

## Durham E-Theses

---

# *The liturgical vision of Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin*

Christabel Jane Powell

### How to cite:

---

Powell, Christabel Jane (2002) The liturgical vision of Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/3761/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

**Dedication**

To my daughter Frances Valaydon-Pillay

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a pleasure to record the wise and generous help I have enjoyed while preparing this thesis. The people who gave me a word of encouragement when I needed it most should not be forgotten, particularly Mrs Elizabeth Davies and my daughter Frances, as well as those who gave me a great deal of help, guidance and support.

I am particularly indebted to Dr Sheridan Gilley without whose excellent supervision the thesis could not have been written, Rev. Dr Ralph Waller who never lost faith in me, and Dr Eric Eve, my own personal rock whose love, common sense and support helped me through blood, sweat and tears; and I have received important gifts of time, information and judgement from a number of archivists and librarians, amongst whom I am happy to mention Father Dickie of Westminster Diocesan Archives, Father Ombre of Blackfriars, Miss S. Eward of Salisbury Cathedral Library, R. Darwall-Smith of Magdalen College Archives, Dr Jones of Balliol College Archives, as well as the librarians and staff of the Bodleian Library and the British Library who were always cheerfully helpful.

I offer them all my warm thanks and lasting appreciation.

CHRISTABEL JANE POWELL

**Abstract**

The Liturgical Vision of Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin

The aim of this thesis is to argue that Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin (1812-1852) was a liturgist who had a liturgical vision. He is commonly regarded as an architect and designer *per se*, but many believe he had eccentric ideas, was a fanatic for the Gothic style of architecture and that while he was religious, he had little impact on the religious controversy and events of his time. The thesis will bring forward a different picture of him.

The reasons put forward to support the claim that he was a liturgist are that he had a particularly definition of liturgy; he studied liturgy for three years; he employed a particular method of writing, which was commonly used by past liturgists; many of his authorities were liturgists and historians, as well as architects and designers, and his sources related to liturgy.

Pugin went from attacking Protestants, to defending his views against Roman Catholics. To argue for his views, Pugin employed a particular methodology, which included a vast number of authorities and sources. He offered to England an alternative setting of the Roman rite. The new converts who had seceded from the Church of England to the Church of Rome, including John Henry Newman and his circle, did not support him and this led to a major conflict. Their different views of liturgy became a matter of judgement for the Roman Catholic Church.

Pugin was influenced by Continental, particularly French, Roman Catholic scholars and liturgists. The influence of the leader of the liberal Catholics in France, Charles-Forbes-René, Count de Montalembert, is also brought to light.

The thesis will argue that Pugin sought to implement his views on liturgy in England and had a vision of a future England that could act as an example to the rest of Catholic Christendom, including the Church of Rome. He initially had a measure of success, but finally failed and bowed to the judgement of the Roman Catholic Church.



**THE LITURGICAL VISION OF  
AUGUSTUS WELBY NORTHMORE PUGIN**

**CHRISTABEL JANE POWELL  
DEGREE: Ph.D. (THEOLOGY)  
UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM  
2002**

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.  
No quotation from it should be published without  
his prior written consent and information derived  
from it should be acknowledged.



18 DEC 2002

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### P.11 **Chapter One – INTRODUCTION**

### p.22 **Chapter Two – THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SURVEY**

- p.23 1) **Those writers who were contemporaries of Pugin and knew him personally.**
- p.34 2) **The Twentieth-century writers.**
  - p.34 i) Chapters of books about Pugin.
  - p.35 ii) The first treatise on Pugin by an historian.
  - p.38 iii) The ecclesiastical historians.
  - p.38 iv) The architectural historians.
  - p.40 v) The Roman Catholic writer.
  - p.41 vi) Architectural historians continue to be interested in Pugin.
- p.44 xii) Pugin's name surfaced in a variety of publications.
- p.50 3) **The biographers.**
- p.55 4) **Further assorted publications about Pugin.**
  - p.60 i) A critical study of Pugin's architecture.
  - p.60 ii) The biographers.
  - p.63 iii) Exhibitions and supporting catalogues about Pugin.

### p.66 **Chapter Three – PUGIN'S CONVERSION**

- p.67 1) **Pugin's upbringing influenced his religious development.**
  - p.67 i) His father Augustus Charles Pugin.
  - p.73 ii) Pugin's mother Catherine (née Welby) Pugin.
  - p.75 iii) The Evangelical influence.
- p.79 2) **Pugin's budding interest in liturgy led him to convert to Roman Catholicism.**
  - p.79 i) A time of trouble and a turning to God.
  - p.80 ii) Pugin began studying the history of Gothic architecture and its use by the Church of England.
  - p.84 iii) His attention increasingly turned to the subject of liturgy.
  - p.86 iv) Pugin's definition of "liturgy" different from that of many modern scholars.
  - p.88 v) Pugin's study of liturgy.
  - p.89 vi) Pugin's conversion to Catholicism.
  - p.90 vii) Disillusionment with the Church of England.
  - p.91 viii) Catholicism only found in one Church.
  - p.92 ix) Architecture not the sole reason for conversion.
  - p.93 x) Difficulties in becoming a member of the Roman Catholic Church.
  - p.94 xi) Reception into the Roman Catholic Church.
  - p.95 xii) Church architecture presented Pugin with another paradox.
  - p.96 xiii) Pugin's mission in life.
  - p.97 xiv) Wiseman's London Lectures.
  - p.98 xv) The way ahead.

### p.99 **Chapter Four – THE FIRST EDITION OF CONTRASTS**

- p.99 1) **Difficulties of publishing.**
- p.99 2) **An unusual approach.**
  - p.100 i) Pugin followed the lead of earlier Roman Catholic controversialists.
- p.101 3) **Pugin's exegesis of ecclesiastical architecture and his exposition and expansion of it in Contrasts.**
  - p.101 4) **Pugin's exposition of the allegorical meaning.**
    - p.101 i) A long tradition of allegorical exegesis of ecclesiastical architecture.
    - p.106 ii) Allegorical interpretation of liturgical architecture.

- p.108 5) **Pugin's exposition in Contrasts of the allegorical meaning.**
- p.108 6) **Pugin's exposition of the doctrinal level of meaning.**
- p.108 i) The Rules of Faith and liturgy.
- p.111 7) **Pugin's exposition of the historical level of meaning.**
- p.111 i) A comparison of two ages.
- p.111 ii) The British historians.
- p.119 iii) The French historians.
- p.121 8) **Pugin's exposition of the practical level of meaning.**
- p.122 i) The Catholic Rule of Faith on a practical level.
- p.123 ii) The Protestant Rule of Faith on a practical level.
- p.124 9) **Pugin's exposition of the moral level of meaning.**
- p.125 10) **A defence of Contrasts.**
- p.125 i) Pugin prepared to defend his views.
- p.125 ii) Criticism of Contrasts.
- p.127 iii) Reply to criticism.
- p.129 11) **Pugin uses the medieval method of exegesis and interpretation for his new publication.**
- p.129 12) **Pugin's exposition of the allegorical meaning.**
- p.129 13) **His exposition of the doctrinal level of meaning.**
- p.129 i) The nature of the true Church.
- p.130 14) **Pugin's exposition of the moral level of meaning.**
- p.131 15) **Anglican polemic.**
- p.131 i) Anglicans anxious to defend the Church of England.
- p.131 16) **Anglican views on the nature of the Church.**
- p.131 i) The Church of England was Catholic.
- p.132 ii) Anglican views on disunity.
- p.132 iii) Tractarian view that the Church of England was not a State invention.
- p.134 iv) The 'Via Media' position of the Church of England.
- p.135 17) **Pugin's controversial debate began to focus on the Church of England rather than Protestantism in general.**
- p.135 i) Protestantism led to disunity.
- p.135 ii) St. Augustine of Canterbury a Roman Catholic.
- p.136 iii) The prayers of the Church of England were not original to that Church.
- p.136 iv) Remnants of Catholicism did not make the Church of England Catholic.
- p.137 v) Fundamentals only in the church of Rome.
- p.137 vi) Some Anglicans pretending to be Catholic.
- p.138 vii) The Church of England devoid of the Holy Spirit.
- p.138 viii) The Church of England a State-created Church.
- p.139 ix) The 'Via Media' not real.
- p.140 x) Anglicans ignorant of ordinances and practices.
- p.142 18) **Protestants made a stand.**
- p.142 i) The Martyrs' Memorial Committee.
- p.142 ii) Pugin scorned the idea of a memorial to Protestant Reformers.
- p.144 iii) The aim of Pugin's Letter was to discredit the Protestant "martyrs" and suggest Catholic martyrs instead.
- p.145 iv) Pugin repeated his claim that the Church of England was a State creation.
- p.146 v) Reaction to Pugin's Letter.

## p.148 **Chapter Five – A NEW VERSION OF CONTRASTS**

- p.148 1) **Pugin's relationship with the Tractarians.**
- p.148 i) Increased visits to Oxford.
- p.149 ii) A commission at Balliol College, Oxford.
- p.150 iii) Only an acquaintanceship with John Henry Newman.
- p.152 iv) More commissions in and around Oxford.

- p.153 2) **Wiseman's arrival at Oxford.**
- p.153 i) Pugin already well established at Oscott when Wiseman arrived.
- p.154 ii) Pugin's ideas not always accepted by those in authority.
- p.156 iii) Pugin continued with his usual activities.
- p.158 iv) An uneasy alliance between Pugin and Wiseman.
- p.160 v) Differences between Wiseman and Pugin continue to grow.
- p.161 vi) Pugin continued his acquaintanceship with Newman and Pusey, but developed a strong friendship with Bloxam.
- p.164 3) **Pugin's health problems aggravated by anxiety.**
- p.165 4) **Pugin's second edition of Contrasts.**
- p.165 i) Method of publishing Contrasts.
- p.166 ii) Pugin used a strict methodology.
- p.167 iii) A radial rather than a lineal method of writing.
- p.168 5) **Pugin's exegesis of ecclesiastical architecture and his exposition of it in the second edition of Contrasts.**
- p.169 6) **Pugin brings out the allegorical meaning of religious architecture in Contrasts.**
- p.169 7) **His exposition of the doctrinal level of meaning.**
- p.169 i) Ignorance was evil.
- p.170 ii) A turning to and a turning away from God.
- p.171 8) **Pugin's exposition of the theological level of meaning.**
- p.171 i) Christian symbolism rejected.
- p.173 ii) Antichrist a controversial issue.
- p.175 9) **Pugin's exposition of the mystical level of meaning.**
- p.175 i) Symbolism and allegory in Classical architecture.
- p.177 ii) An allegorical interpretation of all religious architecture – whether Christian or Pagan.
- p.178 10) **Pugin's exposition of the historical level of meaning in Contrasts.**
- p.178 i) Buildings as history books.
- p.179 ii) Further evidence that Pugin was influenced by medieval and early Renaissance thought.
- p.181 iii) The spread of neo-Classicism on the Continent.
- p.181 iv) Fixed laws to architecture.
- p.183 v) Not a question of reconstruction or copying.
- p.188 vi) Pugin influenced by the Renaissance Naturalist artists.
- p.188 vii) Savonarola's major influence on Pugin's ideas.
- p.190 viii) Pugin influenced by Savonarola in allotting blame for the decline of religion.
- p.190 ix) Pugin expressed his admiration for Savonarola.
- p.191 x) Those ecclesiastics who supported the neo-Classical and Baroque.
- p.194 xi) The "new" St. Peter's, Rome, an example of Humanist architecture.
- p.197 xii) Pugin influenced by the French Revolution.
- p.198 xiii) The French historians.
- p.199 xiv) The destruction of the '*ancien régime*'.
- p.200 xv) Paganism made inroads in England.
- p.202 xvi) The nineteenth-century Naturalist artists.
- p.203 xvii) Pugin shared the ideals of Overbeck and his group of Naturalist artists.
- p.203 xviii) The loss of interest in religion.
- p.204 xix) The British historians.
- p.205 11) **Pugin's exposition of the practical level of meaning.**
- p.205 i) New services.
- p.207 ii) A new liturgical form and arrangement required.
- p.209 iii) The Reformers, too, required a new liturgical form and arrangement.

- p.212 **Chapter Six – PUGIN’S SERIES OF BOOKS**
- p.212 1) **A precedent to The True Principles.**
- p.212 2) **Pugin applied certain categories to his new book.**
- p.213 3) **Pugin’s exposition of the practical or literal level of meaning in The True Principles.**
- p.213 i) His authorities and sources.
- p.214 ii) The Classical temple.
- p.217 iii) Pagan symbols replaced Christian ones.
- p.217 iv) The Mechanics’ Institutes anti-Christian.
- p.218 4) **Pugin’s exposition of the mystical level of meaning.**
- p.218 i) The character of a Catholic building of worship determined by more than the practical aspect.
- p.218 5) **Pugin’s exposition of the moral level of meaning.**
- p.220 6) **The Present State.**
- p.220 i) Another controversial issue.
- p.221 7) **Liturgical sources and authorities for The Present State.**
- p.221 i) Pugin’s principal French liturgical authority.
- p.226 ii) Other French liturgical authorities.
- p.228 iii) Italian liturgical authorities.
- p.230 iv) Pugin’s one German authority.
- p.231 8) **Attitude to schools of painting.**
- p.231 i) Views on Realism.
- p.231 ii) The Naturalist painters.
- p.232 9) **Pugin’s exposition of the allegorical meaning in The Present State of ecclesiastical architecture in England.**
- p.233 10) **Pugin’s exposition of the doctrinal level of meaning.**
- p.234 i) Exposition not the same as Benediction.
- p.236 ii) Reservation.
- p.237 iii) Benediction.
- p.239 11) **Pugin’s exposition of the mystical level of meaning.**
- p.240 i) Churches allegories for mystical and spiritual truths.
- p.240 12) **Pugin’s exposition of the theological level of meaning.**
- p.241 i) Ignorance led to evil.
- p.242 ii) Theological reasons for the position of the church.
- p.242 13) **Pugin’s exposition of the historical level of meaning.**
- p.242 i) The origins of liturgy.
- p.245 ii) The importance of historical inquiry.
- p.245 iii) Pugin not guilty of archaeologism.
- p.246 iv) Continental sources and authorities.
- p.246 v) British historical sources and authorities.
- p.249 14) **Pugin’s exposition of the practical level of meaning.**
- p.249 i) A common liturgical form and arrangement.
- p.250 ii) The requirements for liturgical form and arrangement.
- p.253 15) **An Apology.**
- p.253 i) Pugin’s continued involvement in contemporary issues.
- p.253 ii) Effects of Tract 90.
- p.255 iii) Doubts about Tract 90.
- p.255 iv) Reassurances concerning Tract 90.
- p.256 v) Catholicising of Anglican parish churches.
- p.257 vi) Pugin influenced an Anglican rector.
- p.259 vii) St Saviour’s Church, Leeds.
- p.260 viii) Pugin’s interest in Littlemore.
- p.261 ix) The reordering of further Oxford Anglican parish churches.
- p.262 x) Difficulties encountered.

- p.263 xi) Pugin's Anglican friend seceded to Rome.
- p.263 xiii) A lost commission and diminished support.
- p.265 16) **Style versus form and arrangement.**
- p.265 i) Pugin's purpose not simply a justification of the Gothic style.
- p.266 ii) Not a matter of being unappreciative of other styles.
- p.267 iii) Pugin welcomed modern technology.
- p.268 iv) Style not the issue.
- p.268 v) Style.
- p.269 vi) Form and arrangement.
- p.270 17) **Pugin's exposition of allegorical meaning in An Apology.**
- p.270 18) **His exposition of the theological level of meaning.**
- p.271 19) **Pugin's exposition of the mystical level of meaning.**
- p.271 20) **Pugin's exposition and expansion of the historical level of meaning.**
- p.272 i) The British historians.
- p.272 21) **Pugin's exposition of the practical level of meaning.**
- p.273 22) **Oxford developments.**
- p.273 i) Closer contact with Newman.
- p.273 ii) Disagreement with Romanizing Tractarians.
- p.274 iii) Protestants criticized Pugin's role.
- p.275 iv) Commissioned by the incumbent of St. Mary's, the University Church, Oxford.
- p.276 v) Newman recommended Pugin.
- p.277 23) **The Glossary.**
- p.277 i) Events at Oxford.
- p.278 24) **Pugin's exposition of allegorical meaning in The Glossary.**
- p.279 25) **Pugin's exposition of the theological level of meaning.**
- p.279 i) Liturgy part of Revelation.
- p.282 ii) The unchanging nature of "patterns".
- p.283 26) **Pugin's exposition of the practical level of meaning.**
- p.284 27) **Pugin's exposition of the historical level of meaning.**
- p.284 i) Liturgical authorities.
- p.285 ii) French liturgical authorities.
- p.288 iii) Italian liturgical authorities.

## p.295 **Chapter Seven – THE POLARISED VIEWS OF PUGIN AND THE ORATORIAN**

- p.295 1) **Events surrounding secessions to the Roman Church.**
- p.295 i) Pugin's visits to Oxford ceased.
- p.295 ii) W. G. Ward put forward his opinions.
- p.297 iii) Continued hostility from Ward.
- p.298. iv) Further events at Leeds.
- p.298 2) **Events following secessions.**
- p.298 i) Pugin had hopes for the converts.
- p.299 3) **Settling into the Church of Rome.**
- p.299 i) The converts happy to receive assistance from Pugin and Lord Shrewsbury.
- p.299 ii) Newman happy with another of Pugin's new Gothic revival churches.
- p.300 iii) The converts began to express contrary views.
- p.302 iv) Newman considered becoming a Jesuit or an Oratorian.
- p.302 4) **The Mechanics' Institute.**
- p.303 5) **Pugin honoured by the Pope.**
- p.304 6) **Pugin undermined by Newman.**
- p.304 7) **The design of the new Oratory.**
- p.304 i) The quarrel over the design.
- p.305 ii) Newman wanted a Gothic Oratory and Pugin did not.
- p.306 iii) Newman's lead followed.

- p.307 iv) Phillipps in contact with Newman.
- p.308 v) Newman threatened Pugin.
- p.309 vi) Newman privately continued to undermine Pugin.
- p.310 **8) Newman's argument on a doctrinal level.**
- p.310 i) No apostolical succession to liturgical architecture.
- p.310 ii) Liturgical as well as doctrinal development.
- p.312 iii) Form and arrangement.
- p.312 **9) The focus on one element of liturgical form and arrangement as a representative of different views.**
- p.313 i) Rearrangement at Fulham.
- p.313 ii) Criticism of the arrangement at St. George's Cathedral, Southwark.
- p.315 iii) Ward argued that liturgy had changed.
- p.315 iv) The artistic aspects.
- p.316 v) The liturgical aspects.
- p.316 vi) "New" services and devotions required new arrangements.
- p.318 **10) Criticism of Oratorian views.**
- p.318 i) The periodicals.
- p.319 ii) Pugin replied to criticism.
- p.320 iii) Pugin accused of doctrinal error.
- p.322 **11) J. M. Capes expressed further views on liturgical form and arrangement.**
- p.323 i) A specific example of Oratorian form and arrangement.
- p.324 ii) Pugin believed medieval liturgical form and arrangement were not confined to Gothic architecture.
- p.325 **12) A Roman liturgical form and arrangement preferred by the Romanists.**
- p.326 i) Pugin defended medieval liturgical form and arrangement.
- p.327 ii) Newman wanted Roman usages and practices.
- p.328 **13) The periodicals supported the Oratorians.**
- p.329 **14) The Revival of the Ancient Plain Song.**
- p.329 i) Oratorian views – in defence of the "modern" and of progress.
- p.329 ii) The demolition of Gothic cathedrals.
- p.330 iii) In defence of progress.
- p.331 iv) An eccentric view of "new" devotions and of progress.
- p.333 **15) Pugin retaliated with strong words.**
- p.333 i) Reaction to suggestions of subjugating the Mass.
- p.334 **16) Pugin's exegesis of allegorical meaning in The Revival of the Ancient Plain Song.**
- p.334 **17) Pugin's exposition of the theological level of meaning.**
- p.334 i) An uninterrupted tradition.
- p.335 **18) Pugin's exposition of the mystical and anagogical levels of meaning.**
- p.336 **19) Pugin's exposition of the doctrinal level of meaning.**
- p.337 **20) The quarrel over Cotton Hall.**
- p.337 i) An on-going dispute.
- p.338 **21) Development of liturgy as well as doctrine.**
- p.338 **22) An Earnest Address on the Establishment of the Hierarchy.**
- p.338 i) Initial reaction to the reestablishment of the Hierarchy.
- p.339 ii) Real freedom.
- p.340 **23) The reaction to Pugin's An Earnest Address.**
- p.341 i) Accused of meddling and heresy.
- p.342 **24) Pugin defended his orthodoxy.**
- p.342 i) The Catholic Church in France let down by its clergy.
- p.343 ii) A letter in defence of his views.
- p.343 **25) Support for the Oratorians.**
- p.343 i) The periodicals.

- p.345 **Chapter Eight – THE SCREENS CONTROVERSY**
- p.345 1) **Chancel screens part of medieval arrangement.**
- p.345 i) Pugin's defence.
- p.345 ii) Arguments against changing medieval to Roman liturgical form and arrangement.
- p.347 2) **Pugin's exposition of allegorical meaning in his A Treatise on Chancel Screens.**
- p.347 3) **His exposition of the historical level of meaning.**
- p.347 i) Christian origins.
- p.348 ii) Pugin's liturgical and historical sources and authorities.
- p.348 iii) The French liturgists.
- p.352 4) **Pugin's exposition of the practical level of meaning in his A Treatise on Chancel Screens.**
- p.352 i) A broad spectrum of examples.
- p.352 ii) Liturgical form and arrangement.
- p.353 iii) Types and materials of screens.
- p.355 iv) Rood screens part of liturgical arrangement.
- p.356 5) **Pugin's exposition of the theological level of meaning.**
- p.356 i) Revelation.
- p.357 ii) The altar, too, was an essential part of Gallican-type liturgical form and arrangement.
- p.357 6) **Pugin's exposition of the doctrinal level of meaning.**
- p.357 i) An uninterrupted tradition.
- p.358 ii) Catholic arrangement in other styles.
- p.358 iii) The importance of the Mass.
- p.359 iv) Church discipline regarding the use of screens.
- p.362 v) The Council of Trent accommodated the change in discipline.
- p.363 7) **Pugin's exposition of the mystical level of meaning in his A Treatise on Chancel Screens.**
- p.365 8) **Reaction to Pugin's A Treatise on Chancel Screens.**
- p.365 i) The periodicals.
- p.368 9) **Oil on troubled waters.**
- p.368 i) Wiseman at the Oratory.
- p.369 ii) Pugin's reaction.
- p.371 iii) Pugin not thinking of returning to the Church of England.
- p.371 10) **Pugin's last illness.**
- p.372 i) The Lunatic Asylums.
- p.376 ii) Death.

- p.378 **Chapter Nine – CONCLUSION**
- p.378 1) **The difficulties encountered.**
- p.378 i) A broad spectrum of material and subjects.
- p.378 ii) Pugin's use of levels of meaning.
- p.380 iii) A radial and not a lineal form.
- p.381 2) **The sources of Pugin's views.**
- p.383 3) **Pugin's contribution to the Catholic revival of the nineteenth century.**
- p.385 i) Pugin a fanatic or merely someone with strong views?
- p.386 ii) Pugin's strengths and weaknesses.
- p.387 4) **Pugin's mission in life.**
- p.387 i) Pugin perceived himself to be a liturgist.
- p.387 ii) A liturgical vision.
- p.388 5) **In conclusion.**

- p.389 **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

## **STATEMENT OF COPYRIGHT**

**The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without their prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.**

## Chapter One - INTRODUCTION

Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin (1812-1852) is well known amongst architects and designers for his part in the building and decoration of churches in the nineteenth-century Gothic Revival. Books, chapters of books, articles and essays have proliferated during the last fifty years or so and have fully acknowledged his major role as architect and designer. His own writing is, however, richly coloured by religious and liturgical terms and references, yet scholars have not seriously looked at this aspect of him. The principal aim of this thesis is, therefore, to study these aspects of his work and to argue that Pugin was a liturgist with a liturgical vision.

The term 'liturgy' needs to be defined, because Pugin's understanding of it may be different from that usually understood today. If he had a particular definition then this would suggest that he also had a particular knowledge of the subject. If this is the case, then where he gained his knowledge is relevant. Therefore, within the scope of this thesis, Pugin's definitions, his method of study and practice, his understanding of liturgy and the extent of his knowledge of the subject will be researched and analysed.

If it is concluded that Pugin developed authoritative views or opinions about the subject of liturgy, then he was a liturgist with knowledge of liturgy. If he promoted such views and opinions, then he wished to influence people so that his ideas or opinions would be realised in the future. Therefore, if this could be substantiated, then it could justifiably be claimed that he was a liturgist who had a liturgical vision.

It is rare for modern ecclesiastical historians to devote more than an odd line or two, let alone a paragraph to Pugin and when they do, it is frequently inaccurate and distorted. He is variously represented by them and architectural historians as a fanatic, obsessed with a particular style of architecture, belonging to the Romantic Movement, an antiquarian who

was alarming, touchy, irritating, extreme and mad. These may all be true, but none of these, it will be argued, is an adequate description of him. It has sometimes happened that writers have selected the most sensational aspects of his character and built up a rather one-sided portrait of him which, while it is fascinating to the reader, does not bring forward a true picture of the whole man. Mostly, he is completely ignored and not mentioned at all in a theological, doctrinal or liturgical context by ecclesiastical historians.

To investigate the truth or otherwise of these presuppositions it will be necessary to go back to primary source material: to Pugin's and his contemporaries' books, articles in periodicals and newspapers of the time and correspondence.

Pugin was writing at a time when major changes were occurring in both the Church of England and the Church of Rome in England. The Catholic revival was under way; Catholic Emancipation occurred in 1829; the Oxford Movement began in 1833; Tract 90 caused a furore in 1841; Newman and other leading Anglicans seceded to the Church of Rome around 1845, and the Roman Catholic hierarchy was re-established in 1850, provoking cries of "Papal aggression". Between 1836 and his death in 1852, Pugin was continuously publishing books and articles in support of his religious views and matters concerning the Churches. Yet, this aspect of his life has not previously been seriously researched.

The following brief survey of modern writers will confirm these assertions.

Brian Fothergill in his Nicholas Wiseman (1963) describes Pugin as "touchy"<sup>1</sup> and "irritating"<sup>2</sup> and claims that he had an "extremely eccentric version of the Faith".<sup>3</sup>

Pugin's so-called obsession with Gothic architecture was again advanced by Derek Holmes in his More Roman than Rome: English Catholicism in the Nineteenth Century (1978); he repeated a story originally told by W. G. Ward - "he even designed Gothic moulds

---

<sup>1</sup> Brian Fothergill, Nicholas Wiseman (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1963), p.107.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p.108.

for the cook to use in making puddings and jellies”.<sup>4</sup> He thus suggested he was fanatical about the Gothic style.

The index of The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman edited by Charles Stephen Dessain also mentions Pugin in the context of Gothic architecture. “He considered Gothic the only “Christian architecture”, says Dessain, “and defended his views in numerous pamphlets”.<sup>5</sup> He does not refer to Pugin’s numerous books or his position as Professor of Ecclesiastical Antiquities at Oscott, but draws attention to Pugin’s final illness. “In his last year he went out of his mind”. Thus, by a choice of words he manages to portray Pugin in a less than favourable light.

Ian Ker in his John Henry Newman: a Biography (1988) represents Pugin as both obsessed with Gothic architecture and as a fanatic claiming that “Pugin’s Gothic fanaticism was well known”,<sup>6</sup> although he was “not the only fanatic amongst the converts”.<sup>7</sup> By contrast, Newman’s followers were merely enthusiasts.<sup>8</sup> Ker insinuates, too, that Pugin was not taken seriously by his fellow Romans by mentioning that Faber had a “comical row”<sup>9</sup> with him when he visited St. Wilfrid’s Church.<sup>10</sup>

Sheridan Gilley, in his Newman and his Age (1990) also takes the view that Pugin was a fanatic. He writes of him as the “Roman convert, the fanatical Gothic Revival

---

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p.107.

<sup>4</sup> J. Derek Holmes, More Roman than Rome: English Catholicism in the Nineteenth Century (London: Burns & Oates, 1978), p.70.

<sup>5</sup> Charles Stephen Dessain, The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd.), Vol. XII, Index, p.437.

<sup>6</sup> Ian Ker, John Henry Newman: a Biography (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), p. 338.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p.340.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p.340.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p.338.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p.338.

architect” who “had his Gothic axe to grind, and was to find the Anglo-Catholics better Goths than his fellow Romans”,<sup>11</sup> a view Gilley took from Newman and the Oratorians.

Mary Heimann in her Catholic Devotion in Victorian England (1995) places Pugin firmly in the Romantic Movement and believes that he exhibited archaeologism by wishing to revive the medieval period. Pugin, she says, “had romantic longings for a feudal England”.<sup>12</sup> She admits, however, that church architecture was outside her field of study (devotions).<sup>13</sup>

Most writers, such as Geoffrey Faber in his Oxford Apostles: A Character Study of the Oxford Movement (1933) and David Newsome in The Convert Cardinals (1993) manage only a brief, one line reference to Pugin. Others, such as Owen Chadwick in his The Mind of the Oxford Movement (1960)<sup>14</sup> and his The Spirit of the Oxford Movement (1990),<sup>15</sup> Peter Nockles in The Oxford Movement in Context (1994)<sup>16</sup> and David Newsome in his The Parting of Friends (1966)<sup>17</sup> do not mention him at all.

The same is true of modern liturgists. Yngve Brilioth did not mention him but, unknowingly, has some similar views to Pugin; he believed that a correct knowledge of the development of liturgy could only be attained by a critical, comparative and historical study of it.<sup>18</sup> Pugin, it will be argued, lived by this maxim.

---

<sup>11</sup> Sheridan Gilley, Newman and his Age (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1990), p.190.

<sup>12</sup> Mary Heimann, Catholic Devotion in Victorian England (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), p.138.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p.26.

<sup>14</sup> Owen Chadwick, The Mind of the Oxford Movement (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1960).

<sup>15</sup> Owen Chadwick, The Spirit of the Oxford Movement (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

<sup>16</sup> Peter Nockles, The Oxford Movement in Context (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

<sup>17</sup> David Newsome, The Parting of Friends (London: John Murray, 1966).

<sup>18</sup> Yngve Brilioth, Eucharistic Faith & Practice: Evangelical and Catholic (London: SPCK 1930), pp.274-275.

The Roman Catholic liturgists Josef Jungmann, Jean Daniélou and Louis Bouyer, and the Anglican liturgists J. G. Davies, E. C. Ratcliff, Massey E. Shepherd and H. B. Porter either do not refer to Pugin or briefly and inaccurately mention him. Typical is Louis Bouyer's reference in his Life and Liturgy (1956) to Pugin as an antiquarian reconstructionist. The attempt to reconstruct the medieval period was entirely misguided, believes Bouyer, since "the antiquity which it re-created was no more what it made out to be than the sham Gothic architecture of Viollet-le-Duc or Pugin was truly Gothic".<sup>19</sup> Bouyer's view is not, however, based on any particular study of Pugin but rather on the popular view of architectural historians who portray Pugin as only a Gothic revival architect.

The Anglican liturgist J. G. Davies entirely fails to mention Pugin in connection with liturgy, attributing the liturgical revival in the nineteenth century to Guéranger and the Tractarians.<sup>20</sup>

Although this brief survey has encompassed a number of disparate modern writers, there appears to be an acceptance of several suppositions. Firstly, that Pugin's main concern was the revival of a particular architectural style to the denigration of others and that he was an antiquarian reconstructionist guilty of archaeologism; secondly, that he was a fanatic; thirdly, that he was an architect with merely an interest in religion rather than as an outstanding liturgist; fourthly, that he worked in relative isolation from the main stream of religious thought of the time and did not make any contribution in this area; lastly, that he was a Romantic.

What may be true, and has frequently perhaps been over emphasised by many writers, is that Pugin was eccentric, narrowly focused or, as some have said, rigidly biased towards a

---

<sup>19</sup> Louis Bouyer, Life and Liturgy (London: Sheed and Ward, 1956), p.12. The French Oratorian Louis Bouyer is a modernist liturgist who has followed on from Dom Odo Casel and the Maria-Laach School. Casel's attempt to explain the Christian mysteries in the context of Pagan mysteries, would have been loathed by Pugin.

<sup>20</sup> J. G. Davies, ed., A New Dictionary of Liturgy & Worship (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1986), p.312.

particular viewpoint, impatient with other views, given to violent language, a genius and extremely hardworking.

Yet, Pugin is an enigma. He was very popular and well known in his day; his name was household property<sup>21</sup> and both the Pope and the Queen honoured him. The Pope presented him with a gold medal in 1847; the architect George Gilbert Scott, with the approval of Queen Victoria, insisted that his figure be placed amongst famous men and women on the Albert Memorial and his widow was given a life pension. And yet, after his death there was a significant lessening of public interest in him for many years. Nonetheless, some enthusiastic individuals continued to promote his memory. But it was not until the twentieth century that a conspicuous resurgence of interest in him occurred. His reputation as an architect and designer has gradually become re-established as a result.

This interest, it will be argued, was propelled from the wrong end, so that the symptoms have been mistaken for the cause. The physical proof of his life's work can be seen in the many churches and other ecclesiastical buildings he designed, yet the motivation behind the fruits of his labour has been misunderstood. This has led to a misguided assessment of his role, which, in turn, has led to the perpetuation of myths about him.

This thesis therefore aims to redress the balance, and to look seriously at the motivation of his work. This will lead to a reassessment of his role in the religious revival of the nineteenth century.

An analysis of Pugin's writing will show that he employed a large number of authorities and sources, many of which are little known today and have not previously been considered by scholars. The study therefore offers an exposition of some of these and will argue that they are crucial to understanding him and his writing. They are part of the key to the fascinating picture of Pugin that unfolds. His liturgical sources will be put forward as

---

<sup>21</sup> *The Kent Argus* (10 June 1875). The obituary of Edward Pugin mentioned his father, Augustus

evidence of his interest in liturgy and at the same time it will become apparent that his authorities were not only architects or designers, but also liturgists, theologians and historians because that was where his interests lay.

Following this introduction, Chapter Two commences the study with a bibliographical survey from 1852 up to the present day. It will attempt to bring forward both the accurate views and the misconceptions that have and are being perpetuated about Pugin's life and work. It will quickly be realized that a picture of him only as an architect and designer is uppermost simply because attention has been given to him chiefly in these capacities.

Chapter Three examines the background and early childhood influences, which aided the formation of his religious outlook. This section covers the period 1812 to 1835 (i.e. up to the time when he was twenty-three years old). It looks at the factors that contributed to his conversion.

Chapter Four concerns the first edition of Contrasts (1836) and supporting publications. Contrasts demonstrates the rather reckless boldness of a young man who was naïve in his views. Pugin was an enthusiastic and fervent convert to Roman Catholicism by the time he published this book; his attitude to Protestantism is brought out in his writing. Although this book indicates that he was immature and demonstrates the limits of his knowledge, on closer examination there is evidence of some depth and sophistication. The exposition will bring forward layers of meaning, which show that this was an attempt to write about more than art and architecture and argues that he was concerned with complex issues concerning the Churches. His writing will therefore require careful analysis.

If he studied liturgy as he claimed, then there should be evidence that he studied the origins, history, practices, theoretical views and ideas concerning liturgy; there should also be indications that he wished to implement his knowledge and views.

The nature of the Church is of primary importance to any understanding of liturgy. Pugin had particular views on this, which brought him into controversy with certain Anglicans and, later in his life, with other Roman Catholic converts. It will be argued that he did not see himself as a controversialist *per se*, but as a liturgist.

Pugin defended Contrasts (1836) in his subsequent work, An Apology for Contrasts (1837). It will be considered as part of the argument that he was writing about more than architecture and that the book should be understood on different levels; he interpreted architecture and expounded on its meaning in his writing as a controversialist.

Pugin further developed his views in his next publication, which also brings to the fore further evidence of his role as a controversialist. In response to the proposed Martyrs' Memorial, he wrote a pamphlet titled Letter on the Proposed Protestant Memorial (1839). It demonstrates that he had a tendency to use strong words and scurrilous language when under deep emotional stress. The chapter brings to attention his early connection with the Tractarians.

Chapter Five looks at Pugin's second edition of Contrasts (1841), which was published in 1841. While the first edition was the basis of this second attempt, it included a great deal of new material. Again, it was an attempt to expound on levels of meaning, which he believed existed in architecture. It still contrasted the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries with the nineteenth century, but it did so in a much more inclusive and thorough manner. He sought to argue by analogy, so that while the first edition concentrated on the medieval period and the Reformation in England, the second edition encompassed the Early Renaissance on the Continent as well. If he had researched these periods and was familiar with medieval and Early Renaissance thought, then it is likely that the ideas of medieval and Early Renaissance thinkers influenced him and helped form his views on liturgy.

In this chapter, it is argued that, by 1841, Pugin had widened his circle of acquaintances. He had already made contact with the Tractarians at Oxford and made friends with several of these; he had also met French ecclesiastical scholars and historians, notably Charles-Forbes-René, Count de Montalembert (1810-1870), who became his staunch friend and who had a major influence on him.

In Chapter Six, it is contended that Pugin continued to use the same arguments and methods in a series of books between 1841 and 1844. This chapter shows that he used a method of exegesis which went back to the New Testament and which was favoured by the medieval liturgists. He applied this method to architecture and design, and his The True Principles (1841) was an exposition of his interpretation. But while his writing is an attempt to explain layers of meaning, which he believed existed in architecture, there was a focus in this work on two particular levels – the practical level and the mystical level. The first was a contrast to the second. For this, he gave many first hand examples of liturgical art and architecture. Thus, in this work Pugin attempted to argue by example. The second, the mystical, was an attempt to expound on an allegorical interpretation of architecture.

Pugin's next work, The Present State (1843) set out many of his liturgical and historical authorities and sources; he sought to argue from authority. The historical meaning was again separate from the allegorical and used as a contrast or comparison. Levels of meaning in The Present State include the allegorical - doctrinal, mystical, theological – as well as the historical and practical levels.

The chapter continues with Pugin's An Apology for the Revival of Christian Architecture (1843). He continued to use this particular method of interpretation and exposition of architecture. Proof of this is given in the levels of meaning. On a practical level, Pugin argued that “style” was not the issue for which he was contending. Although it might seem that all his writing up until that time promoted the Gothic style, this, he argued, was not

the case. His purpose was simply not a justification of the Gothic “style” since he was concerned with what he believed to be universal laws. In this respect, although a Gothic designer, he was not merely a medieval reconstructionist or guilty of archaeologism; on the contrary, he welcomed and promoted modern technology.

The chapter proceeds with an analysis of Pugin’s The Glossary (1844). He again employed his particular method of exegesis of architecture, which he expounded and expanded on in his writing with layers of meaning. This time, he argued from example and authority. The Glossary, perhaps more than any other of his works, brought forward Pugin’s belief that liturgy was part of Revelation; as such it could demonstrate an unchanging “pattern”. This is considered in detail. This chapter is important in that it conclusively puts Pugin, the liturgist, into context and concludes that he supported alternative liturgical usages and practices to those increasingly favoured by the Church of Rome.

Chapter Seven argues that Pugin significantly moved from expressing his views to Protestants to defending his views from Roman Catholics. Up until 1846-47, he had been primarily concerned with expressing his views on liturgy and the Church, as part of a continuing debate with Protestants. He now found that the new converts to Rome did not share his vision. They had another equally valid vision, which they wished to promote. It was contrary to what he believed and he was forced to vigorously defend his views against their opposition. Further evidence is brought forward that “style” was not the issue. The proposed design of the new Oratory became a focus for their increasingly differing, partisan and polarised views.

Pugin defended his position as a liturgist in his The Revival of Plain Song (1850). He again employed his particular method of exegesis, exposition and expansion to argue for his liturgical cause. His views were further expressed in his pamphlet on the reestablishment of the Hierarchy, An Earnest Address on the Reestablishment of the Hierarchy (1851). This

book again sets out some of his ideas relating to Church and State. In this, he advocated complete freedom of the Church from State control.

Chapter Eight argues that “the Screens Controversy” became a focus of these differing views between Pugin and the Oratorians; it represented a complex and deep subject. Pugin again defended his position by employing his particular method of interpretation, exposition and expansion in his Treatise on Chancel Screens (1851) and, consequently, he applied levels of meaning to his arguments. Thus, he argued on an historical and practical level as well as an allegorical level (the theological, doctrinal and mystical) for screens. His argument concerned both church arrangement and form and more complex issues regarding Church discipline. This chapter concludes with the end of the “Screens controversy” and its effect on Pugin.

Chapter Nine – the conclusion – will attempt to evaluate Pugin’s liturgical views from various points of reference. Firstly, his role in the religious movements of the nineteenth century; secondly, his value as a liturgist; and, thirdly, his long term and potential influence.

## Chapter Two - THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SURVEY

John Hanbury (1744-1774) built Folly Tower in the eighteenth century on the site of an earlier Roman watchtower. This structure was situated prominently, high on a hill near Pontypool in Monmouthshire, a famous landmark known and loved far and wide. During the Second World War, it proved to be too great a landmark for the German bombers who used it to pinpoint a neighbouring ammunition factory. The British government decided that it had to go. It was demolished and the site grassed over. Many years passed. But despite its disappearance, it was not completely forgotten; occasional reference was made to it and one or two individuals even suggested rebuilding it, but they were considered eccentrics. At last, more than fifty years after it was demolished, a group of enthusiasts assembled to undertake its reconstruction. These people were from many walks of life and included historians, engineers and architects. Eventually, the tower was completed and has successfully re-established its role as a landmark.

The story of the tower is analogous to the story of bibliographical material about Pugin. He was a well-known and loved national figure in his day and was much written about during his lifetime. Yet, with the exception of Benjamin Ferrey's biography of him, there was not a great deal of public awareness or interest in him for seventy years or so after his death. Nevertheless, a few writers, such as Wilfrid and Bernard Ward, continued to mention him in books concerning not architecture, but nineteenth-century ecclesiastical history. Their father, W. G. Ward, was Pugin's contemporary and acquaintance and they were therefore in a position to know something about Pugin's involvement in ecclesiastical events. It was not, however, until the end of the 1920's that there was a significant stirring of interest in him. Unusually, this interest was not confined to a specific group, but included biographers, architectural and ecclesiastical historians.

Writers have tended to express their own religious biases when writing about him. Moreover, while much of the material has been either biographical or bibliographical, there has been little attempt at exegesis or deep study of his religious ideas in an historical context. Furthermore, these limited approaches have continued to the present day, despite an ever-growing interest in this fascinating nineteenth-century figure.

1) Those writers who were contemporaries of Pugin and knew him personally.

Benjamin Ferrey's biography Recollections of A. N. Welby Pugin and his father Augustus Pugin (1861)<sup>22</sup> with a concluding chapter by E. S. Purcell, was the first following Pugin's death. Benjamin Ferrey (1810-1880) was a contemporary of Pugin who knew him intimately in his early years; they had spent their boyhoods together in the elder Pugin's studio. Unfortunately, he had limited contact with Pugin for the second period of twenty years of the latter's life, which was his most productive and influential. Nevertheless, because of his personal intimacy with Pugin, Ferrey was able to draw a flesh and blood portrait of him, which not only projected a picture of a highly talented, intellectual and religious character, but one who had human failings and limitations.

Ferrey began by depicting Pugin as a boy. Pugin received his formal education at Christ's Hospital School (known as the Blue Coat School) at Newgate Street in London. As a schoolboy, he quickly displayed, said Ferrey, his unique characteristics:

Augustus soon began to show that aptitude for acquiring knowledge which was so strikingly displayed in after life. It was remarked of him by one of the masters that whether in Greek, Latin, mathematics, or any other branch of education, he would learn in twenty-four hours what it took other boys many weeks to acquire. Thus, as a mere child, he was quick in all that he attempted, and fluent in speech, expressing his opinions in the most dogmatic manner with volubility and vehemence ... He had an almost intuitive talent for drawing, and as soon as he could handle a pencil, commenced sketching.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Benjamin Ferrey, Recollections of A. N. Welby Pugin and his father Augustus Pugin (London: Edward Stanford 1861).

<sup>23</sup> Benjamin Ferrey, Recollections of A. N. Welby Pugin and his father Augustus Pugin (1861:

But the young boy was not an oracle of perfection. Although “gentle and refined”, he “gradually permitted a habit of slovenliness in person to grow upon him, amounting at last to eccentricity”.<sup>24</sup> Ferrey illustrated this with an anecdote. Mrs Pugin, writing from Paris to her sister, observed, “If he understood how to dress himself I should consider him an universal genius”.<sup>25</sup> Although his mother recognized that he was very talented, “*Nevertheless the fellow cannot dress himself*”.<sup>26</sup>

Ferrey stated that Pugin was rather delicate as a boy and as he grew up began to display symptoms of the disease that was eventually to cause his death. He related how Pugin’s mother had written again to her sister expressing concern about his health. “My poor Augustus has latterly been very unwell”, she wrote.<sup>27</sup> He had suffered a fainting fit while sketching with the Welsh architect John Nash<sup>28</sup> in Notre Dame.

“The Child”, as William Wordsworth wrote, “is Father of the Man”<sup>29</sup> and Ferrey showed that this was certainly true of Pugin. The characteristics that he displayed as a child remained unabated, even more fully developed, as an adult. For while “His genius was great”,<sup>30</sup> wrote Ferrey. “His oddities clung to him through life, but they were of a harmless character, and could easily be over-looked ...”<sup>31</sup>

---

London: The Scholar Press, 1978 edition), pp.32-33.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p.33.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p.35.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p.36.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p.39.

<sup>28</sup> Pugin’s father, Augustus Charles, had worked for the mainly neo-Classical architect John Nash (1752-1835), first in Carmarthen and then in London.

<sup>29</sup> William Wordsworth, “Moods of My Own Mind”, in Helen Darbishire, ed., Wordsworth: Poems in Two Volumes (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1952), poem 4, p.218.

<sup>30</sup> Ferrey, Recollections, p.272.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, p.98.

Ferrey wrote of Pugin's "untiring industry" and the fact that "no day was ever wasted by him" because his "vigorous mind was always at work".<sup>32</sup> Yet, his failings regarding his appearance did not leave him:

His slovenliness in dress at this time amounted to eccentricity. He was in the habit of wearing a sailor's jacket, loose pilot trousers, jack-boots, and a wide-awake hat ... To the ladies of his acquaintance Pugin's carelessness in appearance was very distasteful ... but ... he ... cut the matter short by saying: 'It's all very well, my dress will do perfectly'.<sup>33</sup>

One day, Ferrey wrote, a lady bravely replied to Pugin, "It is not all very well".<sup>34</sup> The next day, taking the remark in good humour, he appeared at breakfast wearing a smart blue coat and buff waistcoat. But, generally, he did not care about appearance because he disliked anything worldly, affected and foppish, unlike the picture drawn by Robert Gray of a contemporary of Pugin's, the youthful future Cardinal Manning, whom Gray displays as being a "mightily affected boy, giving himself airs of fashion and patronage".<sup>35</sup>

Despite the fierceness of some of his writing, Pugin was noted as being "Kind, affectionate, gentle", said Ferrey.<sup>36</sup> These characteristics were also expressed in Pugin's obituary in *The Tablet*: "No-one knew the man who did not forgive his faults on account of the kindliness of his nature".<sup>37</sup> Towards the end of his chapters, Ferrey gave a thumbnail portrait of the man he believed and knew Pugin to be. It is one of a handsome man, greatly

---

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, p.293.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.98-99.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, p.99.

<sup>35</sup> Robert Gray, *Cardinal Manning: A Biography* (London: George Weidenfield & Nicholson Ltd., 1985), p.17. Quoting from J. A. Merivale, ed., *Autobiography of Charles Merivale* (Oxford: Printed for private circulation 1898), p.48.

<sup>36</sup> Ferrey, *Recollections*, p.425.

<sup>37</sup> Frederick Lucas, 'Funeral of Mr. Pugin', obituary notice in *The Tablet* 13 (25 September 1852), pp.617-18.

talented, a genius, who in the end was physically unable to keep up with the intellectual demands of his own mind; thus, a man eventually worn-out through hard work.<sup>38</sup>

Ferrey had two major defects as a biographer. The first was that, although his material is good and varied, full of anecdotes, quotations and letters, the structure of his writing is confusing because of its unchronological approach.

Ferrey's second defect was that, as an Anglican, he had typical nineteenth-century Protestant prejudices against Roman Catholics. He was the Diocesan Architect of Bath and Wells, and he designed almost exclusively Anglican churches while frequently expressing admiration for the Classical style that Pugin abhorred. But he admitted that he was not qualified to write about religion, and he therefore steered clear of Pugin's religious beliefs. He wrote of his reason in the introduction to the last chapter; the Pugin family had put pressure on him not to write about Pugin's religious views. He claimed that he was unable to describe his character from "a Roman Catholic point of view" to make the biography acceptable to members of the family.<sup>39</sup>

The family subsequently commissioned Edmund Sheridan Purcell (1823-1899), to write an end chapter for Ferrey's book with the express purpose of supplying an explanation for Pugin's controversial opinions connected with the Roman Catholic Church.<sup>40</sup> Purcell was a journalist whose qualifications for attempting this chapter were that he was a Roman Catholic. But Ferrey rejected many of Purcell's explanations and emphasised that these were merely construed to appease the Pugin family and were a reflection of their views and Purcell was reliant upon their information.<sup>41</sup> There were others, as he pointed out, who disagreed with these opinions.

---

<sup>38</sup> Ferrey, Recollections, pp.272.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p.302.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, p.302.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, p.302.

Purcell's concluding chapter did little to enhance Ferrey's unchronological text since some of the material he included should (given a chronological structure) have been presented earlier, in Ferrey's preceding chapters. In fact, Purcell wrote the whole chapter as though he had no sympathy at all for Pugin's architectural and controversial ideas. He attempted to negate, or damn with faint praise, Pugin's achievements as an architect even though he knew little about the merits or otherwise of architectural design for "we look in vain for the grand results in stone of the magnificent ideas and theories propounded in his writings".<sup>42</sup>

Purcell was, however, partly right. Pugin was frequently hampered by lack of funds and was unable to fulfil his design concepts in the actual building because of this constraint. Nevertheless, Purcell knew of examples of Pugin's work, which he did not mention, such as St Giles's, Cheadle, and the New Houses of Parliament, where he did not have such constraints and where he was able to demonstrate his genius in the actual building.

On Pugin's proposed history of the 'English Schism' Purcell contended:

He falls into a gross historical error, and advances facts which, on maturer consideration and research, he would have been totally unable to have substantiated.<sup>43</sup>

His new work demonstrated, continued Purcell, "a mistaken judgement as to matters of fact".<sup>44</sup> Since this proposed work was never published, it is not possible to comment on the accuracy of these statements. Purcell continued with praise for the Oratorians and the neo-Ultramontanes (both had been Pugin's antagonists) while denying that Pugin was attacked by

---

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, p.421.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p.440.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, p.440.

the neo-Ultramontane party or even Newman was behind any of the opposition to him.<sup>45</sup> Rather, it was the writers of *The Rambler* who were hostile to him, he claimed.

While Purcell was critical of Pugin's architectural achievements and written work, he had some admiration for his religious fervour. Pugin, he said, had "an unwavering faith"<sup>46</sup> and there was "No truer or more docile son of the Catholic Church".<sup>47</sup>

Overall, Purcell condemned and protested too much to be convincing; he leaves the impression that he was going out of his way to lead the reader up a blind alley. The question is why? The answer may be that this was his style of writing elsewhere.

Commenting on Purcell's Life of Cardinal Manning, J. R. Gasquet remarked in a postscript that "'To a biographer', as Mr. Purcell justly says, 'his hero should be of supreme and special interest;' we might add, of appreciative and sympathetic interest".<sup>48</sup> But, continued Gasquet, he seemed to have been "most successful in dissembling his love, and in leading most readers to believe that his subject inspired him with something like hatred".<sup>49</sup> Intellectual distance for a biographer is one thing; an overtly critical and denigrating style is another. Purcell's biography of Manning and his Appendix about Pugin both give the impression that he had an axe to grind. (In *The Case Of Manning*, it may be that he blamed Manning for the failure of the periodical *The Westminster Gazette*.)<sup>50</sup> Gasquet thought that

---

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.366-368.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, p.457.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, p.459.

<sup>48</sup> J. R. Gasquet, Mr Purcell's Life of Manning. A Postscript to 'Cardinal Manning' (London: London Truth Society, 1896), p.128. This was a postscript to E.S. Purcell, Life of Cardinal Manning (London: Macmillan 1895).

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 128.

<sup>50</sup> *The Westminster Gazette* (founded by Manning in 1866), edited by E. S. Purcell. See Sheridan Gilley, "Henry Manning: Servant of the Spirit". A paper given in the Throne Room, Archbishop's House, Westminster on 11 April 2000.

Purcell's lack of sympathy with his subjects made him completely unfit to write any man's history.<sup>51</sup>

Nevertheless, while Purcell had, on the whole, only limited sympathy with Pugin in the Appendix to Ferrey's book, in his Life of Cardinal Manning (1895), written more than thirty years later, he adopted a completely different tone; not one of disapproval of Pugin, but admiration and praise:

By his genius and profound faith in the Catholic Church, and its ancient traditions, religious and artistic, he acted as pioneer, pointing out to many the way which had led his own heart and soul to Rome.<sup>52</sup>

By this time Pugin's elder son Edward Pugin had been dead more than twenty years and his widow Jane was elderly. Purcell, with the maturity of years, stressed the positive dimension of Pugin's achievement.

The importance of Ferrey's book (including Purcell's Appendix) is that it formed a basis for so much of the future writing about Pugin. Ferrey's limited views as an Anglican and Purcell's biased views as a Roman Catholic have, unfortunately, frequently been taken as an accurate foundation on which to build later judgements. Nevertheless, they captured something of the personality of Pugin, brought him to life and drew a convincing picture of his life and times.

Another who personally knew Pugin was John Hardman Powell. He was Pugin's sole apprentice and became his son-in-law. He wrote a valuable memoir of the last few years of Pugin's life called "Pugin in his Home" which unfortunately he did not publish. Although he said little about Pugin's work it gave a wonderful picture of the man himself; his love of his home and family, his kindness, his concern for the poor, his appearance, his voice and the

---

<sup>51</sup> Gasquet, Mr Purcell's Life of Manning, p.133.

<sup>52</sup> Edmund Sheridan Purcell, Life of Cardinal Manning Archbishop of Westminster (1895: New York: De Capo Press; London: Macmillan & Co.,1896), Vol.1, p.662.

food he enjoyed. It has been quoted and reproduced in several works during the last few years and in 1988 was published by Alexandra Wedgwood in full.<sup>53</sup>

Although another book about Pugin did not appear until the 1930's, his name nevertheless regularly cropped up in a variety of books on other subjects. Charles Eastlake's architectural history, A History of the Gothic Revival (1872), devoted a section to Pugin's architectural contribution and acknowledged his religious conviction.

Eastlake believed that on the architectural side, Pugin's contribution to the Gothic Revival had been great. His name, he commented, "marks an epoch in the history of British art, which, while art exists at all, can never be forgotten".<sup>54</sup> He made some sensitive observations about Pugin's religious commitment, and yet he condemned the concentration on, as he saw it, the inflated and overrated importance of Pugin's design work on ecclesiastical furniture and decorations.<sup>55</sup>

Eastlake believed Pugin to be obsessed with the medieval period both in art and religion. His "very faith", he said, "was pledged to Mediæval tradition".<sup>56</sup> Morally, socially and aesthetically, Pugin's heart was in the medieval period and, thought Eastlake, his whole outlook was consequently biased towards the Middle Ages and Roman Catholicism.<sup>57</sup> Yet, all that Pugin undertook was, he said, "a labour of love".<sup>58</sup> Eastlake therefore pinpointed some of the most obvious characteristics of Pugin's life and work.

Biographers have been hampered by the lack of posthumous references to Pugin in the writings of some of his contemporaries. It may be unusual to mention in a bibliographical

---

<sup>53</sup> Alexandra Wedgwood, 'Pugin in his Home by John Hardman Powell' in *Architectural History*, Vol. 31, 1988, p.171 *et seq.*

<sup>54</sup> Charles Eastlake, A History of the Gothic Revival (1872), p.145.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, p.149.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, p.151.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.151-152.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, p.153.

survey the books which do not allude to the subject, but in the case of Pugin, there was a conspicuous lack of reference by those who were acquainted with him or knew him well. He was rarely mentioned after his death in the writings of Cardinal Wiseman. Nor was he mentioned in Bishop Ullathorne's autobiography (1891-1892), nor in any of the writings during the next twenty or thirty years of William George Ward, nor Frederick William Faber, nor even Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle (1809-1878) and John Rouse Bloxam (1807-1891) - all of whom knew him well and whom he at one time regarded as firm friends or regular acquaintances. When his contemporaries did mention him, references were frequently patchy and ambiguous. John Henry Newman referred to him in his correspondence but not his books. These references mostly concerned their conflicting ideas about the development of Roman Catholicism in England and their different attitudes to ecclesiastical architecture.<sup>59</sup> This was a consequence, it will be argued, of their opposed views on the setting of *the* liturgy.

Although there is little evidence in the actual written material of William George Ward, his son Bernard Ward suggested that he was scathing of Pugin's views and spread the rumour that Pugin was so obsessed with the Gothic style that he "even designed Gothic moulds for the cook to use in making his puddings and jellies".<sup>60</sup> Later writers were to seize on this story and even enlarge on it, ignoring the fact that W. G. Ward may have used it simply as an amusing, if somewhat caustic, anecdote.

W. G. Ward may have taken a remark Pugin made in 1850 and employed it as the basis of his joke. Pugin wrote about the difficulty of finding craftsmen to carry out his ideas in the early days of his career. "I was compelled for the first altar lamp I ever produced", he

---

<sup>59</sup> C. S. Dessain, I. T. Ker, T. Gornall, G. Tracey, eds. The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman, edited at the Birmingham Oratory (London: New York: T.Nelson 1961-).

<sup>60</sup> Bernard Ward, The Sequel to Catholic Emancipation: The Story of English Catholics continued down to the re-establishment of their Hierarchy in 1850 (Longmans, Green and Co.: London, 1915:1950), Vol. I, p.95.

remarked, “to employ an old German, who made jelly moulds for pastry cooks, as the only person who understood beating up copper to the old forms”.<sup>61</sup>

Wilfrid Ward’s Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman (1897), on the contrary, made some sympathetic references to Pugin. Wilfrid was not an extreme neo-Ultramontane like his father William George Ward and he was more sensitive to other forms and views of Roman Catholicism. Indeed, he emphasised the importance of Pugin and his closeness to those at the centre of the Catholic revival. He pointed out that Pugin was already at Oscott when Wiseman arrived there on 14 September 1840 and that there had been a “close connexion” between them in the succeeding years.<sup>62</sup>

Ward claimed that Pugin had become acquainted with Wiseman before 1840 since he had attended Wiseman’s London Lectures in 1835 and 1836. Indeed, it was as a result of these lectures, he thought, that Pugin was converted to Roman Catholicism. Ward also stated that Pugin was “the first link between English Catholics and the Oxford School”<sup>63</sup> and had become acquainted with a number of Tractarians. “Oakeley, Faber, W. G. Ward, Dalgairns and Bloxam - Pugin’s most intimate friend – were among these”.<sup>64</sup>

Another Ward offspring - Bernard Ward - was the next to mention Pugin in The Sequel to Catholic Emancipation (1915), part of a seven volume history of the Catholic Church in England between 1790 and 1850. Pugin, Bernard wrote, was “one who had a large share of influence in the history of Catholics at this time, who by consent of friend and foe alike is reckoned as one of the most remarkable men of his day”.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> Pugin, Some Remarks on the articles which have recently appeared in the ‘Rambler’ relative to ecclesiastical architecture and decoration (London: Charles Dolman, 1850), p.15.

<sup>62</sup> Wilfrid Ward, The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1897), Vol. I, p.354.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, p.371.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp.371.

<sup>65</sup> Bernard Ward, The Sequel to Catholic Emancipation, Vol.I, p.82.

Bernard Ward's attitude to Pugin was ambivalent. Pugin inspired, he exclaimed, both enthusiasm and bitterness. While he "swept away all the opposition due to the conservatism and lethargy of the old Catholics", on the other hand, he "eventually divided the Catholic body into two parties, deeply and even bitterly opposed to one another".<sup>66</sup> He expanded on the meaning of this statement in his chapter on the rood screens controversy. This referred, he said, to the divisions that occurred amongst English Catholics after the development of the neo-Ultramontane party in the late 1840's. Pugin and the Goths were one party - with Liberal Catholic and old Ultramontane views - while the Oratorians, representing the neo-Ultramontanes, were the other party.<sup>67</sup> The converts, he said, became extremely Roman and rejected all national usages in the Catholic Church which they viewed as leaning towards Gallicanism.<sup>68</sup> They saw the Romanisation of the Catholic Church in England as essential to unity.<sup>69</sup> Bernard Ward was extremely critical of aspects of this Romanisation which, he said, led to some unwelcome and even unpleasant practices.<sup>70</sup>

Bernard Ward suggested that laymen looked to Wiseman as a possible leader after his London Lectures.<sup>71</sup> In fact, Pugin was corresponding with Wiseman in 1838 and was urging him to come to England:

of (sic) what service would your great talents and eloquence be in this contry (sic) - where unfortunatly (sic) the great body of those who profess the true faith are Lamentably (sic) deficient in this respects (sic).<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p.82.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p.261.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p.272.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p.262.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p.272.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p.2.

<sup>72</sup> Pugin to Wiseman (1 June 1838). Ushaw College Archives, Correspondence 823. See M. Belcher, The Collected Letters of A. W. N. Pugin (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2001), Vol. I, p.83.

2) The twentieth-century writers.

i) Chapters of books about Pugin.

Interest in Pugin was not dramatically stirred until the publication of Kenneth Clark's The Gothic Revival - An Essay in the History of Taste (1928). Although only a chapter was devoted to Pugin, Clark claimed that he had rescued that extraordinary character from oblivion. Today "the elder Pugin is better remembered than his son", he remarked.<sup>73</sup> It was "hard to believe that a man so little known was really so very important".<sup>74</sup> While admitting that he relied heavily on Ferrey's Recollections, he felt that there was no justification in either Ferrey's writing or Pugin's own writing to indicate why he had been almost forgotten.<sup>75</sup> Why was this? he asked. "Too often the prophetic mantle muffles speech, and we search darkly for truth in a broth of words", he wrote, but "Pugin wrote a clear readable style".<sup>76</sup>

Clark was ill equipped as an architectural historian to trace the development of someone's faith. While he was puzzled by Pugin's motives for his conversion to Roman Catholicism, he simultaneously dismissed Ferrey's "fumbling efforts to excuse it".<sup>77</sup> He subsequently assumed that the motives for his conversion must have been a reaction to Pugin's mother's puritanism, his "passionate love of beauty" and "a conviction that beauty springs from a way of life and a temper of spirit".<sup>78</sup>

Clark considered the possibility that Pugin's interest in Catholicism was only a means of promoting his favoured architectural style. But this remained an unconvincing explanation since the Roman Catholic Church in England at that time was largely uninterested in medieval art, but it did not deter later writers from repeating the assumption.

---

<sup>73</sup> Kenneth Clark, The Gothic Revival (London: John Murray, 1928: 1995), p.123.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, p.143.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, p.144.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, p.144.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, p.126.

Clark touched on an interesting aspect of Pugin's life and interests, although his observation was rather negative and tinged with sarcasm. "His sole recreations were", he said, "the reading (and alas! writing) of theological works and the conduct of church services",<sup>79</sup> ... "to men possessed of a devil", he remarked, "human beings seem clumsy tools with which to realise ideals".<sup>80</sup> Pugin, he suggested, was possessed by such a devil and saw people as "mere obstacles to the re-establishment of Christian architecture".<sup>81</sup> Strong words! Yet, he contradicted himself later by admiring Pugin as "one of those truly religious men to whom ritual gives sensuous pleasure".<sup>82</sup>

Clark's assessment of Pugin's architecture was also contradictory. While medieval art was his principal interest, he thought, "His buildings are never antiques".<sup>83</sup> This suggests that he did not see Pugin as a mere medieval reconstructionist. "Pugin is the Janus of the Gothic Revival; his buildings look back to the picturesque past, his writings look forward to the ethical future".<sup>84</sup> Clark was clearly puzzled by Pugin and his chapter was a genuine attempt at understanding this complex character.

ii) The first treatise on Pugin by an historian.

Stimulated, without doubt, by Kenneth Clark's keen interest in Pugin, the historian Michael Trappes-Lomax set to work on a biography - the first monograph on Pugin in over seventy years, Pugin: a Medieval Victorian, published in 1932. Although much of the

---

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, p.126.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, p.128.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 128.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, p.128.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, p.137.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, p.136.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, p.138.

biographical outline was based on Ferrey's book, it was nevertheless a valiant attempt at placing Pugin in a religious context and contained some valuable insights.

Trappes-Lomax attempted to pinpoint Pugin's conversion; it was at Salisbury Cathedral, he claimed, that Pugin "set out on his tireless search for ancient beauty; and he found the Road to Rome".<sup>85</sup> He did not attempt to explain the connection, if any, between Salisbury and Rome. He disagreed, however, with Kenneth Clark's reasons for Pugin's conversion. There was simply no art for him to admire in the Catholic Church in England in his day.<sup>86</sup>

He argued that most of the private Catholic chapels "were nearly all in the Italian style that he loathed"<sup>87</sup> while there was "no flood tide of Catholicism in sight"<sup>88</sup> at the time (which was not really accurate since Catholicism in England had already begun to expand, encouraged by the Catholic Relief Act of 1791, the French immigrants who had fled from the Revolution and by the large number of Irish Catholics escaping famine in Ireland).

Trappes-Lomax made some significant observations. If Pugin "joined the Catholic Church for the sake of glory, it was God's glory he sought, not his own", he suggested.<sup>89</sup> Not only that, he claimed, but Pugin believed that "God had chosen him to start things again on the proper lines"<sup>90</sup> and that he "was an instrument by which God was carrying out His purpose".<sup>91</sup> As such, there was a "sacred character of his mission".<sup>92</sup> Pugin, he thought, fully believed and realised this and tried his best to fulfil God's purpose ... he had been chosen to

---

<sup>85</sup> Michael Trappes-Lomax, Pugin: a medieval Victorian (London: Sheed and Ward, 1932), p.39.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, p.55.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, p.56.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, p.56.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, p.56.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, p.260.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, p.260.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, p.261.

“make straight the path for those who were to follow”.<sup>93</sup> Like the saints, Pugin demonstrated a paradox, stated Trappes-Lomax, since “out of the height of their humility, they speak as the instruments of God”.<sup>94</sup> Any deliberate denigration of Pugin before and after his death was not enough to condemn him to oblivion since the holiness of his life could not be extinguished.

The date that Pugin was received into the Roman Catholic Church was, Trappes-Lomax claimed, sometime after March 1835 (following the birth of his son Edward).<sup>95</sup>

Trappes-Lomax made some fascinating, although rather brief, comments on Pugin’s religious beliefs and it is regrettable that he did not expand on these. Instead, he reverted to reviewing unchronologically Pugin’s architectural work and his writings. Towards the end of his book, he supplied an explanation for the structure of his text; he admitted that it was difficult to treat the subject chronologically because of Pugin’s various interests. Pugin’s life, he maintained, should not be seen as “a progression in time, but as it were as a fixed centre from which various energies radiated”.<sup>96</sup> This was an accurate observation. God was central to everything that Pugin undertook; his life was dedicated to Him. Whatever subject he treated - architecture, design, writing, church music, teaching, even church embroidery and sewing - he did so with unstinting enthusiasm as an expression of love for and obedience to God. A similar observation could also be made of Pugin’s study and writing on liturgy, in which he took up various arguments and themes which radiated out from the central topic of worship of God.

---

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, p.260.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, p.261.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, p.50, footnote. Edward Welby Pugin was born on 11 March 1835.

<sup>96</sup> *Ibid.*, p.247.

iii) The ecclesiastical historians.

Following the architectural historian and nineteenth-century historian came the ecclesiastical historian, S. C. Carpenter, who briefly mentioned Pugin in his Church and People 1789-1889, which was published in 1933. His knowledge of Pugin was limited and confused and he was unable to throw any new light on Pugin's religious ideas. Indeed, he appeared to base his "facts" on Kenneth Clark's earlier comments suggesting that Pugin was motivated by his love of beauty; Carpenter consequently believed that "'Gothic' was his one term of praise for anything of beauty".<sup>97</sup>

Carpenter's views about form and arrangement were also muddled; he suggested that the changes made to churches was really about architectural styles:

The English priests had Gothic churches, because it was universally assumed by clergy and congregation and architects that no church could be built in any other style, but they put into them classical altars, furnished in the Roman fashion, and they used vestments of the ungainly Roman shape, which Pugin hated.<sup>98</sup>

iv) The architectural historians.

1938 saw the publication of Basil Clarke's Church Builders of the Nineteenth Century: A Study of the Gothic Revival in England, which devoted a chapter to Pugin's role as an architect of the Gothic Revival. Clarke relied heavily on secondary sources. Although his was a valiant attempt at an examination of the architecture of this period, Basil Clarke, like Kenneth Clark before him, was (as an architectural historian) unqualified to give proper consideration to the context and development of Pugin's religious ideas; consequently, he was unable to deal with these either in depth or effectively.

---

<sup>97</sup> S. C. Carpenter, Church and People 1789 - 1889 (London: S.P.C.K., 1933), p.217.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, p.217.

Statements such as “Pugin was essentially right; but wrong in his opinion that Christian architecture had no place in and could not flourish in the Church of England”<sup>99</sup> and Pugin “was not a typical Roman” and “by most of the Romans he was regarded as a rather dangerous and very difficult person,”<sup>100</sup> are too sweeping and require refinement.

Clarke saw Pugin as a man of Romantic temperament who muddled his architectural convictions with moral ones and who lived in a daydream world. Moreover, despite admiring Pugin’s architecture, Clarke had taken on board many of the earlier writers’ prejudiced or distorted statements. He accepted Kenneth Clark’s view that Pugin was motivated by his love for beauty and a fanatical obsession with a particular style of architecture. Clarke developed this view by exaggerating William George Ward’s “Gothic pudding” story. Pugin, he said, became more and more obsessed “with his one idea”,<sup>101</sup> which was that “Gothic is Christian Architecture”<sup>102</sup> and that this obsession went so far that “he expressed himself unable to eat puddings unless they were Gothic in form, and made a design for a Gothic pudding”.<sup>103</sup>

Clarke’s sympathy towards Pugin was therefore limited. He was reluctant to give credit to him for the adoption of the Gothic style by the Church of England, yet admitted that Pugin’s views “were such that we now associate as a matter of course with the Anglican Church”.<sup>104</sup> Thus, he claimed that while the Roman Catholics, who had reason, did not appreciate him, the Anglicans, who had little reason, did not appreciate him either:

Pugin was a prophet without honour in his own country; but principles similar to his were adopted with enthusiasm by Anglicans ... They formed themselves independently in the minds of men of High-Church views.<sup>105</sup>

---

<sup>99</sup> Basil Fulforth Lowther Clarke, Church Builders of the Nineteenth Century: A study of the Gothic Revival in England (Newton Abbot: David & Charles, 1938: 1969), p.73.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.46, 48.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, p.59.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 45 et seq. – this quote refers to the title of chapter IV.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, p.60.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, p.46.

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, p.72.

v) The Roman Catholic writer.

Pugin's name next appeared in 1942 in The Second Spring written by Denis Gwynn, a Roman Catholic man of letters. He made some interesting points about Pugin; emphasising that while he was a Roman Catholic who spent much of his time at Oscott College, he was also in touch with Anglicans, particularly members of the Oxford Movement and as clients<sup>106</sup> (which contradicted Basil Clarke's notion that Pugin had little contact with Anglicans and did not work for them).<sup>107</sup>

Gwynn gave a fuller account of Pugin in his Lord Shrewsbury, Pugin and the Catholic Revival (1946). He admitted that he too relied heavily on Ferrey's biography. The conversion story, however, took on a new twist. Gwynn suggested that Pugin became a Roman Catholic under Lord Shrewsbury's influence.<sup>108</sup> That Pugin was at Alton Towers (Lord Shrewsbury's home) suggests, however, that he was already a Catholic. Lord Shrewsbury, Pugin's patron, was a leading Roman Catholic, who may have given him an opportunity to meet Nicholas Wiseman when he visited in September 1835. Therefore, Wiseman, as much as Lord Shrewsbury, may have encouraged his fledgling interest in Catholicism.

Gwynn also took on board Kenneth Clark's earlier assumption that Pugin became a Roman Catholic because of his "love for beauty". He maintained that Pugin's "close contact with Salisbury Cathedral while he lived near it, had drawn him always more to the beauties of the ancient churches and their liturgy".<sup>109</sup> He also gave a variety of other probable reasons for Pugin's conversion, including a reaction to his disgust at the irreverence shown towards sacred buildings by many Anglican ministers; his abhorrence of James Wyatt's renovations of religious buildings and Pugin's own study of doctrine and liturgy. Gwynn was, moreover,

---

<sup>106</sup> Denis Gwynn, The Second Spring (London: Burns & Oates, 1942), p.104.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.112, 104.

<sup>108</sup> Denis Gwynn, Lord Shrewsbury, Pugin and the Catholic Revival (London: Hollis and Carter, 1946), p.11.

critical of his motives for restoring ceremonial and Gothic architecture and suggested that “improvements” were Pugin’s pretext for restoring English practices that had ceased to exist in the Catholic Church. On this point, Gwynn quoted Bishop Baines (one of the few bishops who did not support Pugin in his day).<sup>110</sup>

Gwynn’s value lies in his attempt to show the role of Lord Shrewsbury, Pugin and Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle in the Catholic Revival, especially their endeavours to revive medieval liturgy in Gothic churches. Moreover, his book was a useful introduction to parts of the Catholic background to Pugin’s life and work.

vi) Architectural historians continued to be interested in Pugin.

Denis Gwynn’s books became the principal reference source for Henry-Russell Hitchcock, the architectural historian, in his Early Victorian Architecture in Britain (1954). He differed, however, from Gwynn and other previous writers (Clark and Clarke, in particular) on one crucial point; he did not accept that Pugin’s principal aim was the restoration of medieval art, architecture and ceremonial, but the revival of faith. His was an “essentially religious crusade deeply imbued with values both ethical and sacramental”.<sup>111</sup> The ideology of which Pugin was the forerunner was the restoration of *true* faith - whether Roman or Anglo-Catholic. Moreover, Hitchcock suggested that the line between Roman Catholicism and Anglo-Catholicism had, as far as Pugin was concerned, no clear demarcation. He remarked that had Pugin “not gone mad, some have conjectured that he might have returned to the Anglican fold”.<sup>112</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, p.14.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, p.55.

<sup>111</sup> Henry-Russell Hitchcock, Early Victorian Architecture in Britain (London: Trewin Copplestone, 1954), Vol. I, p.13.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p.96.

Although interest in Pugin gradually developed it was far from being uncritical endorsement of his life and work. John Betjeman's attitude was typical of a spate of writers who attempted to assess Pugin's contribution to the Gothic Revival. While Betjeman greatly admired and loved medieval Gothic, he, at first, loathed nineteenth-century Gothic Revival architecture because it had "fallen into the hands of antiquarianism".<sup>113</sup> "Real" Gothic architects would have had no time for them, he intimated. It was futile to attempt to "preserve its methods, planning or buildings in an urban civilisation" in the nineteenth century.<sup>114</sup>

His opinion had not changed by 1952. In his First and Last Loves he depicted Pugin in a manner that was scathing and antagonistic:

Perhaps the most disastrous influence on the Gothic Revival was that of Pugin, because he it was, and not Ruskin, who said that no building was Christian unless it had a pointed arch.<sup>115</sup>

Betjeman believed this connection between Christianity and Gothic architecture to be a "false but attractive dictum".<sup>116</sup> And Pugin was, he said, "a lonely genius"<sup>117</sup> - possibly overlooking the fact that Pugin was married three times, had eight children and was a much-loved national figure! Betjeman, however, was initially an admirer of Classical architecture and had little time for the Gothic Revival style because it was "all mixed up with social morality and religion".<sup>118</sup> He concluded with denigrating remarks about Pugin by flatly stating, his "accomplishment is usually less impressive than that of his followers".<sup>119</sup>

---

<sup>113</sup> John Betjeman, Ghastly Good Taste (London: Anthony Blond Ltd., 1933), p.31.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*, p.32.

<sup>115</sup> John Betjeman, First and Last Loves (London: Century in association with the National Trust, 1987, John Murray, 1952), p.135.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, p.149.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*, p.135.

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*, p.135.

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*, p.149.

By 1958 Betjeman was beginning to reform his opinion of Pugin, even if this did not extend to other nineteenth-century Gothic Revival architects. Yet, it was not Pugin's role as an architect that he began to acknowledge. "It is not in his buildings but in his writing that Pugin had so great an influence on the men of his time", he remarked.<sup>120</sup> He unwittingly echoed Pugin's own comment that he made in a letter to John Hardman in 1851. "My writings more than what I have been able to do have revolutionised the Taste of England".<sup>121</sup>

Betjeman's theory for Pugin's conversion to Roman Catholicism is stimulatingly fresh. Pugin joined the Church of Rome because of his "social conscience", he said. "He deplored the slums he saw building round him. He abhorred the soullessness of machinery, and revered hand craftsmanship"<sup>122</sup> and so he contrasted industrial towns with "a dream-like Middle Ages".<sup>123</sup> Betjeman did not explain why he thought Pugin was more likely to effect changes in society as a Roman Catholic. There were great social philanthropists like, Lord Shaftsbury, who were not Roman Catholics, but Anglicans. Betjeman's theory, that a "social conscience" caused Pugin's conversion, could only, at best, be partly true.

That Betjeman had acquired more knowledge about and sympathy for Pugin at this time is illustrated by his acceptance that Pugin was the source and inspiration for a number of later artists and architects; these included William Morris,<sup>124</sup> George Gilbert Scott,<sup>125</sup> William Butterfield,<sup>126</sup> and George Edmund Street.<sup>127</sup>

---

<sup>120</sup> John Betjeman, ed., Collins Guide to English Parish Churches (London: Collins, 1958), p.69.

<sup>121</sup> Pugin. Microfilm, HLRO Historical Collection No. 304/127, p.477. See also Peter Ferriday, Victorian Architecture (London: Jonathan Cape 1963), p.151.

<sup>122</sup> John Betjeman, ed., Collins Guide, p.70

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*, p.70.

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid.*, p.70.

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 71, 72.

<sup>126</sup> *Ibid.*, p.73.

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, p.74.

vii) Pugin's name surfaced in a variety of publications.

Mention should be made of Alf Bøe's From Gothic Revival to Functional Form (1957) which devoted a section to Pugin. Bøe placed Pugin firmly in the Gothic Revival. He had, said Bøe, an "all-absorbing interest in mediaevalism"<sup>128</sup> and he was a "champion of a Catholic Gothic Revival".<sup>129</sup> And yet, Bøe appeared to offer a contradiction; Pugin was, he said, "no advocate of stylistic copyism".<sup>130</sup> Towards the end of the section, he appeared to change his mind about Pugin; it was not his medievalism after all that characterised him; it was his writing. "His great and indisputable achievement rests therefore on his writings, as he himself realised".<sup>131</sup> Hence, he, like Betjeman, identified Pugin's greatest value as being in his writing, not in his architecture.

Raymond Williams in his Culture and Society (1958), like Betjeman, placed Pugin in the context of artistic expression and society. His reference to Pugin is really an introduction to John Ruskin and William Morris, but he pointed out that in Contrasts, Pugin went "from an architectural to a social judgement"<sup>132</sup> and from "criticizing a change of architecture"<sup>133</sup> to "criticizing a civilization".<sup>134</sup>

Williams' view of Pugin's relationship to these other important nineteenth-century figures is different from that of Betjeman, although, like him, he recognized a connection. He suggested that Ruskin plagiarised Pugin's ideas because he "wanted to capture Gothic for Protestantism" while Morris opposed Pugin's ideas because he believed Pugin was

---

<sup>128</sup> Alf Bøe, From Gothic Revival to Functional Form (Oslo: Oslo University Press + Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957), p.20.

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid.*, p.21.

<sup>130</sup> *Ibid.*, p.36.

<sup>131</sup> *Ibid.*, p.39.

<sup>132</sup> Raymond Williams, Culture and Society 1780-1950 (London: Chatto & Windus, 1958), p.132.

<sup>133</sup> *Ibid.*, p.132.

“prejudiced against anything to do with the working-class movement”. Williams’ observations are accurate; Ruskin was a strong advocate of both Protestantism and Gothic architecture, while Pugin, like many ultra-conservative opponents of working class movements, was a strong social critic of capitalism. There was a social dimension to his views, which he demonstrated particularly clearly in his first edition of Contrasts.

Overall the fifties and sixties were periods when interest in Pugin somewhat dwindled. The exception to this lack of interest was Brian Fothergill who, in his Nicholas Wiseman (1963), took up the baton from Basil Clarke by presenting Pugin as an extreme eccentric. Fothergill called him “*eccentric, deranged and insane*”,<sup>135</sup> while repeating and exaggerating Ward’s story about the supposed “pudding” incident to emphasise this eccentricity:

Pugin, the architect, carried his enthusiasm for Gothic architecture to such a pitch that he would offer the guests at his table a gothic pudding with the same enthusiasm as he would announce that his wife had presented him with a gothic baby.<sup>136</sup>

The implication of some of Fothergill’s statements can be questioned; he emphasised that Phillipps de Lisle was “a link between Wiseman and the leading Tractarians”,<sup>137</sup> whereas Wilfrid Ward had emphasised that Pugin was the first link.<sup>138</sup> Although both may have made this link, Pugin’s personal contact with the Tractarians preceded Phillipps’. As Margaret Pawley says, “It was Pugin, then Spencer, then Ambrose” who made the first moves towards contact.<sup>139</sup> Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle corresponded with Bloxam from 25 January 1841 until

---

<sup>134</sup> *Ibid.*, p.133.

<sup>135</sup> Brian Fothergill, ed., Nicholas Wiseman (London: Faber & Faber, 1963), p.107.

<sup>136</sup> *Ibid.*, p.49.

<sup>137</sup> *Ibid.*, p.108.

<sup>138</sup> *Ibid.*, p.108 + W. Ward, Life of Cardinal Wiseman, Vol. I, p.371.

<sup>139</sup> Margaret Pawley, Faith and Family: The Life and Circle of Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle (Norwich: The Canterbury Press 1993), p.109.

c. July 1842,<sup>140</sup> but did not meet the Tractarians until 1841 or Newman until 19 October 1842.<sup>141</sup> By then, Pugin had been regularly visiting Oxford for three years and had met Newman in February 1841.

Fothergill thought that when Pugin did go to Oxford he was not a good choice to promote Roman Catholicism because of his eccentric views:

Pugin was not perhaps the best man to recommend Roman Catholicism to these retiring dons as his extremely eccentric version of the Faith was often as alarming to his co-religionists as it was to potential converts.<sup>142</sup>

Indeed, Newman and Pusey “showed no eagerness”<sup>143</sup> to meet Spencer, Phillipps de Lisle or Pugin, “and still less to engage themselves in controversy with them”.<sup>144</sup>

Although interest in Pugin in Britain was not significant during the early 1960's, an American writer, Josef L. Altholz, made a valuable contribution by placing Pugin in the centre of the controversies surrounding the *Rambler* and *The Tablet* periodicals.<sup>145</sup> The history of the *Rambler* is complex as Altholz skilfully demonstrated. He valiantly attempted to indicate that since the *Rambler* expressed the views of the new converts to Roman Catholicism, it also voiced the complexities and political changes within the Roman Catholic Church itself at that time. The story has some points of agreement with Bernard Ward's comments in his chapter on the rood screen controversy.

John More Capes founded the *Rambler* in 1848 (he had become a convert to Roman Catholicism on 27 July 1845). It represented the views of the later (after 1845) converts and,

---

<sup>140</sup> *Ibid.*, p.118.

<sup>141</sup> Dessain, *Letters and Diaries*, Vol. XI, p.352. See also M. Pawley, *Faith and Family*, p.213.

<sup>142</sup> B. Fothergill, *Nicholas Wiseman*, p.107.

<sup>143</sup> *Ibid.*, p.107.

<sup>144</sup> *Ibid.*, p.107.

<sup>145</sup> Josef L. Altholz, *The Liberal Catholic Movement in England: The 'Rambler' and its Contributors 1848-1864* (London: Burns & Oates, 1960).

during the first series, was Ultramontane in its views. After 1857, Altholz showed that it changed to supporting Liberal Catholic views.

But the *Rambler's* Ultramontanism in 1848 was different from its neo-Ultramontanism of 1850 and after. Therein lies the problem for the unsuspecting. Initially, the Ultramontane views of the *Rambler* were those of a distinguished group in the Roman Catholic Church in the nineteenth century, who were theologically orthodox and favoured political democracy and ecclesiastical reform. They recognized the supremacy of the Pope (and in this sense were Ultramontane), were against certain forms of Gallicanism and included a belief in liberty of conscience, of thought, and of the press, and advocated the separation of Church and State, all ideals that Pugin and some of the converts shared.

Moreover, the *Rambler* also supported the Continental Liberal Catholics, whose cry was "God and Liberty". A number of early editions carried sympathetic articles about French Liberal Catholics such as Lamennais, Lacordaire, and Montalembert. This support was later extended to the German Liberal Catholics Möhler, Gorres and Döllinger.

There was no antagonism at this point to Pugin and the old hereditary Catholics (not all of whom were Liberal or Ultramontane). The situation was to change subtly. Altholz, however, did not give the reasons for the *Rambler's* *volte-face*. Several factors influenced the editor Capes' stance. As mentioned, it moved to representing the views of the later converts, including J. H. Newman and the Oratorians. Once Newman had decided on the Rule of St Philip Neri in 1846-47, he naturally wished to promote that Rule. The Oratorians became Catholics with a strong Ultramontane loyalty to Rome. Capes, ever a supporter of Newman and the Oratorians, grew more antagonistic to Pugin and to Liberal Catholic views.

The other factor, which indirectly had a bearing on the *Rambler's* antagonism to Pugin, was the political situation in Italy. Pope Pius IX had taken a Liberal Catholic stance between 1846 and 1848; thereafter the extremely difficult political situation which he faced

caused him to change his views so that by his return from exile in 1850, he had moved towards conservatism, which favoured the development of neo-Ultramontanism. This increasingly showed itself as antagonism to Liberal Catholics who were perceived as being Gallican, and under this charge they certainly became gradually anti-Ultramontane and anti-Papal. The situation in Italy was political and Pius took his hard-line stance in order to strengthen his threatened "siege" position.

Events leading to the pope's exile were only one factor in the pressure on him to change his views. His popularity as a Liberal subsided when he made it clear that, believing the temporal sovereignty of the Holy See indispensable to its spiritual independence, he had no intention of setting up a constitutional state. In March 1848 he was forced to concede a bicameral assembly, but when he firmly refused on 29 April 1848 to join in the war to expel Austria from Italy his neutrality was taken as a sign of treachery. The storm broke over his head.

In exile at Gaeta, the Pope changed his views. On 14 July 1849, the French troops restored the pontifical dominion and he returned to Rome on 12 April 1850 a different man, embittered, and hostile from this time forth to every form of political Liberalism or national sentiment. He deliberately and stubbornly set his face against any ecclesiastical reform and showed his displeasure at and distrust of liberal theology and philosophy, which were displaying a moderate advance.

The converts and the *Rambler* quickly and easily adapted to these new papal views. While they had been in the minority regarding opposition to Pugin's liturgical ideas, they now found that they could gain significant support from the Vatican and the Pope himself by encouraging Ultramontanism. Newman himself was rather swept away by the enthusiasm of his followers. Moreover, in their eagerness to promote the Rule of St Philip Neri, the

Oratorians moved rapidly from Ultramontanism to an extreme form of neo-Ultramontanism. They consequently rejected many aspects of Liberal Catholicism.

