emendations are in *italics*:

> "Original sin," with us, cannot be called sin, in the mere ordinary sense of the word "sin;" *it is a term denoting Adam's sin as transferred to us,* or the state to which Adam's sin reduces his children; but by Protestants it seems to be understood as sin, in much the same sense as actual sin. *We, with the Fathers, think of it as something negative, Protestants as something positive.* Protestants hold that it is a disease, a radical change of nature, an active poison internally corrupting the soul, *infecting its primary elements, and disorganizing it; and they fancy that we*

[266] Butler, *The Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne*, vol. I, 360-361.
[267] The correspondence between Newman and Ullathorne on this point has been preserved in Newman's collected letters. John Henry Newman, *A Letter to the Rev. E.B. Pusey, D.D., on his recent Eirenicon* 2nd ed. (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1866). John Henry Newman, *A Letter to the Rev. E.B. Pusey, D.D., on his recent Eirenicon*, 3rd ed. (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1866).

> *ascribe a different nature from ours to the Blessed Virgin, different from that of her parents, and from that of fallen Adam.* We hold nothing of the kind…[268]

The first point worth noting is that the language of imputation and the apparent rejection of propagation have disappeared completely in the revised paragraph. What is more, Newman painted the Protestant understanding of original sin in much darker terms ("infecting…disorganizing"). This move opened up space in his doctrinal cartography for a place that the real negative effects of original sin in Catholic theology could occupy. Furthermore, saying that Catholics view original sin as something negative is open to two readings that are not mutually exclusive. One would entail saying that Catholics understand original sin as something negative in the sense that it is a lack of original holiness. Another possible reading would be that original sin is something negative, as in it is a real wound to the soul. When read alongside Ullathorne's discussion of original sin in his book on the Immaculate Conception and Ullathorne's attack on theories of original sin published in the *Rambler*, the points of contact between Newman's revisions and Ullathorne's position on the point are striking. Ullathorne found fault in both Newman's original draft of his *Letter to Pusey* and articles in the *Rambler* for holding an overly positive assessment of the effects of the fall on post-lapsarian human nature.

William Bernard Ullathorne employed a somewhat anachronistic approach to the transmission and effects of original sin that involved the carnal corruption of the God-infused soul. Although this position tracked with the overall position that human ensoulment took place in two acts, Ullathorne's explanation did not accommodate itself easily with the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. In order to be consistent, he had to posit a pre-purification of Mary's flesh that took place before her soul's infusion. Ullathorne's view, while within the realm of Catholic orthodoxy, was on the pessimistic end of the spectrum. The extent to which Ullathorne located the genesis and effects of original sin in the flesh put him at odds with visions that were closer to that of

---

[268] Italics mine. John Henry Newman, *Certain Difficulties Felt By Anglicans In Catholic Teaching Considered, Volume II*, 47-48.

Saint Anselm and Saint Thomas Aquinas, as were those expressed in the *Rambler* and by Saint John Henry Newman. How Ullathorne explained the positive side of Mary's freedom from original sin will be the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter 5—The Dogmatic Formula Itself

In countries where Catholics made up a minority of the Christian population such as England, the definition of the Immaculate Conception raised the difficulty of explaining how this doctrine was consistent with the faith of the first Christians. Recent Catholic commentators readily admit that the Bible does not provide an unassailable proof of the Immaculate Conception as defined in 1854.[269] What is more, medieval doctors of the Church like Saint Anselm of Canterbury, Saint Bernard of Clairvaux, Saint Bonaventure, and Saint Thomas Aquinas explicitly rejected the doctrine[270]

These facts placed a Catholic bishop in nineteenth-century England in the position of having to justify how the definition of the Immaculate Conception did not involve doctrinal innovation by the Catholic Church. Ullathorne responded by explaining that theologians introduced confusion about the active conception of Mary's body and the passive conception of Mary's soul. Furthermore, Ullathorne noted that Scotus' idea of preservative redemption that broke the scholastic logjam on the doctrine actually had ancient antecedents. For Ullathorne, once one knew the exact terminology of the doctrine, it became clear that the Immaculate Conception was something that the lay faithful, led by the bishops, had always believed. Ullathorne's emphasis on the fundamental continuity of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception with a special emphasis on the bishops' role as guarantor of this continuity points toward a major focus throughout Ullathorne's episcopal ministry—namely the bishop as a prophetic witness of the faith to an unbelieving world.

---

[269] "Nowhere in the sacred books do we read, in explicit terms, that Our Lady was conceived immaculate." O'Carroll, *Theotokos*, 180.

[270] O'Carroll, *Theotokos*, 181.

5.1 Preparation for the Definition: 1847-1854

Shortly after his election in 1846 to the throne of Peter, Pius IX began to move toward a dogmatic definition of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary. In 1847, the pope directed Dominicans that their vow to uphold the doctrine of Saint Thomas did not preclude them from making liturgical commemoration of the Immaculate Conception. Giovanni Perrone, S.J., wrote a work that same year exploring the definability of the doctrine.[271] In the book, Perrone addressed at least two important questions regarding the definition. How can one account for medieval saints and doctors who opposed the Immaculate Conception like Anselm, Bernard, Bonaventure, and Thomas Aquinas? Perrone explained that these theologians rejected the doctrine because they misunderstood what it proposed. They thought proponents of the Immaculate Conception referred to the conception of Mary's body rather than the infusion of her soul.[272] Perrone flatly admitted that many scholastics were simply confused on this point.[273] The next question had to do with the manner of defining the dogma. Throughout the history of the Church, gatherings of bishops in communion with the pope normally defined dogmas in order to respond to heresy. How could one understand this definition? Perrone explained that as with one breath (*conspiratio*) bishops and the faithful could bear witness that the Immaculate Conception pertained to the apostolic deposit of the faith.[274274] Scholars have debated to what extent or even if Newman's theory of development of doctrine influenced Perrone on this point.[275]

Perrone's second answer indicated one way forward to move toward the definition of the doctrine. The pope congratulated

---

[271] Laurentin, "Role of the Papal Magisterium," 308.

[272] Perrone, *De Immaculato B.V. Mariae Conceptu,* 15, 98.

[273] "*Illorum plerumque locutiones aut ambiguae atque incutae errant, aut dubio non ita perspicuae…*" Perrone, *De Immaculato B.V. Mariae Conceptu*, 15.

[274] O'Carroll, *Theotokos*, 322.

[275] Chadwick took the view that Perrone rejected Newman's ideas. Owen Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman* 2nd ed.(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 167-171. Shea argued that when Newman and Perrone exchanged views during Newman's Roman years, Perrone warmed toward Newman's idea of development. Shea, *Newman's Early Roman Catholic Legacy, 1845-1854* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 151-185.

Perrone for writing the book on October 28, 1847. In February of 1849, Pius wrote all of the bishops of the world requesting that they report on the sense of the faithful as regards the Immaculate Conception. The bishops responded in an overwhelmingly positive manner to this request. Of the 603 bishops asked, only 56 responded negatively to the idea of defining the dogma.[276] In early 1851, Pius IX instructed Perrone to write a first draft of the papal bull defining the Immaculate Conception.[277] Carlo Passaglia, S.J., and Ullathorne's Benedictine confrere, Guéranger, contributed to subsequent drafts of the document.[278] Passaglia shared Perrone's understanding that Immaculate Conception referred to the infusion of her soul into her as yet unanimated body. Passaglia argued in his work on the Immaculate Conception that Bernard's rejection of the feast of the Immaculate Conception took place because it was not clear to the saint which conception, active or passive, the feast referred. Passaglia had no doubt that the subject of the doctrine was the active conception rather than the passive.[279]

Guéranger did not employ these distinctions between the active and passive conceptions, but looked at the doctrine from a more global point of view. He had already employed the approach to the question of the exact content of the Immaculate Conception that he took in *On the Immaculate Conception* (1850) in his first volume of a multi-volume commentary on the liturgical year in 1847. He explained that "at the very instant when God united the soul of Mary, which He had created, to the body which it was to animate, this ever-blessed soul did not…contract the stain, which at the same instant defiles every human soul." [280] Guéranger did not enter into a distinction between passive and active conceptions, although his writing did not exclude the possibility of this explanation either. He chose to speak rather of the joining soul to body without referencing a pre-existing, inanimate body.

---

[276] Graef, *Mary*, 340.
[277] Laurentin, "Role of the Papal Magisterium," 309.
[278] Boss, "Original Holiness," 493.
[279] Carol Passaglia, *De Immaculato Deiparae Semper Virignins Conceptu,* Pars III (Naples: n.p., 1855), 1159.
[280] Prosper Guéranger, *The Liturgical Year: Advent,* trans. Lawrence Shepherd (Westminster: The Newman Press, 1948), 378. Original French version: Prosper Guéranger, *L'Année Liturgique* (Bruxelles: Greuse, 1847).