Pugin and some old Catholics, however, remained supporters of the original Liberal Catholic Ultramontanism. By this time, following the Falloux Law of 1850 in France, the Liberal Catholics and the neo-Ultramontanes were seen to be two distinct and opposing sections in the Roman Catholic Church. These events all contributed to change the *Rambler's* attitude to Pugin and old Catholics, such as Lord Shrewsbury, from one of partial tolerance to one of open hostility.

Yet Alholz did not seem to recognize that what he called "the small war" between Pugin, the "Goths", and the "anti-Goths"<sup>146</sup> was more than a battle between ideas on ecclesiastical architecture and church building programmes and really concerned this old Ultramontane, Liberal Catholic and neo-Ultramontane conflict. Thus, he claimed that "Only Pugin's death in 1852 put an end to the controversy",<sup>147</sup> not recognizing that it continued in essence with others; notably, Acton who had Liberal views and Manning, Faber and Ward who promoted neo-Ultramontanism.

Alholz did not acknowledge that Pugin remained steadfast in his views while those expressed by the *Rambler* were not consistent. His whole chapter on this subject appears to be an apology for the *Rambler's* views; Pugin's attitude was, he thought, partisan:

The controversy became embittered because of the tone and language of Pugin, who regarded Gothic as the only true Catholic style, which was almost a dogma of faith to support and heresy to oppose. Indeed, he was not above impugning the orthodoxy of his opponents.<sup>148</sup>

While Alholz was critical of Pugin, he implied that the *Rambler's* position happened as a result of "misunderstandings", but, he conceded, "no amount of sympathy could conceal

---

<sup>146</sup> *Ibid.*, p.16.

<sup>147</sup> *Ibid.*, p.16.

the fact that there was a fundamental opposition between the principles on which the *Rambler*, even in the 'safe' hands of Capes, was conducted, and those which Wiseman represented."<sup>149</sup> Although Altholz did not expand on what Wiseman's "principles" were, there is the suggestion that Wiseman was anti neo-Ultramontane and in sympathy with Pugin, the old Catholics and the Liberal Ultramontanes, but this was not the case, as the thesis will argue.

### 3) The biographers.

An important architectural biography appeared in 1971, Phoebe Stanton's Pugin, which was based on her unpublished University of London Ph.D. thesis of 1950. Yet again, much of the biographical material was based on Ferrey's book. Disconcertingly, Nikolaus Pevsner, an architectural historian, who was clearly not an admirer of Pugin, wrote the preface.

Pevsner resurrected Newman's old argument by stating that Pugin was wrong in believing that Gothic was the only Christian architecture. He commenced by quoting Newman who said of Pugin, "The Canons of Gothic architecture are to him points of faith, and everyone is a heretic who would venture to question them"<sup>150</sup> But Newman did question them, stated Pevsner. Newman, he said, argued that Gothic architecture never "prevailed over the *whole* face of the Church', that for example, 'the see of St Peter's never was Gothic', that there is no 'uninterrupted tradition of Gothic architecture', that what Pugin pleaded for is a revival, and that no such revival can 'exactly suit the living ritual of the nineteenth

---

<sup>148</sup> *Ibid.*, p.15.

<sup>149</sup> *Ibid.*, p.39.

<sup>150</sup> Phoebe Stanton, Pugin, Preface, p.7. See also Dessain, C. S., ed., The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman, Vol. XII, p.220. Newman to Phillipps (15 June 1848).

century”<sup>151</sup>. Moreover, the Oratory to which Newman belonged, Pevsner quoted Newman as saying, was “‘a birth of the sixteenth century’ and hence cannot be represented by ‘a cloister or a chapter house’”. But Pevsner did not realise that it was Newman and not Pugin, who had suggested a Gothic Oratory, as the thesis will argue.

Pevsner did not question any of the statements made by Newman. There was the presumption that Pugin really did believe that Gothic architecture was the only Christian architecture. The thesis will argue that this was not altogether an accurate assertion. Pevsner stated that all Newman’s arguments “were right”;<sup>152</sup> he “argues sensibly. He tries to be fair”;<sup>153</sup> Pugin “did not argue in this case at all; he swore, he cursed, he condemned”: he said that the Oratorians “are perfectly monstrous”.<sup>154</sup> Pevsner’s concern was rather to bring out the fact that Pugin was overcome by emotion, which caused him to use extremely immoderate language, while Newman retained an intellectual coolness despite the strength of his views. While this brought forward the characteristics of the two, it did little to bring forward understanding of their quarrel.

Pevsner gave no account of the basis of this row between Pugin and the Oratorians, although it may be what he had in mind when writing the Preface. It had originated as a conflict between Newman and Pugin when they met in Rome in June 1847. Newman had invited Pugin to meet him to discuss plans for building an Oratory in England, but they had quarrelled.

What is apparent from his brief comments is that Pevsner sided with Newman, yet he admitted that “emotionally and aesthetically in the end he was wrong, and Pugin was

---

<sup>151</sup> Phoebe Stanton, Pugin, p.7.

<sup>152</sup> *Ibid.*, Preface, p.8.

<sup>153</sup> *Ibid.*, p.7.

<sup>154</sup> *Ibid.*, p.7.

right”,<sup>155</sup> which suggests that he had some sympathy and admiration for Pugin despite his acceptance of Newman’s views on architecture. Although he did not question why an eminent ecclesiastic and Church scholar should be so concerned about an architect, he was clearly puzzled by it and brought forward a glimpse of the nature of the dispute. Nevertheless, it is fair to say that Pevsner’s was not a very encouraging preface to any book on Pugin!

While Stanton’s book is a chronological catalogue of events in Pugin’s life, she attempted little exegesis or contextual analysis, confining herself to facts in relation to architecture. She hence considered Pugin’s greatest or dominant role to be that of an architect, suggesting that his other roles were insignificant or of less importance. Indeed, she put him on a pedestal as an architect; “Pugin”, she said, “set out to practise architecture and to change it”.<sup>156</sup> Pugin was an architect above all else, she might have added.

She, like Kenneth Clark, suggested that Pugin’s principal motivation was his love of medieval art. Although she recognized that he was “deeply pre-occupied with the meaning of the Catholic liturgy”<sup>157</sup> this was, she thought, because of his interest in restoring “the artistic traditions associated with its medieval setting”.<sup>158</sup> Thus, although Stanton’s reference to Pugin’s religious interest was brief, it nevertheless followed the same lines as Kenneth’s Clark’s earlier argument.

Stanton made a valuable point, however, in recognizing the change in Pugin’s writing from the first edition of his Contrasts in 1836 to his second edition in 1841. “Little of Pugin’s

---

<sup>155</sup> *Ibid.*, p.8.

<sup>156</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.191.

<sup>157</sup> *Ibid.*, p.76.

<sup>158</sup> *Ibid.*, p.76.

wilful but amusing enthusiasm of 1836 remained in 1841; he had acquired new heroes as well as new antipathies”, she commented.<sup>159</sup>

Her biography is very useful as a record of Pugin’s architectural achievements because of its references to these and the inclusion of a large number of photographs.

Stanton has also written a number of valuable articles and essays on Pugin. In her “The Sources of Pugin’s *Contrasts*”, in Concerning Architecture: Essays on Architectural Writers and Writing presented to Nikolaus Pevsner (1968),<sup>160</sup> she indicated some of Pugin’s authorities and sources. She mentioned John Stow,<sup>161</sup> William Dugdale,<sup>162</sup> Dom Jean-Francois Pommeraye,<sup>163</sup> and John Milner.<sup>164</sup> But, while she was perfectly correct in pinpointing these authorities, she undertook only a little analysis of their influence on him.

Moreover, although Stanton recognized a few of Pugin’s authorities she ignored the majority; she was attempting to squeeze him into an art and architectural mould and she found that his references to anyone connected with these subjects was few and far between. Unfortunately, she brought forward unsubstantiated claims of authorities who may have influenced Pugin in order to fill the gaps. “From Cruikshank Pugin surely learned how to use the notices posted on buildings as an opportunity for bitter puns”,<sup>165</sup> she mentioned the Saint-Simonians and J. S. Mill as the thinkers who might have influenced him, as well as Thomas Carlyle,<sup>166</sup> Robert Southey,<sup>167</sup> William Cobbett<sup>168</sup> and Kenelm Digby.<sup>169</sup> She strained to

---

<sup>159</sup> *Ibid.*, p.87.

<sup>160</sup> John Summerson, ed., Concerning Architecture: Essays on Architectural Writers and Writing presented to Nikolaus Pevsner (London: The Penguin Press, 1968).

<sup>161</sup> *Ibid.*, p.128.

<sup>162</sup> *Ibid.*, p.128.

<sup>163</sup> *Ibid.*, p.129.

<sup>164</sup> *Ibid.*, p.139.

<sup>165</sup> Phoebe Stanton, “The Sources of Pugin’s *Contrasts*”, in John Summerson, ed., Concerning Architecture, p.123.

<sup>166</sup> *Ibid.*, p.132.

<sup>167</sup> *Ibid.*, p.132.

prove this - "Pugin must have read Carlyle, and agreed with him";<sup>170</sup> "one which Pugin surely knew was *Mores catholici*".<sup>171</sup> In too many cases, she had little evidence to support the so-called "sources".

The effect of Phoebe Stanton's detailed cataloguing in her Pugin (1971) was to slow up other research on the subject because many assumed, incorrectly, that she had said all there was to say on the subject; consequently, the architectural historians appeared to lose interest for a while. Nevertheless, a small, brief, but valuable biography by the historian John Harries appeared in 1973, again simply titled Pugin. Harries believed, similar to Kenneth Clark, that Pugin's conversion came about from his "'travels in search of the beautiful'"<sup>172</sup> - his visits to British cathedrals.<sup>173</sup> In doing so, said Harries, he became convinced that Roman Catholicism was the true religion because it was "the creator of the architectural beauty he so ardently admired".<sup>174</sup> But most significantly, Harries advanced the theory that

although he admired it, the spirit of this medieval work was 'unintelligible' to him at that time and it was not until he delved into the rites and doctrines of Catholicism that all became apparent, and the Roman Catholic Church emerged in his mind as the great and constant civilizing force of England.<sup>175</sup>

Thus, according to Harries, it was Pugin's study of rites and doctrines that convinced him about Catholicism, not his study of architecture. Harries thus puts the emphasis in the right place.

---

<sup>168</sup> *Ibid.*, p.134.

<sup>169</sup> *Ibid.*, p.134.

<sup>170</sup> *Ibid.*, p.133.

<sup>171</sup> *Ibid.*, p.137.

<sup>172</sup> John Glen Harries, Pugin (Princes Risborough: Shire Publications, 1973), p.11.

<sup>173</sup> *Ibid.*, p.11.

<sup>174</sup> *Ibid.*, p.12.

<sup>175</sup> *Ibid.*, p.12.

4) Further assorted publications mention Pugin.

Articles, essays and chapters on Pugin in the context of the Gothic Revival continued to appear from time to time. Georg Germann included a section on Pugin in his Gothic Revival (1972) and made the interesting point about him that he was simply not a medieval reconstructionist, but had a different agenda:

Pugin was opposed to the imitation of earlier architectural styles. But he was not opposed to the imitation or, rather, the adoption of the principles underlying such styles. Consequently, Pugin rejected both the suspect originality displayed by his eighteenth-century predecessors and the copyism of his own day, and called for architects who had absorbed the spirit of the Gothic and grasped the principles on which it was based. He even rejected the word "style" as inappropriate in this context:

'We do not want to revive a facsimile of the works or style of any particular individual or even period ... it is not a *style*, but a principle'.<sup>176</sup>

The study will argue that Germann's perception about Pugin was correct. He, regrettably, did not expand on his appraisal. Instead, he attempted to fit Pugin into an architectural context by suggesting, with little foundation, that his authorities may have been the neo-Classical architect J. G. Soufflot (1713-1780) or the French Romantic writers François-René, vicomte de Chateaubriand (1768-1848) and Victor Hugo (1802-1885).<sup>177</sup>

James Macauley also includes a section on Pugin in his The Gothic Revival 1745-1845 (1975). He recognizes Pugin's religious zeal, which he believes, was expressed in his architecture; "like all Pugin's churches, St. Mary's can be understood best as an act of faith".<sup>178</sup> Yet, despite this statement, Macauley is reluctant to attribute Pugin's ideas to his Catholicism. Indeed, he thinks that many of Pugin's ideas "corresponded to those of the

---

<sup>176</sup> Georg Germann, Gothic Revival in Europe and Britain: Sources, Influences and Ideas (London: Lund Humphries with the Architectural Association, 1972), p.72.

<sup>177</sup> J. G. Soufflot was the neo-Classical architect who designed the church of Sainte-Geneviève (later renamed the Panthéon) in Paris. Chateaubriand wrote Le Génie du Christianisme (1802), which was an apologetic treatise that asserted Christianity's moral superiority on the basis of its poetic and artistic appeal. Victor Hugo was an important French Romantic writer and poet. His Les Misérables (1862) is the most well known. Many of his works idealized Napoleon.

<sup>178</sup> James Macauley, The Gothic Revival 1745-1845 (London and Glasgow: Blackie, 1975), p.294.

Protestant reformers” and does not consider that there may have been a common factor, such as St Augustine’s teachings, or that Pugin may have influenced their ideas, not the other way around.<sup>179</sup>

David Watkin, the distinguished architectural historian, published his Morality and Architecture in 1977, which devoted a chapter to Pugin. Watkin is most critical of Pugin’s ideas. “To argue, as Pugin does, that the arts employed by the Church to symbolize her divine truths are themselves somehow infused with the aura of unchanging truth is a curious materialist heresy”.<sup>180</sup> Moreover, to suggest that people would actually be better and nicer if surrounded by Gothic detail rather than Classical is “an irresponsible fantasy”<sup>181</sup> which “suggests the unreality of Pugin’s position”.<sup>182</sup> However, he goes on to admit that the theory that architecture has an influence on people’s moral behaviour is one generally accepted by leading architectural critics and theorists including Ruskin, Lethaby, Viollet-le-Duc, Nikolaus Pevsner, John Summerson, Leslie Martin, James Stirling, Le Corbusier and many others.<sup>183</sup> His book is an attack on this theory, which he sees as the foundation of the modernist architectural establishment.

Ecclesiastical historians continued to suspect that Pugin had a place in nineteenth-century church history, even if it remained unclear, a suspicion or a theory.

Derek Holmes, in his More Roman than Rome (1978), suggests that Pugin did have a significant role in the Catholic Revival other than (or as well) as an architect and, perceptively, that he aimed to restore an English Catholicism which would eventually unite with Rome. But some Ultramontanes, claimed Holmes, “feared that the restoration of British

---

<sup>179</sup> *Ibid.*, p.292.

<sup>180</sup> David Watkin, Morality and Architecture (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1977), p.17.

<sup>181</sup> *Ibid.*, p.22.

<sup>182</sup> David Watkin, Morality and Architecture Revised (London: John Murray 2001), p.22.

<sup>183</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 18.

or medieval liturgies and practices might lead to an attempt to emphasize the national character of English Catholicism”<sup>184</sup> - an English Catholicism which would maintain a Gallican distance from Rome. He quotes Richard Schiefen to back up his claim that Wiseman, too, in his later neo-Ultramontane phase (after 1850), feared the Gothic and Catholic Revivals would lead to English Catholicism and not to Roman Catholicism.<sup>185</sup>

Edward Norman, in his The English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century (1984), makes a similar claim to Alholz and Holmes - concerning English Catholicism and neo-Ultramontanism - but attempts to retain the connection with architecture. He suggests that Pugin was at the centre of religious controversy since the Gothic style was “the symbol of the anti-Ultramontanes”.<sup>186</sup> He thus assumed that Pugin was not an Ultramontane. He enlarges on this point in his Roman Catholicism in England (1985), in which he recognizes that Pugin was “a man of strongly held beliefs”, and that there was a great deal of antagonism between, on the one side, Pugin and the hereditary Catholics, and on the other, the neo-Ultramontanes converts. “So sensitive were the feelings of both sides”, he claims, “that in 1839 Propaganda actually stepped in to attempt a prohibition of Gothic vestments (and to enforce the use of the Roman chasuble instead)”. Pugin triumphed in this instance, since “the dogmatism of the ultramontanes”, he said, “met a comparable dogmatism” in ‘English’ Catholicism”.<sup>187</sup> Norman, like Holmes, does not appear to recognize the distinction between Liberal Ultramontanism and neo-Ultramontanism and presumes that Pugin was not Ultramontane simply because he was not a neo-Ultramontane.

---

<sup>184</sup> Derek Holmes, More Roman than Rome, p. 70.

<sup>185</sup> *Ibid.*, p.70. See also Richard J. Schiefen, “The English Catholic Reaction to the Tractarian Movement”. A paper given at a joint session of the Canadian Historical Society and the Canadian Catholic Historical Association, Toronto, summer 1974.

<sup>186</sup> Edward Norman, The English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century (Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press, 1984), p.236.

<sup>187</sup> Edward Norman, Roman Catholicism in England (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), p.76.

Although Norman's version of Pugin's conversion adheres to what he believes are "facts", there does not seem to be any foundation to his assumed date of 1834 for this event. He, however, rejects Kenneth Clark's notion that Pugin was converted because of his "love of beauty". Pugin himself rejected such a notion, he said.<sup>188</sup>

Norman, like Wilfrid Ward before him, makes the claim that Wiseman had a close association with Pugin and that Pugin was "the first personal link between the Catholics and the Oxford men".<sup>189</sup> This association did not continue to the end of Pugin's life since Wiseman apparently did not express by action, word or sympathy any interest in Pugin's last illness and death.

In spite of Stanton's negative effect on Pugin research and because of the continued interest of ecclesiastical historians, there eventually arose an increasing awareness that much remained unsaid on the subject and that further research was required. The result was a new crop of articles and books about Pugin that appeared in the 1980's and 90's.

Michael Bright's "A Reconstruction of A. W. N. Pugin's Architectural Theories", in *Victorian Studies*, places Pugin firmly in the context of architecture and is an analysis of his theories of architectural style. Bright argues that Pugin's theories comply to the pragmatic or functionalist theory and the expressive theory.<sup>190</sup>

Another article by James Patrick, "Newman, Pugin, and Gothic" in *Victorian Studies* (winter 1981), rather disappointingly does not, despite the title, move the focus away from architecture to religious controversy. Instead, he attempts to fit Newman into an architectural context. In this context Patrick observes that, "Since Newman had uprooted his life in the conviction that theological antiquarianism was indefensible, it is hardly surprising that the

---

<sup>188</sup> Edward Norman, *The English Catholic Church*, p.239.

<sup>189</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 209.

<sup>190</sup> Michael Bright, 'A Reconsideration of A. W. N. Pugin's Architectural Theories' in *Victorian Studies*, Vol. 22, No 2 (Winter 1979), pp.151-172. Bright's argument is discussed in detail later in the thesis.

Catholic Newman was untouched by Pugin's appeal to the past".<sup>191</sup> If Pugin had been placed on the other side of the fence – as a Catholic scholar - this statement might have led to an entirely different understanding of his role.

Patrick believes Pugin to be an antiquarian reconstructionist who had “become a medieval Catholic”. He was unable, he said, “to separate the architecture he loved from the age of faith he imagined”.<sup>192</sup>

Patrick occasionally makes assumptions about Pugin that have little factual basis. He states that “by 1850 Pugin's intermittent madness was public knowledge”.<sup>193</sup> While it is true that Pugin suffered intermittent bouts of illness all his life, these were restricted to physical symptoms until the last few months of his life in 1852; few suspected in 1850 that his illness was anything other than the result of over-work. Nevertheless, Patrick brings forward much interesting material about Pugin's connection with Newman, the Tractarians and the Oratorians.

A more recent article by Patricia Spencer-Silver, “George Myers, Pugin's Builder”, that appeared in *Recusant History* (October 1990), again sheds further light on Pugin's architectural role.<sup>194</sup> While Spencer-Silver greatly admires Pugin's architectural work and refers to several of his churches as “beautiful”, an occasional remark paints a different picture:

Pugin's writings were so extreme and he expressed his ideas in public without consideration for the feelings of others, that it is surprising that anyone who was not an ardent Catholic ever asked him to build for them.<sup>195</sup>

---

<sup>191</sup> James Patrick, ‘Newman, Pugin, and Gothic’ in *Victorian Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (Winter 1981), pp.204-205.

<sup>192</sup> *Ibid.*, p.185.

<sup>193</sup> *Ibid.*, p.202.

<sup>194</sup> Patricia Spencer-Silver, ‘George Myers, Pugin's Builder’ in *Recusant History*, Vol. 20, No. 2 (October 1990), pp.262-271.

<sup>195</sup> *Ibid.*, p.267.

While Betjeman and Böe admired Pugin's writing, Spencer-Silver did not, therefore, share their view and remained somewhat puzzled by Pugin.

i) A critical study of Pugin's architecture.

Guy Williams, in his book Augustus Pugin versus Decimus Burton: A Victorian Architectural Duel (1990), compares the architectural careers of these two nineteenth-century figures. The focus of interest is architecture, so it does not set out to enlighten the reader about Pugin's religious ideas, although Williams does write that Pugin's belief was that "God might truly be working through himself".<sup>196</sup>

Williams' contribution is in bringing into focus Pugin's lifestyle. St Marie's Grange, Pugin's house near Salisbury, was, he says, "a bleak, monastic abode"; a building for "monks".<sup>197</sup> Pugin lived there a strict life "of monastic regularity".<sup>198</sup> His source for this was John Hardman Powell.

ii) The bibliographers.

This bibliographical survey would not be complete without mentioning a number of publications, which are themselves bibliographies about Pugin. There has mostly been a move away from biographies to bibliographies and catalogues containing a number of essays. Some have more substance than others. Although these shed very little light on Pugin's religious ideas, they indicate various sources for further research on the subject. Overall, they are somewhat more successful than the biographies.

---

<sup>196</sup> Guy Williams, Augustus Pugin versus Decimus Burton: A Victorian Architectural Duel (London: Cassell Publishers Ltd. 1990), p.75.

<sup>197</sup> *Ibid.*, p.81.

<sup>198</sup> *Ibid.*, p.81.

An early bibliography was Rudolph Schwarz's A Pugin Bibliography: Augustus Welby Pugin 1812 - 1852 (1963) which attempted to gauge the popular response to Pugin. This demonstrated the esteem in which he was held during his life and, therefore, by implication emphasised the strangeness of his obscurity for so many years after his death.

An excellent and systematic attempt to catalogue Pugin's own publications and some correspondence, as well as publications written about him, was made by Margaret Belcher in A. W. N. Pugin: An Annotated Critical Bibliography (1987). Although, as she readily admits, this was not a definitive effort, it nevertheless demonstrates the vast amount of material by and on the subject. Belcher catalogues and reviews over 863 publications about Pugin, including books, articles and reviews. Many writers put Pugin into the category of 'Gothic Revival architect'. A few are mentioned here. Fenella Crichton's "Revivalism and Ritualism: Victorian Art at the V. and A." written for *Apollo* (January 1972: 53-55) reveals, says Belcher, Pugin's "considerable strengths" and shows that he is justly considered "the prime mover of the Gothic Revival" (p.53).<sup>199</sup>

Belcher includes S. Lang's "The Principles of the Gothic Revival in England" written for the *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* (U.S.A. December 1966: pp.240-67).<sup>200</sup> Belcher's remarks, although not intended, shows that Lang's article was as speculative as Phoebe Stanton's works as far as authorities and sources are concerned:

'Schlegel's and Chateaubriand's influence on Pugin seems certain' (p.262); 'Pugin was almost certainly familiar' with the writings of Humphrey Repton; those of Francesco Milizia 'may also have inspired Pugin' (p.264); and Lang speculates on the possibility of other influences.<sup>201</sup>

---

<sup>199</sup> Margaret Belcher, A. W. N. Pugin: An Annotated Critical Bibliography (London: Mansell 1987), D764, p.429.

<sup>200</sup> *Ibid.*, D723, p.415.

<sup>201</sup> *Ibid.*, D723, p.415.

From Belcher's review it would seem that Lang did not, however, actually consider the authorities and sources that Pugin himself clearly used and documented.

Another book that Belcher reviews is David J. Watkin's The Rise of Architectural History (London: The Architectural Press 1980). Belcher says that while Watkin introduces Pugin as, "One of the most influential thinkers about architecture in the nineteenth century", he only gives him "surprisingly brief mention" because "Pugin the historian was ultimately subservient to Pugin the designer' (p.69)".<sup>202</sup>

Belcher has recently published the first volume (1830-1842) of five volumes of Pugin's correspondence.<sup>203</sup> This work is one of the fullest records to date of Pugin's life, thoughts and activities and is invaluable to researchers, not least because of the difficulty of reading Pugin's almost illegible scrawl in the original letters. Belcher comments that "Pugin as a subject of study has been parcelled out among his critics: one deals with this facet, another deals with that. He is such a versatile figure and has such an impact in so many fields that perhaps this division is inevitable".<sup>204</sup> But, she says, "It generates an artificiality notwithstanding, even a distortion".<sup>205</sup> The published correspondence goes some way in correcting this.

Brief mention should be made, too, of Richard James Pickett's "The Churchmanship of A. W. N. Pugin", an MA thesis for the University of Durham (2001), which successfully brings to light Pugin's involvement in the religious activity of his time.

---

<sup>202</sup> *Ibid.*, D823, p.447.

<sup>203</sup> Margaret Belcher, The Collected Letters of A. W. N. Pugin (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2001).

<sup>204</sup> *Ibid.*, p.xv.

iii) Exhibitions and supporting catalogues about Pugin.

There have been several major exhibitions about Pugin in recent years, which have also generated collections of supporting papers and essays. The results of the 1977 and 1985 exhibitions are two catalogues by Alexandra Wedgwood. The first, - The Pugin Family: Catalogue of the Drawings Collection of the Royal Institute of British Architects, - deals with the collection of drawings in the Royal Institute of British Architects archives. This was a valiant attempt at cataloguing the drawings of A. C. Pugin, A. W. N. Pugin and E. W. Pugin preceded by short biographies and giving a survey in chronological order of all the known descendant architects and designers in the Pugin family<sup>206</sup> including Cuthbert Welby Pugin, Peter Paul Pugin, John Hardman Powell, Dunstan John Powell, Sebastian Pugin Powell and Charles Henry Cuthbert Purcell.

Wedgwood thinks that Pugin was influenced by J. Le Roy's Castella et praetoria nobilium Brabantiae delineata (1696) since he used similar effects in his drawings - of shields and inscriptions drawn in the sky above the bird's-eye view of buildings.<sup>207</sup>

Wedgwood's second catalogue is A. W. N. Pugin and the Pugin Family: Catalogue of Architectural Drawings in the Victoria and Albert Museum (1985). It contains material in the Victoria and Albert Museum. The most valuable inclusion for researchers are Pugin's Diary and some of his letters. Work on the Diary has brought to light the broad scope of Pugin's activities; "Pugin's own range of activities was so great that the decision to transcribe his diaries, and to expand and explain their contents by footnotes, led to extensive collaboration with various specialists", says Wedgwood.<sup>208</sup>

---

<sup>205</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p.xv.

<sup>206</sup> Alexandra Wedgwood, The Pugin Family: Catalogue of the Drawing Collection of the Royal Institute of British Architects (London: Royal Institute of British Architects 1977), pp.120-122.

<sup>207</sup> *Ibid.*, p.39.

<sup>208</sup> A. Wedgwood, A. W. N. Pugin and the Pugin Family (London: V. & A. Museum 1985), Acknowledgments, p.11.

More recently there has been an exhibition at the Victoria and Albert Museum (15 June - 11 September 1994) which generated a supporting catalogue of papers, Pugin: A Gothic Passion, edited by Paul Atterbury and Clive Wainwright, mostly concerned with Pugin's role as architect and designer. Wainwright notes that Pugin's "daily life at Ramsgate was rigorously planned; he rose at 6 am".<sup>209</sup> He is as far as possible from being correct when he states that Pugin was "a doer rather than a thinker", and he is possibly wrong when he states that Pugin "seems not to have read large amounts of architectural theory".<sup>210</sup> Wainwright also believes that Pugin had "little time for quiet study; conversations with his friends and contemporaries are a more likely source"<sup>211</sup> of his knowledge. The study will set out to prove that Pugin was exceptionally learned and well-read on his chosen subjects.

This exhibition was followed up by a major exhibition in New York in 1995, at the Bard Graduate Center (sic) for Studies in the Decorative Arts, with a supporting collection of essays, A. W. N. Pugin: Master of Gothic Revival (1995). Again, most papers in this collection concentrate on Pugin's role as an architect and designer and new material is brought to light concerning his impact on Continental architecture. Also included, however, was a biographical sketch by Rosemary Hill, which incorporates some new material and photographs.

David Meara's essay, "The Catholic Context", attempts to set out the principal events of Pugin's life as a Roman Catholic architect. The main criticism is that he brings in very little contextual material to support his arguments. There are echoes of Kenneth Clark and

---

<sup>209</sup> Clive Wainwright and Paul Atterbury, Pugin: A Gothic Passion (Newhaven and London: Yale University Press 1994), p.5.

<sup>210</sup> *Ibid.*, p.7.

<sup>211</sup> *Ibid.*, p.7.

John Betjeman in Meara's suggestion that Pugin thought medieval art to be the panacea for the evils of the nineteenth century.<sup>212</sup>

Meara's and the other essays reflect the primary role of the exhibition, which was "to examine Pugin's role as a designer in the Gothic Revival idiom".<sup>213</sup> Nevertheless, the exhibition and catalogue give some real indication that there was more to Pugin than just his role as architect and designer.

Although the above bibliographical survey is by no means definitive, it does indicate the broad spectrum of interest in Pugin, his life and work. Pugin bibliographies, like Margaret Belcher's, demonstrate that by far the greater number of books and articles since his death have focussed on his role as architect and designer; there has been little or no indication that any of the above writers have taken him seriously as a liturgist or concerned themselves to any great extent with his religious and liturgical views.

However, there is clearly some confusion about his role; while some writers have attempted to place him in the context of art and architecture, difficulties then arose when they tried to establish his authorities and sources in that field; some have acknowledged his religious fervour without attempting to follow this up; some believed Pugin to be a medieval reconstructionist, while others deny that he was a copyist of ancient styles. Writers appear to be both intrigued and baffled by Pugin.

---

<sup>212</sup> David Meara, "The Catholic Context", *The Bard Graduate Center for Studies in the Decorative Arts, A. W. N. Pugin: Master of Gothic Revival* (New York, 1995), p.59-60.

<sup>213</sup> *Ibid.*, Foreword.

### Chapter Three - PUGIN'S CONVERSION

By 1835, when Pugin was twenty-three years old, he had already made the decision to be received into the Roman Catholic Church. He did this at a time when converts were rare; it was ten years or so before the numerous Tractarian secessions to the Roman Church. Moreover, he was brought up a Protestant and had little contact with practising Roman Catholics before his conversion. Indeed, he declared that he was not acquainted with a single Catholic priest when he was "resolved to 'enter His Church'".<sup>214</sup>

Pugin, raised by an ultra-Protestant mother, initially had (by then) an out-dated view that all Protestants were suspicious of Catholics and one-sided in their knowledge of them:

My education ... certainly was not of a description to bias me towards Catholicism; I had been taught to view it through the same distorted medium as the generality of persons in this country; and by the time I was at all capable of thinking on the subject, I was thoroughly imbued with all the popular notions of racks, faggots, and fires, idolatry, sin-purchase, &c., with all the usual tissue of falsehoods so industriously propagated throughout the land...<sup>215</sup>

His early view of Catholics was thus extremely biased.

His reception into the Roman Catholic Church was a move which appeared completely foolhardy for an aspiring young architect since it was unlikely to promote his career, not only because of prejudice against Roman Catholics, but because little ecclesiastical building was taking place within the Roman Church at that time. At first glance, it was obvious that greater opportunities existed in the Church of England for an architect since a building programme was already underway, encouraged by the Church Building Acts of 1818 and 1824. Why, therefore, did Pugin take such an unusual step? The answer may lie in his upbringing and early personal tragedy.

---

<sup>214</sup> Father Thomas Doyle, "Welby Pugin", *The Tablet* (25 September 1852), p.617. Obituary.

<sup>215</sup> Benjamin Ferrey, *Recollections* (1861:1978), p.103 - refers to Pugin's article in *The Times*.

1) Pugin's upbringing influenced his religious development.

It can be assumed that Pugin's mind had been shaped by his upbringing and that those closest to him had an influence on the early development of his views on religion.

His religious background was unconventional in the sense that his mother, Catherine (Welby) Pugin, was a fervent ultra-Protestant while his father, Augustus Charles Pugin, was according to Bernard Ward a lapsed Roman Catholic: "He had been brought up a Catholic; but had long fallen away from his religion".<sup>216</sup> These two polarised views of religion reacted on Pugin's developing mind by being either a stimulant or an irritant.

i) His father Augustus Charles Pugin.

The elder Pugin's background, before he came to England, can only be tentatively pieced together by gathering the small strands of known information and by a conjecture of circumstantial evidence. The lack of a proper biography of this interesting man gives no assistance in building up his religious profile. Evidence of his Roman Catholic roots have, however, some bearing on his son's religious development.

Augustus Charles Pugin was born in France, according to Ferrey, in 1769 (although Alexandra Wedgwood suggested that Ferrey was wrong and the most likely date was 1768) and died in Bloomsbury, London, in December 1832.<sup>217</sup> His father may have been a designer.<sup>218</sup> He arrived in England in the 1790's (probably 1792 since he entered the Royal Academy School in that year) and quickly set about finding employment.<sup>219</sup> He began working for John Nash in Wales. Nash was then a theatre scene designer who was building up an architectural practice in Carmarthen. The elder Pugin moved to London with him in

---

<sup>216</sup> Bernard Ward, The Sequel to Catholic Emancipation (1915), Vol. I, p.83.

<sup>217</sup> Ferrey, Recollections, p.101.

<sup>218</sup> Pierre Larousse, ed., Grand Dictionnaire Universel du XIX Siècle (Paris: Arlâ c. 1993), p.402.

<sup>219</sup> Ferrey, Recollections, p.2.

1796. He had married by 1802. He quickly built a considerable professional reputation in London as an architectural illustrator, artist and antiquarian author.

Boys, including Benjamin Ferrey and Charles Mathews, were keen to seek instruction in his studio as articled pupils. They undertook a period of work and training for four years in order to become professional architectural illustrators.

Ferrey thus knew the elder Pugin well; he emphasised his pleasant nature and his immaculate, fashionable appearance. He was, he said, “remarkably good-looking, and in manner displayed overwhelming politeness”.<sup>220</sup> In the early part of the nineteenth century, most people endeavoured to conform in dress to their rank in society. The elder Pugin, perceiving himself a gentleman, dressed accordingly and wore “a three-cornered hat” and “carried his muff and gold-headed cane ...”<sup>221</sup>

Indeed, he had, believed Ferrey, an aristocratic background. Proof of this was that “his ancestor being a nobleman raised a hundred soldiers for the service of Fribourg” in 1477.<sup>222</sup> Many of his ancestors had been military men who had lived in the Fribourg area of Switzerland. Bernard Ward confused two similar place-names and mistakenly claimed that the family had come from Freiburg-im-Breisgau in Germany.<sup>223</sup> This error was later pointed out by Trappes-Lomax who reaffirmed their origins as Fribourg in Switzerland.<sup>224</sup>

Another indication of the Pugin family’s nobility, believed Ferrey, was their right to a Coat of Arms and its motto *en avant* (forward). He stated that according to Mrs Pugin their ancient Arms had been destroyed in the French Revolution and burnt by the elder Pugin’s

---

<sup>220</sup> *Ibid.*, p.30.

<sup>221</sup> *Ibid.*, p.3.

<sup>222</sup> *Ibid.*, p.1.

<sup>223</sup> Bernard Ward, The Sequel, Vol.1, p.83.

<sup>224</sup> Michael Trappes-Lomax, Pugin: A Medieval Victorian, p.1, footnote.

mother in case it was discovered.<sup>225</sup> This was evidence, he thought, that the family was entitled to a Coat of Arms, since it was unlikely that Mrs Pugin, a strict Evangelical, would have perpetrated a falsehood.

Ferrey explained the elder Pugin's arrival in England. During the French Revolution he had been involved in the fighting in France, was wounded "fighting for the king",<sup>226</sup> presumed dead and thrown into a pit along with some hundred bodies, near the Place de la Bastille in Paris. He escaped by swimming across the Seine and making his way north to Rouen from where he fled to England.<sup>227</sup>

The younger Pugin's obituary in *The Builder* (1852), too, suggested that his father was involved in the French Revolution and that Augustus Charles' father and brothers had been killed by the Revolutionary mob.<sup>228</sup> Charles Mathews, however, gave a different story. The elder Pugin, he claimed, had "fought a duel in Paris, which ended fatally"<sup>229</sup> and had "sought refuge in England".<sup>230</sup> Yet, Mathews also thought that he was a "gentleman of high family".<sup>231</sup>

John Hardman Powell (who knew the family intimately since he became Augustus Welby Pugin's son-in-law) had a similar, but doubtful, story to Ferrey's of the elder Pugin's escape to England; he had escaped the fighting by implausibly swimming "under fire with bullets in his shoulders, to an English fishing smack".<sup>232</sup>

---

<sup>225</sup> Ferrey, *Recollections*, p.40.

<sup>226</sup> *Ibid.*, p.2.

<sup>227</sup> *Ibid.*, p.2.

<sup>228</sup> Talbot Bury, Pugin's obituary (second article) in *The Builder* (Saturday 25 September 1852).

<sup>229</sup> Charles Dickens, ed., *The Life of Charles James Mathews, chiefly autobiographical, with selections from his correspondence and speeches*, 2 vols, vol.1 (Macmillan & Co., 1879), 39.

<sup>230</sup> *Ibid.*, p.39.

<sup>231</sup> *Ibid.*, p.39.

<sup>232</sup> John Hardman Powell, "Pugin in his Home". Manuscript – MS. SEC.Box 21/4, "St. Edmund's College", Westminster Diocesan Archives. See also *Architectural History*, vol. 31 (1988), p.175.

Powell also claimed that the Pugin family came from Switzerland: “from Zion (sic) in the valley of the Rhone”.<sup>233</sup> There is indeed a town called Sion in the Rhone Valley. It is in the district of Fribourg. The Dictionnaire Historique et Biographique de la Suisse (1921-30) states that “barons de Grange” and “de Pugin”, an *ancienne famille* of Fribourg, could trace their ancestors back to the twelfth century and had settled in Sion in the seventeenth.<sup>234</sup> A member of the family, a lady called Marguerite de Roverea, had moved to the town of Sion in 1608 and the family remained there, some adopting the name of Grange, until 1798. Pugin later named his houses ‘St. Marie’s Grange’ and ‘The Grange’. Marguerite’s husband, Colonel de Roverea, was the famous commander of the Swiss armed forces who fiercely opposed the Republican mob in Paris. Another aristocratic branch of the family was called d’Echarlens. The family were staunch, hereditary Roman Catholics who opposed the French Revolution.<sup>235</sup> The area between and including Fribourg and Sion where they lived was a Roman Catholic stronghold, whereas Berne and Lausanne were Protestant.

Ferrey and others may have believed the elder Pugin to be French simply because French was his mother tongue and the fact that he had been involved in some way in the Revolution while in Paris. But all other evidence, as indicated above, suggests that the Pugin family came from Switzerland and, what is more, was fervently Roman Catholic. Moreover, although the elder Pugin visited France several times after 1818 and toured the northern area, including Paris and Versailles, there is no mention that he returned to his old home or birthplace. This implies that these were not in northern France and therefore increases the possibility that he came from Switzerland.<sup>236</sup>

---

<sup>233</sup> *Ibid.*, p.7.

<sup>234</sup> Marcel Godet, ed., Dictionnaire Historique et Biographique de la Suisse (Neuchâtel: Attinger 1921-1934; Vol. 6, 1930), p.20.

<sup>235</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.20, 738.

<sup>236</sup> See also A. Wedgwood, “The Pugin Coat of Arms” in True Principles: The Newsletter of the Pugin Society, Vol. I, No. 9 (Winter 1999), pp.11-12.

There is no information about a family left behind or murdered (except in *The Builder* (1852) which claimed that the elder Pugin's father and brothers had been killed by the Revolutionary mob) or, indeed, if Augustus Charles had earlier led a life of pleasure or study. He was well acquainted with former students of the Academy of Beaux Arts in Paris including David, Isabey, Lafitte, Langlois, de Caumont and other acclaimed French artists, although these may simply have been acquaintances of his designer father whom he met. The only positive information available is that he had two married sisters, one married to Lafitte the artist, who lived near Paris and who had children including a daughter called Clara. They remained practising Roman Catholics.<sup>237</sup>

Once in England, the elder Pugin showed that he was a man of tremendous character. He recognized that he had to start life again completely from the beginning since there was no hope of returning to his homeland, not only because of the massacres, threats of civil war and antagonism to French and Swiss Catholic aristocrats, but because France declared war on England in 1793. He established his new life with great success, employing his talents, intelligence and education to full advantage.

Notwithstanding these strengths, he was a Roman Catholic in a Protestant country then deeply suspicious of Roman Catholics. On a personal level, possible religious conflict existed with his wife, Catherine, an ultra-Protestant whom he had married in 1802. Augustus Welby was born ten years later. While she doted on her only, rather delicate child, it is clear from Ferrey that Catherine was a very severe and determined lady who completely took charge of his religious upbringing. He was to be brought up a Protestant. Her husband was an amiable man who only wished for a peaceful, settled existence after the turmoil of his earlier life. He had no desire to turn his married life into a battleground.

---

<sup>237</sup> Ferrey, Recollections, p.40.

Ferrey implied that the elder Pugin had little influence on the development of his son's religious views. He had "never been very strict in his religious observances; occasionally he attended the services of the English Church, which he preferred to those of any other communion".<sup>238</sup> Although Ferrey's view has been accepted by later writers (including Bernard Ward who believed that the elder Pugin had only instilled into his son the ideas of hardwork and self denial<sup>239</sup>), it is hard to concede (assuming the conjecture about his background is correct) that a man who had an extensive family history of Roman Catholicism would have been wholly indifferent to his faith and the faith of his only son.

As an architectural illustrator and antiquarian, the elder Pugin had a legitimate reason (other than worship) for visiting Gothic churches and cathedrals. He loved and respected the churches that he visited. Unlike the majority of antiquarians, architects, tourists and the curious who visited churches at this time, the elder Pugin refused to take away specimens of interest from these ecclesiastical structures;<sup>240</sup> indeed, he became extremely angry when his pupils attempted to do so.<sup>241</sup> This may have demonstrated a certain respect for those former Roman Catholic buildings.

Therefore, although the elder Pugin did not take an obviously active part in the religious education of his son, he still managed to interest him in one expression of Catholicism - the architecture - and to treasure and respect the churches that they visited. To the young Pugin, with his particular interests and talents, these study tours of churches and cathedrals in England and France accompanied by an elderly (he was in his forties when Pugin was born), amiable and indulgent father must have been immensely exciting.

---

<sup>238</sup> *Ibid.*, p.48.

<sup>239</sup> Bernard Ward, The Sequel to Catholic Emancipation, Vol. I, p.83.

<sup>240</sup> Ferrey, Recollections, pp.19-20.

<sup>241</sup> *Ibid.*, p.21.

As an instructor, the elder Pugin was “delightful”, said Charles Mathews, one of his pupils.<sup>242</sup> He was “strict enough and firm enough to command obedience and respect” while at other times was “all gaiety and good humour”.<sup>243</sup> Ferrey backed this up by remarking on his “cheerful manner and kind attention”.<sup>244</sup> Seeds of an interest in Catholicism, as pleasant memories and associations, were already planted in young Augustus Welby’s mind.

ii) Pugin’s mother Catherine (née Welby) Pugin.

By contrast, the young Pugin’s impression of Protestantism was not so favourable, even though it may have had some lasting effect on him and the formation of his ideas.

His early impression was coloured by his mother’s rigid ultra-Protestant views. She was a well-bred, cultured, intelligent woman who was considered when young to be something of a beauty; she was known as “the Belle of Islington”.<sup>245</sup> She had come from a minor gentry family; her father was William Welby, a Barrister-at-Law of the Middle Temple who could trace his ancestors back to Roger de Welby who had died at the Battle of Hastings. The family was Anglican, and Catherine herself took a very keen interest in the Church and religion.

But, like many others, she became attracted to the Caledonian Chapel, Cross Street, Hatton Garden, a small chapel of the Scottish Presbyterian Church, in order to hear the Scottish minister Edward Irving.<sup>246</sup> He preached a strange blend of premillennialism and Pentecostalism, and went on to inadvertently help found the Catholic Apostolic Church. He took London by storm in 1823. People of all walks of life flocked to “the mean-looking,

---

<sup>242</sup> Charles Dickens, The Life of Charles James Mathews, p.41.

<sup>243</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol.1, p.41.

<sup>244</sup> Ferrey, Recollections, p.28.

<sup>245</sup> *Ibid.*, p.6.

<sup>246</sup> Trappes-Lomax, p.18.

dingy chapel”<sup>247</sup> where hundreds were unable to gain admission.<sup>248</sup> Amongst the congregation could be found the Duke of Sussex, the Earl of Aberdeen, Sir James Graham, Lord Liverpool, even the schoolboy W. E. Gladstone and the ancient S. T. Coleridge. Sunday after Sunday young Pugin’s mother reluctantly dragged him along to hear this Evangelical oracle when he would much rather have gone to Westminster Abbey.<sup>249</sup>

The sermon was very important to Irving. Preach he did, often for three and a half-hours at a stretch. These were the early days of his ministry and, “there was little abnormality and much sanctified sense in his preaching”.<sup>250</sup> “Sense”, holy, common or otherwise, was not a virtue that appealed to a restless, bored, high-spirited boy. The emotional fervour, exaggerations and appeals to popular sentiment expressed by Irving in his preaching, had little direct effect other than repulsion on the young Pugin. Irvingism seemed to him to be shallow, harsh and lifeless and he was “often heard to inveigh against the Calvinistic tone of his early religious education”.<sup>251</sup>

Mrs. Pugin’s Evangelical zeal was not confined to Sundays. Like other Evangelicals, she valued her home and family and demonstrated it in her serious and responsible attitude towards the supervision of her household. Each day started with a prayer; thereafter, every minute was accounted for by her regime of strict discipline and sobriety. Every member of the household, including her son and the articulated pupils, was expected to conform or experience her fury. She regarded any small pleasures and relaxation as worldly and more than likely to lead to sin. Ferrey wrote of her austere management with something bordering

---

<sup>247</sup> A. L. Drummond, Edward Irving and his Circle: including some consideration of the ‘tongues’ movement in the light of modern psychology (London: James Clarke & Co. Ltd. Undated c. 1840’s), p.49.

<sup>248</sup> *Ibid.*, p.49.- from a contemporary account.

<sup>249</sup> Ferrey, Recollections, p.44.

<sup>250</sup> A. L. Drummond, p.56.

<sup>251</sup> Ferrey, Recollections, pp.45, 48.

on horror. The discipline of the household was, he said, "severe and restrictive in the extreme".<sup>252</sup>

By the time Pugin started to take a serious interest in religion in the early 1830's, Irving's reputation had grown and changed. He had become more charismatic and claimed the "liberty of prophesying" and sought evidence of the "Gifts of the Spirit".<sup>253</sup> The Scottish Presbyterian Church, hostile to these charismatic developments in his beliefs and his heresy on the sinful flesh of Christ, presently asked him to resign. Pugin, too, rejected such an approach to faith.

iii) The Evangelical influence.

Although Pugin was repelled by Irving's form of religion, there were nevertheless some lasting impressions. Pugin brought to English Roman Catholicism an Evangelical-type enthusiasm, an enthusiasm that was welcomed by Nicholas Wiseman and supported by Pugin's principal patron, John Talbot, the sixteenth Earl of Shrewsbury, who had become acquainted with him in 1834. He was both the premier Roman Catholic Earl in England and the recognized leader of the old English Catholics. He welcomed Pugin's zeal (contradicting David Mathew's notion that the old Catholics disliked all Evangelical-type enthusiasm amongst converts<sup>254</sup>).

Irving's influence was expressed in Pugin's awareness of the supernatural, a concept of other-worldliness shared by those converts, such as Newman and Manning, who had also

---

<sup>252</sup> *Ibid.*, p.26.

<sup>253</sup> The Albury Conference July 1830 - proposal.

<sup>254</sup> David Mathew, "Old Catholics and Converts", essay in G. A. Beck, ed., The English Catholics 1850-1950 (London: Burns & Oates, 1950), p.232.

been touched in their youth by Evangelicalism. It was, too, a feature of Tractarian belief as summarised by Pusey in his sermon, "The Organ of Faith".<sup>255</sup>

Like Pusey, Pugin regarded this world as "a show"; reality was with God. This 'other-worldly' reality was to him a different dimension. One had to go "from the figure" in order to come to "the reality".<sup>256</sup> In his understanding, this world was unreal since it only symbolized what was real. It could give only an imperfect representation of reality, which was beyond man's abilities to comprehend or demonstrate other than completely superficially. "Who is there", he asked, "that can set forth the glory of God, or add lustre to His majesty?"<sup>257</sup>

Pugin also believed there was one opportunity to gain sight of this reality and to experience it and that was during the celebration of the Mass. God was present in the consecrated Host; this was the Real Presence; the reality, not a symbol or reflection.

Pugin further expressed his belief in this 'other-world' by a fear of "indefinite or mysterious subjects, clairvoyance, apparitions, diabolical possessions, etc.". He had a "child-like awe of the Supernatural", said Powell.<sup>258</sup> An incident occurred while he was staying at Oscott, which illustrated his belief in spirits, even though he was against any involvement in the subject. He was found carrying two lighted candles in a dark corridor at Oscott. When asked why he did not carry one, he replied, "Suppose it blew out!"<sup>259</sup> He was afraid of ghosts and thought the occult incompatible with Roman Catholicism.

Like his mother and other Evangelicals, Pugin retained a love of "hearth and home", despite the fact that the demands of his religion and work frequently caused him to travel

---

<sup>255</sup> Edward Bouverie Pusey, Parochial Sermons preached and printed on various occasions (London: 1884), No.11, pp.1-2.

<sup>256</sup> A. W. N. Pugin, An Apology for the Revival of Christian Architecture (London: John Weale, 1843), p.30.

<sup>257</sup> A. W. N. Pugin, The Present State of Ecclesiastical Architecture in England (London: Dolman, 1843), p.45.

<sup>258</sup> J. H. Powell, "Pugin in his Home", MS. SEC.Box 21/4, 'St. Edmund's College' Box, Westminster Diocesan Archives, p.12. See also *Architectural History*, vol. 31 (1988), p.176.

away for long periods at a time. “His home life was full of sunshine, his life full of joy and of home-made happiness ... home was to Pugin a bath of the mind exhausted in the race and battle of life. No sooner had he crossed his own threshold than he became”, remarked Purcell, “a renovated man”.<sup>260</sup> John Hardman Powell, too, gave a picture of a close and happy family life.<sup>261</sup>

Although invited friends were made welcome in his home, Pugin did not participate in any social events outside it. Ferrey made the point that he “sacrificed the pleasures of society”<sup>262</sup> and this suggests that he, like other former Evangelicals, rejected such worldly activities. His home life at The Grange, Ramsgate, was conducted in a monastic manner; each day was centred on services in his private chapel and in St. Augustine’s Church that he built there. This had similarities to his mother’s strict regime. Guy Williams in his Augustus Pugin versus Decimus Burton (1990) gives a good description (partly taken from John Hardman Powell’s “Pugin in his Home”) of Pugin’s everyday life:

He rose from bed early, as his mother had done, and would invariably be in his private chapel by 6 a.m. to pray and to offer his forthcoming work to God. He would work in his library, then, until half past seven, when a bell would toll for morning prayers. For this ceremony, he would be habited in a cassock and surplice. Breakfast followed, but the meal seldom lasted more than seven minutes. At eight o’clock, on feast days, he would always hear Mass in the adjoining church ... At 10 p.m. Compline would be sung in his private chapel. His busy day would end with an hour spent in the study of religious and historical works.<sup>263</sup>

Pugin himself confirmed his devotion to observing feast days in letters to his third wife Jane (Knill):

---

<sup>259</sup> *Ibid.*, p.176.

<sup>260</sup> E. S. Purcell, “Pugin and Turner”, *The Dublin Review* (London: Thomas Richardson and Son: February 1862), Vol. I, p.262.

<sup>261</sup> John Hardman Powell, “Pugin in his Home”, MS. SEC. Box 21/4. See also subtitle ‘Pugin as a man’ in *Architectural History*, vol. 31 (1988), pp.176-179.

<sup>262</sup> Ferrey, Recollections, p.272.

<sup>263</sup> Guy Williams, Augustus Pugin versus Decimus Burton, p.81.

As this is the Month of Mary I hope you will see proper devotions kept up. The tapers lit every evening in the hall before the image, lights & flowers before the image in the chapel on benediction. The magnificat said or sung every evening in the little chapel with the prayer sub tuum praesidium &c & ora pro nobis & at the end the Litany of B Virgin sung at Benediction on Thursday.<sup>264</sup>

Few in Pugin's day would have gone to such lengths when they were also overworked except his friend Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle. De Lisle was a member of the Third Order of Dominicans. While Pugin lived such a life it is not known if he belonged to an Order; this strictness in his personal life may simply have been an Evangelical influence in a wholly new Catholic setting.

Another Evangelical trait was Pugin's deep personal concern for the poor, the old and those who were experiencing misfortune. John Hardman Powell mentioned many incidents, such as when Pugin arrived home barefoot because he had given his boots to a poor man<sup>265</sup> and the way he cared for and maintained shipwrecked sailors.<sup>266</sup> Moreover, his churches were designed very much with the poor in mind and he designed hospitals for the care of the elderly and poor. At his funeral, Bishop Grant spoke of how Pugin had provided "for the beauty and solemnity of the funeral offices in the case of many poor persons, who, by his care, had been interred in that church".<sup>267</sup>

---

<sup>264</sup> Alexandra Wedgwood, ed., A. W. N. Pugin and the Pugin Family, p.117. Pugin Manuscripts. Pugin to his wife Jane (Knill) (1 May 1850).

<sup>265</sup> John Hardman Powell, "Pugin in his Home", p.17. MS. SEC. Box 21/4, Westminster Diocesan Archives. See also *Architectural History*, vol. 31 (1988), p.12.

<sup>266</sup> *Ibid.*, p.17.

<sup>267</sup> Editorial article, "Funeral of the late Mr. Pugin - Sermon of the Lord Bishop of Southwark (from our own Correspondent)", *The Tablet* 13 (2 October 1852), p.629. See also Margaret Belcher, A.W.

2) Pugin's budding interest in liturgy led him to convert to Roman Catholicism.

i) A time of trouble and a turning to God.

Pugin's conversion was possibly a consequence of personal tragedy; within a short period of a year (1832-33), all those whom he held most dear died. His young wife, Anne, died on 27 May 1832, giving birth to his first child; his father died on 19 December 1832; and his mother on 28 April 1833. He was twenty-one years old. Up until this time, his interest in religion had been real but moderate. Now he turned to God and the process of conversion began.

Pugin suffered a feeling of *timor mortis* brought about by these deaths, which gave him an acute awareness of his own mortality. This feeling was further intensified by personal illness. He had, as Purcell suggested, "like Dr. Johnson ... a strange horror of death".<sup>268</sup> In Pugin's case, a recurring illness made him realize that his life might be short.

Although particular sentiments expressed by Pugin indicate he had been influenced by his early Evangelical upbringing, even before his mother's death he had rebelled against Evangelicalism. As a youth of fifteen he had shown a keen interest in the theatre and became for a short time a scene-painter. This interest would have been shocking to his mother and many other Evangelicals who considered the theatre to be a "den of robbers" and a hotbed of iniquity.<sup>269</sup> Many Evangelicals frowned upon such trivial pleasures as theatre-going, novel-reading, dancing, cards, etc. since it denoted a preoccupation with worldly things and a likely descent into sin.<sup>270</sup>

Newman and Manning both, in their turn, rejected the theatre because of this association with sin. Manning visited Paris during the long vacation of 1828 and went to a

---

N. Pugin: An Annotated Critical Bibliography, p.291.

<sup>268</sup> E. S. Purcell, "Pugin and Turner", p.271.

<sup>269</sup> Jeremiah 7:11

<sup>270</sup> Michael Hennell, Sons of the Prophets: The Evangelical Leaders of the Victorian Church

play but he resolved never to put his foot in a theatre again.<sup>271</sup> “Newman made a similar vow at the same age”,<sup>272</sup> but he “subsequently relented”,<sup>273</sup> although he still believed the theatre to be “a bad way of life”.<sup>274</sup> But Pugin did not finally give up his interest in the theatre until he became a Roman Catholic. It may be that his new understanding of Catholic theology turned him against such pursuits. Despite his earlier love of the theatre, Pugin now abandoned it completely. Later, the pressures of professional and family life did not allow sufficient time for such leisure pursuits, in any case. Nevertheless, he continued to sing snatches from opera while he worked.

Pugin had experienced productive and light-hearted times in the company of his father while visiting medieval churches and cathedrals and he subsequently turned to Gothic architecture with its associated happy memories for comfort after his bereavements. This was not initially an act of turning to God. He inherited sufficient funds to enable him to live for a time without needing employment. His improved financial position allowed him to throw himself into a period of study with the aim of becoming an architect specialising in the Gothic style.

ii) Pugin began studying the history of Gothic architecture and its use by the Church of England.

Pugin already had extensive knowledge of the “mechanics” of Gothic architecture learned while his father was alive. They had worked on several books together, the most

---

(London: S.P.C.K., 1979), p.89.

<sup>271</sup> Purcell, Life of Cardinal Manning, Vol.1 (1896 ed.), p.49.

<sup>272</sup> R. Gray, Cardinal Manning: A Biography, p.31.

<sup>273</sup> *Ibid.*, p.31.

<sup>274</sup> Anne Mozeley, Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman during his Life in the English Church: with a brief autobiography (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1891), Vol. I, p.277. Newman to his sister Jemima 29 December 1832.

important being Specimens of Gothic Architecture (1821-23) and Examples of Gothic Architecture (which Pugin published in 1836, three years or so after his father's death). Consequently, Pugin was already more familiar with the subject than many contemporary architects, such as James Wyatt, whose knowledge was restricted to "Picturesque Gothick".

Pugin's aim was not to view, study and measure actual Gothic buildings because he had already done this, but an academic attempt to discover the ideas behind the style. Initially, it was a career move, a way of gaining superior knowledge and advantage over other architects. By this extended study he hoped to have a greater chance of gaining commissions in the future.

Such theoretical investigation was not easy; Pugin faced some problems in attempting this research. Few contemporary books on medieval design concepts existed. He had the examples of John Carter (1748-1817), John Britton (1771-1857) and Thomas Rickman (1776-1841), but these did not go into the depth of study that he wanted. He was forced to turn to primary sources. These were not readily available but he knew where to look – cathedral libraries. In those days, it was difficult for laity to gain access to these but, towards the end of 1833, Pugin married his second wife, Louisa Burton. She was a friend of the librarian, Rev. John Greenly, of Salisbury Cathedral.<sup>275</sup> Pugin was subsequently granted access because of his new wife's connection. The Salisbury Cathedral library was well stocked<sup>276</sup> and contained many ancient books on Church history, liturgy and symbolism. Pugin later acquired his own copies of many of these books and they were his sources for his own writing. He also obtained admittance to other cathedral libraries and archives in England - "I gained my knowledge of the ancient faith beneath the vaults of a Lincoln or a

---

<sup>275</sup> Ferrey, Recollections, p.93.

<sup>276</sup> John Greenly, Cathedral Library printed.....@ MSS Greenlys (damaged handwritten title page). Catalogue of books and manuscripts in Salisbury Cathedral Library compiled by Rev. John Greenly in 1849. Unpublished handwritten notebook available in Salisbury Cathedral Library.

Westminster<sup>277</sup> - and Continental cathedral libraries where he studied manuscripts in “the crypts of the old cathedrals of Europe”.<sup>278</sup> He was able to study books on church history written in French and Latin since he was able to read these with ease. There are no references to his having learned any German, Flemish or Italian. Indeed, he made only a few references in his work to anything written in the first two languages, although rather more in Italian.

He consequently gained access to cathedral and college libraries and archives in England and the Continent in order to undertake this research.<sup>279</sup> He subsequently discovered many original manuscripts and ancient books. It was unusual at the time for anyone in England to study original documents as a method of historical research. This method had been pioneered in France during the seventeen and eighteenth centuries by the Benedictines of St Maur, but the French Revolution had more or less prevented any continuation to the nineteenth century. Some individuals had adopted this method. Amongst them was the Roman Catholic historian John Lingard (1771-1851)<sup>280</sup> who had strong Gallican views and who worked in the Vatican archives in the 1820's. The German historian Leopold von Ranke (1795-1886)<sup>281</sup> introduced this method into Germany as early as 1828 and Johann Joseph Ignaz von Döllinger (1799-1890)<sup>282</sup>, a major historian at Tübingen, adopted it, as did Augustin Theiner (1804-1874), another Roman Catholic historian, who became at one time part of Lamennais's circle in Paris. Theiner spent long years, in the second quarter of the

---

<sup>277</sup> Pugin's pamphlet, Some Remarks on the articles which have recently appeared in the 'Rambler' relative to ecclesiastical architecture and decoration, p.17.

<sup>278</sup> Editorial article by Father Thomas Doyle, “Welby Pugin”, *The Tablet* 13 (25 September 1852), pp.617.

<sup>279</sup> A. W. N. Pugin, Some Remarks, p.17, pp. 19-21.

<sup>280</sup> The Dictionary of National Biography, Vol. XI, p.1200.

<sup>281</sup> The Encyclopædia Britannica, 15<sup>th</sup> edition, Vol. 9, pp.937-938.

<sup>282</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 15, p.157.

nineteenth century, studying original documents in the Vatican Secret Archives where he was the archivist.<sup>283</sup> After 1850, Acton (1834-1902) advocated this method of study.

Although Pugin's knowledge of the German language was limited, he nevertheless visited Germany in 1833 and continued to do so most years thereafter. He became friends with the brothers August and Peter Franz Reichensperger,<sup>284</sup> who were Roman Catholics.<sup>285</sup> August Reichensperger greatly admired Pugin and published Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin, Der Neubegründer der Christlichen Kunst in England (1877), a biography, after his death. Reichensperger called him the reviver of Christian architecture in England. The brothers were from Catholic Bavaria. They supported the aims of the leading Catholics, including Döllinger and Möhler, at Tübingen University, and interpreted these aims via the media of art and architecture. In fact, Wilfrid Ward claimed that it was Pugin who had instigated this interest or connection between religion and liturgical design in Germany. His influence, Ward said, was not confined to England but had spread to Catholic Germany. In many of the "Theological Seminaries there is a special chair of architecture and art".<sup>286</sup>

Pugin met a number of Continental scholars and theologians. Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle claimed Pugin met Döllinger at his house Grace-Dieu.<sup>287</sup> Döllinger and other German Catholics were interested in Wiseman's research and writings. They visited him at Oscott and

---

<sup>283</sup> Pierre Larouse, ed., Grand Dictionnaire Universel (Paris: c.1865). Augustin Theiner wrote Recherches sur plusieurs publications inédit de décrétales du moyen âge ('Research on several unedited publications descriptive of the Middle Ages') (Paris:1832) and a number of other works on ecclesiastical history. Owen Chadwick, Catholicism and History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1978), 36 *et seq.* gives further information on Theiner.

<sup>284</sup> Wilfrid Ward, Wiseman, p.357 spells the name as 'Reichensberger', although the correct German spelling is 'Reichensperger'.

<sup>285</sup> Wilfrid Ward, Wiseman, Vol. I, p.357. The brothers were politicians and members of the Reichstag, both became councillors to the court of appeal at Cologne. They had Liberal Catholic tendencies and were Ultramontanes. August founded in 1852 the Catholic group, which afterwards became known as the Centre Party. The Centre Party later (after 1870) came into conflict with Bismarck.

<sup>286</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p.357.

<sup>287</sup> E. S. Purcell, Life of Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle (London: Macmillan 1900), Vol. I, p.139.

regularly corresponded with him; he visited them in Paris<sup>288</sup> and Munich.<sup>289</sup> Montalembert, Pugin's friend, knew and visited Döllinger and Möhler at Tübingen. August Reichensperger was in sympathy with Montalembert's views.<sup>290</sup> Moreover, Möhler's Symbolism was translated into French by M. Lachat in 1838 and his Unity in 1839, giving Pugin the opportunity to study their contents before it was translated into English in 1843 by J. B. Robertson.<sup>291</sup>

Pugin probably did not visit Italy until 1847 and, consequently, he had little direct contact with Italian scholars, although after 1841 he referred to a few Italian sources and authorities.

iii) His attention increasingly turned to the study of liturgy.

Pugin began his research by studying the Church of England, its system, organisation, practices and tenets of religion, including its Canon laws, rubrics, rites, ordinances, creeds and prayers. He familiarised himself with the writings of great figures in the Church of England including Archbishop Cranmer, Richard Hooker and William Laud. At this stage, he still had confidence in the Church of England; indeed, he initially had no reason to believe otherwise and he wanted to become a better Anglican by such study.<sup>292</sup>

But he quickly began to believe that there was a Catholic foundation to all he studied. He discovered that the Gothic churches and cathedrals used by Protestants demonstrated a

---

<sup>288</sup> Wilfrid Ward, Wiseman, Vol. 1, p.137.

<sup>289</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p.138.

<sup>290</sup> Willem Jan Pantus, "Aspeke des Briefwechsels Reichensperger – Thijm", paper given at a conference called "Gothic Revival" at the Catholic University of Leuven (7-10 November, 1997).

<sup>291</sup> J. B. Robertson, trans., Möhler's Symbolism: or, Exposition of the doctrinal differences between Catholics and Protestants, as evidenced by their symbolic writings (London: Charles Dolman 1843).

<sup>292</sup> A. W. N. Pugin, An Apology for a work entitled Contrasts: Being A Defence of the Assertions advanced in that Publication, against the various attacks lately made upon it (Birmingham: R. P. Stone and Son 1837), p, 21, footnote. He said that he studied the system of the Church of England because he wanted to become "A strict Church of England-man".

system of building based not on Protestantism, but on Catholicism. The design concepts were to symbolize Catholicism and were an expression of Catholic liturgy. Consequently, the study of liturgy became all-important to him:

applying myself to liturgical knowledge, what a new field was open to me! with what delight did I trace the fitness of each portion of those glorious edifices to the rites for whose celebration they had been erected!<sup>293</sup>

“For upwards of three years did I earnestly pursue the study of this all-important subject”, he stated.<sup>294</sup> He does not appear to have focussed on architectural theory or even to collect more than a few books on architecture for his library. It would be an unusual step for an architect to study liturgy for three years in order to increase his chances of employment as an architect. The explanation must therefore lie elsewhere.

He began to collect liturgical books.<sup>295</sup> In due course, these amounted to well over sixty works specifically on liturgy with a large number of others related to the subject and on ecclesiastical history. There is not room to mention all his liturgical tomes, but they included rare texts and authorities such as the Liturgiæ, siue Missæ Sanctorum Patrum ... De ritu Missæ et Eucharistia ... auctore F. Claudio de Sainctes, theologo Parisiensi ... (Paris 1560), Liturgia Evangelistræ S. Marci et Clementis, et du Ritu Missæ (Paris 1583), Jean Étienne Duranti's De ritibus ecclesiæ catholicæ (Parisiis: Apud Dionysium Moreau 1592), Liturgia Anglicana: seu Liber Precum publicarum aliorumque Rituum et Cæremoniarum in Ecclesia Anglicana (1594), Raymond Bonal's Explication littéraire et mystique des rubriques et ceremonies du Breviaire et du Missal (Lyon 1679), De Vallemont's Secret des Mystères ou Apologie de la Rubrique des Missels (Paris 1710), Domenico Georgi's De liturgia Romani pontificis, in celebratione Missarum (Rome 1731), Giuseppe Maria Tomasi's Codices

---

<sup>293</sup> Ferrey, Recollections, pp.103-104.

<sup>294</sup> *Ibid.*, p.104.

<sup>295</sup> Of course there little direct evidence that he actually read *all* the books in his library or that they all influenced him.

sacramentorum nongentis annis Vetustiores, cura & studio I. M. Thomasij (Rome 1689) and  
Decreta Sacrae congreg. Rituum Congregationis (1788).

iv) Pugin's definition of "liturgy" different from that of many modern scholars.

Liturgy, therefore, became central to Pugin's ideas about Catholicism. His definition of 'liturgy' was not, however, like that of some modern scholars. Indeed, even in a modern context, the word has various definitions.

'Liturgy' as a term and as an identified subject can have both a broad and narrow definition. The word is derived from the Greek *leitourgia*, which means the people's public service. But while some confine '*the liturgy*' to mean the words of the Mass or Eucharist, others see 'liturgy' as encompassing much more and involving everything to do with worship.

The Council of Trent defined liturgy as the worship of the divine Majesty and containing instruction for the faithful. It was not confined to the words of the Eucharist. "For in the liturgy God speaks to His people and Christ is still proclaiming His Gospel. And the people reply to God both by song and prayer"<sup>296</sup>

Some modern scholars support a broad definition of liturgy. Franck-M Quoëx, writing in 1996, suggests that liturgy is a science and requires a knowledge of rites, an understanding of their rationality and economy of grace, methods of carrying them out with precision, their tradition, origins and aims and their link to doctrine, society and civilization in general.<sup>297</sup>

The theologian Louis Bouyer also has a broad definition of liturgy and defines it as "the

---

<sup>296</sup> The Council of Trent, Session XXII, *Doctrine on the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass*, C.8.

<sup>297</sup> *The Proceedings of the Second International Colloquium of historical, canonical and theological studies on the Roman Catholic Liturgy, The Veneration and Administration of the Eucharist* (Southampton: The Saint Austin Press 1997), p.162.

sacred history of salvation”<sup>298</sup> which is “*the* view of the Church forever, precisely because it springs from the whole of Scripture. It is the view of the Word of God, as the Church has always understood it, and which she may not abandon without turning her back on her divine Master”.<sup>299</sup>

Thus, in a modern Christian context its scope can be broad, as ‘liturgy’, to cover all aspects of worship, or narrow, as ‘*the* liturgy’ to cover only the Mass or Eucharist. The latter definition is more usually understood today.

Pugin’s definition was different from any of the above definitions. To him it meant the conveyance of faith to the educated and uneducated; it was a total experience appealing simultaneously to the emotional, spiritual, intellectual and aesthetic faculties of man with the sole purpose of giving glory to God. ‘Liturgy’ thus embraced all aspects of formal worship of God by a Catholic community. It was *the* liturgy in a liturgical context, which included liturgical art and architecture, ceremonials, practices, rites, rituals, rubrics, missals, offices, litanies, benedictionals,<sup>300</sup> structure, order, text, music, movement, vestments, ornaments, vessels, and most importantly, the relationship of doctrine and theology to the consecrated building. This relationship was expressed in church form and arrangement, usages and practices, which reflected and contextualised the principal sacrament - the Mass.

Pugin was not alone in this inclusive definition of liturgy.<sup>301</sup> He thought that ancient theologians and liturgists, such as St John Chrysostom, St Basil, St Ambrose and St Augustine, had also understood it in this way since they were all concerned with the Mass and the setting or context of the Mass, as did the medieval liturgists epitomised by Guillaume

---

<sup>298</sup> Louis Bouyer, The Liturgy Revived: A Doctrinal Commentary of the Conciliar Constitution on the Liturgy (London: Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd. 1965), p.14.

<sup>299</sup> *Ibid.*, p.15.

<sup>300</sup> Pugin, The Present State, p.48.

<sup>301</sup> Pugin’s definition of liturgy is used throughout the thesis unless otherwise stated.

Durandus. Abbé R. Aigrain also defines liturgy as having a broader meaning than simply *the* liturgy:

It is rightly said that liturgy should be considered to be, an art, a science ... a certain expression of the life of the Church. The Church's teaching, government, prayer, that is public prayer, organisation, are all found in the liturgical life.<sup>302</sup>

Therefore, there was a firm foundation to Pugin's definition.

v) Pugin's study of liturgy.

Liturgy was not an easy subject. The scope of liturgy, as Pugin understood it, was so inclusive that it needed to be understood in a practical, historical, theological, doctrinal, moral, mystical and anagogical context and could not be isolated from any of these aspects. If church form and arrangement could express doctrinal and theological statements, spiritual symbolism and allegory, imagery, gestures and practices then he needed to study these subjects individually.

By this time, he had discovered that Cranmer, Hooker and Laud all referred to aspects of medieval Catholicism. He therefore began to research this "old religion" in its various aspects himself, as part of his liturgical studies. His attention turned to orthodox Catholic works of the medieval period such as those of St Thomas Aquinas. At some time, Pugin acquired two books on St Thomas for his library; these were Vita d. Thomas Aquinatis Othone Væni et manu delineata (Brux. 1678),<sup>303</sup> and Super primo et secundo Libro Sententiarum (1494),<sup>304</sup> which may have taught him about Catholic theology and doctrine, although it is not known when he acquired them. Gradually, Pugin became convinced of the

---

<sup>302</sup> Abbé R. Aigrain, Liturgia: Encyclopédie Populaire des connaissances Liturgiques (Paris: 1930: Paris: Librairie Bloud et Gay 1935), p.1. My own translation from the French.

<sup>303</sup> A. N. L. Munby, ed., Sale Catalogues of the Libraries of Eminent People (London: Mansell, Southeby and Park-Bernet 1971), Vol. 4 'Architects', p.249. Item 79.

<sup>304</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 4, p.9. Item 128.

truth of Catholicism. "From the period that the doctrines of the old religion were developed in my own mind", he stated, "I never entertained the least doubt of their truth".<sup>305</sup>

But, the "old religion" was a form of Catholicism in England that had its own character independent of the Church of Rome, although the medieval English Church was in communion with the Roman Church and recognised the Pope as its spiritual head. These were important factors in Pugin's developing views.

vi) Pugin's conversion to Catholicism.

Pugin was greatly influenced by what he read and it changed his views about Protestantism and Catholicism. This "change was not effected in me", he remarked, "but by the most powerful reasons, and that after a long and earnest examination".<sup>306</sup>

He had come to recognise that Catholicism, not Protestantism as he once thought, was the "true faith of the merciful Redeemer". The "irresistable force of truth" had penetrated his heart.<sup>307</sup> His insight into faith was almost an Evangelical "momentous event", but one he had gained only after a period of long and intense study. The passion Pugin expressed for God, for Catholicism and for the Church thereafter discounts a purely intellectual conversion to Catholicism. Conversion was a matter of the whole man moving towards God. His decision was made, as Wiseman was later to express about converts in general, because of accepting the "vital principle".<sup>308</sup>

Thereafter, Pugin was to live by the maxim that the Church's judgement was infallible because it was guided by the Holy Spirit, while private judgement could err since it was limited and would lead to schism. This belief was to be severely tested towards the end of his

---

<sup>305</sup> A. W. N. Pugin, Some Remarks, pp.18-19.

<sup>306</sup> Ferrey, Recollections, pp.104-105.

<sup>307</sup> Ferrey, Recollections, p.104.

<sup>308</sup> Wiseman, Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church (London:

life. Was he, as Purcell asked, “to the last a most consummate hypocrite”<sup>309</sup> or “the most devout and reverent son of the Church?”<sup>310</sup>

After his conversion, Pugin acquired deep faith; he admitted in a letter to his friend, the Roman Catholic architect and antiquarian Edward James Willson (1787-1854), that he was “thoroughly imbued with the glorious feelings of every description appertaining to catholicity”.<sup>311</sup> Moreover, “no man in his senses”, he said, “will ever part with the Least (sic) portion of so glorious a treasure”.<sup>312</sup>

vii) Disillusionment with the Church of England.

Pugin had set out to research into the history and liturgy of the Church of England. His studies had, however, opened a new view of Anglicanism, one that was not altogether satisfying:

... the service I had been accustomed to attend and admire was but a cold and heartless remnant of past glories, and that those prayers which in my ignorance I had ascribed to reforming piety, were in reality only scraps plucked from the solemn and perfect offices of the ancient Church.<sup>313</sup>

He began to see the pre-Reformation English Catholic Church, the events surrounding the Reformation and the formation of the Church of England, in a completely different light (but it was not until 1836 that he identified his sources; these included the works of the historians William Dugdale, John Stowe, Peter Heylin, John Strype and John Stevens):

Pursuing my researches among the faithful pages of the old chronicles, I discovered the tyranny, apostasy, and bloodshed by which the new religion

---

Joseph Booker 1836), vol.1, Lecture 1, p.16.

<sup>309</sup> Purcell, “Pugin and Turner”, p.267.

<sup>310</sup> *Ibid.*, p.267.

<sup>311</sup> Pugin to Willson (13 October 1836). In the Johns Hopkins University, MS JHU 14. See M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, p. 76.

<sup>312</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p.76.

<sup>313</sup> Ferrey, Recollections, p.104.

had been established, the endless strifes, dissensions, and discord that existed among its propagators, and the devastation and ruin that attended its progress...<sup>314</sup>

Previously he had thought the Church of England to be perfectly sound, the true Church and, indeed, one that he greatly admired and accepted without question. But, because of his deep study of the nature of the true Church, he had come to believe the Church of England merely contained shadows or “scraps” of the Catholic faith overlain with Protestant innovations. His conversion experience had led him to examine it for evidence of truth and the result had been disappointing. “I sought for these truths in the modern Church of England”, he said. But he found there “little truth, and no life”.<sup>315</sup>

Yet, it had always appealed to him; “he was not only a member, but an admirer of the Anglican Church”.<sup>316</sup> It was a sad discovery that it did not contain the truth of God. This led him to reason that without its remnants it was essentially Protestant and was not the same Church as the English Catholic Church of pre-Reformation times. It could not therefore be the true Catholic Church. He faced a dilemma. He had accepted Catholicism as the one true faith. Now he wondered where it could be discovered still burning bright and clear in the nineteenth century.

viii) Catholicism only found in one Church.

Pugin’s attention turned to the Roman Church that called itself Catholic. He quickly began to suspect that it might be the true Church. He wrote to Osmond in January 1834, “I

---

<sup>314</sup> *Ibid.*, p.104 + an anonymous article (Father Thomas Doyle), ‘Welby Pugin’ in *The Tablet* 13 (25 September 1852), p.617.

<sup>315</sup> Father Thomas Doyle, “Welby Pugin”, *The Tablet* (25 September 1852), p.617. Obituary.

<sup>316</sup> Purcell, “Pugin and Turner”, p.269.

can assure you after a most close & impartial investigation I feel perfectly convinced the roman Catholick Church is the only true one”<sup>317</sup>.

Thus, despite his earlier prejudice, he began to look favourably on it. By studying its nature and continuity, he becoming convinced that it was as Catholic as it claimed to be; it was a repository of the Catholic faith. It could demonstrate Apostolical Succession and there was a feeling and respect for historical continuity and a regard for the past; it had a sense of the richness and exuberance of the Christian tradition. He discovered, too, a reverence for an otherworldly sanctity and a love of orthodoxy, meaning faithfulness to revealed truth. These could not always be demonstrated with confidence in any other Church, although some or all might be present to some degree. At the end of the day, the Church of England had not proved strong enough to hold him.

ix) Architecture not the sole reason for conversion.

Pugin himself stated that architecture, decoration, costume or music did not influence his decision; indeed, the Church of Rome was deficient in these. “I saw nothing that reminded me of the ancient religion, from the fabric down to the vestments of the celebrants”, he said, and the singing left him “perplexed and disappointed”<sup>318</sup>. Even the Moorfields chapel (built 1820) that he visited had “grandiose Italianate furnishings”<sup>319</sup> - exactly the style he detested! The few Roman Catholic chapels in London would not have attracted him with their plain windows, galleries, iron pillars, gold-laced beadles and opera singers.<sup>320</sup>

---

<sup>317</sup> Pugin to his friend, the mason to Salisbury Cathedral, William Osmond (c.1790-1875) from "the Isle of Ely" (30 January 1834) - see Ferrey, Recollections, p.88 and Margaret Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.24.

<sup>318</sup> *Ibid.*, p.373. See also Purcell, “Pugin and Turner”, p.269.

<sup>319</sup> Peter F. Anson, Fashions in Church Furnishings 1840-1940 (1960: London: Studio Vista 1965), p.23.

<sup>320</sup> Bp. David Mathew, Catholicism in England 1535-1935: Portrait of a minority, its Culture and Tradition (London: 1936), p.176.

If it had been a question of finding a Church which made use of medieval Gothic architecture and where chants and even vestments similar to the medieval could still be discovered on occasion (in one or two places during principal ceremonies, such as at Christmas and Easter at Westminster and Salisbury Cathedrals), then Pugin would have remained in the Church of England. Therefore, while architecture had led him to faith it was not the reason for his conversion; it was because he believed that the Roman Church was the only Church in which the Catholic faith could be found.

Consequently, the extent of Pugin's studies of the medieval period should not be underestimated. His research had caused him to overcome great prejudice and move from a solid Anglican position to conversion to Roman Catholicism. Therefore, his study of medieval theology, liturgy and architectural theory must have been extensive to cause him to formulate views about religion that he had not previously held.

x) Difficulties in becoming a member of the Roman Catholic Church.

To become a member of the Roman Church was difficult because Pugin was uninformed about a great part of the modern Church and he did not know any Roman Catholics priests whom he could ask. Overcoming prejudice and turning away from the Church of England still held in affection was not easy. He had residual fears about the Church of Rome because of his Protestant background; moreover, it was unfamiliar and strange to him and it had elements (particularly its architecture) which he disliked.

Other Anglicans were soon to experience similar mixed feelings. Once Newman became a Catholic he admitted these difficulties and referred to this quandary as "the Anglican paradox",<sup>321</sup> he advised possible converts not to "make that paradox the excuse for stifling an inquiry which conscience tells them they ought to pursue, and turning away from

---

<sup>321</sup> John Henry Newman, Essays Critical and Historical (1828-46: London: Basil Montagu Pickering

the light which otherwise would lead them to the Church".<sup>322</sup> Pugin experienced both this paradox of the revulsion and attraction of the Church of Rome and the dilemma of choosing between two Churches. The choice of accepting or rejecting it was before him.

xi) Reception into the Roman Catholic Church.

Rather impulsively and despite his lack of information about the modern Roman Church, he made the decision to be received into it and was ready to surrender to the infallible judgement of the Church and embraced "with heart and soul its faith and discipline".<sup>323</sup> Wiseman was later to say something similar about infallibility in his lectures: the Catholic rule of faith, including the Church, were "constituted by God" and should "not be liable to the smallest error".<sup>324</sup> Pugin was to be sorely tested on this towards the end of his life.

In his Diary for 6 June 1835, Pugin said that he had "been received into the Holy Catholic Church".<sup>325</sup> Yet, the next year, he mentioned to his friend E. J. Willson that his first communion had been on 3 April 1836.<sup>326</sup> Therefore, the date of his reception remains an enigma. He took St Augustine as his *patronus*.<sup>327</sup> Although it might be assumed that this referred to Augustine of Canterbury, an English Saint, his *patronus* may equally have been Saint Augustine of Hippo.

---

1872), Vol. I, p.184. Notes on Essay IV.

<sup>322</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p.184.

<sup>323</sup> Ferrey, Recollections, p.104.

<sup>324</sup> Wiseman, Lectures (1836), Lecture VIII, Vol.1, p.298.

<sup>325</sup> Alexandra Wedgwood, A. W. N. Pugin and the Pugin Family, p.33 and p.75, note 52 in reference to Pugin's Diary for 6 June 1835.

<sup>326</sup> See M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.60 and p.61, note 3. This date inexplicably contradicts the date in his Diary.

<sup>327</sup> St. George's Cathedral, Southwark Archives, St. Augustine's, Ramsgate: The Churches: The Abbey: The College: 'A Souvenir of our Jubilee' (The Monastery Press MCMVI), p.9.

After Pugin's secession, he frequented the Roman Catholic St Martin's Chapel, which was off Martin Street, Salisbury. The priest at the Salisbury mission between 28 March 1835 and July 1840 was a Yorkshireman and a Jesuit, Father Charles Cooke. It is likely that it was he who received Pugin into the Church, although no records of converts in Salisbury exist for that period. Though Cooke was a kindly and good priest, he had a drink problem that forced him to give up his work in Salisbury in 1840. He intermittently wandered the country as a down-and-out alcoholic vagrant for several years despite the help he received from fellow clergymen. In 1853, he stayed with the Trappist monks at Mount St Bernard (which Pugin had designed for Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle) in an effort to dry-out. He lapsed and died of alcoholic poisoning on 17 August 1854.<sup>328</sup>

xii) Church architecture presented Pugin with another paradox.

The study of medieval liturgy suggested to Pugin that Catholic architecture, like the faith, should be pure, beautiful, unchanging and grand. What he found was very different. The Salisbury chapel was "an ill-shaped room, having no pretensions whatever to an ecclesiastical character".<sup>329</sup> Peter Anson believes that this humble, little chapel had been "erected by a French *émigré* priest about fifty years before",<sup>330</sup> but Alexandra Wedgwood claims, "The Salisbury Catholic Chapel, off St. Martin's Street, was built in 1814".<sup>331</sup> The official history, St Osmund's and Catholic Salisbury, published in 1997 says that in c. 1812, the French priest Nicolas Bégin (1761-1826) built the chapel.<sup>332</sup> Despite the fact that the 9<sup>th</sup>.

---

<sup>328</sup> For information on Fr. Charles Cooke see Records of Religious Orders, List 29. G. Oliver, Collections Illustrating the History of the Catholic Religion in the Counties of Cornwall, Devon, Dorset, Somerset, Wiltshire and Gloucestershire (London: Charles Dolman 1857), pp.269-271.

<sup>329</sup> Ferrey, Recollections, p.102.

<sup>330</sup> Anson, p.23.

<sup>331</sup> Alexandra Wedgwood, A. W. N. Pugin and the Pugin Family (London: V & A 1985), p.74. Pugin's Diaries. Note 31, p.74.

<sup>332</sup> Raleigh St Lawrence, St Osmund's and Catholic Salisbury (printed by Press 70 Limited, Salisbury

Lord Arundell was one of the benefactors, the chapel was a very poor building which lay in the shadow of the cathedral. This change in Pugin's attendance, from the glorious cathedral to the miserable chapel, was "a sacrifice of no small kind for a man of Pugin's taste to make", observed Ferrey.<sup>333</sup>

Pugin's studies of medieval Catholicism had led him to understand Gothic architecture, medieval liturgies, rites and rubrics. He was able to visualise, in his mind's-eye what the Cathedral had actually been like in medieval times when it had been the centre of society, the House of God, built as an act of faith, teaching Catholic doctrines, and carrying out pure Catholic liturgical usages and practices. On accepting the Roman Catholic faith, Pugin was filled with a desire to restore Catholic liturgical architecture to England.

xiii) Pugin's mission in life.

The restoration of Catholicism and liturgy became for Pugin a form of Evangelical "divine mission" and a "moral duty". He remarked, "My moral convictions were such as admitted of no doubt as to my line of duty".<sup>334</sup> He felt that God was guiding him. "God has certainly permitted me to become an instrument in drawing attention to long-forgotten principles", he later commented.<sup>335</sup> Although it appeared to be an impossible dream, it was one he was compelled by the grace of God to take up. It was a mission for the good of God and man, yet a mission unlikely to succeed:

When I took this important step, there was little human probability of effecting anything considerable without influence, and with but slender means.<sup>336</sup>

---

1997), p.5.

<sup>333</sup> Ferrey, Recollections, p.102.

<sup>334</sup> Pugin, Some Remarks, p.21.

<sup>335</sup> Bernard Ward, The Sequel to Catholic Emancipation, Vol. I, p.97 and p.266. Pugin to the students of St Edmund's College, Ware.

<sup>336</sup> Pugin, Some Remarks, pp.21-22.

He was also up against both Roman Catholic ignorance and indifference, as well as huge Protestant prejudices. Protestants were unlikely to welcome a material demonstration of Roman Catholicism in England again. The starting point he believed was where England had departed from it. "England is certainly not what it was in 1440 but the thing to be done is to *bring it back to that era*", he later commented.<sup>337</sup>

Thereafter it could advance again. But the wonderful Gothic cathedrals such as Westminster, Lincoln, York and Canterbury were no longer Catholic, but Protestant. Similarly, the thousands of medieval parish churches dotted up and down the country, many of which he had visited, carefully investigated and measured, were also no longer Catholic, but Protestant.

No one would have thought it at all possible that new Catholic churches and cathedrals would be built to such an extent around England in the next twenty-five years or so.

xiv) Wiseman's London Lectures.

Seven or eight months after Pugin's conversion Nicholas Patrick Stephen Wiseman (1802-1865) arrived in England on a visit from Rome and he planned a series of lectures that would appeal to Protestants and converts alike. But his aim was to appeal more to the literate middle-classes than the uneducated man-in-the-street. In comparing the Protestant with the Catholic Rule of Faith he would argue intently and in great depth; this would require a certain level of education and comprehension in his audience. There was little mention, however, of the modern Roman Catholic Church in Rome.

---

<sup>337</sup> Alexandra Wedgwood, ed., The Pugin Family, Manuscripts, No. 22, p.103. Pugin to Lord Shrewsbury - 5 Jan. 1841.

The first series of lectures, heavily attended, was given during Advent 1835 in the Royal Sardinian Chapel, Lincoln's-Inn-Fields, and the second series in Lent 1836 in a more spacious building, the Church of St Mary Moorfields.<sup>338</sup>

Although Wilfrid Ward suggested that Pugin attended these lectures, the evidence remains weak; Pugin merely mentioned that he had “once had a peep into Moorfields chapel”, but did not say if this was before or after his conversion.<sup>339</sup> Martin Svaglic, however, suggested that the lectures were the reason for Pugin's conversion,<sup>340</sup> but it would seem that he had already been converted! He may not have actually attended all or any of the lectures. Instead, he could have read the freely circulated published lectures.<sup>341</sup> Also, he was living in Salisbury, some considerable distance from London during this period, which meant that he could not easily attend them. What is more probable is that he read the lectures and was familiar with their contents.

xv) The way ahead.

With the enthusiasm of a neophyte Pugin was already preparing to do his part in promoting the faith. He wanted to undertake his “moral duty” and to “go out to the whole world to proclaim the Good News to all creation”.<sup>342</sup> It would not be long before he was “proclaiming”, if not “to the whole world”, at least to England. Within a very short time - August 1836 - he published Contrasts.

---

<sup>338</sup> Nicholas Wiseman, Lectures (1836), preface, p.v.

<sup>339</sup> Ferrey, Recollections, p.373.

<sup>340</sup> Martin J. Svaglic, ed., Apologia pro vitâ suâ (1967), p.526, note 67.8, which refers to Pugin's conversion re Wiseman's Lectures.

<sup>341</sup> Wiseman, Lectures, Vol. 1, preface, p.vi.

<sup>342</sup> Mark 16:16

## Chapter Four - THE FIRST EDITION OF CONTRASTS

### 1) Difficulties of publishing.

Pugin had zealously started working on Contrasts in August 1835,<sup>343</sup> shortly after his conversion and before Wiseman started his first series of lectures. By the beginning of 1836 he had finished it, but could not find a publisher willing to handle such a controversial subject. The book was intended as a promotion of Catholicism, which he did by attacking Protestantism. He backed up his argument against Protestantism by indiscreetly giving individual examples of contemporary buildings and naming neo-Classical architects such as John Nash, William Inwood, Stephen Geary, Robert Smirke and John Soane. It was therefore likely to upset both Protestants and architects.

Pugin had no alternative but to publish it himself, which he did in August 1836. Its effect was startling. Extremes of opinion were soon forthcoming: the *Gentlemen's Magazine* praised its "originality" and its "boldness and freedom"<sup>344</sup>, while the *Civil engineer and Architect's journal* dismissed it as "a torrent of rabid gall".<sup>345</sup> Protestants certainly did not receive it favourably. Typical expressions used by them to describe him as a result of his publication were "infant papist, juvenile apostate, young Jesuit and inquisitor".<sup>346</sup>

### 2) An unusual approach.

Pugin's approach was not commonly encountered in a young, inexperienced Roman Catholic convert. He did not follow the submissive, non-confrontational approach of the old

---

<sup>343</sup> Alexandra Wedgwood, A. W. N. Pugin and the Pugin Family, Note 104, p. 123. Section on "Juvenilia". See also Plate 3, p.125. The idea had been in Pugin's mind since 1831 when he contrasted prototypes in his sketchbook.

<sup>344</sup> Editorial article in the *Gentlemen's Magazine* 161 (March 1837), p.283.

<sup>345</sup> Editorial article in the *Civil engineer and Architect's journal* (October 1837), pp. 9-10.

<sup>346</sup> Phoebe Stanton, 'Sources of Pugin's Contrasts', p.121. Pugin to E. J. Wilson (18 October 1836).

English Catholics who had made every effort to remain in the shadows since the Reformation. Nor did he follow the reasonable, sensible approach of Nicholas Wiseman. In any case, Wiseman's arrival in England and his lectures had been too late to have any major impact on him. Thus, his approach was different to that of the old English Catholics and that of Wiseman.

i) Pugin followed the lead of earlier Roman Catholic controversialists.

Pugin, instead, followed in the steps of the great controversialist Bishop John Milner (1752-1826) and other leading Roman Catholics who had earlier carried out a large and very fierce offensive against the Church of England. Peter Nockles expands on this tradition of controversy in his article "The Difficulties of Protestantism", arguing that controversy and disputation with Protestants as a means of advancing Catholicism had been a practice amongst Catholics since at least the 1580's up to the time of the Tractarians. A number of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Roman Catholic writers, including Bishop Richard Challoner (1691-1781), "vigorously repudiated protestant errors and misconceptions", hoping to win converts by such polemic.<sup>347</sup> Pugin, therefore, attempted to adopt their style of controversy. It was not that he initially saw himself as a controversialist; instead he saw himself as a liturgist whose aim was to promote his views about the Catholic Church. What those views were can only be determined as the study progresses.

---

<sup>347</sup> Peter B. Nockles, 'The Difficulties of Protestantism: Bishop Milner, John Fletcher and Catholic Apologetic against the Church of England in the Era from the First Relief Act to Emancipation 1778-1830', *Recusant History*, Vol. 24, No 2 (October 1998), p.194.

3) Pugin's exegesis of ecclesiastical architecture and his exposition and expansion in Contrasts.

Pugin, in his Contrasts, unlike Wiseman's intention for his Lectures, set out to appeal to a wide cross section of society. He intended to reach even the vulgar understanding, and its moral apparent to the least instructed vision. He wanted, as a liturgist, to play his part in the conveyance of faith to both the educated and uneducated.

Pugin's intense study of Gothic architecture convinced him that the buildings themselves could be interpreted as having meanings attached or embodied within their structures. If architecture was a product of various concepts, these concepts could be discovered by studying the architecture and working backwards. His writing is an exposition of these interpretations and concerns the practical, the historical, and the allegorical meanings. This is loosely termed the "Allegorical Method" of interpretation and was the method favoured by the medieval liturgists and Pugin's study of these may have introduced him to the method.

4) Pugin's exposition of the allegorical meaning.

i) A long tradition of allegorical exegesis of ecclesiastical architecture.

Today, allegory is usually defined as a mode of speech or style of writing in which one thing is understood by another. It is principally known as a technique of exegesis of the Scriptures, a method of interpretation whereby the text is made to yield a meaning, which is other than its literal or surface or historical meaning. But it was not always confined to the written word. This method had also been applied to liturgy, to usages and practices, church arrangement and form, by the scholars of the Early Church and the medieval liturgists, therefore, its application to liturgy went back many centuries.



The medieval liturgists studied the writers of the Early Church such as Tertullian, Athanasius, Basil, Augustine and others for guidance and understanding of allegory. They also looked to eastern writers, such as Maximus the Confessor (580-662), a Greek theologian and ascetic, who applied allegory to liturgy and liturgical architecture. Maximus's writings included a mystical interpretation of liturgy. S. J. Daniélou says that the liturgical writings of the Early Fathers such as Philo, Clement of Alexandria and Origen "give us the traditional typology of the Church; they form part of its elementary teaching".<sup>348</sup>

Some Early Fathers favoured an allegorical interpretation more than others, although they all employed it to some degree. Thus, those of the Egyptian churches (particularly at Alexandria) preferred it; Clement, Origen and Athanasius, developed it to a high standard, but those of Eastern churches (particularly Basil) and the north African churches (Tertullian and Augustine) used it moderately, while in the Syrian Antiochene churches, St John Chrysostom used it sparingly and carefully. Pugin, following the lead of the medieval liturgists, appealed to these Early Church writers in his own works.

Early Renaissance architectural theorists also knew about and applied allegorical exegesis to church architecture, although there is little evidence that Pugin was familiar with their works despite his study of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. In their interpretations, the Renaissance writers looked not only to Platonic, Stoic, and Peripatetic applications, but also, like the medieval allegorists, to Augustine's City of God. They did not, however, value allegorical interpretation like the earlier writers. Nonetheless, the Renaissance architect and architectural theorist Leon Battista Alberti (1402-1472) recognised that architecture was a rhetorical vehicle for spiritual and moral arguments. In his Profugiorum ab erumna libri III (c. 1441)<sup>349</sup> Alberti gave a fine example of allegorical interpretation applied to architecture.

---

<sup>348</sup> S. J. Daniélou, From Shadows to Reality (London: Burns and Oates, 1960), p.3.

<sup>349</sup> Leon Battista Alberti, Profugiorum ab erumna libri III (c. 1441: Genova: Casa Editrice Tilgher-Genova 1988), p.79 *et seq.* See also Christine Smith, Architecture in the Culture of Early Humanism:

His friend Agnolo Pandolfini spoke to him and Nicola de' Medici these words in Brunelleschi's Cathedral in Florence, which had both neo-Classical and Gothic features:

'And certainly this temple has in itself grace and merit,<sup>350</sup> and, as I have often thought, I delight to see joined together here a charming slenderness with a robust and full solidity so that, on the other hand, each of its parts seems designed for pleasure, while on the other, one understands that it has all been built for perpetuity ...'<sup>351</sup>

Christine Smith comments that "Agnolo's words express his direct visual observations and communicate his personal feelings. But, at the same time, they describe the soul's equilibrium through the allegory of the architectural style of the church and the interior ambient it encloses"<sup>352</sup>.

The seventeenth- and eighteenth-century French liturgists, such as Mabillon, Montfaucon and Thiers, who later became Pugin's principal authorities, also applied an allegorical method of interpretation. They were interested, too, in St Augustine's teachings and the works of other Early Fathers.

The Reformers including Luther, Melancthon and Calvin generally rejected all allegorical exegesis since their guiding principle was *Scriptura scripturae interpres*. This attitude remained predominant amongst Protestants and they remained generally unfamiliar with this style of writing. The Tractarians, who did not see themselves as Protestants, attempted to revive it. Roman Catholics, on the other hand, continued to use it as far as literature and the Scriptures were concerned. Pugin may have adopted it partly because he perceived that it was a Catholic method that had been rejected by Protestants.

---

Ethics, Aesthetics, and Eloquence 1400-1470 (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1992), pp.5-6.

<sup>350</sup> 'Merit' rather than 'majesty' (as translated by Christine Smith) would seem to be a more accurate translation.

<sup>351</sup> Leon Battista Alberti, Profugiorum, p. 83 *et seq.*. The full quote is too long to be included in its entirety. Megan Price of Wolfson College, Oxford, assisted with the translation from the Italian.

<sup>352</sup> Christine Smith, Architecture in the Culture of Early Humanism, pp.5-6.

Pugin's extensive research into the medieval period, particularly the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, thus led him to understand the exegesis and exposition of allegory and symbolism by medieval writers. Their writings indicated that architecture, decoration, vestments, music and ceremonial had literal, spiritual and moral imports as well as doctrinal, theological and philosophical meanings. They divided their method of interpretation into four levels – literal, allegorical, moral and anagogical – as cited in a couplet by Nicolas of Lyra: *Littera gesta docet, quid credas allegoria, Moralis quid agas, quo tendas anagogia.*<sup>353</sup> This method of interpretation facilitated research, exegesis and exposition. Pugin consequently chose to use a similar method in his interpretation of architecture and in his written exposition.

Pugin's Contrasts was therefore an unusual book because, while it aspired to be a book about architecture and literally was about architecture, one of its aims was to compare Protestantism and Catholicism. He used architecture to express his views on Church and State, and he made observations on a variety of other subjects. These subjects included Protestantism, Catholicism, history, the Church, the true faith and the moral state of the country.

There are other explanations for Pugin's style of writing. Michael Bright puts forward his own account. He claims in his article "A reconsideration of A. W. N. Pugin's Architectural Theories" (1979) that Pugin subscribed to two theories of art – the pragmatic and the expressive.<sup>354</sup> Bright believes that these two theories could unify understanding of Pugin's writing.

---

<sup>353</sup> Andrew Louth, "Allegorical interpretation" in R. J. Coggins and J. L. Houldens, eds., A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation (London: SCM Press 1990), pp.12-13.

<sup>354</sup> Michael Bright, "A reconsideration of A. W. Pugin's Architectural Theories", *Victorian Studies* Vol. 22, No. 2 (Winter1979), p.161.

Firstly, Bright argues that Pugin was “very much a pragmatist, or functionalist, in his views on architecture”.<sup>355</sup> He quotes from Pugin’s The True Principles (1841) as evidence of this:

The two great rules of design are these: *1<sup>st</sup>, that there should be no features about a building which are not necessary for convenience, construction, or propriety; 2<sup>nd</sup>, that all ornament should consist of enrichment of the essential construction of the building.* The neglect of these two rules is the cause of all the bad architecture of the present time.<sup>356</sup>

Pugin, he continues, has “earned himself” a reputation as a functionalist by such expressions. But Pugin himself contradicted the idea that he was only interested in the functional or practical aspects of architecture:

The mechanical part of Gothic architecture is pretty well understood, but it is the principles which influenced antient (sic) compositions, and the soul which appears in all the former works, which is so lamentably deficient.<sup>357</sup>

It is unlikely that a functionalist or pragmatist would make such a reference to “the soul”. Moreover, Pugin derides utilitarianism in his illustrations in Contrasts. Rosemary Hill also claims that Pugin’s remarks on “propriety” are “no more than the Vitruvian conventions of the drawing school”.<sup>358</sup>

Bright attributes Pugin’s other interests, which did not fit into “functionalism”, to his sympathy with “the expressive theory”, a nineteenth-century theory of art to which the Romantics subscribed.<sup>359</sup> Bright says that the criterion is not whether the work serves its purpose but whether it reflects “the thoughts and feelings of the artist who created it”.<sup>360</sup> It

---

<sup>355</sup> *Ibid.*, p.154.

<sup>356</sup> *Ibid.*, p.154. See also A. W. N. Pugin, The True Principles of Pointed or Christian Architecture (London: Henry G. Bohn 1841), p.1.

<sup>357</sup> A. W. N. Pugin, Contrasts (1836), p.43. (It is noted that Kenneth Clark The Gothic Revival, pp.138-39, omits “antient”).

<sup>358</sup> Rosemary Hill, “Reformation to Millennium: *Pugin’s Contrasts in the History of English Thought*” in the *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* (Chicago: 1 March 1999), Vol. 41, p.40.

<sup>359</sup> Michael Bright, ‘A reconsideration’, p.157.

<sup>360</sup> *Ibid.*, p.156.

directly contradicts the functionalist theory. Although Bright makes a valiant effort at making sense of Pugin's writing, his explanation thus appear to be contradictory and does not succeed in unifying Pugin's writing as he (Bright) intended. Hill's comments also overlook the other aspects of Pugin's writing.

David Watkin argues that Pugin used different categories in his writing simply as arguments. "Driven by a passionate love of Gothic he seized on any and every argument which might be used to justify its revival, though the argument from religious truth and from functional or technological necessity took precedence over any aesthetic arguments".<sup>361</sup> But the thesis will later argue that Pugin's motive was not that of a copyist of medieval architecture and he did not wish a revival of the Gothic style at any cost.

Such explanations as Bright, Watkin and Hill give about Pugin's writing recognize the value of some aspects of his work but do not go far enough or ignore other equally important features.

ii) Allegorical interpretation of liturgical architecture.

While Pugin applied some of the categories of allegorical exegesis to his writing, his interpretation of some aspects of liturgical architecture may be described as allegorical. R. M. Grant says that Hellenistic Jews held that "the Jewish Scriptures are completely inspired. Nothing in them is either pointless or mythical";<sup>362</sup> they believed nothing was written without purpose. Origen thought that everything in Scripture was intentional and that "Every 'jot and tittle' has a meaning which the exegete can discover if God gives him the rational power to do so".<sup>363</sup> But Pugin claimed that, as far as the true Church was concerned, nothing was built without purpose. A traditional Catholic church, he said, fully illustrates that "each portion is

---

<sup>361</sup> David Watkin, Morality and Architecture Revised, p. 24.

<sup>362</sup> R. M. Grant, The Letter and the Spirit (London: S.P.C.K., 1957), p.32.

destined for the performance of some solemn rite”<sup>364</sup> and “every portion of the sacred fabric bespeaks its origin”.<sup>365</sup>

A church was not simply a building for housing a crowd. Architecture could be as thoroughly interpreted as any text, but full interpretation was only possible after extensive study, Pugin explained. Thus, many of the meanings or symbols within the structure itself could only be understood by studying ancient and medieval writings. Both in overall and detailed design the Gothic church, Pugin claimed, had no superficial parts and each part warranted a number of considerations – the allegorical (theological, doctrinal, spiritual) as well as the practical (and moral) and historical – which he had discovered from his own researches. He, like the medieval liturgists and the Early Church scholars, did not neglect the historical and practical aspects, but used them as a contrast with the allegorical level of meaning.

Pugin argued that if religious life influenced architecture, then the “stupendous Ecclesiastical Edifices of the Middle Ages”<sup>366</sup> indicated that the people who built them must have been both fervently Christian and religious.<sup>367</sup> They built these structures with a clear purpose in mind – the worship of God: “well does the fabric bespeak its destined purpose”, he remarked.<sup>368</sup>

Pugin believed architecture held two principal meanings in the form of the natural (or practical) and the mystical. The Early Church scholars also believed that Scripture held two levels of meaning, the literal [body] and the spiritual [soul and spirit]. His use of these

---

<sup>363</sup> *Ibid.*, p.97.

<sup>364</sup> A. W. N. Pugin, Contrasts: or a parallel between the noble Edifices of the Middle Ages and similar buildings of the Present day shewing the Present Decay of Taste (London: Printed for the author 1836), p.2.

<sup>365</sup> *Ibid.*, p.2.

<sup>366</sup> *Ibid.*, p.2.

<sup>367</sup> *Ibid.*, p.2.

<sup>368</sup> *Ibid.*, p.2.

categories in his writing had some comparability to those used by these scholars. But, although he started with two meanings - the practical and the mystical - he subdivided them into categories that were more complex – the historical, practical and moral, doctrinal, anagogical or spiritual and the mystical. His use was closer to that of the medieval liturgists who also divided their allegorical exegesis into four meanings - the literal or historical, the mystical (with special reference to Christ and the Church), the spiritual or anagogical (which points to God) and moral (or practical).<sup>369</sup>

5) Pugin's exposition in Contrasts of the allegorical meaning of liturgical architecture.

Contrasts (1836) was a small book; the text was restricted to thirty-five or so pages while the drawings accounted for another sixteen. As a picture book, it was attractive to the eye, but the text had aspects which would appeal to those of varying religious interests and education. The style of writing made it easy to read on a superficial level, yet it was also laconic in covering a great deal while being economical with words.

Pugin wished to teach the uneducated Protestant masses about Catholicism by subtly influencing them. Thus, while principally Contrasts appeared to be about art and architecture, it had illustrations and was easy to read, it also contained references to deeper issues.

6) Pugin's exposition of the doctrinal level of meaning.

i) The Rules of Faith and liturgy.

It would seem that Pugin had already formed his views on religion and liturgy by the time he wrote Contrasts. It is possible, as the following will argue, to extracate these views from the text, which would argue that he was expounding the doctrinal and liturgical levels of meaning in his writing from his interpretation of architecture.

---

<sup>369</sup> Andrew Louth, "Allegorical interpretation", p.14.

Pugin's three years of study of liturgy may account for his views. He had focussed on two main issues. They were

- i) the identification of the true Church
- ii) the identity of the schismatical Church.

One of the features of the true Church was its unbroken continuity. It was a theme that Pugin, as a Catholic and a liturgist, was to consider repeatedly. In a liturgical context, he sought to demonstrate continuity by

- a) Apostolical Succession.
- b) Tradition.
- c) The *Depositum fidei*.
- d) Evidence of the divine guidance of the Holy Spirit.

On a doctrinal level, in Contrasts, he concentrated on a major issue - the comparison of the Rules of Faith of Catholicism and Protestantism. Wiseman was to define the Catholic Rule of Faith as "the Word of God alone and exclusively", while at the same time the Catholic was "admitting *tradition* - sometimes of their receiving what they call the *unwritten word of God*".<sup>370</sup>

Liturgy was, thought Pugin, indubitably linked to the unwritten Word and could demonstrate a form of Apostolical Succession:<sup>371</sup> he wrote of the "long succession of Saints, Prelates; Abbots, monks, and men who raised every truly noble church in Christendom".<sup>372</sup> Liturgical traditions, as usages, practices, actions and material aspects, could be carried down over the centuries without having been written down (although, of course, there has been

---

<sup>370</sup> Nicholas Wiseman, Lectures, Vol. I, p.59. Lecture III.

<sup>371</sup> A. W. N. Pugin, "Catholic intelligence. Catholic church architecture. Letter of A. W. Pugin, Esq.", *The Tablet* 9 (2 September 1848), p.563. Pugin gave many examples in his writings of his idea that ecclesiastical architecture was commensurate with the faith and paralleled faith throughout history; in this article he called ecclesiastical architecture, "The barometer of faith", and which was, he said, "the creation of faith and reverence". Thus, he implied a form of Apostolical Succession of ecclesiastical architecture.

<sup>372</sup> *Ibid.*, p.563.

much writing about liturgy in all its aspects). The same could not be said of the Scriptures, which were dependent on having been written down and could not, or only with difficulty, be carried down without the texts.

The basis of Pugin's beliefs and the doctrinal standard for his theory of liturgy were that he had "considered the Catholic Church; existing with uninterrupted apostolical succession, handing down the same faith, sacraments, and ceremonies unchanged, unaltered through every clime, language, and nation".<sup>373</sup> In this quote, ecclesiastical architecture came under the umbrella of Apostolical Succession. He probably took this from the Rule of the 5<sup>th</sup> century St Vincent of Lerins, which stated that true doctrine was "What had been believed everywhere, always, by all"; it was the *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus* of the Church,<sup>374</sup> the traditional and orthodox view of Roman Catholics. Pugin's Roman Catholic friend Count Charles Forbes de Montalembert was later to explain that this was so and he called it "the rule of Catholic faith". In his *Les Moines d'Occident* ("Monks of the West") (1861-79), Montalembert wrote admiringly that Vincent of Lerins had "fixed with admirable precision, and in language as decisive as it is simple and correct, the rule of Catholic faith, by establishing it on the double authority of Scripture and tradition, and originating the celebrated definition of orthodox interpretation: *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est*".<sup>375</sup> Thus, in a Catholic context, the Rule of Vincent referred to both Scripture and tradition.

---

<sup>373</sup> Ferrey, p.104.

<sup>374</sup> Also called the Vincentian canon.

<sup>375</sup> C. F. Montalembert, *Monks of the West from St. Bernard to St. Benedict*, 7 Volumes (Paris: 1860-77; Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and sons 1861:), Vol. I, Book III, p.468.

7) Pugin's exposition of the historical level of meaning.

i) A comparison of two ages.

The historical category is evident; the title referred to, "The Noble Edifices of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth centuries and Similar Buildings of the Present Day". Pugin implied that he set out to compare one age against another. The fourteenth and fifteenth centuries compared with the nineteenth; one an age of faith, the other an age of apostasy; one an age of Catholicism, the other of Protestantism. His historical comparison was not strictly confined to England, but included France before the Revolution as an example of a Catholic country.

For a book professedly about architecture, Pugin cited only a few architects, but instead appealed to a number of historians. He wished to express his views on history and, therefore, there is an historical level to his text. Pugin's principal authority on the medieval period was a recognised leading historian, Sir William Dugdale (1605-1686). In order to build up a picture of the pre-Reformation Catholic Church in England, Pugin referred to his Monasticon Anglicanum (1655-1673), a collection of records relating to medieval English religious houses, which Dugdale compiled with Roger Dodsworth.

ii) The British historians.

Pugin's use of medieval historians was therefore limited. His authorities and sources on the medieval period were restricted to Dugdale, Dodsworth and first hand examples. He did not consider that some aspects of medieval society could be wretched and harsh; people died from starvation, wars, robbery, plagues, etc. and sometimes suffered under the feudal system. Instead, he attempted to promote Catholicism in England by arguing for the merits of the medieval period by illustrating how the Reformation had destroyed its best features. The book is therefore as much, or if not more, about the Reformation than it is about the medieval period or the nineteenth century. Indeed, the majority of his authorities were concerned with

the Reformation and post Reformation periods; these authorities for England were mainly seventeenth-century historians and ecclesiastical historians, chroniclers and antiquaries. Their writings included both general and local histories.

Pugin believed that the pre-Reformation Church in England had undisputed authority and that this resulted in unity of faith. The Reformation, however, had caused a rejection of Church authority, which had led to disunity of faith. His assurance for this was given by the sixteenth-century Raphael Holinshed (d. 1580). He cited Holinshed's Chronicles (Vol. ii, p.972) to support his argument that the Reformation had caused the spread of private judgement in matters of faith.<sup>376</sup> Pugin also referred to Henry VIII's speech to Parliament in 1545 (quoted by Holinshed) which demonstrated, he claimed, discord and disunity: "*godly living was never less used, nor God himself amongst Christians never less revered, honored (sic), or served*".<sup>377</sup>

Pugin thought that Henry VIII had supported the old Catholic religion of the country and did not intend to change it. Catholicism had been as acceptable to him as it had been to the majority of the people. This view has lately found support amongst the "revisionist" historians. Richard Rex, in his Henry VIII and the English Reformation (1993) thinks that Henry saw that his initial prime duty as "Defender of the faith" was to "advance religion within his realm" and that he took this duty seriously.

Pugin believed that by making himself the head of the Church and rejecting Catholic communion, Henry caused a chain of events, which had dire repercussions for Catholicism.

One major repercussion was that greed overtook him once the endowments of the Church were within his reach. Pugin wrote, "To a monarch, however, who neither respected sanctity or art, these institutions only offered a lure to his avarice, and the sure means of

---

<sup>376</sup> Pugin, Contrasts, Appendix G, pp.41-42.

<sup>377</sup> *Ibid.*, Appendix G, p.42.

replenishing his exhausted treasury”.<sup>378</sup> Henry wished to “replenish his coffers”<sup>379</sup> and he saw that the religious houses and churches of the country were very rich indeed and, as Defender of the Faith, he had the power to gather these riches to himself.<sup>380</sup> The temptations proved irresistible.

Pugin looked for further confirmation of the true situation to the Chronicles of the antiquarian John Stowe (c.1525 -1605). Stowe had written a large number of Chronicles and Annals, many on London, and revised Holinshed’s Chronicles, which he published in 1585-7. Pugin had copies in his library of Stowe’s “Annales or generall Chronicle of England, continued and augmented by E. Howe” (1615), and his Survey of London (1633).<sup>381</sup>

Pugin pointed out that to strip the wealth from the religious houses and churches,<sup>382</sup> Henry appointed Commissioners. He referred to several historians, including Peter Heylin (1600-1662)<sup>383</sup> for information about these Commissioners, appointed, Pugin said, for “the pretended reformation of ecclesiastical abuses”.<sup>384</sup>

Another of his authorities on the Commissioners was the Roman Catholic John Stevens (or Stephens) (d.1726).<sup>385</sup> Stevens edited and translated a number of books to which Pugin appealed including a folio translation and abridgement of Dugdale’s Monasticon Anglicanum published in 1718; in 1722, Stevens published a continuation of the Monasticon in 2 vols. entitled The History of the Ancient Abbeys, Monasteries, Hospitals, Cathedrals, etc., illustrated with copperplates and in 1722 he published a further continuation of the

---

<sup>378</sup> *Ibid.*, p.7.

<sup>379</sup> *Ibid.*, p.7.

<sup>380</sup> *Ibid.*, p.11.

<sup>381</sup> A. N. L. Munby, Vol. 4, p.278. Items 607-8.

<sup>382</sup> Pugin, Contrasts (1836), pp.3-10. Also mentioned in The Present State, p.123.

<sup>383</sup> *Ibid.*, Appendix A.

<sup>384</sup> *Ibid.*, p.8.

<sup>385</sup> *Ibid.*, Appendix A, p.39.

Monasticon Anglicanum called Monasticon Hibernicum. These books gave a picture of ecclesiastical buildings before and after the Commissioners went to work.

The Commissioners stripped the churches of all valuables stated another of Pugin's authorities, Stowe. According to him, "only one chalice or cup", and one paten was allowed to remain in each.<sup>386</sup> And again citing Stowe, Pugin said that the clearing out of the churches was so thorough that even the lead coffins of dead bishops were melted down.<sup>387</sup> The result was a systematic destruction of Catholic churches and monasteries.

Gilbert Burnet (1643-1715) was one of Pugin's authorities on the "great complaints made of the violences and briberies" of the Commissioners<sup>388</sup> and their destruction of ecclesiastical buildings. While Burnet was Chaplain to Charles II he was often at Court and involved in politics. He wrote his History of my Own Time, which was published in 1723 after his death. Pugin had copies of his Memoirs of James and William, Dukes of Hamilton (1677) and his History of the Church of England (Dublin 1730-31-33).<sup>389</sup>

Another source for information on the destruction of ecclesiastical buildings was Dugdale's History of St Paul's (pp.128-130). Citing this, even cathedrals and churches in London, said Pugin, were destroyed. Somerset was responsible for "barbarous demolitions",<sup>390</sup> including "large portions of the metropolitan cathedral, and a host of ecclesiastical edifices".<sup>391</sup> Pugin had copies in his library of Dugdale's Monasticon Anglicanum, cum Additamentis (1655-61-73), History of St. Paul's Cathedral in London (1658) (two copies), Origines Juridiciales (1671), Baronage of England (1675-76), History of

---

<sup>386</sup> *Ibid.*, Appendix J, p.43.

<sup>387</sup> Pugin, Contrasts (1836), Appendix K, p.43 & p.14.

<sup>388</sup> Pugin referred to Burnet's History of England, p.182. Contrasts (1836), Appendix A, p.39.

<sup>389</sup> A. N. L. Munby, Vol. 4, p.11. Items 158 & 159.

<sup>390</sup> *Ibid.*, Appendix I, p.42.

<sup>391</sup> Pugin, Contrasts (1836), p.12.

Imbanking and Drainage, revised by C. N. Cole (1772), and his Antiquities of Warwickshire, revised, augmented and continued by W. Thomas (1730).<sup>392</sup>

Pugin believed that the medieval Church was exceedingly rich and owned vast acres of land. Members of the aristocracy were respected as protectors and patrons. One of the results of the measures taken by Henry VIII and his successors was that the favoured members of the aristocracy were rewarded with these riches and lands, which had formerly belonged to the Church.<sup>393</sup> Consequently, the aristocracy no longer commanded respect from the common people and its members were thought of as avaricious nobles.<sup>394</sup>

Pugin considered that once Henry had departed from the Church of Rome, the Protestant innovators were encouraged to hope that he might go further. By the 1530's, Henry became alarmed at the rapid spread of heresy. His Act of Six Articles was directed against Protestant heretics, not Catholic ones. Nevertheless, this eventually led to the persecution of Catholics and to the torture and death of many.<sup>395</sup> John Foxe (1516-1587) was one of Pugin's authorities for this and he quoted Foxe's The Book of Martyrs (republished in 1563 as Actes and Monuments of those Latter and Perillous Dayes) as a source for the effects of Henry VIII's "Six Articles"<sup>396</sup> which, he argued, led to executions because of religion. Pugin was particularly interested in this work, which he said was an account of "Actes and monuments of these latter and perillous dayes touching matters of the Church, wherein are described the great persecutions practised by the Romishe prelates";<sup>397</sup> its importance lay in Foxe's acquaintance with Protestant martyrs and his first hand account of the times that he lived in.

---

<sup>392</sup> A. N. L. Munby, ed., Sale Catalogues, Vol. 4, p.255. Items 198-201.

<sup>393</sup> Pugin, Contrasts, p.7 & p.12.

<sup>394</sup> *Ibid.*, p.16.

<sup>395</sup> *Ibid.*, Appendix E, pp. 40-41.

<sup>396</sup> *Ibid.*, Appendix F, p.41.

<sup>397</sup> Dictionary of National Biography, Vol. VII, p.588.

Another of Pugin's authorities on persecutions was the High Anglican Peter Heylin (1600-1662), who wrote about the many executions that occurred. He had copies of Heylin's Help to English History (1709),<sup>398</sup> and his Cyprianus Anglicus (1668) which was also a defence of William Laud. Pugin also referred to Thomas Fuller (1608-1661) and his The Holy and Profane State (published 1642) as well as his Church History, which he published in 1655, for further information on the executions.

Pugin believed that the persecution of Catholics and the destruction of Catholicism continued in the centuries following the Reformation. Of particular interest to him was Heylin's Ecclesia Restaurata: or the History of the Reformation of the Church of England (1661), which extended from the accession of Edward to the completion of the Elizabethan settlements in 1566. In this, Heylin attempted a balanced view of the losses and gains of the religious convulsions of the sixteenth century. Pugin had a copy of the 1674 edition of this book in his library.<sup>399</sup> The suppression of Catholicism and the advance of Protestantism resulted, thought Pugin, in a change of religion.

Pugin thus argued that the Reformation had not reformed an existing Catholic Church but had invented a new religion. He believed that instrumental in this was Archbishop Cranmer. While Henry VIII was a "merciless tyrant", he was "not a reformer". Cranmer, however, was "perfidious and dissembling",<sup>400</sup> lived an immoral life and "declared himself a bitter enemy" to Catholicism. The new Church that he set up contained only remnants of Catholicism, whether in its liturgy, theology or doctrines. But remnants, Pugin argued, did not prove that the reformed Church in England was still Catholic.

---

<sup>398</sup> A. N. L. Munby, Sale Catalogues, Vol. 4, p.258. Item 240.

<sup>399</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 4, p.264. Item 355.

<sup>400</sup> Pugin, Contrasts (1836), p.12.

Pugin's principal authority on Cranmer and his associates was John Strype (1643-1737).<sup>401</sup> Pugin cited his Memorials of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury (1694) and Annals of the Reformation in England (1708-9), which were based on original manuscripts. He collected four copies of Strype's books, his Lives of Archbishop Grindal (1710), Life and Acts of Archbishop M. Parker (1711), Annals of the Reformation in England from the Accession of Queen Elizabeth to the Commencement of the Reign of James I (1735-37), and his Memoirs of Archbishop Cranmer (1694).

The new religion was not restricted to England, but spread to Scotland. Pugin's authority was the academic and theologian Thomas Goodwin D.D. (1600-1680) who was one of the sub-committee of five nominated on 16 December 1643 to meet the Scottish Commissioners with the aim of drawing up a directory for worship. Pugin also cited Foxe's account of events in Scotland. "The reformation in Scotland began by the murder of Cardinal Beaton, in which Knox was a party; and to which Fox (sic), in his 'Acts and Monuments' says, 'The murderers were actuated by the Spirit of God'".<sup>402</sup>

Pugin considered that after the Reformation the arrangement of the churches was altered to accommodate this new Protestant religion. Dugdale's History of St Paul's Cathedral was his source for the destruction of tombs by the Reformers<sup>403</sup> and Heylin's A Coale (sic) from the Altar (1636)<sup>404</sup> the authority for the position of the communion-table. Heylin wrote that altars were eventually ordered to be pulled down and a common "square table"<sup>405</sup> used instead, which he criticised. Heylin followed the Catholic revivalist views of the Laudian school in matters of church arrangement and form.

---

<sup>401</sup> *Ibid.*, Appendix H, p.42.

<sup>402</sup> *Ibid.*, Appendix S, p.49.

<sup>403</sup> *Ibid.*, Appendix I, p.42.

<sup>404</sup> *Ibid.*, Appendix L, p.43.

<sup>405</sup> *Ibid.*, p.14.

Pugin's view was that most people did not welcome the Reformation and that they put up resistance to it. He claimed that the people did not support Henry's moves against the Church; "the change of religion" was "not the result of popular feeling" but was "carried by a *coup de main*".<sup>406</sup> Eamon Duffy takes a similar view to Pugin and does not share the picture of the "breakdown of that corporate Christianity which other historians have seen as the essential feature of late medieval Catholicism".<sup>407</sup> Indeed, Duffy quotes Émile Mâle as saying, "it may well be that the saints were never better loved than during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries".<sup>408</sup>

This resistance to any change in the religious life of the people was only broken down, said Pugin, when they became frightened by the persecutions and executions<sup>409</sup> of those who resisted and by the destruction of the monasteries and churches.<sup>410</sup> Some resistance, however, continued long after the Reformation. This was confirmed by the writings of Jeremy Collier (1650-1726), including his An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain (1708-14). He was an English non-juring bishop (who refused to take the oaths of allegiance to William III and Mary II in 1689).

While Pugin used reliable and highly regarded authorities for the Reformation and following periods, it is of note that the majority of these authorities were Protestant historians.

Indeed, John Foxe was a staunch supporter of Protestantism and was a martyrologist who strongly favoured extreme forms of Protestantism and advocated advanced reforming

---

<sup>406</sup> *Ibid.*, p.9.

<sup>407</sup> Eamon Duffy, The Stripping of the Altars (Newhaven and London: Yale University Press 1992), p.131.

<sup>408</sup> *Ibid.*, p.155. Quote from Emile Mâle, Religious Art in France: the Late Middle Ages (Paris: 1908: 1986), p.147.

<sup>409</sup> *Ibid.*, Appendix M, p.44.

<sup>410</sup> *Ibid.*, p.16, 'Introduction'.

laws. Foxe gave a somewhat distorted picture of the Reformation because he wrote Protestant propaganda designed, says Christopher Haigh, to discredit Catholics and “extolling the ‘true humble martyrs and servants of God’”.<sup>411</sup> Yet, despite Foxe’s Protestant bias, Pugin referred to him in order to “shew the horrible excesses committed by these pretended reformers”.<sup>412</sup> Another authority was Thomas Goodwin who was an ardent Calvinist. Strype, too, was a committed admirer of Cranmer and the Reformers. None of these could be said to have been advancing Catholic views. Pugin, on the other hand, was clearly not advancing Protestant views. He had already formed his views and carefully selected his material to support these views from historians of the Restoration period. This was a period of reaction against Cromwell and the Commonwealth, which had resulted in historians attempting to look back and regain pre-Commonwealth, even pre-Reformation, history and tradition. Pugin’s use of these well-known Protestant authorities was a clever, if not sardonic move. It had been employed by Bishop Challoner before him; he, too, had used authorities esteemed by Protestant controversialists to argue for a Catholic position.<sup>413</sup>

iii) The French historians.

Pugin referred to a few French historians of local churches and cathedrals in France in order to promote Catholicism by building up a picture of the old, traditional Catholic Church before the Revolution. His selection of Continental authorities and sources in his Contrasts (1836) was much more restricted than his use of British ones.

---

<sup>411</sup> Christopher Haigh, ed., The English Reformation Revised (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1987), p.2.

<sup>412</sup> Pugin, Contrasts (1836), Appendix S, p.49.

<sup>413</sup> See, for example, R. Challoner, A Short History of the Beginnings and Progress of the Protestant Religion gathered out of the Best Protestant Writers by Way of Question and Answer (London: J. P. Coghlan MD CC XCV), also his The Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine, contained in the Professions of Faith (London: J. P. Coghlan MD CC XCVI), pp. 46-47.

Pugin turned to Dom Jean-Francois Pommeraye (1617-1687) for information on local Catholic churches and cited his Histoire de l'Abbaye Royale de S. Ouen de Rouen (Rouen 1662), and his Histoire des Archevesques de Rouen (Rouen 1667) (he had copies of these two books in his library) as his sources on the “horrible excesses” the Calvinist Huguenots committed during the Wars of Religion. Pugin compared the Huguenots in France with the Protestants in England.<sup>414</sup> Both had set out to destroy Catholicism.

Michel Béziers (1721-1782), a French ecclesiastic and historian, provided Pugin with further local examples of the Catholic Church in France.<sup>415</sup> Pugin turned to Béziers' Chronologie historique des baillis et gouverneurs de Caen (1769), Mémoire historique sur l'origine et le fondateur de la collégiale du S. Sépulchre de Caen (1773), Histoire sommaire de la ville de Bayeux précédés d'un discours preliminaire sur le diocèse de ce nom (Caen: 1773), Histoire de Rouen (Rouen: 1775) and Voyage Pittoresque de Paris (1778) for information on these. While these books by Pommeraye and Béziers were primarily concerned with local history, the writers saw the local churches with their particular expressions of liturgy as an essential feature of those histories. Pugin acquired copies of most of these works for his library.

Another of Pugin's authorities on local Catholic churches was Antoine Pierre Maris Gilbert (1785-1858). Pugin used his Histoire de l'Eglise de Saint-Ouen de Rouen (Rouen: 1822) and he had a first edition copy of this book in his library. He was particularly interested in Rouen Cathedral (built between 1201 and 1527), to which Gilbert referred, since it was acclaimed as a fine example of Gothic and Catholic architecture.

---

<sup>414</sup> Pugin Contrasts (1836), Appendix Q, p.46.

<sup>415</sup> *Ibid.*, Appendix Q, pp.47-48.

8) Pugin's exposition of the practical level of meaning.

On a practical level, Pugin compared architecture and interior fittings of different dates. He contrasted, for instance, parochial churches: the neo-Classical All Souls Church, Langham Place, by John Nash with the medieval Redcliffe Church, Bristol; chapels: Inwood's Greek revival St Pancras Chapel with the medieval "Bishop Skirlaws' (sic) chapel, Yorkshire"; altar screens: Hereford Cathedral after the "renovations" made by James Wyatt (1746-1813) in the early nineteenth century compared with the Neville screen of 1430 in Durham Cathedral.

There were similarities in Pugin's views to those of Montalembert and the Mennaisian School in France. The "école mennaisienne", which came into being in the 1830's, followed the early ideas of Hugo Felicité Robert de Lamennais (1782-1854). Pugin may have come under the influence of this School during his three years of study in the early 1830's. Further evidence for this influence occurred later, in his second edition of Contrasts (1841). The Mennaisians were Liberal Ultramontanes who believed they were in the forefront in the reform of the French Church. Their chief characteristics were that they yearned for a revival of medieval Christendom and had a distaste for the Enlightenment, the Classical and neo-Classical traditions. One of the members of the Mennaisian School, the Abbé Daniel Haighneré (1824-1896), said that they believed they were returning to the sources of Christian inspiration: "we dreamed of nothing but Gothic architecture, medieval vestments, Roman plainchant of the thirteenth century, the restoration of the religious orders and of the ancient diocesan boundaries".<sup>416</sup>

---

<sup>416</sup> Austin Gough, Paris and Rome: The Gallican Church and the Ultramontane Campaign 1848-1853

i) The Catholic Rule of Faith on a practical level.

Pugin set out to explain that the spread of Christianity into Western countries had been accompanied by the refinement of the expression of Catholicism, culminating in a medieval Catholic utopia. Unchristian elements had been largely discarded and this was reflected in the design of churches. The unity of ideas and principles of Catholicism had grown alongside a parallel improvement in liturgical architecture; an understanding of fundamental truths and liturgy had grown together towards perfection and were intertwined and inseparable. Perfection of knowledge equalled perfection of expression. He set out to emphasise that during the medieval period, people had become wonderfully creative because they turned to God. Their churches and cathedrals had, consequently, “attained a most extraordinary degree of excellence in this country”.<sup>417</sup> This was the Catholic Church in England, not the Catholic Church of Rome. Pugin had made no effort to trace the history of the latter.

While it would be ridiculous to say that Gothic architecture existed in the Early Church and the succeeding centuries up to the medieval period, this was not the case with Catholic form and arrangement, which Pugin believed the Gothic fully incorporated. He set out to argue that the type of liturgical context that he favoured had the same origins as Christianity. He tried to show that altars, naves, chancels, screens, crosses, vertical emphasis, cruciform plans, images of Saints, chalices, patens, bread, wine, vestments, etc. had always been part of the Christian Church from the early basilicas to the churches of the nineteenth century. He argued that they were as valid for nineteenth-century Catholicism as they had been for the first- or fourteenth-century. Moreover, he had a vision of a future society that

---

(Oxford: The Clarendon Press 1986), p.125.

<sup>417</sup> Pugin, Contrasts (1836), p.4.

incorporated these traditional features, which was a view similar to that upheld by the Mennaisian School.

ii) The Protestant Rule of Faith on a practical level.

Pugin argued that the Protestant Churches were flawed by their insistence on *sola Scriptura* as the only Rule of Faith, while the interpretation of Scripture depended on individual judgement and opinion and not on the authority of a divinely guided Church.

He believed that the Reformed Churches were anti-liturgical. While preaching and the pulpit increased in importance because of the Reformation, the Sacraments, he said, were not so significant and all sense of mystery, awe and reverence for “the holy mysteries” were discarded. Altars, belief in the Real Presence, the sign of the cross with the image of the crucifixion, invocation of Saints and the use of Latin were generally forbidden. The Reformers claimed that these elements were superstitions and therefore unchristian. Their services were nonvisual because they believed that the visual distracted from the preached and prayed Word. The promotion of the vernacular instead of Latin was also aimed at promoting preaching.

These new views, believed Pugin, did away with any doctrinal necessity for a chancel, sacristy and altar, as well as rood screen, crucifixes and statues of Saints. Even the Eucharist was suspect as a divine mystery and was only acceptable as a memorial supper; stone altars became wooden tables, reflecting this change in doctrine. The Act of Parliament of 1550 enforced this. The result was a church design that was completely lacking in symbolism and allegorical meaning. All that was required was a large, plain hall with galleries and a prominent pulpit; it was, as he illustrated, theatre-like and utilitarian.

9) Pugin's exposition of the moral level of meaning.

Pugin showed beautiful buildings as illustrations of a caring society and ugly buildings as an illustration of a harsh, cruel one. Contrasts was clearly not a simple comparison of architectural styles, but included a moral statement. Yet, despite these references or insinuations about a variety of other subjects, Pugin did not waiver or digress from the central topic of architecture.

Pugin's argument was that Catholicism is the true faith, given by God, and Protestantism is not the true faith, but had been invented by men. He interpreted Catholic and Protestant architecture and saw these meanings embodied in the buildings. He argued that Protestantism, unlike Catholicism, was not capable of producing any worthwhile expressions of Christianity or a society imbued with Christian values.

Pugin used his illustrations as comments on the social conditions of a Protestant capitalist society compared with a medieval society based on Catholicism. The first demonstrated negative qualities including meanness, ugliness and unkindness. He showed the harshness and cruelty meted out to the orphan and the widow, the pauper who was sent to a prison-like workhouse, the burial without dignity or grace. These were social issues of deep concern to many, including Pugin's contemporary Charles Dickens.<sup>418</sup> Pugin compared this society to his second, a medieval utopia. This was a society where the Church rather than the State was responsible for the social welfare of its members. The huge Catholic monasteries, which dotted the country from one end to another, were havens of rest and refreshment to those who had become victims of misfortune; here the widow and the orphan were welcomed, fed and clothed. They were able to gain strength from the monks and from the beautiful Gothic buildings with their fruitful, pretty gardens. The poor man and the pauper were equally welcomed by the monks who looked after them and showed them how to live a

---

<sup>418</sup> Pugin and Charles Dickens had a mutual friend in Clarkson Stanford (1793-1867), the artist. See

Christian life by the monks' own example. Thus, strengthened and refreshed, the poor would return to their lives better Christians and better able to cope with the troubles of life. In keeping with the views of Liberal Ultramontanes, Pugin believed that a future return to such a monastic-led society would benefit everyone.

10) A defence of Contrasts.

i) Pugin prepared to defend his views.

Pugin had expected an adverse reaction to Contrasts and so it was not without a few qualms that he had undertaken such an enterprise.<sup>419</sup> In a letter to Willson he wrote, "I have stated nothing but truth undisguised truth and I am happy in the position I have taken. I know my asertions (sic) are true. it (sic) is time these church (sic) of England men were held up in their true Light (sic) and I trust I have done it effectivly (sic)".<sup>420</sup> Anglicans naturally saw such an action as hostile and controversial, but he was prepared to defend it.

ii) Criticism of Contrasts.

The first expression of Anglican outrage came from Arthur Fane (d. 1872),<sup>421</sup> writing in the *Salisbury and Wiltshire Herald* on 17 September 1836. In his article 'Mr Pugin's "Contrasts"' he advised him to "study the pages of history" where he would find that "the Grecian style arose at Rome".<sup>422</sup> Pugin had poured scorn on neo-Classical architects and their buildings but, thought Fane, the neo-Classical style had originated in Rome and was

---

Margaret Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, pp.384-385.

<sup>419</sup> A. W. N. Pugin, An Apology for a work entitled Contrasts: being a defence of the assertions advanced in that publication against the various attacks lately made upon it (Birmingham: 1837), p.3.

<sup>420</sup> Pugin to Willson (early August 1836). MS JHU 15. See M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.61.

<sup>421</sup> Arthur Fane became a prebendary of Yalesbury, Salisbury (1854-1872).

<sup>422</sup> Arthur Fane, 'Mr Pugin's "Contrasts"', *Salisbury and Wiltshire Herald* (a Protestant periodical - 17 September 1836).

supported by the Roman Catholic Church. Pugin must surely not be aware that the neo-Classical did not originate with Protestantism, but with Roman Catholicism. The mean and meagre neo-Classical buildings that Pugin had used to illustrate Protestantism, could, suggested Fane, equally demonstrate Catholicism. In this he was correct.

On a superficial level, not everyone had been convinced by Pugin's arguments that Catholicism and Protestantism had any bearing on architecture or vice versa. A small publication appeared, Reply to Contrasts (1837), written by an anonymous "Architect", possibly A. W. Hakewill (1808-1856), who poured scorn on Pugin's hypothesis that buildings could demonstrate the religious state of the country and society. The author declared, "The works of the two centuries preceding the Reformation were not linked with the religious feelings of the nation".<sup>423</sup> In other words, he did not believe that the massive medieval programme of church and cathedral building had been an expression of the piety of the people. He maintained that "fashion, not feeling" was responsible for the various styles of architecture before the Reformation,<sup>424</sup> even if true of post-Reformation architecture. He contended that Pugin had invented the whole thing in order to recruit antiquarians for the Church of Rome! Yet, this implication of a popish plot was to be the basis of future criticism of Pugin's later writing.

Not all criticism, therefore, was architectural. An anonymous writer in the *Salisbury and Wiltshire Herald* urged Protestants to be vigilant and warned others "not to yield to the siren voice of Romish sophistry, but resist every attempt at Popish encroachment" for "Popery is unchangeable; and the character of Popery, Sir, is written in lines of blood,

---

<sup>423</sup> Anon. 'Architect', 'Reply to "Contrasts" by A. Welby Pugin' (London: J. Masters 1837), p.16. A. W. Hakewill (1808-1856) studied under the neo-Classical architect Decimus Burton. Hakewill published several works on architecture including An Apology for the Architectural Monstrosities of London (1835). See Howard Colvin, A Biographical Dictionary of British Architects (1600-1840) (London: John Murray 1978), p.377, re Henry Hakewill (his father).

<sup>424</sup> *Ibid.*, p.6.

rendered legible by the blaze of Smithfield's lurid fires!" (a reference to Queen Mary's execution of the Protestants martyrs).<sup>425</sup>

iii) Reply to criticism.

Pugin replied to Fane in the pro liberal and Whig *Salisbury and Wiltshire Journal*, a rival publication to the Tory biased *Salisbury and Wiltshire Herald*.<sup>426</sup> He replied to more general criticism with a small pamphlet titled An Apology for Contrasts (1837). In advancing his views on the nature of the Church, he rejected the Church of England in particular and Protestantism in general: "the system should be changed", he urged.<sup>427</sup> "Catholics, in their turn, must now become the assailants, expose the disgraceful origin of Protestantism, the debasing and destructive influence of its system".<sup>428</sup> He had taken a partisan position against Protestants. With neophyte zeal, he boldly stepped into the arena with them, keen to do battle.

He was both confrontational and undignified in this new publication. His approach - his choice of violent words, his antagonistic reference to his contemporaries, his lack of restraint in attacking widely held beliefs about Protestantism - was completely different to Wiseman's moderate approach. Moreover, while there had been a tradition of bold controversy undertaken by English Catholics such as Milner and Challoner, Pugin took it much further.

"Controversy with Protestants has, for the last 300 years, consisted, almost entirely, of malignant falsehoods advanced by them against the Catholic Church, and satisfactory

---

<sup>425</sup> An anonymous writer, "Popery unchangeable", *Salisbury and Wiltshire Herald* (5 Nov. 1836).

<sup>426</sup> A. W. N. Pugin, "To the Editor of the Salisbury and Wiltshire Journal" in *Salisbury and Wiltshire Journal* (a Catholic periodical - 26 September 1836), p.116.

<sup>427</sup> Pugin, An Apology for Contrasts (1837), p.4.

<sup>428</sup> *Ibid.*, p.4.

answers and refutations of such attacks”, he alleged.<sup>429</sup> He intended to carry on giving “satisfactory answers and refutations”.

Contrasts, he stated, focussed on the difference between the Catholic preservation of faith and the way Protestantism had destroyed it:

My book treats of England - of the overthrow of the Catholic religion in this country ... It is the broad principle of erecting the most glorious temples to the worship of God, and consecrating the highest efforts of art to his honour, for which I am contending. These are feelings which I assert belong exclusively to Catholicism; and that they have entirely disappeared wherever Protestantism has been established, is a fact so thoroughly borne out by all history, that few will venture to deny it.<sup>430</sup>

Historical and critical inquiry would support his hypothesis.<sup>431</sup> The subject, he said, was “one of a tangible nature”;<sup>432</sup> the architecture itself would support any historical examination.<sup>433</sup>

One who was not convinced was the architectural critic W. H. Leeds (1786-1866). The seven months since its publication had not lessened his strong feelings of condemnation of Contrasts. His article “A Batch of Architects” in *Fraser’s Magazine*<sup>434</sup> was full of contempt, abuse and ridicule. He called Pugin “very ignorant”,<sup>435</sup> a “Smelfungus”<sup>436</sup> and “an insolent reviler”<sup>437</sup> of the architectural profession and asked why should he “mix up religion at all with a subject professing to be strictly architectural?”<sup>438</sup> Moreover, he rightly thought

---

<sup>429</sup> *Ibid.*, p.3.

<sup>430</sup> *Ibid.*, p.7, footnote. Reference to Contrasts 1836.

<sup>431</sup> *Ibid.*, p.5.

<sup>432</sup> *Ibid.*, p.5.

<sup>433</sup> *Ibid.*, p.5.

<sup>434</sup> W. H. Leeds, “A Batch of Architects”, *Fraser’s Magazine* (London: James Fraser March 1837), Vol. 15, pp.324-339. William Henry Leeds (1786-1866) was an architectural critic – see Margaret Belcher, A. W. N. Pugin, p.468.

<sup>435</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 15, p.330.

<sup>436</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 15, p.333.

<sup>437</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 15, p.330.

<sup>438</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 15, p.330.

that Pugin's choice of subject could be reversed to show medieval buildings in a bad light and nineteenth-century ones in a good.<sup>439</sup>

11) Pugin uses the medieval method of exegesis and interpretation for his new publication.

Having adopted similar levels of meaning as those used by the medieval liturgists, Pugin continued to enlarge on his interpretation of ecclesiastical architecture in The Apology for Contrasts. He again set out to bring out these various levels of meaning.

12) Pugin's exposition of the allegorical meaning.

13) His exposition of the doctrinal level of meaning.

i) The nature of the true Church.

Pugin interpreted the state of Protestant buildings as symbolising decay and neglect of faith. He declared that everything Catholic was wonderful and full of life, while everything Protestant was debased and wretched, and would eventually die. Protestantism had latched on to what had previously been a Catholic Church in England. But new Protestant churches, particularly the Church of England, even with the remnants of Catholicism that they contained, were certain to fail eventually. They were already moving to non-existence. "The truth is, the Established Church of this country will die a natural death, that is to say, it will fall by the wretched working of its own system. It is an affair of purely human invention".<sup>440</sup> It was already tottering, he thought.<sup>441</sup> Other Protestant churches, like the Church of England, would continue to crumble and eventually cease to be.

---

<sup>439</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 15, p.332.

<sup>440</sup> Pugin, An Apology for Contrasts (1836), p.21.

14) Pugin's exposition of the moral level of meaning.

A gradual deterioration in the standards and values of society was the direct result of the Reformation; society since then had become increasingly worldly and less holy. All that was accomplished in the name of Protestantism was debased, done for ulterior motives, for worldly gain or selfish reasons. There was no charity in it, no love of God or man, no desire to do anything in the name of God or to dedicate anything to Him. In Pugin's view, Protestantism debased society and its architecture expressed these poor moral qualities.

Even St Paul's Cathedral in London, built by Protestants and yet much admired, was not, claimed Pugin, an expression of faith; rather it was an expression of Protestantism, of a man-made, worldly and pretended religion. St Paul's was not built by voluntary and loving contributions from the faithful, but by compulsory taxes levied by the government of the time.<sup>442</sup> It was, he said, "the most expensive exhibition in the metropolis".<sup>443</sup> It exhibited, he continued, "a sort of ecclesiastical shew, on the same principle as a 'shilling night' at Vauxhall".<sup>444</sup> In other words, people did not visit it for worship, but simply because it attracted by its "concerts". To Pugin, St Paul's symbolised all that was worldly and hypocritical. Nevertheless, he admitted that it was "a noble building"<sup>445</sup> and thought that it could be adapted to Catholic worship by changing its arrangement to a more Catholic one. This could be done by appropriating it to the rites and ceremonies of the Catholic Church; a simple matter since it already had a nave and two aisles.<sup>446</sup> The additions of an altar, chapels and a screen would make it complete.<sup>447</sup>

---

<sup>441</sup> *Ibid.*, p.22.

<sup>442</sup> *Ibid.*, p.15.

<sup>443</sup> *Ibid.*, p.15.

<sup>444</sup> *Ibid.*, p.11.

<sup>445</sup> *Ibid.*, p.16, footnote.

<sup>446</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.15-16, footnote.

<sup>447</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.15-16, footnote.

15) Anglican polemic.

i) Anglicans anxious to defend the Church of England.

Church-of-England men were already concerned that the Established Church was losing its authority; it was no longer the Church of the nation in the same way as before the constitutional reforms of 1828-32. They thought that it had deteriorated and showed signs of decay and lost a great deal of its power. The High Church party and the Tractarians had already set out to defend and strengthen it following Keble's sermon on National Apostasy in 1833. Anti-Protestant comments could not easily be ignored or swept aside. Impetus was given to their defence by such fresh attacks on Protestantism and the Established Church. Therefore, Pugin's remarks had struck an extremely sensitive spot.

Although Anglicans and Roman Catholics were keen to engage in debate in order to bring religion up to a higher standard in England, whichever Church it concerned, sectarian rivalry was rife. But, there was a genuine desire to review matters, to strengthen religion, to identify the true Church and a willingness to engage in debate in order to do so.

16) Anglican views on the nature of the Church.

i) The Church of England was Catholic.

Some Anglican controversialists, in particular the Tractarians, claimed that the Church of England was a Catholic Church and, further, that it was the true Catholic Church, though not Roman Catholic. This view led to much confusion. Others disagreed with the idea that the Church of England was Catholic and were Evangelical or Calvinistic in their views, or merely Protestant. One proof the Tractarians put forward was that the present Church of England could trace its doctrines and origins back to the Early Church, through an Apostolical Succession of bishops. After all, they argued, St Augustine had converted the British to Christianity, and this was evidence that the Church of England was Catholic and a

member of the Universal Catholic Church. Roman bishops could not claim St Augustine as their predecessor because their religion had been changed at the Council of Trent; it was not therefore the same religion as St Augustine's, even though they granted that it still had an Apostolical Succession of bishops. The Church of Rome was consequently of recent origin and was schismatical. As such, they argued, its bishops in England had no right to encourage the English nation to join them. The Church of Rome had no right to interfere in the religion of England.

ii) Anglican views on disunity.

Some High Church Anglicans, such as William Palmer of Worcester College (1803-1885), replied to the Roman Catholic claim that disunity was a symptom of Protestantism and that this could be seen within the Church of England itself. They stated that even if there were parties within the Church of England, similar parties divided on the same questions existed in the Church of Rome; viz. Dominicans, Augustinians, Jesuits, Ultramontanes and Gallicans. The Roman Church certainly could not claim any exclusive internal unity. If it could not claim unity, then neither could it be the true Church.

iii) Tractarian view that the Church of England was not a State invention.

The Tractarians thought that an historical inquiry into faith and the nature of the Church, which Wiseman and other Roman Catholic controversialists championed, far from proving the Church of England to be Protestant, would verify that it was indisputably a Catholic Church under divine guidance and not intrinsically a State invention, dependent for life and authority on the State, as Roman Catholics claimed. The Romanists argue, stated William Palmer, that

a church which by her fundamental principle is deprived of all spiritual authority, and which merely relies on the civil power for protection against anarchy, cannot be a true church of Christ.<sup>448</sup>

He disclaimed the notion that the Church of England was a State invention.

While some Anglicans agreed with Roman Catholics that Henry was not a reformer, his character as far as the Church of England was concerned, was irrelevant since it did not affect it in any way. They contended that from a position of justice or reason the Church of England should not be identified with the inadequacies of the monarchs who supported its reformation. Moreover, the Protestant position was that Cranmer and other Reformers could be easily defended from accusations of hypocrisy, perjury, and other abominable crimes suggested by the Roman Catholic controversialists. Protestants thought that every effort had been made by the Romanists to blacken Cranmer's character. Certainly Pugin had not written kind words about Cranmer.

Roman Catholic controversialists, including Pugin, pinpointed the "change of religion" to the Reformation. Rev. Thomas Lathbury (1798-1865), a High Church Anglican clergyman in the archdeaconry of Bath and a noted ecclesiastical historian,<sup>449</sup> attempted to swing the argument around by claiming that while the doctrines of the Church of England could not be pinpointed to a particular period, those of the Church of Rome could. "If the Popish doctrines are true, those of the Protestant churches must be false. Both cannot be true. The Papists, therefore, assert that our doctrines were never heard of till the Reformation".<sup>450</sup>

---

<sup>448</sup> William Palmer, Treatise on the Church of Christ: designed chiefly for the use of students of theology, Vol. I (London: Rivington 1838), p.426.

<sup>449</sup> Amongst Thomas Lathbury's publications were A History of the English Episcopacy, from the Period of the Long Parliament to the Act of Uniformity, with Notices of the Religious Parties of the time, and a Review of Ecclesiastical Affairs in England since the Reformation (London: 1836); A Review of a Sermon by the Rev. W. Jay on the English Reformation to the ...Roman Catholic Relief Bill in 1829, and the Charge of Novelty, Heresy, and Schism against the Church of Rome substantiated (London: 1838).

<sup>450</sup> Rev. Thomas Lathbury, Protestantism the Old Religion, Popery the New: or, Protestantism Scriptural and True, and Popery Unscriptural and False (London: Painter & Leslie c.1839, enlarged

This was simply not the case, he argued. The boot was really on the other foot. While the true Church should be able to trace its doctrines back to Jesus Christ and the Apostles, the Church of Rome simply could not do this. Pius IV had collected together all the “false doctrines of Rome” in 1564, he said.<sup>451</sup> These were, therefore, “the *new* dogmas of this recently established creed”.<sup>452</sup>

Lathbury’s intense dislike of Roman Catholics was evident. He later replied in a hostile manner to further publications by Pugin.

iv) The ‘Via Media’ position of the Church of England.

The Tractarians argued that most Roman Catholic polemic was directed at Protestantism in general and was not relevant to the Church of England; indeed, they believed it helped to strengthen their case that the Church of England was not Protestant, but Catholic. They considered it had always been different from Protestant Churches since it was a reformed Catholic Church that did not possess the corruptions of the Roman Church. As such, it had always been the true Catholic Church with a moderate, conciliatory, *sensible*, middle *Via Media* way that had no room for the extremes of Protestantism or Roman Catholicism. One of its main characteristics was that it was a peculiarly English as well as Catholic Church.

---

edition), p.17.

<sup>451</sup> *Ibid.*, p.5.

<sup>452</sup> *Ibid.*, p.5.

17) Pugin's controversial debate began to focus again on the Church of England rather than Protestantism in general.

i) Protestantism led to disunity.

Pugin believed unity was a feature of Catholicism. He supported earlier Roman Catholic controversialists by arguing in his Apology for Contrasts that disunity and fragmentation expressed the nature of Protestantism. He did not accept that the Church of England was a Catholic Church since he believed it had no continuity with the old medieval Catholic Church. Instead, he argued that, since the Church of England showed symptoms of disunity, it was proof that it was a Protestant Church. The Catholic Church in England, once the true Church and united, had been replaced by this Protestant Church of England without unity, demonstrated by its division into various parties including the "high-church party" and the "low-church, or evangelical set", who were really "rank Calvinists, disguised under the surplices of the Establishment".<sup>453</sup>

ii) St Augustine of Canterbury a Roman Catholic.

Pugin replied to the Anglican claim that St Augustine (of Canterbury) had converted England and therefore the Church of England could claim a Catholic Father and thus continuity. He argued that St Augustine was in fact a Roman Catholic who had come to England from Rome with the blessing of Pope Gregory the Great.<sup>454</sup> If the Catholic Church in England was understood to have its proper independent character, it still recognized the Pope in Rome as its spiritual head. The importance attached to the acceptance of the Pope as spiritual head was a Liberal Ultramontane view; it was a view that Pugin held.

---

<sup>453</sup> Pugin, An Apology for Contrasts (1837), p.22.

<sup>454</sup> *Ibid.*, p.26.

The medieval Church started by St Augustine was Catholic and had more of a claim to being called a Catholic Church, Pugin argued, than the Established Church which had only come into being at the Reformation. The Church of England could not, therefore, be the same Church as that started by St Augustine because it had never accepted the Pope as its spiritual head. And so, in Pugin's view, the Church of England could not be Catholic.

iii) The prayers of the Church of England were not original to that Church.

The creeds and prayers the English laity and clergy now admired in the Church of England had, Pugin claimed, all been appropriated from the pre-Reformation Catholic Church in England.<sup>455</sup> Cranmer, he argued, had been obliged to use part of the old Catholic services, prayers and Mass in the new liturgies because he was unable to create completely new Protestant alternatives - which was further evidence of Protestant lack of creativity:

Let them search into the ancient Missals and Breviaries of the Church, and they will find, verbatim, the very creeds and prayers, which they so justly extol as most sublime and appropriate.<sup>456</sup>

Cranmer's attempts to create new services only resulted in a confusion of Protestant and Catholic elements. Yet, the new service gradually destroyed the old faith. Thus, Anglican controversialists were, Pugin said, mistaken in their views.

iv) Remnants of Catholicism did not make the Church of England Catholic.

Pugin argued that the Established Church could not claim to be Catholic merely because it retained remnants of Catholicism. Remnants were not sufficient reason to claim continuity. It was a Protestant Church and always had been. Anyone looking at the decayed state of its organisation and churches, as well as its lack of worshippers, could see that that it

---

<sup>455</sup> *Ibid.*, p.19.

<sup>456</sup> *Ibid.*, p.19.

was not the true Church. Who but a senseless or completely biased person, he asked, would suggest otherwise?<sup>457</sup> Therefore, the deteriorated state of the Established Church, evident in its architecture, cancelled out any claim to continuity from remnants.

v) Fundamentals only in the Church of Rome.

Anglicans had suggested that the Church of Rome was in schism because it was guilty of certain additions and corruptions in its doctrines, which had been accepted at the Council of Trent. Pugin admitted that all was not perfect in the Church of Rome but argued that additions or even corruptions did not mean that fundamentals were impaired. It could have corruptions but these would not, for instance, interfere with its claim of continuity. Newman, too, in the same year of 1837, saw that this was possible. He stated that “Romanism *holds the foundation, or is the truth overlaid with corruptions*”.<sup>458</sup> Newman was later to reconsider the difficulty of distinguishing developments, corruptions, additions and Revelation in his Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine (1845), while Pugin focussed on the importance of these in 1837 and on Revelation in his Glossary (1844).

vi) Some Anglicans pretending to be Catholics.

Pugin contended, in a subtle reference to the Tractarians, that leading Anglicans were attempting to pass themselves off as Catholics although they were really Puritans at heart. When pressurised they would be reluctant to give up the Protestant elements in their religion, he said, while the Catholic elements only served to cover up the extent of their Church’s Protestantism. That some doctrines and elements still remained he had fully acknowledged in Contrasts; now he endorsed this in his Apology by arguing that if Catholic elements were

---

<sup>457</sup> *Ibid.*, p.33.

<sup>458</sup> John Henry Newman, Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church viewed relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism, Lecture I (London: J. G. and F. Rivington 1837), p.51.

taken away, a purely Protestant Church would be all too obvious. "Strip off the borrowed Catholic plumes, in which she now struts, and she will instantly be degraded to a level with the Puritan".<sup>459</sup>

vii) The Church of England devoid of the Holy Spirit.

The Church of England, in Pugin's view, was without divine guidance. It was, he contended, "an empty shell",<sup>460</sup> subject to continuing innovations and deterioration. Peel away the shell of corruptions from the Roman Church and the kernel of divine truths would be revealed; peel away the shell from the Church of England and it would be found empty; devoid of divine truths and the Holy Spirit. If Anglicans did this, said Pugin, they would find that "they only hold the *shell*; the kernel, - the essence has been extracted".<sup>461</sup>

viii) The Church of England a State-created Church.

Pugin expressed his belief that the true Church had continuity, which was symbolised by Catholic liturgy, including its architecture. He argued that the Church of England could not be the true Church because it could not demonstrate this continuity. Consequently, following in the footsteps of Challoner, John Milner and Wiseman, he made a great deal of the claim that the Church of England was a Church invented by men, "a great state engine",<sup>462</sup> "a Church got up for political motives"<sup>463</sup> which owed its very existence "to acts of parliament".<sup>464</sup> Its clergy, he wrote, were aware that "the promise of Christ to support his

---

<sup>459</sup> Pugin, An Apology for Contrasts (1837), p.15.

<sup>460</sup> *Ibid.*, p.18.

<sup>461</sup> *Ibid.*, p.18.

<sup>462</sup> *Ibid.*, p.21.

<sup>463</sup> *Ibid.*, p.21.

<sup>464</sup> *Ibid.*, p.21.

Church”<sup>465</sup> did not include their Church supported by “Cranmer and his associates in villainy”.<sup>466</sup> From Pugin’s viewpoint, this was a Church that had no precedent before the Reformation and there was no continuity with the Church of England.

It was precisely because the Anglican Church had been invented by the State, he argued, that Church-of-England men had become worried following the constitutional acts of 1828-32. Cries of “the Church in danger” had arisen simply because its clergy realized that, inasmuch as the State had created the Church, it could just as easily destroy it.<sup>467</sup> “What ministers are in power”<sup>468</sup> greatly concerned its clergymen and, consequently, “a general election throws them into a feverish state of excitement”.<sup>469</sup> They were thrown into “a dreadful state of consternation”<sup>470</sup> by these events for they knew they could expect no spiritual help.<sup>471</sup>

ix) The ‘Via Media’ not real.

Pugin made an appeal to “Anglican controversialists” in his Apology for Contrasts. He beseeched those who held *Via Media* views of the Church of England to “examine narrowly all they admire”<sup>472</sup> and they would discover that all they held most dear and admired in worship, and everything “sublime and devotional in prayer, orthodox in doctrine, or fine in art”,<sup>473</sup> had been taken or survived from earlier expressions of Catholicism.<sup>474</sup>

---

<sup>465</sup> *Ibid.*, p.21.

<sup>466</sup> *Ibid.*, p.21.

<sup>467</sup> *Ibid.*, p.21.

<sup>468</sup> *Ibid.*, p.21.

<sup>469</sup> *Ibid.*, p.21.

<sup>470</sup> *Ibid.*, p.21.

<sup>471</sup> *Ibid.*, p.21.

<sup>472</sup> *Ibid.*, p.18.

<sup>473</sup> *Ibid.*, p.18.

<sup>474</sup> *Ibid.*, p.18.

These elements were neither productions of Protestantism in general nor the Established Church in particular. Catholics, not Protestants, had built the great buildings in which they assembled for worship. These cathedrals and churches “existed centuries before their modern faith was dreamt of, and they then existed ten times more glorious than they now behold them.”<sup>475</sup>

Now, Catholic elements in the Church of England (using its buildings as evidence), even at their best, were merely faded products of Catholicism which, in their correct (Catholic) context, were vastly brighter and immeasurably more resplendent.

x) Anglicans ignorant of ordinances and practices.

Pugin believed that ignorance of their own ordinances and practices was responsible for the misconceptions of Anglicans. Wiseman had earlier suggested that Protestants rarely examined doctrines because of their narrow and limiting focus on the Scriptures.<sup>476</sup> Pugin, followed this lead, but concentrated upon Anglicans. He declared that if they were put to the test, they would be unable to produce any examples of Protestant doctrines, while even the borrowed Catholic ones they held were treated with indifference:

Church of England-men, in these days seem to be perfectly unacquainted with the discipline that is *laid down* by their Church for the observance of its members ... If my limits permitted, I would bring much forward to shew modern Church of England-men how little they know of the real tenets of their religion. The fact is, all unity being lost, everyone judges and legislates for himself in ecclesiastical matters, so that doctrines and observances are alike become obsolete, and are regarded with the utmost indifference.<sup>477</sup>

Tractarians argued that they would not have to produce new doctrines because the Church of England was Catholic anyway and its doctrines and dogmas were Catholic and not

---

<sup>475</sup> *Ibid.*, p.19.

<sup>476</sup> Wiseman, Lectures (1835-36), p.7.

<sup>477</sup> Pugin, An Apology for Contrasts, pp.19-21, footnote.

new, although they had been neglected for so long and had faded and become distorted. This was precisely Pugin's argument; that turning away from God resulted in aspects of faith becoming obscured and distorted. Moreover, since only a memory of fundamental truths existed, these truths would fade away with that memory. Therefore, in his view, the Church of England did not have a living faith, only an ever fading memory of it.

Pugin implored Anglicans to study and research their own system; the tenets of their religion, their Canon Laws, rubrics and rites, their ordinances, Creeds and prayers.<sup>478</sup> Their studies would lead them inevitably to recognize the truth of Catholicism. "I can truly assert", he maintained, "that the greatest stride I made in my conversion to the Catholic faith was, in endeavouring to become a strict Church of England-man, by studying its system".<sup>479</sup> Study of this nature, he believed, would open their eyes to truth and it would inevitably lead them, as it had himself, to accept Roman Catholicism. "I feel confident", he declared, "that a similar attempt in others would be followed by a similar result".<sup>480</sup> He pressed them to consider the beauty and propriety of the Roman rite, particularly in an English setting:

Solemnity of worship is only to be found in the Catholic Church; and let those, who would behold it, repair to those majestic churches, which still maintain unchanged, unimpaired, those rites, from whose celebration they were erected: where the high altar stands bright and glorious; where the choir is filled with devout ecclesiastics; and each chapel contains its reverential worshippers; where the sculptured images of saintly men and holy deeds are undefaced and unbroken, and where the same spirit which, centuries ago, first instigated the glorious pile, still dwells in the hearts of the faithful, who flock within its walls.<sup>481</sup>

---

<sup>478</sup> Pugin made references to these in An Apology for Contrasts (1837), p.19 and An Apology for Christian Architecture, p.21.

<sup>479</sup> Pugin, An Apology for Contrasts (1837), p.21, footnote.

<sup>480</sup> *Ibid.*, p.21, footnote.

<sup>481</sup> *Ibid.*, p.16.

18) Protestants made a stand.

i) The Martyrs' Memorial Committee.

Roman Catholic attacks on Protestantism and Cranmer and his associates deeply upset many Anglicans, particularly the vast majority with Protestant ideals. Moreover, these Anglicans also resisted the revival of Catholicism by the Tractarians. Indeed, they suspected that the Tractarians were more than a little sympathetic to the Roman Catholics since they both shared the goal of reviving Catholicism in England. Consequently, there were hostile factions within the Church of England itself.

These anti-Catholic Anglicans in Oxford joined forces and set up a committee. Their local leader was the High Churchman and controversialist C. P. Golightly (1807-1885) and they met together in his house and agreed that the best method of advancing Protestant ideals and protecting their martyrs from Catholic criticism was by undertaking the construction of a Memorial to the Protestant martyrs Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer in Oxford. The Bishop of Oxford, Richard Bagot (1782-1854), and the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, all supported the Committee.

The Martyrs' Memorial Committee published their inaugural Address on 17 November 1838. They stated that they wished to erect a memorial as an expression of "religious thankfulness" and all were invited to contribute to the work who loved the "Protestant Reformed Religion".<sup>482</sup>

ii) Pugin scorned the idea of a memorial to Protestant Reformers.

Pugin quickly wrote A Letter on the Proposed Protestant Memorial to Cranmer, Ridley, & Latymer<sup>483</sup>: Addressed to the subscribers to and promoters of that undertaking

---

<sup>482</sup> Address of the Martyrs' Memorial Committee (17 November 1838).

<sup>483</sup> Pugin used the archaic spelling of Latimer.

(1839). He was at first amused and then angered by their publication.<sup>484</sup> It mocked the truth, he remarked.

Until this time, Pugin's main concern had been to promote his views on the nature of the true Church; that these views were hostile to Protestant beliefs was unavoidable. His Letter on the Protestant Memorial was more directly challenging. If his earlier writing had been confrontational then this publication was doubly so. Indeed, he exhibited little fear of controversy in seriously questioning the qualifications of Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer for Christian martyrdom.

Pugin's Letter also showed his tendency to use strong and abusive language when moved by deep and intense emotions, designed to produce a response from those to whom it was aimed. The "martyrs" exhibited, he stated, "an almost unrivalled compound of dissimulation, cruelty, and weakness" and were "vile blasphemous impostors, pretending inspiration while setting forth false doctrines".<sup>485</sup> He said that he intended to expose them. He believed Protestants of his day were unaccustomed to a Roman Catholic taking such a forthright stand and to "the truth set forth in this plain and undisguised manner".<sup>486</sup> But the time had come and he fully intended to enlighten them.

Pugin had previously accused Anglicans in general of being ignorant about their religion; now he threw the same accusation at a particular group of Church-of-England men. He believed they had proposed the Memorial out of ignorance. Otherwise, he argued, if they had been aware of the facts, they would have kept quiet about their supposed martyrs and even attempted to conceal "the disgraceful origin" of the Established Church.<sup>487</sup>

---

<sup>484</sup> A. W. N. Pugin, A Letter on the Proposed Protestant Memorial (London: Booker and Dolman 1839), p.3.

<sup>485</sup> *Ibid.*, p.14.

<sup>486</sup> *Ibid.*, p.26.

<sup>487</sup> *Ibid.*, p.4.

To their amazement, the day before their next Committee meeting, Pugin contacted the principal subscribers at Oxford personally and thrust copies of his Letter into the hands of the “big-wigs”<sup>488</sup> in the University. Some were not impressed. Newman later commented that Pugin “(in spite of his vulgar letter about the Cranmer Memorial) is a very good fellow, I do think”.<sup>489</sup> Pugin’s Diary traced events: “Finished letter about Cranmer” (6 January 1839), “Cranmer letter published” (26 January), “went to Oxford ... delivered letter” (29 January). He also wrote to Thomas Doyle (1793-1879)<sup>490</sup> outlining this bold move. “I mean to have another brush with them before Long (sic)”, he remarked.<sup>491</sup> Pugin’s strength of feeling was obvious; he was a man with a mission. Newman, though, was at first cautious about the Memorial: “I think it may do good”, he commented. “It is *not* to be a monument, which is a gain”.<sup>492</sup> He later developed his views on the matter.

iii) The aim of Pugin’s Letter was to discredit the Protestant “martyrs” and suggest English Catholic martyrs instead.

In his Letter, Pugin attempted character assassinations of Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer; they were not holy men with strong beliefs as the Protestants, in their ignorance, believed. Cranmer, wrote Pugin, was never a servant of God. He was always under the influence of something or other - worldly passions, the king, the Roman Catholics and fear. Latimer and Ridley were no better, he claimed. They were, like Cranmer, unprincipled and

---

<sup>488</sup> Pugin to Doyle (20 February 1839), MS SAA St G. See M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.112, postscript.

<sup>489</sup> Newman to Thomas Mozley (7 March 1841) in G. Tracey, ed., Letters and Diaries, Vol. VIII, p.57.

<sup>490</sup> Thomas Doyle was a Catholic divine and a friend of Wiseman. It was owing to Doyle’s exertions that St George’s Cathedral, Southwark (which Pugin designed) was built. Doyle became provost of St George’s.

<sup>491</sup> Pugin to Doyle (20 February 1839), in Southwark Cathedral Archives, MS SAA St G. See M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.112, postscript.

<sup>492</sup> Newman to Frederick Rogers (14 January 1839) in Dessain, ed., Letters and Diaries, Vol. VII, p.12.

weak men. Pugin asked, "What a miserable foundation does your establishment stand upon, if such men as these are its pillars!"<sup>493</sup>

They were not the real founders of the real Church in England, he declared. The real founders had been St Gregory, St Augustine of Canterbury, Bede, Alcuin, the Cuthberts, the Anselms, the Wilfrids, and "all the Saxon saints and martyrs of this realm".<sup>494</sup> He did not mention any Roman martyrs. Moreover, the real Church of the ancestors of the supporters of the Memorial was the Catholic Church in England not the Church of England. Pugin repeated his view that ignorance was behind modern Anglican views. They had no idea, he said, that they were, in fact, attempting to suppress their own true religion.<sup>495</sup> He suggested Thomas à Becket would be a far worthier subject for a memorial, in a comment in support of Froude who had some years earlier written several articles for the *British Magazine* about St Thomas à Becket, which Newman and Keble had published in the Remains as "History of the contest between Thomas à Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury and Henry 11".<sup>496</sup> Pugin remarked that St Thomas "may then seem more deserving of a monument".<sup>497</sup> This comment demonstrated Roman Catholic support for the Tractarians, albeit from only one Roman Catholic.

iv) Pugin repeated his claim that the Church of England was a State creation.

Finally, Pugin reiterated once again in a most persistent manner, that the Established Church was in reality a "*great state engine*"<sup>498</sup> and its religion "*sprang entirely from temporal*

---

<sup>493</sup> Pugin, Letter on the Proposed Protestant Memorial, p.20.

<sup>494</sup> *Ibid.*, p.21.

<sup>495</sup> *Ibid.* p.23.

<sup>496</sup> John Henry Newman & John Keble, eds., Remains of the Late Reverend Hurrell Froude M.A.: Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford (London: J. G. & F. Rivington 1839), Vol. 2, appendix I, p.561 *et seq.*

<sup>497</sup> Pugin, Letter on the Proposed Protestant Memorial, p.30.

<sup>498</sup> *Ibid.*, p.28.

causes".<sup>499</sup> It could not therefore claim continuity from the Early Church. He also repeated his words of warning that since the State had given birth to the Church of England, it could just as easily destroy it by another Act of Parliament.<sup>500</sup>

v) Reaction to Pugin's Letter.

The most immediate reaction to Pugin's Letter came from the Anglican vicar, Rev. Thomas Lathbury.<sup>501</sup> In a small pamphlet, Strictures on a Letter addressed by Mr. Pugin to the Supporters of the Martyrs' Memorial at Oxford (1830), Lathbury spoke plainly. "The pamphlet is", he stated, "a tissue of falsehoods from beginning to end"! He believed that Pugin's authorities were not Anglicans such as Stow, Hollinshed, Heylin, Collier, Strype, Dugdale, Foxe, and Burnet, as he had claimed, but Roman Catholics such as "Saunders, Rastal, Pole, and others of a similar description".<sup>502</sup> There may have been a grain of truth in this since it has already been argued that Pugin did not take his judgements from English Protestant historians but merely selected his material from their works to support his own. On the other hand, there was little evidence that he took his views from these named Roman Catholics.

Pugin had asked, "What miserable foundation does your Establishment rest upon?". This was easy to answer, said Lathbury. "Our Church is built upon the rock Jesus Christ".<sup>503</sup> It was therefore the true Church. "We have the Bible, the three creeds, and the early Fathers with us".<sup>504</sup> Pugin could not, he said, claim this of the Church of Rome: "we are willing to

---

<sup>499</sup> *Ibid.*, p.27.

<sup>500</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.29-30.

<sup>501</sup> Rev. Thomas Lathbury had earlier commented on Pugin's Contrasts.

<sup>502</sup> Rev. Thomas Lathbury, Strictures on a Letter addressed by Mr. Pugin to the Supporters of the Martyrs Memorial at Oxford (Undated but probably 1839), p.4.

<sup>503</sup> *Ibid.*, p.7.

<sup>504</sup> *Ibid.*, p.8.

leave the spurious Fathers and the Schoolmen to the Papists. All their peculiar doctrines are unsupported by Scripture, and consequently false".<sup>505</sup>

Lathbury's High Anglican position emphasised dependence on the Scriptures, the written Word of God, and the Church of antiquity. At the same time, he rejected the doctrines of the Council of Trent. Lathbury's article did little to defend the chosen martyrs; it was more a defence of the Church of England, a Church that could, in his view, demonstrate continuity.

Pugin had now become a leading participant in the continuing debate about the revival of Catholicism in England. Golightly, the leader of the Memorial Committee, was to resurface a couple of years later (1843) with yet more animosity towards Pugin concerning his commission for the rebuilding of Balliol College.

---

<sup>505</sup> *Ibid.*, p.7.

## Chapter Five - A NEW VERSION OF CONTRASTS

1) Pugin's relationship with the Tractarians.

i) Increased visits to Oxford.

Pugin had already made contact with at least one Anglican at Oxford, notably Newman's curate at Littlemore, John Rouse Bloxam (a Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford), at the beginning of 1839, due to his Letter on the Proposed Protestant Memorial. He continued his visits, with the encouragement of Bishop Walsh, in order to establish links with those Anglicans interested in reviving Catholicism. By the end of 1839, he had begun to form friendships with a few leading Tractarians – Frederick Oakeley, F. W. Faber, W. G. Ward and J. D. Dalgairns, as well as Bloxam. Wilfrid Ward described the last as being Pugin's "most intimate friend".<sup>506</sup> The visits strengthened these friendships and when he was not visiting, he was exchanging letters with them.

"Pugin came as a Catholic to Oxford to preach to the Tractarians the gospel of Christian Art and of the Faith of Rome", stated E. S. Purcell. "By his genius and profound faith in the Catholic Church, and its ancient traditions, religious and artistic, he acted as pioneer, pointing out to many the way which had led his own heart and soul to Rome".<sup>507</sup> As Ferrey remarked, "Though Pugin was not much professionally employed at Oxford, yet he frequently visited friends at the colleges".<sup>508</sup> Yet, while he made regular monthly visits there for almost six years from 1839 until the end of 1844, thereafter there was only one recorded visit on 23 August 1848.<sup>509</sup> A great number of his friends in Oxford became Roman Catholics in 1844-45 and this may be the reason for the end of his visits. He did not even visit Bloxam

---

<sup>506</sup> Wilfrid Ward, Wiseman, Vol. I, p.371.