Despite his advisors, Pius IX decided to define the Immaculate Conception in terms of Mary's person rather than her soul. Guiseppe Sardi's *Atti e Documenti* of the preparatory commission demonstrate that when it came to defining the privilege, some on the commission favored greater specificity to the nature of the privilege, e.g., defining Mary's freedom from concupiscence, and teaching that she was free from all stain of sin from the first moment of her (singular) conception.[281] The dogma promulgated by Bl. Pius IX made no reference to the infusion of Mary's soul but specified that her immunity from original sin began from the first moment of her conception. This shift in language was a last minute change. All of the previous eight drafts spoke in terms of the infusion of Mary's soul.[282] Cardinal Gioacchino Pecci of Pavia (the future Pope Leo XIII) gave a contribution to the proceedings on December 1 that argued against limiting the privilege to Mary's soul.[283] The pope made this change between receiving the very final draft from the preparatory committee on December 1 and the publication of the definition on December 8.[284284] In response to advice from four cardinal advisors that significant problems remained in the penultimate version of the bull, Pius decided to take matters into his own hands.[285] On December 8, Pius declared the dogmatic formula, which spoke of God preserving Mary's person instead of her soul from original sin. The text that accompanied the definition did not see publication until mid-January of 1855. Rather than make explicit and detailed arguments from Scripture and Tradition, Pius presented arguments

---

[281] The bishops of Acquapendente and Ugento are two particularly clear examples. Vincenzo Sardi, ed., *La Solenne Definizione del Dogma della Immacolata Concepimento di Maria Santissima: Atti e Documenti*, vol. II (Roma: Typografia Vaticana, 1905), 238, 242.

[282] Sardi, *Atti e Documenti,* vol. II, 296-312.

[283] "*Tandem quoad verba Dogma de Immaculata Conceptione definientia, illa vitanda putarem, quae quomodocumque redolerent Scholam animam in Conceptione a corope seiungentia: ita ut definitio respiceret personam Mariae, quemadmodum Ecclesia festum Conceptionis eiusdem celebravit hucusque de persona, non de anima tantum.*" Sardi, *Atti e Documenti,* vol. II, 292,

[284] O'Carroll, *Theotokos,* 183.

[285] One of the four cardinals, Cardinal Wiseman, wrote to the pope explaining that he could not lie that his feelings were opposed to the document in its present form. "*[N]on posso dissinulare il mio sentimento é contrario alla forma della Bolla come adesso concepita ed estesa.*" Sardi, *Atti e Documenti*, vol. II, 291.

in globo.[286] Pius emphasize doctrinal continuity and overlooked discontinuities. In doing so, he adopted an approach similar to that of Guéranger's in the Benedictine's monograph.[287] O'Carroll has stated that this change did not aim at specifying the exact mechanics of Mary's ensoulment but sought to place an emphasis on Mary's integral, personal reception of the privilege.[288]

While the final process of definition yielded a last-minute change, Ullathorne's project in *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God* was to illustrate the changelessness of the Church's faith on the Immaculate Conception. In order to do that he needed to be able to establish a chain of tradition that started with the apostles and continued down to the present day. He had to find one of the Twelve who had held the doctrine. Through Saint Andrew, he claimed to have done so.

5.2 Roots in Antiquity

Ullathorne began his defense of the antiquity of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception by appealing to patristic witnesses regarding Mary's holiness while drawing from Dom Prosper Guéranger's (1805-1875) work *On the Immaculate Conception*.[289] In fact, Ullathorne used a healthy majority of the sources that Guéranger quoted in his chapter on the Fathers as witnesses to the Immaculate Conception. Ullathorne added only two voices from the early Church that Guéranger did not use, those of Origen and Theodotus of Ancyra.[290] Guéranger cited over a dozen patristic

---

[286] Laurentin, "Role of the Papal Magisterium," 311.

[287] This should hardly be surprising on account of Pius' endorsement of Guéranger's work. Rene Laurentin, "The Role of the Papal Magisterium," 309.

[288] One of the four cardinals with which the pope consulted between December 1st and 8th when formulating the final dogmatic formula was Wiseman of Westminster, who, unlike Ullathorne, was present in Rome for the definition. O'Carroll, *Theotokos,* 183.

[289] Prosper Guéranger, *On the Immaculate Conception,* trans. Nun of St Cecilia's Abbey, Ryde (Farnborough: Saint Michael's Abbey Press, 2006). Original French version: Prosper Guéranger, *Mémoire sur la Question De l'Immaculée Conception* (Paris: Julien, Lanier et Comp, 1850.

[290] Guéranger, *On the Immaculate Conception,* 71-89; Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception,* 112-124.

sources in eighteen pages; he spent five of those pages on Augustine and three on the apocryphal *Martyrium S. Andreae*, which Guéranger regarded as an historically trustworthy record of what the apostle said and did.[291] When treating Augustine, Guéranger focused particularly on the Doctor of Grace's *De Natura et Gratia* where Augustine stated that he could not speak of sin in Mary "for the honor of the Lord."[292]

Ullathorne's argument traced a similar path to Guéranger's not only in the Fathers Ullathorne quoted but also to the extent to which he gave special prominence to the *Martyrium S. Andreae* and Saint Augustine. The twelve pages that Ullathorne devoted specifically to the Fathers on the Immaculate Conception read almost like a *catena* of patristic quotations. The list began in earnest with a citation from the *Martyrium S. Andreae*, which placed on the lips of the apostle the words, "it was necessary that the perfect man should be born of an immaculate Virgin, through whose means the Son of God, who had before created man, might repair that eternal life which had been lost through Adam."[293] This apocryphal source is particularly important for Ullathorne's argument that the Church has always held to the underlying content of the Immaculate Conception from the time of the apostles, as the document purportedly establishes an apostle who spoke of Mary as "immaculate." However, more recent scholarship has called into question the value of the manuscript with which Guéranger and Ullathorne worked, which was "a tendentious and frequently garbled six-century Latin epitome by Saint Gregory of Tours" that did not have a critical edition until 1885, only several years before Ullathorne's death.[294] The original Greek text, much of which no longer exists, shows evidence of Gnosticism and middle Platonism.[295] These difficulties call into serious question the extent to which one can invoke this document as passing down information from the Apostle Andrew himself, which concords with the negative decision of the Church regarding the book's place in the Bible. The

---

[291] Guéranger, *On the Immaculate Conception,* 87-89.
[292] Guéranger, *On the Immaculate Conception,* 82-86.
[293] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 113.
[294] Dennis MacDonald, "Introduction," in *The Acts of Andrew*, trans. Dennis MacDonald (Santa Rosa: Polebridge Press, 2005), 1.,
[295] MacDonald, "Introduction," 6-9,

only patristic testimony that Ullathorne spent more than two paragraphs addressing was Augustine of Hippo, particularly his treatise *De Natura et Gratia*, which is exactly the work on which Guéranger also focused.[296]

5.3 Terminological Confusion

Ullathorne found his strongest support for the antiquity of the Immaculate Conception in the liturgical observance of Saint Anne's active conception of Mary. He argued that it had origins that possibly go back to the first five hundred years of Christianity in the East.[297] From the East, the feast had already found its way to Spain by no later than the tenth century. In the Neapolitan celebration of the feast on December 9, Ullathorne saw evidence of Greek influence in Naples. The Byzantine Church celebrates the feast on the 9th rather than the 8th.[298] According to Ullathorne, eleventh-century England not only kept the feast of Mary's conception, but also spread it through English influence in other countries.[299]

Ullathorne acknowledged that as the feast began to spread in Latin Christianity, it met with opposition, as in the case of Saint Bernard. In Bernard's objection, Ullathorne found a thread on which he believed that he could pull to unravel charges that the newly-defined dogma constituted an innovation. The Mellifluous Doctor found a feast of Mary's conception to be incoherent on the principle that the Church celebrates feasts only for the holy. Bernard questioned how Mary could be holy at her conception if her body were conceived in sin (i.e., with concupiscence), and it had not yet received a soul. Ullathorne argued that Bernard's objection was correct insofar as the Immaculate Conception does not refer to the active conception of Mary's physical body, but rather to the infusion of Mary's soul into an already existing body.

---

[296] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 112, 117-119,
[297] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception,* 158.
[298] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception,* 161.
[299] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 162-165.