<sup>507</sup> E. S. Purcell, Life of Cardinal Manning, Vol. I, p.662.

<sup>508</sup> Benjamin Ferrey, Recollections, pp.187-188.

<sup>509</sup> Alexandra Wedgwood, A. W. N. Pugin and the Pugin Family, p.64. Pugin Diary (23 August 1848).

after 1844, although he continued to correspond with him up until the early months of 1852. References to Pugin's visits indicate that all his friends in Oxford were Anglicans; there is no evidence that he associated with artists or architects and there were almost no Roman Catholics there at that time anyway.

It was during one of these visits (certainly sometime in 1839) that Bloxam introduced Pugin to William George Ward (1812-1882).<sup>510</sup> Pugin, in his usual manner, was initially impressed:

Pugin, with his love of mediævalism, saw with satisfaction on Ward's table the *Summa* of St. Thomas and the works of St. Buonaventure, in huge folio volumes; and their student's enthusiasm for the Church of the Middle Ages struck a chord of common sympathy. To Pugin this signified the existence of that devotion to Gothic architecture which was in his eyes a necessary corollary following from the true Catholic spirit.<sup>511</sup>

The *Summa Theologica* (c. 1266) was St Thomas Aquinas's most important theological text on the Christian mysteries. Buonaventure and other Franciscans composed other *Summae*, but with more of a leaning to St Augustine than Aristotle. Pugin was evidently familiar with the works of St Thomas. Neither Aquinas nor Buonaventure mentioned Gothic architecture. Therefore, the suggestion is that Pugin's interest in the medieval period extended further than architecture and included theology and doctrine.

ii) A commission at Balliol College, Oxford.

Soon Ward and Oakeley were promoting Pugin's name in Oxford. Ward had been a Fellow at Balliol College since 1834. He and his colleague Oakeley had some influence there amongst the other Fellows and persuaded them to commission Pugin as architect for the college rebuilding and renovation. The obstacle was Richard Jenkyns (1782-1854), the

---

<sup>510</sup> Wilfrid Ward, William George Ward and the Oxford Movement (London: Macmillan and Co. 1889), p.154.

<sup>511</sup> *Ibid.*, p.154.

Master, who was against employing a Roman Catholic, even if he was the leading authority on Gothic architecture. But Oakeley assured him that Pugin was the best man for the job and emphasised the care he took with commissions: he would suddenly appear when the workmen were least expecting him to check on their work.<sup>512</sup>

Jenkyns somewhat reluctantly agreed to Pugin starting the work and allowed him to visit Balliol in order to measure the site and to discuss requirements during 1839 and 1840. Writing to Lord Shrewsbury, Pugin mentioned that he had been “arranging Balliol College”.<sup>513</sup> He speedily produced a very fine set of drawings, which he sent to the college. “I have had some very satisfactory letters from Oxford since my drawings arrived. They seem quite delighted with them”, he commented.<sup>514</sup> It looked as though the construction work could commence by 1841 or thereabouts.

iii) Only an acquaintanceship with John Henry Newman.

Pugin had his doubts about Newman; was he as truly for the Catholic cause as he claimed to be? He had read with delight Newman’s Church of the Fathers, which had been published in February 1840. Although it was “hardly more than the words and works of the Fathers”, Newman had made the mistake of writing “the good old time of king George III” at the beginning of the chapter. This caused Pugin some disquiet since he considered it a low point in the religious life of the country.<sup>515</sup>

---

<sup>512</sup> MS. D21 50B, Pugin Papers re rebuilding of Balliol College, Balliol College Archives.

<sup>513</sup> Alexandra Wedgwood, A.W.N. Pugin and the Pugin Family, p.106, MS letter from Pugin to Lord Shrewsbury (13 April 1840), but incorrectly dated 1843 since Pugin was preparing these drawings in 1840. Not included in Margaret Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, for the year 1840.

<sup>514</sup> *Ibid.*, p.106.

<sup>515</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (28 June 1841), MS. 528/11, Magdalen College Archives. See M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.192.

Pugin's visits to Oxford continued in February<sup>516</sup> and March 1840. At this time Newman was planning his "college" at Littlemore. "I suppose you do not know any superior specimen of an architect whom one could consult relative to it", he asked S. F. Wood on 17 March 1840.<sup>517</sup> Newman himself already knew one. A few days later, Pugin visited Oxford. On 29 March, he wrote to Lord Shrewsbury's chaplain and liturgist Dr. Daniel Rock (1799-1871), "I could ill afford the time for my unexpected *stay* at Oxford but do you blame me? I have every reason to believe and hope my visit there was productive of much good".<sup>518</sup> By May, Newman was fired with enthusiasm. "Were I a draughtsman I could hit off something good", he commented to Thomas Mozley.<sup>519</sup> He wanted study cells, a library and a chapel; it may be that he had already discussed requirements.

At this time, Newman preferred Gothic to neo-Classical. As James Patrick comments, "Newman still shared Pugin's dislike for the buildings of Renaissance Rome".<sup>520</sup> He preferred Gothic and joined the Oxford Society for Promoting the Study of Gothic Architecture.<sup>521</sup> Mozley said that in 1839, Newman "was decidedly interested in Gothic, determined, as he later wrote, to recover for his church (St Mary's, Oxford) as much of its

---

<sup>516</sup> Wilfrid Ward, The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman, vol. I, p.371.

<sup>517</sup> Gerard Tracey, ed., Letters and Diaries Vol. VII, p.267. Newman to S. F. Wood (17 March 1840).

<sup>518</sup> Pugin to Dr. Rock (29 March 1840). Southwark Diocesan Archives, Pugin/Rock papers. Not included in M. Belcher's, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, but see Anne Mozley, The Letters and Correspondence, p.287. She dates the letter 25 November 1840. Dr Daniel Rock wrote Hierurgia, or the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass Expounded (1833) and The Church of our Fathers (1849-1853), which were both about the history of liturgy in England and about the Sarum rite.

<sup>519</sup> G. Tracey, ed., Letters and Diaries Vol. VII, p.304. Newman to Thomas Mozley (20 May 1840).

<sup>520</sup> James Patrick, "Newman, Pugin and Gothic", in Victorian Studies (Winter 1981), Vol. 24, no. 2, p.193.

<sup>521</sup> James Patrick, "Newman, Pugin and Gothic", p.190. See also James F. White, The Cambridge Movement: The Ecclesiologists and the Gothic Revival (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1962). 24.

ancient heritage as might ‘strengthen and beautify it’”.<sup>522</sup> He consequently chose Gothic for his church at Littlemore.

iv) More commissions in and around Oxford.

In May, Pugin visited Oxford again. He wrote in his Diary on 11 May 1840, “At Ramsgate sent off Oxford Church”.<sup>523</sup> Alexandra Wedgwood claims that this Oxford Church is unknown; it may have been Radford. Pugin’s hand might, however, be detected in Newman’s Gothic revival church at Littlemore. Bloxam was curate there from 1837-40 and undertook new work to the interior decoration, including the addition of beam angels, encaustic tiles (which were Minton tiles to Pugin’s designs), pews and stained glass windows.

Pugin noted in his Diary that he travelled to the Continent in July 1840. While he was away, Bloxam was collecting money for four stained glass windows. The subjects had already been determined - ‘the good mens, the good womens, the bachelors and the maids’ windows. The commission was contracted with Thomas Willement in August (Pugin was his chief designer of stained glass windows until 1845). During the same month, Pugin was in Oxford (from 20-22 August 1840).<sup>524</sup> In October, he wrote in his Diary, “Went to Oxford. Dined at Exeter ... All day with Mr. Bloxham [sic]”.<sup>525</sup>

Other small parish churches were being altered to a more Catholic arrangement as Newman approvingly mentioned to Miss Holmes in July. “Iffley Church is going to be set to rights - and Sandford Church has had a tower built and the inside reformed in a very Catholic way”.<sup>526</sup>

---

<sup>522</sup> James Patrick, “Newman, Pugin and Gothic”, p.189.

<sup>523</sup> Alexandra Wedgwood, A. W. N. Pugin and the Pugin Family, p.45.

<sup>524</sup> *Ibid.*, p.46. Pugin Diary (20-21 August 1840).

<sup>525</sup> M. C. Church, ed. Life and Letters of Dean Church (London 1895), pp.26-7. Pugin Diary (29-30 October 1840), see Wedgwood, A. W. N. Pugin and the Pugin Family, p.46.

<sup>526</sup> G. Tracey, ed., Letters and Diaries Vol. VII, p.360. Newman to Miss M.R. Giberne 17 July 1840.

Pugin was certainly busy working on several Anglican churches, including “Oxford, Banbury Churches, etc”.<sup>527</sup> Bloxam also gained him a commission for Tubney parish church in Berkshire.

2) Wiseman’s arrival at Oscott.

i) Pugin already well established at Oscott when Wiseman arrived.

By the time Wiseman arrived at Oscott to take up his duties on 16 September 1840, Pugin had established his influence there. After his conversion he had visited Oscott and impressed Bishop Walsh. In 1837, he had been appointed Professor of Ecclesiastical Antiquities and given a series of lectures, some of which he later published in 1843. He realised that the training of clergy would be the key to the acceptance of his liturgical views and he became a popular lecturer who instilled in the seminarians an enthusiasm for the Gothic Revival. Pugin supplanted the Catholic architect Robert Potter in 1839 for work on St Mary’s College, Oscott, supplying architectural details and furniture. At the consecration of the Potter Chapel on 29-30 May 1838, Pugin was Master of Ceremonies<sup>528</sup> and, under his direction, the clergy were vested in full Gothic chasubles, for which he was to be later criticised. Pugin also designed two Gothic lodges at Oscott. By 1841, he was also communicating his ideas to the students at the other main seminaries, St Cuthbert’s College, Ushaw, where he designed many of the buildings, including the Chapel, and St Edmund’s, Ware, where he was involved in a more extensive building programme.<sup>529</sup> But it was his

---

J. Derick was officially the architect for the new tower at St. Andrew's Church, Sandford-on-Thames. He was heavily influenced by Pugin. Faber was involved in the restoration.

<sup>527</sup> Alexandra Wedgwood, A. W. N. Pugin and the Pugin Family, Pugin Diary (21 August 1840), p.46.

<sup>528</sup> Judith F. Champ, Oscott (Birmingham: Archdiocese of Birmingham Historical Commission 1987), p.8.

<sup>529</sup> Roderick O’Donnell, “Pugin as a Church Architect” in Paul Atterbury and Clive Wainwright, Pugin, pp.79 & 81.

lectures that carried the most influence in these theological schools. The students both admired and respected him.<sup>530</sup>

What is evident is that Pugin was already the centre of attention when Wiseman arrived at Oscott since “he found going on there already what was styled by its author a great Catholic Movement - the architectural revival of Augustus Welby Pugin”.<sup>531</sup> Pugin had not only established his influence there, but had forwarded his aim of reunion between the Churches by making contact with a number of Anglicans at Oxford; indeed, he could count some Tractarians amongst his friends.

Pugin had high hopes of Wiseman; indeed, he had enthusiastically written to him in 1838 urging him to come to England.<sup>532</sup> Wiseman’s predecessor, Bishop Walsh, had given Pugin very positive support and had been his keenest supporter amongst the bishops. In truth, “Good Dr. Walsh was my only supported (sic)”, he remarked later.<sup>533</sup>

ii) Pugin’s ideas not always accepted by those in authority.

Pugin had already clashed with the views of some Roman Catholics in authority. His efforts to introduce the older type of Catholic vestment a year or two before Wiseman’s arrival had resulted in a formal discouragement from Rome. Bishop Baines had refused to attend the opening of St Mary’s Church, Uttoxeter, when he heard that vestments of the Gothic style were to be used.<sup>534</sup> A letter had been sent to Propaganda about the changes Pugin was implementing. Pugin had expressed his dismay and annoyance in a letter to his friend

---

<sup>530</sup> Bernard Ward, Sequel, Vol. I, p.265.

<sup>531</sup> Wilfrid Ward, The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman, Vol. I, pp.353-354. (Pugin did not only see it as an architectural movement, but as a Catholic revival).

<sup>532</sup> Bernard Ward, Sequel to Catholic Emancipation, Vol. II, p.2. Pugin to Wiseman (1 June 1838). Ushaw College Archives, Correspondence 823. See M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.83.

<sup>533</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (24 October 1840), MS. 528/12, Magdalen College Oxford Archives. See M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.155.

Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle. It showed his tendency to over-exaggerate and use scurrilous words when under deep emotional stress:

This is the result of some diabolical falsehoods and misrepresentations made at Rome by our adversaries...Dr. Walsh found the churches in his district worse than Barns; he will leave them sumptuous erections. The greater part of the vestments were filthy rags, and he has replaced them with silk and gold. For this he has been censured!!! ... I am sick at heart. The apathy of the Catholic body on these things is alarming. I had formed dreams of returning glory; but if this censure of the Propaganda is persisted in after the remonstrance which has been sent, I shall abandon all my hopes. I see every thing that we had hoped dashed to pieces. Do not deceive yourself, My dear friend, do not deceive yourself: the Catholics will cut their own throats, the clergy will put down religion.<sup>535</sup>

He continued, "if you venture to speak of antient (sic) glory and ecclesiastical dignity, oh, you are a man of extravagant opinions, an enthusiast, a visionary – and *ecclesiastical censure* awaits you. Again I say I am disgusted".<sup>536</sup> Ambrose Phillipps felt the same way. He wrote to Lord Shrewsbury expressing his opinion that those in Rome "suspect our sincerity"<sup>537</sup> because certain Roman Catholics in England had misrepresented them: "it is not Propaganda that I complain of", he said, "it is a set of nominal heartless Catholicks here at home, who have misrepresented and calumniated us to Propaganda. Men, who have no scruples themselves of violating rubricks every day of their lives, who hesitate not to wear Chasubles of worsted in defiance of the Church ..."<sup>538</sup> Pugin's relationship with Rome and some fellow Roman Catholics in England was already fraught.

---

<sup>534</sup> Alexander Wedwood, ed., *A. W. N. Pugin and the Pugin Family*, p.82. Note 29 for 1839.

<sup>535</sup> Purcell, *Life and Letters of Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle*, Vol. II, p.222. See also M. Belcher, *The Collected Letters*, Vol. I, p.127. Pugin to Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle (1 December 1839).

<sup>536</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p.224. Also Margaret Belcher, *The Collected Letters*, p.128.

<sup>537</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p.220.

iii) Pugin continued with his usual activities.

Wiseman had little effect on Pugin for two or three months after his arrival. Pugin continued to work on the designs of Roman Catholic churches and cathedrals, to study liturgy, and to carry on with his crusade at Oxford. He again visited his friends in Oxford in October 1840. R. W. Church wrote to Frederic Rogers on 31 October that

Pugin has been staying with Bloxam ... The only specimens of Oxford that Pugin saw must have edified him. Jack Morris had invited the rest of the "Mountain"<sup>539</sup> i.e. Ward, Bloxam, and Bowyer, to dine with him in the Tower and "talk strong": and to their delight Bloxam brought Pugin as his *umbra*. Ward is said to have repeatedly jumped up and almost screamed in ecstasy at what was said, and Bowyer and Pugin had a fight about Gothic and Italian architecture; but what else took place I know not. Morris is not pleased with Pugin, however: I wonder if he has humbugged Bloxam. Do you know Bowyer? I wish he would not come here so much; his line is to defend what everybody else gives up, and he took the side of O'Connell and his friends against Pugin.<sup>540</sup>

Pugin had not only met a number of Anglicans in Oxford, but had greatly impressed the "mountain" with his vast knowledge of liturgy and Catholicism. Bloxam mentioned this in a letter to Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle:

Mr. Pugin has gratified me, more than I can express, by his three days sojourning within our College walls. His conciliating manners and extensive knowledge of ecclesiastical and architectural antiquities have gained him the respect and commendation of all who have had the pleasure of meeting him. And though I am at this moment suffering from exhaustion produced upon a feeble frame by

"Thoughts that breathe and words that burn",

I cannot resist acknowledging with grateful delight the instruction imparted by his drawings, lectures, and conversation. To know such a person is indeed a privilege.<sup>541</sup>

---

<sup>538</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp.221. Also Margaret Belcher, The Collected Letters, pp.127-128.

<sup>539</sup> Newman's name of a small group of friends who regularly met in the tower over the gateway at Exeter College.

<sup>540</sup> Mary C. Church, ed., Life and Letters of Dean Church (London 1895), pp.26-27. The extreme Tractarian John Brande Morris (1812-1880)<sup>540</sup> was a Fellow of Exeter College, while George Bowyer (1811-1883) was a jurist who later wrote The Private History of the Creation of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in England (1868). Both eventually became Roman Catholics, Morris in 1846 and Bowyer in 1850.

<sup>541</sup> E. S. Purcell, The Life and Letters of Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle, Vol. I, pp.227-228.

In the meantime, Willement had finished the stained glass windows for Littlemore church and the account settled by Newman at this time (October 1840) as he confirmed to Thomas Mozley.<sup>542</sup>

After his successful visit in October, Pugin was convinced that the Oxford men were sincere in their desire for reviving Catholicism and it increased his optimism about reunion of the Churches. They had welcomed what he had to say on the subject and were clearly sympathetic to his cause.

The next month - 19 November 1840 - Pugin wrote to Dr. Rock to say that he was not planning to go to Oxford for a while: "I intend going to oxford (sic) early in the spring when I will come over & stop for a short time with you".<sup>543</sup> He evidently changed his mind at short notice since less than a week later Newman remarked, "Pugin has been here speaks strongly against the R. C. body, and says that if 200 of the ablest and best of our men were to go over, they would be received coldly".<sup>544</sup> Newman mistakenly believed that Pugin had no desire to encourage individual conversions to Roman Catholicism; indeed, that he saw these as possible hindrances to the realization of corporate reunion between the Churches. (A few months later – March 1841 - Pugin made it clear that he welcomed individual conversions as much as he wanted corporate reunion).

---

<sup>542</sup> Gerard Tracey, ed., Letters and Diaries Vol. VII, p.411. Newman to Thomas Mozley (21 October 1840).

<sup>543</sup> Pugin to Dr. Rock (19 Nov. 1840), Southwark Diocesan Archives, Pugin/Rock papers. See also M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.166.

<sup>544</sup> G. Tracey, The Letters and Diaries Vol. VII, p.449. Newman to Frederic Rogers (November 25, 1840).

Rock was annoyed when he found out about the visit and suspected that Pugin had been less than honest. Pugin tried to excuse himself by saying that the visit was unexpected and very brief. "it (sic) is true", he admitted, "I was at Oxford for a *short time*".<sup>545</sup>

Pugin wrote to Phillipps on 18 December about the sympathy of feeling he had found there amongst the Tractarians. He commented, "we nearly *stand alone* if we except the Oxford men, for among them I find full sympathy of feeling ... were it not for the Oxford men I should quite despair".<sup>546</sup> Others, including both Anglicans and Roman Catholics, were not so enthusiastic about reviving Catholicism. While Pugin expected some opposition from Anglicans, it may be that he was disappointed by the lack of support he was getting from the hereditary Catholics who, after so many years of persecution, were naturally suspicious and fearful of all Anglicans. They did not believe that any Anglican interest in Catholicism could be genuine. Indeed, "the tenderness and kindness of Wiseman and Pugin, Mr. Phillipps and Father Spencer, were strongly blamed by many English Catholics", noted Wilfrid Ward.<sup>547</sup>

In December 1840, Pugin was concerned that an article he had written for the *British Critic* had a mistake - although not of his making. Newman mentioned this in a letter to Thomas Mozley.<sup>548</sup> Pugin had written "Cath." as an abbreviation of "Catholic", but to his embarrassment this had been interpreted as "Cathedral".

iv) An uneasy alliance between Pugin and Wiseman.

While things were going well for Pugin at Oxford, problems were beginning to surface at Oscott. Although he had been hopeful that Wiseman would support him, he

---

<sup>545</sup> Pugin to Dr. Rock (4 December 1840), Southwark Diocesan Archives, Pugin/Rock papers. See also M. Belcher, *The Collected Letters*, Vol. I, p.168.

<sup>546</sup> Pugin to Phillipps (18 December 1840), MS.335, Magdalen College Archives. See also M. Belcher, *The Collected Letters*, Vol. I, p. 175.

<sup>547</sup> Wilfrid Ward, *Wiseman*, Vol. I, p.378.

<sup>548</sup> Tracey, ed., *Letters and Diaries* Vol. VII, p.456. Newman to Thomas Mozley 4 December 1840.

discovered, to his dismay that Wiseman revered all that was Roman and had arrived with Roman ideas and liturgical practices. Wiseman's interest in these was not merely subjective or superficial, but based on his own deep studies. While a youth he had excelled in scholastic theology, dogmatic theology, Syriac and other Oriental languages and he had gained an expert knowledge of Roman Baroque architecture, painting and sculpture, and of Italian Renaissance and Baroque music. His aim was to promote these interests in England.

Wiseman's interests, however, extended further than a knowledge of Baroque architecture, etc; he also favoured a "modern" Roman liturgical arrangement and form, which were frequently incorporated in neo-Classical and Baroque churches. He had "learned to love the liturgy in its wonderful presentation at the Sixtine (sic) Chapel"<sup>549</sup> and wanted to introduce and promote these Roman liturgical practices to England wherever possible. He rejected Pugin's rather "neo-Gallican" ideas of reviving local and national liturgies. Evidence of this soon emerged when he attempted to abolish Pugin's rood screen in St Chad's Cathedral, Birmingham. Pugin wrote to Ambrose Phillipps in despair:

Yesterday I was informed the screen was not to be allowed, but what a miserable state of things the grand division between sacrifice and the worshippers, between priest and people to be attempted to be abolished by those who should be foremost in their restoration.<sup>550</sup>

Wiseman backed down; he was after all a newcomer and Pugin had support for his ideas. But from thereon their relationship was strained.

But after Wiseman made decisions about his Oscott career, he realised that Pugin, with his contacts in Oxford, could be a valuable ally. Oscott was to be the centre that was to draw the Catholic Movement in the Established Church towards the Apostolic See.<sup>551</sup> Indeed,

---

<sup>549</sup> W. Ward, Wiseman, Vol. I, 360.

<sup>550</sup> Pugin to Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle (18 December 1840). See Margaret Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.75.

<sup>551</sup> Richard J. Schiefen, Nicholas Wiseman: and the transformation of English Catholicism

he found that only Pugin and Father Ignatius Spencer actively supported him in this and they gave him “the support of piety and genius which none could gainsay”, remarked Wilfrid Ward.<sup>552</sup> The reason for this was that the “majority of the Oscott professors were absorbed in College routine, and from the first they were quite out of sympathy with what they considered the adventurousness of Wiseman’s designs”.<sup>553</sup> Nevertheless, fundamental differences between Pugin and Wiseman were barely pushed below the surface.

v) Differences between Wiseman and Pugin continued to grow.

Their differences again emerged at Nottingham where Pugin had built another cathedral - St Barnabas’ Cathedral. This was, he said, a stone building with a “grand appearance, although *perfectly plain*” and with “a most solemn and rich interior” (“solemnity” was a feature of the Gallican Church).<sup>554</sup> Pugin was proudly showing an Anglican friend around the cathedral and whispered that no one without holy orders should enter the sanctuary. “Within,” he said, “is the Holy of Holies. The people remain outside. Never is the sanctuary entered by any save those in sacred orders”.<sup>555</sup> As he was speaking a priest appeared in the sanctuary with two ladies. Pugin was indignant and asked the sacristan to order them out. He was greatly dismayed to be told that it was Bishop Wiseman conducting two lady friends over the new church. Pugin simply burst into tears.<sup>556</sup>

---

(Shepherdstown: The Patmos Press 1984), p.127. Wiseman to Lord Shrewsbury. Undated letter, “probably written in 1847”, according to Schiefen.

<sup>552</sup> Wilfrid Ward, Wiseman, Vol. I, p.347.

<sup>553</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp.346/7.

<sup>554</sup> John Glen Harries, Pugin, p.39.

<sup>555</sup> Wilfrid Ward, Wiseman, Vol. I, p.359.

<sup>556</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p.359. See also Wilfrid Ward, W. G. Ward and the Catholic Revival (London: 1893), p.386.

They clashed again in February 1841. Wiseman attempted once more to supplant Pugin's liturgical ideas by taking out the altar fittings conforming to "ancient solemn practices"<sup>557</sup> and introducing "Italian novelties"<sup>558</sup> at St Chad's Cathedral, Birmingham.<sup>559</sup> Pugin wrote despairingly to his friend Ambrose Phillipps, "The bishop is cutting his most energetic assistants from under him".<sup>560</sup>

Pugin and Wiseman again attempted to work together – this time with some success – towards their mutual aims. Indeed, said Ward, they "soon came to an understanding"<sup>561</sup> and worked together "for the common cause"<sup>562</sup> in the succeeding years.<sup>563</sup> This association was far from being based on a shared interest in liturgical architecture; rather the reverse because they clearly differed on this subject. They had reached a compromise based on other grounds. Thereafter, Wiseman encouraged Pugin's associations in Oxford in the cause of Catholicism.

vi) Pugin continued his acquaintanceship with Newman and Pusey, but developed a strong friendship with Bloxam.

By the beginning of 1841, the letters that Pugin received from his friends Oakeley, Faber, W. G. Ward, Dalgairns and Bloxam again strengthened his belief that things were moving in the right direction:

While Newman was writing the Tract,<sup>564</sup> in January and February 1841, Pugin was receiving letters which greatly encouraged the hopes of Oscott and were duly communicated to Bishop Wiseman. The programme, which Pugin was

---

<sup>557</sup> Margaret Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.206. Pugin to Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle (7 February 1841).

<sup>558</sup> *Ibid.*, p.206.

<sup>559</sup> *Ibid.*, p.206.

<sup>560</sup> *Ibid.*, p.206.

<sup>561</sup> Wilfrid Ward, Wiseman, Vol. I, p.539.

<sup>562</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p.359.

<sup>563</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p.358.

<sup>564</sup> A reference to Tract 90.

urging on Wiseman as most promising, was the gradual winning of the English mind to sympathy with Catholic ideals - the monastic system, Catholic devotion to saints and shrines and the like - and keeping the Roman question out of sight.<sup>565</sup>

Ward thus suggested that Pugin was by now both influencing and advising Wiseman concerning the winning over of certain Anglicans. Pugin continued his visits.

Newman, meanwhile, had a bee in his bonnet about Roman Catholics; he did not wish any association with them, or so he claimed. Yet, in January 1841<sup>566</sup> he met Pugin who was an ardent and leading Roman Catholic and a Professor at Oscott Roman Catholic College. In fact, Pugin went purposely to Oriel College to see Newman in his rooms there. He was determined to build an acquaintanceship, if not a friendship, with Newman. They had common interests; the revival of Catholicism in England and the fact that, at this time, Newman still disliked neo-Classical architecture almost as much as Pugin. "I wonder you were *disappointed* at the buildings of Rome", Newman commented to Henry Wilberforce. "Whom did you ever hear praise their architecture as beautiful or solemn? I never did." Nevertheless, he admitted they had some good qualities as far as "Richness of materials – taste in combining them – vastness of design – and *antiquity*, were concerned".<sup>567</sup>

"At Oxford dis.[discussion with] Mr Newman", Pugin noted in his Diary in February 1841. Newman remarked, "Pugin has been here ... and I cannot help liking him, though he is an immense talker"<sup>568</sup> and in his diary he wrote, "Dined with Bloxam, where JM and

---

<sup>565</sup> Wilfrid Ward, Wiseman, Vol. I, p.372.

<sup>566</sup> There is some confusion about this date. Margaret Belcher, in her A.W.N. Pugin: An Annotated Critical Bibliography, p.470, refers to Marvin R. O'Connell, The Oxford Conspirators: a history of the Oxford Movement, 1833-45 (London: Macmillan 1969), p.305, which gives the date as February 1840. Tracey, ed., The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman, Vol. VIII, p.41, gives the date as 2 February 1841.

<sup>567</sup> Tracey, ed., Letters and Diaries, Vol. VIII, p.41. Newman to Henry Wilberforce (22 February 1841).

<sup>568</sup> Marvin R. O'Connell, The Oxford Conspirators: a history of the Oxford Movement 1833-45 (London: Macmillan & Co. 1969), p.305. Newman to Henry Wilberforce (22 February 1841). In the

Pugin”.<sup>569</sup> “The Roman question” which he intended keeping in the background and his enthusiasm for the revival of Catholicism were again somewhat misconstrued by Newman since he thought an anti-papal feeling was rising amongst some English Roman Catholics. “Pugin too is very strong on our side”, he remarked.<sup>570</sup> But Pugin was only encouraging their interest in Catholicism and had little sympathy with their Anglican ideals.

Pugin had not had much contact with Pusey until 1841. Uncharacteristically, he had not been impressed by first impressions; a view he probably took from his patron, Lord Shrewsbury, who “thought Pusey especially distasteful: ‘There never was a more deluded mind’”.<sup>571</sup> But in February 1841, Pugin wrote to Bloxam expressing his recently revised opinion of him and that he now thought highly of him.<sup>572</sup> There had been an article in the *Tablet* that suggested that Pusey was the leader of “Puseyites”, a group who were thought to be a new Catholic sect within the Church of England.<sup>573</sup> Pugin believed this suggestion unjust. Pusey, he said, represented a traditional, conservative High Church view in the Church of England; he was not Catholic and his party never had been. They were, therefore, mistaken, he said: “they are certainly of *no Sect* & existed for hundreds & hundreds of years before Dr. Pusey was born”.<sup>574</sup>

---

papers of John Henry Newman deposited in the archives of the Oratory, Birmingham. See also Gerard Tracey, ed., The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman (Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press 1999), Vol VIII, p.41.

<sup>569</sup> G. Tracey, ed., Letters and Diaries, Vol. VIII, p.38. Newman’s diary for 21 February 1841. JM was James Bowling Mozley (1813-1878), brother of Thomas and a Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford.

<sup>570</sup> Anne Mozley, The Letters and Correspondence, Vol. 11, p.290. Newman to J.W. Bowden (Feb. 12, 1841). See Tracey, The Letters and Diaries, Vol. VIII, p.32, which suggests that there were no commas in the original letter.

<sup>571</sup> Marvin O’Connell, The Oxford Conspirators, p.305.

<sup>572</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (c. February 1841), MS 528/21.

<sup>573</sup> An editorial article entitled “Oxford ashamed of Mr. Sewell” in *The Tablet* (30 January 1841), no. 38, p.67. It incorporated a letter from a writer in Oxford whose aim was to dissociate the Puseyites from Sewell.

<sup>574</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (30 January 1841). MS. 528/14, Magdalen College Archives. See also M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.199.

Some Anglicans believed Pugin was defending Pusey, but he was not so much defending Pusey as defending Catholicism against unauthorised followers. He had no wish to include those whom he believed were fundamentally Protestant.

While he was in Oxford, Pugin usually called on his friend Bloxam at Magdalen College. He, too, was interested in liturgy. During 1841, he and Pugin visited Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle at Grace-Dieu and Bloxam was invited by Pugin to visit the Earl of Shrewsbury's home, Alton Towers. Pugin was keen for Bloxam to see the extensive work he had done there on the interior decoration of the chapel and the liturgical arrangements adopted.<sup>575</sup>

Bloxam's visit came in for criticism. He was accused of bowing at Mass in the chapel.<sup>576</sup> Because of Newman's inquiry about this to Bishop Bagot, Bloxam subsequently resigned his curacy at Littlemore (he was soon reinstated).

### 3) Pugin's health problems aggravated by anxiety.

1841 was not a good year for Pugin's health. He became very ill with a relapse of his disease on 22 February. Moreover, his contract as Architect and Professor of Antiquities at Oscott had ceased (possibly due to Wiseman's conflicting views on liturgical practices, though we have no direct evidence about this). His stress aggravated illness may be one reason why he did not visit Oxford in March. Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle wrote to Bloxam on 10 March 1841 to inform him that Pugin was recovering. "I suppose you know that our dear friend Pugin has been very ill. Thank God he is better now."<sup>577</sup> He recovered for a while but the symptoms reappeared at the end of August and continued throughout September.

---

<sup>575</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (17 August 1841), MS. 528/121, Magdalen College Archives. See M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.261.

<sup>576</sup> Joseph Bacchus ed., Correspondence of John Henry Newman with John Keble and Others 1839-1845 (London: Longmans & Green 1917), p.42.

<sup>577</sup> Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle to Bloxam (10 March 1841), MS.335, Magdalen College Archives.

Nevertheless, in between these spells of illness he was busy publishing the second edition of Contrasts. He had recovered again by October.

4) Pugin's second edition of Contrasts.

i) Method of publishing Contrasts.

Both the first part of Pugin's new edition of Contrasts and Newman's Tract 90 came out in March 1841. Pugin, who was still at home recovering from his illness, asked Bloxam to send him a copy of Tract 90. "I should Like (sic) amazinly (sic) to see the tract on the 39 Articles", he wrote, "cannot you send it by post?"<sup>578</sup> This Bloxam did. "I return you many thanks for the tract on the 39 articles", Pugin wrote on 8 March.<sup>579</sup> By 17 March he wrote of it to Lord Shrewsbury:

A tremendous sensation has been created among the protestants by an Oxford tract just published - in which the doctrine of *Purgatory* - the *Sacrifice of the mass for the Living & dead* are fully proved to be of *equal* antiquity with *Christianity itself*. the(sic) invocation of saints & indulgences are also well defended. these(sic) oxford (sic) men do more good in one week than we we (sic) do in a whole year towards Catholicising England.<sup>580</sup>

Unlike most people, Pugin saw Tract 90 in a very positive light since he believed it was helping the cause of Catholicising England.

Pugin's Contrasts came out in parts over most of 1841. In a letter of 29 March to Bloxam he remarked, "My contrasts [sic] will appear next week - at Least (sic) the 1<sup>st</sup> Part."<sup>581</sup> By November he was writing, "My contrasts [sic] will be finished next week".<sup>582</sup>

---

<sup>578</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (2 March 1841), MS. 528/17, Magdalen College Archives. See M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.214.

<sup>579</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (8 March 1841), MS. 528/13, Magdalen College Archives. See M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.217.

<sup>580</sup> Alexandra Wedgwood, A.W.N. Pugin and the Pugin Family, p.105. Pugin to Lord Shrewsbury (17 March 1841). See M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.220.

<sup>581</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (28 March 1841), MS. 528/125, Magdalen College Archives. See M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.223.

The first review of the completed edition appeared in December 1841 according to Alexandra Gordon Clark (Alexandra Wedwood).<sup>583</sup>

Whereas this second edition was an upgraded version of his first, it also contained a great deal of new material, which he mentioned in a letter to Bloxam on 10 January 1841.<sup>584</sup> It provided strong evidence that he had continued researching the medieval period since his first edition.

ii) Pugin used a strict methodology.

Pugin's methodology for his second attempt at Contrasts (1841) was much more sophisticated than for the first edition of 1836. He again adopted a similar method to the medieval liturgists of exegesis and exposition as can be seen in his systematic approach to all his books after 1841. Although his initial endeavour had caused something of a stir, it was still a rather naïve and limited effort of a young man tackling a major controversial subject. By 1841, his style had changed. It was far more mature and methodical, better researched, and backed up by substantial sources and authorities (which, like the first edition, he added as appendixes rather than footnotes).

The great difference between the first and second editions of Contrasts was that in the second edition, the corruption of medieval Catholicism was now ascribed, not simply to the Reformation, but also to the Renaissance.

---

<sup>582</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (14 November 1841), MS. 528/141, Magdalen College Archives. See M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.286.

<sup>583</sup> Alexandra Gordon Clark (Alexandra Wedwood), "A. W. N. Pugin" in ed. Peter Ferriday, Victorian Architecture (London: Jonathan Cape 1963), p.142.

<sup>584</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (10 January 1841), MS. 528/11, Magdalen College Archives. See M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.191.

iii) A radial rather than a lineal method of writing.

This edition of Contrasts set out his principal themes, which he brought forward in all his works thereafter. The books he published between 1841 and 1844 were a series that complemented one another. Indeed, he might better have described them as volumes of the same book rather than separate and autonomous works. He developed the same themes, although by different arguments.

One such theme concerned Paganism and neo-Paganism. A development of the same theme also turned up eight years later in his A Treatise on Chancel Screens and rood lofts (1851).<sup>585</sup> Another theme was that the Church of England was a State-created Church. There are many more examples. The similar themes carried over from one book to another make the books appear unfocussed and exceedingly repetitive. It might seem that if he had treated Paganism and neo-Paganism, for instance, in a single book then the reader would have been able to understand it more easily. Yet, this was not an oversight on his part, but was done intentionally.

It was an example of a radial method of writing, similar to that adopted by the Jansenist writer Blaise Pascal (1623-62), which was “deliberately not linear, and consists of converging arguments, all directed to the same end but with different starting points.”<sup>586</sup> This was also true of Pugin’s writing. There is little evidence, however, that he was familiar with Pascal’s writing, although he was familiar with the works of a number of other seventeenth-century Jansenists.

---

<sup>585</sup> A. W. N. Pugin, A Treatise on Chancel Screens and rood lofts, their antiquity, use and symbolic signification (London: Charles Dolman 1851), p.2.

<sup>586</sup> A. J. Krailsheimer, translation and introduction, Pascal Pensées (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books 1966), p.26, Introduction.

Central to Pugin's arguments was the worship of God; the whole point of liturgy, as life, was to adore and worship God through His Son Jesus Christ. The "most important occupation of man in this world is to prepare for the next", declared Pugin.<sup>587</sup>

5) Pugin's exegesis of ecclesiastical architecture and his exposition in the second edition of Contrasts.

In the preface to this second edition of Contrasts, Pugin indicated that he intended writing about more than architecture:

The real origin of both the revived Pagan and Protestant principles is to be traced to the decayed state of faith throughout Europe in the fifteenth century.<sup>588</sup>

Again, the reader might question the connection, if any, between Paganism and Protestantism and architectural styles. The above quotation alone (and there are numerous examples in Contrasts) would suggest that Pugin was expressing views on:

- i) Architecture.
- ii) Paganism.
- iii) Protestantism.
- iv) Faith.
- v) History.

Furthermore, Pugin called Paganism and Protestantism "the two monsters" (a reference to the two beasts of Revelation 13, rather than the four beasts of the Book of Daniel 7<sup>589</sup>), which would suggest that he was expressing a religious view. He also wrote about the Reformation as being "permitted by divine Providence in punishment for its decayed

---

<sup>587</sup> A. W. N. Pugin, Contrasts: or a parallel between the noble edifices of the middle ages and corresponding buildings of the present day shewing the Present Decay of Taste (London: Charles Dolman 1841: 1969), p.6.

<sup>588</sup> Pugin, Contrasts, p.iii, preface to second edition.

<sup>589</sup> Expanded upon later.

faith”.<sup>590</sup> This again expressed both a view of history and of religion. There was a consistent quality to these views.

6) Pugin brings out the allegorical meaning of religious architecture in Contrasts.

7) His exposition of the doctrinal level of meaning.

i) Ignorance was evil.

In this new edition of Contrasts, Pugin returned repeatedly to his theme of ignorance and evil. Paganism and Protestantism were equally evil. He believed they pretended to be progressive, reformed and good, but they were intent on destroying their host, that is, Catholicism. Their so-called goodness, he suggested, was really a masquerade, disguise or “sham” to hoodwink unsuspecting people. Both the Roman and Anglican Churches continued to exhibit corruptions; causing the *depositum fidei* to be masked, dimmed or obscured.

Evil perpetuated by ignorance was evident in many ways. Pugin interpreted the condition of churches as giving this evidence. It was common to find “pious but uninformed persons” in both the Church of England and Church of Rome, who were sliding into corruption simply because of their lack of knowledge of divine truth. So when Catholics wanted to improve their churches, they had “a false idea of improvement”.<sup>591</sup> Their view of the Eucharist and other doctrines was incorrect and, consequently, they fell into errors in attempting to improve the practical aspects; thus, the liturgical and theological had a tendency to synchronise – but not always for the better.<sup>592</sup> The same was true of Protestant churches, although Protestants were usually indifferent to their Church.<sup>593</sup> But when they were actively contemplating improvement, they were “ten times worse than their extravagances, since it

---

<sup>590</sup> Pugin, Contrasts, p.iv, preface to second edition.

<sup>591</sup> *Ibid.*, p.57.

<sup>592</sup> *Ibid.*, p.57.

<sup>593</sup> *Ibid.*, p.57.

embodied the same wretched pagan ideas, without either the scale or richness of the foreign architecture of the same period.”<sup>594</sup> In other words, if Anglicans attempted to modernise, their knowledge of doctrine did not become clearer but moved still further from divine truths and nearer heresy.

Pugin believed that the right emotions, as much as knowledge, were essential for those seeking salvation. Only by the “restoration of the ancient feelings and sentiments” could knowledge of things divine be obtained.<sup>595</sup> People in his day, he believed, were “utterly wanting in that sentiment and feeling”<sup>596</sup> of the holy and mystical, which the medieval builders had put into their designs of churches.

ii) A turning to and a turning away from God.

Pugin believed that the Renaissance had encouraged people to turn away from God. On the other hand, the Early Church and medieval periods demonstrated a turning to God when faith became more obvious and bright, while knowledge of the *depositum fidei* became purer and more complete. Pugin saw in architecture evidence of doctrinal development. In his interpretation, there were parallels in ecclesiastical architecture to doctrine. In Christian ages, architecture, like doctrine, improved; in irreligious ages they both decayed. All periods, he thought, demonstrated a fluctuating knowledge of divine truths. In other words, a knowledge of doctrine like liturgy, progressed or regressed in a fluctuating manner. Pugin’s view was unlike that of Newman who later, in his Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine (1845), believed the history of doctrine could demonstrate organic and consistent growth. Pugin’s view was also unlike that of the Protestant view of doctrine, which was that it was always the same because it was taken from Scripture.

---

<sup>594</sup> *Ibid.*, p.57.

<sup>595</sup> *Ibid.*, p.43.

8) Pugin's exposition of the theological level of meaning.

i) Christian symbolism rejected.

In Pugin's view, it was bad enough that Christian art and architecture, like the faith itself, were ignored and overlooked in the nineteenth century. But even worse, he thought, was that a huge prejudice existed against any form of them. This was the case even in the churches: "only a few years back", he said, "the mere sight of a crucifix or a Madonna would have excited far greater horror, and caused more animadversion amongst the godly of the land, than the most obscene and filthy idol that the grossest superstition of paganism could produce".<sup>597</sup> Examples of Pagan art were welcomed in the churches. The effect on people was detrimental. Naturally they turned to Paganism when *only* Paganism was put before them.

If people were only aware of the symbolism inherent in Christian liturgical art and architecture, they would, he contended, welcome their use. Thus, Pugin interpreted architecture allegorically and argued that people could only do the same if they were educated on the subject. Then they would know that liturgical art and architecture had their roots in Christianity, he explained, and so were tied up with theology and doctrine:

The three great doctrines, of the redemption of man by the sacrifice of our Lord on the cross; the three equal persons united in one Godhead; and the resurrection of the dead, - are the foundation of Christian Architecture.

The first – the cross – is not only the very plan and form of a Catholic church, but it terminates each spire and gable, and is imprinted as a seal of faith on the very furniture of the altar.

The second is fully developed in the triangular form and arrangement of arches, tracery, and even subdivisions of the buildings themselves.

The third is beautifully exemplified by great height and vertical lines, which have been considered by the Christians, from the earliest period, as the emblem of the resurrection.<sup>598</sup>

These requirements were not simply found in Gothic architecture but were characteristics of church architecture from "the earliest period" to nineteenth-century

---

<sup>596</sup> *Ibid.*, p.43.

<sup>597</sup> Pugin, *Contrasts*, p.48.

churches. The early basilicas gave evidence of this; they were not originally cruciform in plan, arrangement or form, but soon developed this characteristic. J. H. Srawley cited St Basil and St Chrysostom for evidence of the arrangement of eastern basilicas in the fourth century:

The writings of the Egyptian Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries enable us to supplement the fragmentary references of Origen. Of the arrangement of the churches we have several notices. The sanctuary, which the laity might not enter, was screened off by a lattice or rail ... Altar veils are mentioned by Synesius about A.D. 411. Within was the altar, sometimes made of wood, sometimes a slab supported on pillars. The bishop's throne and the seats of the clergy around the altar are also referred to.<sup>599</sup>

Richard Krautheimer confirmed that large early Christian basilicas during and after the time of Constantine frequently had a predominantly cruciform form within their three dimensional structure, which was not always evident from the plan. Most had a nave divided into three by aisles, but the central aisle was much higher, giving it greater prominence; this central aisle, together with the transept, and the apse and/or chancel as focal point, gave the church a cruciform emphasis. Typical was S. Croce in Gerusalemme, Rome, (c.329), S. Marco (c.336), S. Maria Maggiore, Rome, (432-440). The last had a screen during the time of Pascal I (817-824).<sup>600</sup> Old St Peter's basilica, Rome (c.319-22), too, had three main aisles and two lesser ones, but again the central aisle was far higher than the rest. This central aisle together with a transept and apse gave a cruciform form when it was built by Constantine. Eusebius of Caesaria (c.260-c.340) in his Ecclesiastical History said that the transept and apse were separated from the nave by columnar screens; the huge basilica of Santa Sophia, Constantinople, was also cruciform in three dimensional form; S. Sebastiano, Rome, had the

---

<sup>598</sup> *Ibid.*, p.3.

<sup>599</sup> J. H. Srawley, The Early History of the Liturgy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1949), p.45.

<sup>600</sup> Richard Krautheimer, Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae (1937: Rome: Città del Vaticano 1967), Vol. 3, p.53. He says that the *Liber Pontificalis* refers to Pascal I (817-824) who gave a gift of "eight silver arches and sixteen silver pillars" and notes "the silver main gates of the 'vestibule' of the altar". This was, Krautheimer said, "a fenced precinct in front of the altar".

typical three aisles; high central aisle, transept and apse giving a cruciform emphasis; it also had an early screen. Some had an extra altar in the nave, such as at S. Lorenzo's, which was used to administer the already (at the high altar) consecrated elements to the laity. A similar arrangement existed in some English medieval cathedrals. By the eleventh century, the huge basilicas of France, such as those of Fontenay, Cluny and Caen, are all cruciform in three-dimensional form, as is that of Durham in England.

Pugin was familiar with the liturgical form and arrangement of these early and medieval basilicas. E. A. Fisher illustrates that some large Anglo-Saxon churches, such as Breamore Church, Hampshire,<sup>601</sup> the Church of St Mary-in-Castro, Dover, Kent,<sup>602</sup> and Repton church, Derbyshire,<sup>603</sup> were cruciform in arrangement, although, like the basilicas, this was not always obvious to the casual observer. The layout was divided into long narrow nave, transept with tower and deep chancel with altar, forming a crucifix arrangement within the structure, even when the basic plan was rectangular. Some, such as Jarrow church, Durham, had stone screens formed by the arches of the tower;<sup>604</sup> a few, Fisher suggests, may have had wooden screens and/or galleries across the western end of the chancel.<sup>605</sup> These features were, he considers "unusual", but pre-conquest.<sup>606</sup>

ii) Antichrist a controversial issue.

Pugin touched upon the theme of Antichrist, which had long been popular amongst Protestants. The late medieval heretics and then Luther and the Reformers regarded the Pope as Antichrist, and so did most Protestant exegetes after them for some centuries. The French

---

<sup>601</sup> E. A. Fisher, The greater Anglo-Saxon Churches (London: Faber and Faber Ltd. 1962), p.389.

<sup>602</sup> *Ibid.*, p.362.

<sup>603</sup> *Ibid.*, p.164.

<sup>604</sup> *Ibid.*, Plate 12.

<sup>605</sup> *Ibid.*, p.80.

Revolution revived an interest in the subject among Protestants, so in appealing to the idea of Antichrist, Pugin engaged with a major Protestant preoccupation.

It is likely that Pugin was also influenced by Savonarola who took up the theme of Antichrist, not from the four monsters of Daniel's vision, but from the two monsters of Revelation: *The Beast out of the Sea* and *the Beast out of the Earth*.<sup>607</sup> He would, however, have recognised that the first set of monsters inspired the second. Pugin interpreted the two monsters as meaning that one was Paganism and the other Protestantism.<sup>608</sup> The nineteenth-century Church, he claimed, faced these two monsters.

While Antichrist, the Pagan monster, he said, held "powerful sway over the intellects of mankind" ever since the Renaissance,<sup>609</sup> its grip on men's intellects was as great through Protestantism as through "revived Paganism". Protestant perceptions of Catholic doctrines were distorted, false and artificial, he maintained, and this was clearly expressed in liturgy. The Church of England had little hope of recovery, he thought, unless reunion with the Catholic Church was achieved.<sup>610</sup>

Pugin again contended that people were being deceived because Catholicism in Protestant churches was only a mask for Protestantism. By such a disguise, Antichrist was able to control the best minds; some of the finest Christian intellects, he claimed, had been seduced by this falsehood. The "noblest powers of their minds" had been diverted "from the pursuit of truth to the reproduction of error" by prejudices and ignorance.<sup>611</sup>

---

<sup>606</sup> *Ibid.*, p.80.

<sup>607</sup> Revelation, 13: 1-18.

<sup>608</sup> Pugin, *Contrasts*, p.iii, preface to the second edition.

<sup>609</sup> *Ibid.*, p.18.

<sup>610</sup> *Ibid.*, p.45.

9) Pugin's exposition of the mystical level of meaning.

i) Symbolism and allegory in Classical architecture.

In his interpretation of religious architecture, Pugin stated that religious belief and mystical meaning had been the motivation behind all ancient styles and forms of religious buildings; it amounted to a fixed law or rule:

The same principle of Architecture resulting from religious belief, may be traced from the caverns of Elora, to the Druidical remains of Stonehenge and Avebury; and in all these works of Pagan antiquity, we shall invariably find that both the plan and the decoration of the building is mystical and emblematic.<sup>612</sup>

He also quoted a nineteenth-century scholar to support this view. This was his friend the Liberal Ultramontane C. F. Montalembert who continued to exerted a strong influence on the development of his views.

There were traits and circumstances surrounding Montalembert that attracted Pugin. Montalembert's father, like Augustus Charles Pugin, had been a refugee from the troubles in France during the French Revolution. They both had an aristocratic background and were therefore at risk from the Revolutionary mobs. Both had fled to Britain, married English ladies and settled in London. Montalembert, like Pugin, was born in London and had grown up bi-lingual with an intense interest in France and the French Church. Both were deeply religious. Montalembert was, like Pugin, rather a flamboyant character, very handsome and eloquent. There was only two years' difference in their ages.

As a young adult, Montalembert moved to Paris where he became a contributor to *l'Avenir*, founded by Lamennais in 1830. He wanted "a free Church in a free State".<sup>613</sup> During the July Monarchy (1830-1848) he became a leader of the Liberal Catholics in

---

<sup>611</sup> *Ibid.*, p.16.

<sup>612</sup> *Ibid.*, p.2.

<sup>613</sup> Montalembert first used this phrase when he gave an address on Catholic Liberalism at the Catholic Congress in Malines, Belgium, in 1863.

France, but was opposed by bishops with parliamentary Gallican leanings and later by the neo-Ultramontanes.

Pugin quoted extensively from Montalembert's De l'État Actuel de l'Art Religieux en France (Paris 1839).<sup>614</sup> Montalembert claimed, like Savonarola, that Classical architecture symbolized the Pagan religion. The ancient Pagans, he said, "faithfully embodied the errors of their mythology"; theirs was an honest, although misguided attempt at expressing their religion. Pugin followed along the same lines as Montalembert. Pagan architecture had developed, he said, to such a fine art that "not only were the forms of the temples dedicated to different deities varied, but certain capitals and orders of Architecture were peculiar to each; and the very foliage ornaments of the friezes were symbolic".<sup>615</sup>

Renaissance Humanist architects and artists had turned to Classical antiquity for instruction but, out of ignorance, thought Pugin, they were unable to distinguish between the abstract and universal laws of art and architecture which the ancient people applied and the Paganism to which they applied them. The result was that Humanist architects inadvertently imported Paganism into their buildings without realizing what they were doing. While they admired the beauty of Classical columns, for instance, and sought to revive and copy their use, they did not realise that the ancient Pagans considered such columns to be gods – Doric columns being male gods and Corinthian columns female gods - because their spirits had been summoned to dwell in them. Therefore, Pugin believed that to use such columns in a church building was to bring Pagan gods into a Christian church. It was this association that he objected to, not the Classical style *per se*. He again quoted Montalembert's De l'État Actuel to support his argument:

... 'modern Catholics have revived these profanities in opposition to reason, and formed the types of their churches, their paintings, their images, from the

---

<sup>614</sup> Pugin, Contrasts, p.8 and Appendix no. III, pp.76-95; "l'Etat" not "l'État" in Contrasts.

<sup>615</sup> *Ibid.*, p.2.

detestable models of pagan error which had been overthrown by the triumph of Christian truth, raising temples to the crucified Redeemer in imitation of the Parthenon and Pantheon; representing the Eternal Father under the semblance of Jupiter; the blessed Virgin as a draped Venus or Juno; martyrs as gladiators; saints as amorous nymphs; and angels in the form of Cupids'.<sup>616</sup>

By the term “modern Catholics”, Montalembert meant the “new” Orders. Pugin therefore followed both Savonarola and Montalembert in believing that the revival of Classical culture was also reviving Pagan mysticism.

ii) An allegorical interpretation to all religious architecture – whether Christian or Pagan.

Pugin had previously suggested in the first edition of Contrasts that Christianity possessed a symbolic architecture.<sup>617</sup> By the second edition he had developed this idea and now thought that it was possible to apply allegorical and symbolic interpretation to other religious architecture - of any religion or any period - not merely Christian architecture. He appealed to Montalembert for confirmation of this view: “The ancient Pagans were at least consistent; in their architecture, symbols, and sculpture, they faithfully embodied the errors of their mythology”.<sup>618</sup> Pugin was able to “read” such buildings and interpret their liturgical forms and arrangements; to do so was to discover that they conformed to an order or pattern and complied with strict laws.

---

<sup>616</sup> *Ibid.*, p.8.

<sup>617</sup> Pugin, Contrasts (1836), pp.49-50, appendixes T and U.

<sup>618</sup> Pugin, Contrasts (1841), p.8.

10) Pugin's exposition of the historical level of meaning in Contrasts.

i) Buildings as history books.

Pugin set out to interpret ecclesiastical architecture following similar categories to those applied by the medieval liturgists. His writing is an attempt to expound his interpretations. In studying the nature of the Church, Pugin looked to alternative religions to act as comparisons. It was a form of argument by analogy. He argued that alternative religions might have salient features that would help to identify the main features of the true Church by a process of comparison. These features might be:

- i) A belief in gods or God.
- ii) An effect on the community.
- iii) Religious buildings.
- iv) Religious practices.
- v) Belief or not in an afterlife.

Ancient Paganism gave him a prime model of an alternative religion; it could demonstrate the above features. He wrote that in the ancient Pagan world there had been a genuine attempt to reflect and express religion in the art and architecture of the time and it was possible to learn about and understand these ancient people themselves from study of their buildings. Buildings or ruins were history books in stone. They revealed information about the people who had constructed the buildings. Thus, any religious architecture was like a history book that could be read. It honestly demonstrated what the people believed, how they lived and what the country and climate were like at the time. In particular, it gave information about their religion and beliefs. "The more closely we compare the temples of the Pagan nations with their religious rites and mythologies, the more shall we be satisfied with the truth of this assertion".<sup>619</sup>

If these features could be determined in Paganism or any other religion, then it must be true of Catholicism. Therefore, if Pagan temples revealed truths about the people who

constructed them and their religion, then the same must be true of ancient Christian churches, the people who constructed them and their religion.

ii) Further evidence that Pugin was influenced by medieval and early Renaissance thought.

Pugin was familiar with the writings of one of the most important medieval allegorists and liturgists, Guillaume Durandus (c.1230/7-1296), a canon lawyer and Bishop of Mende. He became one of Pugin's principal authorities. Durandus's eight books of his Rationale divinatorum officiorum were concerned with allegorical exegesis of liturgical art and architecture; his writing did not deal with actual buildings, works of art or ornament. It was a treatise on liturgy and the appointment of churches, with symbolic and allegorical interpretation of their mystical aspects.

Durandus, in his Rationale, considered, too, the practical and historical meanings as a contrast or comparison with the allegorical. This work was not confined to the Mass, but included "a number of other subjects concerned with the ceremonies of the Church: for example, vestments and ornaments of the clergy and the form and arrangement of churches, such as altars, etc."<sup>620</sup> As Timothy R. Thibodeau points out, Durandus was actually insensitive or indifferent to the Gothic style of his day and his study was in no way confined to the medieval period or to the Roman liturgy.<sup>621</sup> Durandus followed a long tradition of allegorical exposition of the liturgy<sup>622</sup> and examined all possible sources from all ages including the influence of the ancient Greeks on symbolism and allegory. In doing so, he

---

<sup>619</sup> *Ibid.*, p.2.

<sup>620</sup> Timothy M. Thibodeau, "Les Expositions Allégoriques sur la Liturgie". Essay in Gy Pierre-Marie, O.P., ed., Guillaume Durand: Évêque de Mende 1230-1296 (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique 1992), p.144. My own translations from the French.

<sup>621</sup> *Ibid.*, p.145. Timothy M. Thibodeau, "Les Sources du Rationale".

<sup>622</sup> *Ibid.*, p.144.

suggested that Christian use was in some ways different from that employed by Plato, Pythagoras and Plutarch.

A very small part of the Rationale of Guillaume Durandus<sup>623</sup> was eventually published in 1843 by the predominantly High Church Camden Society. This publication, therefore, could not have influenced Pugin as early as 1841, although he may have seen the French versions, which had been published earlier. The Camden Society limited the translation to mean symbolism in Gothic churches, although, as mentioned, Durandus was not concerned with style or period. Symbolism usually referred to individual elements of the church that simply represented or stood for a person, object, group or idea. Durandus was concerned with allegorical exegesis, rather than merely symbolism.

Durandus was not unusual or alone in interpreting liturgy allegorically. He was entirely faithful to a long tradition of allegorical exegesis of both Scripture and liturgy and there were a large number of other “allégoristes”<sup>624</sup> in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries to whom he referred. Indeed, he used large extracts from the allegorical interpretations of Innocent III, Sicard de Crémone (c.1150-1215), Guillaume d’Auxerre (d.1231) and Prévostin de Crémone (c.1150-1210) and other mostly twelfth century liturgical scholars.<sup>625</sup> Since Pugin was familiar with Durandus’s work, he was also aware that there had been a long tradition of allegorical exegesis and that this was a common method of interpretation in the medieval period.

---

<sup>623</sup> Gulielmo Durando, Rationale Divinorum Officiorum (c. 1286: Republished in Naples 1859), Book 4, ch. XXV, ‘*De Symbolo*’.

<sup>624</sup> Thibodeau, “Les Sources du Rationale”, p.144.

<sup>625</sup> *Ibid.*, p.145.

iii) The spread of neo-Classicism on the Continent.

Pugin argued that Gothic architecture was common in Italy during the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries until it was overtaken by neo-Classical and Baroque.<sup>626</sup> It is indeed true that Gothic architecture was common in Italy and throughout Europe until the fourteenth century and it was only with the rise of Humanism and its desire to “imitate and recreate the glories of the classical past” that it fell out of fashion.<sup>627</sup> Humanism can be understood as expressing both a method of study, which became common to Protestants and Catholics by the sixteenth century, and a neo-platonic theology which sometimes sat lightly to Christian conviction. In the broader sense, the term includes any philosophy or teaching which emphasizes the worth and dignity of human beings, seeks the welfare of the human race and rejoices in human achievement. The Renaissance was an age of Humanism and its chief characteristic was the rediscovery of Classical culture. From Pugin’s point of view, Humanism was a move away from God to man, from a Christian culture to a pre-Christian Pagan culture.

iv) Fixed laws to architecture.

Pugin again claimed there were exacting and universal laws to architecture in general and they involved much more than construction, design techniques or styles. They were as valid for ancient Classical architecture and architecture of other periods as they were for Gothic or nineteenth-century architecture. In the fifteenth century, Leon Battista Alberti (1404-72), wrote his treatise on architecture De re aedificatoria, which was a direct imitation of Marcus Vitruvius Pollio’s De architectura, the only surviving text on Classical architecture available at that time. Vitruvius was a Roman architect who worked from c.46 to 30 BC.

---

<sup>626</sup> Pugin, Contrasts, Ch. II “On the Revised Pagan Principle”, p.11, footnote.

<sup>627</sup> G. Holmes, The Florentine Enlightenment 1400-1450 (New York 1969), p.174.

Alberti also believed that there were fixed laws to architecture and that “categories of architectural criticism were style-neutral, and that principles of excellence such as beauty and utility could be embodied in Gothic as well as Classical works”.<sup>628</sup> Indeed, although he was a neo-Classical architect he admired the Gothic cathedral at Florence because it conformed to the laws of good design. Therefore, Pugin had the same idea as Alberti on this point, although there is no evidence that he was familiar with Alberti’s writing; indeed, there were few books on either Classicism or neo-Classicism in Pugin’s library other than a translation of Vitruvius’ Ten Books of Architecture and T. F. Dibdin’s Introduction to the Greek and Roman Classics (1804).<sup>629</sup> Both Pugin and Alberti may have gained their idea of a fixed law from the early Platonists who believed in a universal law of nature.

Pugin admitted that he found in ancient Classical architecture and art many of the same qualities that he knew were in Gothic. There were definite laws, or principles, to all religious architecture and art, he claimed.<sup>630</sup> These laws included ecclesiastical, philosophical and scientific principles. He concluded his analogical argument by questioning why Christian architecture should be excluded from such laws.<sup>631</sup>

Pugin wrote that something very amiss had happened during the Renaissance; the universal and age-old laws of architecture had been ignored or broken.<sup>632</sup> The beliefs and manners of Renaissance people were no longer manifested in their architecture. Whereas there was an affinity between ancient Classical and Gothic architecture because they were based on these universal laws, the pseudo-Classical architecture of the Renaissance was by its

---

<sup>628</sup> Christine Smith, Architecture in the Culture of Early Humanism: Ethics, Aesthetics, and Eloquence 1400-1470 (New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press 1992), p.xv.

<sup>629</sup> A. N. L. Munby, Sale Catalogues, Vol. 4, pp. 247, 279. Items 54 and 631.

<sup>630</sup> Pugin, Contrasts (1841), p.1-2, Ch. I.

<sup>631</sup> *Ibid.*, p.2, Ch. I.

<sup>632</sup> *Ibid.*, p.iii, preface to the second edition.

nature not rooted in these principles. Therefore, in Pugin's view, Renaissance architecture was inconsistent and had broken these universal rules.

In France, the Gothic Revivalists Eugène Viollet-le-Duc (1814-1879), Adolphe-Napoléon Didron (1806-1867), editor of the *Annales archéologiques*, and the great Romantic writer François-René Chateaubriand (1768-1848) – all contemporaries of Pugin – argued something similar to his idea of universal laws. But they later criticized Pugin for his modern use of the Gothic style. They believed he had “greatly changed the old Gothic art in adapting it to the wants of the present day”, although there were liturgical aspects of architecture that he did not change.<sup>633</sup>

They, like Pugin, attempted to go beyond the Romantic attractions of the Gothic Revival. They looked to eighteenth-century architectural theorists and envisaged an architecture of the nineteenth century that was based on universal laws or rules that were embodied in the Gothic style, but were not confined to it. The French theorists were not, however, as successful as Pugin in fully working out their ideas. While he may have been familiar with their ideas and influenced by them to some extent, he advanced much further and he set about promoting Catholic ideals and universal principles that he believed the Gothic style embodied with fervour unmatched before or since.

v) Not a question of reconstruction or copying.

As Andrew Saint recognizes, Pugin “never quite championed an absolute return to the habits of the Middle Ages”<sup>634</sup> and, in fact, he “never copied exactly”.<sup>635</sup> Saint develops this idea to the point where he believes Pugin “invents something like a new style”.<sup>636</sup>

---

<sup>633</sup> ‘An Archæologist’ – probably either Pugin or the editor Frederick Lucas, “Church Architecture”, *The Tablet* II (2 February 1850), p.77. This was an article in support of Pugin. See Margaret Belcher, *A. W. N. Pugin*, pp.265-266.

<sup>634</sup> Andrew Saint, “Pugin’s Architecture in Context” in the Bard Center for Graduate Studies in the Decorative Arts, *A. W. N. Pugin: Master of Gothic Revival*, p.91.

Those who knew Pugin well, such as Thomas Grant, the Bishop of Southwark who preached his funeral discourse, did not see him simply as a medievalist. Indeed, Grant made little reference to Pugin's work in the context of Gothic revivalism and recognised, instead, the fact that "the architecture which he employed has been styled the expression of the Christian idea". Moreover, Grant placed the emphasis not on Pugin's interest in the medieval Church but on his interest in the Early Church:

... how affectionate was his interest in the Saints; when you think over the varying resources and ceaseless efforts of his mind, to impress upon those who should enter a church the emotions of love and gratitude towards the Saints which he could not conceal, as he was conversing with you about them. You can well remember how his eyes filled with tears as he spoke, and the rapture with which he pronounced the very name of our Fathers, the Blessed Apostles, and the White-Robed Companions of the Lamb ... in the moment of trial, when its depths were opened, all could understand his full and child-like confidence in the power of God, displayed in His Saints.<sup>637</sup>

Pugin, therefore, was not simply a medieval reconstructionist in the same way as Dom Prosper Guéranger, the nineteenth-century "Father of the Liturgical Movement" whose aim was to restore medieval monasticism with its display of Gothic buildings, elaborate vestments, Gregorian chant, and all the pomp characteristic of the later days of Cluny. For Dom Guéranger, to go back to the authentic liturgy meant to go back to medievalism. Although Guéranger was a Liberal Ultramontane and had some similar views to Pugin, they had, too, significant differences. Guéranger was unconventional or had conflicting ideas of liturgy in that, while he believed there should be a return to medieval Catholicism, this also meant a return to Roman usage and practices of the Roman rite and liturgy, rather than Gallican-type usages and practices.

---

<sup>635</sup> *Ibid.*, p.90.

<sup>636</sup> *Ibid.*, p.91.

<sup>637</sup> Lucas, the editor, "Funeral of the late Mr. Pugin - Sermon of the Lord Bishop of Southwark", *The Tablet* (2 October 1852), Vol. XIII, No 651, p.630.

The French Liberal Ultramontanes roughly divided into two groups after the unsuccessful mission to Rome by Lamennais, Montalembert and Lacordaire, which was condemned in 1832. Firstly, there were those Liberal Ultramontanes, like Pugin, who believed in the Pope as spiritual head of the Catholic Church. They were scathing about political Gallicanism, advocated a complete separation of Church and State, rejected Classicism and believed Ultramontanism would put Catholics once again in touch with the rich devotional life and mystical exaltations of the Middle ages.<sup>638</sup> Although they rejected most forms of Gallicanism, this first group had some empathy with ecclesiastical Gallicanism, which advocated a return to local and national usage of the Roman rite during the Middle Ages and beyond. Austin Gough makes the point about their similar aims.<sup>639</sup> Ecclesiastical Gallicanism was to become an increasingly important factor in Pugin's Liberal Ultramontane views because of his interest in the Middle Ages and beyond.

The second group were those authoritarian Ultramontanes who favoured a belief in a centralized Church, uniformity in liturgy, doctrine, style, and discipline, controlled by an infallible Pope and a watchful Roman administration. They rejected the liturgy of the medieval Church and all aspects of Gallicanism.

In France, Charlemagne (768-814) and the Frankish king Pepin III (d. 768) had favoured the Roman over the Gallican rite, but this had not prevented local Gallican usages and practices. The main feature of the ancient Gallican liturgy, conjectured W. C. Bishop in the "Church Quarterly Review"<sup>640</sup> for July 1908, was that it was not introduced into Gaul from anywhere, but was the original liturgy of that country, apparently invented and

---

<sup>638</sup> Austin Gough, Paris and Rome, pp.60-79, Ch. IV, 'Ultramontanism after Lamennais', which explains liberal Ultramontanism in some detail.

<sup>639</sup> *Ibid.*, p.65.

<sup>640</sup> "The Church Quarterly Review" (London 1875-1868).

developed there. He spoke of an original independence of Rome (liturgically speaking only) followed by later borrowings.

In England, much the same had occurred with the Roman rite, which was celebrated with local variations, which were peculiar to and developed in England. Thus, the Sarum, Durham, York, Lincoln, Exeter, Hereford and Bangor rites were local variations of the Roman rite. In England, the general pattern of these medieval rites was similar; they were all exuberant, ornate and long. They were really local or national uses of the Roman rite,<sup>641</sup> although the medieval Catholic Church in England is not normally described as a Gallican Church. The differences or variants between the Sarum, Durham and Roman rites are explained in detail in the Catholic Encyclopædia as follows:

The Sarum rite was “enormously lengthened by varied and prolix sequences” and “the Antiphons of the Sarum Offices differ considerably from those of the actual Roman Breviary”. There were other differences:

Very striking in the Sarum Use is the elaborate splendour of the accompanying ceremonial, which contrasts vividly with the comparative simplicity of Roman Practice. Three, five, seven deacons and as many subdeacons, two or more thurifers, three cross-bearers and so on are often prescribed or at least contemplated. Two or four priests vested in copes ... preside over the sacred chants. There was censuring of many altars, and even during the reading of the Lections at Matins priests in their vestments, offered incense at the high altar. Processions were frequent. And that preceding the High Mass on Sundays was specially magnificent. On the altar itself rarely more than two or at the most four candlesticks were placed, but standing round or suspended from the roof were many more lights”.<sup>642</sup>

The Durham rite included a number of local practices, which were different from both the Sarum Rite and the Roman Rite:

---

<sup>641</sup> Referred to as “medieval usages and practices” in the thesis, although Pugin argued that these were a feature of the Early Church and continued up to the nineteenth century, even though they reached perfection in the medieval period.

<sup>642</sup> F. Thomas Bergh (transcribed by John Fobian), the “Sarum Rite” in The Catholic Encyclopædia (1909), Vol. XIII.

A special feature of the Good Friday service was the crucifix taken by two monks from inside a statue of Our Lady, for the Creeping to the Cross. On the same day the Blessed Sacrament was enclosed in a great statue of Christ on a side altar and candles burned before it till Xaster Day ... Whit-Sunday, and Trinity Sunday processions went round the church, on Corpus Christi round the palace green, and on St Mark's Day to Bow Church in the city. The rogation-days also had their processions. In all these, the relics of St Bede were carried and the monks appeared in splendid copes. The prior, especially, wore a cope of cloth of gold so heavy that he could only stand when it was supported by "his gentlemen".<sup>643</sup>

In cathedrals, abbeys, and larger churches, there were a large number of clergy, called "the rulers of the choir", on solemnities, many assistants in copes on certain feasts, and there were additional rubrics for the choral celebration of the Office.<sup>644</sup>

The variations in the rites were reflected in the form and arrangement of the churches. Church planning and architecture, vestments, ornaments and church music had their roots in the liturgies or rites they served and adorned. To Pugin, the ruined or deserted churches of medieval Christendom bore witness to what the liturgy of the Church once was. But although he sought to revive Gallican-type, English medieval usages and practices, he did not do so as a Gallican, but as a Liberal Ultramontane, as later events would demonstrate. He nowhere defended his views as "Gallican", and did not use the term; if he had, he would have been accused of heresy. His interest in the medieval Church was in keeping with his Liberal Ultramontane views, but it was the principles or concepts that he wished to revive, not merely the style. Like other Liberal Ultramontanes, he was not averse to using modern methods of construction or materials; the result was that he did not copy exactly.

---

<sup>643</sup> Adrian Fortesque (transcribed by Douglas J. Potter), "Durham Rite" in The Catholic Encyclopædia (1909), Vol. V.

<sup>644</sup> See William Maskell, The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England, According to the Uses of Sarum, Bangor, York and Hereford, and the Modern Roman Liturgy (3<sup>rd</sup> edition Oxford 1882), A. A. King, Liturgies of the Past (Milwaukee 1959), and The Catholic Encyclopædia (Robert Appleton Company 1912), Vol. XV.

vi) Pugin influenced by the Renaissance Naturalist artists.

Pugin was influenced by another group that rejected the revival of Classical culture. While the Renaissance had a renewal of interest in Classical antiquity there were two different strands to this renewal. Up to the fifteenth century, there was an Early Renaissance in Europe that did not look for inspiration to Classical antiquity. It might be termed a “Gothic-led” Renaissance. Amongst those who supported such a Renaissance were the Naturalist artists.

Pugin spoke of his admiration of these Naturalist artists:

Italy was the very focus of Christian painting during the middle ages, and produced a most illustrious race of Catholic artists, amongst whom are to be reckoned a Giotto, an Andrea Orgagna (sic), a Fra Angelico, a Perugino, and a Raphaelle (sic).<sup>645</sup>

At the head of Pugin’s “most glorious race of Catholic artists” was Giotto di Bondone (c.1276-1337), known as the father of the great Italian Naturalist masters. The others he mentioned were followers of *giottisme*.

Although its artists felt free to look to Classical antiquity for instruction about techniques and did so, their roots were not in Roman or Greek antiquity, but firmly planted in the Middle Ages. Many of this movement followed the ascetic life-style of St Francis of Assisi. Pugin understood their use of allegory and their creation of recondite layers of meaning in their paintings.

vii) Savonarola’s major influence on Pugin’s ideas.

So far, the theory has been put forward that Pugin may have studied Early Renaissance writers, artists and/or theorists. Concrete evidence that he did study at least one

---

<sup>645</sup> Pugin, Contrasts, p.12, footnote, Ch. II.

such person is given in his choice of Girolamo Savonarola (1452-98), a fifteenth-century Dominican friar, as one of his major authorities.

Savonarola was influenced by Augustinian and Thomist thought. It should be mentioned that Donald Weinstein, although arguing that Savonarola was mostly influenced by the Joachimite prophetic tradition, (although Savonarola himself denied that this was so), admitted that many of Savonarola's views were taken from St Augustine's teaching and that he "did not depart significantly from the Augustinian view of history".<sup>646</sup>

Pugin studied Savonarola whose mission was to found a Christian city in Florence, the heart of Italy, as a well-organised republic that might initiate the reform of Italy and the Church. "Florence must become the city of God renewed, like Jerusalem, with the rebuilding of the temple after the return from the captivity", he stated.<sup>647</sup> God was to be its head. Savonarola gained a large following in Florence and he encouraged his followers to destroy all material things derived from the study of Classical antiquity such as poetry, pictures, sculptures of profane subjects, as well as ornaments and tawdry clothes. This led to the so-called "Bonfire of the Vanities". These were objects of Paganism, he believed, worldly things that should be destroyed.

Pugin, like Savonarola, attempted to warn people that their interest in Classical antiquity would lead them to Paganism, not Christianity. It encouraged a preoccupation with worldly things such as wealth and status; worse still, it would lead to the growth of selfishness, ambition and greed. "The Pagan monster", he remarked, has a growth of "hideous form".<sup>648</sup>

---

<sup>646</sup> Donald Weinstein, Prophecy and Humanism in Late Fifteenth Century Florence (D. Phil. Thesis University of Iowa 1957. Microfilm in the Taylor Institute, Oxford), p.134.

<sup>647</sup> G. Savonarola, Prediche italiane ai Fiorentini: Novembre e Dicembre 1494 (Bologna 1515: Perugia – Venezia: La Nuova Italia 1930), Vol. I, pp.1, 201-14.

<sup>648</sup> Pugin, Contrasts, p.18, Ch. II.

viii) Pugin influenced by Savonarola in allotting blame for the decline of religion.

Pugin believed the clergy were responsible for the “decay of faith” which had resulted in the Renaissance and the Reformation. “Protestantism and revived Paganism both date from the same epoch,” he claimed.<sup>649</sup> This loss of interest in religion was not caused by the State, as he had believed in the first edition of Contrasts, but by “some other more powerful agency”. This “agency” was the clergy who alone had been responsible for the Catholic Church’s “decayed state of faith”<sup>650</sup> and “*internal decay*”.<sup>651</sup> They had allowed people to turn away from God to worldly things. This resulted in a period of religious regression. Pugin claimed that modern ecclesiastical buildings, such as the Commissioners churches, that expressed no honour or worship of God in their design also amply illustrated another period of decayed faith and religious regression.<sup>652</sup>

Savonarola, too, thought the clergy were responsible for the decline of Christian standards and peoples’ interest in Classical culture had encouraged a revival of Paganism. Therefore, Pugin’s views were compatible with those of Savonarola on this and confirmed his Liberal Ultramontane views that some of the clergy were responsible for the decay of faith.

ix) Pugin expressed his admiration for Savonarola.

Pugin called Savonarola “that great champion and martyr for the truth” who portrayed, “in the most powerful language, the terrible danger in the then new rage for classic and Pagan styles”.<sup>653</sup> The papacy forbade Savonarola to preach, but he was eventually captured, tortured, declared a heretic and schismatic. He was condemned to death and hanged

---

<sup>649</sup> *Ibid.*, p.13.

<sup>650</sup> *Ibid.*, p.iii, preface to second edition.

<sup>651</sup> *Ibid.*, p.iv, preface.

<sup>652</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.49-50, Ch. V.

<sup>653</sup> *Ibid.*, p.v, preface.

on 23 May 1498 with his two followers and their bodies burnt so that no relic of them could survive.

x) Those ecclesiastics who supported the neo-Classical and Baroque.

Italy, Pugin said, “has been the fountain-head of the Pagan revival”;<sup>654</sup> Rome’s own clergy had been responsible for the first symptoms of the decay of faith. From “St Peter’s at Rome downwards”<sup>655</sup> the neo-Classical style had radiated into the Catholic world and spread to Spain, Portugal, the Catholic parts of Germany, Austria, Hungary, and the Low Countries. Britain was notably less affected. Yet, even in England, could be seen “glorious churches dismantled, her religion dispersed, and clergy brought into bondage”.<sup>656</sup>

Partly in order to combat the threat of the Protestant Reformation, the papacy set up the Council of Trent (1545-63) and approved a number of new Orders in the sixteenth century, including the Jesuits and the Theatines. These were not monks or friars, but Clerics Regular. In a different category were the Oratorians, who were not Clerks Regular but an association of secular priests founded in Rome by St Philip Neri. The Jesuits were the largest of the Orders, the most clerical, highly organised and Roman.<sup>657</sup> They were committed to the service of the papacy and made Rome their headquarters. They set up a large number of schools and colleges where “schooling was to be humanist, that is, literary and based on the classics of ancient Greece and Rome”.<sup>658</sup> As these multiplied, “the Society helped to spread Baroque across Catholic Europe”.<sup>659</sup>

---

<sup>654</sup> *Ibid.*, p.11, footnote.

<sup>655</sup> *Ibid.*, p.9.

<sup>656</sup> *Ibid.*, p.9, footnote, Ch. II.

<sup>657</sup> J. J. Scarisbrick, The Jesuits and the Catholic Reformation (London: The Historical Association 1988: 1989), p.5.

<sup>658</sup> *Ibid.*, p.16.

<sup>659</sup> *Ibid.*, p.18.

Because of their strength and size, the Jesuits had an influence on the other new Orders; they encouraged their interest in neo-Classicism and the Baroque. But the older Orders of monks (the Benedictines, Cisterians and Carthusians) and mendicant friars (Trinitarians, Dominicans, Franciscans, and Servites, etc.)<sup>660</sup> were critical of the new Orders.<sup>661</sup> The Jesuits saw themselves as “the new men, the men of the time” and, like the other new Orders, “failed to win the approval or sympathy of old-fashioned men”.<sup>662</sup> This rivalry was later to have repercussions in the French Counter-Reformation liturgical movement of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (which is discussed later). The Jesuits, like the other new Orders, were authoritarian Ultramontanes.

Following the Council of Trent’s brief pronouncements on the function of art in the service of religion (1563) church architects of the new Orders felt they had *carte blanche* to develop their interests in Classical architecture, particularly that of ancient Rome. They felt encouraged to develop a visually exciting style by using marble, gilt-bronze and carefully controlled lighting. Catholic architects, commissioned by the ecclesiastics of the new Orders, followed the lead of Humanist writers who had a fondness for antique pagan literature and mythological imagery. A. G. Dickens says that there was a striking use of Baroque by the new religious Orders, “especially by the Jesuits, the Oratorians, the Theatines”.<sup>663</sup> Pugin alleged that these were “modern Catholics with their own hands polluting and disfiguring, by pagan emblems and theatrical trumpery, the glorious structures raised by their ancestors in the faith”.<sup>664</sup> While Pugin, like the Liberal Ultramontanes, condemned neo-Classicism, he also condemned the clergy who promoted it - the Jesuits, Oratorians and the Theatines.

---

<sup>660</sup> *Ibid.*, p.24.

<sup>661</sup> Keith Randell, The Catholic and Counter Reformations (1990: London: Sidney: Toronto: Hodder and Stoughton 2000), p.15.

<sup>662</sup> The Encyclopædia Britannica (11<sup>th</sup>. edition), p.340, Vol. XV.

<sup>663</sup> A. G. Dickens, The Counter Reformation (London: Thames and Hudson 1968), p.165.

<sup>664</sup> Pugin, Contrasts, p.52, ‘Conclusion’.

Pugin was not alone in his views. The nineteenth-century Liberal Ultramontane Mennaisians looked with horror and contempt on such neo-Classical efforts. In particular, they “deprecat[ed] the Renaissance splendour of Saint-Peter’s”.<sup>665</sup> The movement had “concentrated the minds of its followers on an image of Christian Rome itself as the ultimate answer to the cultural influences of the Enlightenment, classicism and rationalism”.<sup>666</sup> In Rome, “they looked around them and saw only Christianity, with the classical ruins badly out of focus in the background”.<sup>667</sup>

But by the sixteenth century, the Jesuits and the Oratorians in Italy were at the forefront of both the Counter-Reformation and support for the Baroque and other neo-Classical styles. These ecclesiastics, said Pugin, had been as responsible as anyone in introducing the “bastard pagan style”<sup>668</sup> into church design in Continental countries, including France.<sup>669</sup> They had replaced “the solemnities of the Church” by the “theatrical trumpery of a modern fête”.<sup>670</sup> Geoffrey Scott says, “When the Counter-Reformation made its bid for popularity, it erected on every hand churches in the baroque manner frankly calculated to delight the senses and kindle common enthusiasms”.<sup>671</sup>

The style appealed to the theatrical instincts of mankind and the Jesuits and Oratorians were successful in capturing this interest for Catholic use. Pugin did not see it that way, “for Romanism read Paganism”,<sup>672</sup> he said, “for it is through *revived paganism* that the

---

<sup>665</sup> Austin Gough, Paris and Rome, p.62.

<sup>666</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 62.

<sup>667</sup> *Ibid.*, p.62.

<sup>668</sup> Pugin, Contrasts, p.52, footnote.

<sup>669</sup> *Ibid.*, p.52 and footnote.

<sup>670</sup> *Ibid.*, p.52, Conclusion.

<sup>671</sup> Geoffrey Scott, The Architecture of Humanism: A Study in the History of Taste (London: Constable and Company Ltd. 1914), p.24.

<sup>672</sup> Pugin, Contrasts, p.287.

sedelia (sic)<sup>673</sup> and Sacrarium<sup>674</sup> have been disused. the(sic) *Roman* rite supposes these things”.<sup>675</sup>

xi) The “new” St Peter’s, Rome, an example of Humanist architecture.

Pugin was highly critical, too, of the new, rebuilt St Peter’s; he said that its design implied “a most degenerate spirit”,<sup>676</sup> and, “as a Christian edifice it is by no means comparable to either St Peter’s of York or St Peter’s of Westminster, in both of which churches every original detail and emblem is of the purest Christian design, and *not one arrangement or feature borrowed from pagan antiquity*”.<sup>677</sup> Moreover, although it had not been a Gothic cathedral, he greatly admired the basilica of the old St Peter’s because it had an ancient liturgical form and arrangement (expanded upon later). Donato Bramante (c. 1444-1514) and Buonarroti Michelangelo (1475-1564), who were at the forefront of Humanist architectural ideas, were among those principally responsible for the rebuilding of the “new” St Peter’s and the style was frequently copied thereafter. Pugin claimed that, “every church that has been built from St Peter’s at Rome downwards” was an example of degenerate Pagan architecture.<sup>678</sup> Certainly, Bramante’s design for St Peter’s was for a temple-like, centrally planned church with the use of the Doric Order, which he considered to be the most suitable

---

<sup>673</sup> “Sedilia” are seats, usually three, built into the thickness of the chancel wall on the Epistle side, for the use of the celebrant, the deacon, and subdeacon.

<sup>674</sup> “Sacrarium” is a Latin word for “Sacristy”, which is a vestry in a church where the vestments and the liturgical vessels used in the Mass are kept.

<sup>675</sup> Pugin to John Fuller Russell (15 November 1841). See Margaret Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.287.

<sup>676</sup> Pugin, Contrasts, p.9, footnote, Ch.II.

<sup>677</sup> *Ibid.*, p.9, footnote, Ch.II.

<sup>678</sup> Pugin, Contrasts, p.8-9.

for a male saint, since this was in accordance with the principles set out by Vitruvius for a Pagan hero or god.<sup>679</sup> Michelangelo further developed this neo-Classical design.

Pugin was, therefore, extremely critical of the “new” St Peter’s, Rome, because he thought that it demonstrated a revival of Paganism. His view was that while many men, who thought of themselves as Englishmen and Christians likewise studied and took a great interest in Classical antiquity, they were really Pagans in their hearts.<sup>680</sup> The question is, was there any truth in the assertion that interest in Classical architecture signified a revival of Paganism?

Some architectural historians, such as P. Frankl and Burckhard, argue that neo-Classical art and architecture were Pagan. Rudolf Wittkower, on the other hand, in his Architectural Principles: in the Age of Humanism (1949) attempts to argue that Renaissance neo-Classical architecture was not Pagan, but early Christian.<sup>681</sup> Peter Murray, however, suggests that Early Renaissance architectural theorists, such as Alberti, had a limited knowledge of Classical antiquity, which they derived from the works of Vitruvius; they could not really distinguish between early Christian and Pagan architecture.<sup>682</sup> Others also believe that their knowledge of ancient Rome was deficient. T. Buddensieg argues that there was a widespread, rather romantic or naïve opinion amongst “humanist historians, including Ghiberti and Vasari, that with the rise of Christianity the *artes* came to an end” with Gregory the Great.<sup>683</sup> He says that Renaissance architects thought they could rebuild ancient Rome,<sup>684</sup>

---

<sup>679</sup> Peter and Linda Murray, The Oxford Companion to Christian Art and Architecture (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1996), p.65.

<sup>680</sup> *Ibid.*, p.20, Ch. II.

<sup>681</sup> Rudolf Wittkower, Architectural Principles: in the Age of Humanism (London: Academy Editions 1949; London: Warburgh Institute University of London 1998), p.17.

<sup>682</sup> Peter Murray, The Architecture of the Italian Renaissance (London: Thames and Hudson 1963; 1994) pp.53, 60. See also A. Blunt, ‘Baroque Architecture and Classical Antiquity’ in R. R. Bolgar, Classical influences, pp.349-354, who also claims that Baroque architects were ill-informed about Classical architecture.

<sup>683</sup> T. Buddensieg, “Criticism of Ancient Architecture in the sixteenth and seventeenth Centuries”, in

but their ideas were not, he says, based on scientific study of ancient buildings until the end of the fifteenth century, but on “romantic and naïve” views.<sup>685</sup>

Indeed, later archaeological investigation showed that temples were rarely reused as Christian churches because they had housed shrines of gods and because animal sacrifices had been held outside their walls; Christians knew that the form and decoration of such temples symbolized Paganism. “Only rarely, and centuries later, was the revulsion against paganism sufficiently overcome for a pagan temple to be converted into a Christian church”.<sup>686</sup> The Pagans themselves believed the temple to be the dwelling of the god or goddesses and the very structure embodied their spirits.

One of the most famous Roman temples ‘dedicated to all the gods’, which was converted into a Christian church, was the Pantheon, which was rededicated in 608 as Sta Maria ad Martyres. But this was an exception rather than the rule. Before its rededication most Christians held it in contempt and it was called a “dirty temple, a house of darkness, inhabited by the Devil”.<sup>687</sup> It was condemned by the Liberal Ultramontanes as a “meaningless heap of stones”.<sup>688</sup>

Instead, the early Christians took over basilicas (court, market or royal throne room) which, although built by Pagans, had not been used for Pagan worship and did not have Pagan deities and Pagan symbolism embodied within the building structure itself. The basilica suited early Christian use because it was essentially a large assembly hall, where people could enter and assemble for worship. The interior was not left with the arrangement

---

R. R. Bolgar, ed., Classical Influences, p.344.

<sup>684</sup> *Ibid.*, p.338.

<sup>685</sup> *Ibid.*, p.338.

<sup>686</sup> Peter and Linda Murray, The Oxford Companion to Christian Art and Architecture, p. 105.

<sup>687</sup> T. Buddensieg, “Criticism of Ancient Architecture” in R. R. Bolgar, ed., Classical Influences, p.336.

<sup>688</sup> Austin Gough, Paris and Rome, p.62.

of a court or market or other such use, however, but altered to an arrangement to suit Christian services - with a nave, chancel, aisles, altars, screens, etc.. Pugin had a few books on basilicas in his library, including J. Martinii's Theatrum Basilicae Pisanae (Rome 1705) and P.L. Dionysii's Sacrarum Vaticanae Basilicae Cryptarum Monumenta (Rome 1828).

xii) Pugin influenced by the French Revolution.

Pugin's ideas of Paganism predated the Revolution in France since he believed Paganism was revived in the sixteenth century and continued thereafter. Paganism became evident, he thought, in the Catholicism of the Grand Monarque who died in 1715:

... the revived pagan system, which began with the classicism of the sixteenth century, was fostered in the mythological palaces of the Grand Monarque, and only attained its climax in the great French revolution, when its principles were fully worked out in the massacre of the clergy, the open profession of infidelity, and the exhibition of a prostitute raised over the altar of God.<sup>689</sup>

Pugin may, however, have been influenced by the Revolution's anti-Christian or Pagan character. He compared the French Church up until the eighteenth century with the medieval Church in England; both were exclusively Catholic, very wealthy and in dire need of reform. The Reformation in England and the Revolution in France started out with similar aims of reforming the Church. Pugin saw parallels in these, but his view of the former may have been coloured by the horrors of the latter. The Ultramontane and Gallican movements, too, were reactions to the Revolution; both aimed to reChristianize France.

Pugin built up a picture of the French Church before the Revolution with reference to a number of French historians.

xiii) The French historians.

As in the first edition of Contrasts, Pugin referred to Dom Jean-Francois Pommeraye, Michael Beziers and A. P. M. Gilbert.<sup>690</sup> He also included Jonas and Langlois in his new edition. Eustache Hyacinthe Langlois (1777-1837) was his authority on the liturgical form and arrangement of these Catholic churches. Pugin consulted his Essay on the Abbey of St Wandrille, Normandy and other local histories.<sup>691</sup>

Pugin had several of Langlois's books in his library including his Description historique des Maisons de Rouen (Paris: 1821), Notice sur l'incendie de la Cathedrale de Rouen (Rouen: 1823), Essai sur l'Abbaye de Fontenelle ou de Saint Wandrille (Paris: 1827), Mémoire sur des Tombeaux Gallo-Romains (Rouen: 1827-29), Hymne à la Cloche (Rouen: 1832), Essai sur la Peinture sur Verre (Rouen: 1832), Discours sur les Désguisemens Monstreux dans le Cours du Moyen Age et sur les Fêtes des Fous (Rouen: 1833), Notice sur l'Abbaye de St Amand à Rouen (Rouen: 1834) and Souvenirs de l'Ecole de Mars et de 1794 (Rouen: 1836).<sup>692</sup>

Pugin's choice of French historians also argues that, while he had Liberal Ultramontane views, he also had leanings towards ecclesiastical Gallicanism because of their interest in the medieval period and beyond. There was a great deal of antithesis between the two forms of Gallicanism in the nineteenth century – “gallicanisme ecclésiastique” and “gallicanisme parlementaire”. The ecclesiastical Gallicans looked for guidance to the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century neo-Gallicans such as Bossuet, Fleury and Bergier. On liturgical matters, they, like Pugin, turned to Mabillon, Félibien, and other Maurists. Pommeraye, Beziers, Gilbert and Langlois were part of this group of ecclesiastical Gallicans.

---

<sup>689</sup> Pugin, Contrasts, p.9, footnote, Ch.II.

<sup>690</sup> See p.120 of thesis.

<sup>691</sup> Pugin, Contrasts, p.99, Appendix V.

<sup>692</sup> A. N. L. Munby, ed., Sale Catalogues, Vol. 4, pp.258, 259. Items 256-263.

xiv) The destruction of the '*ancien régime*'.

Pugin believed that the destruction of Christianity in the Revolution was an example of the destruction of a holy society. What had begun in France as a democratic reform programme turned into an anticlerical, exceedingly bloody revolution that destroyed the *ancien régime*, murdered or exiled the clergy and desecrated the churches and monasteries. It was engendered in part by critics such as Voltaire, Rousseau and other *philosophes*. By 1793, the Revolutionary bigots who took the ideas of the *philosophes* very seriously, had set about a conscious programme of de-Christianization. The old calendar was abolished along with Sundays, and a new one instituted in which the *décadi* was the day of rest. New Revolutionary cults such as the Cult of Reason and the Cult of the Supreme Being were promulgated as substitute religions. There were similarities in this to ancient Paganism and its many cults.

The Revolution had a drastic affect on church buildings, which were vandalised and desecrated. There was a total rejection of Gothic architecture with its connotations of Christianity and an adoption of the neo-Classical style for all official or public buildings. Even though Gothic and Classical styles had often been used together for churches since the Renaissance (the designs of the eighteenth-century neo-Classical architectural theorists Laugier and Cordemoy were typical of this approach), the Classical still did not have the close link with Christianity in the same way as the Gothic style, as the Revolutionaries perceived. Indeed, Classical was specifically chosen because it was thought to be anti-Christian and it was the architecture of the Roman Empire, which was Pagan. The Church of St Geneviève, designed by the neo-Classical architect Jacques-Germain Soufflot (1713-1780), was intended, before the Revolution, to be the principal church of Paris. While there was Christian symbolism in the plan – essentially a Greek cross – the façade, like that of the Roman Pantheon on which it was modelled, was an enormous temple front with a porch of

Corinthian columns and triangular pediment; the body of the building was set off by a huge dome surrounded by four smaller domes on the four arms of the cross. The Revolutionaries renamed it the Panthéon when they abolished religion and used it for secular purposes; Voltaire, Rousseau and other prominent Revolutionary figures are buried there. The predominantly Classical nature of the design appealed to the Revolutionaries and they did not regard it as a building that was especially Christian because of this. It was easily and quickly adapted to non-Christian use.

Neo-Classicism was encouraged in art and the official court painter was David who painted scenes of political events in contemporary France as though they were taking place in ancient Rome. Indeed, Napoleon wished to recreate the Roman Empire and he made himself Emperor to suit. Much of the art and architecture of his era reflected this. Many Italian styled buildings were built in France after 1790, which were, said Pugin, filled “with vast apartments of pagan design”.<sup>693</sup>

Pugin, therefore, in the second edition of Contrasts, associated neo-Classical architecture with the terrors of the French Revolution and the destruction of Christianity.

xv) Paganism made inroads in England.

Whereas the effects of Paganism in Europe had been obvious, in England, claimed Pugin, its direct impact had only been moderate and limited. He admitted that, “the prevailing rage for paganism during the last three centuries on the Continent”<sup>694</sup> had caused more havoc than in England.<sup>695</sup> The English churches had partly escaped the Continental fashion for all that was Classical.<sup>696</sup>

---

<sup>693</sup> Pugin, Contrasts, p.54, Conclusion.

<sup>694</sup> *Ibid.*, p.56, Conclusion.

<sup>695</sup> *Ibid.*, p.56.

<sup>696</sup> *Ibid.*, p.54.

Yet, these English churches had not altogether eluded this fashion; this was evident, Pugin said, in the many neo-Classical tombs and monuments found in them. Instead of symbols of Christianity and hope of the life to come, these were covered by symbols of a no-hope religion. It was common to see “The inverted torch, the club of Hercules, the owl of Minerva, and the cinery urn” on tombs.<sup>697</sup> These had replaced the cross, the symbol of hope, as well as “saints and angels, on the tombs of popes, bishops, kings, ecclesiastics, statesmen, and warriors”.<sup>698</sup> He could not conceive how even Christian popes and bishops wanted Pagan tombs and monuments instead of Christian emblems of the Resurrection. The Pagan emblems were “frequently accompanied by Pagan divinities, in Pagan nudity”.<sup>699</sup> Pugin, with a touch of Evangelical prudishness, saw nudity as Pagan and evil.

As more evidence that people’s thoughts had been influenced by Paganism, Pugin pointed out that even the inscriptions had changed from “a prayer for the soul of the deceased” to “a long and pompous inscription” of their worldly virtues and exploits.<sup>700</sup> He allowed that in neo-Classical churches, this might be consistent with the style, but when neo-Classical monuments were put into Gothic churches they were totally out of place and brought the emblems of Paganism into Christian surroundings. Therefore, he argued, although the Classical revival had not taken hold in England, nevertheless, a small but gradual infiltration had taken place.

Pugin claimed that people were still unconsciously being influenced by Pagan symbolism because “the Versailles, the Tuileries, Louvre, St. Cloud, Fontainebleau, Brussels, Munich ... Buckingham Palace” were neo-Classical buildings with designs from Pagan mythology and without any Christian symbolism whatsoever. “Gods and goddesses,

---

<sup>697</sup> *Ibid.*, p.12, Ch.II.

<sup>698</sup> *Ibid.*, p.12.

<sup>699</sup> *Ibid.*, p.12.

<sup>700</sup> *Ibid.*, p.12.

demons and nymphs, tritons and cupids, repeated *ad nauseam*, all represented in a most complementary attitude”, he stated.<sup>701</sup> An ancient Pagan, he believed, would have felt quite at home in these surroundings, even if he had earlier claimed that these buildings were poor representations of their ancient counterparts. Therefore, he concluded, people in his day were living in such surroundings as though they were Pagans themselves.

xvi) The nineteenth-century Naturalist artists.

Pugin admired and referred to a group of artists led by Johann Friedrich Overbeck (1789-1869) and Alexis-Francois Rio. The latter, an acquaintance and friend of Wiseman, Montalembert and Lamennais,<sup>702</sup> established the groups links with Savonarola in his De la poésie chrétienne (1836) and De l'art chrétien (1851). Pugin welcomed their works of Christian art.<sup>703</sup> “The work of M. Rio on Christian Painting is an admirable production”, he commented. Rio, like Schegel and Overbeck, maintained the inseparability of Christianity and art and contended that although the Renaissance began as a spiritual movement with spiritual causes, it only became Pagan in its later stages with the advent of Humanism. Pugin particularly admired “the great Overbeck, that prince of Christian painters” whom, he said, “has raised up a school of mystical and religious artists”<sup>704</sup> and who, “with several of his associate artists have directed their talents to religion”.<sup>705</sup>

This group of German painters was formed in 1809 in Vienna and called themselves the Brotherhood of Saint Luke; they were also known as the Nazarenes, Nazareners or the Lucas Brotherhood. Like Pugin, there was a certain eccentricity about Overbeck and the other

---

<sup>701</sup> *Ibid.*, p.10.

<sup>702</sup> Wilfrid Ward, Wiseman, Vol. I, p.274.

<sup>703</sup> Pugin, Contrasts, p.18.

<sup>704</sup> *Ibid.*, p.18.

<sup>705</sup> *Ibid.*, p.18, footnote.

members of the group; they adopted a strange dress, of wide flowing capes and long hair which caused others to mock them and give them the nickname of 'Nazareners' (a reference to the Nazarites in Numbers 6).<sup>706</sup> Many of its members were, again like Pugin, converts to Catholicism.

xvii) Pugin shared the ideals of Overbeck and his group of Naturalist painters.

The Lucas Brotherhood, who in 1810 moved to Rome, were opposed to Realism and Humanism and took up the ideas of the Early Renaissance Naturalist artists. They rejected the artistic fashions of the nineteenth century which looked to Classical models and attempted to set up a different standard by returning to older Gothic or Christian ones. They venerated Fra Angelico and the early Raphael; they greatly admired Dürer. "For artistic inspiration they turned to Albrecht Dürer and to Italian Renaissance art, particularly the works of Perugino and early Raphael".<sup>707</sup> Pugin, too, admired these and had a copy of Dürer's Messung mit Zirkel (Arnhem 1603) in his library.<sup>708</sup> Kenneth Clark claimed that when Pugin was young he developed his drawing talent by copying Dürer's engravings.<sup>709</sup>

xviii) The loss of interest in religion.

In England, it was not so much the Renaissance as the Reformation, thought Pugin, that had caused the most havoc to religion. In order to build up a more complete picture of the Catholic Church in England and the way it had been affected by the Reformation, Pugin used the same British historians that he had cited in his first edition of Contrasts: Heylin, Burnet, Stevens, Stowe, Dugdale, Goodwin, Fuller, Holinshed and Strype. In addition, he

---

<sup>706</sup> Peter and Linda Murray, The Oxford Companion to Christian Art and Architecture, p. 354.

<sup>707</sup> The New Encyclopædia Britannica (1997, 15<sup>th</sup> edition), Vol. 9, p.16.

<sup>708</sup> A. N. L. Munby, Sale Catalogues, Vol. 4, p.14. Item 204.

<sup>709</sup> Kenneth Clark, The Gothic Revival, p.154.

referred to Spelman, Rushworth, Dodds and Collinson. Again, his use of these Protestant authorities was questionable; he selected his material from them to support his arguments, but his conclusions were entirely different.

xix) The British historians.

On Church laws in the Catholic Church, Pugin turned to the historian and antiquary Sir Henry Spelman (1564-1641). He had a copy of Spelman's Glossarium Archæologicum (1687) (published after his death), some volumes of which were edited by Dugdale and Dodsworth.<sup>710</sup>

For events after the Reformation, particularly the seventeenth century, Pugin referred to the historian John Rushworth (1612-1690) and his Historical Collections of Private Passages of State (1659-1701).<sup>711</sup> It covered the period from 1618-1649 and was an attempt at a true history of events leading up to and during the English Civil Wars.

Charles Dodds (1672-1743), the writer of many books and treatises on historical and theological subjects, was one of Pugin's few Roman Catholic authorities. He had a copy of his Church History of England (1739-42) which had been edited by Mark Tierney in 1839-42. After Tierney's death in 1862, Dodds' manuscript material was bequeathed to Thomas Grant, Bishop of Southwark, the bishop who officiated at Pugin's funeral in 1852.

Pugin consulted the works of John Collinson (1757-1793), a county historian and an Anglican clergyman, for information on local churches and histories. Collinson published The Beauties of British Antiquities (1779) and the History and Antiquities of the County of Somerset (1791).

---

<sup>710</sup> Munby, Vol. 4, p.36. Item 605.

<sup>711</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 4, p.35. Item 584.

Again, Rushworth, one of these British historians, was writing during the Restoration period when there was great interest in regaining a sense of history and tradition.

11) Pugin's exposition of the practical level of meaning.

i) New services.

Pugin's passionate interest in the worship of the medieval period and beyond meant that he rejected any variations, changes or new services that came into effect from the sixteenth century onwards. These came about because the Oratorians, like the Jesuits and other new Orders under the influence of Humanism, were innovative and introduced new services. The older Orders, however, were displeased with what they believed to be the introduction of novelties into the concept of the religious life.<sup>712</sup> Pugin's rejection of variations, change or new services later caused him to clash with the nineteenth-century Oratorians.

The Oratory began as a meeting place for readings and discussions; music was added, first as songs and hymns, and then with instrumental accompaniments.<sup>713</sup> St Philip Neri (1515-1595) wanted to attract as many potential new converts as possible and thus introduced new popular devotions. As many as 3-4,000 people attended his popular services, many of who might not otherwise have attended a traditional church service.

This popular service was not a Mass or Eucharist. According to Bacci in his The Life of St. Philip Neri (1902), it consisted of four half-hour sermons with additional prayers and litanies, punctuated by devotional music. Besides the Hours including Vespers, the Psalms and the Antiphons, vernacular popular hymns were also sung. The service was a synthesis of old and new devotions with popular and modern trends.

---

<sup>712</sup> The Encyclopædia Britannica, p.340. 11<sup>th</sup>. edition.Vol. XV.

<sup>713</sup> Pastor Ludwig Von Freiherr, History of the Popes (London: St. Louis: Herder: Routledge & Kegan Paul 1936-53), XIX, p.585.

St Philip Neri was the one who first introduced some new services including the Quarante'ore (the Forty-Hours Devotion) to Rome in 1550 and Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament as a separate service.<sup>714</sup> The new Orders gave greater emphasis to prayer, spiritual reading, and the Holy Eucharist in the Forty Hours Devotion; these new services were an alternative to the traditional forms of service offered by monks, canons and friars.

While St Philip Neri attended a short Mass himself every day, he believed confession and preaching should be more frequent than communion for “with him frequent communion was not quite on a par” with confession.<sup>715</sup> His disciple Fabrizio de' Massimi openly said, “There is no doubt that he wished people to go to confession often, and to approach the sacrament of Penance more frequently than that of the Holy Eucharist: this is well known and notorious among all those who knew Father Philip”.<sup>716</sup> He restricted participation to those he felt were not worthy of receiving communion, for instance, women and those who were repentant (they were, however, encouraged to attend the Mass).<sup>717</sup> Moreover, he “forbade several priests to say mass every day”<sup>718</sup> and he “wished young people to go to confession very frequently, but not to communicate so often”.<sup>719</sup> This restriction extended to his own priests as much as the laity. “Even in the case of the priest’s mass, Philip was cautious in his advice: the Abbate Crescenzi had from him the custom of saying mass only once in the week besides Sunday”.<sup>720</sup>

---

<sup>714</sup> Natham Mitchell, OSB, Cult and Controversy: The Worship of the Eucharist Outside Mass (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company 1974: 1982), p.311-312.

<sup>715</sup> Louis Ponnelle and Louis Bordet, St Philip Neri and the Roman Society of his Times (1515-1595) (London: Sheed and Ward 1932: 1979), p.590.

<sup>716</sup> *Ibid.*, p.590.

<sup>717</sup> *Ibid.*, p.590.

<sup>718</sup> Father Bacci, (trans. By Frederick Ignatius Antrobus), The Life of St. Philip Neri (Rome: 1837: London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trober Co. 1902), Vol. I, p.200.

<sup>719</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p.199.

<sup>720</sup> Ponnelle and Bordet, p.591.

St Philip Neri may have adopted this view of the Mass simply because he had a certain veneration for the Body and Blood of Our Lord; there is no doubt that he was a very spiritual person himself. Yet, “for more than forty years Philip’s Mass was regarded as a miracle of holy fervour”.<sup>721</sup> This reluctance concerning regular communions for the laity and the adoption of popular services was later to be misconstrued by W. G. Ward. Yet, there is no doubt that Saint Philip Neri preferred more frequent confession to communion and favoured popular services. Only after his day did the Oratorians change the receiving of communion to every day due to the influence of the Jesuits and their new interpretation of the Council of Trent’s edict on the Eucharist.

The Oratorians (like the Jesuits<sup>722</sup>), during St Philip’s time, thus began to see a new importance in sermons, confession and popular services. Consequently, the pulpit and confessional became as significant to them as the altar, and the nave had to be large. This was to have a major effect on liturgical form and arrangement. Later, the renewed importance the Oratorians attached to the Eucharist was to change this view and frequent communion then became the norm.<sup>723</sup> The old Orders, however, did not approve of frequent communion.<sup>724</sup>

ii) A new liturgical form and arrangement required.

The Oratorians’ new services and devotions required a new plan. The traditional liturgical arrangement did not fit in with their requirements. They called for huge naves for very large congregations and facilities for numerous services, preaching and confessions. The nave had to become an assembly hall. This was a similar approach to that already adopted by

---

<sup>721</sup> Cardinal Capecebatro Alfonso, The Life of St Philip Neri (London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne 1926), p.107.

<sup>722</sup> Rudolf Wittkower and Irma B. Jaffe, eds. Baroque Art: The Jesuit Contribution ( New York: Fordham University Press 1972), p.3.

<sup>723</sup> Ponnelle and Bordet, p.182.

<sup>724</sup> *Ibid.*, p.184.

some of the friars' churches of the Dominicans. Since year-round preaching and frequent confessions were seen as effective instruments of public reform, the pulpit increased in importance, as did the confessional. The logical place for the pulpit was at the end of the nave, forming a natural terminus that tended to distinguish it from the chancel and crossing. This gave the nave a different focus and made it more important in its own right because its relationship to the chancel had changed. The emphasis on preaching affected not only the form of the nave, but its structure as well. Preaching required good acoustics so that the preacher might be clearly heard. A flat wooden ceiling was considered by Francesco Giorgi to be the best for this.<sup>725</sup> However, he recommended that the chapels and chancel remain vaulted as this was considered best acoustically because of the chanting of the priest.<sup>726</sup> The Oratorians, as well as the Jesuits, thought that the nave should be unencumbered by tombs, screens or pillars.<sup>727</sup>

Consequently, a new form of building was needed to express these new requirements. The Oratorians encouraged Humanist artists and architects to come forward with new designs:

During the first twenty years of the seventeenth century the contribution made to the artistic life of Rome by the Oratorians was very much more impressive than that of the Jesuits. There was both in their selection of artists and in the inspiration that they provided for them a fineness of taste and a sense of exaltation that for long made them true pioneers among the religious Orders of the Counter Reformation. This is not altogether surprising. Despite their insistence on powerful visual imagery as a help for devotion, none of the Jesuit leaders showed any subtlety of appreciation. St Philip Neri, on the other hand, was a man of the profoundest aesthetic sensibility who responded passionately to painting and music.<sup>728</sup>

---

<sup>725</sup> Rudolf Wittkower and Irma B. Jaffe, eds., Baroque Art, pp.19-20.

<sup>726</sup> *Ibid.*, p.19.

<sup>727</sup> *Ibid.*, p.19.

<sup>728</sup> Francis Haskell, Patrons and Painters: A Study in the Relations Between Italian Art and Society in the Age of the Baroque (London: Chatto and Windus 1963), p.68.

Thus, when the Oratorians commissioned the architect Francesco Borromini (1599-1667) to rebuild their Oratory of St Philip, the Chiesa Nuova, they specified:

1. A large wide nave with flat ceiling.
2. 3 shallow altar chapels to each side of the nave with no screens.
3. A transept with semi-circular termination marked at the crossing by a notably elevated cupola.
4. A chancel or altar area elevated three steps above the nave that was open to the nave - no screen.
5. Behind the chancel a columnar screen separating the clergy from the laity.

By this time, regular communion had become much more important to the Oratorians. Their specification included features specifically designed to make the Mass more visible to all – shallow chancel or apse, lack of screen and narrow aisles. Borromini built the Oratory in the Baroque style with an innovative arrangement to suit these new requirements. This new liturgical form and arrangement was frequently repeated thereafter so that a certain measure of uniformity in their churches emerged.

The Jesuits and Dominicans, who were under direct Roman control, insisted on Roman usages and practices. They wanted Roman liturgy and saw this as essential to a centralized and unified Church. Roman usages and practices required subtle changes to liturgical form and arrangement. They believed that by achieving these the authority and power of the papacy would be increased.

iii) The Reformers, too, required a new liturgical form and arrangement.

Pugin thought that while the Renaissance had eventually led to sixteenth-century liturgical changes on the Continent, an analogy could be made with events in England after the Reformation. He expanded on the difficulties of the Reformers when attempting to implement their new religion in England. He claimed that they found themselves in a paradoxical situation. The necessity of providing auditorium-type churches posed a problem. Once the Reformation was underway and the “new religion was by law established”, they

were reluctant to build new churches. There was the likely expense and, since the people did not support the new religion, they would be unlikely to subscribe to church building funds. Consequently, the burden would be likely to fall on the Reformers themselves. Pugin wrote that their alternative was to attempt to adapt existing churches and fit them up for “the new form of worship”.<sup>729</sup> Changes to liturgical form and arrangement would have to be made to accommodate new services:

The manner of preparing the churches for the exercise of the new liturgy, consisted in blocking up the nave and aisles, with dozing-pens, termed pews; above this mass of partitions rose a rostrum, for the preacher, reader, and his respondent; whilst a square table, surmounted by the king’s arms, which had everywhere replaced the crucified Redeemer, concluded the list of necessary erections.<sup>730</sup>

Ironically, because the ancient churches that the Protestants inherited had been designed and built to express Catholicism down to the minutest details, it was not possible to rid them of every trace of their former function. They were completely unsuitable for the focus on preaching. The attempt to transform them into auditoriums proved to be far from satisfactory for “There was no sympathy between these vast edifices and the Protestant worship,” wrote Pugin.<sup>731</sup> The plan, the interior spaces, the vertical emphasis, the stone carvings both inside and out, the lancet-shaped windows of the old Catholic churches and cathedrals, could not be obliterated without massive expense. The result was a mishmash of elements, a mixture of Protestant and Catholic liturgical forms and arrangements. Just as much of the old system was kept in the Church of England “as would serve for the professors of the new; for these reformers, although they professed to revive the simplicity of the

---

<sup>729</sup> Pugin, Contrasts, p.31.

<sup>730</sup> *Ibid.*, p.31.

<sup>731</sup> *Ibid.*, p.44.

apostles in all such matters” they were “quite unwilling to become imitators of their poverty”, he remarked.<sup>732</sup>

Pugin had a fixed view of Catholic liturgical form and arrangement suited to local and national conditions and he saw the liturgical changes brought about by the Renaissance and Reformation as damaging to Catholicism. In his mistaken view, some Catholics believed that the Mass was no longer the principal consideration for church design.

---

<sup>732</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.29-30.

## Chapter Six - PUGIN'S SERIES OF BOOKS

### 1) A precedent to The True Principles.

The architectural content and format of Remarks on the Architecture of the Middle Ages (1835)<sup>733</sup> by Robert Willis (1800-1875), Professor of Applied Mechanics at the University of Cambridge, to which Pugin referred, may have given him an outline for his The True Principles of Christian or Pointed Architecture (1841).

Although Willis was only concerned with architecture, he tackled some of the issues that Pugin was interested in. While Pugin took up these issues, he looked far beyond the architecture. Therefore, Willis's work may only have served as a superficial guide.

### 2) Pugin applied certain categories to his new book.

If The True Principles is read from beginning to end, the reader will initially observe that the book appears to be about materials and structures relevant to buildings; it is very practical. Pugin made this practical or natural purpose clear in the first two pages and continued to the conclusion. Yet, he soon began to weave other subjects into the text. Thus, there is the historical aspect where he studied the Classical temple (pp.2,3); the religious aspect where pinnacles, he said, had a vertical emphasis, which was "an emblem of the Resurrection"; and he also mentioned the "mystical" principle (p.8). He also made numerous brief references to "deception" (pp.22, 27, 38) and he wrote that there is a distinction between Protestant (p.32) and Catholic architecture (p.37). These subjects plainly have little to do with materials and structures. Why, therefore, should he have mentioned them? The answer may be that he wished his interpretation of the practical aspects to be seen in the context of a much wider interpretation.

---

<sup>733</sup> Robert Willis, Remarks on the Architecture of the Middle Ages (Cambridge: Deighton 1835).

Pugin, for instance, referred to “deception” as a quality of Antichrist.<sup>734</sup> He believed that Catholic architecture, like the Catholic faith, was pure and true. God gave it to the faithful. Protestant and Pagan architecture, on the other hand, were not from God and therefore, by his reckoning, must be from Antichrist. Pugin’s interpretation of Protestant church architecture was that features of Antichrist could be seen in the structures themselves, i.e. by “deception” and by “showy worldly expedients”.<sup>735</sup> Pugin therefore used his brief references to these other subjects in support of his views on the true Church, Protestantism, Catholicism, history, and religion. The main categories that he used, however, were the practical and mystical.

### 3) Pugin’s exposition of the practical level of meaning in his The True Principles.

#### i) His authorities and sources.

Pugin did not depend on secondary sources and authorities for his The True Principles, unlike his other books. He preferred, instead, to rely on his own first hand experience. He wrote of the “fictitious dome” of St Paul’s Cathedral<sup>736</sup> and the mouldings of Crowland Abbey, Lincolnshire,<sup>737</sup> from personal knowledge. Similarly, he wrote of the metal hinges that he had seen at Notre Dame, Paris, St Elizabeth’s Church at Marburg, Lichfield Cathedral and the Chapter House, York.<sup>738</sup> The roofs at the churches of Bury St Edmund’s, St Peter’s and All Saints, Norwich, Lavenham and Long Melford, Suffolk had impressed him

---

<sup>734</sup> Pugin, The True Principles of Pointed or Christian Architecture (1841: London: Henry G. Bohn 1953), p.50.

<sup>735</sup> *Ibid.*, p.38.

<sup>736</sup> *Ibid.*, p.8, footnote.

<sup>737</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.14.

<sup>738</sup> *Ibid.*, p.19.

and he thought these fine examples of Gothic work.<sup>739</sup> Thus his aim in this book was to argue by example and to make it intensely practical.

One of the few authorities on the Middle Ages that he used was again William Dugdale and his Monasticon. Pugin argued that spires on churches were common before the Reformation and he turned for evidence to Dugdale who gave views of spires at Hereford Cathedral, Worcester Cathedral, Southwell Minster, Rochester Cathedral, Ely Cathedral, Ripon Minster, Finchal Abbey, and Lincoln Cathedral.<sup>740</sup>

ii) The Classical temple.

Pugin again attempted to argue in his The True Principles that the specific form and arrangement of the Classical temple was intrinsically linked to Pagan worship. He, like Willis and other architectural theorists interested in Classical architecture, turned to Vitruvius as an authority. Pugin was familiar with Vitruvius's treatise on architecture in ten books, De architectura, which was dedicated to the Emperor Augustus.<sup>741</sup> This work was regarded as an exemplar of Classical architectural orthodoxy by Renaissance architects. Thus, it is likely that Pugin's study of Early Renaissance architectural theory led him to Vitruvius as a principal authority and that he had a similar knowledge of Classical architecture to Early Renaissance architects.

Pugin set out to explain on a practical level why neo-Classical architecture and its derivatives were in effect helping to revive Paganism and not Christianity.<sup>742</sup> The three main reasons he gave were, first, that the plan and the arrangement of the temple was designed for

---

<sup>739</sup> *Ibid.*, p.32.

<sup>740</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10, footnote.

<sup>741</sup> Peter and Linda Murray, The Oxford Companion, p.562.

<sup>742</sup> Pugin, The True Principles, p.39.

Pagan worship, for “the idolatrous rites which were performed in them”.<sup>743</sup> He set out the form of the Pagan temple and explained the ritual that took place there:

These temples were erected for idolatrous worship, and were suited only for the idolatrous rites that were performed in them. The interior, entered only by the priests, was comparatively small, and either dark or open at the top, while the peristyle and porticoes were spacious, for the people who assisted without.<sup>744</sup>

Secondly, that the form was suited to Pagan worship since “The Greeks did not introduce windows in their temples”,<sup>745</sup> indeed, the worshippers did not enter them. No matter how large it might be outside, the temple was not intended to be entered by devotees of the cult. In this, the Pagan temple was similar to the Jewish “holy of holies”, but Pugin did not mention this similarity. Christianity, on the other hand, he said, required that “the people should be *within* the church, not outside”.<sup>746</sup> In a Christian service, the presence of the faithful is essential, he argued, but the Pagan temples were unsuitable to house such a congregation.<sup>747</sup>

Wittkower acknowledges that a few neo-Classical architects admitted they based their designs, not on Early Christian churches, but on Pagan temples. Michelozzo’s choir of the SS Annunziata in Florence was “fashioned after the ‘temple’ of Minerva Medica”.<sup>748</sup> Others chose the round temple because of its high aesthetic appeal.

Pugin was not alone in believing that Pagan temples were unsuitable models for Christian churches. Carlo Borromeo, the celebrated sixteenth-century Archbishop of Milan, in his Instructionum Fabricae ecclesiasticae et Superlectilis ecclesiasticae Libri duo (c. 1572),

---

<sup>743</sup> *Ibid.*, p.40.

<sup>744</sup> *Ibid.*, p.40.

<sup>745</sup> *Ibid.*, p.41.

<sup>746</sup> *Ibid.*, p.40.

<sup>747</sup> *Ibid.*, p.40.

<sup>748</sup> Wittkower, Architectural Principles: in the Age of Humanism (Chichester: Academy Editions

applied the decrees of the Council of Trent to church building and condemned the circular form as Pagan. He recommended a return to the *fornam crucis* of the Latin cross. Despite his objection, a small number of centralized churches continued to be built in the 17th and 18th centuries.<sup>749</sup> It is difficult, given the main argument of the thesis that Pugin was a liturgist, to agree with Séan O'Reilly that "Pugin was *contra* Borromeo". He says that

While Pugin, for all his medievalism, adopts the position of architect as creative force, Borromeo's architect must design within a framework of liturgical function and propriety which remains under the direct supervision of the clerical patron.<sup>750</sup>

Pugin's third argument was that Classical decorations, such as friezes decorated with the heads of sheep and oxen, were not added by Pagans for aesthetic effect, but because they symbolised sacrifice to the gods and other aspects of Pagan worship. These had no connection to Christianity, he said.<sup>751</sup> He demonstrated that each minute part of the decoration of the temple was linked to an aspect of Pagan worship. The inverted torch and urn symbolised cremation and the Pagans "would not have placed urns on the tombs, had they not practised burning instead of burying their dead; of which former custom the urn was a fitting emblem, as being the depository for the ashes".<sup>752</sup> Therefore, he thought that Classical decoration was unsuitable for Christian churches and tombs.

---

1998), p.17.

<sup>749</sup> *Ibid.*, p.40.

<sup>750</sup> Séan O'Reilly, "Roman versus Romantic: Classical Roots in the Origins of a Roman Catholic Ecclesiology", *Architectural History*, Vol. 40 (1997), p.223. See also Wittkower, p.40, re Carlo Borromeo.

<sup>751</sup> Pugin, The True Principles, p.39.

<sup>752</sup> *Ibid.*, p.39.

iii) Pagan symbols replaced Christian ones.

Pugin did not think that all the exponents of neo-Classicism were consciously attempting to revive Paganism. “It would be unjust to charge the advocates of revived Pagan decoration with an actual belief in the mythology of which they are such jealous admirers; hence they are guilty of the greater inconsistency, as the original heathens proceeded from conviction”.<sup>753</sup> He merely questioned why Christians should use Pagan decoration and architecture instead of Christian decoration and architecture. “But what have we as *Christians*, to do with all those things illustrative *only of former error?*” he queried.<sup>754</sup>

iv) The Mechanics’ Institutes anti-Christian.

Pugin intensely disliked the Mechanics’ Institutes. They had sprung up around the country for the education of the lower classes; but they were either Nonconformist in that they did not have religious tests of any kind or had a Deist approach to learning. He expressed his abhorrence of them and believed they were “a mere device of the day”<sup>755</sup> to poison the minds of the operatives with infidel and radical doctrines.

Medieval blacksmiths, he said, such as Quentin Matys,<sup>756</sup> were artists who produced beautiful work because they worked for the Church and in faith. This was not the case, Pugin thought, with modern mechanics; they frequently had no faith and did not work for the good of the Church. Mechanics Institutes were later to become a contentious issue between him and Newman.

---

<sup>753</sup> *Ibid.*, p.39.

<sup>754</sup> *Ibid.*, p.39.

<sup>755</sup> *Ibid.*, p.30.

<sup>756</sup> *Ibid.*, p.29.

4) Pugin's exposition of the mystical level of meaning.

i) The character of a Catholic building of worship determined by more than the practical aspect.

Pugin thought that to take a Catholic church or cathedral literally, in its "natural" or practical sense, as a building much the same as any other building, was to destroy the power it possessed for giving insight into the mysteries of God. To take it in a spiritual sense was to use it as a guide to mystical levels of meaning and as signposts to salvation.

An inception of faith was not dependent on liturgy as it was not dependent on the Scriptures, but these external things helped a person to come to God. A church building could act as a guide to God as much, thought Pugin, if not more, than any literary work. Symbols in liturgical form and arrangement, while constructed from practical elements such as building materials, were also mystical signposts that pointed to God. Even the carvings on wooden roofs had "mystical and appropriate meaning".<sup>757</sup> They represented "angels, archangels, and various orders of the heavenly hierarchy, hovering over the congregated faithful".<sup>758</sup>

5) Pugin's exposition of the moral level of meaning.

These signposts, Pugin argued, helped people to turn to God since a Christian environment made it easier for them to relate to Him. In turn, a Christian society thus created would be likely to have higher moral standards than an apostate society. There were moral implications to Pugin's ideas; his illustrations compared a Christian environment in which a Christian people were kind, considerate and charitable, with an apostate environment in which a heterodox people were mean, selfish and harsh. Peter Murray says that Alberti also

---

<sup>757</sup> *Ibid.*, p.31.

<sup>758</sup> *Ibid.*, p.31.

recognized that architecture could be “used for moral arguments”,<sup>759</sup> so that the architect should be raised to the status of moral exemplar.<sup>760</sup> Therefore, Pugin had similar ideas, on the morality of architecture, to Early Renaissance architectural theorists, although there is little indication that he was familiar with their writings.

David Watkin suggests that Pugin was influenced by the eighteenth-century French rationalist architectural theorists such as Laugier, Cordemoy, Perrault, Frézier and others who believed that functionalism and utility led directly to beauty in architecture.<sup>761</sup> These used this argument to justify using a combination of Classical and Gothic in their church designs. The French Jesuit, Marc-Antoine Laugier, held an architectural theory which was that all forms should have a structural or functional purpose. This resulted from his belief in the pursuit of a primitive truth and thus of an inherent rationalism. These ideas were set out in his Essai sur l'architecture (1753). He did not recommend copying Greek forms, but rather, advocated developing their principles according to the needs of the time. While Pugin used similar arguments, he restricted them to the use of Gothic and not neo-Classical architectural designs. Moreover, this was not the only argument or viewpoint that he put forward. The French theorists were unconcerned about the moral aspects of design, or, for that matter, the historical and allegorical aspects.

---

<sup>759</sup> Peter Murray, The Architecture, p.5.

<sup>760</sup> Christine Smith, Architecture in the Culture of Early Humanism, p.5. Reference to Alberti's Profugiorum.

<sup>761</sup> David Watkin, Morality and Architecture Revisited (London: John Murray 1977: 2001), pp.7, 23.

6) The Present State.

i) Another controversial issue.

Pugin had undertaken a series of lectures in Oscott in 1838-39 and had published some of these in the *Dublin Review* in 1841 and 1842.<sup>762</sup> He eventually published this material with additions in his The Present State of ecclesiastical architecture in England (1843). He did not lose this opportunity to make comments on a controversial subject. The Tractarians maintained that the Church of England was really Catholic and a branch of the Universal Catholic Church and as such it was “Anglo-Catholic”.

Pugin thought they were mistaken. The Church of England’s claim to be Catholic was unfounded and, at best, it was a Protestant Church disguised as a Catholic one. To be “patching-up Protestantism with copes and candles, would be no better than whitening a sepulchre”, he remarked.<sup>763</sup> His support for the Tractarians had its limitations. While he was sympathetic to their predicament, he did not share their Anglican principles. This was later to become an issue.<sup>764</sup>

Pugin again pinpointed ignorance as the root cause of the problem. He thought the use of the term “*Anglo-Catholicism*”<sup>765</sup> was a pretence or disguise to confuse, mislead and deceive the ignorant since it “was used *exclusively* to signify times and events *essentially Protestant*”.<sup>766</sup> The post-Reformation period was “strangely distinguished as *Anglo-Catholic*, by men who are professionally engaged in building up the walls of Sion,”<sup>767</sup> he remarked,

---

<sup>762</sup> *The Dublin Review*, No. XX (May 1841) and No. XXIII (Feb. 1842).

<sup>763</sup> A. W. N. Pugin, On the Present State of ecclesiastical architecture in England (London, 1843), p.157.

<sup>764</sup> *The Rambler* (July 1851), p.45. This is discussed later.

<sup>765</sup> A. W. N. Pugin, The Present State, p.155.

<sup>766</sup> *Ibid.*, p.155.

<sup>767</sup> *Ibid.*, p.155.

while the pre-Reformation period was “termed *Romish*”<sup>768</sup> when in reality it was Anglo-Saxon.<sup>769</sup>

Only when reunion with the Church of Rome was achieved would it have the right again to call itself “*Anglo-Catholic*”. As it was, it was fundamentally Protestant. Ironically, the majority of Anglicans would have agreed with him.

#### 7) Liturgical sources and authorities for The Present State.

While Pugin had argued by example in his The True Principles, in his The Present State he sought to argue by appealing to a large number of sources and authorities. This latest book is an important work, not least because he set out a number of his liturgical authorities. The majority of them were neither English nor medieval, but seventeenth- and eighteenth-century French liturgists. Notably, he referred to only one medieval liturgist - Guillaume Durandus, Bishop of Mende – who, as stated previously, was a significant authority for him.

There were two groups to Pugin’s sources: the liturgists and historians who held similar views to his; and another group, such as Protestant historians, who did not share his background beliefs and from whose work he carefully select material to support his arguments.

#### i) Pugin’s principal French liturgical authority.

Pugin continued to build up a picture of the Catholic Church in France before the Revolution, indeed, from the Early Church up until that time. He appealed to a relatively unknown authority - Father Jean-Baptiste Thiers (1636-1703) - whom he called a “great

---

<sup>768</sup> *Ibid.*, p.155.

<sup>769</sup> Pugin was making the point here that the pre-Reformation period was English and not Italian.

Theologian and learned Rubrician”<sup>770</sup> and “a great champion of Catholic antiquity”.<sup>771</sup> Pugin said he was “thoroughly acquainted” with his works and strongly recommended him to others as an authority “on this all-important subject” of liturgy.<sup>772</sup> Thiers was a lay member of the great seventeenth- and eighteenth-century group of French critics, scholars and liturgists who laid the foundation of modern historical criticism. Pugin later appealed to other members of this group including Mabillon, Du Cange, Montfaçon, Martène, Cardinal Bona and Le Brun des Marettes.<sup>773</sup> They were neo-Gallicans and they were leading figures in the Counter-Reformation who wished to reform the Church from within. Their works had some limitations due to the inadequacy of the information available to them. Some of them wrote, more or less, as Jansenists, but attempted, in their works, to present information accurately, critically and, possibly, scientifically. These remain great tomes of learning, which modern scholars are beginning to study in depth.

Thiers wrote a number of treatises on liturgy, which despite covering the full panorama of liturgical history, nevertheless had a particular emphasis on the Early Church and the post-Reformation period. His Dissertationes Ecclesiastiques is very well researched and extensively referenced using sound authorities and sources. He was therefore an informed authority. Pugin was aware of Thiers’ Jansenist bias and critically evaluated his background beliefs. “Although approved of by the holy see, he was too sincere a writer, and fearless exposé of abuses for the corrupt age in which he lived”, he remarked.<sup>774</sup>

While Thiers was a Jansenist, this was not necessarily true of Pugin. But the Jansenists also became neo-Gallicans. A characteristic of the neo-Gallican liturgists was that

---

<sup>770</sup> Pugin, The Present State, p.25, footnote. J. B. Thiers is better known in France than in England.

<sup>771</sup> *Ibid.*, p.25.

<sup>772</sup> *Ibid.*, p.26, footnote.

<sup>773</sup> These French liturgists are enlarged upon later.

<sup>774</sup> Pugin, The Present State, p.26, footnote.

they wished to revive Gallican-type national and local usages, practices and variations of the Roman rite in order to reestablish a Gallican Church in France. The reformed Breviaries of the French dioceses, which were the results of their labours in the seventeenth to mid-nineteenth centuries, had little to do with the early Gallican rite.<sup>775</sup> In France, an Ultramontane campaign against local and national usages, which they perceived as Gallican, had culminated in the encyclical *Inter multiplices* of March 1853 condemning Sulpicianism,<sup>776</sup> which was at the heart of the Gallican system, and the entire concept of “the liberties of the Gallican Church”.<sup>777</sup> The Sulpician seminaries taught that while Catholics should be encouraged to believe in the indefectibility of the papacy, they did not have to accept the infallibility of the Pope.

The ancient Gallican rite, like Gallican liturgy, was not restricted to France, but was found in northern Italy, parts of ancient Germany, the Iberian Peninsular, Britain and Ireland. Liturgical rites were never the same in all Churches – the Church of Antioch, Alexandria and Constantinople were not like those of Rome or the African Church or the Spanish Church. Nevertheless, they had a certain unity, although Abbé Aigrain believed they were never homogenous, solid or unified like the Roman liturgy.<sup>778</sup> While Pugin accepted Gallican-type national and local variations and differences in detail, he believed the Roman rite, its liturgical form and arrangement to be universal, consistent and uniform. The essential functions were obviously the same everywhere – the Eucharist celebrated with bread and wine. Thus it would be true to say that the fundamentals and the faith itself were universal, consistent and uniform.

---

<sup>775</sup> The Catholic Encyclopædia, “The Gallican rite” (New York: Robert Appleton Company 1909), Vol. VI, p.4.

<sup>776</sup> The main seminary of the Sulpician Order was at Saint-Sulpice, Paris. It had the status of a university and taught the Gallican system.

<sup>777</sup> The Catholic Encyclopædia, p.vi, preface.

<sup>778</sup> The Abbé R. Aigrain, Liturgia, p.793. My own translation from the French.

Thiers followed the views of the neo-Gallicans on liturgy and wrote extensively and in depth on this subject concerned with Gallican-type usages and practices. Pugin obtained rare copies of several of Thiers' books for his own library. The auctioneers, S. Leigh Sotheby and John Wilkinson, who sold his library after Pugin's death, called his collection of Thiers' works "A VERY RARE SERIES OF THE WORKS OF J. B. THIERS, consisting of nearly Thirty Volumes".<sup>779</sup> They made a further note in the Catalogue calling attention to the rarity of Thiers' books.<sup>780</sup>

Pugin made it clear that Thiers' views on Paganism and Protestantism were in accordance with his own. "Acting on that grand principle expressed in these words, - 'falsitas non debet tolerari sub velamine pietatis', - he became one of the greatest witnesses of Catholic truth against the innovation of revised Paganism and Protestant error", he stated.<sup>781</sup> While Thiers' ecclesiastical Gallican persuasions were compatible with some Liberal Ultramontane views – views that Pugin held - this does not suggest that Pugin had moved away from Liberal Ultramontanism, as later events would confirm. There were other Liberal Ultramontanes, such as Félix-Antoine-Philibert Dupanloup (1802-1879), Bishop of Orléans, friend and supporter of Montalembert, who took a similar stand. While they completely dissociated themselves with parliamentary Gallicanism, they were sympathetic to ecclesiastical Gallicanism. Montalembert, by the First Vatican Council, supported some forms of Gallicanism. He said in 1870 that the group he led had always in the past been Ultramontanes but that they had become the Gallicans of the Church: "*Nous étions autrefois les ultramontanes at nous voilà devenues les gallicans de l'église*".<sup>782</sup>

---

<sup>779</sup> A. N. L. Munby, ed., Sale Catalogues, Vol. 4, p.243.

<sup>780</sup> *Ibid.*, p.270. Referring to Lot 469.

<sup>781</sup> Pugin, The Present State, p.26, footnote.

<sup>782</sup> M. Tallichet, ed., M. de Montalembert et le Père Hyacinthe (Paris: E. Dentu 1877), p. 62.

Pugin cross checked Thiers' sources and authorities which included St John, St Augustine, Archbishop Symeon of Thessalonica, St Athanasia, Eusebius, St Gregory of Tours, St John Chrysostom, the Venerable Bede, Guillaume Durand, Gavantus and Du Cange. Pugin's library contained a translation by Stapleton (Antwerp 1565) of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People (731), a copy of Durand's Rationale Divini Officiorum (undated), and Dom C. Dufresne Du Cange's Glossarium ad Scriptores Medle et Infimae Latinitatis (1733-36), Carpentier's translation of Du Cange's Glossary with his own supplement titled Glossarium Novum seu Supplementum Glosarii Cangiani (1766), Du Cange's Glossarium ad Scriptores Medlea et Infimae Graecitatis (1688).

In The Present State, Pugin invoked Thiers' Dissertation sur les Principaux Autels des Eglises ("Dissertation on the principal Altars of Churches") (Paris 1688), which was Book I of his Dissertation Ecclesiastiques, for the origin, history, use, reasons for use, materials and design of altars. Another of Thiers' books to which Pugin appealed was Dissertation sur les Jubès des Eglises ("Dissertation on the Roodscreens of Churches") (c.1700) for evidence that rood screens and lofts had "profound mystical reasons" for their use. Pugin said, "Father Thiers has divided his learned treatise on roodlofts into thirty-four chapters, containing a most elaborate account of their origin and purpose".<sup>783</sup> Thiers traced the history of rood screens from the first to the fifth centuries, down to the medieval period and then to his own time. His authorities for the early centuries were Origen, St Cyprian and the Emperor Justinian.

Pugin referred to other works by Thiers, including his Sur les Superstitions ("On Superstitions") (c.1700) "a most learned and laborious work",<sup>784</sup> Dissertation sur Perukes

---

<sup>783</sup> Pugin, The Present State, pp.74-75.

<sup>784</sup> *Ibid.*, p.25, footnote.

(“Dissertation on Wigs”) (Paris: 1690),<sup>785</sup> Sur la Clôture des Religieuses (“On the Monasteries and Religious Orders”) (Paris: 1681),<sup>786</sup> Sur les Porches des Eglises (“On the Porches of Churches”) (Orléans: 1679),<sup>787</sup> Sur la Larme de Vedôme (“On the Tear of Vedome”) (Paris: 1699)<sup>788</sup> and Sur un Inscription dans une Eglise de Rheims en honneur de St François (“On an Inscription in a church at Rheims in Honour of St Francis”) (c.1700).<sup>789</sup>

All these works of Thiers concerned the Catholic Church from the Early Church to the end of the seventeenth century. They detailed the origins, use, practices, materials, forms, symbolic and allegorical reasons for material aspects of Catholic worship, even down to the smallest detail. Pugin had moved away from the pro-medieval ideas of a number of Liberal Ultramontanes, including the young Montalembert.

ii) Other French liturgical authorities.

Pugin also referred to a number of other French liturgists. One was the Jansenist liturgist Le Brun des Marettes (pseudonym De Moleon) (c.1661-1729) whom Pugin said “stood high as a writer on ecclesiastical or liturgical antiquities”. He described Le Brun as an authority on local liturgies in France before the Revolution and quoted from his Voyage Liturgique de France, ou recherches faites dans divers villes du royaume (1718) (“Liturgical Journey in France, or research done in many towns in the kingdom”). Pugin described this as “a most edifying work”<sup>790</sup> and he also cited his Liturgies de toutes les Eglises (1726) (“Liturgies of all Churches”).<sup>791</sup>

---

<sup>785</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.25-26, footnote.

<sup>786</sup> *Ibid.*, p.26, footnote.

<sup>787</sup> *Ibid.*, p.22, footnote.

<sup>788</sup> *Ibid.*, p.26, footnote.

<sup>789</sup> *Ibid.*, p.26, footnote.

<sup>790</sup> *Ibid.*, p.75, footnote.

<sup>791</sup> *Ibid.*, p.133.

Le Brun made detailed observations on the various Catholic rites, stressing their unanimity in regard to liturgical fundamentals. Especially detailed were his observations on the ceremonials of the sacraments in the church of Notre-Dame at Rouen,<sup>792</sup> where he described “la grand Messe”, baptism, marriage, extreme unction and burial; processions, vestments and choir music.

On the subject of the Eucharist, Pugin said that Le Brun had gone into this in great detail; his authorities and sources were the Fathers, Councils and early liturgies. In the Early Church, the priest celebrated the Mass in silence, claimed Le Brun, and that this was the practice everywhere. The Abbé R. Aigrain confirmed that the Mass was said in a low voice: “Le canon de la messe, depuis un temps immémorial, se récite à voix basse”.<sup>793</sup> Therefore, this practice was “an irresistible argument for the ancient construction of the churches”,<sup>794</sup> declared Pugin, and “for the celebration of the sacred mysteries in the ancient language”.<sup>795</sup> It would seem that he fully supported Le Brun in the use of Latin for services; he had no wish for these to be changed to the vernacular.

Another of Pugin’s French authorities was the Benedictine liturgist Dom Edmond Martène (1654-1739) who was an authority on Latin rituals and canons from the third century. Pugin cited his De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus (1700-2). Martène’s researches were not confined to France, but included the Netherlands, Germany, Italy and England. He researched rituals and canons in England, Italy, France and Switzerland and even local use in England, such as at York. Martène had studied ancient manuscripts concerning the Early Fathers in the Abbey of the Mercy of God at Poitiers.

---

<sup>792</sup> De Moleon (Le Brun), Voyage Liturgique (1718), p.327.

<sup>793</sup> L’Abbé R. Aigrain, Liturgia, p.868.

<sup>794</sup> Pugin, The Present State, p.133.

<sup>795</sup> *Ibid.*, p.133, footnote.

iii) Italian liturgical authorities.

Pugin gave broader evidence for the Catholic Church as it once was. For authorities on the Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament and its use in processions he referred to a number of Italian authorities including Bartholomeo Gavanto Mediolanen (known variously as Gavanto & Gavanti) (1569-1638). Gavanti was a significant seventeenth-century Italian liturgical scholar and Rubricist who belonged to the Congregation of St Paul and was a member of the Congregationis Sacrae Rituum attached to the Vatican. He revised the Roman Missal and Breviary during the time of Clement VIII and Urban VIII in his Thesaurus Sacorum Rituum sev Commentaria in Rubricas Breviarii Romani (1634).

Another authority of Pugin's was Carlo Borromeo (1538-1584) whom he consulted on Canon Law and because of his knowledge of liturgical architecture. Pugin believed that tradition was hugely important in determining correct liturgy. Borromeo wrote Instructionum Fabricae Ecclesiasticae et Superlectilis ecclesiasticae Libri duo (c.1572) following the Council of Trent. It carried enormous authority and was of interest to Pugin because its contents included arrangement,<sup>796</sup> siting of the church,<sup>797</sup> decoration, art and sculpture,<sup>798</sup> which were all strictly based on the traditions of the Church.

Pugin continued to compare old and "new" St Peter's. An authority on the old Vatican and St Peter's Basilica was the liturgist Joannis Ciampini (1633-1698). In his De Sacris Aedificiis A Constantino Magno Constructis synopsis bistorica (Rome: 1693) he covered the conversion of Constantine and his construction of the Basilica of the Lateran, the old St Peter's. Pugin also had a copy of Ciampini's De Sacris, profanisque Calicibus; De Sacrarum

---

<sup>796</sup> Carlo Borromeo, Instructionum Fabricae Ecclesiasticae (1577: Paris and Arras 1855), pp.17, 23, footnote.

<sup>797</sup> *Ibid.*, p.12.

<sup>798</sup> *Ibid.*, p.38, footnote.

Imaginum afu earumque veneratione (c.1695) in his library. Ciampini fully illustrated these works, which were of interest to Pugin because they showed form and arrangement.

Another of Pugin's authorities on the post-Renaissance Vatican and the "new" St Peter's was the High Renaissance neo-Classical architect Carlo Fontana (c.1634-1714). Fontana's engravings of the Vatican in his Templum Vaticanum et ipsius origo (1694) were also of particular interest to Pugin since they showed the neo-Classical origins of "new" St Peter's. Pugin had a copy of this book in his library.<sup>799</sup> Twenty-seven of Fontana's manuscripts and drawings are in the Royal Library at Windsor Castle where Pugin worked on designs when he was only fifteen.

Another Italian authority on the post-Renaissance Vatican and the "new" St Peter's was Erasmo Pistolesi (no dates available but he wrote in the first half of the 19th century). What was of interest to Pugin was his Il Vaticano descritto ed illustrato (1829), which, although in Italian,<sup>800</sup> contained a large number of finely executed line drawings of the interiors, sculptures, paintings and decorations of the Vatican and the "new" St Peter's. The illustrations suggested to Pugin the neo-Classical nature of the architecture, art, decoration and interiors, while Christian symbolism, including the cross, appeared to take a subordinate and minimal position. There was little indication by Pistolesi of the fact that the church's plan is cruciform; the baldacchino is dominated by a cross; there is also a cross on the dome; there is a huge statue of Saint Veronica by Francesco Mochi (1629-40), one of four massive statues on the piers at the crossing, as well as images of many other saints. Pistolesi's drawings instead show Jesus Christ, the Apostles, the Martyrs, angels and cherubim clothed in Roman togas or naked. St Peter, sitting on a pedestal, clad in a toga and with curly hair and beard,

---

<sup>799</sup> A. N. L. Munby, Sale Catalogues, Vol. 4, p.256. Item 214.

<sup>800</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 4, p.14. Pugin used an old French-Latin dictionary by Robert Stephens Estienne (Paris 1539).

had a strong resemblance to Jupiter, the Roman god (as Montalembert had similarly pointed out).

Another of Pugin's Italian authorities was the philosopher, theologian and liturgist Gaetano Maria Mèrati (1668-1744). Pugin referred to Mèrati's books on liturgy, rubrics and ceremony including Commentariorum Gavanti ad Rubricas Missalis ad Rubricas Breviarii Romani (Rome: 1738), which he updated in 1740 in his Novae Observationes et Additiones - Commentaria in Rubricas: Missalis et Breviarii Romani (1740). 2 vols.. For the use of the chancel and the need of "keeping the seat of the holy mysteries at a reverential distance from the people, and in setting forth the dignity and privilege of the priestly office, by separating the ministers who are offering up the holy sacrifice from the worshippers",<sup>801</sup> Pugin quoted Mèrati's Commentaries.<sup>802</sup> He inferred from this the need for a screen.

Pugin probably did not travel to Rome until 1847 and his knowledge of the Vatican and St Peter's Basilica was gleaned from books such as those produced by Pistolesi, Fontana, Merati and Ciampani. Thus, his authorities may have influenced his view that neo-Classical and Baroque art, sculpture and architecture were Pagan, even when used in St Peter's, Rome.

iv) Pugin's one German liturgical authority.

Pugin's German (Austrian) authority was the theologian, liturgist and music scholar Martin Gerbert (1668-1744).<sup>803</sup> Pugin appealed to his Scriptores Ecclesiastici de Musica Sacra Potissimum (1784), which concerned the sacred music for the Latin Rite, and his Monumenta Veteris Liturgiae Alemannicae (1777) which listed and described in great detail all the liturgical ceremonies rites and rituals of the Latin Church such as the parts of the Mass

---

<sup>801</sup> Pugin, The Present State, p.34.

<sup>802</sup> *Ibid.*, p.34. Quote from Merati.

<sup>803</sup> The Encyclopædia Britannica (11th. ed. Vol. XI), p.766.

e.g. Introit, Kyrie, Gloria, First Collect, Epistle, Response, Alleluia, Gospel Readings and Study.

8) Attitude to schools of painting.

i) Views on Realism.

In the second edition of Contrasts and his The True Principles, Pugin had expressed support for Naturalist artists. In The Present State he expressed his distain for Realist and Humanist artists such as Rubens and Michaelangelo. He thought their attention to anatomical and scientific study of the subject was out of place in Christian art:

*It is much safer to treat those holy mysteries in a conventional and emblematic manner, than to aim at unattainable realities.*<sup>804</sup>

Again, this was compatible with his Liberal Ultramontane views.

The Oratorians had commissioned (in 1606) the great Baroque artist, Sir Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640), to paint an altarpiece. Pugin remarked, "The celebrated Crucifixion of Rubens is painful, not to say disgusting; certainly not edifying".<sup>805</sup> The reality of it was abhorrent to him because he thought it did not lead the faithful towards spiritual and mystical truths which, to him, was the purpose of such images.

ii) The Naturalist painters.

Pugin again expressed his admiration of the Naturalist painters, such as Giotto and Fra Angelico, and their ability to express mystical truths. He referred to them as "the old mystical school of Christian painters". Their paintings, he said, "convey a profound mystical meaning". These artists had been able to "envelop every incident of our Lord's life and suffering with a spiritual and mystical form, calculated to impress the mind with deep

---

<sup>804</sup> Pugin, The Present State, p.31, footnote.

<sup>805</sup> *Ibid.*, p.31, footnote.

“veneration for the sacred truths they represent”. He was concerned about the effect these paintings had on the intellect: “Their productions are addressed to the *understanding*, not merely *to the eye*”, he remarked.<sup>806</sup>

9) Pugin’s exposition of the allegorical meaning in The Present State of ecclesiastical architecture in England.

The subject of this tome, as signalled by the title, is nineteenth-century church architecture in England. In a work with such a title, the reader might expect to find a survey of nineteenth-century churches, their condition, materials, use and style of architecture. A superficial glance at the text would immediately show that the scope is much greater than this and that the title belies the variety and depth of the subjects covered. To take an example, Pugin wrote that it was scarcely less important

to adhere to the traditions of the Church as regards the arrangement of material buildings, than as to any other matters connected with the celebration of the divine mysteries; for it is impossible that these latter can be performed in accordance with the rituals and intentions of the Church, if the former are disregarded.<sup>807</sup>

Thus, in one sentence, Pugin brought up a number of subjects on which he had views:

- i) The traditions of the Church (i.e. the nature of the Church).
- ii) Ecclesiastical architecture.
- iii) Religion.
- iv) Liturgy.
- v) The intentions of the Church (i.e. Church discipline).

His exposition of these various meanings that he believed were inherent in ecclesiastical architecture are considered in the following.

---

<sup>806</sup> *Ibid.*, p.31, footnote.

<sup>807</sup> Pugin, The Present State, p.7.

10) Pugin's exposition of the doctrinal level of meaning.

There were, argued Pugin, doctrinal reasons for rood screens and this involved an interpretation of Church discipline. This was to become a major issue for Catholics in the nineteenth century. In particular, the argument centred on an interpretation of Exposition. Some interpreted this as meaning that full sight of the consecrated elements was required and therefore screens were an obstruction and should be removed; Pugin interpreted it as meaning that while sight of the consecrated elements was required this did not mean at the expense of other traditional aspects of worship. In his view, screens did not hinder the view of the consecrated elements and there were major liturgical reasons why they should be retained. In order to argue this, he turned to Thiers' Traité de l'Exposition du très Saint Sacrement de l'Autel, and his interpretation of Church's discipline regarding the Eucharist. This was a point of contention between the Jesuits and the Jansenists. The Abbé R. Aigrain called this disagreement, "La controverse sur le 'secret' du canon",<sup>808</sup> which referred to an argument over practices concerning the Mass. It preceded the reform of the breviary. Aigrain said that the canon of the Mass, since time immemorial, was recited in a low voice. The neo-Gallicans, he continued, endeavoured to restore ancient practices and to revive the relevant rubric. In particular, they believed that the actual consecration should be said by the priest in a loud voice, while the rest of the ceremony was said in a low voice. Other liturgists disagreed. A good number of French liturgists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries took part in the controversy and published books and dissertations on this subject.<sup>809</sup> Thus, both 'sight' and 'sound' were contentious issues.

There were differences between the neo-Gallican and Roman usages and practices, concerning Exposition and Reservation. The Liberal Ultramontane and friend of

---

<sup>808</sup> The Abbé R. Aigrain, Liturgia, p.868.

<sup>809</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.868-869

Montalembert, Adolphe-Marie-Pierre Circourt (1801-1879), maintained that the Roman rite in its present liturgical context had only come into being in the sixteenth century.<sup>810</sup> Thiers defended the neo-Gallican view on Exposition and Reservation in his Traité, and Pugin explained that

in this work the discipline of the Church relative to the reservation and veneration of the blessed Eucharist, from the earliest ages down to the last century, is fully described, with the form and materials of the various vessels used for this sacred purpose.<sup>811</sup>

Thiers did not take any one period, but considered discipline over a considerable period “from the earliest ages down to the last century”. His work was a compilation, the material being derived from sources from many periods. Thiers’ aim was to describe a pattern and continuity of use and the traditional understanding and attitude to the blessed Eucharist exhibited over centuries. He considered the differences and similarities between Exposition, Reservation and Benediction and argued that the practice of Exposition in the ancient Church was different from modern usages and practices, of which the service of Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament was an example.<sup>812</sup>

i) Exposition not the same as Benediction.

Thiers’ book was about the difference of discipline between the Early Church and his contemporary Church regarding Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament at the altar. It reflected a change of discipline of the Church brought about by Scholastic theologians regarding the view of the Eucharist.

---

<sup>810</sup> Austin Gough, Paris and Rome, p.122.

<sup>811</sup> Pugin, The Present State, p.26, footnote. Refers to Thiers’ Traité de l’Exposition du très Saint Sacrament de l’Autel, 2 Vols (“Treatise on the Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament”), Avignon 1777.

<sup>812</sup> J. B. Thiers, Traité de l’Exposition du très Saint Sacrament de l’Autel, Vol. VII, Ch. VII, Book 2, p.260 *et seq.* My own translation from the French.

Thiers explained that from circa 11<sup>th</sup> century in the Western Church there was the beginning of a public manifestation of faith and love of the Sacramental Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. This showed itself in the desire of the people to look at the Host when elevated during Mass, to have it exposed for veneration outside Mass, and carried in solemn processions.

Pope Urban IV, as Thiers said, instituted the ceremony of Corpus Christi for the Exposition of the Sacred Sacrament in the thirteenth century. At least, he as good as instituted it, remarked Cassander.<sup>813</sup> The Scholastics debated the desire for a greater role of Exposition. The Church accepted their view that the consecrated elements should be seen and not hidden away as in the ancient *Disciplina arcani*, which did not survive longer than the fifth century. According to R. P. C. Hanson, there is no satisfactory evidence for the *Disciplina Arcani* until the fourth century, “when it was occasioned partly by imitation of the mystery religions and partly by the increased interest in Christianity taken by the pagans”.<sup>814</sup> Other scholars believe that it existed from the middle of the second century until the fifth century. The elevation of the Host had become popular since the eleventh century. The result was a change in discipline. A new devotion was introduced to accommodate this, which was the Exposition of the Sacred Sacrament. Exposition is the ceremony in which the priest removes the sacred Host from the tabernacle and places it on the altar for the adoration of the faithful. It may be public or private, differing only in rite. Neither form was undertaken lightly.

The Council of Trent affirmed the establishment of Exposition and it was consecrated to the memory of the institution of the Eucharist and the glory of Jesus Christ in order to save the false and the heretic. It involved processions as well as exposition on the high altar. Urban

---

<sup>813</sup> *Ibid.*, p.216, Book 2. Vol. VII. My own translation from the French. George Cassander (1513-1566) was a Flemish Catholic theologian.

<sup>814</sup> R. P. C. Hanson, “Disciplina Arcani” in Alan Richardson and John Bowden, eds., A New Dictionary of Catholic Theology, p.158.

VII's speech extolled the benefits of Corpus Christi, a form of Exposition, which he published in the Bull 'Transiturus' on 11 August 1264.<sup>815</sup>

ii) Reservation.

Reservation was the keeping of the Blessed Sacrament in the tabernacle or in some other fitting place,<sup>816</sup> as viaticum for the dying and as an object of devotion for the faithful. It was very much older than Exposition and existed in the Early Church. But for a thousand years of the Church's history, that is, until the eleventh century, Thiers believed it was not customary to show public devotion to the Reserved Sacrament. Reservation was revived during the Middle Ages by popular demand and eventually expressly ordered by Innocent X (1574-1655) and Clement VIII (1536-1605). After this, Bishops could then reserve the Blessed Sacrament on the altar - either the High altar or an altar in a beautiful and grand chapel especially set aside. It was to be continually guarded, said Thiers; "en laquelle seule il seroit continuellement gardé"<sup>817</sup> and was protected in either situation by an open screen through which it was perfectly visible. One or two lamps had to be kept alight in this chapel when the Blessed Sacrament was there and the altar was always to be richly adorned so that it adorned the sight of it. The faithful, in front of the screen, could pray and worship before the reserved Sacrament and it could be given in communion. Some modern liturgists do not believe a screen was a feature, but that the Blessed Sacrament was protected by low rails.

---

<sup>815</sup> Father Christian-Philippe Chanut, 'Concerning Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament', The Veneration and administration of the Eucharist (Southampton: The Saint Austin Press 1997). p.104. Paper given at *The Proceedings of the Second International Colloquium of historical, canonical and theological studies on the Roman Catholic Liturgy*, organised by the Centre International d'Etudes Liturgiques.

<sup>816</sup> In Durham Cathedral the consecrated elements were kept in a silver pelican suspended from the roof over the altar.

<sup>817</sup> Thiers, Exposition Book 1. Volume VII, p.209.

iii) Benediction.

‘Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament’ and ‘Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament’ were not the same, explained Thiers, although they had characteristics in common. Modern ecclesiastical historians, such as the Jesuit Herbert Thurston in his article “Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament” (1907), frequently couple them together in an attempt to demonstrate an historical precedent for Benediction. One of Thurston’s authorities was Thiers and his Traité de l’Exposition du S. Sacrament (1673).<sup>818</sup>

Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament can be either a service in its own right in which the blessing or benediction of the Blessed Sacrament is the focal point of the service, or the end part of another service. Exposition, as explained, was restricted and brief. The Benediction service became the most common form of evening service in Roman Catholic churches after the sixteenth century until the introduction of Evening Masses after 1953.<sup>819</sup> Benediction as a separate service is now discouraged and is commonly only given at the end of another service. Exposition should not be undertaken merely to allow Benediction.<sup>820</sup>

Like Thurston, Livingstone derives the origins of Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament from the Salve. However, he acknowledged that the Salve Regina was a tenth century monastic devotion to the Virgin Mary, not the Blessed Sacrament. Salve was not a devotion in its own right, but the end part of other services.<sup>821</sup>

---

<sup>818</sup> Herbert Thurston, “Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament”, (1907: New York: Robert Appleton: 1999), article in The Catholic Encyclopædia, Vol. II.

<sup>819</sup> E. A. Livingstone, The Concise Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2000), p.64. See also J. G. Davies, A New Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship (London: SCM Press 1986), p.89.

<sup>820</sup> E. A. Livingstone, ed., The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1997), p.187. See also J. M. Champlin, ‘Benediction and Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament’ in The New Catholic Encyclopædia (Washington DC, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1979), Vol. XVIII, p.37.

<sup>821</sup> *Ibid.*, 187.

Philippe Chaut also claims that something similar to Benediction developed in Hildesheim in Saxony, Germany, in the fifteenth century.<sup>822</sup> Natham Mitchell argues that Benediction was derived from liturgical sources connected with the devotions of the hours, but he also thought that it may have derived from the devotion of Corpus Christi. But, he says that

Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament was not perceived as an independent ritual; instead it served as a solemn conclusion to another liturgy. It was not Benediction *per se* that supplied the central motive for a gathering of Christians.<sup>823</sup>

Most modern liturgists agree that Benediction originally terminated another service. Thiers contended that while demonstration of devotion in processions was a normal part of Exposition, Benediction as a service in its own right was a 'new' sixteenth century devotion. Few modern scholars would dispute this, although most believe that it had precedents in earlier devotions. Mitchell says, "By the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries Benediction has certainly achieved a quasi-independent existence", although it was still frequently used as a solemn conclusion to other services.<sup>824</sup> This 'new' use reflected, he continues, "popular but unofficial custom".<sup>825</sup>

Pugin followed Thiers' view concerning the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament service. But he, like Thiers, rejected this form of Benediction as a service in its own right, and other 'new' sixteenth century devotions because of the effects they had on liturgical form and arrangement. He wrote of

all the horrible innovations introduced in the 16th century by the semi-pagan artists, who despised and rejected the Catholic wisdom of centuries, that they might astonish for a season by their extravagances.<sup>826</sup>

---

<sup>822</sup> Father Christian-Philippe Chaut, "Concerning Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament", p.107.

<sup>823</sup> Mitchell, Cult and Controversy, p.184.

<sup>824</sup> *Ibid.*, p.204.

<sup>825</sup> *Ibid.*, p.205.

<sup>826</sup> Pugin, The Present State, pp.113-114.

His view on this became increasingly significant as later events would show.

11) Pugin's exposition of the mystical level of meaning.

Pugin did not welcome new devotions that distracted from the Mass. The Mass, in his view, meant the Roman rite with medieval usages and practices. He upheld the view that the Mass was both central and vital to Catholic devotions. Moreover, he thought that the Mass and other Sacramental ceremonies were not symbols or representations of things divine, but direct contact with the Divine Himself:

It should always be remembered that the ceremonies of the Church are *realities*, not *representations* ... and should our sanctuary for the reality be less splendid than that of the figure?<sup>827</sup>

Earlier, Charles Borromeo had said much the same.<sup>828</sup>

Mitchell makes the point, "Officially, the church has always insisted that the norm of Eucharistic devotion in the life of Christians is participation in the Mass ... this insistence became even firmer after the Council of Trent".<sup>829</sup> Therefore, Pugin was not alone in believing that all other sacraments and devotions should be subservient and point to the Mass. To substitute popular devotions for the Mass was completely wrong in his view. Pugin had a similar view to that of the old Orders, such as the Benedictines, who had a special, rather medieval and traditional devotion to the Eucharistic mystery. This devotion could be found in all their monasteries.<sup>830</sup>

---

<sup>827</sup> *Ibid.*, footnote, p.44.

<sup>828</sup> Carlo Borromeo, *Instructionum Fabricae Ecclesiasticae*, p.38.

<sup>829</sup> Natham Mitchell, *Cult and Controversy*, p.209.

<sup>830</sup> Dom Yves Chaussy, *Les Bénédictines et la réforme Catholique en France au XVIIe. Siècle* (Paris: Éditions de la Source 1975), p.401. My own translation from the French.

Pugin, however, would not have agreed with Mitchell and other present day liturgists who believe that this view of the Mass is a warrant for liturgical modernism; indeed, Pugin would have loathed such an idea.

i) Churches allegories for mystical and spiritual truths.

Man's understanding of the purpose of liturgical form and arrangement and what was required had gradually grown over the centuries. The Mass, in Pugin's view, was central to these requirements. Churches were allegories for mystical and spiritual truths. It was possible, Pugin said, for any interested person to pursue this study and to discover these truths. They must, he said, "*become humble disciples of the old Catholic architects, whose silent teaching may be learnt from every venerable pile, from the humblest parish church to the vast and lofty cathedral*".<sup>831</sup> The medieval liturgists had done precisely this; therefore, Pugin not only followed their lead himself, but recommended this method to others.

12) Pugin's exposition of the theological level of meaning.

Pugin saw parallels in Scriptural events with those of later periods. In his understanding, the Biblical authors were also prophets. He compared the "desecrated state of England's churches after the great schism of the sixteenth century" with the writings of Jeremiah:

Truly does it seem that the words of Jeremiah in his Lamentations had come to pass in this unhappy land: "*Viæ Sion lugent eo quod non sint qui veniant ad solemnitatem omnes portæ ejus destructæ, sacerdotes ejus gementes, virgines ejus squalidæ, et ipsa oppressa amaritudine*". Again, "*Quomodo obscuratum est aurum, mutatus est color optimus, dispersi sunt lapides Sanctuarii in capite omnium platearum*".<sup>832</sup>

---

<sup>831</sup> Pugin, *The Present State*, p.114.

<sup>832</sup> *Ibid.*, p.155. Refers to Jeremiah 4:6.

This refers to Jeremiah 4:6-8. “Set up the standard towards Zion: retire, stay not: for I will bring evil from the north, and a great destruction” and “For this gird you with sackcloth, lament and howl: for the fierce anger of the Lord is not turned back from us”. In 1831 Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle had made an English translation of Fr Dominic Barberi’s, The Lamentations of England, or the Prayer of the Prophet Jeremiah applied to the same, in which Barberi bewailed the Reformation and the destruction of England’s pre-Reformation Catholicism.<sup>833</sup> Pugin thought the Reformation was an example of “the fierce anger of the Lord”. “No doubt England deserved this scourge; she had become unworthy of the blessings she enjoyed”.<sup>834</sup> It was God’s will that the old Catholic churches of England were delapidated and desecrated; it was done to teach people a lesson for turning away from Him.

i) Ignorance led to evil.

It has previously been pointed out that Pugin repeatedly referred to the dangers of “ignorance”: “evil does not proceed from either poverty or neglect, but from the ill-judged expenditure of money by pious but unformed persons”, was one such remark.<sup>835</sup> In other words, evil proceeded from ignorance and error. This was evident in specific examples as well as in the general English response to Catholicism.

He thought that the casual and indifferent attitude in the nineteenth century to the Eucharist was another example: “the most holy sacrament of our Lord’s body, deserted and forlorn, is left in a mean receptacle, without lamp or honour, in some half-furnished, half-dilapidated, and decayed chamber.”<sup>836</sup> People would not accept this state of affairs if they

---

<sup>833</sup> Richard James Picket, “The Churchmanship of A. W. N. Pugin”, MA thesis for the University of Durham (2001), pp.147-148.

<sup>834</sup> Pugin, The Present State, p.154, footnote.

<sup>835</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.12-13.

<sup>836</sup> *Ibid.*, p.14.

“The Emperor Constantine made seven altars of silver in the Church called after his name, and that of St John Lateran, which weighed 260 lbs” (which he took from Thiers’ Les Principaux Autels des Eglises, 2.).<sup>850</sup> He briefly mentioned liturgy in north Italy and at Rome (St Ambrose<sup>851</sup>). He also noted the writings of the ancient historian Eusebius, which he called “the testimony of Eusebius”<sup>852</sup> and “other writers of antiquity”.<sup>853</sup>

For liturgy as an expression of theology and doctrine, Pugin turned to the Homilies of St John Chrysostom on St John and St Matthew,<sup>854</sup> which also concerned liturgies of the Eastern rather than the Western Church. These Fathers brought up a reference to water stoups in church porches, which they considered part of liturgy. St John Chrysostom, he said, referred to stoups as “Manus lavamus in ecclesiam ineuntes” in his Homily on St. John.<sup>855</sup>

Pugin’s sources, except for the Homilies of St John Chrysostom, were mostly secondary and taken from the works of his favoured authorities, such as Father Thiers and Le Brun. The emphasis on the early Eastern Church, rather than the Western, was a characteristic of neo-Gallican views. J. H. Srawley in his The Early History of the Liturgy (1947) has covered the development of liturgy in these churches and gives a helpful background for putting Pugin’s material into context.<sup>856</sup>

---

<sup>849</sup> *Ibid.*, p.38.

<sup>850</sup> *Ibid.*, p.39, footnote.

<sup>851</sup> *Ibid.*, p.71. St Ambrose was one of Pugin’s authorities on ancient fonts.

<sup>852</sup> *Ibid.*, p.139.

<sup>853</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.24, 139.

<sup>854</sup> *Ibid.*, p.24, footnote.

<sup>855</sup> *Ibid.*, p.24, footnote.

<sup>856</sup> J. H. Srawley, The Early History of the Liturgy (1913: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1949).

ii) The importance of historical inquiry.

Pugin, like Wiseman had expressed in his London Lectures, believed that any misconception or doubts about any aspects of liturgy could be reconciled by historical inquiry. By examining the interpretation of liturgy and doctrines over such a long period of time the overall true picture or pattern would emerge. Since the Holy Spirit was guiding knowledge of the deposit of natural and revealed religion, as well as guarding the *depositum fidei* itself, it was not possible, Pugin thought, that a false doctrine or liturgical practice could have survived such a long period of time in the true Church.

Consequently, Pugin, like his authorities, did not take any one particular period, such as that of the Early Church or the medieval period, as an absolute source. He considered all in order to arrive at a consensus or pattern of use over the centuries.

iii) Pugin not guilty of archaeologism.

Some, such as the early Tractarians, on the other hand, tended to rely on antiquity, the Early Church, as an infallible authority for doctrinal truths, while neglecting later periods. Nineteenth- and early twentieth-century liturgists were generally guilty of archaeologism; a rejection of the Church and the world as they were in their day with the aim of restoring a particular period and the neglect or rejection of all others. Thus, Casel<sup>857</sup> and his followers merely took the Patristic period, Guéranger and his school took the Middle Ages, while Herwegen's<sup>858</sup> attempt was to bring back the first ten centuries. The seventeen- and eighteenth-century neo-Gallican liturgists, such as Mabillon, Félibien, Le Brun and Thiers,

---

<sup>857</sup> Odo Casel (1886-1948), a Benedictine monk, wrote: The Mystery of Christian Worship: and other writings (London: Translated into English and published in 1962), Myserientheologie: Ansatz und Gestalt (Regensburg: Hrsg. vom Abt-Herwegen-Inst. d. Abtei Maria Laach 1986), which was a selection of his writings about mysticism, the sacraments and the history of doctrines in the Catholic Church, published to commemorate the centenary of his birth, and Der Begriff des Mysteriums Bei Johannes Chrysostomus (Bonn: Hanstein 1953) on the liturgy of the Eucharist.

<sup>858</sup> Abbot Ildefons Herwegen (1874-1946) wrote Beiträge zur Geschichte des Alten Mönchtums und

who were Pugin's authorities, did not rely on the study of one particular period but took a pattern or consensus of use of every period. This has previously been shown to be the method used by Thiers and by the medieval scholar Durandus and other liturgists.

iv) Continental historical sources and authorities.

Having cited, in The Present State, the historical use and practice of liturgy in the Early Church, Pugin turned his attention to later periods and local use. John Harper writing in the twentieth century, does much the same in his The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy from the Tenth to the Eighteenth Century (1991) in his chapter titled "The Ordering of Selected Medieval Sources".

Pugin again turned to Béziers, Pommeraye and Gilbert, for information on local histories in Catholic churches in France before the Revolution. He cited Pommeraye's Histoire Catholick de Rouen (1686) to support his studies on roodlofts. "The ancient roodloft of the splendid abbey of St. Ouen, Rouen, engraved in Dom Pomeraye's (sic) history of that great house, must have been truly glorious".<sup>859</sup> He followed with the description supplied by Pommeraye.

Pugin also mentioned medieval Catholic liturgy in Germany and Belgium. "In Germany and Belgium several magnificent tabernacles of stone, carried up to a prodigious height, and exquisitely wrought, remain on the gospel side of the choir", he commented.<sup>860</sup>

v) British historical sources and authorities.

Pugin appealed to a vast number of British historical sources and authorities to support his views on liturgical form and arrangement in the pre-Reformation Catholic

---

des Benediktinerordens (Munster 1912).

<sup>859</sup> Pugin, The Present State, p.77, footnote.

Church in England. These included Jonas' Life of St Wulfran,<sup>861</sup> the Venerable Bede (c.673-735),<sup>862</sup> the Records of Holy Trinity Church, Long Melford, near Lavenham, Suffolk,<sup>863</sup> originally built circa 1050,<sup>864</sup> and Matthew Paris (1199-1259).<sup>865</sup>

England, wrote Pugin, was particularly rich in its rubrics and ancient missals<sup>866</sup> and its canons and liturgies prior to the Reformation. "We had in England, from Saxon times downwards, our own missals, rituals, benedictionals, offices, litanies".<sup>867</sup> The thirteenth-century chronicles<sup>868</sup> of Matthew Paris, a Benedictine monk, were his sources for this.

In expanding his view of the pre-Reformation Catholic Church, Pugin considered Canon Law and he cited the Provinciale of William Lyndwood (c.1375-1446), which includes his inventory of ornaments required in every parish church.<sup>869</sup> Pugin's library contained (according to the sale Catalogue) "Lyndwode, (G.) Provinciale seu Constitutiones Angliae".<sup>870</sup> The Provinciale is still important as a standard authority on English ecclesiastical law and Lyndwood's text of the constitutions is generally still used for official purposes.

Pugin researched various pre-Reformation practices, usages and local liturgies. His aim was to reintroduce them in the future. It was part of his vision of what could be. He

---

<sup>860</sup> *Ibid.*, p.42, footnote.

<sup>861</sup> *Ibid.*, p.40.

<sup>862</sup> *Ibid.*, p.40.

<sup>863</sup> *Ibid.*, p.31, footnote.

<sup>864</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.30 and 31.

<sup>865</sup> *Ibid.*, p.41, footnote.

<sup>866</sup> *Ibid.*, p.38.

<sup>867</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.48-49.

<sup>868</sup> Matthew Paris, Chronica majora (1235-1259: republished Stroud: Cambridge: Alan Sutton; Corpus Christi College 1993). This book was about monastic life in the thirteenth century.

<sup>869</sup> Pugin, The Present State, p.39, footnote.

<sup>870</sup> A. N. L. Munby, ed., Sale Catalogues, Vol. 4, p.265. Item 377.

referred to the Sarum Rite,<sup>871</sup> which was the ancient local variation of old Salisbury on the Roman rite, and the Rites of Durham,<sup>872</sup> which was written down in 1593 by one of the last surviving monks of the Abbey.<sup>873</sup> According to this eyewitness monk, Iconoclasts like Dean Horne and Dean Whittingham despoiled and desecrated the great medieval Cathedral and Shrine, which was “a great religious and artistic heritage of stained glass, pictures and images and richly embroidered altar furnishings.”<sup>874</sup> They left the Cathedral a bare hulk, which was later briefly used as a prison under Cromwell. The eighteenth-century antiquarian Patrick Sanderson’s Antiquities of Durham Abbey (dated 1767)<sup>875</sup> also helped to build up the picture of Durham Cathedral. Pugin had a copy of Sanderson’s book in his library.

Pugin researched the local usages and practices of the church of Peterborough. His authority was the divine and antiquarian Simon Gunton (1609-1676) and Pugin cited his History of the Church of Peterburgh (Peterborough),<sup>876</sup> a copy of which he had in his library. In particular, Gunton described the post Reformation restored stone screen which, Pugin argued, was evidence of continued use.<sup>877</sup>

Other authorities that Pugin referred to in The Present State were Strype, Heylin, Burnet, Dugdale, Stow, Dodds, Collier and Rushworth, which he had already used in both editions of Contrasts (1836 and 1841).

---

<sup>871</sup> Pugin, The Present State, p.38.

<sup>872</sup> *Ibid.*, p.36, footnote.

<sup>873</sup> R. W. J. Austin, Rites of Durham: Material selected and rendered from the Rites of Durham into modern English (Chester-le-Street: The City Printing Works 1986), Preface, p.iv.

<sup>874</sup> *Ibid.*, Preface, p.iv.

<sup>875</sup> Pugin, The Present State, p.100, footnote.

<sup>876</sup> *Ibid.*, p.74, footnote.

14) Pugin's exposition of the practical level of meaning.

i) A common liturgical arrangement and form.

All western churches before the Reformation (that is churches from the time of the Early church and not just medieval churches) had, Pugin believed, “*a perfect similarity of purpose, and by their form and arrangement*”<sup>878</sup> attested to “*the same faith*” and “*the same rites*” being performed within their walls.<sup>879</sup> Indeed, he said that the Church took active measures to ensure that corruptions of the rites and ceremonies of the sacraments did not occur.<sup>880</sup> “Gallican-type” mostly referred to as medieval usages and practices of the Roman rite had frequently been criticised by authoritarian Ultramontanes as being different from each other, not uniform, inconsistent and changed by local colour and customs. Pugin set out to contradict this notion.