In Ullathorne's analysis, Bernard rejected the Immaculate Conception because he misunderstood to which conception it referred.[300]

When examining Thomas Aquinas' position on the Immaculate Conception, Ullathorne acknowledged that Thomas' problem was twofold. First, Thomas saw that because human ensoulment for everyone but Jesus happened in steps (vegetative-animal-rational), it was irrational to speak of an Immaculate Conception before the existence of an immortal soul in the body of Our Lady. This position on ensoulment is similar to what Ullathorne himself maintained. Second, Ullathorne also admitted that Thomas objected to the Immaculate Conception because he believed that the dogma excluded Our Lady from the ranks of the redeemed.[301]

In Ullathorne's account, the breakthrough of Scotus lay in articulating the idea of preservative redemption, reconciling Christ's role as savior of all with Mary's Immaculate Conception at the first moment of her existence, thus overcoming Thomas' objection on this point.[302]

5.4 Evaluating Ullathorne's Claim of Past Terminological Confusion

As Champ has already pointed out, Ullathorne's account of doctrinal development provided a simple and apparently perspicuous way to resolve the problematic. Early on, the bishops and the simple faithful held to Mary's sinlessness and unique holiness. Through the centuries, this support continued unwaveringly. When theologians began to try to define the mystery, their desire for precision obscured it. Once it finally became clear that Mary's Immaculate Conception referred to her second conception, theologians began to fall into line and the pious devotion returned to the serene peace that it had enjoyed before

---

[300] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 135-136.
[301] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 136-137.
[302] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 138-139.

theologians had disturbed it. For Ullathorne, unlike Newman, development of doctrine was a relatively straightforward matter of bishops restoring order where theologians had created confusion.[303]

The first problematic area of Ullathorne's arguments lay in the foundation that underlay his claim that the theologians' confusion was about to which of Mary's two conceptions the doctrine referred. The impression that Ullathorne gave was that all theologians presumed a passive and active conception and the confusion about which one of Mary's conceptions was without sin led to opposition of the Immaculate Conception. Perrone and Passaglia made similar arguments in the years leading up to the doctrinal definition. In point of fact, the theory of progressive ensoulment that Ullathorne presented as normative is a theory to which a significant number of Christian theologians have not adhered. Since the first centuries of Christianity, theologians in both the East and West have subscribed to the theory that body and soul simultaneously come into existence. In his *Treatise on the Soul,* the Latin ecclesiastical writer Tertullian (c. 160-c. 225) wrote that "life begins with conception, because we contend that the soul also begins from conception; life taking its commencement at the same moment and place that the soul does."[304] In the East, St. Gregory of Nyssa (335-394) held the same position as Tertullian. St. Maximus the Confessor (c. 580-662) likewise taught that Christ's conception was the model and prototype for all human conceptions once one sets aside the fact that Christ was a divine and not a human person.[305]

It would still be possible for Ullathorne to explain that progressive ensoulment came to be the common doctrine in the West during scholasticism and that this context explains objections during this period. There is a significant flaw in this position, however. In the West, those who advocated most ardently for the Immaculate Conception were precisely those who differed most from Ullathorne's explanation of the Immaculate Conception. Scotus himself held that Mary's body and immortal soul came into

---

[303] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 166-172, 181-191.

[304] Tertullian, *A Treatise on the Soul,* trans. Peter Holmes, NewAdvent.org, accessed 16 October 2019, http://newadvent.org/fathers/0310.htm.

[305] Lindsey Disney and Larry Poston, "The Breath of Life: Christian Perspectives on Conception and Ensoulment," *Anglican Theological Review* 92, no. 2 (2010): 275-276.

existence simultaneously.[306] This reflects a general trend among the immaculist school.[307] Were Ullathorne correct, those theologians who subscribed to progressive ensoulment would have had the tools to recognize the source of confusion and assign Mary's Immaculate Conception to the passive rather than the active conception. In reality, those who were most enthusiastic supporters of the privilege initially were those who took for granted that Our Lady's conception was unitary.

The second difficulty that Ullathorne's account of the dogma faced was the definition of the dogma itself, which changed at the last minute in an uncongenial way for the argument he proposed. The focus of the papal magisterium on the Immaculate Conception from the fifteenth century until the week before the promulgation of the dogmatic definition on December 8, 1854, was that God preserved Mary from all stain of original sin from the moment of the infusion of the soul into her body. Ullathorne clearly pointed to what he saw as growing clarity in papal and theological teaching on this doctrine as it became clearer that the privilege referred primarily to Mary's soul. He explained:

> The question regards the moment of rational animation; of the reception or, more truly, of the conception of the soul and the instant of its union with the body. To use the words of Perrone [a contemporary theologian at the Roman College], who follows Alexander VII. [sic], Benedict XIV. [sic], and all modern divines, the true question is, whether the soul of the Blessed Virgin was adorned at its creation with sanctifying grace, and, whether therefore, her animation or passive conception was immaculate and exempt from all sin. This is clearly explained and defined to

---

[306] "The question, then, becomes the discovery of that point when Mary's first sanctification occurs…Scotus, on the other hand, fixes the moment of her sanctification 'in first instant of her conception" [*Ordinatio*, III, d. 3, q. 1, n. 10 (Vivès 14, 165)]. Ruggero Rosini, *Mariology of Blessed John Duns Scotus*, 73.

[307] "Moreover, the commemoration of Mary's sinless beginning had as its object her body as well as her soul. The Immaculists stressed that what was being celebrated on the feast of the Conception was not only Mary's spiritual sanctification, but also her beginning as a human being, including her flesh." Sarah Jane Boss, "The Doctrine of Mary's Immaculate Conception," in Sarah Jane Boss, ed., *Mary: The Complete Resource* (Oxford: University Press, 2007), 217-218.

be the question in the celebrated Constitution of Alexander VII of December 8, 1661 [*Sollicitudo Omnium Ecclesiarum*].[308]

Reading Ullathorne's words, one can almost see the unfolding of doctrinal development before one's eyes. The problem is that not all "modern divines" held that normal human conception took place in two acts.

Ullathorne did not consider two important currents in the Church that trended toward life beginning at the fertilization of the ovum by the sperm: 1) those advocating the full humanity of the fetus from the moment of conception for scientific reasons and 2) Scotists, who did so for philosophical and theological reasons. Ruggero Rosini explained in *The Mariology of Blessed John Duns Scotus* that for Scotus and his followers "the body by natural law requires the soul; in fact one does not have man and therefore a human person without the instantaneous union '*in actu conceptionis*' [in the very act of conception] of both elements, soul and body."[309] Additionally, whatever theologians might have held with respect to Mary's ensoulment in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, a powerful movement arose among scientists and philosophers that advocated situating ensoulment at the moment of conception. So strong was this movement that the author of an article in 1970 arguing for delayed ensoulment had to admit that from the seventeenth century onwards "the theory of delayed hominization seems to have been dropped."[310] In 1869, Pius IX, the same pope who defined the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, abolished the canonical distinction between formed and unformed fetuses—pointing toward human life beginning at a unitary moment of conception.[311]

One might ask, "Why did Ullathorne not revise his book after the dogmatic definition in order to reflect the unexpected change in dogmatic formula?" This question is especially relevant

[308] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception,* 56.
[309] Brackets inserted by English translator. Rosini, *Mariology of Blessed John Duns Scotus*, 74.
[310] Joseph Donceel, "Immediate Hominization and Delayed Hominization," *Theological Studies* 31, no. 1 (Feb. 1970), 96.
[311] David Albert Jones, *The Soul of the Embryo* (New York: Continuum, 2004), 72.

because Ullathorne did make some other minor revisions to the 1855 text that saw publication in 1904. Two obvious reasons come to mind. Firstly, many theologians continued to hold well into the second half of the twentieth century that despite the change in language, the dogma does in fact refer to Mary's passive conception, i.e., the infusion of her soul.[312] Significant reworking of his argument was simply not necessary when many theologians continued to teach what Ullathorne himself taught even after the language of the definition. The second reason is that addressing the change in language would involve entering into a much more complex theory of development of doctrine along the lines of the historical research that Newman completed during his retreat at Littlemore from 1842 to 1845 in his *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine.*[313] Ullathorne's episcopal duties precluded the amount of time for study necessary for such a task. Furthermore, Ullathorne lacked the theological training to undertake it.

The other important element of medieval rejections of the Immaculate Conception that Ullathorne had to address involved the theological principle of the universality of Christ's redemption. Jesus is the redeemer of the entire human race. If Mary neither contracted original sin nor committed an actual sin, she had no need of Christ as her redeemer. Therefore, theologians like Thomas Aquinas saw the Immaculate Conception as contrary to the dignity of Christ as the universal redeemer.[314] Ullathorne identified Scotus' unique contribution to the definition of the dogma with the concept that he proposed of preservative redemption.[315] How could Ullathorne, who did not leave much space in his argument for doctrinal development, account for Duns Scotus' novel proposal of preservative redemption?

---

[312] Allan Wolter, "The Theology of the Immaculate Conception in Light of *Ineffabilis Deus*," *Marian Studies* 5 (1954): 25-28; Ott, *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, 215.
[313] Ker, *Newman*, 257-315.
[314] Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae, Tertia Pars, 1-61*, 281-284.
[315] "He proved that so far from being excluded from redemption the Blessed Virgin obtained of her divine Son the greatest of graces and redemptions through that very mystery of her immaculate preservation from all sin." Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception,* 138-139.