The whole Church, he claimed, wherever its individual churches might be, “was arranged on a certain *regulated system*”.<sup>881</sup> A certain pattern of use and purpose was apparent in churches from one end of Europe to another.<sup>882</sup> Thus, although local variations could be encountered these were likely to occur only in detail since the standard underlying structure of the Roman liturgy, that is, the consecration of the elements and the communion, was always the same. Consequently, there were liturgical elements of the Mass which were always the same. The Mass dictated the liturgical form and arrangement, which reflected this sameness. Because of the common *regulated system* or pattern, Pugin recognized that he

---

<sup>877</sup> Charles Jacob, ed., History of the Cathedral Church of Peterborough (Peterborough 1813), p.40.

<sup>878</sup> Pugin, The Present State, p.9.

<sup>879</sup> *Ibid.*, p.9.

<sup>880</sup> *Ibid.*, p.8.

<sup>881</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.8-9.

<sup>882</sup> Pugin later enlarged on this in his Glossary of ecclesiastical Ornament and Costume (1844), which will be looked at in detail later.

would not be moving away from traditional Catholic form and arrangement if he focussed on any individual church. Consequently, he studied local liturgies and local rites.

Pugin saw *the* liturgy as taking place in a liturgical context. Gregory Dix believes that *the* liturgy is a fully contained, independent action, but contained within a continually changing setting, which he calls an “intricate pattern of local variety”.<sup>883</sup> While Dix’s “shape” of the liturgy refers to “form and arrangement”, he restricts it to the “ritual pattern” of the Eucharistic action itself and he does not include its liturgical context or setting. Nevertheless, Dix recognises there is a pattern or regulated system to this one aspect. As a comparison, Pugin’s liturgical context was about *the* liturgy in a liturgical setting and, in this, his view was much more inclusive than that of Dix’s.

Yngve Brilioth also applies a sort of consensus or pattern of use on the traditional shape of *the* liturgy. In his Eucharistic Faith and Practice (1930) he claims that *the* liturgy had always embodied five elements: communion, sacrifice, Eucharist (thanksgiving), commemoration (or the historical side) and Mystery.<sup>884</sup> Moreover, he fully acknowledges that these five elements had consistently been carried down over the centuries. However, he, like Dix, does not place *the* liturgy in a liturgical context or setting in the same way as Pugin.

ii) The requirements for liturgical form and arrangement.

In The Present State, Pugin moved on to what he thought, given his deep and intensive research, was required for liturgical form and arrangement of Christian churches.<sup>885</sup> He had previously given his rules for the design of buildings in general:

---

<sup>883</sup> Dom Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, preface, p.xii.

<sup>884</sup> Yngve Brilioth, Eucharistic Faith and Practice: Evangelical & Catholic (London: SPCK 1930), p.17.

<sup>885</sup> Pugin, The Present State, p.16.

1<sup>st</sup>, that there should be no features about a building which are not necessary for convenience, construction, or propriety; 2<sup>nd</sup>, that all ornament should consist of enrichment of the essential construction of the building.<sup>886</sup>

Moreover, construction should “vary with the material employed”,<sup>887</sup> again allowing for local variations. This use of materials was one of the common principles or laws that applied to all buildings. It was therefore essential that they were followed for the design of churches.

He now turned his attention to more detailed requirements for Catholic parish churches. The evidence of nearly two thousand years showed what was specifically required for a Catholic church; Pugin believed all his authorities had agreed on what that was. He therefore set down those requirements for form and arrangement, which he believed cumulative evidence after the third century indicated:

The building should consist of a nave, with a tower or belfry. A southern porch, in which a stoup for hallowed water should be provided; at the western end of the nave, and usually in the south aisle, a stone font with a wooden cover fastened with a lock, and near it an ambry in the wall for the oleum catechumenorum and holy chrism. The chancel at the eastern end should be separated from the nave by an open screen supporting the rood loft, ascended by a staircase in the wall.

Wooden seats, with low backs, and placed wide enough apart to admit of kneeling easily, may be fixed in the nave and aisles, allowing alleys of sufficient width for the passage of processions.<sup>888</sup> A stone or wooden pulpit sufficiently elevated may be erected in a convenient position in the nave.

The chancel floor should be raised at least one step above the nave, and the upper step on which the altar stands three steps above the floor of the chancel. The altar should consist of one slab of stone (marked with five crosses, and a cavity for relics) raised on solid masonry or stone pillars.

On the epistle side of the altar a sacarium should be fixed, with a basin and waste pipe, with a stone shelf for the cruets. On the same side, and corresponding to the width of the three steps ascending to the altar, three niches should be built, partly in the thickness of the wall, and, partly projecting, with canopies, and convenient seats for the priest, deacon, and subdeacon. Opposite to these an arched tomb, to serve as the sepulchre for

---

<sup>886</sup> Pugin, *The True Principles*, p.1.

<sup>887</sup> *Ibid.*, p.1.

<sup>888</sup> There were no permanent seats in the naves of medieval churches except around the walls. The worshippers may, however, have brought in their own seating.

holy week. Adjoining the chancel, a sacristy or revestry for keeping the vestments and ornaments; or, in any small churches an almary may be provided for this purpose on the gospel side of the altar, within the chancel. An image of the saint in whose honour the church is dedicated, should be set in the chancel. Where there are lateral aisles, they should be terminated towards the east by altars, either erected against the wall, and protected by open screenwork, or in chapels, eastward of the aisles, divided off from the church by screens.<sup>889</sup>

He went on to describe what was required for the form of a church - position, tower, spire and "the vertical principle".<sup>890</sup> Symmetry was not a requirement - "uniformity never entered into the ideas of the ancient designers", he said.<sup>891</sup> "they regulated their plans and designs by localities and circumstances; they made them *essentially convenient and suitable to the required purpose, and decorated them afterwards*".<sup>892</sup> He described in detail essentials such as the altar, the porch, a water stoup, the font, the nave and aisles where men and women were separated, seats which "from a very early period"<sup>893</sup> were "very low and wide apart",<sup>894</sup> pulpit, chancel, screen, rood, and rood loft which was "a gallery partly resting on the screen"<sup>895</sup> and used "as an elevated place from whence the holy Gospel might be sung to the people".<sup>896</sup> Earlier he had stated that he was the first to restore the sedilia, sacrarium, rood and rood-lofts, two candlesticks on the altar and curtains either side, basins with "prickets" for tapers, holy water stoups in porches, old English surplices, chasubles and albs, and the recumbant ecclesiastical effigy.<sup>897</sup>

---

<sup>889</sup> Pugin, The Present State, pp.16-17.

<sup>890</sup> *Ibid.*, p.21.

<sup>891</sup> *Ibid.*, p.22.

<sup>892</sup> *Ibid.*, p.22.

<sup>893</sup> *Ibid.*, p.28.

<sup>894</sup> *Ibid.*, p.28.

<sup>895</sup> *Ibid.*, p.30.

<sup>896</sup> *Ibid.*, p.30.

<sup>897</sup> Pugin to *The British Critic* (October 1840). See also Pugin to Bloxam MS 528/12 (24 October 1840) and M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.153.

This was not simply a description of a Gothic church, but was a description of what he thought was the uniform pattern set forth for churches of all ages. There is nothing in Pugin's description to suggest that he only had a reproduction of a Gothic church in mind as he gave the above specification. Altars, for instance, were far from being confined to the medieval Church. Up to the seventh century, he said, they were generally made of wood and then they were changed to stone. Pugin, therefore, was convinced that true Catholic liturgical form and arrangement had not changed over many centuries. Many modern liturgists and scholars would disagree.

Pugin's statement was, however, also a description of Gallican-type usage and practice common in the medieval English Church. Roman usage and practice from the sixteenth century onwards did not include a chancel or screen; the nave terminated at one end with an apse, which contained the altar on which there were six candlesticks. The apse was protected from the nave by a low balustrade and all was much more open.

#### 15) An Apology.

##### i) Pugin's continued involvement in contemporary issues.

At the beginning of 1841, despite his health problems, things were going well for Pugin at Oxford. He had several commissions, including designs for Magdalen College, Balliol College and St Mary's University Church, sundry commissions to advise on the re-ordering of parish churches in and around Oxford and many Tractarian friends. However, by spring 1841, things were starting to fall apart.

##### ii) Effects of Tract 90.

After the publication of Newman's Tract 90 and the resultant uproar from ultra-Protestants, Pugin and the Tractarians had to be more discreet about being seen together until

the situation had calmed down again. He was becoming a well-known public figure by this time due to his success as an architect and from his writing. Visits therefore had to be prudent and clandestine. As he later remarked to Bloxam, if he and the Tractarians were seen together the Protestants might think they were “plotting some desperate form of Guy Fawkes deed”.<sup>898</sup> He did not, in fact, visit in March 1841 at the height of the furore because of his illness. Months later the the difficulties over Tract 90 remained and he implored Bloxam, “pray (sic) remember me most kindly to all Friends (sic) at oxford (sic)” and added, “I am sure you must have a trying time of it at present”.<sup>899</sup>

Correspondence between Roman Catholics and Tractarians remained furtive. Letters were frequently carried by hand and passed to ‘safe’ people, like Bloxam,<sup>900</sup> who ensured that they safely arrived. The Tractarians were by this time becoming isolated from the mainstream of Anglicanism:

Rejected by their own communion, it was natural that the Oxford party should look more and more to their friends in the Roman Catholic Church. Leading members of the party corresponded with Pugin and Wiseman on the union of their party with Rome, while their assimilation with the national Church of England seemed more and more improbable.<sup>901</sup>

Despite the difficult situation caused by Tract 90, Pugin nevertheless visited Oxford in the middle of April when he carried a letter from Wiseman (who gave it to Phillipps to hand to Pugin) with instructions to “show it to the Oxford men”.<sup>902</sup> Pugin was one of the few,

---

<sup>898</sup> *Ibid.*, Pugin to Bloxam ( 19 December 1841), MS 528/111. This was possibly a delayed reference to Thomas Lathbury’s Guy Fawkes, or a complete History of the Gunpowder Treason: and some Notices of the Revolution of 1688 (London: 1839. See M. Belcher’s, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.301.

<sup>899</sup> *Ibid.*, Pugin to Bloxam (19 December 1841), MS 528/111. See M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.301.

<sup>900</sup> E. S. Purcell, Life and Letters of Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle, Vol. II, p.244.

<sup>901</sup> Wilfrid Ward, Wiseman Vol. I, p.407.

<sup>902</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol.I, p.386.

if not the only Roman Catholic, who was in direct contact with the Tractarians in Oxford at that time.

iii) Doubts about Tract 90.

Although Pugin retained confidence in Newman's motives, some niggling doubts remained. He initially believed that Tract 90 was written to support corporate reunion of the Churches and that Newman and the Oxford men had nothing but "*one grand end of reunion in view*".<sup>903</sup> But he gradually began to think that the aim of Tract 90 was not to persuade Anglicans to join the Church of Rome, but to Catholicize the Church of England and to keep it autonomous, indeed, that Newman thought the Church of England could become Catholic without reunion. It was not what Pugin wanted. In his Liberal Ultramontane view, a Church could not be Catholic unless it recognised the Pope as its spiritual head. He and Newman were thus poles apart, even though they both wanted to revive and restore Catholicism in England.

Pugin, therefore, suspected that "the Oxford men" were more enthusiastic about reviving Catholicism in the Church of England than they were about reunion. During his visit in April, he was adamantly reassured that this was not the case. Bloxam mentioned this in a note to Phillipps. Pugin, he said, had been under a misconception, but now perfectly understood their position.<sup>904</sup>

iv) Reassurances concerning Tract 90.

Pugin, greatly reassured, wrote to Phillipps, too, giving him an optimistic account of the situation at Oxford. He still held the opinion that Newman's Tract 90 had done a great

---

<sup>903</sup> Pugin to Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle (13 April 1841). MS 335, 37. Magdalen College Archives. See M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.231.

<sup>904</sup> Bloxam to Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle (13 April 1841).

deal of good. Following Bloxam's reassurances, he now believed that Newman had written it with reunion in mind and he was greatly encouraged:

every(sic) thing here is going on as well as we could even *hope for*. the(sic) progress of Catholic affairs since my Last (sic) visit is immense. the (sic) Late (sic) events have been *productive of incalculable benefit* & brought over hundreds of hitherto (sic) vacillating (sic) individuals. I feel now quite satisfied Newman is right in the course he is pursuing. he(sic) has nothing but the reunion in view & is working towards it as fast as possible.<sup>905</sup>

While Newman had been under the impression that Pugin did not want individual conversions, Pugin's own remarks in the above suggest the contrary. He *wanted* individual conversions as much as he wanted corporate reunion.

Wiseman had received an equally glowing account, in the style of Pugin, of the situation at Oxford. Overjoyed at this progress, he wrote to Dr Russell of Maynooth:

I have received a letter from a friend gone to Oxford, where he is most intimate with the heads of the party. I will extract a few sentences, *for yourself and Dr Murray only*, unless you think the Archbishop would be glad to see what I write, from whom I have no secrets – *but no further*. 'I have the most cheering and satisfactory intelligence to communicate relative to the progress of Catholic affairs in this place, and I feel satisfied that events have advanced the cause far beyond what our most sanguine hopes could have led us to expect. I feel now quite satisfied that Mr. Newman is acting with the greatest sincerity, that his whole efforts are directed towards a reunion, not a distant, theoretical union, but a practical one, and that as soon as it can be openly agitated without causing too much alarm ...'<sup>906</sup>

v) Catholicising of Anglican parish churches.

Pugin discreetly continued back and forth to Oxford over the summer of 1841 visiting Bloxam, arranging for Catholic artefacts to be delivered to and from Bloxam's rooms and advising on the Catholicizing of Anglican parish churches in and around Oxford.<sup>907</sup> Only a

---

<sup>905</sup> Pugin to Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle (13 April 1841). MS 335, p.37. Magdalen College Archives. See M. Belcher, *The Collected Letters*, Vol. I, p.231.

<sup>906</sup> Wilfrid Ward, *Wiseman*, Vol. I, p.388.

<sup>907</sup> Purcell, *Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle*, Vol. II, p.289. Phillipps to Lord Shrewsbury from Barmouth (1841). A year earlier, on 21 August 1840, Pugin had mentioned in his diary "Oxford, Banbury

few knew that he was involved in this enterprise as he mentioned to Bloxam. After sending some chalices to Jewitt, the engraver, he commented to Bloxam, "You can mention them to the initiated".<sup>908</sup>

The decoration of Newman's church at Littlemore was progressing and by June 1841 Pugin was taking an active interest in the furnishings, particularly the design of the pews. "I do not think the seats at Reading (St. James') would be quite in Character (sic) for Littlemore (sic). I will send you a better plan", he wrote to Bloxam.<sup>909</sup>

Bloxam visited Pugin at Ramsgate in August 1841. "Mr. Bloxam came", he laconically remarked in his Diary.<sup>910</sup> There was only time for fleeting visits to Oxford since during August Pugin was busy working on the re-ordering and alteration of a parish church at Banbury near Oxford. He mentioned this in a letter to Rock. "I shall arrange to get down to you at Farringdon when I go to Banbury where I am making several additions to the church".<sup>911</sup>

vi) Pugin influenced an Anglican rector.

By October 1841, the pressure of Pugin's work had eased. He had more time for visiting his friends in Oxford. It was in Bloxam's rooms in October 1841 that he was introduced to Bernard Smith, the Anglican rector of Leadenham, Lincolnshire. "Pugin was delighted with his views on architecture (and religion), and reported of him as a *most glorious*

---

Churches, etc." and this may refer to the Catholicising of the Oxford and surrounding area churches.

<sup>908</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (c. June 1841). MS.528/110 Magdalen College Archives. Not included in Margaret Belcher, Collected Letters, Vol. I.

<sup>909</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (28 June 1841), MS. 528/124, Magdalen College Archives. See M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.247 (Note- full stops after 'Littlemore' and 'plan' are included by M. Belcher, but are not in the original letter). Pugin's reference to St James', Reading, which he had designed.

<sup>910</sup> Pugin Diary (19 August 1841), Wedgwood, A. W. N. Pugin and the Pugin Family, p.49.

<sup>911</sup> Pugin to Dr. Rock (25 August 1841). Southwark Diocesan Archives. MS SAA T-R 179. Pugin/Rock papers. See M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p. 267.

man”.<sup>912</sup> Smith invited Pugin to return with him to his Rectory, which was situated ten to twelve miles south of Lincoln. He subsequently stayed with Smith on 11-12 October 1841.<sup>913</sup> They had long conversations about Catholicism, further proof that Pugin wanted individual conversions as much as he wanted corporate reunion. One such conversation struck a chord with Smith since he took to heart “Pugin’s *saeva indignatio*”<sup>914</sup> at his ignorance and prejudice about Catholic matters. He determined to find out more by seeking an introduction to Oscott and Bishop Wiseman.<sup>915</sup> During his stay at Leadenham, Pugin advised Smith on a Catholic re-ordering of his church, including ornaments and the painting of the ceiling.<sup>916</sup> Pugin remarked, “There has been a *visitation* at *Leadenham*. how (sic) I tremble for the result”.<sup>917</sup>

His fears were well founded. Bishop Kaye of Lincoln was enraged and believed that Romanism was behind it - “The unleavened bread, the altar lights, and the rest were inhibited”, he exclaimed.<sup>918</sup> He pronounced it “unmistakably Roman”.<sup>919</sup> Smith did not take the criticism well; he “felt that the Anglican authorities were rejecting him, while Rome was inviting him”.<sup>920</sup>

Pugin left Leadenham for Oxford and arrived on 13 October 1841; he stayed two days.<sup>921</sup> He had received a good welcome. He commented, “the truly devout & single hearted

---

<sup>912</sup> Wilfrid Ward, Wiseman, Vol.I, p.409.

<sup>913</sup> Pugin Diary (13 October 1841), which also mentioned Banbury where he was working on the re-ordering of a church. See Wedgwood, A. W. N. Pugin and the Pugin Family, p.50.

<sup>914</sup> Wilfrid Ward, Wiseman, Vol. I, p.409.

<sup>915</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p.410.

<sup>916</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (21 November 1841). See Margaret Belcher, The Collected Letters, p.288.

<sup>917</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (14 November 1841), MS. 528/141, Magdalen College Archives. See M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.286. See Alexandra Wedgwood, A. W. N. Pugin and the Pugin Family, p. 86, Note 19, 1841. She states that Pugin supervised the painting of the ceiling.

<sup>918</sup> Wilfrid Ward, Wiseman, Vol. I, p.411.

<sup>919</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p.411.

<sup>920</sup> *Ibid.* Vol. I, p.411.

<sup>921</sup> Pugin Diary (13 and 15 October 1841). See Alexandra Wedgwood, A. W. N. Pugin and the Pugin Family, p.50.

men of both sides will in the course of time be united in the great work of recatholicising England I have little doubt & for this we must ever pray".<sup>922</sup> He wrote to Bloxam in November: "I suppose you have heard that the Chancel at Leadenham has been completely(sic) denuded of catholic ornaments as if a troop of puritans had visited it in Cromwellian days".<sup>923</sup> He does not appear to have visited Oxford again for a few months. He was busy in Leeds.

vii) St Saviour's Church, Leeds.

At about this time Pusey was pressing on with his plans to build a parish church at Leeds. He had received an offer from an anonymous benefactor ("Z") in August 1839 to support the building of such a church. By December 1841 he had a choice of sites and an architect.

The architect for St Saviour's was not Pugin, but John Macduff Derick. Yet Derick was closely acquainted with Pugin. He was an Irishman who had been an apprentice as an architectural draughtsman in the offices of the elder Pugin. He had consequently more or less grown up with Pugin. By December 1841, Derick had visited Pusey twice to discuss the plans. Pusey gave something of his character in a letter to Hook. He was, he said, "a very modest, simple minded retiring, amiable person, very much attached to his employment, for its religious character, and with very good views".<sup>924</sup>

Meanwhile, Pugin was frequently seen in Leeds working on the building of St. Anne's Roman Catholic Church. Derick, however, had done very little architectural work prior to St Saviour's, although the *Gentleman's Magazine* for February 1842 stated that he

---

<sup>922</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (24 October 1841), MS. 528/7, Magdalen College Archives. See also M. Belcher, *The Collected Letters*, Vol. I, pp.156-157.

<sup>923</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (21 November 1841). See Margaret Belcher, *The Collected Letters*, p.288.

<sup>924</sup> Pusey to Hook (December 1841). MS Pus 21/11 Pusey House Archives, Oxford.

had been the architect for Holy Trinity Church in St Ebbes's parish, Oxford (demolished 1957). St Saviour's, like Holy Trinity, was very similar to Pugin's designs with its emphasis on Catholic form and arrangement with height, deep chancel and aisles. Construction work started in 1842.

Most references to Pugin, regarding St Saviour's, concern his commission for the stained glass windows. He was "responsible for the glass of the Martyr's and the Passion windows in the south and the north transepts as well as the west window with the Holy Face", stated G. G. Pace.<sup>925</sup> Liddon also referred to this window in his Pusey;<sup>926</sup> "I like his design very much", wrote Pusey, even though he was not completely happy with the "Holy Face".<sup>927</sup>

Pugin's involvement had to be extremely discreet. The vicar of Leeds Parish Church, Walter Farquhar Hook, was a staunch Anglican who detested Roman Catholics. As the construction of St Saviour's progressed, Hook became increasingly hostile to Pusey whom he suspected of being a crypto-Roman Catholic. Any hint that Pugin was involved in any part of the design of St Saviour's would have caused an uproar.

viii) Pugin's interest in Littlemore.

By 6 February 1842, Newman had retreated to Littlemore from Oxford in search of a more peaceful life, although he remained Vicar of St Mary's for the time being. Pugin, meanwhile, was back in Oxford towards the end of February 1842. He wrote to Bloxam on

---

<sup>925</sup> G. G. Pace, "Pusey and Leeds", *The Architectural Review*, vol.98 (December 1945), p.180.

<sup>926</sup> Henry Parry Liddon (J. O. Johnston and R.J. Wilson, eds.), The Life and Times of Edward Bouverie Pusey (London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1893) Vol.2, p.478.

<sup>927</sup> *Ibid.*, p.478, footnote.

the 21<sup>st</sup> of the month, “I hope D.V.<sup>928</sup> to be with you on *Wednesday* next(sic) I propose coming down by one of the many trains. I hope I shall *catch a sight* of Ward”.<sup>929</sup>

It is not known if he saw Ward. Another visit took place in March 1842 when he saw Frederick William Faber (1814-1863) with whom he was already corresponding. “Faber is a wonderful man. I have great expectations for him”, he remarked to Bloxam.<sup>930</sup>

Soon Newman had attracted a group of young men to join him at Littlemore including John Dobrée Dalgairns, William Lockhart, Mark Pattison, James Anthony Froude and David Lewis. It was reported in a newspaper on 9 April that Littlemore had turned into a sort of quasi Anglo-Catholic monastery.<sup>931</sup> Months later, Pugin inquired of Bloxam, “is(sic) it true what I see in the papers that Mr. Newman is building a monastic establishment at Littlemore? if so what is style & plan?”<sup>932</sup> He was interested and wanted to get involved in its design.

ix) The reordering of further Oxford Anglican parish churches.

Pugin was soon back in Oxford again. He mentioned this visit in May in a letter to Dr. Rock. “I would stop with you till *Wednesday* morning & then go on to oxford (sic)”.<sup>933</sup> On 31 May 1842, he wrote in his diary that he had visited “several churches in Oxfordshire”; this was to do with inspecting or viewing the work that had been done concerning re-ordering to a

---

<sup>928</sup> D.V. - *deo volente* - ‘God willing’.

<sup>929</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (21 Feb. 1842), MS. 528/82, Magdalen College Archives. Not included in M. Belcher’s, The Collected Letters, Vol. I.

<sup>930</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (c.16 March 1842). MS. 528/81, Magdalen College Archives. Not included in M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I.

<sup>931</sup> Anne Mozley, Letters and Correspondence, Vol. II, 349. Newman to J. Keble (7 April 1842).

<sup>932</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (19 December 1841), MS. 528/111, Magdalen College Archives. See M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.301.

<sup>933</sup> Pugin to Rock (20 May 1842), Southwark Diocesan Archives. Pugin/Rock Papers. MS SAA T-R 179. M. Belcher, The Collected Letters, Vol. I, p.349.

more Catholic arrangement of churches such as Banbury, Iffley and Sandford. Again, in June he mentioned, "At Oxford and Dorchester, dined with Mr. Bloxam".<sup>934</sup>

Pugin did not appear to visit Oxford during the Long Vacation from June to October 1842. But by the end of the year, he was again visiting frequently. The furore about Tract 90 had died down. "Everything is quiet in Oxford", mentioned Newman.<sup>935</sup> It was a good time to visit. Yet, things were not as they had been. A shift in attitude by some of Pugin's Tractarian friends had taken place. He was no longer as welcome in some quarters as he had been.

x) Difficulties encountered.

First indications of a change of attitude occurred when Ward grumbled about him being seen in Oxford quite so often, yet Pugin had not been there for months. His earlier ecstatic reception of Pugin in the Tower meeting of October 1840 had given way by November 1842 to coolness and complaint. Pugin was clearly hurt, puzzled and annoyed by his comments and remarked, "Ward is the last man who ought to complain of my appearance at Oxford for I only see him for 2 minutes & a half when I do come, although I hold him in great veneration".<sup>936</sup>

Why had this change in attitude occurred? Pugin's publications of this period expressed views that were controversial from both an Anglican and a Roman Catholic viewpoint. In these works, Pugin had tried to bring out the distortions and corruptions that had occurred in the Church of Rome<sup>937</sup> as well as the Church of England because of the Renaissance and Reformation. It was impossible for Romanizing Tractarians such as Ward

---

<sup>934</sup> Pugin Diary (31 May and 1 June 1842). See Wedgwood, A. W. N. Pugin and the Pugin Family, p.52.

<sup>935</sup> Anne Mozley, Letters and Correspondence, Vol. II, p.361. Newman to Mrs. J. Mozley (26 Nov. 1842).

<sup>936</sup> Pugin to Rock (23 May 1842), Pugin/Rock Papers, MS SAA T-R 179. Southwark Cathedral Library.

and Oakeley to express any sympathy with his views, given their new beliefs. As they moved towards Rome, they rejected any idea of reviving a Catholic Church in England that had local and national, rather than Roman, usages and practices, and they continued to move towards authoritarian Ultramontanism rather than Liberal Ultramontanism. They refused to accept that the Church of Rome was anything other than perfect. William Palmer of Worcester College thought that they had moved away from a study of Catholicism to a study of the Church of Rome.<sup>938</sup> Their attitude to Pugin became increasingly hostile.

xii) Pugin's Anglican friend seceded to Rome.

Bernard Smith, feeling rejected by his own bishop, seceded to the Church of Rome in December 1842, leaving his parish without a pastor.<sup>939</sup> His secession caused a newspaper scandal but, by a twist of fate, it was Newman and not Pugin who came in for criticism. Bishop Kaye claimed that he (Newman) had advised Smith to retain his living in Leadenham as a Papist.<sup>940</sup> There was no evidence for the accusation and it was later retracted. Pugin's part in Smith's secession was not mentioned. Smith went to Oscott where he studied for the priesthood. He remained Pugin's friend and revised and enlarged the second edition of his Glossary of Ecclesiastical Ornament and Costume, which was republished in 1846.

xii) A lost commission and diminished support.

Ward and Oakeley's new attitude towards the Church of Rome had negative repercussions for Pugin, since they were no longer interested in the Gothic revival. Other Fellows of Balliol College, however, continued to support him. Richard Jenkyns (1782-

---

<sup>937</sup> Pugin, Contrasts (1841).

<sup>938</sup> William Palmer, A Narrative of events connected with the publication of the "Tracts for the Times" with reflections on existing tendencies to Romanism (Oxford: John Henry Parker 1843), p.44.

<sup>939</sup> Pugin Diary (18 December 1842), which says, "R.B. Smith reconciled".

<sup>940</sup> Dessain, ed., Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd.

1854), the Master, who had always been unhappy about commissioning a Roman Catholic, had become increasingly nervous and worried following the publication of Tract 90. His worries were further aggravated by the incitements of Golightly who played upon his great dislike of the Tractarian movement because of their association with Catholicism. He persuaded Jenkyns that their support of Pugin was proof of their support for Roman Catholicism.

Articles appeared unsympathetic to Pugin and suggested that he and the Tractarians were involved in some kind of Romish plot at Balliol. The press seized upon his Letter on the Proposed Protestant Memorial written four years before (in which he had employed some strong language). It was pointed out that he had written down Protestants as “canting hypocrites, and raving fanatics; the Reformers as apostatising villains; the subscribers to the Martyrs Memorial as foul revilers, etc.”.

Dalgairns wrote to the *Univers* on 10 January 1843 backing up Pugin and suggesting that Golightly was the instigator who had alarmed the Master.<sup>941</sup> Jenkyns had no wish to be at the centre of a cause he detested and shortly decided in February 1843 to de-commission Pugin. He resolved to withhold his consent to affixing of the College seal, which was required to confirm the commission.

Ward had attempted to substitute another, rather incompetent and unreliable architect, with Pugin secretly in charge, probably in an effort to avert the anger of Golightly and friends. Pugin, however, was upset and confounded by Ward’s suggestion. He saw it as a veiled insult to his abilities. “I have had a most perplexing letter from our Fred Ward(sic) I hardly know what to do, or what he *wishes* me to do.”<sup>942</sup>

---

1961), Vol. XI (October 1845 - Dec 1846), p.357. Index.

<sup>941</sup> Dalgairns, a letter, *The Univers* (10 January 1843), in support of Pugin.

<sup>942</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (undated c.1843), MS. 528/85, Magdalen College Archives.

Thus, Pugin lost the contract at Balliol College and the bad publicity damaged his chances of future commissions at Oxford, as he sadly and perhaps with some exaggeration expressed to Bloxam.<sup>943</sup> Moreover, Balliol College was reluctant to pay him for the vast amount of work he had already done. He eventually wrote it off as a bad debt, only asking for his expenses to be covered.<sup>944</sup>

While Oakeley and Ward had lost interest in reviving Anglicanism, other Tractarians had not yet changed camps and were still working towards the corporate reunion of the Churches. Nothing had changed for Pugin to alter his mind about Frederick William Faber by the following month. "I hope I shall have a chance of seeing Mr. Faber", he wrote to Bloxam, "I have received a most kind letter from him".<sup>945</sup> But Faber was moving to the Romanizers' camp and would become one of his most bitter adversaries.

All in all, 1843 was an exceedingly arduous year for Pugin. His own diary for that year is missing. Alexandra Wedgwood suggests that he destroyed it himself because he had a difficult year.<sup>946</sup>

#### 16) Style versus form and arrangement.

##### i) Pugin's purpose not simply a justification of the Gothic style.

In common with many who were writing Tracts, Pugin saw his next publication as a kind of Tract, as he mentioned this work in a letter to Bloxam: "I am writing a sort of Tract for the Times, entitled an(sic) apology(sic) for the revival(sic) of Catholic architecture(sic)", he said, "I trust it will help on the good cause".<sup>947</sup>

---

<sup>943</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (24 February 1843), MS. 528/73, Magdalen College Archives.

<sup>944</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (c. March 1843), MS. 528/36, Magdalen College Archives.

<sup>945</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (10 March 1843), MS. 528/96, Magdalen College Archives.

<sup>946</sup> Alexandra Wedgwood, A. W. N. Pugin and the Pugin Family, p. 89. Note referring to 1843.

<sup>947</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (15 December 1842), MS. 582/94, Magdalen College Archives.

In this work (published 1843), Pugin set out to emphatically deny that he was attempting to revive Gothic architecture *per se*. This appears to have been a new response to criticism that, as an architect, he was only interested in reviving a particular style of architecture. It was not a *style*, he exhorted, that should be revived, but the faith behind it and the expression of this faith by a particular liturgical form and arrangement:

We do not want to revive a facsimile of the works or style of any particular individual, or even period; *but it is the devotion, majesty, and repose of Christian art, for which we are contending*; - it is not a *style*, but a *principle*.<sup>948</sup>

Therefore, in his Apology, Pugin himself was to deny that he was attempting to revive any *style* – even Gothic – for its own sake.

ii) Not a matter of being unappreciative of other styles.

Pugin's expertise on medieval ecclesiastical architecture should not be confused with medievalism and Romanticism. Although obviously his special knowledge had something to do with these, this was not the whole story. That he studied Classical architecture, as well as Gothic and later styles, has been argued previously. Indeed, he wrote about Pollio Vitruvius in admiring tones, and considered Classical architecture to be "*perfect expressions of imperfect systems*".<sup>949</sup> He remarked that the "abstract beauty of these various styles, when viewed with reference to the purposes for which they were raised, is great indeed".<sup>950</sup> He denied that he was "a blind bigot insensible to, and ignorant of, any beauty but that of the middle ages".<sup>951</sup> That he did not wish to build in the Classical style was entirely due to his

---

<sup>948</sup> Pugin, An Apology for the Revival of Christian Architecture (London: John Weale 1843), p.44.

<sup>949</sup> Pugin, An Apology, p.5.

<sup>950</sup> *Ibid.*, p.4.

<sup>951</sup> *Ibid.*, p.5.

religious beliefs; he nevertheless could be appreciative of other styles purely from an aesthetic viewpoint.

iii) Pugin welcomed modern technology.

While it has been argued that he was not a mere medieval reconstructionist, it would seem that he was actually against such an idea. The Liberal Ultramontanes saw themselves as members of an intellectual movement that, while looking backwards to the medieval period for inspiration, also welcomed new discoveries and inventions in science and the arts. Indeed, Pugin was a keen advocate of modern inventions, building techniques, modern materials, machinery and new methods of construction. In his Apology for the Revival of Christian Architecture, under the heading ‘Modern Inventions and Mechanical Improvements’ he stated that “the Christian architect should gladly avail himself of those improvements and increased facilities that are suggested from time to time”.<sup>952</sup> While liturgical form and arrangement would stay the same, the style would change because of the adoption of modern technology. This can be seen in Pugin’s own designs that are based on a traditional form and arrangement, but use modern materials such as brick and encaustic tiles. He wrote:

Any modern invention which conduces to comfort, cleanliness, or durability, should be adopted by the consistent architect: *to copy a thing merely because it is old, is just as absurd as the imitations of the modern pagans.*<sup>953</sup>

In his own words, it was “absurd” to copy an ancient style for its own sake – even Gothic. It was the faith, not the style that needed to be conserved and revived:

*for we do not wish to produce mere servile imitators of former excellence of any kind, but men imbued with the consistent spirit of the ancient architects, who would work on their principles, and carry them out as the old men would*

---

<sup>952</sup> *Ibid.*, p.39.

<sup>953</sup> *Ibid.*, p.38.

*have done, had they been placed in similar circumstances, and with similar wants to ourselves.*<sup>954</sup>

Thus, in his Apology, Pugin made it abundantly clear he was not interested in copying Gothic architecture *per se*. His justification for promoting the Gothic style was its liturgical correctness, not its aesthetic appeal.

iv) Style not the issue.

In his Apology, he set out the differences between “style” and “form and arrangement”; this was something he had not previously attempted. It was not a question of “mere private views and opinions relative to comparative abstract beauty in the different styles” for which he contended.<sup>955</sup> It was much more complex than that; he wanted to explain the two different approaches to church art and architecture; firstly, “style”, and secondly “form and arrangement”.

v) Style.

In terms of “style”, “architecture and art should be a consistent expression of the period”, he stated.<sup>956</sup> As far as costume was concerned, “To represent persons of the present century in the costumes of the fourteenth, is little less inconsistent than to envelope them in the Roman toga”.<sup>957</sup> Again, these were not statements of a mere medieval reconstructionist. He stated that style could and should change according to the times.

---

<sup>954</sup> *Ibid.*, p.22.

<sup>955</sup> *Ibid.*, p.4.

<sup>956</sup> *Ibid.*, p.34.

<sup>957</sup> *Ibid.*, p.34.

“The beliefs and manners of all people are embodied in the edifices they raise” because “each style was the type of their Religion, customs and climate”.<sup>958</sup> People changed, their societies and religions changed and these changes were expressed in ever changing architectural styles.

Styles were not invented merely as examples of abstract beauty, he argued, but as an expression of ever changing societies, cultures and religions and their requirements. It amounted to a universal law or principle relative to “style”. In his view, styles were man-made and therefore constantly changing. He was not against styles; he did not advocate an imitation of Gothic and the denigration of other styles, as is sometimes thought to be the case.<sup>959</sup>

vi) Form and arrangement.

Pugin stated, in his Apology, that there was “a similarity of purpose”, an age-old law or principle, which dictated liturgical form and arrangement. He argued that since the “purpose” had been revealed nearly two thousand years ago and had been carried down the centuries, so the form and arrangement had also existed in its entirety since the time of Jesus Christ and the Apostles. It was important to him to prove the origins and continuity of medieval usages and practices, as opposed to Roman, which he contended only existed from the sixteenth century. Liturgy, as part of the true Church, should demonstrate continuity and should therefore display a legitimate form of Apostolical Succession. He argued that, like the faith, liturgy did not change. Therefore, in his view, liturgy (including medieval local and national usages and practices, as well as form and arrangement) was given by God, rather than man-made.

---

<sup>958</sup> *Ibid.*, p.4.

<sup>959</sup> Ferrey, Recollections, p.113. Ferrey's views have frequently influenced later writers as the bibliographical survey indicated.

17) Pugin's exposition of allegorical meaning in religious architecture in An Apology.

18) His exposition of the theological level of meaning.

Pugin turned to the subject of an *uninterrupted* tradition in reference to liturgy. He was responding to criticism that Gothic architecture had not come into being with Jesus Christ but had developed several centuries later.<sup>960</sup> While it was true that the "pointed style" was not fully developed for some centuries, he contended, it was not invalidated since it was implicit in the forms and arrangements that preceded it:

How long were the chosen people of God allowed to exist before the erection of the great temple of Jerusalem was permitted? Did not the skins of the desert typify the polished stones of that wondrous structure? And may we not say that the foundations of Cologne were commenced in the catacombs of the eternal city?<sup>961</sup>

He gave another Scriptural example of precedence:

But modern men are constantly referring to the church in her suffering state, described by our Lord under the similitude of a grain of mustard-seed, while they refuse to recognise her, when, as the greatest of all trees, she extended triumphant in beauty and luxuriant foliage over the earth.<sup>962</sup>

In other words, men were blind to the fact that from tiny beginnings the Church had extended over the whole world; they could not see the connection between the Early Church, which was tiny, and the huge Church as it now was. Liturgy was similar to the mustard seed in this respect. It had started as a tiny idea but, over the centuries, it had fully and extensively developed. It had not changed, as the mustard tree had not changed; it had merely become more explicit. Again, it was not a question of man-made style, but of God-given principles. Gothic architecture embodied these principles more explicitly than any other style before or since.

---

<sup>960</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.6-7.

<sup>961</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.6-7.

<sup>962</sup> *Ibid.*, p.7.

19) Pugin's exposition of the mystical level of meaning.

Pugin believed neo-Classical architecture was not as fine as the Classical it was based upon. While Classical architecture was "the summit of human invention" (rather than divine intervention), neo-Classicism and Baroque represented a deterioration from that position.<sup>963</sup> "The moderns, in their pretended imitation of the classic system, are constantly producing the greatest anomalies", he remarked.<sup>964</sup> Neo-Classical architecture was, therefore, in his view, a shabby imitation of former fineness.

Neo-Classical architecture, unlike Christian architecture, was incapable of leading men towards understanding of the Christian mystical. "The change which took place in the sixteenth century was not a matter of mere taste, but a change of soul; it was a great contention between Christian and pagan ideas, in which the latter triumphed".<sup>965</sup> There had been a move away from good to evil ways of life; man no longer related to God and things divine, but to Antichrist and things earthly.

20) Pugin's exposition and expansion of the historical level of meaning.

Pugin saw in architecture evidence of historiography. "The history of architecture is the history of the world", he contended.<sup>966</sup> He sought to explain this in his Apology. "As we inspect the edifices of antiquity, its nations, its dynasties, its religions are all brought before us", he said. To support and enlarge upon his claim he referred to a number of historians.

---

<sup>963</sup> *Ibid.*, p.5.

<sup>964</sup> *Ibid.*, p.5.

<sup>965</sup> *Ibid.*, p.7.

<sup>966</sup> *Ibid.*, p.4.

i) The British historians.

Again, Pugin appealed to English, mainly Protestant historians and their local histories in his An Apology for examples of liturgical form and arrangement. These authorities included, “Dugdale, Spelman, Bingham, Collier, Ashmole, and many illustrious English antiquaries and historians, might be cited to prove the great reverence for Catholic antiquity that was occasionally manifested in this country”.<sup>967</sup> Except for the historian and antiquarian Joseph Bingham (1668-1723) and the antiquarian Elias Ashmole (1617-1692), he had referred to these authorities before.

21) Pugin’s exposition of the practical level of meaning.

Pugin thought that when English nineteenth-century society became truly Christian, then its architecture should reflect its religion.<sup>968</sup> His aim in his Apology was to realise this. It was the vision of a Christian environment for a Christian people. Pugin’s vision was a proposal in material terms of “noble cities” for the faithful. There was “no reason in the world why noble cities, combining all possible convenience of drainage, water-courses, and conveyance of gas, may not be erected in the most consistent and yet Christian character”, he stated.<sup>969</sup> These were hardly the words of a simple medieval reconstructionist. Nevertheless, he had a medieval reconstructionist view in that the railway viaduct arches had to be pointed, the larger churches vaulted, the gas brackets Gothic and so on.

Pugin’s was a valiant, but unrealistic, view of what could be achieved in an industry-led, nineteenth-century partly irreligious society. Still, over his working lifetime of about twenty-five years, it is fair to say that he achieved a degree of success: there were to be Gothic railway viaducts, arches and gas brackets.

---

<sup>967</sup> *Ibid.*, p.47.

<sup>968</sup> *Ibid.*, p.6.

22) Oxford developments.

i) Closer contact with Newman.

While Pugin's relationships with Ward and Oakeley were tense, his relationship with Newman was still on an even keel. The Lives of the Saints was Newman's current project and he asked Pugin to provide the illustrations, which he agreed to do on an *ad hoc* basis. He did not fully charge fees since he saw it as promoting an English form of Catholicism. Newman mentioned his proposal in a letter to J. W. Bowden: "I was going to write to you about a plan I have of editing in numbers 'Saints of the British Isles'".<sup>970</sup> Newman's attitude to reviving Catholicism in England was displaying national sympathies in his choice of saints at this time. This was not initially a work about Roman saints.

Despite Ward and Oakeley's new hostile attitude to him, Pugin continued his visits to Oxford. He still had high hopes of Newman, following the reassurances he had received. He sent a copy of his An Apology to "the Revd. Mr. Newman" on 8 April 1843. The following day, on 9 April, he dined with Newman at Littlemore.<sup>971</sup> As he mentioned in a letter to Bloxam, "dined the other E the Rev. Mr. Newman".<sup>972</sup> He did not stay with Bloxam on this occasion and possibly stayed overnight at Littlemore.

ii) Disagreement with Romanizing Tractarians.

Pugin could not agree with Ward's idea that reunion of the Protestant Churches with the Roman Catholic Church should be on any terms. Reunion was only possible, he thought, on equal terms. Pugin made his position clear; he saw no reason why England could not keep

---

<sup>969</sup> *Ibid.*, p.39.

<sup>970</sup> Anne Mozley, Letters and Correspondence, Vol. II, p.369. Newman to J. W. Bowden (3 April 1843).

<sup>971</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (8 April 1843), MS. 528/92, Magdalen College Archives.

<sup>972</sup> *Ibid.*, Either the date is wrong or Pugin had dined with Newman before 9 April 1843. See the Newman Papers in the Oratory, Birmingham.

its national identity while remaining part of the Catholic Church and acknowledging the Pope as spiritual leader. “now (sic) our ancestors were not *Roman Catholics* they were English Catholics & our (of) course in *communion* with Rome”, he wrote to his friend, the artist Clarkson Stanford. “We are of the old school of our Edwards, Anselms, Thomas’s (sic), Englishmen to the backbone”.<sup>973</sup> This was a view that reflected the strong nationalism expressed during the reign of Queen Victoria as well as demonstrating a certain sympathy with neo-Gallicanism.

Pugin had not, however, abandoned his Liberal Ultramontanism. English Catholicism, once re-established, in communion with Rome and acknowledging the Pope as its spiritual head would, he believed, be held up as an example of excellence, which could lead the way for the rest of Catholic Christendom. Such a Church would be nearer perfection in its liturgy and thus in its perception of doctrine. England could be the centre for reform of the whole Catholic Church and even Rome would learn from it. This was the ideological view of a visionary, which was analogous with Savonarola’s vision of Florence as a “city of God” that would be an example and a centre for a reformed Catholic Church. Savonarola may thus have influenced Pugin on this point.

iii) Protestants criticized Pugin’s role.

With the publication of his An Apology, people outside Pugin’s circle of close associates criticised the fact that he was writing about more than architecture. A number of articles remarked on this over the next few months. An editor’s review in the *Civil Engineer and Architect’s Journal* stated that they were disgusted to find the subject of architecture “made a stalking-horse to ecclesiastical controversy”.<sup>974</sup> The next edition of the *Civil*

---

<sup>973</sup> Pugin to Stanfield the artist (2 May 1843), MS. SEC Box 21/4, Westminster Diocesan Archives.

<sup>974</sup> *The Civil Engineer and Architect’s Journal*, 5 (April 1843), pp.117-118.

*Engineer and Architect's Journal* in May advised Pugin in future to “give us less ding-dong about Catholicism and Protestantism”.<sup>975</sup> Another review in the *Athenaeum* criticised his “lengthy politico-theological reflections” and claimed, perceptively, that his aim was not the restoration of medieval architecture, but “the revival of the Roman Catholic religion”.<sup>976</sup> *Fraser's Magazine* published a review of the work in November 1843. The reviewer, W. H. Leeds, detected that “the Revival of Christian Architecture was merely a stalking-horse, the real revival so strenuously contended for being nothing less than that of Romanism”.<sup>977</sup> There was a consensus of opinion, not unjustified, that Pugin's primary interest was not in architecture, but in a Roman Catholic revival.

iv) Commissioned by the incumbent of St Mary's, the University Church, Oxford.

In May 1843, Newman was still Vicar of St Mary's, although living in Littlemore. The son of Thomas Williams Bartley, one of the parishioners, died on 18 May 1843. Bartley senior made an appointment to discuss a memorial window that he wished to place in St Mary's in memory of his son. By coincidence, Pugin happened to be sitting opposite him on the train from London. Although they did not know it, they were both going to meet the same incumbent.<sup>978</sup> Bartley was surprised when he arrived to find his fellow passenger there. The three of them sat down to discuss the proposal and Pugin was commissioned to produce the design.

The undertaking had to be approved by the incumbent (but no faculty appears to exist to confirm it).<sup>979</sup> Although there are only references to “an incumbent” and “the clergyman”

---

<sup>975</sup> *The Civil Engineer and Architect's Journal*, 6 (May 1843), p.180.

<sup>976</sup> *The Athenaeum* (15 July 1843), pp.643-50.

<sup>977</sup> *Fraser's Magazine*, 28 (November 1843), p.604.

<sup>978</sup> Ferrey, Recollections, p.188.

<sup>979</sup> The existence of a faculty could not be discovered in MS.D.D. Par. Oxford, St. Mary the Virgin, City Archives, folio section 4, a.l.d.

the likelihood is that it was Newman, since the commission was given before he gave his last sermon as an Anglican vicar - no. 604 - on 25 September 1843. The new vicar of St Mary's (from 17 October 1843 to 1851), Charles Page Eden, was a High Anglican who had no sympathy for Roman Catholics. He was, said John William Burgon, "An Anglican to the backbone", although he had been sympathetic to the Tractarians.<sup>980</sup> Eden rejected Newman after he resigned his living and Newman stated that once he (Eden) was made vicar of St Mary's, "he would not engage even to let me read daily prayers at Littlemore ..."<sup>981</sup> It is exceedingly unlikely, given his extreme anti-Roman point of view, that he would have entertained commissioning Pugin, a well-known Roman Catholic.

The window was completed in 1845 and Pugin asked Bloxam, "Have you seen the window at S. Mary's yourself. It ought to be a good job but I should like to know how you like it."<sup>982</sup> Pugin was again commissioned in 1851 to design another window for Bartley senior in memory of his daughter. It depicts Christ's ministry to women. By this time, Eden had left and would not have commissioned Pugin in any case. The window was not completed until 1854, two years after Pugin's death.

v) Newman recommended Pugin.

Newman was, by July 1843, well acquainted with Pugin and was beginning to move towards a more positive relationship, if not yet a friendship, with him. Newman may have acknowledged Pugin's talent and skill by recommending him for the window commission, but now he definitely recommended Pugin to his friend Miss Holmes who was thinking of

---

<sup>980</sup> John William Burgon, Lives of Twelve Good Men (John Murray: London 1889), Vol. II, p.318.

<sup>981</sup> Sheridan Gilley, Newman and his Age, p.217.

<sup>982</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (December 1845), MS. 528/69, Magdalen College Archives.

writing a book. He asked her, “Would you not require advice from some person like Pugin?”<sup>983</sup>

Pugin continued contact with Newman as he worked on the illustrations of the British Saints. “The work appeared in five volumes, and numbered amongst its contributors were R. W. Church, J. B. Dalgairns, F. W. Faber, Frederick Oakeley, Mark Pattison, Robert Aston Coffin, James Anthony Froude, Thomas Meyrick, John Barrow, Thomas Mozley, William Lockhart and others”, states R. D. Middleton. Newman asked Bloxam to find out from Pugin what to do about two of the illustrations of St Richard and St Stephen.<sup>984</sup> Pugin shortly mentioned to Dalgairns that he hoped the drawing of St Stephen would “meet Mr. Newmans [sic] wishes”.<sup>985</sup> He did these drawings at the end of a working day, almost as a form of relaxation.

After the first few illustrations were completed during 1843, Pugin was officially commissioned in January 1844 to do the rest.<sup>986</sup> He prepared eleven illustrations in all. It gave him legitimate and lengthy opportunities during 1844-45 to visit Oxford and exchange ideas with Newman and his friends. His acquaintanceship with Newman showed signs of turning into a friendship; Pugin was accepted as part of his circle.

### 23) The Glossary.

#### i) Events at Oxford.

During 1844 Pugin was still working on the design of stained glass windows for St Saviour's, Leeds, and it was in connection with these that Pusey and Benjamin Webb visited

---

<sup>983</sup> E. H. Day, Letters from Oxford to Littlemore (1911) vol. 18, pp.119-124, part 2. Newman to Miss Holmes (25 July 1843).

<sup>984</sup> Newman to Bloxam (1843). Magdalen College Archives.

<sup>985</sup> Pugin to Dalgairns (1843-44), in the Birmingham Oratory.

<sup>986</sup> MS. 7 “Correspondence on Lives of the Saints”, in the Birmingham Oratory. This confirms that Pugin was commissioned by James Toovey on 17 January 1844.

him at his house in Ramsgate in January of that year. Pugin had workshops for stained glass set up there. Webb mentioned in his journal that “Dr. Pusey called on me: examined cartoons of his windows; with him to Pugin’s”.<sup>987</sup> The long journey in the depth of winter meant an overnight stay in Pugin’s house.

On 12 February 1844 Pugin “Left London for Oxford” and he was there until the next day when he travelled to Bilton.<sup>988</sup> It seems that he took some of his sketches of the Saints to Jewett, the engraver, since a week later Newman remarked to Bloxam, “I like Jewett’s proof and sent it to Pugin”.<sup>989</sup>

Pugin was next in Oxford in April 1844 when he signed a contract with Principal Routh to design a gateway for Magdalen College.<sup>990</sup> Martin Joseph Routh (1755 – 1854) was “an old High Churchman, who shared Newman’s patristic interests, and appreciated both him and his aims”.<sup>991</sup> His High Church views did not, however, prevent him from commissioning Pugin for a new gateway; Pugin also prepared drawings for the proposed Magdalen College School.<sup>992</sup>

In May, and again at the end of June to the beginning of July, Pugin was abroad.

#### 24) Pugin’s exposition of allegorical meaning in the Glossary.

Pugin saw in costume and ornament historical, practical and allegorical levels of meaning; his Glossary of Ecclesiastical Ornament and Costume (1844) is an exposition of these meanings:

---

<sup>987</sup> Benjamin Webb's Journal in “W.W. Begley Papers” in the RIBA. BEG.9.i.(verso).

<sup>988</sup> Pugin Diary (12-13 February 1844).

<sup>989</sup> Newman to Bloxam (21 Feb 1844) in the Birmingham Oratory.

<sup>990</sup> Pugin Diary (15 April 1844). See Wedgwood, A. W. N. Pugin and the Pugin Family, p.55. The gateway was taken down in 1885 to make way for new buildings.

<sup>991</sup> Dessain, ed., Letters and Diaries, Vol. XI, p.354, Index.

<sup>992</sup> Pugin to Bloxam, Magdalen College Archives. MSS 528/33 and 528/72.

Every ornament, to deserve the name, must possess an *appropriate meaning*, and be introduced with an intelligent purpose, and on *reasonable grounds*. The symbolical associations of each ornament must be understood and considered: otherwise things beautiful in themselves will be rendered absurd by their application.<sup>993</sup>

Thus, Pugin wished to convey these meanings as much as he wished to describe the literal use, materials, history and style of ornaments and costumes. The following is an example of a different meaning or idea embodied in a literal sentence:

The conventional forms of ecclesiastical antiquity contain within them certain unchanging elements of character.<sup>994</sup>

This literally is about costume, but Pugin also interpreted this as meaning that faith, which God had given to man by divine Revelation, was unchanging. Thus, as allegories for deeper truths, ornaments and costumes, like the Scriptures, might contain within them prophetic statements.<sup>995</sup>

25) Pugin's exposition of the theological level of meaning.

i) Liturgy part of Revelation.

Pugin had previously intimated that he believed liturgy came from God. He looked to tradition and the Scriptures to confirm this. He believed that the Bible was infallible and was the Word of God. It was very important to him that liturgy, including usages and practices, form and arrangement, vestments and ornaments, had come from God, not man.

The Scholastics thought Revelation in God-given Scripture and tradition was a main source of truths, which could not be discovered by human reason on its own. "The scholastics sought to make theology a science, that is, to establish a systematically ordered body of true

---

<sup>993</sup> Pugin, Glossary of Ecclesiastical Ornament and Costume: compiled from Ancient Authorities and Examples (London: Henry G. Bohn 1844), 'Introduction', p.iii.

<sup>994</sup> *Ibid.*, p.iii.

<sup>995</sup> Enlarged upon later.

and certain knowledge derived from the certain but undemonstrable principles of revelation".<sup>996</sup> Pugin, too, attempted to make liturgy a science based on Revelation and tradition, to systemise the study of it and to prove that liturgy was, indeed, part of Revelation. He followed the Scholastics' belief that historical or intellectual inquiry could lead a person to truth. The Scholastics system was one that the Humanists rejected as "misguided, arrogant and dangerous because it produced sophistry, and intellectualism, emotional poverty and lack of charity".<sup>997</sup>

As Gillian R. Evans points out, allegorical interpretation itself had certain pitfalls:

In Scripture, allegory is a device for expressing a holy mystery in figurative form. Augustine has put himself in a position where he has to tread a narrow path between false representations which are 'empty signs' and 'deceptive symbols', and the true signs which Holy Scripture contains in its allegories. Similarly, the signs and symbols of the liturgy used in Christian worship are to be carefully distinguished from the deceitful signs of the 'theatre'... If a man is to avoid absurdity in his interpretation of Scripture he must see what he reads not only with the eyes of the body, which view the words on the page, but also with the eyes of faith which help him to understand it.<sup>998</sup>

Pugin was, therefore, treading a narrow path by using the "Allegorical Method" and he needed to know that his interpretation was not based upon human ideas or interpretations, but upon a truth originally revealed by God. He needed to establish that traditional usages and practices, liturgical art and architecture, church arrangement and form, rites, rituals, ceremonials, favoured by the medieval Church, were part of God's Revelation. He therefore looked to the Scriptures, as well as tradition, because he believed these gave truths and, therefore, infallible guidance on liturgy. This was an unusual view, but one shared to a certain extent by the Eastern Orthodox Church.<sup>999</sup> Few modern liturgical scholars in the Western

---

<sup>996</sup> E. F. Rice JR, 'The Humanist Idea of Christian Antiquity and the Impact of Greek Patristic Work on Sixteenth-Century Thought' in R. R. Bolgar, ed., Classical Influences, pp.178, 202.

<sup>997</sup> *Ibid.*, p.202.

<sup>998</sup> Gillian R. Evans, Augustine on Evil (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1990), p.79.

<sup>999</sup> The editorial article, possibly by Beresford Hope, "The Influence of Christian Art" in *The Christian*

Churches suppose that liturgical history is subject to fixed laws or is the direct product of divine Revelation. An exception is Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. In his book, The Spirit of the Liturgy (2000)<sup>1000</sup> his “purpose is to show that liturgy is part of divine revelation which the Church has received”<sup>1001</sup> He was responding to the “Liturgical Wars” of the Roman Catholic Church between the liberals and the Traditionalists. Ratzinger makes it clear, according to Stephen Hand, that he is not merely writing about *the* liturgy, but liturgy in a broader sense, including liturgical art:

Thus sacred images are a consoling reminder that God has “become flesh” (John 1:14) and is now forever part of our history ... the Christ Event in all its fullness ... can now be painted, sculpted, recalled to and for our senses, precisely to aid in our perceiving. And when we venerate such images, we give glory to him whom such images represent.<sup>1002</sup>

Pugin studied the Scriptures and found that God Himself had given specific directions for the construction of several mystical structures - Noah’s Ark, the tabernacle of Moses, and the Temple of Solomon. All prefigured the Church. In particular, the pattern of form and arrangement was implicit in Solomon’s Temple; he believed it heralded the pattern to be followed for church buildings, ornaments and vestments thereafter:

Under the Jewish Dispensation, and in the Temple of Solomon itself, all the arrangements, down to the smallest details, so far from being arbitrary, were ordered in accordance with a Divine Revelation; - and in a spirit as well of religious obedience, as of an overflowing zeal. Witness David’s exhortation to his son Solomon, recorded in ch. xxviii of the I. Paralipomenon<sup>1003</sup>:- ‘And thou, my son Solomon, know the God of thy father, and serve him with a perfect heart, and willing mind: for the Lord searcheth all hearts, and understandeth all the thoughts of minds. If thou seek Him, thou shalt find Him: but if thou forsake Him, He will cast thee off for ever. Now, therefore,

---

*Remembrancer and Quarterly Review* (January 1851), p. 192, says that the Eastern Orthodox Church believed that paintings were divinely inspired and that a pattern was given by God for Icons.

<sup>1000</sup> Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, The Spirit of the Liturgy (San Francisco: Ignatius Press 2000).

<sup>1001</sup> Stephen Hand, “Cardinal Ratzinger’s Proposed Reform of the Reform”, *New Oxford Review* (an orthodox Catholic Magazine published in Berkely, USA, January 2001). A review of Cardinal Ratzinger’s, The Spirit of the Liturgy.

<sup>1002</sup> *Ibid*. This is Stephen Hand’s summary of a part of Cardinal Ratzinger’s writing.

<sup>1003</sup> I. Chronicles 26:9-19.

seeing *the Lord hath chosen thee* to build the House of the Sanctuary, take courage and do it. And *David gave to Solomon his son a description of the Porch, and of the Temple, and of the treasures, and of the upper floor, and of the inner chambers, and of the House of the Mercy Seat,* As also of all the Courts which he had in his thought, and of the chambers round about, for the treasures of the House of the Lord, and for the treasures of the consecrated things: And of the divisions of the Priests and the Levites, *for all the works of the House of the Lord, and for all the vessels of the service of the Temple of the Lord.* Gold by weight for every vessel for the ministry: and silver by weight *according to the diversity of the vessels and uses ... All these things, said he, came to me written by the Hand of the Lord: that I might understand all the works of the pattern*.<sup>1004</sup>

It did not concern Pugin that this direct Word of God was in the Old Testament since he believed it prefigured the New; it was a form of Revelation, in which the letter concealed a hidden meaning, even though full Revelation only came with Jesus Christ and the Apostles. Because places of worship had shown a continuity from the time of the New Testament up to the nineteenth century, Pugin believed they were still part of the divine pattern.

ii) The unchanging nature of “patterns”.

God, thought Pugin, had laid down a pattern that had gradually become more explicit over the centuries. But, he remarked, to “procure examples and patterns of Christian design is no easy matter”.<sup>1005</sup> To understand true liturgical requirements was exceedingly difficult. Moreover, to write about just one aspect of it was extremely taxing because each was such a vast subject. Even such a seemingly small subject as altar clothes, he said, was in fact complex and required a considerable depth of research.<sup>1006</sup>

He was certain, as he had previously argued, that Catholic liturgy was “subject to fixed laws” over many centuries.<sup>1007</sup> The most significant of these laws was its unchanging,

---

<sup>1004</sup> Pugin, The Glossary of Ecclesiastical Ornament and Costume (1844), pp.iv-v.

<sup>1005</sup> *Ibid.*, p.vii.

<sup>1006</sup> *Ibid.*, p.vii.

<sup>1007</sup> *Ibid.*, p.iii.

“consistent” nature because anything belonging to God could not change. God Himself was unchangeable. People needed to understand this to appreciate ancient architecture and to realise that patterns for the future were implicitly contained in them:

The conventional forms of ecclesiastical antiquity contain within them certain unchanging elements of character, the ignorance of which precludes the possibility of our either appreciating or imitating the great works of the old Christian artists.<sup>1008</sup>

It was essential to determine this unchanging aspect of liturgical architecture; otherwise ignorance of it would lead to the design of a wholly unsatisfactory church. It would lead, he said, to an absurd application, which would be meaningless and inconsistent.<sup>1009</sup> Ecclesiastical artists and architects needed to “understand the true forms and symbolical significations of the sacred vestments and ornaments of a church”<sup>1010</sup> to be able to “apply the various decorations in a *consistent manner* to the edification of the faithful, and as lively illustrations of the sacred Mysteries”.<sup>1011</sup> It was thus important that the “symbolical associations of each ornament” were properly considered and understood.<sup>1012</sup>

26) Pugin’s exposition of the practical level of meaning.

Pugin began by defining each term; for altar clothes, he took his definition from Gunton’s History of Peterborough, which included the use of clothes in England. He continued with a description of each item used in the Church; he defined them, considered their origins, use, type, design and material.

---

<sup>1008</sup> *Ibid.*, p.iii.

<sup>1009</sup> *Ibid.*, p.iii.

<sup>1010</sup> *Ibid.*, p.vii.

<sup>1011</sup> *Ibid.*, p.vii.

<sup>1012</sup> *Ibid.*, p.iii.

27) Pugin's exposition of the historical level of meaning.

Pugin again sought to argue from authority and therefore turned to historical and liturgical sources and authorities to trace the origins, purpose, use and type of vestments and ornaments. His authorities and sources, included Thiers' Dissertation Sur Les Autels, De Vert, De Moleon and his Voyage Liturgique, the *Monasticon Anglicanum*, the inventories of York Minster and St Paul's, and Jacob's History of Faversham. From Thiers' account of altar clothes, said Pugin, "we may gather the following interesting facts" on their form and use, gleaned from Thiers' study of the Early Church, the Greek and Latin Churches from earliest times to the ninth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.<sup>1013</sup> There was no restriction to the medieval period in England. Therefore, Pugin relied on Thiers' coverage of a broad period in order to discover common factors or a pattern of use of altar clothes, as well as many other ornaments and vestments.

i) Liturgical authorities.

Pugin's authorities all used an impressive list of respected authorities and sources themselves. But he also crosschecked authorities from one country with those from another. Thus he turned to both French and Italian liturgists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

At the start of his 'Introduction' Pugin wrote, "The following Notices of some of the Authorities quoted in the Glossary may not be uninteresting".<sup>1014</sup> He then gave condensed biographies of his principal authorities, which he mainly obtained from the French Biographie Universalle.<sup>1015</sup>

---

<sup>1013</sup> *Ibid.*, p.26. "Extract touching altar clothes" from Thier's Dissertation sur les Autels.

<sup>1014</sup> Pugin, Glossary (2<sup>nd</sup>. Edition: London: Henry Bohn 1846), Introduction, pp.viii-xii. Chapter titled "The following Notices of some of the Authorities quoted in the Glossary may not be uninteresting".

<sup>1015</sup> *Ibid.*, (2<sup>nd</sup>. Edition: 1846), pp.viii-xi.

ii) French liturgical authorities.

Pugin continued to build up his picture of the Catholic Church, including the Catholic Church in France before the Revolution. Several of his French and Italian authorities and sources were not well known in England in the nineteenth-century; these are introduced in the following and subsequently analysed. They were all neo-Gallicans and their aim was to revive Gallican usages and practices while retaining the Roman rite. As part of this, they researched the origins, usages and practices of local and national liturgies; this was a method that Pugin continued to follow.

One of Pugin's authorities in the Glossary was the magistrate and liturgist Jean Etienne Durantus or Duranti (1534-1589) and his De Ritibus Ecclesiae Catholicae (Coloniae Agrip. 1592) (of which Pugin had a copy in his library).<sup>1016</sup> Another was Charles Fresne du Cange (1610-1688). He referred to Du Cange's Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediae et infamae Latinitatis (Paris 1678), and pointed out that a new edition had been published by the Benedictines between the years 1733 and 1736; followed by another with a Supplement by Carpentier in 1766. "The value of the Glossary, of course, consists in the antiquity and rarity of the monuments which it quotes," said Pugin. It laid the foundations of modern historical criticism. Pugin had copies in his library of his Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediae et Infimae Graecitatis (1688), his Glossarium ad Scriptores Medlae et Infimae Latinitatis (1733-36), as well as Carpentier's four additional volumes.<sup>1017</sup>

The great Maurist Benedictine scholar Jean Mabillon (1632-1707) was another of Pugin's authorities for his Glossary. He assisted, said Pugin, "Dom Luc D'Achery in the publication of his famous 'Spicilegium', a collection of inedited documents, which has ever

---

<sup>1016</sup> A. N. L. Munby, ed., Sale Catalogues, Vol. 4, p.248. Item 58.

<sup>1017</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 4, p.255. Item 193.

since been so highly prized by all students of ecclesiastical or profane history”.<sup>1018</sup> Another publication, said Pugin, “which he undertook in company with D’Achery, was the ‘Acta Sanctorum Ordinis S. Benedicti’”. He also recommended his Vetera Analecta, which was “of the utmost use to ecclesiastical students” and “with his learned friend, Dom Michel Germain” his De Re Diplomatica, “a work of the greatest authority”, which was about the critical study of the formal sources of history. Mabillon was an “historical scientist” who wanted to show in his Diplomatica that historians were capable of discovering scientifically demonstrable truths.

The *Museum Italicum*, said Pugin, contains “an account of many valuable discoveries made by him (Mabillon) of works of the Fathers, and other precious remains of Christian Antiquity”. Pugin also referred to his Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti and “several other works of great value”, which were all on Gallican-type liturgy.

“Mabillon”, said Pugin, “was certainly one of the most learned men France ever produced”. He had copies in his library of Mabillon’s Museum Italicum, seu Collectio vett. Script. ex Bib. Italicis (1687), De Liturgia Gallicana (1729), Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti (1703), and Mabillon and Ruinart’s Ouvrages Posthumes par Thuillier (1724).<sup>1019</sup>

Pugin again referred to Jean Baptist Thiers in his Glossary. “The immense bulk of well digested ecclesiastical and antiquarian lore to be found in his writings render their presence a *sine quâ non* in a library of any pretensions”, he stated.

The liturgical writer Dom Claude de Vert (1645-1708) was another of Pugin’s authorities in the Glossary. Pugin appealed to his Lettre à M. Jurieu sur les cérémonies de la messe (Paris 1690), for the origins of the ceremony of the Mass. Following the encouragement of Bossuet, De Vert published Explication simple, littérale, et historique des

---

<sup>1018</sup> Pugin, Glossary (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition: 1846), Introduction, p.viii.

<sup>1019</sup> A. N. L. Munby, Vol. 4, p.262. Items 312-314.

cérémonies de l'Eglise (Paris 1706), which was about the origins of all the ceremonies of the Church. Pugin had a second edition copy in his library. He critically evaluated this work and said that although it was valuable it was unchronological or “deficient in order”. He also had a first edition copy of De Vert’s Dissertation Sur les Mots de Messe et de Communion (Paris 1694).

Pugin mentioned the theologian and Jansenist Abbé Lazare-André Bocquillot (1649-1728) and his Traité Historique de la Liturgie sacrée ou de la Messe (Paris 1701), which he said was “highly esteemed”. Pugin quoted extensively from this work<sup>1020</sup> in reference to the history of the Eucharist, particularly that of the Early Church. Bocquillot’s sources were Saint Augustine, Gregory of Tours and other manuscripts written during the time of the Emperor Constantine (d.337). Constantine himself, was particularly interested in church arrangement and form, demonstrated by his huge church building programme, including the Lateran, Rome, and Santa Sophia, Constantinople. The designs of these churches revealed signs of standardization or, in other words, they were designed on a similar pattern; they were basilicas and each contained gateway, atrium, narthex, nave, triumphal arch, clerestory, aisles, transept and apse.

Another of Pugin’s authorities was Dom Edmond Martène (mentioned previously). He advocated his Commentary on the Rule of St. Benedict, his De antiquis monachorum ritibus (1690) and “his valuable work” De antiquis Ecclesiae ritibus circa Sacramenta (1700 - 1702) of which he had a copy.<sup>1021</sup> Pugin also mentioned his De antiquâ Ecclesiae disciplinâ in celebrandis Divinis Officiis (1706) which was about “the ancient Rites of the Church”, his Voyage littéraire de deux religieux de la congrégation de St. Maur (1719 and 1724) “in which many interesting usages of different churches are recorded”.

---

<sup>1020</sup> Pugin, Glossary (1844), pp.9-19.

<sup>1021</sup> A. N. L. Munby, Vol. 4, p.266. Item 387.

Pugin also cited the works of Dom Michel Félibien (1619-1695). He referred to Félibien's L'Histoire de l'Abbaye de Saint Denys en France (Paris 1706),<sup>1022</sup> and his Life of St. Amselm which, said Pugin, had not been published. He had copies of Félibien's Histoire de l'Abbaye Royale de Sainte Denys en France, avec la Vie des Abbez (1706) and his and Lobineau's Histoire de la Ville de Paris (1725).<sup>1023</sup>

One of Pugin's French authorities on the ecclesiastical history of the Middle Ages was the Jansenist Martin Gerbert (1720-1793). Gerbert's main interests lay in Augustinian theology, sacramental theology, liturgy, and in ecclesiastical music. When Librarian at the Abbey of St. Blaise, in the Black Forest, southern Germany, said Pugin, "he made his great researches into the church history of the middle ages" and "collected his material for his History of Music, and of the Antiquities of the German Liturgy". His works included De Cantu et Musicâ sacrâ (St Blaise 1774) and Monumenta veteris liturgiae Alemannicae (1776), both copies of which Pugin had in his library.

iii) Italian liturgical authorities.

Pugin crosschecked his French authorities and sources with Italian; these were also neo-Gallicans and some were Jansenists. These Italian authorities for the Glossary included the Jansenist Antonio Bosio (died 1629) who examined the ancient catacombs of Rome. "He has the merit of being the first writer upon the subject", said Pugin. His work Roma Sotterranea on this subject was published in 1632, after his death. Pugin had a copy of this work in his library.<sup>1024</sup>

The seventeenth-century Oratorian Paul Aringhi (1600-1676) was another of Pugin's authorities. He composed a Commentary on the work of Bosio, mentioned above, which is

---

<sup>1022</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 4, p.256. Item 210.

<sup>1023</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 4, p.256. Item 211.

generally known, said Pugin, as Aringhi's Roma Subterranea (1651). He said that it threw "great light upon ecclesiastical antiquities", but had, he critically stated, been overtaken by later research.

Pugin appealed also to Philip Buonarroti (1661-1733) who was, he said, an authority on Ivory Diptych's "both pagan and ecclesiastical". Buonarroti wrote a book about the sacred antiquities of Rome, Osservazioni istoriche sopra alcuni medaglioni antichi del cardinal Carpegna (Rome 1698), which Pugin said was about medallions.

Another of Pugin's authorities was John Justine Ciampini (1633-1698), whom he had also used for his The Present State. Pugin consulted his Conjectura de perpetuo azymorum usu in Ecclesiâ Latina, (Rome 1688), De sacris Edificiis a Constantino Magno constructis Synopsis historica (Rome 1693) (a copy of which Pugin had in his library<sup>1025</sup>) and his Vetera Monimenta (Rome 1690-99) (of which he also had a copy).<sup>1026</sup>

Cardinal John Bona (1609-1674) was another of Pugin's Italian authorities in the Glossary. In Italy, the Jansenists Cardinals Bona and Giuseppe Maria Tommasi made a scientific study of liturgy. Bona's liturgical works include De Libris Liturgicis and the Divina Psalmodia and Pugin had a copy in his library of his Opera Omnia (Antwerp 1723).<sup>1027</sup> Tommasi's liturgical works included Codices sacramentorum (Rome 1680) and Liturgia antiqua (1746).

Pugin sought information on ancient Catholic liturgy from the ecclesiastic and antiquarian Dominicus Georgius (or Giorgi) (1690-1747) and his work De liturgia Romani (Rome 1731, 1743, and 1744) (of which Pugin had a copy). Besides these books on Roman

---

<sup>1024</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 4, p.253, Item 149.

<sup>1025</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 4, p.254. Item 176.

<sup>1026</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 4, p.254. Item 175.

<sup>1027</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 4, p.253. Item 146.

ecclesiastical history and liturgy “he was interested and well versed in matters belonging to the old English Church”, Pugin remarked.

Another authority was the Jansenist Cardinal Stephen Borgia (1730-1804). Pugin referred to his Vaticana Confessio B. Petri (1776), De Cruce Veliternâ commentarias (1780) and another De Cruce Vaticanâ (c. 1780) from which he gave large extracts in the Glossary.

Pugin expressed his admiration for the above French and Italian writers and highly valued their work. The majority of the French writers had connections with the Benedictines of St Maur and all were neo-Gallicans; some were Jansenist sympathisers. Their works indicate that they were intensely interested in liturgy, including liturgical architecture. Few modern writers refer to the Jansenists and Maurists as liturgists; the exception is the French liturgist, Father Emmanuel de Butler, a monk of the Benedictine Abbey of Barroux. He assesses the work of a few of Pugin’s authorities - Dom Edmond Martène, Jean-Baptiste Le Brun Des Marettes and Jean Mabillon - and places them firmly in the forefront of French liturgists before Vatican II. However, he says that

These works are not without limits, one reason being that some information was not available during their epoch, certainly, but also because these authors were more or less Jansenists and Gallicans. Les Brun de Marettes was an old pupil of Port Royal. His work, it is felt, was as much a defence of Jansenism as it was a scientific study, despite the amount of accurate information he included.<sup>1028</sup>

The Abbé R. Aigrain gave a much fuller picture in his Liturgia (1930), which is a useful book for putting Pugin’s views into context. The Council of Trent, explained Aigrain, was not only called for the reform of the Church, but also for a programme of liturgical reform.<sup>1029</sup> This programme commenced in the first half of the sixteenth century and the Congregation of Rites was formed to carry the reform out. The Congregation turned to Canon

---

<sup>1028</sup> Father Emmanuel de Butler OSB, “Le celebrant et l’autel avant et après Vatican II”. Paper given at *The Third International Colloquium on the Liturgy*, organised by the Centre International d’Etudes Liturgiques (October 1997). My own translation from the French.

Law, the liturgical and rubrical books and in 1643, Jean-Francois de Gondy ordered a critical revision of Roman liturgical texts. It was to include the study of hagiography, ecclesiastical history and the writings of the Fathers of the Church. In the last third of the seventeenth century there commenced a liturgical movement to carry this out, which Abbé Aigrain called “la ‘déviation liturgique’”.<sup>1030</sup> The liturgists of this movement were neo-Gallicans.

The Abbé wrote that France has produced many great liturgists. During the Middle Ages there had also been a liturgical movement, which was an attempt to return to ancient usages and methods. After the Council of Trent, the necessity of reforming liturgy was imposed, he said, because many of the canons had been forgotten, confusion reigned and there were numerous errors in the breviaries and missals, which were often carelessly printed.<sup>1031</sup> During these centuries, in France, the Church and the faithful welcomed individual initiatives on the study of liturgy; research was not restricted, but included many primitive and Gallican liturgies. The liturgists’ faithfulness to the Roman rite given by Pope Hadrian and by Charlemagne was never in question.<sup>1032</sup> This study of liturgy more or less continued, commented the Abbé, into the middle of the nineteenth century when Roman usage and practices were adopted by all.<sup>1033</sup>

The neo-Gallicans were interested in the origins of the Gallican rite; Aigrain thought that this rite developed from the Mozarabic and Ambrosian liturgies. Certainly, Pugin was as interested in Eastern Church usages and practices, including form and arrangement, as he was in the Western; indeed, he did not distinguish between them and used evidence from the Eastern tradition to support arguments concerning the Western.

---

<sup>1029</sup> L’Abbé R. Aigrain, *Liturgia*, p.32. My own translation from the French.

<sup>1030</sup> *Ibid.*, p.865.

<sup>1031</sup> *Ibid.*, p.865.

<sup>1032</sup> *Ibid.*, p.864.

<sup>1033</sup> *Ibid.*, p.865.

The neo-Gallicans, however, did not wish to actually restore the ancient Gallican rite, but only to return to some ancient usages and formulas. They wished to establish what influence the Gallican liturgies had had on the Roman liturgy and what elements of Gallican liturgies were still preserved in the Roman liturgy.<sup>1034</sup> To do this, they studied hagiography, ecclesiastical history and the Fathers of the Church. They studied and revised local breviaries, such as those of Vienne, Harlay of Paris and Cluny. These were Gallican liturgies that had adapted to the Roman liturgy. They concluded that the formulas and rites of the ancient Gallican liturgies thus influenced the Roman rite.

The study of liturgical science in France, said the Abbé, can be divided into distinct phases: the first phase, from the eleventh to the sixteenth century, which produced Alcuin, Amalair, Agobard, Florus, Walafriid Strabon, Rhabon Maur, Beleth, Durand de Mende, Yves de Chatres and Honorius d' Autun; the second phase, the last third of the seventeenth century up to the French Revolution, which produced the "plus grands liturgistes" Ménard, Isaac Habert, Mabillon, Morin, Martène, Renoudot, Father Le Brun, Grancolas, de Vert, and J. B. Thiers; and the last phase, from the Revolution to the bull *inter multiplices* of 21 March 1853. These liturgists were all termed "néo-gallicanes", said the Abbé. The majority of Pugin's authorities, including the above, can be found in the Abbé's lexicon of great liturgists.<sup>1035</sup>

The Abbé wrote of the nineteenth century, which saw a rebirth of brilliant liturgical study. Amongst these neo-Gallican liturgists he included Dom Prosper Guéranger whom he said was influenced by the Romantic writer Chateaubriand. Guéranger, he said "dreamt of gallican prayers and usages of old and of which Rome would surely approve".<sup>1036</sup> However,

---

<sup>1034</sup> *Ibid.*, p.864.

<sup>1035</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.1033-1088. The 'Lexicon of Principal Liturgists' includes all those mentioned and used by Pugin.

<sup>1036</sup> *Ibid.*, p.872.

Guéranger thought that neo-Classical “impious” bishops had drawn up many of the French Gallican-type liturgies.

The neo-Gallican liturgists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were mostly sympathetic to the old Orders; thus the Maurists were Benedictines. After the creation of the new Orders of the sixteenth century, it was not long before these clashed with the older Orders such as the Dominicans and Benedictines. Dom Yves Chaussy says that a division not only occurred between Protestants and Catholics, but within the Church, between protagonists of different views. The internal opposition had three principles: Gallicanism, the quarrel between the bishops (the old Orders) and the regulars (the new Orders), and Jansenism.<sup>1037</sup> Dom Yves Chaussy also says that the condemnation of Jansenism accentuated this conflict between the Benedictines and the Oratorians and Jesuits.<sup>1038</sup>

The “new” Orders, such as the authoritarian Ultramontane Jesuits and Oratorians, supported the replacement of the Gallican-type usages of the Roman liturgy by Roman usages. They wanted not only the Roman liturgy, but everything that reminded them of Rome. By the seventeenth century, the *odium theologicum* had risen to a desperate height between the representatives of the old and “new” Orders (i.e. between the Benedictine Jansenists and the Jesuits).

In conclusion, it would seem that Pugin’s position, as a liturgist, was rather complicated. He was influenced by events in France. While he was a Liberal Ultramontane, he also had ecclesiastical Gallican and neo-Gallican views. He was opposed to neo-Classical and Baroque architecture – a style favoured by the “new” Orders; he indicated that he was against certain sixteenth-century and later Catholics; he wished to revive national and local usages and practices; he looked to the medieval liturgists and the medieval Catholic Church

---

<sup>1037</sup> Dom Yves Chaussy, *Les Bénédictines*, p.388. My own translation from the French.

<sup>1038</sup> *Ibid.*, p.387. My own translation from the French.

in England which had local usages and variations of the Roman rite; his liturgical authorities were seventeenth- and eighteenth-century neo-Gallicans; he wanted to restore a national architecture and he did not wish to promote Roman usages, Roman architecture, Roman art or music. Instead, he followed in the footsteps of the French neo-Gallicans whose aim was to restore some Gallican usages and practices. Pugin was shortly to clash resoundingly with fellow Roman Catholics over these views and aims.

## Chapter Seven - THE POLARISED VIEWS OF PUGIN AND THE ORATORIANs

1) Events surrounding secessions to the Roman Church.

i) Pugin's visits to Oxford ceased.

Later in July 1844, Pugin visited "Bath, Oxford, Tubney, London".<sup>1039</sup> (Bloxam had obtained a commission for him to design the Anglican parish church at Tubney). A cryptic note in his Diary for 3 September 1844 indicated that at Oxford he had seen "Dr. Pusey". Pugin was again in Oxford in October 1844.

By this time, Pugin realised that his cause for reunion of the Churches was seriously hampered by the imminent secession of the Tractarians. His visits to Oxford ceased at the end of 1844. Within six months most of his friends were no longer there; the majority had gone or were about to go to the Church of Rome. He did not record in his Diary visiting Oxford again until 1848. Nevertheless, he continued to correspond with Bloxam up until his final illness.

The secessions were to have a great impact on Pugin's views. Up until this time, his chief interest had been to promote his views on Catholicism to Protestants. After the secessions, he was forced to defend those views to Roman Catholics.

ii) W. G. Ward put forward his opinions.

Events leading up to the secessions were tense. Ward and Oakeley's attitude to Pugin had drastically changed. They could not accept that the Roman Catholic Church was anything other than perfect. Ward expressed his views in a lengthy and arduous text, The Ideal of a Christian Church (1844). He rejected the idea that historical or intellectual inquiry into revealed religion could lead a person to truth, since the aim of religion was personal

---

<sup>1039</sup> Pugin Diary (11 July 1844). See Wedgwood, A. W. N. Pugin and the Pugin Family, p.56.

sanctification and salvation; only faith and obedience to the Church's authority could achieve these. Although Ward had not yet seceded to the Roman Catholic Church, his book was an expression of his burgeoning neo-Ultramontane views.

By now Ward saw "Anglicanism as radically heretical in doctrine and degraded in moral condition, and of Roman saints and Roman religion as exalted objects to be worshipped at a distance".<sup>1040</sup> Ward had no sympathy towards the revival of medieval usages and practices within the Catholic Church and he believed the Church of England's only hope was to be accepted on any terms by the Church of Rome.

In November 1844, Ward had been summoned before the Hebdomadal Board of the University of Oxford and requested to denounce six extracts from his Ideal. He declined to comment and was asked to appear before the Board in February 1845 when he was stripped of his degree. Newman's Tract 90 was thought responsible for Ward's attitude and attempts were made to censure it. Ward and several other prominent Anglicans were now on the brink of seceding to Rome.

Newman delayed moving to the Church of Rome until his Essay was finished and undergoing publication. Both events were eventually undertaken in October 1845. Contemplating his likely reception into the Church of Rome, Newman commented, "I hardly ever was at a Roman service; even abroad I knew no Roman Catholics".<sup>1041</sup> He forgot to mention that he was well acquainted with Pugin, who was a leading and, by then, famous Roman Catholic, had met him a several times, worked with him on The Lives of the Saints, and had even dined with him on a few occasions.

Faber followed Newman and was received into the Church in November 1845.

---

<sup>1040</sup> Wilfrid Philip Ward, William George Ward & the Oxford Movement (London: Macmillan & Co 1889), p.225.

<sup>1041</sup> Anne Mozley, Letters and Correspondence, Vol. II, p.398. Newman to Mrs. J. Mozley (24 November 1844).

iii) Continued hostility from Ward.

After Ward left the University of Oxford he was received in the Jesuit Chapel at Bolton Street, London, on 5 September 1845 and confirmed by Wiseman at Oscott on 14 September 1845. He eventually went with his family to St Edmund's College, Ware, to teach. He became a professor in moral theology. Despite growing tensions between them, Pugin designed a small house for him. Ecclesiastical residences should be, Pugin had earlier written, "in harmony of design with the sacred structures to which they formed necessary appendages, that is to say, they *exhibited a solid, solemn, and scholastic character that bespoke them at once to be the habitations of men who were removed far beyond the ordinary pursuits of life*".<sup>1042</sup> But during a discussion about the design, he discovered that Ward did not share this view; he preferred comfort and luxury for his family home.<sup>1043</sup>

Before long, Pugin discovered that "Ward heads the anti-screen men".<sup>1044</sup> In reality, this meant that Ward supported Roman and opposed medieval or Gallican-type usages and practices. This was, Pugin remarked to Bloxam, "Sad, sad, sad".<sup>1045</sup> He was very upset and shortly wrote to Ward with these strong words:

I can only say that the less we have to do with each other in future the better, for I must plainly tell you that I consider you a greater enemy to true Christianity than the most rabid Exeter Hall fanatic.<sup>1046</sup>

Hence, they finally and irrevocably fell out over their views on Catholicism and liturgy. Screens might seem to be a minor matter to a modern Christian, but in the context of Pugin's Catholic liturgical revival, such a detail was important in its own right and also because screens had come to symbolise two particular views of liturgy.

---

<sup>1042</sup> Pugin, The Present State, p.104.

<sup>1043</sup> Wilfrid Ward, William George Ward, pp.154-55.

<sup>1044</sup> *Ibid.*, p.155.

<sup>1045</sup> *Ibid.*, p.155.

<sup>1046</sup> *Ibid.*, p.155.

iv) Further events at Leeds.

By January 1845, the drawings of the internal fittings and stained glass windows for St Saviour were well advanced. Michael O'Connor wrote to Pusey to say that he had written to Pugin and that the drawings were "wonderful".<sup>1047</sup>

Derick suddenly disappeared in 1845 before St Saviour's was completed, despite being "very much attached to his employment", at a time when Pugin was taken ill with a relapse of his illness. Derick was believed to have gone to America due to his wife's health. The Church was eventually consecrated later in 1845.

2) Events following secessions.

i) Pugin had hopes for the converts.

Following the Tractarian secessions to the Church of Rome around 1845, Pugin was disappointed that hopes of corporate union had quickly faded with their anticipated reception into the Roman Catholic Church, but he was glad at first that individuals had taken this final step and he welcomed them as potential allies. He looked forward to working with Newman, Oakeley, Ward, Faber and the other converts and of having them on his side in a great Catholic movement. As Bernard Ward said, "Pugin had formed high hopes of the Oxford Tractarians, and was enthusiastic about all the late conversions".<sup>1048</sup> Pugin assumed they would support his own liturgical revival.

---

<sup>1047</sup> Michael O'Connor to Pusey (27 January 1845). MS Pus/21/22 in Pusey House Archives. Michael O'Connor (1801-1867) had studied medieval stained glass techniques with Thomas Willement. He made the stained glass, which had been designed by Pugin, for St Saviour's, Leeds.