5.5 The Antiquity of Preservative Redemption

According to Ullathorne's careful reading of salvation history, the first to experience preservative redemption were the faithful angels. In this sense, preservative redemption is as old as the visible created universe, as it took place when God was revealing His plan for the human race to the angels. Ullathorne appealed both to Pseudo-Dionysius and Saint Bernard of Clairvaux as authorities that corroborated the existence of preservative redemption. In this witness to the beliefs of the early Church, Ullathorne posited that the Areopagite "lays down a formal division of the two kinds of redemption…—the one preserving from evil and nothingness; the other repairing what is deteriorated by sin and error."[316] Ullathorne mentioned the *Divine Names* immediately after acknowledging the importance of Scotus' theological breakthrough on preservative redemption. The logic implicit in this progression is simple. Although proposed late in Latin Scholasticism, this theological thesis was not innovation if a disciple of Paul described it as if it were commonplace.

Did the Areopagite actually say what Ullathorne claimed that he said? A close reading of the text that Ullathorne referenced will be helpful in answering this question. Ullathorne claimed that book eight, number nine of the *Divine Names* made a distinction between preservative and reparative redemption. This passage begins by an appeal to God's righteousness, which "is also called the Salvation or Preservation of the world." The Areopagite began by equating salvation with preservation. As the Areopagite explained, "that the primary Salvation of the world is that which preserves all things in their proper places without change, conflict, or deterioration, and keeps them all severally without strife or struggle obeying their proper laws."[317] According to this vision, the

---

[316] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 89.
[317] Dionysius the Areopagite, *Dionysius the Areopagite: On the Divine Names and the Mystical Theology*, trans. C.E. Rolt, Documentacatholicaomnia.eu , accessed 14 February 2020, http://www.documentacatholica omnia.eu/03d/0450-0525,_Dionysius_Areopagita,_On_The_Divine_Names_And_The_Mystical_Theology,_EN.pdf.

primary means through which God exercises His salvation is by preserving the elements of the created order incorrupt.

The Areopagite did not limit redemption to preservation from corruption. In the *Divine Names* he wrote as if the salvation that repairs corruption existed as a secondary rather than primary form of redemption. The apparent inversion embedded in this claim startles**.** Pseudo-Dionysius conceded that "if any one speaks of Salvation as the saving Power which plucks the world out of the influence of evil, we will also certainly accept this account of Salvation since Salvation hath so many forms." [318] The primary sense the Areopagite gave to redemption involved God sustaining the created order, not repairing it.[319] While one may question the extent to which Scotus and other advocates of God's preservative redemption of Mary in the Immaculate Conception had the Dionysian sense of the concept in mind, there is at least some conceptual overlap between the two.

Ullathorne also proposed Saint Bernard of Clairvaux's teaching on the preservative redemption of the angels as proof that the Areopagite's teaching on preservative redemption was more than an eccentricity in Dionysius' thought. At the end of a paragraph that detailed the idea of preservative redemption in the *Divine Names*, Ullathorne concluded with the sentence, "And so St. Bernard says of the angels who stood, that Christ saved them by His grace, that they may not fall, and was in that way their Redeemer."[320] Here Ullathorne quoted Bernard's twenty-second sermon on the Song of Songs. When read in its wider context, it becomes clear that Bernard is discussing a form of redemption that holds significant similarities to the type of redemption that Scotus proposed with respect to Mary's Immaculate Conception. Bernard's own words, which Ullathorne did not quote directly, are worth reviewing. Bernard asked "for what reason do you say that the Lord Jesus Christ had been to them [i.e., the angels] redemption?" To this

---

[318] Dionysius the Areopagite, *Dionysius the Areopagite: On the Divine Names and the Mystical Theology.*

[319] "[T]his Salvation, working in that beneficence which preserves the world, redeems all things (according as each can receive this saving power) so that they fall not from their natural virtues." Dionysius the Areopagite, *Dionysius the Areopagite: On the Divine Names and the Mystical Theology.*

[320] Ullathorne, *Immaculate Conception*, 89.

question he responded that Christ gave the angels "the grace not to fall" and so preserved them "from becoming subject to bondage." To those who might object that preserving one from sin is only redemption in an analogous way, Bernard responded very clearly that Christ "was Redemption to each class, delivering one from its fall [i.e., human beings], and preserving the other from falling [i.e. angels]."[321]

Proponents of the Scotistic Thesis have appealed to Saint Bernard's teaching on the preservative redemption as a source for Scotus' teaching on the preservative redemption of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Commenting on Saint Bernard's teaching on the redemption of the angels and the redemption of humans, Rosini commented "both types of redemption…are properly such: the 'diversity' rests simply in the manner of redeeming, remaining always the same in substance."[322] The angels who stood firm in God's grace did not have a *debitum peccati* or internal necessity to commit sin. They simply had the possibility of sinning. In this respect, at least from the Scotists' point of view, they were just like Mary. While it is true that Saint Bernard denied the Immaculate Conception, his discussion of the preservative redemption of the angels gave witness to the pre-existence of a key concept in the development of the doctrine. In some sense, Bernard's witness to the idea of preservative redemption is even more convincing because he invoked it outside of the context of Mariological controversy while speculating on how the faithful angels remained in friendship with God.

Despite the small amount of space that Ullathorne devoted to depicting preservative redemption as an ancient belief, this point holds great importance for Ullathorne's overall argument. Lack of clarity about embryology or the metaphysics of ensoulment could explain some of the reasons why some theologians mistakenly rejected the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. Yet, the fundamental problem that the theologians faced lay in explaining how a human person could receive redemption in Christ both before the Incarnation and at the first

---

[321] Brackets mine. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Cantica Canticorum: Eight-Six Sermons on the Song of Solomon,* trans. Samuel Eales (London: Eliot Stock, 1895), 126.
[322] Rosini, *Mariology of Blessed John Duns Scotus*, 96.

moment of existence. In order to give an account of how both of these could happen, preservative redemption was necessary. An appeal to the Areopagite, especially if one believed him to be a disciple of Saint Paul, as teaching the doctrine of preservative redemption made a very strong case that Scotus did not create a new concept but simply applied a most ancient one in order to explain a truth of the faith that had hitherto suffered a degree of conceptual obscurity. The fact that Saint Bernard explicitly held to preservative redemption in the case of the good angels pointed toward the likelihood that Ullathorne correctly identified the beginning of this tradition in the Church when he saw it in Dionysius. Unfortunately for Ullathorne's argument, textual criticism in the nineteenth century proved beyond a doubt that the Areopagite wrote four to five centuries after the apostolic age. This state of scholarship has made Ullathorne's case for the antiquity of the doctrine of preservative redemption far less compelling than it would have been otherwise. As with his argument for antiquity based on a lack of understanding of distinction between the passive and active conception, a scholarly consensus of a later date for when the Aeropagite lived stole force from Ullathorne's case that the substance of and building blocks for the Immaculate Conception dated back to the first generation of Christians.

Ullathorne's argument for doctrinal continuity placed great emphasis on the role of bishops as guarantors of the apostolic deposit of faith. As Champ has noted, Ullathorne saw his work on the Immaculate Conception as a vindication of the unwavering fidelity of the bishops over against overly subtle theologians who confused the simplicity of the faith when they sought to subject it erudite analysis. The story that Ullathorne told was one of the bishops overthrowing the theologians and striking a blow of the pure belief of the simple faithful.[323] Ullathorne's believed that in the nineteenth century more than ever, the bishop's most important task involved proposing the faith unambiguously and zealously to a world progressively drifting toward unbelief.

---

[323] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne*, 224.

5.6 Doctrinal and Episcopal Correlations

A pastoral focus of Archbishop Ullathorne throughout his priestly life was extending the exercise of episcopal authority. This preoccupation should hardly surprise, as he grew up in a country where all the Catholic sees had fallen into the definitive possession of Anglican bishops during the Reformation. As a newly-ordained missionary priest in Australia, Ullathorne made episcopal authority present personally for the first time as a resident vicar general. At the age of thirty three during a sea voyage between Australia and Europe, he began to sketch a plan to establish a territorial episcopal hierarchy in Australia.[324] On the date of his episcopal consecration in 1846, Ullathorne started to conceptualize a scheme to restore a territorial hierarchy in England, which came to fruition in 1850.[325] In 1850, he published a pamphlet-sized reflection on the nature of the office of bishop.[326] He also treated episcopal authority in his response to Pusey's *Eirenicon*—especially the relationship between the pope and the bishops.[327] Moreover, Ullathorne discussed the episcopacy frequently in the collection of addresses he published as *Ecclesiastical Discourses.*[328] He even penned a history of the events leading up to this restoration of hierarchy years later in 1871.[329]

Ullathorne believed that the great task of a bishop in the nineteenth century was teaching right doctrine. This was somewhat remarkable because his work to establish a local hierarchy, both in Australia and England, served primarily to strengthen the bishop in his exercise of ruling authority within his diocese.[330] Ullathorne recognized the importance of the bishop's regal or kingly office; yet

---

[324] William Bernard Ullathorne, *History of the Restoration of the Catholic Hierarchy in England* (London: Burns, Oates, and Company, 1871), 1.