<sup>1048</sup> Bernard Ward, The Sequel to Emancipation, Vol. II, p.125.

3) Settling into the Church of Rome.

i) The converts happy to receive assistance from Pugin and Lord Shrewsbury.

Initially, the new converts did not appear to reject Pugin's view of liturgy. The process of finding their way in the Church of Rome took up much of their time. Faber was grateful for the assistance of Lord Shrewsbury and Pugin in setting up his community of Wilfridians. Lord Shrewsbury first offered them a site next to Pugin's "gem" - St Giles' Church, Cheadle - which was nearing completion. They preferred, they said, a country place and he responded by presenting them with Cotton Hall, a house on the outskirts of Cheadle. They still needed a church. Lord Shrewsbury offered to guarantee a loan for the building of one on land, which he had also given them attached to Cotton Hall, and to be responsible for the repayments. They gladly accepted and Pugin was "Once more called to their assistance, and he designed the Church of St Wilfrid, adjoining the mansion".<sup>1049</sup> The Wilfridians were more than happy with their circumstances and the assistance they had received.

ii) Newman happy with another of Pugin's new Gothic revival churches.

After his entry into the Roman Catholic Church in 1845, Newman had little objection to Pugin's view on liturgy, at least for a short time. Indeed, his diary and correspondence for June/July 1846 expressed his favourable attitude to Pugin and his work. In a letter to Mrs. J. W. Bowden following a visit in July to Lord Shrewsbury, he praised "the ceremonial at Alton Towers" (which Pugin had set up for Lord Shrewsbury). He wrote to Mrs J. W. Bowden that Pugin's church was "the most splendid building I ever saw".<sup>1050</sup> He looked forward to the opening ceremony of the church with some excitement. In fact, he purposely delayed going to

---

<sup>1049</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p.126.

<sup>1050</sup> Dessain, ed., *Letters and Diaries*, Vol. XI, p.210. Newman to Mrs J. W. Bowden (21 July 1846).

Rome in order to “wait for the opening of Cheadle Church” at the beginning of September.<sup>1051</sup> It was an important date in his Diary.

The opening of St Giles’ on 1 September 1846 was a grand affair as described by Frederick Lucas in *The Tablet* on 5 September 1846. “Two archbishops, eleven Bishops and about sixty priests - secular and regular, Cistercian and Dominican, Benedictine and Jesuit”, attended it. It was a major gathering in England of Roman Catholic leaders. By all accounts, it was a joyous occasion. Pugin took the opportunity to speak about his ideas of liturgy at length. Lucas’s article was a gushing eulogy of praise of both the church and of Pugin.<sup>1052</sup>

iii) The converts began to express contrary views.

But shortly after this opening ceremony, the new converts began to express a change of attitude to Pugin. Following his discourse and during the course of discussions that took place, they came to realise that they did not share his views although they admired his genius.

Newman soon expressed discontent. It became evident that, like many converts to Roman Catholicism, he had completely moved away from his previous views concerning reviving the old Catholic Church in England. It may be that he saw Pugin’s church at Cheadle as a symbol of this. Instead, Newman had moved on to accepting everything connected with the *Roman Catholic Church*, including Roman usages and practices.

Wiseman had discussed with Newman the possibility of becoming an Oratorian, thus stimulating his interest in neo-Classical and Baroque architecture, the architectural styles favoured by the “new” Orders. Newman’s repugnance to the architecture of Renaissance Rome, which he had expressed before 1841, completely disappeared.<sup>1053</sup>

---

<sup>1051</sup> *Ibid.*, p.223. Newman to Phillipps (18 August 1846).

<sup>1052</sup> Editorial article by Frederick Lucas, “The opening of St. Giles’s, Cheadle”, *The Tablet* 7, Vol. VII, No. 331 (5 September 1846), p.565.

<sup>1053</sup> Anne Mozley, Letters and Correspondence, Vol. II, p.287. Newman to Frederick Rogers (January 1841).

Two days after the ceremony at Cheadle, Newman left Alton on 3 September for his journey to Rome. He remarked on the Cathedral at Langres that it was “in the Basilica style, the quire being behind the altar - which I must say, pace Pugin, I like”.<sup>1054</sup> He expressed a similar sentiment at Milan, on the 24 September 1846 when he visited the Church of St Fidelis; he admired the chapel because it was “Grecian or Palladian, and belonged to the Jesuits”.<sup>1055</sup> The arrangement in the case of the first and the form in the case of the second were not that of a Gothic church. Again, in the second example, Newman commented further on liturgical form and arrangement:

It has such a sweet, smiling, open countenance - and the Altar is so gracious and winning - standing out for all to see, and to approach. The tall, polished marble columns, the marble rails, the marble floor, the bright pictures, all speak the same language. And a light dome perhaps crowns the whole ... so in the ceremonial of religion, younger men have my leave to prefer gothic, if they will be (sic) tolerate me in my weakness which requires the Italian.<sup>1056</sup>

Newman also wrote, “I cannot deny that, however my reason may go with Gothic, my heart has ever gone with Grecian. I loved Trinity Chapel at Oxford more than any other building”.<sup>1057</sup> He now had no hesitation in endorsing Jesuit neo-Classical architecture.

From this time onwards Newman did not hesitate in expressing admiration for Baroque and neo-Classical architecture, the style favoured by the “new” Orders and the majority of Roman Catholics between 1550 and 1800.

---

<sup>1054</sup> Dessain, *Letters and Diaries*, Vol. XI, pp.246-247. Newman to F. S. Bowles (15 September 1846).

<sup>1055</sup> *Ibid.*, p.249. Newman to W. G. Penny (24 September 1846).

<sup>1056</sup> *Ibid.*, p.249.

<sup>1057</sup> *Ibid.*, p.252. Newman to Henry Wilberforce (24 September 1846).

iv) Newman considered becoming a Jesuit or an Oratorian.

On their arrival at Rome, the Jesuits warmly welcomed Newman and St. John.<sup>1058</sup> ““We were treated like princes””,<sup>1059</sup> Newman wrote to Mrs Bowden. Soon he expressed great admiration for individual Jesuits, as well as the Society of Jesus in general.<sup>1060</sup>

Newman gained increasing confidence in the Jesuits the longer he stayed in Rome. By January 1847, he wrote to Dalgairns that he was even considering joining the Jesuit Order.<sup>1061</sup> St John was very much of the same mind as Newman and expressed his admiration for the Jesuits in a letter to Dalgairns.<sup>1062</sup> Yet, Newman felt that at forty-five he was too old to become a Jesuit or enter one of the other “new” religious Orders. He never, however, considered joining the old Orders of Benedictines or Dominicans. By the middle of January 1847, he was earnestly considering becoming an Oratorian.<sup>1063</sup> Nevertheless, he “retained a great admiration for the Society of Jesus for the rest of his life”.<sup>1064</sup>

#### 4) The Mechanics’ Institute.

Newman began to study the Rule of St Philip Neri in earnest. He noted that it included discussions similar to those “found in a mechanics’ institute”. The irreligious nature of many of the Mechanics’ Institutes of the day was not a deterrent to him. “Indeed”, he wrote in a letter to Dalgairns, “I should wish at any rate the Oratory to include the functions

---

<sup>1058</sup> Raleigh Addington (Priest of the Oratory), The Idea of the Oratory (London: Burns and Oates 1966), p.100.

<sup>1059</sup> *Ibid.*, p.100.

<sup>1060</sup> *Ibid.*, p.101.

<sup>1061</sup> Dessain, ed., Letters and Diaries, Vol. XII, p.8. Newman to Dalgairns (10 January 1847).

<sup>1062</sup> Wilfrid Ward, The Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman (Longman, Green and Co., 1927), Book I, p.153.

<sup>1063</sup> *Ibid.*, Book I, p.176. Newman to Dalgairns (15 January 1847).

<sup>1064</sup> *Ibid.*, p.176.

of a Mechanics' Institute among its duties".<sup>1065</sup> He proceeded to write a note to Cardinal Fransoni on 14 February expressing his desire that the proposed Oratory should be a "Mechanicorum Instituta".<sup>1066</sup> W. G. Ward was later to refer to the Oratory as "the Spiritual Mechanics' Institute".<sup>1067</sup> As previously mentioned, Pugin had earlier expressed his great dislike of Mechanics Institutes, which he believed were anti-Christian.

#### 5) Pugin honoured by the Pope.

Pius IX, who was still in his Liberal phase, voiced sympathy for liturgical revival. At the time of Pugin's visit to Rome in April 1847, Francis Lyte stated the Pope was "going to make a grand reform in the sacred music of the Church, so as to make it more uniform, and less theatrical ... discarding of modern flourishes, and with a special eye to the revival of the old Gregorian chant".<sup>1068</sup> Moreover, Pius IX awarded Pugin a gold medal for the service he had done to Catholicism by promoting its revival in England.<sup>1069</sup> This great honour was bestowed on him during his visit in April. Rev. Henry Francis Lyte described the likely occasion, which was on 7 April 1847, when seventy-nine English converts were presented to Pius IX.<sup>1070</sup>

---

<sup>1065</sup> Dessain, Letters and Diaries Vol XII, p.17. Newman to Dalgairns (15 January 1847).

<sup>1066</sup> *Ibid.*, p.38. Newman to Cardinal Fransoni (14 February 1847).

<sup>1067</sup> William George Ward, "Popular Services", *The Rambler*, Vol. VI (October 1850), p.326. This was a review of Faber's The Spirit and Genius of St. Philip Neri.

<sup>1068</sup> A. M. M. Hogg, ed., The Remains of the late Rev. Henry Francis Lyte MA (London: Francis and John Rivington 1850), p.ciii. H. F. Lyte is best known for the words of the hymn "Abide with me", see pp.119-121.

<sup>1069</sup> Papal etiquette at the time generally confined the gold medal to cardinals and princes, although John Lingard had received one in 1825 (he had reputedly been made a cardinal *in petto*).

<sup>1070</sup> A. M. M. Hogg., p.cvi.

6) Pugin undermined by Newman.

Shortly after Pugin received his medal from the Pope, Newman began seriously to undermine him. To Mrs. J. W. Bowden, who commissioned Pugin to design her church, he offered discouragement. "As to the Church and Pugin's plans, what you say reminds me to observe that P. is notorious for making people spend twice or thrice what they intend - so you must set out with that clear expectation".<sup>1071</sup> This was not the impression given by Ferrey in 1861, who said "Pugin was always ready to give his gratuitous advice or assistance" in the cause of church building.<sup>1072</sup>

Newman sought to persuade Mrs. Bowden to support his own developing ideas of liturgy by altering the internal arrangement. Chief amongst these alterations was the omission of a rood screen and the inclusion of a communion rail.<sup>1073</sup>

7) The design of the new Oratory.

i) The quarrel over the design.

Newman soon had it in mind to build an Oratory in England. "I'm afraid I shall shock Pugin", he remarked. In a letter to Wiseman he wrote, "It must be a building for preaching and music; not an open roof, certainly no skreen (sic)". "I don't mind its being almost a barn".<sup>1074</sup> Yet, he must have had a "Gothic" Oratory in mind since he invited Pugin to visit him in the College of Propaganda to discuss the design.

Pugin accepted Newman's invitation. Newman briefly referred to this visit in his Diary for 26 April 1847. "Pugin called", he laconically wrote.<sup>1075</sup> What Newman so briefly

---

<sup>1071</sup> Dessain, ed., *Letters and Diaries*, Vol. XII, p.71. Newman to Mrs. J. W. Bowden from Rome (23 April 1847).

<sup>1072</sup> Ferrey, *Recollections*, p.100.

<sup>1073</sup> Pugin, "Church of St Thomas of Canterbury, Fulham", *The Tablet* (1 July 1848), p.419.

<sup>1074</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. XII, p.52. Newman to Wiseman (23 February 1847).

<sup>1075</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. XII, p.74. Note (26 April 1847).

commented on was, in some ways, a major event. A fierce disagreement broke out between them. The bitterness of their quarrel can be gleaned from remarks made four years later. Newman, still with some feeling, repeated the events of this meeting to Ullathorne in April 1851. Mr Pugin, he said,

when at Rome, poured contempt upon the very notion which I suggested to him of building a *Gothic* Oratory, because an Oratory is not a Medieval idea, and who told me that St Philip's institution was nothing else than a mechanics' institute, on his return to England, so far from letting me and mine alone, has ventured to say that we have mistaken our way and ought to have put up at Geneva - has associated us with immoral livers and, I think, with heretics.<sup>1076</sup>

Newman's intellectual coolness had been greatly shaken. Their disagreement over the design of the Oratory brought to the surface their very different views on liturgy, particularly on liturgical form and arrangement, views that had their basis in theology and doctrine.

ii) Newman wanted a Gothic Oratory and Pugin did not.

Pugin completely rejected the idea of the Oratory, even if it was in a Gothic style. The Oratory, he thought, was as anti-Christian as the Mechanics' Institute. Newman took his views from his studies of the sixteenth-century Oratorians. It has previously been explained that the sixteenth-century Jesuits and Oratorians supported Humanist and Realist architecture and art. Moreover, Newman naturally wanted the devotions and related matters promoted by the sixteenth-century St Philip Neri. Frederick William Faber later confirmed this. The liturgical form and arrangement of the Oratory needed to accommodate potential converts, "new" devotions and a "new" understanding of Church discipline regarding Exposition, already some centuries old. Yet, Newman must have retained a certain regard for the Gothic style since he did not automatically favour the Baroque or neo-Classical style for the new Oratory. Alternatively, he may have wished to convert Pugin to fully Roman usages and practices by

---

<sup>1076</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. XIV, pp.258-9. Newman to Ullathorne (18 April 1851).

persuading him to alter the Gothic style to suit new requirements. If this latter explanation was the case, Newman was completely unsuccessful. Séan O'Reilly, however, argues that it was Newman, rather than Pugin, who was unconcerned about style and more concerned with liturgical practices:

Newman was less disturbed by the style itself than by the manner in which its aesthetics, as expounded by Pugin, might conflict with the liturgical practices of the Roman Church.<sup>1077</sup>

Thus the thesis argues that Pugin and Newman were both much occupied with liturgical practice.

O'Reilly makes the observation that "Newman remained concerned that church architecture should facilitate the Roman liturgy that had evolved during the counter-reformation".<sup>1078</sup> This was the sixteenth-century setting for the Roman rite that Pugin abhorred. "Style" was clearly not the issue.

By 17 September 1847, Newman's favourable view of the Jesuits had not diminished, but had rather increased, as he wrote to Henry Wilberforce.<sup>1079</sup> But despite his admiration of the Jesuits, he had already decided to become an Oratorian. By October 1847 the Pope had made him "first Superior" of the new Oratorians.

iii) Newman's lead followed.

Following Newman's advice, a communion rail replaced the rood screen in the church which Pugin had designed for Mrs Bowden at Fulham. Pugin was very annoyed; he considered that the relationship between nave and chancel had been destroyed. Newman, however, was delighted with Mrs Bowden's stand. He wrote enthusiastically to her in May,

---

<sup>1077</sup> Séan O'Reilly, "*Roman versus Romantic*", p.226.

<sup>1078</sup> *Ibid.*, p.226.

<sup>1079</sup> Dessain, ed., *Letters and Diaries*, Vol. XII, p.120. Newman to Henry Wilberforce (17 September 1847).

“I will readily preach on the 30th.”, at the opening of the church.<sup>1080</sup> Pugin stayed away in disgust. *The Tablet* did not mention him in its article about the event and supported Newman instead.<sup>1081</sup>

Pugin soon discovered another attempt to change his arrangement. While at Cotton Hall, Faber had expressed support for Newman by re-arranging the Church of St Wilfrid's by pulling down Pugin's rood screen, thereby changing the arrangement, and introducing Italian decorations. But Pugin discovered this re-arrangement during a visit to St Wilfrid's in May 1848 with Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle. He was shocked and upset. Consequently, a quarrel broke out with Faber who attempted to justify his action:

‘Why, Pugin, you might as well treat the Blessed Sacrament as Henry VIII's people did, as do what you do at a benediction at Cheadle’.<sup>1082</sup>

Hence, the issue was centred on an interpretation of Church liturgy, usages and practices, not aesthetic considerations. The row regarding Pugin and Faber continued.

iv) Phillipps in contact with Newman.

Although the relationship between Pugin and Newman had by this time already broken down, Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle, Pugin's friend, continued a correspondence. He complained to Newman about the hostile reception that they had received from Faber. “I hope he<sup>1083</sup> may become less violent and excessive in his ways and ideas”, he remarked. In the meantime, Faber had written to Newman saying that Phillipps had “cursed” the Oratory.

---

<sup>1080</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. XII, p.205. Newman to Mrs. J. W. Bowden (10 May 1848).

<sup>1081</sup> F. Lucas, editor, “Church of St. Thomas of Canterbury, Fulham”, *The Tablet* 9 (3 June 1848), pp.355-356.

<sup>1082</sup> Dessain, ed., *Letters and Diaries*, Vol. XII, p.212, footnote. Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle to Newman (29 May 1848).

<sup>1083</sup> Faber.

It was not, as David Meara suggested, that Newman then “allowed himself to be identified with the line taken by Frederick Faber”.<sup>1084</sup> He had already made a stand while in Rome.

Newman replied to Phillipps on 3 June 1848, following this letter from Faber, to say that he was grieved that such a misunderstanding had occurred.<sup>1085</sup> He expressed concern about the incident in which Phillipps had participated. “Faber assures me that he did *not* say what you conceive he did”, he said.<sup>1086</sup> “I do not say *you*; but are there not persons, who would be more distressed at a man’s disliking a chancel skreen(sic) than at his being a gallican?”<sup>1087</sup>

The suggestion was that some people would have been much less bothered about being called a Gallican, than of accepting a Roman liturgical arrangement. Phillipps was an antiquarian rather than a liturgist and was more tolerant about changing the liturgical arrangement. Nevertheless, he fully supported Pugin.

The uneasy correspondence between Phillipps and Newman continued. In one such letter, Newman expressed the opinion that “*ritual opinions*” should not be treated as “*doctrinal errors*”.<sup>1088</sup>

v) Newman threatened Pugin.

Newman issued a veiled threat to Pugin. He would have him stopped by going to the Pope and having him censured:

If Mr Pugin persists, as I cannot hope he will not, in loading with bad names the admirers of Italian architecture, he is going the very way to increase their number. He will not be *put down* without authority which is infallible. And if

---

<sup>1084</sup> The Bard Center, A. W. N. Pugin: Master of Gothic Revival, p.58.

<sup>1085</sup> Dessain, ed., Letters and Diaries, Vol. XII, p.212. Newman to Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle (3 June 1848).

<sup>1086</sup> *Ibid.*, p.212.

<sup>1087</sup> *Ibid.*, p.213.

<sup>1088</sup> *Ibid.*, p.217. Newman to Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle (6 June 1848).

we go to authority, I suppose Popes have given a greater sanction to Italian than to Gothic.<sup>1089</sup>

Popes would be more likely to favour Roman rather than medieval Gallican-type usages and practices. This was an idle threat at the time since Newman had little influence with the Pope other than via his friends, the Jesuits. He simply wanted what St Philip Neri had wanted. "Now is it wonderful that I prefer St. Philip to Mr. Pugin?", he asked.<sup>1090</sup> He was after all an Oratorian and was justified in preferring St Philip.

vi) Newman privately continued to undermine Pugin.

Newman continued with both his criticisms of Pugin and his attack on medieval liturgical form and arrangement. In a letter to M. R. Giberne describing the opening of the church at Fulham his tone was very different to the enthusiasm he had expressed earlier concerning the opening of St Giles', Cheadle:

Last week I went up to preach at the opening of Mrs. Bowden's new Church at Fulham; it is very pretty, but it has the faults of Pugin. In details Pugin is perfect but his altars are so small that you can't have a Pontifical High Mass at them, his tabernacles so low that you can scarce have exposition, his East windows so large that every thing else is hidden in the glare, and his skreens so heavy that you might as well have the function in Sacristy, for the seeing it by the Congregation. He insisted on a skreen at Fulham, though Mrs. B. from the beginning told him she would not have one - and when, after two interviews, she finally refused, he actually began putting up one without her leave, which she thereupon ordered away. He did not make his appearance at the Consecration.<sup>1091</sup>

Phillipps wrote to Newman on 9 June in a more conciliatory tone but nevertheless expressing admiration for Pugin.<sup>1092</sup> Again Newman did not care for the ambivalent note of Phillipps' letter and replied on 15 June 1848, "I really will not let you say, without protesting

---

<sup>1089</sup> *Ibid.*, p.213. Newman to Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle (15 June 1848).

<sup>1090</sup> *Ibid.*, p.221. Newman to A. Lisle Phillipps (15 June 1848).

<sup>1091</sup> *Ibid.*, p.215. Newman to M. R. Giberne (6 June 1848).

against it, that we are ‘preaching a Crusade’ against you, or are throwing in what ‘weight’ as you kindly say, we have, against Mr Pugin”.<sup>1093</sup> “The Canons of Gothic architecture are to him points of faith, and everyone is a heretic who would venture to question them”.<sup>1094</sup> There was some truth in this.

8) Newman’s argument on a doctrinal level.

i) No Apostolical Succession to liturgical architecture.

As previously mentioned, Pugin argued for the usages and practices of the medieval English Church and beyond, by considering the nature and continuity of the Church. Newman sought to argue on the same level. He expressed the opinion that ecclesiastical Gothic architecture and chancel screens, if part of liturgy, did not have “an *uninterrupted tradition*”<sup>1095</sup> in the same way as doctrines. Rubrics had changed “since the death of Gothic Architecture”, he stated.<sup>1096</sup> Thus, medieval usage could not demonstrate continuity in the same way as Roman usage. That is to say, traditional Gallican-type liturgical form and arrangement had not continued with the faith and had been superseded. Therefore, Pugin was “notoriously engaged in a revival”<sup>1097</sup> since medieval usages and practices had been interrupted.

ii) Liturgical as well as doctrinal development.

“Change” became the issue. The sixteenth-century Oratorians and Newman’s own theory of doctrine supported change and development, although not in the fundamentals of

---

<sup>1092</sup> *Ibid.*, p.220, footnote. Phillipps to Newman (9 June 1848).

<sup>1093</sup> *Ibid.*, p.220. Newman to Phillipps (15 June 1848).

<sup>1094</sup> *Ibid.*, p.220.

<sup>1095</sup> *Ibid.*, p.221.

<sup>1096</sup> *Ibid.*, p.222.

the faith. Newman approved of a particular kind of change and subsequently interpreted Church discipline to mean supporting change; this was “in accordance with that view at once of change and of advancement which has marked her discipline from the first”.<sup>1098</sup> If liturgy was an expression of doctrine then liturgy, too, should develop, thought Newman. The rubrics, he said, confirmed this and showed that Gothic details, that is, medieval liturgical form and arrangement, were inconsistent with Church discipline for they were against the rubrics.<sup>1099</sup> Since the nineteenth century was later than the sixteenth it should demonstrate a development in both doctrine and liturgy. By this theory, the liturgical architecture of the nineteenth century should be the type chosen for his new nineteenth-century Oratory.<sup>1100</sup>

Newman was not arguing about style; in this he agreed with Pugin, but about liturgical form and arrangement. He wanted a nineteenth-century liturgical architecture that suited the nineteenth-century ritual of the Roman rite. Pugin, however, did not intend to change Gothic Gallican-type form and arrangement to suit the Oratory because he rejected the whole idea of an Oratory with its Roman liturgical setting. Newman was equally adamant that he wanted an Oratory, and an Oratory that contained these changes. He referred, again with emotion, to their quarrel in Rome:

We do not want a cloister or a chapter room but an Oratory. I, for one, believe that Gothic can be adapted, developed into the requisitions of an Oratory. Mr. Pugin does not; he implied, in conversation with me at Rome, that he would as soon build a mechanics institute as an Oratory. I begged him to see the Oratory of the Chiesa Nuova, he gave me no hope that he would do so. Now is it wonderful that I should prefer St Philip to Mr Pugin? and is it not wonderful that he should so relentlessly and indissolubly unite the *principles* of his great art with the *details*?<sup>1101</sup>

---

<sup>1097</sup> *Ibid.*, p.221.

<sup>1098</sup> *Ibid.*, p.222.

<sup>1099</sup> *Ibid.*, p.222.

<sup>1100</sup> *Ibid.*, p.221.

<sup>1101</sup> *Ibid.*, p.221. Newman to Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle (3 June, 1848).

Newman thus expressed his deep loyalty to St Philip Neri and Oratorian ideals. Although it had been his intention to build his Oratory as a Mechanics' Institute, Newman used Pugin's reaction to imply that he was being sarcastic and unreasonable.

iii) Form and arrangement.

Pugin turned to his authorities Thiers and other seventeenth- and eighteenth-century neo-Gallicans to support his view on medieval usages and practices, including form and arrangement. While the Scholastics had reasoned that sight of the Blessed Sacrament could be beneficial to the laity, Thiers had argued that they did not mean at the cost of losing any part of traditional usages and practices. Newman, as an Oratorian, believed that *sight* and *sound* of the consecrated elements were of the utmost important to Roman liturgy and that Roman liturgical forms and arrangements were consequently required. He was not against Gothic as a style, but it had to be adapted to suit Roman usage and practice. Screens, he believed, blocked sight of the sacred Sacrament. Thus, in his view, changes in liturgical architecture had not kept up with changes in discipline.

9) The focus on one element of liturgical form and arrangement as a representative for discussion on different views.

The 'Screens Controversy' symbolised these polarised views of liturgical context and Church discipline. These viewpoints had become a major issue by July 1848. The quarrel had commenced with Newman in April 1847 in Rome and was now gathering momentum. This was at odds with Newman's note to Ullathorne in April 1851 when he implied that neither he nor the Oratorians were involved in the "the controversy about skreens(sic).<sup>1102</sup> Bernard Ward gave some indication of the nature of the differences:

---

<sup>1102</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. XIV, p.258. Newman to Ullathorne (18 April 1851). Newman referred to "*The*

The English Catholics were not Roman enough for them;<sup>1103</sup> they were to be Romanised ... the originators of this movement were the Oratorians; but it was by no means limited to them. The more extreme members of the party traced the misfortunes of the Reformation to the national spirit in the English Church, and looked on national architecture – rood screens, painted windows, pointed arches and the like – as positively suggestive of theological error.<sup>1104</sup>

Newman, said Bernard Ward, “who professed to be impartial on the matter, became practically an anti-Goth”.<sup>1105</sup>

i) Rearrangement at Fulham.

Pugin was still smarting over the rearrangement of Mrs Bowden’s church at Fulham. “If I had understood that the ancient arrangements of a parish church were to be disregarded”, he said, “I should have declined the building.” “The origin of communion-rails in England is most decidedly Protestant”, he continued, “most assuredly I will not become an adapter of Protestant fittings to Catholic churches”.<sup>1106</sup> Pugin chose to reject the many low screens in sixteenth-century basilica churches or else he equated them to Protestant innovations.

ii) Criticism of the arrangement at St George’s Cathedral, Southwark.

Newman refused to preach or even attend the opening of Pugin’s St George’s Cathedral at Southwark on 4 July 1848.<sup>1107</sup> *The Rambler* of 8 July 1848, ever supportive of the Oratorians, had an article by “X” severely criticising the rood screen there. “We do not think”, said the writer, “that the present example, though a fair design, is at all worthy of Mr

---

*Rambler*” (15 July 1848), p.263. Article by Lockhart signed “A country priest”.

<sup>1103</sup> *Ibid.*, a reference to the converts.

<sup>1104</sup> B. Ward, Sequel to Catholic Emancipation, Vol. II, pp.261-262.

<sup>1105</sup> *Ibid.*, 262.

<sup>1106</sup> Pugin, “Church of St. Thomas of Canterbury, Fulham”, *The Tablet* (1 July 1848), p.419.

<sup>1107</sup> Dessain, ed., Letters and Diaries, Vol., XII, p.240, footnote.

Pugin's genius". The rood, he said, "is to our taste, utterly intolerable and repulsive".<sup>1108</sup> The screen, he thought, was "incompatible" with worship. Taking a similar view to Newman, 'X' stated that the screen blocked sight of the altar and hence the celebration. For good measure, he argued, too, that liturgy should change to suit the times.

'X' took up the argument that screens could not exhibit an *uninterrupted* tradition. Even if a particular liturgical form and arrangement necessitating screens had been an expression of Catholicism in the pre-Reformation Catholic Church, he argued, this had changed and the use of screens had consequently ceased. They had, he claimed, not been in use for the last three hundred years.

Pugin, aware of the views of Newman and Faber on screens that they had already expressed to him, suspected that one or the other was behind the article.<sup>1109</sup> In due course, he identified the writer as one who was sympathetic to Oratorian ideals, William George Ward. He wrote to Bloxam, "I find it is Ward who is the furious anti-Screen & Italian man(sic) he(sic) and Capes are the 2 who are creating all this excitement". It was, he said, "quite lamentable to see men making such a bad use of their talents".<sup>1110</sup>

While some Anglicans were taking up Pugin's views, the new converts had lost the last vestiges of enthusiasm for them. Pugin felt let down by them. He remarked that he found them to be "some of the most disappointing men that have ever existed".<sup>1111</sup> They were Romanists through and through.

---

<sup>1108</sup> William George Ward, "The Opening of St George's Catholic Church", *The Rambler* 2 (8 July 1848), p.228.

<sup>1109</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (undated, c. July 1848), MS 528/149. Magdalen College Archives.

<sup>1110</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (undated, c. July 1848), MS 528/167. Magdalen College Archives.

iii) Ward argued that liturgy had changed.

Ward continued his articles in *The Rambler*. “When *Greek* meets *Goth*”,<sup>1112</sup> he commented, “we display all our fierceness, and all our foolishness”.<sup>1113</sup> He suggested that the revival of rood screens had nothing to do with modern liturgy and were called for only on “antiquarian, or artistic, or national grounds” and was not supported by doctrinal or theological reasons.<sup>1114</sup> He continued, “The question of the use of rood-screens has, then, two aspects, which may fairly be termed the artistic or architectural, and the liturgical”.<sup>1115</sup>

iv) The artistic aspects.

On artistic or architectural grounds, “little can be said in the way of argument”,<sup>1116</sup> said Ward. While the screen “does *not* enclose the sacred rites from the gaze of the congregation”,<sup>1117</sup> yet it “*does* prevent them from contemplating them to their edification”.<sup>1118</sup> Screens did not conceal completely, but even partial loss of view was annoying, he thought. “The sight is fretted, fidgetted, and tried beyond endurance”<sup>1119</sup> and caused “irreverent craning and peering”.<sup>1120</sup> It was a subjective argument and was actually based on “artistic” grounds.

---

<sup>1111</sup> HLRO Pugin/Hardman correspondence No. 8.

<sup>1112</sup> ‘X’ (William George Ward), “Rood-screens”, *The Rambler* 2 (29 July 1848), p.293.

<sup>1113</sup> *Ibid.*, p.293.

<sup>1114</sup> *Ibid.*, p.294.

<sup>1115</sup> *Ibid.*, p.295.

<sup>1116</sup> *Ibid.*, p.295.

<sup>1117</sup> *Ibid.*, p.296.

<sup>1118</sup> *Ibid.*, p.296.

<sup>1119</sup> *Ibid.*, p.297.

<sup>1120</sup> *Ibid.*, p.297.

v) The liturgical aspects.

Although he was not a liturgist, Ward boldly set out his objections to screens on what he believed to be liturgical grounds in another article that appeared in *The Rambler* on 5 August 1848.

His main argument was that liturgy should change because doctrine had changed, although he did not expand on this statement. Instead, he continued his argument that there was not an *uninterrupted* tradition for the use of screens. The reasons for screens – the *Disciplina arcani*, awe, reverence and veneration – had ceased, he said. There was now no need to keep back anything from the laity since “the old ‘discipline of the secret’ ... has for ages and ages become an impossibility”.<sup>1121</sup> Moreover, the principle of “reverence” in the approach of man towards God could not demonstrate an uninterrupted tradition. While it had been prevalent in the Early Church, it had “not been maintained for any very considerable period” and, in fact, had died out. There was, therefore, not even an uninterrupted tradition of “reverence”.<sup>1122</sup>

Consequently, Ward argued, this new approach (because the awe, reverence, reserve of the *Disciplina Arcani* were obsolete) had resulted in a new liturgical form and arrangement to suit new services. Screens were thus obsolete.

vi) “New” services and devotions required new arrangements.

“In the last two or three hundred years”, argued Ward, “new religious offices have been by degrees introduced into the Church”. The most important of these new services was the ‘Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament’, which, he said, “summons at once every pious

---

<sup>1121</sup> *Ibid.*, p.317.

<sup>1122</sup> *Ibid.*, p.316.

soul to draw near”.<sup>1123</sup> The liturgical arrangement was changed to accommodate this, he contended. The old screens had been pulled down at the introduction of the service of Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament and Church discipline was responsible. The faithful were invited to “*look* at the celebration of her mysteries”, where the Sacred Host was exposed “to the view and adoration of her congregations”.<sup>1124</sup> Screens, he claimed, had gradually been removed by the Church to accommodate this change in discipline.

The service of Benediction could, Ward claimed, be as grand a spectacle as any High Mass. The sixteenth-century Church desired the grandeur of the ancient Classical Pagan play. Or, as Geoffrey Scott says, wanted to express “ancient continuities, its claim to universal dominion, its pagan inheritance, and its pomp”.<sup>1125</sup> Ward wanted a similar effect. “The gorgeous altar, glowing with gold and jewelry, and blazing with a hundred lights - the clouds of incense wafted up towards the heavens”.<sup>1126</sup> The Benediction service was ideal for this, he believed, and it had the advantage that it was also a service that was ‘modern’ and which could absorb the culture of the nineteenth century. Screens hindered the sight of such a service. “How”, Ward asked, “can the Church possibly consent to suffer the reverent gaze of her children to be forbidden by carved and sculptured oak and stone, when she is bidding them draw near and behold her present Lord?”.<sup>1127</sup> He wanted a “reverent gaze” on the sacrament itself. The chief considerations must therefore be ‘sight’ and ‘sound’ of the proceedings. Screens created a symbolic distance and separation. The lack of screens would therefore add to the sight of the Blessed Sacrament and bring a symbolic closeness to and

---

<sup>1123</sup> ‘X’ (William George Ward), “The Revival of Rood Screens”, *The Rambler*, no.32 (5 August 1848), p.317.

<sup>1124</sup> *Ibid.*, p.317.

<sup>1125</sup> Geoffrey Scott, *The Architecture of Humanism*, p.22.

<sup>1126</sup> ‘X’ (William George Ward), “The Revival of Rood Screens” in *The Rambler* (5 August 1848), p.317.

<sup>1127</sup> *Ibid.*, p.317.

familiarity with the Lord's body. Ward believed that Roman usages and practices accommodated this change in discipline. Pugin was disgusted and indignant.<sup>1128</sup>

10) Criticism of Oratorian views.

i) The periodicals.

Benjamin Ferrey mentioned a review<sup>1129</sup> (by a member of the High Church party) of the nature of the argument in his biography of Pugin. The writer saw the Oratorians as partisan. They were, he said, “Amongst the most strenuous and embittered antagonists of the said unfortunate chancel-screens”. They had “developed the necessity of the congregation getting as near the altar as possible, as if in this bodily approach an increase of blessing was involved. The result has therefore been a movement in a certain section of the English Roman Catholics against chancels and their screens”.<sup>1130</sup>

An article appeared in *The Rambler* by ‘Q’ (possible Pugin)<sup>1131</sup> addressed to the editor in a reply to criticisms, in which the writer said that he always bowed to the discipline of the Church and was contemptuous of “mere antiquarian revivalism”.<sup>1132</sup> The Church did not destroy screens on the Continent, he argued. Other agents were responsible and the real cause was not a change in Church discipline but:

- 1) Religious fanaticism.
- 2) Bad taste.
- 3) Revolutionary violence.

---

<sup>1128</sup> Margaret Belcher, *A. W. N. Pugin*, p.254.

<sup>1129</sup> This probably referred to an editorial review by Alexander James Beresford Hope (1820-1865), “Oratorianism and ecclesiology”, in *The Christian Remembrancer and Quarterly Review* (January 1851) Vol. XXI, pp.141-164.

<sup>1130</sup> Benjamin Ferrey, *Recollections*, pp.363-365.

<sup>1131</sup> *The Rambler* (12 August 1848). This article was written in the style of Pugin or Frederick Lucas.

<sup>1132</sup> *Ibid.*, p.344.

As long as the doctrine of Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament and the Sacrifice of the Mass remained, screens would also remain, the author maintained:

For screens are a consequence of it, absolutely and directly; they in a manner set forth at once the holiness of the rites and the distinct character of the priesthood, and, as such, are not legitimate subjects for the caprice of this or that generation to adopt or remove at will, on the grounds of convenience and effect.<sup>1133</sup>

ii) Pugin replied to criticism.

Pugin wrote despairingly that it was “grievous, most grievous” to expend energy on refuting attacks from fellow Catholics “from whom, till but a short time ago, we had every reason to hope for the most powerful co-operation in the good work”.<sup>1134</sup> He was very bitter and disappointed in the new converts.

Nevertheless, he retained a certain optimism about the progress of Catholicism in the country as a whole. Barriers that had existed since the Reformation between Catholics and Protestants were gradually being eroded; aspects of the pre-Reformation English Church, its usages and practices, were being revived. He was moved to exclaim:

What a number of Catholic spires now rise above the landscape ... How many sweet and solemn-sounding bells summon the Faithful to the Holy Sacrifice ... how many altars rich in sculpture and splendid with gold, is the Holy Eucharist, now offered by Priests in vestments of ample fold, and precious material, as in the old days of England’s faith and glory. How many images of our Divine Redeemer and His blessed Mother have been set up ... How many sacred vessels ... how many touching memorials have been erected to the departed Faithful ... What a progress of things, what a progress of men!<sup>1135</sup>

People were increasingly moving towards God and, consequently, they were building a Christian environment for a Christian people. The Houses of Parliament that he had worked on since 1835 and which was nearly complete by 1850 was an example of this. Surrounded

---

<sup>1133</sup> *Ibid.*, p.345.

<sup>1134</sup> Pugin, “Catholic Church Architecture”, *The Tablet* 9 (2 September 1848), p.563.

<sup>1135</sup> *Ibid.*, p.563.

by the externals of Christianity, people were increasingly encouraged to relate to God and to develop their faith. Thus, in Pugin's view, a holy and Christian environment specific to England was in progress.

iii) Pugin accused of doctrinal error.

Newman decided to write to authority at Rome. "I know I have at present the Pope's ear", he remarked hopefully, "and I think he might be made to see that a so-called Englishman, may speciously conceal under skreens and roods a great deal of doctrinal error".<sup>1136</sup> On 10 November, he wrote in Latin to Monsignor G. B. Palma, the Secretary to the Propaganda at Rome, whom he knew was sympathetic to his views. The letter was a bold move on Newman's part. He subtly suggested that although interest in Gothic architecture was merely an antiquarian fad, it was also dangerous; it could lead to schism. England would remain an independent Catholic country and not become part of the Church of Rome.

Newman suggested that because Pugin's liturgical revival was taking place only in England, it was restricted to English tradition and English history and was therefore nationalistic and Gallican. He was partly right, but Pugin's many references to Continental sources, authorities and examples would suggest that he supported neo-Gallican ideals for the Continent, as well as for England. Newman's suggestion was that Pugin was a Gallican, schismatic, anti-Roman and against the Pope. All but the last had elements of truth. Pugin, as a Liberal Ultramontane, fully recognised and accepted the Pope's spiritual authority, as later events would prove. Newman concluded the letter:

And therefore I would confirm that while this Gothicism has outwardly had favourable results in winning over the minds of Protestants, it is not an advantage to someone who has become a Catholic of his own accord, because it may cause England and her antiquities to be preferred to the Seat of Peter. The most famous Catholic amongst us who is not an ecclesiastic [Pugin] would not deny that this was so and it will be remembered that when he was at

---

<sup>1136</sup> Dessain, ed., Letters and Diaries Vol. XII, p.304. Newman to R. A. Coffin (22 October 1848).

the Vatican temple recently, unmindful of the portals of the Apostles, burst out that the Holy Temple was 'Pagan', even calling it by that name, no doubt because it was in the Classical Style. Moreover, he added in an absolutely frenzied manner, "If only that cupola would disintegrate and collapse!"<sup>1137</sup>

There was a further element of truth in what Newman wrote; Pugin, with his Liberal Ultramontane views, was intent on reviving a national architecture and abhorred neo-Classicism.

Newman had attempted to stir up problems for Pugin at a time when political conditions in the Vatican State were fraught. Indeed, this political situation was one reason why his letter (intended to be passed on to Pius IX) had no effect. Palma was shot dead less than a week later and it is doubtful if he even read it since mail took more than a week to reach Rome. Pius IX himself was exiled a week after Palma's death on the 24 November 1848 and he remained in exile until April 1850. Newman was out of favour in Rome in any case. "The more I think the more it seems to me, *we shall get nothing more from Rome* now. We cannot expect the Pope to give us any thing *without referring the matter* to someone", he wrote a year later.<sup>1138</sup>

The letter to Palma appeared to backfire on Newman and he received a reprimand from Propaganda.<sup>1139</sup> Nevertheless, he and the Oratorians were not experiencing opposition from those in authority in England.

---

<sup>1137</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.324-326. Newman to Monsignor Palma (10 November 1848). (Translation from the Latin by Dr Eric Eve, Harris Manchester College Oxford; there is only room for part of the letter in the thesis).

<sup>1138</sup> Dessain, ed., *Letters and Diaries*, Vol. XIII, p.310, footnote. Newman to Faber (25 November 1849). Newman wanted to make St Wilfrid's (Cotton Hall) a subsidiary of the Oratory at Birmingham, but those at Rome thought that each house had to be disconnected from each other. His idea of sending three Oratorians there was thwarted. Rome was against the propagation of Oratories in this way.

<sup>1139</sup> *Ibid.*, p.332. Newman to George Ryder (7 December 1849).

11) J. M. Capes expressed views on liturgical arrangement and form.

A series of articles appeared in *The Rambler* in 1850 titled, "Town Churches" which were written by J. M. Capes, the editor, and illustrated by M. E. Hadfield, an architect. The articles were aimed at promoting Oratorian views<sup>1140</sup> on Roman liturgical form and arrangement:

With certain exceptions our new churches should be of such a size as to permit a preacher with average voice to be distinctly heard by the whole congregation; and also to bring the altar so near to all, that no-one shall *feel* himself driven away even from the sight of that spot where his heart delights to dwell.<sup>1141</sup>

Another major development in Oratorian thought had occurred; while the service of 'Benediction' had been the primary reason for *seeing* the celebration, they also began to promote this "new" Counter-Reformation form and arrangement for the Mass. The Mass became the target for further modernisation in an attempt to present it as developed and "modern". Again *sight* and *sound* were the primary considerations:

There is something positively ludicrous in attempting to instruct a countless mass of human beings, of whom one half can barely see the preacher enacting what to them is a dumb show. There is something most chilling to one's devotion to be compelled to hear Mass so far from the altar, that a pocket telescope is almost needed to discern the movements of the celebrating priest; and when, as at the present time, the immense majority of people are poor, dull, and ill-instructed to the very last degree, it becomes a cruel mockery thus to tantalize them with dim, distant visions, and with the voiceless gesticulations of a preacher, of whose words scarce one in ten can penetrate through their ears to their innermost souls.<sup>1142</sup>

Screens, argued Capes, inhibited people's understanding of the celebration. Since the faithful would have understood the celebration, he must have meant "a countless mass" of

---

<sup>1140</sup> The editor, "The Rambler - Mr. Pugin's comments on the Oratorian model church", *The New-York Ecclesiologist*, Vol. 3 (March 1851), pp.55-58. The title of the article made the connection between the Oratorians and *The Rambler*.

<sup>1141</sup> J. M. Capes and M. E. Hadfield, "Town Churches", *The Rambler* (January 1850), p.12. (Bound volume V). Hadfield was an architect.

<sup>1142</sup> *Ibid.*, p.12.

potential converts. Pugin, however, believed that the church and Mass were primarily for the faithful, not potential converts.

i) A specific example of Oratorian form and arrangement.

The articles on “Town Churches” in *The Rambler* had so far discussed in general terms Oratorian requirements for their church services and architecture. Finally, an announcement appeared which suggested that “the world was about to receive plans of an architecture adapted to our present wants”.<sup>1143</sup>

A church designed by Matthew Hadfield of Sheffield appeared in the next issue of *The Rambler*. It was in the “Byzantine”<sup>1144</sup> style rather than a “modern” style to suit a “modern” service. Later in the same article, Capes said that it was, in fact, a Lombardic style.<sup>1145</sup>

The Lombardic style could be adapted to Oratorian use, as easily as any other style; but then it would not be strictly Lombardic or Byzantine. Newman had wanted to adapt the Gothic style for an Oratory; now Capes suggested that the Lombardic style could just as easily be adapted to modern requirements and would be ideal for an Oratory. He wanted an ancient style with a modern Roman liturgical form and arrangement “suited to the habits and feelings of many of our own countrymen”.<sup>1146</sup>

---

<sup>1143</sup> Article in the style of Pugin or Frederick Lucas, “Church Architecture” in *The Tablet* (2 February 1850), p.76.

<sup>1144</sup> J. M. Capes and M. E. Hadfield, “Town Churches” in *The Rambler* (January 1850).

<sup>1145</sup> *Ibid.*, p.16.

ii) Pugin believed medieval liturgical form and arrangement were not confined to Gothic architecture or to that period.

Ancient Lombardic, Romanesque, and Early basilica styled churches had characteristics in their liturgical forms and arrangements that were similar to the medieval Gothic churches. "Lombardic" was allegedly a style which had originated in Lombardy and spread to northern Italy where it became the established style between the 7<sup>th</sup>. and 13<sup>th</sup>. centuries. The style has also been termed Romanesque or Byzantine. G. T. Rivoira gave a definition of Lombardic form and arrangement in his Lombardic Architecture (1933), with particular reference to Durham Cathedral. "The plan is that of a Latin cross with choir, nave, and aisles, terminating originally in an apse with minor apses at the sides".<sup>1147</sup>

The ancient Lombardic churches conformed to Pugin's principles. They were very high (the vertical principle symbolising the Resurrection); they were planned on a Latin cross (symbol of Redemption), they had long naves with aisles on either side (for processions and for the use of pilgrims), aisled transepts, a deep choir, the altar at the east end, they had relics, images of the Saints and martyrs, stained glass, sculpture and decoration of exceptional quality. The choir, frequently raised over a crypt containing a shrine, was separated from the nave by screens. Pilgrims and others of the laity did not gain access to either the choir or the apses containing altars. The choir and high altar of cathedrals such as Canterbury and Durham were not particularly visible to the laity because they were raised above the nave, the aisles and nave contained a large number of pillars which restricted the view of these, and because they all contained either open or closed screens.

---

<sup>1146</sup> *Ibid.*, p.16.

<sup>1147</sup> G. T. Rivoira, Lombardic Architecture (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1933), Vol. II, p.256.

12) A Roman liturgical form and arrangement preferred by the Romanists.

*The Rambler* claimed that this (Lombardic) style with a modern arrangement of the interior, including a change in the altar's position, would now probably be preferred in England to that of the Gothic with its old arrangement of nave, chancel and screens, simply because people wanted what was already in existence in St Peter's, Rome.<sup>1148</sup>

At first glance, Hadfield's design appeared to satisfy many of Pugin's requirements. "The plan consists of a nave, double aisles, tower, and absidal termination, embracing a choir and an ambulatory beyond".<sup>1149</sup> These were features of the ancient Lombardic style, but Hadfield had introduced changes which did not satisfy Pugin's requisites. The nave was disproportionately large; in fact, a vast open space with galleries to accommodate a great number and a flat ceiling for better acoustics (which to Pugin meant no vertical emphasis symbolic of the Resurrection). The church also did not have a screen or a separate chancel and the altar was not separate from the nave; the whole interior was "open-plan". Moreover, there were other alterations to the arrangement; the main entrance was through the tower, not the southern porch; indeed, there was no porch in this design. The tower was not considered essential and could be replaced by a bell-turret, again resulting in little vertical emphasis; the chapel of the Blessed Sacrament was placed at the eastern end of the northern aisle, instead of the eastern end of the southern aisle; the baptistry was placed at the eastern end of the southern aisle, instead of at the western end of the southern aisle, and so forth; there were only two aisles. Symbolism was thus ignored. The above were never features of the old Lombardic basilicas. "This departure from ordinary custom and the rules of symbolism was necessary under the peculiar circumstances of the site and design", declared Capes.<sup>1150</sup>

---

<sup>1148</sup>J. M. Capes, the editor and M.E. Hadfield, "Town Churches", *The Rambler* (January 1850), p.18. (Bound Vol. V).

<sup>1149</sup> *Ibid.*, p.16.

<sup>1150</sup> *Ibid.*, p.17.

The advantages of this alternative arrangement were, Capes argued, firstly, that it gathered the people together in a compact mass, so that all may *see* and *hear* both preceptor and celebrant; and, secondly, it presented “great advantages for light and ventilation”.<sup>1151</sup> (This was an argument taken directly from Pugin’s own True Principles).

i) Pugin defended medieval liturgical form and arrangement.

Pugin replied to these articles on “Town Churches” in an article in *The Builder* on 23 March 1850, which was quickly republished in *The Tablet*.<sup>1152</sup>

On a practical level, Pugin thought that the whole concept of changing the church in order to accommodate *sight* and *sound* of the celebration resulted in a church with remarkable similarities to the Protestant churches. The proposed Oratories had, he said, the same principles as “huge dissenting preaching-houses”. Indeed, Frederick William Faber later made the point that preaching was important to the Oratorians and commented that the Oratory was “a factory of sermons”.<sup>1153</sup> The congregation and the pulpit took on new significances in the Oratories; in this, too, they had similarities to Protestant churches.<sup>1154</sup>

The “ideal” church did not stand up to analysis on a practical or mystical level either, claimed Pugin. He considered that the design by Hatfield expressed practices that were against Catholic liturgical principles. A Catholic church required a precise liturgical form and arrangement not only on a practical, but also on a mystical level:

No; the edifice must be so constructed as to symbolise the mysteries of religion, not only in its plan, but in all its arrangements and its minutest details

---

<sup>1151</sup> *Ibid.*, p.16.

<sup>1152</sup> A. W. N. Pugin, “How shall we build our Churches?”, *The Tablet* (30 March 1850), p.199.

<sup>1153</sup> Frederick William Faber, The Spirit and Genius of St Philip Neri: Founder of the Oratory: Lectures delivered in the Oratory, King William Street, Strand, by Frederick W. Faber (London: Burns and Lambert 1850), p.103.

<sup>1154</sup> A. W. N. Pugin, “How shall we build our Churches?” copied from *The Builder* 8 (23 March 1850), *The Tablet* (30 March 1850), p.199.

- an edifice that, both by its external form and internal disposition, bears unquestionable evidence of its sacred purpose.<sup>1155</sup>

ii) Newman wanted Roman usages and practices.

Newman was still thinking about the design of his proposed Oratory at Birmingham. He quickly put Oratorian thoughts into action. He favoured, he said, “a double cube”<sup>1156</sup> or “a circular church”.<sup>1157</sup> He had no objection to any style, but it had to give the congregation space and allow “easiness for preaching”. He wanted, too, “a flight of steps to it, and vaulting underneath”,<sup>1158</sup> a feature commonly found in ancient basilicas. It was a feature, also, of the “new” St Peter’s, Rome. But he did not want a screen.

The more authoritarian or neo-Ultramontane Oratorians favoured a basilica in the style of “new” St Peter’s, Rome, so Newman conceded that since St Philip Neri was of the sixteenth century and lived in Rome, he (Newman) would be quite happy to have a similar Roman basilica for his new Oratory instead of a circular church. He was indifferent to its style as long as the form and arrangement included a large space for the congregation with full *sight* and *sound* of the altar and celebrant during the Mass.

Newman suggested that Pugin was mistaken or uninformed and ignorant of nineteenth-century Church rubrics, rites and canons and thought he did not care about them. While Pugin claimed that the same liturgical form and arrangement were carried down over the centuries in the same way as faith had been carried down, Newman denied that this was so; liturgical architecture had not stayed the same like the fundamentals of faith. Liturgy had changed, he contended, as the rites of the Church had changed. He expressed this opinion in a

---

<sup>1155</sup> *Ibid.*, p.199 and p.206.

<sup>1156</sup> *Ibid.*, p.441.

<sup>1157</sup> Dessain, ed., Letters and Diaries, Vol. XIII, p.441. Newman to Anthony Hutchinson (8 March 1850).

<sup>1158</sup> *Ibid.*, p.441, footnote.

letter to Miss Holmes in April 1850.<sup>1159</sup> Although she unfortunately destroyed most of the letters received by her from Newman, those that survive suggest that he was regularly corresponding with her while she lived in Pugin's house as governess to his children.<sup>1160</sup>

Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament meant that screens were no longer necessary, wrote Newman. "Sight" of the altar was of paramount importance. He reasoned that Pugin had returned to a Protestant idea whereby the pulpit in the centre of the church hid the altar. "Not only the screen, but especially the high eagle-reading desk, effect this", he argued.<sup>1161</sup> When screens and reading desk were part of the arrangement, such as in "a Puginian Church", he continued, they hid the priest and the Blessed Sacrament from the people.<sup>1162</sup>

Newman believed the new interpretation of discipline made it necessary to break away from a medieval form and arrangement. "Now if the rites of the Church have *changed*, let the architecture *develop* – let it modify and improve itself to meet them", he remarked.<sup>1163</sup> If the Catholic Church had once favoured medieval usages and practices, now it preferred the Roman.

### 13) The periodicals supported the Oratorians.

*The Rambler* of April 1850 proceeded to accuse Pugin of being against Rome and of being a Puseyite.<sup>1164</sup> The articles continued to support Oratorian views. Despite this, Newman denied that he and the Oratorians had anything to do with this periodical. He explained to

---

<sup>1159</sup> *Ibid.*, p.462. Newman to Miss Holmes (7 April 1850).

<sup>1160</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. XIV, p.186. Newman to Miss Holmes (31 December 1850) (i.e. while she was living with Pugin's family). See also Vol XV, p.15. (Miss Holmes remained in the Pugin house probably until January 1852, so we do not know Newman's full thoughts on the matter. In March 1852, she became music mistress to W. M. Thackeray's daughters for a short time).

<sup>1161</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. XIII, p.461. Newman to Miss Holmes (7 April 1850).

<sup>1162</sup> *Ibid.*, p.462.

<sup>1163</sup> *Ibid.*, p.462.

<sup>1164</sup> J. M. Capes, the editor, "Mr Pugin and the 'Rambler'", *The Rambler* 5 (April 1850), p.374.

Mary Holmes, "For myself, no one here has ever written one line of discussion, criticism or correspondence in the *Rambler*".<sup>1165</sup> It may be that they did not actually making individual written contributions to *The Rambler* but Capes, the editor, frequently referred to Newman for his approval, opinion and advice about articles. Various letters between them indicate that this was so.<sup>1166</sup>

14) The Revival of the Ancient Plain Song.

i) Oratorian views - in defence of the "modern" and of progress.

While it could be argued that W. G. Ward and Capes were not expressing Oratorian views because they were not Oratorians, the same could not be claimed of Newman or Faber. Faber became the Superior of the London Oratory in 1849. He shortly expressed Oratorian views in his The Spirit and Genius of St. Philip Neri (1850), when he was in full flush of his Roman enthusiasm. He stated that every Oratorian had an obligation to imitate St Philip Neri. Yet, while his book was a defence of the Oratorian position, more than half of it was devoted to an attack on Pugin's views on liturgy.

ii) The demolition of Gothic cathedrals.

Faber wrote that St Philip would have rejected ancient and medieval architecture. He suggested that if St Philip had possessed a "dark Gothic Cathedral" he would have "pulled it down, and built another more to his own taste".<sup>1167</sup> Therefore, the Oratorians should "pull down the buildings of our fathers", even Westminster Abbey if necessary.<sup>1168</sup>

---

(Bound volumeV).

<sup>1165</sup> Dessain, ed., Letters and Diaries, Vol. XIII, p.460. Newman to Miss Holmes (7 April 1850).

<sup>1166</sup> Examples of Newman's involvement with Capes, the editor of *The Rambler* - Newman to Capes 12 September 1848, 21 November 1848, 6 December 1848, 8 December 1848, 19 April 1851. There are many more examples in the Letters and Diaries.

<sup>1167</sup> Frederick William Faber's The Spirit and Genius of St. Philip Neri: Founder of the Oratory.

Faber also defended Newman's ideas concerning a Mechanics' Institute. He queried, "I wonder what St. Philip would have thought of a People's Hall or a Mechanics' Institute". He would have encouraged them, he concluded.<sup>1169</sup>

iii) In defence of progress.

Whereas Pugin had unfavourably compared the nineteenth century with the early Church, Faber reversed this so that the ancient Church was unfavourably compared with the nineteenth century. The latter was portrayed as being improved and progressive. Those who wished to revive ancient Catholicism in England were criticised as being unimaginative and unable to appreciate modern rubrics and devotions. He believed that "the spirit of the past, and so its beauty, are lost in the stupid servility of a dull, unimaginative copy".<sup>1170</sup> The revivers yearned for the *Disciplina Arcani*, he said, and saw progress as "anti-Christian barbarism". His conclusion was, "To enthrone a past age in our affections above the one which God has given us in his Church, is implicitly at least to adopt the formula of heresy and schism".<sup>1171</sup> Such a theory was, he argued, "incompatible with orthodox belief, as well as with a true Catholic obedience". Faber, therefore, rejected tradition and historical precedence in favour of development and progress.

---

Lectures delivered at the Oratory, King William Street, Strand (London: Burns and Lambert 1850), pp.55-56.

<sup>1168</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.55-56.

<sup>1169</sup> *Ibid.*, p.103.

<sup>1170</sup> *Ibid.*, p.42.

<sup>1171</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.41-42.

iv) An eccentric view of “new” devotions and of progress.

Ward was highly eccentric, as was evident in an article he wrote shortly titled “Popular Services”, for *The Rambler* (under the pseudonym of ‘X’).<sup>1172</sup> In this, he expressed support for “new” devotions, chiefly the service of Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. Ward seemingly misinterpreted St Philip Neri’s reluctance concerning frequent Masses for the laity and his promotion of popular services by suggesting that Benediction could take precedence over the Mass. The Eucharist need only be celebrated at very infrequent intervals, he eccentrically thought, if the Blessed Sacrament was reserved and therefore available for services of Benediction at any time in between Masses.

He described the ideal ‘Benediction’ service and promoted it in such a way that Vespers and the Mass<sup>1173</sup> were denigrated to an inferior and subordinate position. “Vespers, when not congregational, are nothing”,<sup>1174</sup> he said, and are “anything but a popular service”.<sup>1175</sup> The Mass “is not a congregational service at all”,<sup>1176</sup> he stated in his article on “Popular Services”. “To most Catholics it would be a painful burden to be always compelled to follow the priests precisely in the very words he is uttering before the altar”.<sup>1177</sup> In particular, “the ceremony of the High Mass is,” he wrote, similar to “a grand secular show”<sup>1178</sup> and most churches were not equipped to carry it out properly. Ward may have been objecting to High Masses that were sometimes ‘performed’ by opera singers, with tickets for admission. One London Catholic chapel was actually called “the shilling opera house”. In which case he agreed with Pugin. But the actual reason he gave was that the ceremony was

---

<sup>1172</sup> ‘X’ (W. G. Ward), “Popular Services”. A review of Faber’s The Spirit and Genius of St Philip Neri in *The Rambler* (October 1850). (Bound volume VI), pp.315-351.

<sup>1173</sup> Probably the High Mass.

<sup>1174</sup> ‘X’ (W. G. Ward), “Popular Services”, p.337.

<sup>1175</sup> *Ibid.*, p.335.

<sup>1176</sup> *Ibid.*, p.338.

<sup>1177</sup> *Ibid.*, p.339.

carried out in Latin, which he thought was incomprehensible to the congregation who could only watch the proceedings without understanding the words. Moreover, he thought that the Mass was too long and wearied non-intellectual people with its long prayers; he wanted it shortened and made popular.<sup>1179</sup> Indeed, he believed, “*What attracts the people*” was not Vespers and the Mass in Latin at all, but “*the sermon and Benediction*” in English.<sup>1180</sup> The “quasi-sacramental”<sup>1181</sup> service of Benediction could, he thought, be “made an eminently congregational service”.<sup>1182</sup> For that reason he was in favour of sermons, hymn-singing and ‘Benediction’ as a service in its own right.<sup>1183</sup> Ward had, indeed, an exceedingly individual view, yet one probably aimed at promoting the idea that the Church’s main responsibility was to attract and proselytise the people, especially Protestants.

Ward hoped that Oratories might be opened in every town in Britain and Oratorian ideas spread throughout the country.<sup>1184</sup> Priests, he suggested, could spend every weekday at the Oratories and only return to their parishes on Sundays to implement Oratorian ideas.<sup>1185</sup>

Ward’s views were a distortion of Oratorian policy. St Philip Neri had restricted communion at Mass to those he thought worthy, but many had nevertheless regularly attended the service. While St Philip Neri had enthusiastically promoted new services, the later Oratorians (after St Philip’s death) had exalted the Mass as well as keeping “new” services. There was no intention by St Philip Neri and certainly not by later Oratorians to replace the Mass with these.

---

<sup>1178</sup> *Ibid.*, p.345.

<sup>1179</sup> *Ibid.*, p.335.

<sup>1180</sup> *Ibid.*, p.335.

<sup>1181</sup> *Ibid.*, p.337.

<sup>1182</sup> *Ibid.*, p.337.

<sup>1183</sup> *Ibid.*, p.336.

<sup>1184</sup> *Ibid.*, p.327.

<sup>1185</sup> *Ibid.*, p.327.

15) Pugin retaliated with severe words.

i) Reaction to suggestions of subjugating the Mass.

Pugin noted the change to more aggressive tactics in his An Earnest Appeal for the Revival of the Ancient Plain Song (1850); the promotion of plainchant was another Liberal Ultramontane aim. He responded to Faber's suggestion that St Philip Neri would have pulled down Gothic cathedrals:

At first the screens alone were objectionable, the architecture itself was praised as beautiful and appropriate, but now we are told that it is utterly unsuited to Catholic worship; that our finest Cathedrals, those most noble edifices of the piety of our forefathers, are only fit for demolition, and that, in fine, the buildings we should erect for divine worship should be as similar as possible to dissenting conventicles in their arrangement, only rather more offensive than their meagre prototypes, by the meretricious decoration of their interiors.<sup>1186</sup>

Pugin was appalled by Ward's proposal "to change the ancient offices"<sup>1187</sup> and he had gone too far in suggesting that the Benediction service could equal and even supplant the Mass. Pugin was clearly annoyed. It was "monstrous enough" that the Oratorians wanted to change the liturgical arrangement and form but

they become light when compared to the changes that are proposed in the divine service itself, and which have been lately put forth in a publication<sup>1188</sup> which is the recognized organ of the party<sup>1189</sup> from whom this miserable system of modern degeneracy emanates. It is, indeed, seriously proposed to change the whole nature of the divine services of the Catholic Church, under the specious pretext of rendering them more popular and adapting them to the spirit of the age: and what is scarcely credible this change is advocated not merely for the services of a peculiar order or body, but for the Parochial Churches of the whole country.<sup>1190</sup>

---

<sup>1186</sup> Pugin, An Earnest Appeal for the Revival of Ancient Plain Song (London: Charles Dolman, 1850), p.3.

<sup>1187</sup> *Ibid.*, p.4.

<sup>1188</sup> A reference to *The Rambler*.

<sup>1189</sup> A reference to the Oratorians.

<sup>1190</sup> Pugin, An Earnest Appeal, p.3.

The Oratorians were attempting, Pugin said, to “create divisions among the faithful, and to use the ancient liturgy as a mere vehicle for the display of their Methodism”.<sup>1191</sup> There was no liturgical precedent for what they were attempting, he claimed. If they knew anything about liturgy, history or tradition they would realize that all Catholic churches had always esteemed the Mass above any other service. The medieval liturgical arrangement and form of the church building that he favoured had, he repeated, reflected this and was universal throughout Christendom.

“England”, he said in reply to Faber and Ward, “can never be Catholicised by the destruction of her cathedrals, the conversion of the liturgy into a song-book, and the erection of churches, whose appearance is something between a dancing-room and a mechanics’ institute”.<sup>1192</sup>

16) Pugin’s exposition of the allegorical meaning in his The Revival of Plain Song.

17) Pugin’s exposition of the theological level of meaning.

i) An uninterrupted tradition.

Oratorians had repeatedly argued that liturgy could not demonstrate an *uninterrupted tradition* and therefore it could not be part of Revelation or be guided by the Holy Spirit. Pugin defended his view of an *uninterrupted tradition* of liturgy. The form and arrangement favoured by the medieval Church had continued after the Renaissance, he argued, and that

these arrangements for the Church service were universal throughout Christendom. It is no new scheme or system, proposed for trial; it is simply carrying out the practices of the Church for certainly more than fourteen centuries ... from the Basilica of St. Clement’s down to the humblest church of the 17th. century, we shall find the same traditional arrangement.<sup>1193</sup>

---

<sup>1191</sup> *Ibid.*, p.4.

<sup>1192</sup> *Ibid.*, p.4. Possibly a reference to Newman and the Oratorians who favoured the idea of a “Mechanics Institute”.

<sup>1193</sup> *Ibid.*, p.7.

These usages had not therefore been abandoned, argued Pugin, despite the influence of the Renaissance and Reformation and had continued uninterrupted in the same way as the Church and the Faith. Most modern liturgical scholars would not agree with him.

18) Pugin's exposition of the mystical and anagogical levels of meaning.

Pugin attempted a deductive argument. If liturgy was part of Revelation, then ancient churches, like the writings of the New Testament, were prophetic statements imbued with divine power of future events. St Paul saw the relationship between the Church and the Synagogue prefigured in the story of Isaac and Ishmael, and Christ in Adam or the Pascal Lamb. The Early Fathers continued to use this method of interpretation. If God's divine power was revealed in liturgical architecture, thought Pugin, then the ancient liturgists and architects who built the first churches must be instruments of Revelation in the same way as the writers of the Gospels were instruments. Therefore, modern liturgists needed, he said, to study ancient church architecture in order to understand prophetic statements contained within them.

Pugin may have obtained this idea from his study of medieval allegorists. These saw, writes R. M. Grant, that "if they were to maintain that God (or the gods) spoke to men through the writings, they had to hold that revelation was not given simply in events; the poets and prophets who wrote them were themselves instruments of revelation".<sup>1194</sup> The medieval allegorists thus believed that St Paul, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John and the Early Fathers were instruments of Revelation.

---

<sup>1194</sup> R. M. Grant, The Letter and the Spirit (London: S.P.C.K. 1957), p.105.

19) Pugin's exposition of the doctrinal level of meaning.

Pugin believed, like Thiers, that new rites and devotions did not mean discarding any earlier practices and that these had been accommodated in the past without loss. An article appeared in the *Tablet* of 2 February 1850 in support of these views:

We do not wish to deny that any new devotions have been devised. Thanks to our good Mother the Church, in the development of the doctrines entrusted by Christ to her care, she has, in all ages, devised new expressions of the one only feeling - devotion.<sup>1195</sup>

Such a view was not partisan, not deaf to counter evidence or arguments. That new devotions had been devised there was no doubt. But, "What we call in question is, that these new devotions are of such a nature as to entitle them to be used as an argument why 'Catholic churches of the present day ought not to be of the same as those of the middle ages'", said the writer.<sup>1196</sup>

While Pugin welcomed new devotions, he did not want any to "modernise" the Mass:

... when a scheme is actually put forth to abolish the very words of the ancient offices and to reduce the services of Almighty God to the level of the conventicle, I can remain no longer silent.<sup>1197</sup>

He had patently not yet "remained silent", despite his claim. The Mass was supreme, in his view. "What can be more perfect, what more edifying and consoling than the divine office, the compilation of so many saints and glorious men?" he asked. He believed that even the chants of the psalms were those that "penetrated the heart of St Augustine" and they could equally penetrate the hearts of the faithful in the nineteenth century.<sup>1198</sup>

Pugin recognised the popularity of hymn singing and sought to guide such interest in a certain direction. In keeping with his Liberal Ultramontane views, he wanted the five

---

<sup>1195</sup> *The Tablet* (2 February 1850), p.76. Article in the style of Pugin or Frederick Lucas.

<sup>1196</sup> *Ibid.*, p.76.

<sup>1197</sup> Pugin, *An Earnest Appeal for the Revival of the Ancient Plain Song*, p.8.

Gregorian Masses to be taught in schools in order to bring unity to worship. If the people were familiar with these Masses then they could unite “not only in heart, but in *voice*, in the worship of their Creator.”<sup>1199</sup> This could far surpass any methodistical hymn singing, he believed.

20) The quarrel over Cotton Hall.

i) An on-going dispute.

It had been several years since Faber and his followers made the decision to leave Cotton Hall to join the Oratory. Their move had, however, presented them with a continuing problem concerning St Wilfrid’s Church. They wanted to regain the money they had put into it. Newman backed them by attempting to gain £3000 compensation from Lord Shrewsbury for the money they had spent. They seemed to overlook the fact that Lord Shrewsbury had generously given the Wilfridians Cotton Hall, the land on which the church was to be built and he had borrowed the money for the building of the church and arranged his repayments. Moreover, that they had brought the situation on themselves by leaving.

By 1850 the row over compensation was still going on and had reached the courts. Pugin was disgusted and angered at their behaviour as he expressed in a letter to Bloxam in 1850. “But what can you expect from a man<sup>1200</sup> who went to law to recover a gift offered to the Church”,<sup>1201</sup> he commented.<sup>1202</sup>

---

<sup>1198</sup> *Ibid.*, p.9.

<sup>1199</sup> *Ibid.*, p.10.

<sup>1200</sup> A reference to Newman.

<sup>1201</sup> A reference to the generosity of Lord Shrewsbury.

<sup>1202</sup> Pugin to Bloxam (undated c. 1850), MS.528/85, Magdalen College Archives.

21) Development of liturgy as well as doctrine.

The Anglican periodical, *The Christian Remembrancer*, detected a problem for Newman. While he had “committed himself to the Theory of Doctrine, as a rule of the Church’s doctrine and practices”, wrote the editor, “there could hardly be a development of doctrine without its being accompanied by a development of ritual and worship”.<sup>1203</sup> If he believed in his own theory of doctrinal development, then he had to make a stand on liturgical development, the writer suggested.

22) An Earnest Address on the Establishment of the Hierarchy.

i) Initial reaction to the reestablishment of the Hierarchy.

Pugin saw the re-establishment of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in England in 1850 as an important milestone in the revival of Catholicism in England. In the beginning of 1851 he wrote and circulated a pamphlet in support of this titled, An Earnest Address on the Establishment of the Hierarchy. It was a strong endorsement of freedom of the Church from State control which had echoes of Montalembert’s ideal of “A free Church in a free State” and other Liberal Ultramontane cries of “God and Liberty”. Pugin had clearly not abandoned his own Liberal Ultramontane views.

The lack of freedom from State control had caused many problems for the faithful in the past, believed Pugin. He saw parallels in this to the bondage of the Israelites in Egypt.<sup>1204</sup>

The problems in England were, he thought, caused by the State influencing “a corrupt Catholic hierarchy”.<sup>1205</sup> Again this had echoes of the French Liberal Ultramontane view that the Gallican bishops in France had ‘sold out’ to the State. In Pugin’s view, the problems in

---

<sup>1203</sup> Editorial article by Beresford Hope, “Oratorianism and ecclesiology”, *The Christian Remembrancer and Quarterly Review* (January 1851), Vol. XXI, p.157.

<sup>1204</sup> Pugin, An Earnest Address on the Establishment of the Hierarchy (London: Charles Dolman 1851), p.2.

<sup>1205</sup> *Ibid.*, p.2.

England were not caused by Protestantism *per se*. “All this ruin was brought about by the old ecclesiastical authorities, before a single professed Protestant appeared on the scene”, he remarked.<sup>1206</sup> “The great spoiler of Lincoln’s glorious church was”, he said, “not a Protestant fanatic, but Dr. Heneage, the Catholic archdeacon”.<sup>1207</sup> It was essential that the higher clergy were never again placed in this vulnerable position. Since they had been tempted by greed in the past, they should not have State benefactors or patrons, or receive large endowments. “*The only dependable endowment of the church is to be found in the zeal and devotion of the faithful*”.<sup>1208</sup>

While Pugin was critical of the old Catholic hierarchy and some clergy, his treatment of certain High Anglicans was less so: “the name of Hacket and Cosin may awaken a grateful remembrance in a Catholic heart”, he said.<sup>1209</sup> John Hacket (1592-1670), Bishop of Coventry and Litchfield, and John Cosin (1594-1672), Bishop of Durham, who was a great liturgical scholar, are, broadly speaking, grouped with the Laudian school. William Laud (1573-1645), Archbishop of Canterbury, defended the traditional ceremonies and practices of the Church from the Puritans. The Laudian school wished to restore aspects of liturgy that had been lost because of the Reformation. People such as these, Pugin said, had saved Catholic antiquity in England from oblivion.

ii) Real freedom.

Pugin argued, in his An Earnest Address, that if people were truly free in their country then this meant that they also had civil freedom in all respects, including religious freedom.

---

<sup>1206</sup> *Ibid.*, p.4.

<sup>1207</sup> *Ibid.*, p.4.

<sup>1208</sup> *Ibid.*, p.25.

<sup>1209</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12.

From his point of view, it was “not a religious question at all”, but “one of civil freedom”.<sup>1210</sup> Religious freedom “in its full acceptance, is a fundamental principle of the laws by which this country is governed”. Indeed, “the Pope believed England to be the most free and liberal country in the world”,<sup>1211</sup> which had already established “*perfect religious freedom*”.<sup>1212</sup> The evidence for this was that freedom of action had been allowed in setting up the Hierarchy.

In France, there was no such freedom, Pugin claimed. The State paid the ministers of religion and in return, “the temporal authorities expect some voice in the appointment of those who they pay”. This was an example of a form of parliamentary Gallicanism in practice. Fortunately, this was not the situation in England: “*thank God, we receive nothing*”<sup>1213</sup> and this meant complete freedom from State control. This freedom was to be regarded as “*the greatest progress that the age has yet produced*”.<sup>1214</sup> In fact, Pugin anticipated Montalembert’s later (1863) Liberal Ultramontane cry of “A free Church in a free State”.

### 23) The reaction to Pugin’s An Earnest Address.

#### i) Accused of meddling and heresy.

Wiseman received several private letters of complaint about Pugin’s publication and wrote to him about the accusations that he had received. Pugin replied in February 1851 to assure him that his views were completely orthodox and to say that he was “excessively grieved that any pain should have been felt”. Moreover, he was entirely prepared to withdraw

---

<sup>1210</sup> *Ibid.*, p.17.

<sup>1211</sup> *Ibid.*, p.17.

<sup>1212</sup> *Ibid.*, p.17.

<sup>1213</sup> *Ibid.*, p.17.

<sup>1214</sup> *Ibid.*, p.18.

anything that Wiseman considered heretical. Nevertheless, he claimed the right to speak on historical points and to form judgements on them.<sup>1215</sup>

Pugin stated that he was not against proselytising, particularly of Anglicans. Would anyone, he asked, “dare to affirm that I defend anyone *convinced* of Catholic truth remaining separated one hour from unity, or the obedience of those pastors holding jurisdiction from the Holy See”.<sup>1216</sup> What Pugin considered to be only “great charity and sympathy towards those of my separated brethren” and encouragement to move towards Catholicism was later taken up and distorted by *The Rambler* as a defence of the Church of England and as “sympathies with the Anglican heresy”.<sup>1217</sup>

Because he had encouraged Anglicans to move towards Catholicism did not mean, Pugin argued, that he was supporting their views. He merely followed in the footsteps of Bishop John Milner, the great Catholic controversialist, who was not considered a heretic simply because he “defended the real doctrines of the Church of England against the insidious and latitudinarian principles of Hoadley (sic)”.<sup>1218</sup> Milner had argued, “I wish to prevent them from frittering away their religion and launching into latitudinarianism”. But, said Pugin, “no one has ever accused Dr. Milner of *justifying the Anglican Schism*, or maintaining heretical doctrines” by this expression.<sup>1219</sup>

Wiseman took no further action.

---

<sup>1215</sup> Pugin to Wiseman, MS W3/43:9a, Westminster Diocesan Archives (c.1851).

<sup>1216</sup> Pugin, Copy of a letter Addressed to ‘The Tablet’ Newspaper (15 March 1851), p.2, from the publication of February 1851 in *The Tablet*.

<sup>1217</sup> *The Rambler* (July 1851), p.45. A note by the editor Capes following the article “Churches versus Rooms”.

<sup>1218</sup> The Latitudinarian Bishop Benjamin Hoadly (1676-1761).

<sup>1219</sup> Pugin, Copy of a Letter, p.3.

24) Pugin defended his orthodoxy.

i) The Catholic Church in France let down by its clergy.

“I have shown that great abuses existed in the English church long before the schism”, Pugin said.<sup>1220</sup> Even before the Reformation, the clergy had been corrupted by State influences. This was as true for France before the Revolution as it was for England before the Reformation. “France was a *Catholic country* and there were no Protestants at all to be seen or heard; but there were *infidels on every side*, men who *believed nothing*, but *conformed to everything*”.<sup>1221</sup> These Catholic clergymen, seeking favours and riches from the State, were responsible for infidelity and unbelief. And, “in an incredibly brief space, this *exclusively Catholic Country* publicly denies – what? Some articles of faith? No; the *very existence of a God*”.<sup>1222</sup> He saw the Revolution as the destruction of Christianity and a Christian society.

Pugin went on to name those French Catholic cardinals and first ministers he thought responsible - Armand-Jean du Plessis Richelieu (1585-1642),<sup>1223</sup> whom the Benedictines staunchly opposed because of his attitude to religion,<sup>1224</sup> Jules Mazarin (1602-1661),<sup>1225</sup> Guillaume Dubois (1656-1723)<sup>1226</sup> and Charles Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord (1754-1838).<sup>1227</sup> The Jesuits supported them all. Yet, Talleyrand was attracted to the works of Montesquieu, Voltaire and other writers who had undermined the authority of the *ancien régime*, both in the Church and the State. All were treacherous and cruel, thought Pugin. He could see no good in them for he believed them to be against the Catholic Church and

---

<sup>1220</sup> Pugin, An Earnest Address, p.15.

<sup>1221</sup> *Ibid.*, p.29.

<sup>1222</sup> *Ibid.*, p.16.

<sup>1223</sup> *Ibid.*, p.26.

<sup>1224</sup> Dom Yves Chaussy, Les Bénédictines, p.391. My own translation from the French.

<sup>1225</sup> Pugin, An Earnest Address, p.26.

<sup>1226</sup> *Ibid.*, p.26

<sup>1227</sup> *Ibid.*, p.27.

responsible for the destruction of Christianity in France. Therefore, they were utterly contemptible in his view.

ii) A letter in defence of his views.

Pugin believed that he was working for the Church in a completely orthodox manner. In his Copy of a letter Addressed to 'The Tablet' Newspaper on 15 March 1851 he stated, "I defy any man to show that I have ever put forth anything contrary to Catholic doctrine, or that I have been guilty of any breach of Discipline, or compromised any Catholic practice, since the day of my reconciliation to Catholic unity and authority".<sup>1228</sup> In fact, he was an orthodox Roman Catholic of the extreme right.

25) Support for the Oratorians.

i) The periodicals.

By March 1851, it was widely accepted that *The Rambler* was voicing Oratorian views. *The New-York Ecclesiologist* took this for granted. No doubt was expressed about its allegiance when referring to their article on "Town Churches" since the title chosen by *The New-York Ecclesiologist* was "*Mr. Pugin's comments on the Oratorian model church*".<sup>1229</sup>

By May 1851, Newman was forced to ask Capes to put in a disclaimer in *The Rambler*.<sup>1230</sup> In response, Capes drafted an article denying any connection with the Oratorians.<sup>1231</sup> He asked Newman for his comments and approval before its publication. Newman replied on 11 May 1851, "The Paragraph will do very well. I think you might add two or three words to it for greater distinction - Look at my pencil marks; if possible, I should

---

<sup>1228</sup> Pugin, Copy of a letter, p.3.

<sup>1229</sup> *The New York Ecclesiologist*, Vol. 3 (March 1851), pp.55-58.

<sup>1230</sup> Dessain, ed., Letters and Diaries Vol. XIV, p.276. Newman to Capes 6 May 1851.

<sup>1231</sup> *Ibid.*, p.279, footnote. See also Capes' note to *The Rambler* (June 1851), p.452.

like the word influence, suggestion, inspiration (as our neighbours say) or some similar term, to be introduced".<sup>1232</sup>

The *Christian Remembrancer* in 1851 suggested that the Oratorians were "anti-primitive" because they conformed to "modern Romanism" and this was "symbolized by their actual ritualism".<sup>1233</sup>

Pugin's position still appeared safe. He still had Catholic lay support as *The Catholic Standard* made clear in an encouraging and sympathetic article:

If Mr. Pugin attaches too much importance to rood-lofts and pointed arches, do not the Oratorian school go as far in support of gaudy paintings, festoonery, and candlesticks? If medievalism be, as alleged by the review (*The Dublin Review*) "forced upon our people, however reluctant to accept it", are not the advocates of the Italian school equally open to the same charge? But where is the evidence of the reluctance of the people to the revival of medieval architecture and ecclesiology?<sup>1234</sup>

People were not reluctant to support Pugin; indeed, many enthusiastically supported him – at least as far as the Gothic revival was concerned. However, *The Rambler* of July 1851 commented, "there can be no doubt that his pamphlet would be placed on the *Index* if delated to Rome".<sup>1235</sup>

---

<sup>1232</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.279-280. Newman to Capes (11 May 1851).

<sup>1233</sup> Editorial article by Beresford Hope, "Oratorians and Ecclesiology", *The Christian Remembrancer and Quarterly Review* (1851), p.148.

<sup>1234</sup> *The Catholic Standard*, Vol. IV, No. 83 (10 May 1851), p.8.

<sup>1235</sup> *The Rambler* (July 1851), p.46.

## Chapter Eight - THE SCREENS CONTROVERSY

1) Chancel screens part of medieval liturgical arrangement.

i) Pugin's defence.

Since 1847, the converts had not accepted what they thought was his exclusive Gothicism: "at first they did not exhibit any repugnance to pointed churches", he recollected.<sup>1236</sup> But, he continued, "they speedily developed other propensities and ideas, and latterly have exhibited symptoms almost similar to hydrophobia at the sight, or even mention, of pointed arches or pillars."<sup>1237</sup> This was, thought Pugin, very probably "a case of pure development",<sup>1238</sup> thus indirectly accusing Newman. The Oratorians rejected medieval usages and practices. They had continually argued against the retention of screens as representing these. Pugin defended his views in his A Treatise on Chancel screens and rood lofts: their antiquity, use and symbolic signification (1851).

By this time, the disagreement between Pugin and the Oratorians had become completely partisan. The battle was between "tradition and reverence against modern development and display".<sup>1239</sup> Each thought they were right and the other side was wrong. They had both become deaf to counter arguments and counter evidence.

ii) Arguments against changing medieval to Roman liturgical form and arrangement.

By changing the liturgical form and arrangement to suit "new" devotions, the times or modern innovations, thought Pugin, it denigrated the Mass. According to his authority, Thiers, the idea of pulling down screens was not a new one. A small faction had pulled down

---

<sup>1236</sup> Pugin, A Treatise on Chancel Screens and Rood Lofts: Their Antiquity, Use and Symbolic Signification (London: Charles Dolman 1851), p.98.

<sup>1237</sup> *Ibid.*, p.98.

<sup>1238</sup> *Ibid.* p.98.

screens in the early centuries and they were called “Ambonoclasts”. Pugin employed the same terminology and wrote a chapter in his Treatise on “The Four Classes of Ambonoclasts” – “The Calvinist Ambonoclast”, “The Pagan Ambonoclast”, “The Revolutionary Ambonoclast” and “The Modern Ambonoclast”. Pugin said that a similar faction had surfaced amongst the clergy in France in the eighteenth century according to Thiers.<sup>1240</sup>

Thiers argued that both early and eighteenth-century Ambonoclasts were against the ancient practices and ceremonies of the Early Church, against the discipline of the Church, against its usages and practices, and its tradition, authority and reason.<sup>1241</sup> Moreover, by recklessly pulling down screens they notably changed the form of the church: “ils changent notablement la forme des Eglises”.<sup>1242</sup>

Ambonoclasts also changed aspects of worship and destroyed traditional devotions. Those who pulled down screens took the blame for abolishing the memory of one of the most majestic, most ancient and most mysterious ceremonies of the Church - the *Evangile* (chanting of the Gospels from the roodloft)<sup>1243</sup> - as well as other ceremonies, said Father Thiers.<sup>1244</sup> A characteristic of Ambonoclasts was that they completely opposed traditional ceremonies such as the *Evangile* - “Les Ambonoclastes ont pris une route toute opposée”.<sup>1245</sup> The faithful should have respect for the “anciennes Cérémonies de l’Eglise”<sup>1246</sup> because “they contain great mysteries; they are praiseworthy when one knows their background and spirit;

---

<sup>1239</sup> *Ibid.*, p.3.

<sup>1240</sup> *Ibid.*, p.1.

<sup>1241</sup> J. B. Thiers, Les Jubés des Eglises in Dissertations Ecclesiastiques (Paris: Antine Dezallier 1688), pp.231-232. (My own translation from the French).

<sup>1242</sup> *Ibid.*, p.235.

<sup>1243</sup> *Ibid.*, p.169. The “*Evangile*” was the chanting of the Gospels. The word “*Evangile*” is derived from the Greek word “*Evangelion*” meaning “*Gospel*”.

<sup>1244</sup> *Ibid.*, p.168. My own translation from the French.

<sup>1245</sup> *Ibid.*, p.231.

<sup>1246</sup> *Ibid.*, Ch. XXVI, p. 226.

they elevate our thoughts to God, increase awareness of our sacred religion and help maintain our piety at all times".<sup>1247</sup>

Thiers, consequently, thought screens were important in preserving traditional devotions and ceremonies and that their use was very ancient.

2) Pugin's exposition of allegorical meaning in his A Treatise on Chancel Screens.

3) His exposition of the historical level of meaning.

i) Christian origins.

Pugin sought to find the pattern of rood screens, the tradition of their use and practice, and their relationship to theology and doctrine. Most importantly to him, he sought to trace their origins at least back to the Early Church and to divine Revelation. While the Scriptures might not mention screens explicitly, it was sufficient if he could prove that they were implied, as he had earlier suggested. This was partly a belated response to Ward's argument in 1848 that screens were obsolete. Thus, the Early Church practices of falling down in awe and not being able to look upon God, of veils and the *Disciplina Arcani* all, to Pugin, implied the use of screens without the Gospels specifically mentioning them.

Screens, he said, were simply not restricted to the medieval period or to England or to any particular style for

their use was universal, they commenced many centuries *before the introduction of pointed architecture*, and *they have survived its decline*; in fact, they belong to the first principles of Catholic *reverence and order*, and *not to any particular style*.<sup>1248</sup>

Most modern liturgists would disagree with him since they are doubtful about the universal and continuous use of screens and their use in the Early Church.

---

<sup>1247</sup> *Ibid.*, p.226.

<sup>1248</sup> Pugin, A Treatise on Chancel Screens, p.100.

ii) Pugin's liturgical and historical sources and authorities.

In his Treatise on Chancel Screens, Pugin consulted French, Italian and English liturgists and ecclesiastical historians, as well as a number of other sources, including historical records. As part of his argument he took as broad a spectrum of usage as he was able and he drew upon his own first-hand knowledge of churches and cathedrals in England and the Continent in order to give a greater probability that his argument was correct; his research was not, therefore, restricted to England, but included study of many Continental screens. He also studied and considered each period in order to determine the common factor and the pattern of use.

iii) The French liturgists.