[325] Ullathorne, *History of the Restoration*, 1-2.

[326] William Bernard Ullathorne, *The Office of a Bishop: A Discourse* (London: Thomas Richardson and Son, 1850)

[327] William Bernard Ullathorne, *The Anglican Theory of Union, as maintained in the 'Appeal to Rome' and Dr Pusey's 'Eirenicon'. A Second Letter to the Clergy of Birmingham* (London: Burns, Lambert and Oats, 1866.

[328] Ullathorne, *Ecclesiastical Discourses,* 31-55, 95-146.

[329] Ullathorne, *History of the Restoration.*

[330] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne,* 186-187.

he did not believe that in the nineteenth century the kingly office should take precedence. Nor did he believe the sacerdotal office of the bishop should be at the forefront. Ullathorne saw the teaching office of the bishop as the most important for the time in which he lived. He explained that "[t]o this age of unbelief, to this age of godless teaching, to this age of troubled minds and distressed consciences, the bishop is the mouthpiece of God, and represents the prophetic character of Christ."[331] Bishops played a paramount role in the Church because they spoke authoritatively to an age that did not accept authority on religious matters. With this stance in mind, one would expect that in defending the Immaculate Conception Ullathorne would take full advantage of any opportunity that he had to promote a bishop's teaching authority and status as a witness to authentic, changeless tradition.

Ullathorne's argument for the fundamental continuity of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception with the apostolic tradition safeguarded by the bishops leaves some questions. He ascribed the late-developing clarity regarding the doctrine to a misunderstanding of the distinction between Mary's active and passive conceptions. Yet, the final papal formula of definition suppressed this distinction. He looked to Pseudo-Dionysius for proof of the apostolicity of the doctrine of preservative redemption, but scholars have debunked the claim that the Aeropagite lived in the apostolic age. While neither of these difficulties entirely undermine his argument for continuity, they weaken it to some degree. Due to Ullathorne's eclectic approach to theology, the convincingness of his overall argument did not depend entirely on one or the other of these two points. Central to his overall approach to the doctrine was the conviction that the fundamentals of the faith do not change. Through the centuries, he argued that bishops bore witness to the truth of the Immaculate Conception even when the theologians confused the matter. This contention was a key point towards which the arguments he made in *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God* tended. The next chapter will recapitulate the arguments this thesis has made up to this point as well as present some of the most important paths for further research.

---

[331] Ullathorne, *Ecclesiastical Discourses*, 111-112.

Chapter 6—Conclusion

6.1 Findings

This thesis has sought to take a novel approach to a significant figure in nineteenth-century English Catholicism by showing how a non-theologian bishop used theology and the ways in which his theological views grounded some of his pastoral actions. Chapter one explained that although William Bernard Ullathorne was a very consequential churchman in nineteenth-century English Catholicism, scholars have not yet analyzed his writings on Our Lady through a theological lens. Ullathorne exercised a pivotal role in the Catholic mission to Australia and the re-establishment of the hierarchy in England. He was an indefatigable laborer in the vineyard of the Lord as the first Catholic bishop of Birmingham and played the role of reference point for continuity in English Catholicism. When it comes to his writings on Our Lady, historians have noted their pastoral and devotional aspects. Theologians have shown very little interest in what Ullathorne wrote on Our Lady. On one level, this neglect makes sense because Ullathorne was not, nor did he aspire to be, a theologian. On another level, Ullathorne's prominence in English Catholicism and the transitional state in which the Church both in England and beyond found herself in the nineteenth century makes his use of theology an appropriate subject for academic study. His use of theology both identifies different theological currents that influenced nineteenth-century English Catholicism and helps to explain some of Ullathorne's pastoral actions.

Chapter two gave important overall background for Ullathorne's life, his English and wider Catholic contexts as well as providing an outline of the chapters in his most consequential Marian work, *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God*. The monk-bishop came of age during a time of transition for Catholicism in England and the universal Church. The long winter of the penal laws began to pass away in England just as an anti-clerical furor forced the exiled network of English Catholic schools,

seminaries, and monasteries to return to England. The *modus vivendi* that developed in the English Catholic mission during the recusant period but was unravelling due to historical necessities still shaped Ullathorne's spiritual and intellectual formation. More broadly speaking, Catholicism in its then European heartland was grappling with the dissolution of the vestiges of Christendom as a result of the French Revolution. Ultramontanism sought to respond to this challenge by looking more intensely to the pope's spiritual authority and leadership both within the Church and in relationship to the world. In the midst of these significant transitions, Ullathorne's life resisted facile generalizations. He was a Benedictine monk deeply impacted by the active spirituality of Saint Francis de Sales. His intellectual life defied limitation to a single theological school because his mind received its definitive cast just as the Ultramontane movement was picking up steam but before the beginning of the scholastic revival of Leo XIII. Chapter two concluded with a precis of each chapter in Ullathorne's book on the Immaculate Conception.

Chapter three showed how Ullathorne drew from the Dionysius the Aeropagite's description of spiritual hierarchy and the Scotistic thesis to illustrate Mary's place in the overall divine economy. The influence of the French School of Spirituality is apparent in the ways in which Ullathorne employed both of these theological tools. Ullathorne's pastoral appropriation of these two conceptual pillars provided a solid foundation on which he could build his Marian recapitulation of the narrative of Christian salvation history. Unlike Dionysius' writings, Ullathorne gave a clear place to Mary in the divinely-order hierarchy. His adherence to the Scotist position did not preclude following a more Thomistic approach on other Mariological points like the *debitum peccati*. These theological concepts had pastoral applications. Both Ullathorne's articulation of the priesthood and what resonated for him about the message of the Marian apparition at La Salette drew from the vision he enunciated for Mary's place in the divine economy.

Chapter four traced Ullathorne's use of a neo-Augustinian approach to original sin that focused on the flesh rather than the soul along with its implications for the Immaculate Conception and pastoral life. Ullathorne looked back to the neo-

Augustinianism of Peter Lombard and Saint Bernard of Clairvaux, who saw original sin as a corruption of the body that spreads like an infection to the soul. This approach to original sin was in sharp contrast to the positions that opened the conceptual way for the formulation of the Immaculate Conception, such as those of Anselm, Thomas, and Duns Scotus. These positions held that original sin constituted a lack of original justice and was primarily in the soul. The archaic etiology that Ullathorne provided for original sin forced him to postulate an additional pre-purification of Mary's flesh before her Immaculate Conception. This explanation of original sin also helps to explain the reason why Ullathorne judged the approaches to the doctrine expounded by Saint John Henry Newman and in the *Rambler* as overly minimizing the effects of Adam and Eve's sin.

Finally, chapter five demonstrated that Ullathorne based his argument for the non-innovative nature of the dogma itself on a clear distinction between Mary's active and passive conceptions and the primitive belief of the Church in preservative redemption. Ullathorne's insistence on doctrinal continuity bore close relation to his pastoral focus on the bishop's role as an authoritative teacher of doctrine. For this part of his argument, he owed much to Perrone. With respect to the two conceptions, Ullathorne insisted that theologians confused the distinction between the two and that this confusion led some to reject the doctrine. This argument ran into significant problems in the face of a last-minute change in the wording of the dogmatic formula. All of this data demonstrates that when writing on the Immaculate Conception, Ullathorne took an eclectic approach, cobbling together diverse theological strands from different schools of thought as he believed it suited his purposes as a pastor best. Ullathorne's ultimate goal involved making it clear to Catholics and Protestants alike that the Immaculate Conception corresponded to the substance of the faith of early Christians regarding Mary's absolute holiness.

6.2 Synthesis

A synthesis of Ullathorne's use of Mariology, to the extent that one can draw a synthesis from a pastor who employed theology in as idiosyncratic a way as Ullathorne did, lies in the narrative that one can construct from the outline of salvation history that Ullathorne traced. The Immaculate Conception was not merely an ancient doctrine that the Church was finally getting around to defining dogmatically in the nineteenth century. It was a doctrinal expression of Mary's place in God's eternal plan for the universe. In this sense, one can identify in Ullathorne's approach to the Immaculate Conception a sort of counter-narrative to the understanding of human history advanced by many associated with the French Revolution. Just as Mary's place in God's eternal plan for the universe was forever constant, so was doctrine in the Church.

In this narrative, the human person was not the ultimate criterion by which to judge the world, but rather God and his plans for man were the true standards that allow one to read the unfolding of history. Our Lady's message at La Salette focused on sins against the second and third commandments, sins directly against God. It explained suffering in relation to sin abounding and prescribed the remedy of divine grace abounding all the more. One can even identify a Marian imprint on the Christian priesthood. These points fit well with the larger story Ullathorne told of Mary's central place in salvation history.

While Ullathorne's insistence on an archaic approach to original sin remains somewhat puzzling, it begins to make more sense when one takes two things into account. Firstly, Ullathorne had little interest in discussing change relative to doctrine in a schema that highlighted God's fixed, eternal plan. Older was better. Secondly, Ullathorne's emphasis on the radically fallen nature of the human person apart from God opposed a secular vision for progress without reference to God. This worldview derived from an anthropology wherein man alone was the measure of all things. This way of seeing things explains Ullathorne's vigilance in maintaining

the reality of the wound that original sin inflicted on the human person, even if it pitted him against the likes of Newman.

Any confusion regarding the antiquity of the Immaculate Conception lay in theologians muddying the waters by introducing too much of the human element and obscuring the pristine clarity of the apostolic faith. The intellectual effort of theologians expositing sources of Christian revelation using human wisdom yielded far from accurate results when it came to misunderstanding to which of Mary's conceptions the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception referred. In fact, the doctrine of preservative redemption that undergirds the Immaculate Conception was not only ancient, it also highlighted the profoundly theocentric nature of reality. God's redemption does not merely save from sin, it also preserves from sin. As such, nothing lies outside of the divine economy in Ullathorne's theocentric recapitulation of the Immaculate Conception. Bishops provided a more sure reference point to God's eternal plan because they interjected rational deduction less and clung more closely to the sources of revelation.

6.3 Areas for Further Study

This thesis has sought to provide an analysis of the use of Mariology by a bishop who had no pretensions of being a theologian. In doing so, it has focused on a volume on the Immaculate Conception that was just over two hundred pages long. While it might be possible to analyze more deeply some of the other aspects in *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God*, this present work has treated the most significant material and further study using the method here employed is unlikely to yield much more of significance. As noted in the first chapter, scholars have already given attention to the devotional and pastoral aspects of Ullathorne's Marian teaching. Barring the use of another method to read Ullathorne's Marian writings, further treatment of them is unlikely to yield significant finings.

There are, however, opportunities for further exploration of Ullathorne's use of theology as a pastor. As noted in chapter one,

the great majority of Ullathorne's writings did not treat Our Lady. In addition to two works on our Lady, he completed a trilogy of books in his last years that were the fruit of lifelong reflection on theological anthropology, humility, and patience—the longest of which was on theological anthropology.[332] In light of Ullathorne's disagreements with Newman and the *Rambler* on original sin, examining Ullathorne's approach to the human person could yield interesting results as regards the sources from which he drew in writing *The Endowments of Man Considered* and how Ullathorne's articulation of theological anthropology compared with his contemporaries in the context of his pastoral ministry as a bishop. One of Ullathorne's lieutenants in Birmingham, Michael Glancey, regarded *The Endowments of Man* as Ullathorne's most significant work.[333] Champ's assessment, however, sounded a less sanguine tone with respect to the abiding worth of Ullathorne's trilogy, which included *The Endowments of Man*. With the passage of time, it has become increasingly clear that "it is the trenchant public statements of [Ullathorne's] pamphlets and pastoral letters which retain an echo of the voice and stir the heart, rather than the somewhat dense and turgid spiritual writings."[334] Any further examination of Ullathorne's works from a theological point of view would do well to keep Champ's words in mind as well as the fact that Butler's 1926 observation that Ullathorne's main works still enjoy wide readership has long ceased to be true.[335]

Another possible area for further study using the method that this thesis has employed could be Ullathorne's approach to the Church. When Ullathorne wrote on the Church, he did so as shepherd of souls oftentimes in the midst of controversy. Ullathorne's writings on the Church would definitely fall in the category of works that Champ identified as having the greatest abiding value, as they gave witness to a pastor seeking to use all of the tools available to him to teach and lead his flock. In evaluating Ullathorne's works, Butler classed two in the category of "popular theology." One, *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God*,

---

[332] Ullathorne, *Christian Patience*; Ullathorne, *The Endowments of Man Considered;* Ullathorne, *The Groundwork of the Christian Virtues.*
[333] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne*, 492.
[334] Champ, *William Bernard Ullathorne*, 492.
[335] Butler, *The Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne*, vol. II, 222.

has been the primary focus of this thesis. The other, *The Anglican Theory of Union*, was a response to the ecclesiological questions raised by Pusey's *Eirenicon*. Ullathorne's rejoinder to Pusey was meant to compliment Newman's *Letter to Pusey*. Newman addressed Mariology, Ullathorne ecclesiology.[336] Reading *The Anglican Theory of Union* in the context of the other Church-related questions that Ullathorne faced throughout his life, such as the restoration of the Catholic hierarchy in England and the definition of Papal Infallibility, could provide ample opportunity to chart Ullathorne's use of ecclesiology as a pastor and how it conditioned his actions as a bishop in relation to the wider Church. Such a study would complement this thesis, as the mystery of Mary and the Church are deeply intertwined realities.

In contemplating the woman clothed with the sun in the twelfth chapter of the Book of Revelation, William Bernard Ullathorne chose to give a Marian rather than ecclesial reading to the text. This decision did not constitute the foundation of a Marian synthesis but rather the priorities of a pastor seeking to use whatever tools he could to promote the message of Christ and His Church to an increasingly secularizing world. When writing on Our Lady, Ullathorne sought to remind his readers of the wider Christian narrative of salvation history in which Mary played a very important part. The eclectic manner in which Ullathorne called theology into service to tell this story did not exist in isolation from his episcopal ministry. The arguments that Ullathorne utilized explain some of his pastoral actions. While few today read Ullathorne's Marian writings for devotional profit or doctrinal enrichment, this study has put them forth in order to provide important context for the theological and pastoral culture in nineteenth-century Catholicism, especially in England.

---

[336] Butler, *The Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne,* vol. II, 222-223.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

The Acts of Andrew. Translated by Dennis MacDonald. Santa Rosa: Polebridge Press, 2005.

Addington, Raleigh, ed. *Faber: Poet and Priest, Selected Letters by Frederick William Faber, 1833-1863*. Cowbridge: D. Brown & Sons Ltd., 1974.

Anselm. *Cur Deus Homo.* London: John Henry and James Parker, 1865.

Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologiae Tertia Pars, 1-59, Latin-English Opera Omnia.* Translated by Lawrence Shapcote. Lander: Emmaus Academic, 2012.

Augustinus. "*Enchiridion Ad Laurentium Liber Unus*." Augustinus Hipponensis. Accessed 10 October 2019. https://www.augustinus.it/latino/enchiridion/enchiridion.htm.

Bernard of Clairvaux. *Cantica Canticorum: Eight-Six Sermons on the Song of Solomon.* Edited and translated by Samuel Eales. London: Eliot Stock, 1895.

——————. *Sancti Bernardi Abbatis Clarae-Vallensis, Opera Omnia*, 2 vols. Edited by Joannis Mabillon. Paris: Gaune Fratres, 1839.

——————. *Some Letters of Saint Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux.* Translated by Samuel Eales. Edited by Francis Aidan Gasquet. London: John Hodges, 1904.

Catechism of the Catholic Church, 2nd ed. New York: Doubleday, 1997.

Challoner, Richard. *The Garden of the Soul: Or a Manual of Spiritual Exercises and Instructions for Christians Who (Living in the World) Aspire to Devotion.* London, n.p., 1741.

──────. *The Wonders of God in the Wilderness*. London: Needham, 1755.

──────. *Think Well On't; or Reflections on the Great Truths of the Christian Religion for Every Day of the Month*. London: n.p., 1728.

Chesterton, G.K. *Orthodoxy*. New York: John Lane, 1908.

Couve de Murville, Maurice, ed. *The Unsealed Fountain: Essays on the Christian Tradition.* Oscott: Veritas, 1987.

Dionysius the Areopagite, *Dionysius the Areopagite: On the Divine Names and the Mystical Theology*. Translated by C.E. Rolt. Documentacatholicaomnia.eu. Accessed 14 February 2020. http://www.documentacatholica omnia.eu/03d/04500525,_Dionysius_ Areopagita,_On_The_Divine_Names_And_The_Mystical_ Theology,_EN.pdf.

de Marsollier, M. *The Life of Saint Frances de Sales: Bishop of Geneva, Founder of the Order of the Visitation.* 2 vols. Translated by William Henry Coombes. Shepton-Mallet: W.J. Quartley, 1812.

de Sales, Francis. *The Sermons of St. Francis de Sales for Advent and Christmas,* vol. IV. Translated by the Nuns of Visitation. Edited by Lewis Fiorelli. *Oeuvers,* vols. 8-10. Annecy: Niérat: 1892-1964. Abr. ed., Rockford: Tan, 1987.

—————. *Treatise on the Love of God*. Translated by Henry Mackey. New York: P. O'Shea, 1861. Reprint, Blacksburg: Wilder Publications, 2011.

Faber, Frederick. *The Blessed Sacrament, or the Ways and Works of God.* London: Richardson and Son, 1855.

Guéranger, Prosper. *L'Année Liturgique*. 8 vols. Bruxelles: Greuse, 1847.

—————. *The Liturgical Year: Advent.* Translated by Lawrence Shepherd, Westminster: The Newman Press, 1948.

—————. *Mémoire sur la Question De l'Immaculée Conception.* Paris: Julien, Lanier et Comp, 1850.

—————. *On the Immaculate Conception.* Translated by a nun of St Cecilia's Abbey, Ryde. Farnborough: Saint Michael's Abbey Press, 2006.

Newman, John Henry. *Certain Difficulties Felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching*, vol. II, 2nd ed. London: Longmans, Green, and Co, 1891. Reprint, London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1900.

—————. *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent.* London: Burns and Oats, 1870.

—————. *Apologia Pro Vita Sua: Being a History of His Religious Opinions.* London: Collins Fontana, 1864. Reprint, London: Longmans, Green, And Co., 1908.

—————. *A Letter to the Rev. E.B. Pusey, D.D., on his recent Eirenicon*. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1866.

—————. *A Letter to the Rev. E.B. Pusey, D.D., on his recent Eirenicon*. 2nd ed. London Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1866.

—————. *A Letter to the Rev. E.B. Pusey, D.D., on his recent Eirenicon*. 3rd ed. London Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1866.

—————. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman.* 31 vols. Edited by Charles Stephen Dessain, et. al. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Pareri dell'Episcopato Cattolico sulla Definizione Dogmatica dell'Immacolato Concepimento, Parte Prima, Volume Terzo. Roma: Civiltá Cattolica, 1851. Google Books. Accessed 20 December 2019.

Passaglia, Carlo. *De Immaculato Deiparae Semper Virginis Conceptu Caroli Passaglia Commentarius.* 3 vols. Naples: Josephum Dura, 1854-1855.

Paul VI. *Solemni Hac Liturgia (Credo of the People of God)*. Vatican.va. Accessed February 13, 2020. http://w2.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/en/motu_proprio/documents/hf_p-vi_motu-proprio_19680630_credo.html.

Perrone, Johnnes. *De Immaculato B.V. Mariae Conceptu An Dogmatico Decreto Definiri Possit Disquisitio Theologica.* Rome: Ioannes Baptista Marini et Bernardus Morini, 1847. Reprint, Olysipone: Ex Typis Regiis Lusitanis, 1849.

Pusey, Edward Bouviere. *The Church of England: A Portion of Christ's One Holy Catholic Church, and a Means of Restoring Visible Unity, An Eirenicon.* New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1866.

Sardi, Vincenzo, ed. *La Solemne Definizione del Dogma della Immacolata Concepimento di Maria Santissima: Atti e Documenti.* 2 vols. Roma: Typografia Vaticana, 1905.

Scheeben, Matthias. *Handbuch der Katholischen Dogmatik.* 7 vols. Freiburg: Herder, 1873-1887.

Scotus, Ioannes Duns. *Opera Omnia.* 26 vols. Paris: Apud Ludovicum Vives, 1891.

Tertullian. *A Treatise on the Soul.* Translated by Peter Holmes. New Advent.org. Accessed 16 October 2019. http://newadvent.org/fathers/0310.htm.

Ullathorne, William Bernard. *The Anglican Theory of Union, as maintained in the 'Appeal to Rome' and Dr Pusey's 'Eirenicon'. A second letter to the clergy of Birmingham.* London: Burns, Lambert and Oats, 1866.

——————. *The Autobiography of Archbishop Ullathorne, with Selections from his Letters*. Edited by Augusta Drane. London: Burns & Oats, Limited, 1891.

——————. *Christian Patience: The Strength and Discipline of the Soul.* London: Burns & Oates, 1886.

——————. *The Devil is a Jackass: The Autobiography of William Bernard Ullathorne.* Edited by Leo Madigan. Bath: Downside Abbey, 1995.

——————. *Ecclesiastical Discourses: Delivered on Special Occasions*. London: Burns and Oats, 1876.

——————. *The Endowments of Man Considered in Their Relations with His Final End: A Course of Lectures*. London: Burns & Oates, 1888.

——————. *The Groundwork of the Christian Virtues: A Course of Lectures*. London: Burns and Oates, 1882.

——————. *History of the Restoration of the Catholic Hierarchy in England.* London: Burns, Oates, and Company, 1871.

——————. *The Holy Mountain of La Salette*. London: Richardson and Son, 1854.

——————. *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God: An Exposition.* London: Richardson, 1855.

——————. *The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God*, edited by Canon Iles. Westminster: Art and Book Co., 1904.

——————. "Manuscript of Bishop Ullathorne's Book on the Immaculate Conception." 1854. Reference Number: R1616, Hierarchical Number: Z6/2/4/37/2/1. Archdiocese of Birmingham Archives, Birmingham, England.

——————. *The Office of a Bishop: A Discourse*. London: Thomas Richardson and Son, 1850.

Secondary Sources

Abalodo, Sebastien. "2016 Bibliography." Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton. Accessed June 8, 2019. https://ecommons.udayton.edu/imri_bibliographies/16.

——————. "2017 Bibliography." Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton. Accessed June 8, 2019. https://ecommons. udayton.edu/imri_bibliographies/15.

Abalodo, Sebastien, and Gloria Falcão Dodd. "2015 Bibliography." Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton. Accessed June 8, 2019. http://ecommons.udayton.edu/imri_bibliographies/14.

Bastero, Juan Luis. *Mary, Mother of the Redeemer: A Mariology Textbook*. Translated byMichael Adams. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2011.

Beck, George, ed. *English Catholics: 1850-1950*. London: Burns and Oats, 1950.

Bellenger, Dominic Aidan. *Monks with a Mission: Essays in English Benedictine History*. Bath:Downside Abbey Press, 2014.

Bessuti, Guiseppe, Ermanno Toniolo, and Silvano Danieli, eds. *Bibliografia Mariana*. 13 vols. Roma: Marianum, 1948-2008.

Blackbourn, David. "The Catholic Church in Europe since the French Revolution." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 33, no. 4 (1991): 778-790.

Boss, Sarah Jane. *Empress and Handmaid: On Nature and Gender in the Cult of the Virgin Mary*. New York: Cassell, 2000.

Boss, Sarah Jane, ed. *Mary: The Complete Resource*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Butler, Cuthbert. *The Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne, 1806-1889*. 2 vols. London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, Ltd., 1926.

—————. *The Vatican Council: The Story Told from Inside in Bishop Ullathorne's Letters.* London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1936.

Carney, Edward. *The Mariology of St. Francis de Sales.* Westminister: Newman Bookshop, 1963.

Carol, Juniper. *Why Jesus Christ? Thomistic, Scotistic and Conciliatory Perspectives.*

Manassas: Trinity Communications, 1986.

Carroll, Warren. *The Guillotine and the Cross.* Front Royal: Christendom Press, 1991.

—————. *Revolution against Christendom: A History of Christendom, Volume 5*. Front Royal: Christendom Press, 2006.

The Catholic Encyclopedia. 15 vols. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1907-1912.

Chadwick, Owen. *From Bossuet to Newman.* 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Champ, Judith. "Dogma as Pastoral Necessity: Archbishop Ullathorne and the definition of the Immaculate Conception of Mary." *The Month* 20 (Aug-Sept 1987): 304-308.

—————. *William Bernard Ullathorne, 1806-1889: A Different Kind of Monk*. Leominster: Gracewing, 2006.

Collins, Paul. "William Bernard Ullathorne and the Foundation of Australian Catholicism, 1815-1840." PhD diss., Australian National University, 1989.

Cooper, Adam. "Hierarchy, Humility, and Holiness: The Meaning of Ecclesial Ranks according to Dionysius the Areopagite." *Nova et Vetera,* 11, No. 3 (2013)*: 649-661.

Cross, Richard. *Duns Scotus.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Cwiekowski, Frederick. *The English Bishops and the First Vatican Council.* Louvain: Universitaires de Louvain, 1971.

Davies, Horton. *Worship and Theology in England from Newman to Martineau, 1850-1900.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.

De Fiores, Stefano. *Maria: Nuovissimo Dizionario*. 3 vols. Bologna: EDB, 2006-2008.

De Fiores, Stefano, Valeria Ferrari Schiefer, and Salvatore M. Perrella, eds. *Mariologia*. Milano: San Paolo, 2009.

Dean, Maximilian. *Primer on the Absolute Primacy of Christ: Blessed John Duns Scotus and the Franciscan Thesis.* New Bedford: Academy of the Immaculate, 2006.

Denzinger, Heinrich. *Compendium of Creeds, Definitions, and Declarations on Matters of Faith and Morals*. Edited by Peter Hunermann. Translated by Robert Fastiggi and Anne Englund Nash. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2012.

Disney, Lindsey, and Larry Poston. "The Breath of Life: Christian Perspectives on Conception and Ensoulment." *Anglican Theological Review* 92, no. 2 (2010): 271-295.

Dodd, Gloria Falcão. "2012 Bibliography." Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton. Accessed June 8, 2019. https://ecommons.udayton.edu/imri_bibliographies/4.

_____. "2013 Bibliography." Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton. Accessed June 8, 2019. http://ecommons.udayton.edu/imri_bibliographies/3.

_____. "2014 Bibliography." Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton. Accessed June 8, 2019. http://ecommons.udayton.edu/imri_bibliographies/2.

Dodd, Gloria Falcão and Johann Roten. "2011 Bibliography." Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton. Accessed June 8, 2019. https://ecommons.udayton.edu/imri_ bibliographies/1.

Donceel, Joseph. "Immediate Hominization and Delayed Hominization." *Theological Studies* 31, no. 1 (Feb 1970): 76-105.

Drane, Francis Raphael. *Life of Mother Mary Hallahan*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1929.

Duffy, Eamon. "Richard Challoner and the English Salesian tradition." *The Clergy Review* 66 (Dec 1981): 449-455.

—————. *Saints and Sinners: A History of the Popes*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.

Duffy, Eamon, ed. *Challoner and His Church: A Catholic Bishop in Georgian England.* London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1981.

Europe 1789-1914: Encyclopedia of the Age of Industry and Empire. 5 vols. Detroit, MI: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2006.

Fehlner, Peter. "The Franciscan Mariological School and the Co-redemptive Movement," *Marian Studies* 59 (2008): 59-88.

Gallagher, Lowell, ed. *Redrawing the Map of Early Modern English Catholicism.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012.

Gambero, Luigi, ed. *Testi Mariani Del Secondo Millennio*. Roma: Città Nuova Editrice, 1996.

Garrigou-Lagrange, Reginald. *The Mother of the Saviour and Our Interior Life*. Translated by Bernard Kelly. St. Louis: B. Herder, 1949.

Gooch, Leo. "The Religion for a Gentleman: The Northern Catholic Gentry in the Eighteenth Century." *Recusant History* 23, no. 4 (Oct 1997): 543-568.

Graef, Hilda, and Thomas Thompson. *Mary: A History of Doctrine and Devotion*. Notre Dame: Ave Maria Press, 2009.

Guilday, Peter. *English Catholic Refugees on the Continent 1558-1795.* Vol. 1, *The English Colleges and Convents in the Catholic Low Countries, 1558-1795.* London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1914.

Hardy, Mary. "The seventeenth -century English and Scottish reception of Francis de Sales' An Introduction to a Devout Life." *British Catholic History* 33, no. 2 (2016): 228-258.

Haydock, George and F. C. Husenbeth, eds. *The Holy Bible: translated from the Latin Vulgate, diligently compared with the Hebrew, Greek, and other editions in divers languages*. New York, Edward Dunigan and Brother, 1855.

Heimann, Mary. *Catholic Devotion in Victorian England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.

Herringer, Carol Engelhardt. *Victorians and the Virgin Mary: Religion and Gender in England, 1830-1885*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008.

Holmes, Derrick. *More Roman than Rome: English Catholicism in the Nineteenth Century*. London: Burns and Oates, 1978.

Ker, Ian. *Newman*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Knepper, Timothy. "Ranks are Not Bypassed, Rituals are not Negated: The Dionysian Corpus on Return" *Modern Theology* 30, no. 1 (Jan 2014): 66-95.

Kollar, Rene. *A Foreign and Wicked Institution?: The Campaign against Convents in Victorian England.* Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 2011.

Matthew, David. *Catholicism in England, 1535-1935.* London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1936.

Maunder, Chris, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Mary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Mills, Matthew. "Behold Your Mother: Virgin Mary in English Monasticism, c. 1050-1200. PhD diss.: Regent's Park College Oxford, 2016.

Miravalle, Mark, ed. *Mariology: A Guide for Priests, Deacons and Seminarians*. Goleta: Queenship Publishing, 2008.

McClelland, Vincent. *Cardinal Manning: His Public Life and Influence, 1865-92.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.

McDonnell, Eunan. *The Concept of Freedom in the Writings of St. Francis De Sales.* Oxford: Peter Lang, 2009.

The New Catholic Encyclopedia. 17 vols. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967-1979.

The New Catholic Encyclopedia. 2nd ed. 15 vols. Detroit: Gale, 2003.

Nichols, Aidan. *There is No Rose: The Mariology of the Catholic Church.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015.

Norman, Edward. *The English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.

O'Carroll, Michael. *Theotokos: A Theological Encyclopedia of the Blessed Virgin Mary*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 1982.

O'Connor, Edward, ed. *The Dogma of the Immaculate Conception: History and Significance*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1958.

O'Donoghue, Frances. *The Life of John Bede Polding, Australia's First Catholic Archbishop.* London: Angus & Robertson Publishers, 1982.

O'Malley, John. *Vatican I: The Council and the Making of the Ultramontane Church.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2018.

Ott, Ludwig. *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, edited by James Bastible and Robert Fastiggi. Translated by Patrick Lynch. London: Baronius Press, 2018.

Perrier, Jacques ed. *Je Suis L'Immaculée: Colloque Organisé par les Sanctuaires N.-D. de Lourdes avec la Collaboration de la Société Française d'Études Mariales (SFEM)* Paris: Éditions Parole et Silence, 2006.

Peters, Danielle. "2006 Bibliography." Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton. Accessed June 8, 2019. http://ecommons.udayton.edu/imri_bibliographies/8.

——————. "2007 Bibliography." Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton. Accessed June 8, 2019. http://ecommons.udayton.edu/imri_bibliographies/9.

——————. "2008 Bibliography." Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton. Accessed June 8, 2010. http://ecommons.udayton.edu/imri_bibliographies/10.

——————. "2009 Bibliography." Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton. Accessed June 8, 2019. http://ecommons.udayton.edu/imri_bibliographies/12.

——————. "2010 Bibliography." Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton. Accessed June 8, 2019. http://ecommons.udayton.edu/imri_bibliographies/11.

Pham, John-Peter. *Heirs of the Fisherman: Behind the Scenes of Papal Death and Succession.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Pomplun, Trent. "The Theology of Gerard Manley Hopkins: From John Duns Scotus to the Baroque." *The Journal of Religion* 95, no. 1 (Jan 2015): 1-34.

Rosini, Ruggero. *The Mariology of Blessed John Duns Scotus*. Edited by Peter Fehlner. Translated by Franciscans of the Immaculate. New Bedford: Academy of the Immaculate, 2008.

Roten, Johann G., "1994-1997 Bibliography." Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton. Accessed June 8, 2019. http://ecommons.udayton.edu/imri_bibliographies/5.

—————. "1999 Bibliography." Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton. Accessed June 8, 2019. http://ecommons.udayton.edu/imri_bibliographies/6.

—————. "2000-2005 Bibliography." Marian Bibliographies, University of Dayton. Accessed June 8, 2019. http://ecommons.udayton.edu/imri_bibliographies/7.

Rowlands, Marie. "The Education and Piety of Catholics in Staffordshire in the 18th Century." *Recusant History* 10, no. 2 (Apr 1969): 67-78.

Ryan, Ambrose. *Australia and the Immaculate Conception: 100 Years Ago.*" Melbourne: Advocate Press for Australian Truth Society, 1954.

Shea, C. Michael. *Newman's Early Roman Catholic Legacy: 1845-1854.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Sheen, Fulton. "The Assumption and the Modern World." *The Thomist* 14, no. 1 (Jan 1951): 31-40.

Swanson, R.N., ed. *The Church and Mary: Papers Read at the 2001 Summer Meeting and the 2002 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society.* Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2004.

Thompson, William, ed. *Berulle and the French School: Selected Writing.* Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1989.

Turner, Frank. *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.

Vasey, Vincent. "Mary in the Doctrine of Bérulle on the Mysteries of Christ." *Marian Studies* 36 (1985): 60-80.

Vincent, Mary Clare. "Mary and Monastics." *Word and Spirit: A Monastic Review* 10 (1988): 78-93.

Weldon, Dom Benet. *English Benedictine Congregation: Chronological Notes.* Stanbrook: The Abbey of Our Lady of Consolation, 1881.

Wilkinson, Melissa. *Frederick William Faber: A Great Servant of God.* Leominster: Gracewing, 2007.

Wiseman, Vincent. "Marian Profile of Classical Orders." *Marian Library Studies* 31 (2013): 95-124.

Wolter, Allan. "The Theology of the Immaculate Conception in Light of *Ineffabilis Deus*." *Marian Studies* 5 (1954): 19-72.

Unger, Dominic. "Franciscan Christology: Absolute and Universal Primacy of Christ." *Franciscan Studies* 22, no. 4 (1942): 428-475.