Pugin's principal authorities were again Le Brun and J. B. Thiers. He referred to Thiers' Traité de l'Exposition du S. Sacrament de l'Autel (c.1700), 2 vols., Dissertation sur les Principaux Autels des Eglises (1688), and Dissertation des Jubés des Eglises (c.1700), which were all volumes of his major work Dissertations Ecclesiastiques. Some modern liturgists would judge several of Thiers' claims as dubious, although he backed them up with reliable authorities.

In accordance with his methodology, Pugin researched the history of the separation of the chancel and nave, and the use of screens. His researches covered the Early Church, the Saxon, medieval, pre- and post Reformation periods as well as reference to seventeenth- and eighteenth-century churches and cathedrals. His authority on Early Church usage on the enclosure of the choir and the separation of the choir from the nave was Thiers' Sur le Clôture des Choers (c. 1700). From the chapter headed "Of the Enclosure of Choirs" Thiers wrote there was not much information on separation of the nave and chancel in the first three centuries. "Yet the Apostle St Paul, Tertullian, St Irene, Origen, and Eusebius all mention

that this was so, and Cardinal Baronius gives very convincing proof".<sup>1249</sup> Nevertheless, he admitted some doubt remained concerning the origin of screens.

Pugin also appealed extensively to Thiers' Dissertation des Jubés des Eglises. Thiers began with Early Church usage, including examples of screens in the ancient Christian basilicas such as St Sophia in Constantinople. Roodscreens, he suggested, were usually called galleries, desks and sometimes lecterns or *doxales*.<sup>1250</sup> The ancient Latins gave other names to screens. They sometimes called them *Pluteus* and *Pluteum*, *Letricium*, *Lectorium* and *Legitorium*, *Analogius* and *Analogium*<sup>1251</sup> because it was where the people who preached and chanted stood. His authorities for this were Origen (c.185-c.254) and St Cyprian of Carthage (c. 200–d.258) of the Latin North African Church. However, Thiers said that there were more references to “balustrades” than to screens in ancient works. He asked, “Were the choirs then closed by high walls or low balustrades?” There was proof, he argued, that the balustrades were high, like screens and were, in fact, screens. The proof was that they had tapestries or veils hanging from them; they had stairs<sup>1252</sup> and they had doors – three in the larger churches, one in the smaller.<sup>1253</sup> One of his authorities was Durandus who wrote about the first centuries of the Church.<sup>1254</sup> Durandus, in turn, referred to Eusebius (c.260-c.340), the “Father of Church History”. Most modern liturgists believe that in Byzantine churches the screen was originally a low barrier, sometimes surmounted by columns joined by a decorated parapet and coping and that only since the fourteenth century has it presented the form of an iconostasis with a solid wall of wood or stone and pierced by three doors.

---

<sup>1249</sup> J. B. Thiers, Dissertation sur la Clôture du Choeur des Eglises, p.2, article I, in Dissertations Ecclesiastiques. My own translation from the French. This was a dubious claim.

<sup>1250</sup> Thiers, Dissertation sur des Jubés des Eglises, Ch. 1, p.1. This was also a dubious claim since galleries, desks and lecterns may have actually existed.

<sup>1251</sup> *Ibid.*, p.3.

<sup>1252</sup> *Ibid.*, p.26.

<sup>1253</sup> *Ibid.*, p.19.

<sup>1254</sup> *Ibid.*, p.27.

Thiers, however, used further authorities to support his argument on the use of screens in the Early churches and basilicas. He appealed mostly to the Eastern rather than the Western Church, indicating that he did not see these two branches of the Catholic Church as having separate traditions. His earliest authority was the fourth-century George of Cappadocia, Archbishop of Alexandria from 357 to 361, St John Chrysostom (347-407), followed by the fifth-century St Flavian, the Patriarch of Constantinople (d. 449) and the sixth-century Paul the Silent<sup>1255</sup> whose chief work was a hymn to mark the consecration of Santa Sophia at Constantinople in 562. It gave a full architectural description of the church, including its screen. Modern architectural historians, like Richard Krautheimer, also refer to Paul the Silent as an authority on the screen in Santa Sophia.

W. R. Lethaby and Harold Swainson translated Paul the Silent's poem in their The Church of Sancta Sophia Constantinople: a Study of Byzantine Building (1894). Paul the Silent wrote about the eastern arch being "all fenced with silver metal"<sup>1256</sup> and also of "the middle panels of the sacred screen, which forms the barrier with the priests ... through the triple doors the screen opens to the priests".<sup>1257</sup> Further examination of his account, however, suggests that Santa Sophia had a low screen or balustrade surmounted by six pairs of columns, which Paul the Silent described as the silvered columned screen with rood above separating the altar area from the choir<sup>1258</sup> and the nave where the main body of the worshippers was assembled.<sup>1259</sup> He said that lamps and pictures were hung on this screen during festivals (by the Middle Ages the pictures remained permanently), which suggests that

---

<sup>1255</sup> *Ibid.*, p.25.

<sup>1256</sup> W. R. Lethaby and Harold Swainson, The Church of Sancta Sophia Constantinople: A Study of Byzantine Building (London: New York Macmillan & Co., 1894), p.46.

<sup>1257</sup> *Ibid.*, p.47. It should be noted that Lethaby and Swainson have used the sub-heading 'Iconostasis' for clarity or convenience, but this term was not used by Paul the Silent.

<sup>1258</sup> *Ibid.*, p.47, footnote.

<sup>1259</sup> *Ibid.*, p.38, Fig. 5.

this was more than a balustrade in the modern sense.<sup>1260</sup> Indeed, he referred to it as a screen and compared it to the screen of the old St Peter's, Rome.<sup>1261</sup> Although it had three doors, the central or Holy Door for admittance to the altar, and those on the right and left respectively to the diaconicon and the prothesis, it is more likely that it was a balustrade surmounted by columns, which could form a screen at times when paintings were hung from the beam above these columns.<sup>1262</sup>

Another sixth-century authority that Thiers used for evidence of screens was Gregory of Tours (c. 540-94) and his hagiographical Miaculorum Libri.<sup>1263</sup> A seventh-century authority he used was St Germanus of Constantinople who wrote a treatise that fostered the cult of the Blessed Virgin Mary titled De haeresibus et synodis. Yet again, Thiers cited M. du Cange and his Commentary for more information on early screens.<sup>1264</sup>

Thiers wrote that early writers constantly mentioned the screen of St Sophia because it was more magnificent than any other was. The basilica's liturgical form and arrangement, including its screen, were not original to that church, he said, but copied well-established uses and practices.

Pugin, therefore, warned the modern reader to be wary of the meaning of the term "balustrade" which had changed from that understood in the ancient documents. He was, of course, dependent on what scholarship was available to him at the time. Most modern liturgists regard the low balustrade as a development in history. Screens, too, must be viewed in this light.

---

<sup>1260</sup> *Ibid.*, p.51.

<sup>1261</sup> *Ibid.*, p.74.

<sup>1262</sup> K. Holl, "Die Entstehung der Bilderwand in der griechischen Kirche", *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, 9 (1906), pp. 365-84 and J. Walter, AA, "The Origins of the Iconostasis", *Eastern Churches Review*, 3 (1971), pp. 251-67.

<sup>1263</sup> Thiers, Dissertation Sur Les Jubés, p.17.

<sup>1264</sup> *Ibid.*, p.10.

4) Pugin's exposition of the practical level of meaning in his A Treatise on Chancel Screens.

i) A broad spectrum of examples.

Despite the aesthetic appeal and agreeable architectural style of medieval churches, the promotion of the Gothic or the beautiful for its own sake was irrelevant and even abhorrent to Pugin. Liturgical architecture, symbolised by screens had, he thought, attained the "greatest beauty in the mediæval period",<sup>1265</sup> which was due to a high standard of Catholicity, conformity to the "pattern" and because the study of traditional usages was extensive at that time.

Pugin sought to argue by example, as well as by authority, in this work. His examples were not restricted to the medieval period or any one country. He included in his Treatise more than one hundred churches, cathedrals and collegiate chapels from all ages of the Christian Church and spread throughout Western Europe, most of which he had studied at first hand, in order to determine the pattern that they followed.

ii) Liturgical form and arrangement.

Pugin argued that the "most holy sacrifice", the Mass, required a sacred place separated from the less sacred portion of the church: "it is but natural that the place where this most holy sacrifice is to be offered up, should be set apart and railed off from less sacred portions of the church, and we find this to have been the case in all ages, in all styles, and in all countries professing the Catholic faith down to a comparatively recent period".<sup>1266</sup> The purpose of screens was to "exclude unauthorized persons from the sacred enclosures".<sup>1267</sup> He continued, "practically, they prevent any irreverence or intrusion in the sacred places at those

---

<sup>1265</sup> Pugin, Treatise, p. 11.

<sup>1266</sup> *Ibid.*, p.3. Pugin was here referring to the Rule of St. Vincent of Lerins.

times when no celebration or office is going on".<sup>1268</sup> Moreover, "it is a natural principle to enclose any portion of a building or space which is set apart from public use and access".<sup>1269</sup>

This "first principle of Catholic *reverence and order*" had been the custom down all the centuries, he claimed, and the principle did not belong "to any particular style" or age.<sup>1270</sup> Screens were an essential part of Catholic arrangement "for one is inseparable from the other, and *more*, inseparable from *Catholic arrangement in any style*, Byzantine, Norman, Pointed, or debased".<sup>1271</sup> This was surely proof yet again that Pugin was not guilty of simple medieval reconstructionism. In fact, it proves the opposite. He was drawing on historical evidence.

### iii) Types and materials of screens.

There were two types of screens, Pugin explained. One for parochial churches, the other for monasteries and the like. The first required an open screen of metal or brass grilles or trellis-work (the *Opere reticulato*) on top of dwarf marble walls. Open screens of metal, stone, marble or wood were placed in front of chancels, choirs, side chapels, and altars.<sup>1272</sup>

Pugin referred to Thiers, who

in his treatise, *Sur le Cloture (sic) des Choeurs*, it will be seen that open screens existed from the earliest erection of churches, and that they were composed of wood or metal, most frequently brass.<sup>1273</sup>

The second type was the medieval solid or close screen made of stone which divided, cathedrals, monasteries and college chapels into two, wrote Pugin. Medieval buildings were not initially built for public worship, Pugin said, but for monastic purposes. Solid screens

---

<sup>1267</sup> *Ibid.*, p.9.

<sup>1268</sup> *Ibid.*, p.12.

<sup>1269</sup> *Ibid.*, p.9.

<sup>1270</sup> *Ibid.*, p.11.

<sup>1271</sup> *Ibid.*, p.3.

<sup>1272</sup> *Ibid.*,p.11.

were meant for the comfort of ecclesiastics during long hours of prayer as well as for carrying out various devotions. Typical of this type of screen was the marble screen at the early Christian basilica of St Nerei and Achille, Rome. It was about seven feet high “cut like a panelled wall”.<sup>1274</sup>

Unlike the parochial churches with their open screens, cathedrals with their solid screens were unsuitable for lay worship and were never intended to serve them. David L. Edwards confirms, “The laity were not allowed to enter some cathedrals that were monastic”.

Pugin conceded that solid screens were unsuitable for worship after the Council of Trent and the change of discipline regarding Exposition. Close screens, he said, “are certainly most unsuitable for any churches to be erected in this country under existing circumstances”.<sup>1275</sup> He was against solid screens in modern cathedrals, even though they were medieval and Gothic, because the laity worshipped in them.

The laity were never allowed in the chancel or choir or to approach the high altar or altars in side chapels of medieval churches and cathedrals. They had a subsidiary altar placed in the nave from which the consecrated elements were administered, the consecration having already taken place at the high altar. One of Pugin’s authorities for this separation of the laity from the ecclesiastics was Robert Willis (1800-1875) about Gervase, a twelfth-century monk, who wrote that in Canterbury Cathedral “the choir of the singers was extended westward into the body (aula) of the church, and shut out from the multitude by a proper enclosure”.<sup>1276</sup> Willis says that the plan and arrangement of the Saxon Cathedral of Canterbury (pulled down 1070) was built as a replica of old St Peter’s, Rome, with apse, transept, high central aisle and

---

<sup>1273</sup> *Ibid.*, p.16.

<sup>1274</sup> Pugin, Treatise, p.26. Pugin said he took this from five illustrations in Monumenti della Religione Cristiana, an unidentified Italian work.

<sup>1275</sup> *Ibid.*, p.10.

<sup>1276</sup> Robert Willis, Architectural History of Canterbury Cathedral (London: Longman & Co. 1845), p.11, see also Fig. 45. Ch. I includes a translation of Gervase’s tract “On the burning and repair of the

two lesser aisles either side.<sup>1277</sup> The replica screen was formed by “twelve columns of Parian marble, arranged in rows ... Their bases were connected by lattice work of metal, or by walls of marble, breast high”<sup>1278</sup>

Screens were made from different materials, had different forms and were placed in different positions, stated Pugin. He referred to Thiers on this as well as to his own first-hand experience.<sup>1279</sup> Many were made of wood, wrote Thiers, particularly in parish towns, hamlets and villages.<sup>1280</sup> But the Cathedral of Beauvais had a screen of wood and marble. He said that Cardinal Lèon, Bishop of Ostie, reported:

Those of stone are the most common, but some are plain. The others have ornate sculptures, others are embellished with paintings and decorations, others have murals and yet others balustrades. Some are in white marble like that of St Clement in Rome; others are of pale marble such as that of St Saviour of Ravenna; others are of marble of various colours, like that of St Jean of Lyon. The Emperor Justinian approached a screen in St Sophia of Constantinople that was made of alabaster.<sup>1281</sup>

iv) Rood screens part of liturgical arrangement.

Pugin again consulted Thiers who wrote that rood lofts had two or four stairs. The lofts were used for preaching and, rather whimsically, he said that St Augustine preached on the rood loft extracts from his City of God, which he mentioned in that work as “*In gradibus exedre...feci stare ambos fratres*”.<sup>1282</sup> St Cyprian, who lived in the third century also

---

Church of Canterbury”.

<sup>1277</sup> *Ibid.*, p.20.

<sup>1278</sup> *Ibid.*, p.22, See Fig. 1 and Fig. 2.

<sup>1279</sup> Thiers, Dissertation Sur Les Jubés, Ch. III, pp.16-31.

<sup>1280</sup> *Ibid.*, p.16.

<sup>1281</sup> *Ibid.*, p.17.

<sup>1282</sup> *Ibid.*, p.35. Cited from St John Chrysostom's Epistle of St John. Possibly this is a reference to stairs to a pulpit. Thiers takes “ambo” as meaning “rood-loft”.

allegedly spoke of the rood screen as the joy of all the faithful, “d’être entendu du Jubé avec la joie de tous les fidèles”<sup>1283</sup>.

Screens had become a symbol for different views about liturgy. Pugin believed that faith and liturgy were unchanging because they came from God. The Oratorians believed that, while the fundamentals of faith were unchanging, other aspects of faith should and did change. Both views were expressed under the pretext of an argument about screens.

Pugin wrote bitterly, “we have a class of men to oppose the revival of ancient symbolism... the past is to them a nullity”<sup>1284</sup>.

#### 5) Pugin’s exposition of the theological level of meaning.

##### i) Revelation.

Pugin contended that there were theological reasons for liturgical form and arrangement. It has previously been argued that he believed liturgy, like the Bible, was part of Revelation. In his A Treatise on Chancel Screens he repeated his claim. Liturgy was “a revelation made by the mercy of God”:

Then the chancel, with its stilled quire seen through the traceried panels of the sculptured screen, above which, in solemn majesty, rises the great event of our redemption, treated after a glorified and mystical manner, the ignominious cross of punishment changed into the budding tree of life, while, the tessellated pavement to the sculptured roof, every detail sets forth some beautiful and symbolic design; how would such a fabric strike to the heart of a devout soul, seeking for the realization of ancient solemnities! And is it not a case of gross infatuation for men professing the old faith to reject what we may truly imagine to be a revelation made by the mercy of God for the consolation of his servants upon earth, and to turn back to the old vomit of Pagan design, associated only with the infernal orgies of false gods and heathen corruptions?<sup>1285</sup>

Again, “his servants upon earth” refer to the faithful, not potential converts.

---

<sup>1283</sup> *Ibid.*, p.170.

<sup>1284</sup> Pugin, A Treatise, p.100.

ii) The altar, too, was an essential part of traditional liturgical form and arrangement.

Pugin considered the importance of the altar as part of traditional liturgical form and arrangement. The connection of the altar with theology was perhaps more obvious than that of screens, so he used them to demonstrate his point. This was the place where the Lord's presence could certainly be found in the church; "the divine presence abiding among men: *ecce tabernaculum Dei cum hominibus*", he stated.<sup>1286</sup> Pugin referred to Thiers for his perception that the ancient Fathers had all believed the altar to be sacred.<sup>1287</sup>

6) Pugin's exposition of the doctrinal level of meaning.

i) An uninterrupted tradition.

Pugin went back to his argument that screens, as part of liturgy, could demonstrate an uninterrupted tradition. After the sixteenth century the medieval liturgical arrangement of churches continued, he argued, despite calls by a minority for changes. Even when the favoured style was neo-Classical or Baroque the principles remained intact. Moreover, he argued:

The traditions of the church, as regards the *disposition* and *arrangement* of ecclesiastical buildings in the northern countries, do not appear to have been much affected by the revived paganism of the sixteenth century; the details were debased and incongruous, but the *things* remained unaltered *in principle*, - rood lofts were erected, choirs were stalled, cruciform churches, with aisles and lateral and lady chapels, and transepts, were the general type followed, and screens for choirs, side chapels, and altars were universal.<sup>1288</sup>

It was important for him to establish the unchanging and continuous nature of every part of liturgy if, as he argued, it was given by God.

---

<sup>1285</sup> Pugin, A Treatise, p.108.

<sup>1286</sup> *Ibid.*, p.107.

<sup>1287</sup> J. B. Thiers, Dissertation sur Les Principaux Autels des Eglises in Dissertations Ecclesiastiques, Ch. 1, p.2. Thiers referenced his sources to all the early Fathers, e.g. "*In Liturgia ipsi tributa and L. de Templo & Missa*". (My own translation from the French).

<sup>1288</sup> Pugin, Treatise on Chancel Screens, pp.1- 2.

ii) Catholic arrangement in other styles.

Pugin said that even some churches built in the neo-Classical style in Paris such as St Eustache, St Roch and St Sulpice were “constructed on Catholic traditions”<sup>1289</sup> and “are adapted by their *arrangements* for the celebration of Catholic rites”.<sup>1290</sup> All had screens and all, he said, were

*cruciform, choral, and absidal, with aisles and chapels, a clerestorey, and vaulting supported by flying buttresses, and the latter [St Sulpice] has even two great western towers for bells.*<sup>1291</sup>

Even the chapels with altars had screens, he believed. Some modern liturgists would cast doubt on this.

iii) The importance of the Mass.

Pugin reiterated that the Eucharist or Mass was all-important and had always been performed under respectful conditions and where possible in appropriate surroundings. All the other sacraments and doctrines stemmed from it and helped to reinforce its vital importance because

so sacred, so awful(sic), so mysterious is the sacrifice of the mass, that if men were seriously to reflect on what it really consists, so far from advocating mere rooms for its celebration, they would hasten to restore the reverential arrangements of Catholic antiquity.<sup>1292</sup>

The Mass was, he thought, the principal sacrament and therefore the principal celebration of the Church. He continually emphasised its importance. The Eucharistic mystery was also very important to the old Order of Benedictines and had a large place in their devotions, indeed, it was the principal celebration in all their monasteries. Dom Yves

---

<sup>1289</sup> *Ibid.*, p.2, footnote.

<sup>1290</sup> *Ibid.*, p.2, footnote.

<sup>1291</sup> *Ibid.*, p.2, footnote.

<sup>1292</sup> *Ibid.*, p.7.

Chaussy says that in order to celebrate the Eucharist in the way they wished, the Benedictines maintained the traditional and medieval character of their abbeys.<sup>1293</sup> The Benedictine Le Brun was the authority that Pugin quoted:

“There is no higher act in the Christian religion,” says Father Le Brun, “than the Sacrifice of the Mass; the greater portion of the other sacraments, and nearly all the offices and ceremonies of the church, are only the means or preparation to celebrate or participate in it worthily.”<sup>1294</sup>

The ceremony of the Mass represented vital doctrines - Redemption, by the saving grace of the body and blood of Jesus Christ; the Trinity, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, were one in the consecrated Host; Resurrection, the faithful were given hope of the life to come by becoming part of the body of Christ. Pugin, like all Catholics, believed in the Real Presence; Almighty God Himself made flesh in Jesus Christ, was present in the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist. This was, “our blessed Lord truly present and abiding in the temple in the holy sacrament of the altar”.<sup>1295</sup> His belief was similar to the Benedictine devotion to “La vie de Jésus-Christ dans le sacrement des autels”.<sup>1296</sup> Thiers’ idea of the Mass also accorded with the Decree of the Council of Trent.<sup>1297</sup> Here there was no difference between Pugin, his authorities or his opponents.

iv) Church discipline regarding the use of screens.

Pugin expanded on his interpretation of Church discipline regarding “sight” of the Blessed Sacrament; this really concerned Exposition. His principal authority on this was again Thiers who explained that two different stages of understanding occurred in the Church

---

<sup>1293</sup> Dom Yves Chaussy, *Les Benedictines*, p.411.

<sup>1294</sup> Pugin, *A Treatise*, p.3. Quote from Father Le Brun.

<sup>1295</sup> *Ibid.*, p.7.

<sup>1296</sup> Dom Yves Chaussy, *Les Bénédictines*, p.401.

<sup>1297</sup> The Council of Trent, Par. 7, Session XXII. Canon 1164. *Decree on the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass* – available in the library of Father R. Ombres OD at Blackfriars, Oxford.

regarding the consecrated Host. This had a serious effect on Church discipline. There were two main differences between the old custom and the medieval, wrote Thiers:

In the Early Church the Eucharist was hidden from view because those in authority in the Church were cautious and fearful; they believed that it was a sin to look at the Sacrament because of its formidable and awesome nature. If Almighty God was present, who could look on God? While there was nothing more familiar in the early Church than the celebration of the Eucharist in the first centuries, there was nothing that had more respect from Christians. But even this familiarity did not authorise them to view the Exposition of the Sacred Sacrament. The ancient Fathers believed that sight of the consecrated Host required a state of grace, careful and grand arrangements regarding the celebration of the divine Mysteries, and, lastly, that it was offensive to God for sinners to view it.<sup>1298</sup>

Thiers said that a change of discipline on Exposition occurred during the late medieval period. The Scholastic theologians, contrary to the ancient Fathers, argued that sinners could view the Sacred Sacrament without incurring further sin and therefore should see it because it gave them great benefit. They were thus in favour of encouraging Exposition. Thiers was against frequent Exposition because he thought it decreased reverence to God.<sup>1299</sup>

The Roman Catholic Hierarchy decided that there were great advantages in having a view of the consecrated Host because they thought the extreme charity of Jesus Christ who died for sinners would extend to all. This caused the Church to reconsider its discipline on this point.<sup>1300</sup> After studying the passages of the Early Fathers and the many treatises on this subject by the Scholastic theologians, including the works of Alexander of Hales, his two disciples, Saint Thomas and Saint Bonaventure, William Durandus of St Pourçain, Bp. of

---

<sup>1298</sup> J. B. Thiers, Sur l'Exposition du S. Sacrement de l'autel (Avignon: Louis Chambeau 1777), Vol. VI, Book 1, p.7 "Table of Chapters, reference to Ch. XXII", pp.206-207. This described the *Disciplina Arcani*.

<sup>1299</sup> J. B. Thiers, Sur l'Exposition du S. Sacrement de l'autel, Vol. VI, pp.7, 208.

<sup>1300</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. VI, Book 1, p.208.

Mieux, and other Scholastics, the Roman Catholic Hierarchy came to a decision to change discipline regarding Exposition – sight of the Eucharist could only be beneficial.

Thiers appealed to St Bonaventure (c.1217 – 1274), an Italian Franciscan monk and theologian, who remained faithful to the tradition which derived from St Augustine. St Bonaventure concluded that sight of the Eucharist was salutary.

Thiers fully accepted the change in discipline; he thought it a good thing. He asked, “Is it not the enemies of true religion who can discover badness in the sight of the Blessed Sacrament on the altar and in public Processions?”<sup>1301</sup> Given his acceptance of the change in discipline regarding Exposition it might be expected that he would also accept the argument that rood screens, chancels, separation of the clergy from the laity, even aisles and obscuring pillars in churches, which did not give complete sight of the consecrated Host were, therefore, obsolete. Instead, he contended that even after the change in discipline, medieval practice continued with sight of the Host with open screens and other aspects of form and arrangement. There was consequently no need to abolish any traditional components in order to facilitate sight of the Host.

Destruction of these parts in the Church was, Thiers claimed, against the rules of the Council of Trent, against the Church’s approval, against tradition and against Catholicism. In his Traité des Jubés des Eglises he defended the medieval and earlier liturgical arrangement of the Church, including rood screens, in thirty-four chapters.

Pugin echoed Thiers’ views. He was not against sight of the consecrated elements but it was a matter of degree and moderation. Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament was not intended to exclude any ancient rites or devotions or to substitute them; nor was the sight of the altar deliberately excluded from the “assisting faithful” although this sometimes happened

---

<sup>1301</sup> *Ibid.*, Book 2, Vol. VII, p.2. My own translation from the French.

from early times, he admitted, because of “the canonical arrangement of her sacred edifices”.<sup>1302</sup>

The pillars and cruciform arrangement of the ancient basilicas and cathedrals did not allow everyone to have a clear view of the altar in any case, “and this *independent of any screen-work*”,<sup>1303</sup> remarked Pugin. The pillars had obstructed the sight of all those who were in the aisles and transepts, but no one had objected. Limited sight of the altar had not been thought of as a problem in the basilicas of the Early Church.<sup>1304</sup> Certainly this was the case in S. Maria Maggiore, S. Sebastiano, S. Maria in Cosmedin, S. Clement’s and other Roman basilicas. It was enough that the faithful could “see” the consecrated Host with the “eyes” of faith.

v) The Council of Trent accommodated the change in discipline.

Pugin believed that measures taken by the Council of Trent, including processions and the old custom of exposing the Blessed Sacrament from the roodloft and altars, were sufficient to bring sight of the Blessed Sacrament to everyone and satisfied the change in discipline:

The Blessed Sacrament was usually exposed from the rood loft. The exposition on the high altar of Lyons Cathedral was mentioned as occurring for the first time in the year 1701. All the solemn expositions at Rouen took place from one of the altars under the rood loft, and there is every reason to believe that the Blessed Sacrament was usually exposed either on the rood lofts or the altars attached to them.<sup>1305</sup>

Pugin thus argued for roodlofts, altars and aisles in order to facilitate people’s view of the Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament. There was an emphasis in his writing on the

---

<sup>1302</sup> Pugin, A Treatise, p.7.

<sup>1303</sup> *Ibid.*, p.4.

<sup>1304</sup> *Ibid.*, p.6.

<sup>1305</sup> *Ibid.*, p.19.

solemnity of worship and this was a feature of medieval usages and practices. The seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Gallican-type liturgical practices, essentially the Roman rite with local and national usages, were much more solemn and complicated than the Roman. They were much more attuned to the senses, exterior, dramatic and symbolic; all features that Pugin wished to revive. These liturgical practices did not, however, have the force or simplicity of the Roman.

What Pugin called “the modern all-seeing principle”,<sup>1306</sup> “room-worship”, “display” and “making the mass *a sight*.”<sup>1307</sup> would, he thought, “lower the majesty of religion to the level of a common show, and degrade the sacrament before the people, giving occasion for scoffing and ridicule”.<sup>1308</sup> To carry out the change in discipline to such an extreme degree would, he thought, end in an “absurd conclusion” where, to allow everyone full sight of the celebrations, an amphitheatre arrangement would be required or alternatively, the Eucharist would be celebrated in theatres. Over exposure would result in a loss of significance and importance.

7) Pugin’s exposition of the mystical level of meaning in his A Treatise on Chancel Screens.

Pugin interpreted church architecture as having mystical and spiritual elements. Liturgical art and architecture without the spirit of God, however beautiful and correct, he contended, were lifeless and meaningless: “how dead do even the most stupendous churches appear when denuded of the sacramental presence”.<sup>1309</sup> The reserved Sacrament imparted a

---

<sup>1306</sup> Pugin, A Treatise, p.8.

<sup>1307</sup> *Ibid.*, p.3.

<sup>1308</sup> *Ibid.*, p.107.

<sup>1309</sup> *Ibid.*, p.107.

sanctity and holiness to its surroundings; “the ground itself in such a place is holy”, he thought.<sup>1310</sup>

Chancels had always been separated from the nave and this was due to recognition of “the very sacred nature of the Christian mysteries” in which the Mass was paramount. “Indeed, so sacred, so awful, so mysterious is the sacrifice of the Mass” that men “would hardly feel worthy to occupy the remotest corner of the temple”. It was truly due to the presence of our Lord. Consequently, the faithful should adore “at a respectful distance”.<sup>1311</sup> “The form and arrangement of the ancient churches” was due, he reiterated, “to the deepest feelings of reverence”<sup>1312</sup> towards the Lord’s presence in the Blessed Sacrament. Moreover, he repeated that “the altar, or place of sacrifice, was accessible only to those who ministered, it was enclosed by pillars and veils; the sanctuary was veiled” and “the choir was enclosed”.<sup>1313</sup> Carlo Borromeo, one of Pugin’s authorities, advocated this protection of the chancel from the laity in the nave. In his Instructionum Fabricae Ecclesiasticae he stated that liturgists believed one of the reasons for this separation was that the nave symbolized the Church on earth while the chancel that of the Church in heaven; the faithful could only pass from one to the other via the cross (i.e. the rood on the chancel screen).<sup>1314</sup> Pugin’s view was compatible with this.

Pugin repeated that screens “impress on the minds of the faithful the great sanctity of all connected with the sacrifice of the altar, and that, like the vicinity of the ‘burning bush,’ the ground itself is holy”.<sup>1315</sup> Moreover, “when such a boundary is erected round the place of

---

<sup>1310</sup> *Ibid.*, p.107.

<sup>1311</sup> *Ibid.*, p.8.

<sup>1312</sup> *Ibid.*, p.8.

<sup>1313</sup> *Ibid.*, p.8. This had been the reason behind Pugin’s reaction at St Barnabas’s Cathedral, Nottingham, in 1840-41, when he burst into tears.

<sup>1314</sup> Carlo Borromeo, Instructionum Fabricae Ecclesiasticae (1577: Paris & Arras 1855), p.37, footnote.

<sup>1315</sup> Pugin, Treatise, p.12.

sacrifice in a church, it teaches the faithful to reverence the seat of the holy mysteries, and to worship in humility”<sup>1316</sup>.

Pugin was belatedly responding to W. G. Ward’s reference to the “burning bush” in *The Rambler* (October 1848). Ward had argued that screens were not necessary because “it is sufficient for the priest to say to the people, as Almighty God said of old to his approaching prophet, ‘Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground’ and they will stand afar off and bow their head before their present God”<sup>1317</sup>. In this, Ward pleaded for reverence. All the same, the Oratorians did not want the faithful to “stand afar off”.

#### 8) Reaction to Pugin’s A Treatise on Chancel Screens.

##### i) The periodicals.

Various articles of the time enlarged upon the conflict between Pugin and the Oratorians. One such article was “Oratorians and Ecclesiology” by the Anglican Beresford-Hope in *The Christian Remembrancer* (1851). Hope believed the Church of Rome to be at the bottom of the row over screens.<sup>1318</sup>

Capes replied to Hope in “The Church and Antiquarianism” in *The Rambler* (April 1851). He accused him of being a Puseyite and writing about ““antiquity against novelty””. This had formerly been brought up by “the Jansenists and Gallicans”<sup>1319</sup> and had now been taken up by the Puseyites.<sup>1320</sup> Capes believed that Puseyites, like the Jansenists, were conducting an onslaught on Catholic doctrine and duty disguised as professions of veneration

---

<sup>1316</sup> *Ibid.*, p.9.

<sup>1317</sup> W. G. Ward, “The Revival of Rood Screens”, *The Rambler* (5 October 1848), p.319.

<sup>1318</sup> Beresford Hope, “Oratorians and Ecclesiology”, *The Christian Remembrancer and Quarterly Review* (1851), pp.141-164.

<sup>1319</sup> J. M. Capes, the editor, “The Church and the Antiquarians”, *The Rambler* (April 1851), p.324.

<sup>1320</sup> *Ibid.*, p.324.

for the Church. He objected to Beresford-Hope's view that the conflict about church building over the last three hundred years had been caused by "Oratorianism."<sup>1321</sup> Capes thought that the liturgical form and arrangement of Gothic churches were unsuitable for "modern devotions, modern feelings, and modern rubrics";<sup>1322</sup> and so the Church had reverted to more ancient types that were more easily adapted to suit these new requirements.<sup>1323</sup>

Capes continued with the view that changes to the liturgical form and arrangement were more commensurate with modern Catholicism. The Gothic style could only be retained, he argued, if "the plans and furniture of the interior were remodelled" to suit "modern devotions and rubrics"<sup>1324</sup> – exactly the proposal that Newman had made to Pugin in 1847, in Rome.<sup>1325</sup> The main requirement of a church was, said Capes, that it contained "one vast open space".<sup>1326</sup>

Capes dismissed Pugin's Treatise on Chancel Screens as a superficial study; incorrectly stating that "it is not a history of rood-screens generally, but a record of certain cases in which they have been destroyed and rebuilt in France, together with the opinions of certain French antiquaries who have protested" against their destruction. Moreover, he thought that Pugin's views were uncatholic. "In common with most other Catholics, we have been shocked at Mr. Pugin's sympathy with the Anglican heresy", he stated.<sup>1327</sup> Pugin was a Puseyite, he claimed, for, "We have ever regarded Puginism as identical with Puseyism".<sup>1328</sup> Pugin was called a "Puseyite" but not a "Gallican" even though he promoted Gallican-type

---

<sup>1321</sup> *Ibid.*, p.327.

<sup>1322</sup> *Ibid.*, p.332.

<sup>1323</sup> *Ibid.*, p.332.

<sup>1324</sup> *Ibid.*, p.333.

<sup>1325</sup> *Ibid.*, p.333.

<sup>1326</sup> *Ibid.*, p.334.

<sup>1327</sup> *The Rambler* (July 1851), p.45. Comment by Capes following the article "Churches versus Rooms".

<sup>1328</sup> *Ibid.*, p.45.

aspects of the medieval Church in England. If he had been accused of being a Gallican, he would also have been accused of heresy. *The Rambler* refused to review either Pugin's Treatise on Chancel Screens or his Earnest Address on the grounds that he had previously criticised its editors and subscribers.

Some praised Pugin's A Treatise on Chancel Screens as a skilled work. Frederick Lucas admired his effort and pointed out that he had given, "examples and remarks on screens in Italy, Spain, Germany, Flanders, France, Brittany, and England".<sup>1329</sup> This was "cumulative evidence", said Lucas.<sup>1330</sup> *The Ecclesiologist* of June 1851 stated that Pugin's book was "A mine of information on the whole subject".<sup>1331</sup> *The Lamp* of 7 June 1851 called it a "learned and elaborate treatise".<sup>1332</sup>

Bishop Ullathorne received complaints about the conflict between Pugin and the Oratorians. One such complaint was from Newman who had written to Ullathorne on 18 April 1851 denying any connection with the 'Screen-controversy', stating that "the members of the Oratory have had really nothing to do with causing it".<sup>1333</sup> Ullathorne promised to look into the matter, but had not done anything by 11 May 1851, as Newman's letter to Capes indicated. "Dr. U. (Ullathorne) has changed his mind about his letter to P. (Pugin)".<sup>1334</sup>

The editor of *The Tablet*, Frederick Lucas, had a presentiment of things to come; he suddenly backed away from his long-standing support for Pugin. In an article of 17 May 1851, he instead expressed his support of Newman and the Oratorians. Ironically, in the same issue, indeed, on the same page, he had written the article fully supporting Pugin's Treatise

---

<sup>1329</sup> Frederick Lucas, A review of Pugin's A Treatise on Chancel Screens in *The Tablet* (17 May 1851), p.315.

<sup>1330</sup> *Ibid.*, p.315.

<sup>1331</sup> *The Ecclesiologist* (June 1851), p.206.

<sup>1332</sup> *The Lamp* (7 June 1851), p.364.

<sup>1333</sup> Dessain, Letters and Diaries, Vol. XIV, p.258. Newman to Ullathorne (18 April 1851).

<sup>1334</sup> *Ibid.*, p.280, Note. Newman to Capes (11 May 1851).

on Chancel Screens. He now declared that the argument over liturgy was only about *style* and had nothing to do with doctrine, theology or discipline. “Architecture is not part of the rule of Faith”, he commented. Church “discipline admits of change”. “Architecture cannot be permitted thus to interfere with the science of theology”. It was false “to suppose that Faith is to be corrected, or to be kept in order, by the researches of the learned”.<sup>1335</sup> Since the Church was infallible, its architecture could not be less than perfect. “A general corruption in Christian art” as Pugin contended, was wrong.<sup>1336</sup> This was a Jansenist and Protestant idea.<sup>1337</sup> Even at this point Pugin was not directly accused of being a Gallican. Lucas’s article, however, amounted to a public statement of rejection of Pugin and support for the Oratorians and Roman usages and practices.

9) Oil on troubled waters.

i) Wiseman at the Oratory.

Newman had been informed that Cardinal Wiseman would preach at the Oratory on St Philip Neri’s Day with the intention that ““he was going to pour some oil on the troubled waters””.<sup>1338</sup> He was not too optimistic that this would do the Oratorians any good. Indeed, he was fearful that Wiseman would speak against them. “So I trust it will be rather a condescending sop or patting on the back to our modern-antiques, than any thing reflecting upon us”, he nervously commented.<sup>1339</sup>

---

<sup>1335</sup>*The Tablet* 12 (17 May 1851), p.315. Review of Pugin's Treatise on Chancel and Rood-Screens.

<sup>1336</sup> *Ibid.*, p.315.

<sup>1337</sup> *Ibid.*, p.315.

<sup>1338</sup> *Ibid.*, p.281. Newman to Richard Stanton (11 May 1851).

<sup>1339</sup> *Ibid.*, p.281.

The Oratorians had no idea of what Wiseman was about to proclaim in such a public manner. An article in *The Tablet* of 31 May 1851 - "St Philip Neri's Day at the Oratory - important sermon of Cardinal Wiseman's" - gave his address:

... a time of captivity came. The Church was once more consigned to an Egyptian bondage for three centuries, and her buildings were consigned to the care of heretics, who, by the over-ruling Providences of God, not by their own goodwill, became the careful guardians of her desolated sanctuaries, which are thus preserved as the petrified cast of what was once the religion of this land. But during these three centuries, the Church has been triumphant in other countries. She has had power to express her feelings ... The spirit of modern times is one of activity and practical usefulness in the world; and St. Philip was one of the great promulgator's of this message, which since his time has quite altered the practical spirit of the Church ... In the countries where the Church has not suffered, the external development of her buildings has followed this change in the lesson taught her by her Divine Spouse ... Shall we revert to the old example of our ancestors, or shall we import the changed style of those countries where the Church has never slumbered? ... These externals must be reduced to what they are, a mere indifferent matter of taste; and all things must give way to the exigencies of the rubrics of the Church, and to the spirit of modern devotions.<sup>1340</sup>

Wiseman had withdrawn his limited support for Pugin by proclaiming the authority of Roman rubrics. The result was that all Wiseman loved about Rome, its Baroque architecture, Italian music, Roman liturgy and the Roman rite came to the fore and swept Pugin's ideas aside.

ii) Pugin's reaction.

What was Pugin's initial reaction to his sudden rejection? He was noted as a fierce and outspoken controversialist. Yet he did not scream and shout or even publicly protest at Wiseman's pronouncement. He quietly accepted the authority of the Roman Catholic Church. Again, this was an important feature of Liberal Ultramontanism, which advocated final

---

<sup>1340</sup> F. Lucas, "St. Philip Neri's Day at the Oratory - Important Sermon of Cardinal Wiseman", *The Tablet* (31 May 1851), p.346.

submission to the papacy.<sup>1341</sup> Pugin shelved his last book, which was more or less finished; it was never published.<sup>1342</sup> He went calmly about his business for six months from 31 June until December 1851 when he suffered a severe bout of his illness, probably brought on by anxiety. He recovered briefly and remained active in his architectural practice for another two months until the unfortunate circumstances of his last illness commenced at the end of February 1852.

*The Rambler* had one last attempt at controversy in July 1851 when Capes, the editor, threw down the bait for Pugin by expressing the views given in Wiseman's address:

A 'church' then, is not a building of any one peculiar shape, or plan, or style of architecture; square, or oblong, or round; built of wood, or stone, or lath and plaster, or brick; with columns or without columns; with galleries or without; a 'church' is a building constructed with the special view of enabling Christians to worship God as the Catholic Church directs them in their public assemblies ... To call a building with a nave, aisles, and transepts a 'church', and a plain oblong edifice a 'room' is simply nonsensical.<sup>1343</sup>

Capes had become convinced that the role of *The Rambler* was to champion the cause of progress within the Roman Catholic Church. *The Rambler* seemed, as Margaret Belcher comments, to have been "gratuitously baiting" Pugin and "luring him to continue controversy".<sup>1344</sup> Capes' words were a mirror of Pugin's own that he had used in his The Present State (1843) in his argument against cheap, auditorium styled nineteenth-century

---

<sup>1341</sup> Austin Gough, Paris and Rome, pp. 63-64.

<sup>1342</sup> Pugin's last unpublished book (1851) was Preparing for publication in parts at intervals richly illustrated. An apology for the Separated Church of England since the reign of the eighth Henry. Written with every feeling of Christian charity for her children, and in honour of the glorious men she continued to produce in evil times. By A. Welby Pugin. Many years a Catholic minded son of the Anglican Church, and still an affectionate and loving brother and servant of the true sons of England's Church.

<sup>1343</sup> J. M. Capes, the editor, "'Churches' versus 'Rooms'", *The Rambler* (July 1851), p.43. (Bound volume VIII).

<sup>1344</sup> Margaret Belcher, An Annotated Critical Bibliography, p.272, D343.

Protestant churches - "Anything may be built and called a church; any style, any plan, any detail".<sup>1345</sup>

Pugin did not respond. If he had done, this could have been seen as a deliberate act of disobedience with the risk of censorship from the Roman Propaganda. Instead, he remained silent to safeguard his position and completely submitted to the authority of the Church.

iii) Pugin not thinking of returning to the Church of England.

There is no evidence at all, "no shadow of proof" to suggest that Pugin was thinking of returning to the Church of England.<sup>1346</sup> If he had done so he would have characteristically proclaimed it loudly and vehemently; he would not have whispered it in corners. He remained loyal and steadfast; a staunch Roman Catholic. Indeed, he proved, said Purcell, to be "as Ultramontane, that is, as obedient a son of the Pope, as those from whom he so widely differed".<sup>1347</sup> In this Purcell was correct. Pugin, as a Liberal Ultramontane, submitted to the final judgement of the Church on matters of discipline. He "sought strength and support in faith, and had for its object the glory of God", remarked Purcell.<sup>1348</sup> Pugin's obedience to the Church of Rome was tested and found to be complete.

10) Pugin's last illness.

By the time of the First Provincial Synod of Westminster which was held at Oscott from 5 July to 17 July 1852, Pugin was seriously ill and suffering the horrors of Bedlam

---

<sup>1345</sup> Pugin, The Present State, p.9.

<sup>1346</sup> E. S. Purcell, "Pugin and Turner" in *The Dublin Review* (February 1862), p.267.

<sup>1347</sup> Edmund Sheridan Purcell, "Recollections of A. N. W.(sic) Pugin" in *The Builder* 19(17 August 1861), p.567. Review of Benjamin Ferrey's Recollection of A. N. Welby Pugin and his father Augustus Pugin.

<sup>1348</sup> Review by E. S. Purcell, p.567.

Asylum. Many of his former close associates and friends were at the synod, since the “church was largely filled with the children of the Oxford Movement”.<sup>1349</sup>

Newman preached his famous “The Second Spring” sermon with deep emotion. It was a “noble tribute to the faith of our forefathers”.<sup>1350</sup> He spoke of the miracle of reinstating Catholicism in England and of rebuilding Roman Catholic churches and cathedrals throughout the country.

Eighteen months elapsed between Wiseman’s pronouncement and Pugin’s death. It was a testing time when Pugin’s faith was tried to its depths.

i) The Lunatic Asylums.

Between 27 February and 30 July 1852, Pugin was in Lunatic Asylums, first at Kensington and then at Bethlehem Lunatic Asylum,<sup>1351</sup> which was a neo-Classical hospital building which housed paupers and the criminally insane; neither category applied to Pugin.

The Report of the Metropolitan Commissioners in Lunacy to the Lord Chancellor (1844) suggested that the horrendous conditions and treatment at Bethlem Hospital frequently exacerbated, even caused rather than cured, mental and physical problems; patients were likely to be discharged in a far worse condition than when admitted. Pugin clearly deteriorated during his time in the asylums. “Jane hardly recognized him: she thought he looked seventy”.<sup>1352</sup>

Once his wife was allowed to see him she quickly removed him (on 30 July) and attended to him herself in temporary lodgings in London under the care of Dr Dickson.<sup>1353</sup>

---

<sup>1349</sup> Wilfrid Ward, Wiseman, Vol. II, p.61.

<sup>1350</sup> Edmund Sheridan Purcell, Life of Cardinal Manning, Vol. I, p.690.

<sup>1351</sup> Now the Imperial War Museum.

<sup>1352</sup> Rosemary Hill, “Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin: A Biographical Sketch” in the Bard Graduate Center for Studies in the Decorative Arts, A.W.N. Pugin, p.41.

<sup>1353</sup> Edward Pugin, “Augustus Welby Pugin – Note”, *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 91(February

Pugin recovered to a certain extent. Indeed, “great hopes were entertained of his recovery”.<sup>1354</sup> Frederick Lucas remarked that “he was fast recovering”.<sup>1355</sup> At this time he was “quite lucid, and conversed rationally and cheerfully with his family and friends”.<sup>1356</sup> He had not “lost his mind”. Bishop Grant also suggested that Pugin was not as mentally ill in the last few weeks of his life as many believed. He spoke of Pugin praying for long periods before the Blessed Sacrament. Considering that there was only a matter of six weeks between Pugin leaving Bedlam and his death, it would seem that despite his poor physical condition his mind was clear enough to pray and remember prayers during this time. Although physically broken, Pugin retained the ability to pray. Therefore, he was not suffering from mental deterioration or insanity, rather the opposite. It would take a man of considerable mental strength to retain his sanity after having endured the horrific physical rigours and mental traumas of Bedlam Lunatic Asylum.

There were various speculations about his illness and the causes of the possible deteriorating state of his mind. Pugin himself started the idea that his illness was due to overwork, although his medical men may have influenced him. “My mind”, he said, “has been deranged through over exertion. The medical men said I have worked one hundred years in forty”.<sup>1357</sup> The Casebook notes of Bethlehem Hospital gave a similar diagnosis.

*The Tablet* of 25 September 1852 also claimed that overwork had caused his breakdown in health and that his sudden death had occurred when he was “fast recovering

---

1862), pp.259-260.

<sup>1354</sup> Ferrey, Recollections, p.269.

<sup>1355</sup> Frederick Lucas, the editor, “Death of Mr. Pugin”, *The Tablet* (25 September 1852), p.620.

<sup>1356</sup> Father Thomas Doyle, “Welby Pugin”, *The Tablet* (25 September 1852), p.617. Obituary.

<sup>1357</sup> Pugin to Minton, 16 Feb. 1852, cited by Ferrey, Recollections, p.256.

from the state into which unhappily the pressure of arduous professional duties had reduced him”<sup>1358</sup>.

Benjamin Ferrey, his principal biographer, also believed that Pugin’s mental and physical collapse had been brought about through overwork and worries concerned with work. His failing health arose, stated Ferrey, from “the incessant exercise of his mental faculties”, which “destroyed his physical frame”.<sup>1359</sup> “Continued anxiety, feverish exertions, and sleepless nights” finally led to a fatal decline.<sup>1360</sup>

This suggestion was shortly taken up by John Campbell Colquhoun in his critical account of Pugin, Scattered Leaves of Biography (1864), in which he, too, stated that Pugin’s health problems had been caused by overwork and he wrote of “the intense labour which soon broke his health”.<sup>1361</sup>

Pugin’s eldest son, Edward, also perpetuated the idea that his father died of overwork. “In these days”, he said, “it is not so very uncommon an occurrence for men of genius and ardent natures to be cut off as he was in the pride and hope of life, shattered in body and mind”. It was not surprising, he continued, given that his father took “no bodily or mental relaxation, his continuous daily labours commencing at sunrise and seldom ending before midnight”.<sup>1362</sup>

The editor of Pugin’s obituary in The Ecclesiologist (1852) also thought overwork was the cause of his death. “The fatigue and anxiety undergone by him in connection with the Great Exhibition probably contributed to the sad obscuration of his powerful intellect”.<sup>1363</sup>

---

<sup>1358</sup> Frederick Lucas, the editor, “Death of Mr. Pugin”, *The Tablet* (25 September 1852), p.620.

<sup>1359</sup> Benjamin Ferrey, Recollections (1861), p.272.

<sup>1360</sup> *Ibid.*, p.272.

<sup>1361</sup> John Cambell Colquhoun, Scattered Leaves of Biography (London: W. Macintosh, 1864), p.345.

<sup>1362</sup> Edward Pugin, Letter to the editor of *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* (February 1862).

<sup>1363</sup> The editor, “The late Mr. Pugin”, *The Ecclesiologist* (October 1852), pp.352-357.

Thus, the consensus was that Pugin died of overwork. But people rarely die of overwork; overwork may lead to physical and mental collapse, but the patient normally recovers after a period of rest and convalescence. Indeed, while in the care of his wife and Dr Dickson, Pugin appeared to be making a full recovery. Moreover, before the onset of his illness, he had enjoyed some recreation or at least a change of scenery (despite continuing his work and studies) when he went sailing and he annually travelled on the Continent for a few weeks. Indeed, he had spent at least a fortnight travelling in Europe only seven months before his relapse in February 1852.<sup>1364</sup>

Mrs. Oliphant, a distinguished writer and journalist (whose husband worked for Pugin drawing the cartoons for stained glass windows), cast a shadow of doubt on overwork being the true cause of Pugin's death:

Whether his brain gave way under natural pressure, or whether he was driven mad, into Bedlam and the grave, by agencies more occult than toil and excitement, will probably never be known; and whether known or not, is now deeply indifferent to the dead soldier.<sup>1365</sup>

The Athenaeum (1861) suggested that his mental problems were not something that he had suddenly acquired towards the end of his life because of over-exertion, but that his "mental distemper" had probably started during his childhood.<sup>1366</sup>

Whatever the nature of his illness, Pugin himself believed when young that it might be terminal. Early death was not uncommon during Victorian times. Even during his time at Salisbury as a young man Pugin was concerned that he might not live very long, possibly as short as "two or three years".<sup>1367</sup> This partly accounts for his impassioned attitude to religion

---

<sup>1364</sup> Alexandra Wedgwood, A. W. N. Pugin and the Pugin Family, p.71. Note in Diary from 15 July to 31 July 1851.

<sup>1365</sup> Mrs. O. W. Oliphant, "Augustus Welby Pugin", *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, No.DLIV Vol. XC (December 1861).

<sup>1366</sup> *The Athenaeum*, No. 1761 (15 July 1861), p.109.

<sup>1367</sup> Ferrey, Recollections, p.95.

and work; he set out to accomplish as much as possible in the time he had, with the belief that his purpose in life was to carry out a “divine mission”.

ii) Death.

Following his return to his home at Ramsgate, Pugin suddenly relapsed and died a few days later on Holy Cross Day - 14 September 1852. He died in his own bed, in his own house at Ramsgate, surrounded by his wife, family and friends. Most importantly, from his point of view, a Roman Catholic priest, the Rev. John Melville Glennie (1816-1878), attended and gave him the last rites.<sup>1368</sup> He had the sort of death that he thought the faithful should have. It was a death where the “minister of God” and the “rites of holy church, were there to exhort and strengthen the departing soul” and where the “stoled priests kneel around in prayer and supplication” and “the ardent lights show forth the glorious hope of resurrection”.<sup>1369</sup>

Although he had left the Asylum six weeks earlier, the Bethlem Casebook stated that the cause of death was “Insane six months: Convulsions followed by Coma Certified”.

Pugin’s funeral on Tuesday, 21 September 1852 was at St Augustine’s, Ramsgate, and he was laid to rest in the crypt of the private chantry chapel that he had retained for his family. The church had been his gift to the Roman Catholic Church early in 1851.<sup>1370</sup>

The Roman Catholic leaders present were Grant, the Bishop of Southwark, who officiated, William Wareing, the Bishop of Northampton (who presided at the Monday evening service, but was not present at the actual funeral service the next day), Father

---

<sup>1368</sup> F. Lucas, the editor, “Death of Mr. Pugin”, *The Tablet* (18 September 1852), 3<sup>rd</sup>. edition, p.600. Obituary. John Melville Glennie (1816-78) was received into the Roman Catholic Church at Oscott in 1845; he was ordained in 1851 and worked at St. George’s, Southwark.

<sup>1369</sup> Pugin, *A Treatise*, p.115.

<sup>1370</sup> *The Thanet Catholic Review*, Vol. No. 1 (The Monastery Press 1931), p.6.

Thomas Doyle, the Provost of Southwark, Rev. Dr. Moore of Oscott, Rev. H. Formby,<sup>1371</sup> Rev. J. Walsh, Rev. A. White and Rev. J. M. Glennie. None of his fellow converts attended.

The choir chanted matins and Lauds for the Dead and the Very Rev. Dr. Doyle, Provost of Southwark, for whom Pugin had designed Southwark Cathedral, sang Solemn High Mass of Requiem. Bishop Grant gave the funeral discourse after the Requiem Mass.<sup>1372</sup> He stood near the coffin, with the clergy and members of the choir each carrying a lighted taper gathered around, while the coffin itself was surrounded with lights. The Bishop's oration took the theme from *Ecclesiasticus* xlv, 6. He spoke of Pugin's love of the Saints, of his deep faith, his love for the poor and his humility concerning his own work. He concluded by saying, "Pray for him who struggled with so much perseverance to make his designs and the execution of them correspond to the truths and to the mysteries which it was intended to serve and to honour".<sup>1373</sup>

It was a dignified and private Roman Catholic funeral. Pugin had not courted public acclaim in life and now, in death, he quietly went to the next life he had so faithfully prepared for.

---

<sup>1371</sup> Henry Formby was an authority on Gregorian Chant. In 1847 he had published Catholic Christian's guide to the right use of Christian psalmody and of the psalter which he dedicated to 'A. Welby Pugin, esq. with the prayer that a life so valuable may be long spared to the Church'.

<sup>1372</sup> F. Lucas, editor, "Funeral of Mr. Pugin", *The Tablet* (25 September 1852), p.612. Obituary. Thomas Grant, who had been rector of the English College in Rome from 1844, was appointed Bishop of Southwark at the re-establishment of the hierarchy. He had a long-standing quarrel with Wiseman about the division of the London District into two.

<sup>1373</sup> F. Lucas, the editor, "Funeral of the late Mr. Pugin - Sermon of the Lord Bishop of Southwark", *The Tablet* (2 October 1852), Vol. XIII, No.651, p.630.

## Chapter Nine - CONCLUSION

The study has set out to argue that Pugin was a liturgist who had a liturgical vision. The conclusion must therefore attempt to evaluate the results of the research and to question whether the claim has been justified.

1) The difficulties encountered.

i) A broad spectrum of material and subjects.

The writing of this thesis presented a number of difficulties and covered hazardous ground. Initially the broad spectrum of subjects covered in Pugin's writings led to a confused and muddled picture. Moreover, it was quickly discovered that this simply was not a case of researching Pugin's views on medieval church architecture because it became apparent that he referred to the Early Church, the centuries leading up to the medieval period, the medieval period itself, the Renaissance, the Reformation and the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries; he appealed to French as well as English history, particularly ecclesiastical history; he covered controversial Church issues; architecture, design, art, church vestments, history, religion, theology and doctrine. He also invoked a large number of French, Italian and British authorities and sources, some of which are relatively unknown. This broad spectrum was difficult to research, to understand completely or to go into individual subjects in any depth.

ii) Pugin's use of levels of meaning .

Pugin's style of writing has been carefully analysed and it has led to some surprising conclusions. Firstly, that he adopted an unusual style of writing because of his researches into the medieval period; this was based on the allegorical method of interpretation used by William Durandus and other medieval liturgists. This method of

exegesis is relatively unknown today. This involved three main levels of meaning – the historical, the practical and the allegorical. The first two were used by the medieval liturgists as a contrast with the last. Pugin, like them, contrasted these levels of meaning and further subdivided each level to include the doctrinal, theological, spiritual, anagogical and moral levels.

Allegorical exegesis of Scripture is a difficult task and liturgical exegesis even more so. One would really need to be an expert on at least theology, doctrine, ecclesiastical architecture and architectural theory to do it justice. Pugin attempted an interpretation of religious architecture and his writing is an exposition and expansion of his findings. There is a distinction, therefore, between his interpretation of architecture and the views expounded in his writing.

Pugin was uneasy about anything that was man-made, including the interpretation of what he believed to be divine subjects. This was one of the drawbacks of allegorical exegesis applied to Scripture or to ecclesiastical architecture. Pugin believed there was only one reliable source of true information and that was God Himself. Therefore, by searching both Scripture and tradition for evidence, he sought to prove that Christian liturgy, which to him meant the various local and national usages and practices of the Roman rite, was given by God to the faithful and was, therefore, part of Revelation. Since he supported national and local usages, he was not opposed to Roman usages of the Roman rite in Italy. In England, though, this meant making use of English local variations to the Roman rite, such as the rites of Sarum and Durham and, in France, meant French local usages such as those of Caen, Bayeux and Rouen.

In Pugin's writing, the levels of meaning that he considered differed widely from each other; in attempting to explain these the thesis may appear to be disjointed or to

jump from one subject to another. For instance, it is difficult, at first glance, to see the connection between the construction and materials of churches and mystical subjects.

The identification of these levels of meaning in Pugin's works changed the initial perception of what appeared to be his rather muddled and confusing texts, into a recognition that the works were, in fact, scholarly and deep. The levels of meaning demonstrate that there was a unity to Pugin's writing, more convincingly, perhaps, than any other explanation.

iii) A radial and not a lineal form.

It has also been argued that Pugin's writing took a deliberately radial, rather than a lineal form. His writing, directed to the worship of God by the faithful, consisted of a number of different styles of argument, which argued for the same themes. These themes concerned the nature and continuity of the Church. It has been shown that he argued by example, authority, analogy and by deductive and inductive methods. He was therefore knowledgeable about methods of argument. He may have learned this from his study of the medieval period, particularly the Scholastics who favoured such an approach. Yet, this radial method of writing was also similar to that used by the Jansenist Blaise Pascal, although there is no indication that Pugin was familiar with his writing. He did, however, cite a number of other seventeenth-century Jansenists as his authorities.

Given this method of writing, it was difficult to demonstrate any consistent development of his ideas from book to book. There was evidence of a development of knowledge from the first to the second edition of Contrasts, but it would be unsound to say that his views had changed; he had merely discovered more material or more evidence to substantiate them. The principal grounds for a kind of development was that

he went from promoting his views to Protestants up until 1845, to defending his views from a group of Roman Catholics thereafter.

Pugin took a systematic approach to the study of liturgy, much in the same way as the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century French neo-Gallican liturgists, particularly Mabillon, who has been described as the father of the scientific method. The basis of this was the historical-critical approach that laid great importance on correct information. The neo-Gallicans wanted to revive Gallican usages and practices, while retaining the Roman rite, within the Catholic Church. It has been argued that Pugin had a similar aim.

## 2) The sources of Pugin's views.

Pugin set out to discover the concepts behind Gothic architecture. The thesis has argued that he had intense Liberal Ultramontane views demonstrated by his interest in the medieval period, his aim of reviving liturgical forms and arrangements, usages and practices of that period, and he was against neo-Classicism and Realism.

Pugin was a complex character in that, while he was a Liberal Ultramontane, he also had neo-Gallican views and aims; he was not merely a medievalist, but looked back to the Early Church and forward to the nineteenth century and beyond. After his conversion to Roman Catholicism, he continued to study the medieval Catholic Church in England in which traditional usages and practices were common. Unlike the later converts, he did not set out to study the Roman Church in Italy or Roman usages and practices of his day. The Catholic Church, he believed, was in dire need of liturgical reform and so he took up the aims of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century "Gothic-led" Counter-Reformation liturgists.

Pugin studied the medieval period because it was a time when there was great interest and research into Gallican-type usages and practices. In France, the seventeenth

and eighteenth century periods were also ages when this study continued; Pugin turned to its great neo-Gallican scholars, such as Mabillon, Thiers, Martène and Félibien as his authorities on liturgy. Taking his lead from these, as well as the medieval liturgists, he extended his study on liturgy far beyond the medieval period.

Pugin's position during 1847 to 1852 throws up some unexplored areas concerning the connection between Liberal Ultramontanism and ecclesiastical Gallicanism, which are mostly beyond the scope of this thesis. Austin Gough says that, as an historical episode in France, the seventeenth and eighteenth century period of conflict between Gallicanism and Ultramontanism is not at all well known.<sup>1374</sup> The study would suggest that neither is a similar conflict of the nineteenth century period well known in England.

Pugin's authorities on the history of the medieval period were limited; he mostly relied on William Dugdale. However, he read and owned an enormous quantity of books on medieval subjects. Moreover, he did attempt to gain a broader picture by consulting the works of a few French medieval historians. In fact, there were a limited number of medieval historians in his day and he chose the best available to him.

Pugin was able to draw on a greater pool of Reformation historians and, again, he chose the best available to him. He used Protestant historians (like Challoner before him), possibly because he, as a former Protestant, was more familiar with their works and also because it was a sardonic move to convince Protestants of the truth of Catholicism by using their own authorities, although his conclusions were different from theirs. The thesis has argued that Pugin had merit and made a contribution as an historian.

---

<sup>1374</sup> Austin Gough, Paris and Rome, p. vii.

3) Pugin's contribution to the Catholic revival of the nineteenth century.

Pugin's role in the events of the nineteenth century was important because, firstly, he engaged with contemporary Protestant/Roman Catholic controversial issues. He had orthodox Catholic views and fiercely promoted those views and he became a controversialist as a result. He believed he was following in the footsteps of previous Roman Catholic controversialists, particularly Bishops John Milner and Richard Challoner. Secondly, it has been argued that he was one of the few people who was well acquainted with Newman and his circle while they were Tractarians within the Church of England, while they seceded into the Church of Rome and during their early years as Oratorians within that Church. Their relationship throws light on events of that time and on the development of their views.

The thesis has argued that, to begin with, Pugin found support for his views on medieval liturgical form and arrangement from Roman Catholics in England, the Tractarians, and even other Anglicans since they adopted his ideas; he had several commissions to change Anglican parish churches to a more Catholic arrangement.

Pugin had great hopes that Wiseman and the new converts would support his views on liturgy. He quickly discovered that this was not the case; Wiseman revered all that reminded him of Rome. Some of the converts became Oratorians who, as enthusiastic neophytes, rejected everything connected with the old Catholic Church in England that they, as Tractarians, had previously sought to revive. They had moved to sharing Wiseman's love of Roman liturgy and everything Roman; they became neo-Ultramontanes who opposed Pugin's views.

The Oratorians contended that liturgical form and arrangement, usages and practices, should obey the liturgical rubrics that had come into force since the sixteenth century. The Oratorians were not liturgists. In fact, they and Pugin argued past each other.

The evidence and reasons of both were based upon unequal positions and uncommon ground. Neither side was able to reconcile or revise their general views or philosophies and it led to serious religious unrest concerning Church discipline. Moreover, they were not able to reverse or revise their prejudices or biases. Pugin was unwilling to see the benefits of a “new” style of worship as promoted by the sixteenth-century St Philip Neri and the “new” Orders’ promotion of neo-Classical architecture and design; Newman and the Oratorians were unable or unwilling to study medieval Gallican-type form and arrangement, usages and practices. They could not therefore argue from an informed and common basis.

Neither Pugin nor the Oratorians were able to revise their views to arrive at a peaceful, non-exploitative coexistence in the Church. This led to an impasse, which was only resolved, for good or ill, by the intervention of the pro-Roman Archbishop of Westminster, Nicholas Wiseman. Moreover, the political situation in Italy was such that Pugin’s Liberal Ultramontane and neo-Gallican views were out of favour at Rome. Efforts were successfully made by the papacy to suppress such views in England and in France.

Pugin gradually became isolated from other members of the Roman Catholic Church. He was out of step with most Roman Catholics, who favoured Roman usages and practices, and was therefore unlikely to succeed in realizing his liturgical vision in England at that time. Yet, the vast majority of new churches remained Gothic, both in the Catholic Church and the Church of England, so it is fair to say that he did have a measure of success, even if his beloved screens became rarer.

The view of liturgists that religious architecture embodied spiritual and mystical qualities was taken up in the second half of the nineteenth-century by the neo-Ultramontanes, but they did not base Christian symbolism on the Scriptures or tradition,

but attempted to introduce new Christian symbolism into their church designs. As the medieval scholar and iconographer, Émile Mâle said to the designer Sainte-Marie Perrin in 1896:

Your symbolism is extremely ingenious. The relationships that you have established between the heresies, the animals and the Biblical texts are very felicitous. I believe that the early symbol makers of the 12<sup>th</sup> century would have approved of these combinations. It would have been hard for them to have done any better; for in these cases, there is no tradition; one must invent it all.<sup>1375</sup>

Pugin would not have agreed that Christian symbolism could be invented by man in either the twelfth or nineteenth centuries.

i) Pugin a fanatic or merely someone with strong views?

Pugin has frequently been described as eccentric and as having a fanatical obsession with a particular style of architecture. The first implies that he had singular and strange views and ways. The thesis has argued that this was not true, as far as his views were concerned, since he followed Liberal Ultramontanism and a long tradition of Gallican liturgists and allegorists who held similar views. He may have been eccentric in that he did not care about his physical appearance, but this might be true of a number of scholars and intellectuals. This was merely a minor eccentricity. The thesis has argued that he was not as fanatical for a particular style of architecture, as is commonly thought to be the case, as for Catholicism and about the Gallican-type liturgical form and arrangement that he believed Gothic architecture embodied. But he was not simply a medieval reconstructionist or guilty of archaeologism in the same way as Guéranger and other contemporary liturgists.

---

<sup>1375</sup> Nancy Davenport, "Fortress Catholicism: The Art of Ultramontanism at Notre Dame de Fourvière", in Linda Woodhead, ed., Reinventing Christianity: Nineteenth Century Contexts

ii) Pugin's strengths and weaknesses.

What at first appeared to be a strength was Pugin's attempt to take advantage of the fashion for antiquarianism, Romanticism and nationalism. The Romantic Revival had stimulated an interest in the medieval period and Gothic architecture. He recognised this as an interest that could be directed towards Catholicism and in this, he was successful. He encouraged Anglicans to study medieval churches and to study the rites, rubrics and tenets of the Church of England. He thought that by doing so, they, like he had, would be led to accept Catholicism – an English national form of Catholicism. Catholic education was high on his list of priorities since he believed ignorance to be evil. He was interested in the education of young people in Catholicism and taught at Oscott for nearly four years as Professor of Ecclesiastical Antiquities.

Pugin's interest in the medieval Church was easily misconstrued. It became a weakness. People assumed he was merely a medieval reconstructionist. It has been argued that this was not the case, that his justification for the Gothic style was that it embodied Gallican-type liturgical usages and practices, form and arrangement more perfectly than any style before or since. This did not lessen his fervour for the Gothic style, quite the reverse. But his own designs demonstrated that he was not a copyist and indeed, he was criticised for creating something like a new style. He argued in his An Apology for the Revival of Christian Architecture (1843) that styles should and would change because they were man-made. This was again a feature of Liberal Ultramontane views, which supported modern inventions and developments. Only liturgical form and arrangement would not change because he believed God had given instructions for these.

4) Pugin's mission in life.

i) Pugin perceived himself to be a liturgist.

It would be unusual for an architect to study liturgical, doctrinal and theological subjects in order to increase his chances of employment; therefore, Pugin's reasons for doing so were other than architectural ambition. The majority of his authorities were not architects or designers, but liturgists and historians, for that was where his interest lay. Moreover, by far the greater numbers of books in his library were on liturgy and history, not architecture or architectural theory. Therefore, the conclusion from this evidence alone must be that Pugin's principal interest was not architecture *per se*, but history and liturgy, and architecture and art as their embodiment. Cumulative evidence in the study argues that he saw himself as a liturgist, not merely as an architect and designer; the spectrum of subjects that he concerned himself with was far greater than those required for an architect or designer.

ii) A liturgical vision.

The thesis has argued that Pugin had a vision of a Christian environment for a Christian people. It was a vision of the revival of a Catholic Church in England that was completely separate from the State. He wanted an independent and free Church, which reflected his Liberal Ultramontane views. Such a Church could serve as an example to other Catholic Churches, including the Church of Rome. It was analogous with Savonarola's vision of making Florence a holy city, which would be an example to the rest of Catholic Christendom.

5) In conclusion.

Many people have been both intrigued and baffled by Augustus Welby Pugin. Many have admired his genius, particularly his architecture and design. In his day, he attracted both support and rejection, yet both friends and enemies agreed that he was a deeply religious man who spent his whole adult life in the service of God. The thesis has brought to light some of the complexities of this fascinating character and has touched on aspects of his life that have never previously been considered, particularly his connection with the French Church and its influence, and that of events in France upon him. His aesthetic ideas were rooted in and justified by a French theological and liturgical tradition, and by the study of history, and it is as a liturgical architect that we should try to understand him. He was a Gothic revival architect, but was more than just a Gothic revival architect. His ecclesiastical ornaments were liturgy translated into cloth, wood, glass, and silver and gold. His buildings were liturgy embodied in stone. For Pugin, architecture was merely a part, albeit a principal part, of his liturgical vision.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY:

### 1. Manuscripts at Archives:

#### i) Magdalen College Oxford Archives, "Pugin/ Bloxam Papers":

- MS. 528/11, Pugin to Bloxam (28 June 1841).
- MS. 528/21, Pugin to Bloxam (February 1841).
- MS. 528/17, Pugin to Bloxam (2 March 1841).
- MS. 528/16, Pugin to Bloxam (12 March 1841).
- MS. 528/18, Pugin to Bloxam (29 March 1841).
- MS. 528/121, Pugin to Bloxam (17 August 1841).
- MS. 528/ 7 – (24 October 1841) Ref. to "Church Architecture" in *The British Critic* (February 1841).
- MS. 528/141, Pugin to Bloxam (14 November 1841).
- MS. 528/111, Pugin to Bloxam (19 December 1841).
- MS. 528/82, Pugin to Bloxam (21 February 1842).
- MS. 528/81, Pugin to Bloxam (16 March 1842).
- MS. 528/94, Pugin to Bloxam (15 December 1842).
- MS. 528/85, Pugin to Bloxam (c.1843).
- MS. 528/92, Pugin to Bloxam (8 April 1843).
- MS. 528/84, Pugin to Bloxam (24 February 1843).
- MS. 528/96, Pugin to Bloxam (10 March 1843).
- MS. 528/69, Pugin to Bloxam (December 1845).

#### ii) Magdalen College Archives, "Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle/ Bloxam Papers".

- MS. 335, Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle to Bloxam (22 February 1841).
- MS. 335, Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle to Bloxam (10 March 1841).
- MS 335, Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle to Bloxam (13 April 1841).

#### iii) The Birmingham Oratory Archives, the "Pugin File":

- MS. 7, (17 Jan. 1844), correspondence on The Lives of the Saints (published 1844).

#### iv) Southwark Cathedral Archives, "Pugin/Rock Papers":

- MS SAA T-R179, Pugin to Rock (30 March 1840).
- MS SAA T-R179, Pugin to Rock (18 November 1840).
- MS SAA T-R179, Pugin to Rock (4 December 1840).
- MS SAA T-R179, Pugin to Rock (25 August 1841).
- MS SAA T-R179, Pugin to Rock (20 May 1842).
- MS SAA T-R179, Pugin to Rock (22 November 1842).

v) Westminster Diocesan Archives:

MS. W3/43:9a, Pugin to Wiseman (c. 1851).

MS.SEC. 21/4, Pugin to Stanfield the artist (2 May 1843).

MS SEC. Box 21/4 "St. Edmund's College" Box. MS of John Hardman Powell, "Pugin in his Home".

vi) Balliol College Oxford Archives, "Pugin Papers":

MS. D21 50B – Papers on the rebuilding of Balliol College.

vii) The Royal Institute of British Architects, "W. W. Begley Papers":

MS. BEG.9.i. (verso), Benjamin Webb's Journal.

viii) Pusey House Library Archives, Oxford, "Pusey/Hook Letters":

MS Pus 21/11, Pusey to Hook (December 1841).

MS Pus 21/22, O'Conner to Pusey (27 January 1845).

## **2. Pugin's works:**

Pugin, A. W. N., Contrasts: or a Parallel between the noble Edifices of the Middle Ages and similar buildings of the Present day shewing the Present Decay of Taste, London: printed for the author, May 1836.

----, An Apology for Contrasts: being a Defence of the assertions advanced in that publication against the various attacks lately made upon it, Birmingham: 1837.

----, First Lecture at Oscott: Lectures on Ecclesiastical architecture Delivered to the students of St. Mary's College, Oscott, by A. W. Pugin, Professor of Ecclesiastical Antiquities in that College, *The Catholic Magazine*, April 1838.

----, Second Lecture at Oscott: Lectures on Ecclesiastical architecture Delivered to the students at St Mary's College, Oscott, *The Catholic Magazine*, June 1838.

----, Letter on the Proposed Protestant Memorial, London: Booker and Dolman 1839.

----, Contrasts: or, a parallel between the noble edifices of the middle ages and corresponding buildings of the present day shewing the Present Decay of Taste, London:

Charles Dolman 1841.

----, Two Lectures on The Present State of ecclesiastical architecture in England, *The Dublin Review*, No. XX, May 1841 & No. XXIII, February 1842.

----, The Present State of ecclesiastical architecture in England, London: 1843.

----, The True Principles of Pointed or Christian Architecture, London: John Weale 1841.

----, An Apology for the Revival of Christian Architecture, London: John Weale 1843.

----, Glossary of Ecclesiastical Ornament and Costume: compiled from Ancient Authorities and Examples, 1844. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 'Enlarged and Revised by Rev. Bernard Smith', London: Henry G. Bohn 1846.

----, An Earnest Appeal for the Revival of Plain Song, London: Charles Dolman 1850.

----, An Earnest Address on the Establishment of the Hierarchy, London: Charles Dolman 1851.

----, A Copy of a letter Addressed to 'The Tablet' Newspaper, no publisher recorded: March 1851.

----, Some Remarks on the articles which have recently appeared in the 'Rambler' relative to ecclesiastical architecture and design, London: 1850.

----, A Treatise on Chancel Screens and rood lofts, their antiquity, use and symbolic signification, London: Charles Dolman 1851.

----, Pugin's last unpublished book, Preparing for publication in parts at intervals richly illustrated: An apology for the Separated Church of England since the reign of the eighth Henry. Written with every feeling of Christian charity for her children, and in honour of the glorious men she continued to produce in evil times. By A. Welby Pugin. Many years a Catholic minded son of the Anglican Church, and still an affectionate and loving brother and servant of the true sons of England's Church, c. 1852.

### **3. Pugin's sources:**

i) Early Church: Books:

Chrysostom, St John, Epistle Ad Ephes., c. 4<sup>th</sup>. century.

----, Homilies on St John and St Matthew, c. 4<sup>th</sup>. century.

Eusebius, Bp. of Caesarea, Chronicle, c. 303-325.

----, History of the Christian Church, c. 324-325.

Vitruvius (Marcus Vitruvius Pollio), De Architectura Libra Decem, c. 1<sup>st</sup> century A.D.

ii) Medieval: Books:

Aquinas, St Thomas, Summa Theologica, c. 1266.

Bonaventure, St., Journey of the Mind to God, 1259.

Durandus, Gulielmus, Rationale Divinorum Officiorum, c. 1286, but published 1459.

Gervase (or Gervasius), a monk of Canterbury, "Historical Works", c. 12<sup>th</sup>. century.

Jonas, monk of St Wandrille and Bishop of Orléans, Life of St Wulfran, c. 850.

Lyndwood, William, Provinciale seu Constitutiones Angliae, England: 1430.

Paris, Matthew, In Stephano, 1140.

----, Historia major, published 1235-1273.

Records of Holy Trinity Church, Long Melford, near Lavenham, Suffolk. (From c. 1050).

The Rites of Durham, 1593.

The Sarum Rite, (Middle Ages).

iii) Sixteenth century: Books:

Borromeo, Carlo, Intructionum Fabricæ Ecclesiasticæ et Superlectilis Libri duo, Paris and Arras 1577.

Duranti (or Durantus), Jean Etienne, De Ritibus Ecclesiae Catholicae, 1592.

Foxe, John, Martyrum Historia, 1554.

Jewel, Bp., Letter in Apud. Jeremy Collier's "An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain", c. 16<sup>th</sup>. century: London: 1708 ed.

Rastel, John, A treatise entitled, Beware of m. Jewel (sic), Antu. 1566.

iv) Sixteenth century: Records and Inventories:

The Inventory of York Minster.

The Inventory of St Paul's.

The Inventory of Peterborough.

Records of Long Melford Church.

v) Seventeenth – eighteenth century: Books:

Aringhi, Paul, Roma Subterranea, Rome: Novissima 1651.

Ashmole, Elias, The Antiquities of Berkshire, with a particular account of the Castle, College, and Town of Windsor, London: 1719.

Béziers (or Besiers), Michel, Histoire sommaire de la Ville de Bayeux, 1773.  
----, Voyage Pittoresque de Paris, 1778

Bingham, Joseph, Origines ecclesiasticæ: or, The Antiquities of the Christian Church, London: 1708-1722.

Bocquillot, Abbé Lazare-André, Traité Historique de la Liturgie sacrée, ou de la Messe, Paris: 1701.

Bona, Cardinal John, Codices sacramentorum nongentis annis vetustiores cura & studio, Rome: 1680.

----, De Libris Liturgicis, c. 17<sup>th</sup>. century.

----, Divina Psalmodia, c. 17<sup>th</sup>. century.

----, Opera Omnia, Antwerp: 1723.

Borgia, Cardinal Stephen, Vaticana Confessio B. Petri, chronologicis testimoniis illustrata, Rome: 1776.

----, De Cruce Veliternâ commentarias, Rome: 1780.

----, De Cruce Vaticanâ ex dono Iustini Augusti in Parasceve majoris hebdomadæ publicæ venerationi exhiberi solitæ commentarius, Rome: 1779.

Bosio, Antonio, Roma Sotteranea, Rome: G. Facciotti 1632.

De Brant, Histoire Reformation des Pays Bas, unidentified.

Buck, Samuel, Perspective views of the ruins of the most noted abbeys and castles of England, by S. and N. Buck, London 1726-39.

Buonarotti, Philip, Osservazioni sopra alcuni frammenti di vasi antichi di vetro ornati di figure, irorati ne' cimiteri di Roma, Florence: 1716.

----, Osservazioni istoriche sopra alcuni medaglioni antichi del cardinal Carpegna, Rome: 1698.

Burnet, Gilbert, Bp. of Salisbury, History of the Reformation of the Church of England, London: 1679-1715.

Burton, John, Monasticon Eboracense: and the ecclesiastical history of Yorkshire, York: 1758.

Du Cange, Dom C. Dufresne, Glossarium ad Scriptores Medlea et Infimæ Graecitatis, 1688.

----, Glossarium ad Scriptores Medle et Infimæ Latinitatis, Paris: 1678.

Carpentier, Glossarium novum ad scriptores mediævi cum hatinos tum Gallicos, seu, Supplementum ad auctiorem glossari Cangiani editionem. Adjuncta est Cangii dissertatio de inferioris ævis aut imperii numismatibus, trans., of Du Cange's Glossary with supplement, Paris: 1766.

Carter, John, The Ancient Architecture of England, London: 1795.

Ciampini, Joannis, De Sacris Aedificiis A Constantino Constructis synopsis historica, Rome: 1693.

----, De Sacris, profanisque Calicibus; De Sacrarum Imaginum afu earumque veneratione,

----, Conjectura de perpetuo azymorum usu in Ecclesiâ Latina, Rome 1688.

----, Vetera Monumenta, in quibus præcipuè musica opera, scarum profanarumque aedium structura, ac nonnulli antiqui ritus dissertationibus iconibusque illustratur, Rome 1690-99.

Collier, Jeremy, An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, London: printed for Samuel Keble and Benjamin Tooke 1708-14.

Collinson, John, The Beauties of British Antiquity selected from the writings of esteemed antiquaries with notes and observations, London: 1779.

----, The History and Antiquities of the County of Somerset, collected from authentick (sic) Records and an actual Survey made by the late Mr. Edmund Rack, 1791.

Dodd, Charles (pseudonym for H. Tootell), Church History of England, ed. by M. A. Tierney, 1739-42.

Dugdale, Sir William & Roger Dodsworth, Monasticon Anglicanum cum Additamentis, London: 1655-61-1673.

----, History of St Paul's Cathedral in London, London: 1658.

----, Antiquities of Warwickshire, revised, augmented and continued by W. Thomas, 1730.

Dürer, Albrecht, Messung mit Zirkel, von den Befestigung und von meuschlicher Proportion, Arnhem: 1603.

Félibien, Dom Michel, L'Histoire de l'Abbaye royale de Saint-Denys, avec la Vie des Abbez, Paris: 1706.

----, Life of St Amselm, (unpublished).

Félibien, Dom Michel and Lobineau, Project d'une nouvelle histoire de la ville de Paris, Paris: 1713.

Fontana, Carlo, Templum Vaticanum et ipsius origo, Rome: opus in septem libros distributum Latînisque literis consignatum a J. J. Bonnerue de S. Romain 1694.

Fuller, Thomas, The Church History of Britain ... untill (sic) the year M.DC. XLVIII (With) The history of the University of Cambridge (and) The history of Waltham-abby (sic), London: 1655.

----, The Holy and Profane State, 1642.

Gavanto (or Gavanti), Bartholomeo Mediolanen, Thesaurus Sacorum Rituum sev Commentaria in Rubricas Breviarii Romani, Rome: 1634.

Georgius (or Giorgi), Dominicus, Trattato sopra gl' abiti sacri del sommo pontefice di Roma, Rome: 1724.

----, De liturgia Romani pontificis in Solemni celebratione Missarum, Rome: 1731-43-44.

Gerbert, Martin, Scriptores Ecclesiastici de Musica Sacra Potissimum, 1784.

----, Monumenta Veteris Liturgiae Alemannicae disquisitionibus praevis, notis et observationibus illustrata, 1776. (Referred to by Pugin as "Gerbert de Veturi Liturgia Alemannica").

----, De Cantu et Musicâ sacrâ a primâ Ecclesiae Ætate usque ad praesens tempus, St Blaise: 1774.

Goodwin, Thomas, D.D., The history of the reign of Henry the fifth, king of England, London: 1704.

Gunton, Simon, History of the Church of Peterburgh, Peterborough: 1686.

Hammond, Henry, Of Schisme, a defence of the Church of England against the exceptions of the Romans, London: 1653-54.

Heylin (or Heylyn), Peter, Ecclesia Restaurata: or the history of the reformation of the Church of England, London: 1661.

----, Help to English History, 1641: London: 1709.

----, Cyprianus Anglicus, London: 1668.

----, A Coale from the Altar; or, an answer to a letter written (by J. William, Bp. of Lincoln) to the vicar of Gr. Against the placing of the communion table at the east end of the chancel, London: for R. Milbourne 1636.

----, Historical Collection, c. 1650.

----, History of Elizabeth, c. 1650.

Holinshed, Raphael, Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland, London: 1577.

Kenoux, M., L' Abrégé de l' Histoire de la Hollande, unidentified.

Laud, William, Abp. Of Canterbury, Liturgy, episcopacy and Church ritual, 3 speeches, c. 1640: Oxford 1846 ed.

Mabillon, J. and Dom Luc D' Achery, Spicilegium: sive, collectio veterum aliquot scriptorum qui in Galliaë bibliothecis delituerant, Paris: 1723.

----, Acta Sanctorum Ordinis S. Benedicti, Paris: 1703-13.

Mabillon, J., Vetera Analecta, Paris 1723.

----, Museum Italicum, seu Collectio vett. Script. Ex Bib. Italicis, 1687.

----, De Liturgia Gallicana libri iii, in quibus veteris missae, quae ante annos mille apud

Gallos in usu erat, forma ritusque eruntur, Paris: 1685: Paris: 1729.

Mabillon, J. with Dom Michel Germain, De Re Diplomatica, c. 1720.

Marettes, Le Brun des (pseudonym de Moleon), Voyage Liturgique de France, ou recherches faites dans divers villes du royaume, 1718.

----, Liturgies de toutes les Eglises, 1726.

Martène, Edmond, De antiquis monachorum ritibus libri quatuor, Lugd.: 1690.

----, De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus circa Sacramenta, 1700-2.

----, Tractatus de Antiquis Ecclesiae Disciplini in Divinis Celebrandis Officiis, Vol. 4 of De antiquis Ecclesiae, Paris:1706.

----, Voyage Litteraire de Deux Religieux Benedictins de la Congrégation de Saint Maur, Paris: 1717.

Merati, Gaetano Maria, Commentariorum Gavanti ad Rubricas Missalis ad Rubricas Breviarii Romani, Rome: 1738.

----, Novae observationes et Additiones – Commentaria in rubricas: Missalis et Breviarii Romani, Aug. Vind.: 1740.

Milner, John, Dissertation on the Modern Style of altering Ancient Cathedrals, exemplified in the Cathedral of Salisbury, London: 1798.

----, Observations on the means necessary for the further illustrating of the Ecclesiastical architecture of the Middle Ages, in a Letter from the Rev. John Milner, 1800.

----, A treatise on the ecclesiastical architecture of England, during the Middle Ages, London: 1811.

Nicholl, John, Londinum Redivivum, London: 1763.

Paget, Rev. E., St Antholin's or Old Churches and New, unidentified.

Peck, Francis, Academia tertia Anglicana; or, The antiquarian annals of Stanford, London: 1727.

Dom Jean-Francois Pommeraye, Saint Ouen de Rouen, Rouen 1662.

----, Histoire de l'Abbaye de S. Ouen de Rouen, Rouen 1662.

----, Histoire des Archevêques de Rouen, Rouen 1667.

----, Histoire Cathedrale Rouen, Rouen 1686.

Rubens (or Ross), John, Bonifacius VIII, Rome: 1651.

Rushworth, John, Historical Collections of Private Passages of State beginning ... anno 1618 (to the death of king Charles the first 1648), London: 1657-1701.

Sanderson, Patrick, Antiquities of the abbey or cathedral church of Durham. Also a particular description of the county palatine of Durham, Newcastle-upon-Tyne: 1767.

Spelman, Sir Henry, Glossarium Archæologicum, London: 1664.

Stevens (or Stephens), John, The History of the Ancient Abbeys, Monasteries, Hospitals,

Cathedrals, etc., illustrated with copperplates, London: 1722-23.

----, Continuation to Monasticon Anglicanum, c. 1730.

----, trans., Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English nation, 1723.

Stowe (or Stow), John, Annales or generall Chronicles of England, 1565: London: 1615 ed..

----, Survey of London, 1598: London: I. Windet 1633 ed..

Stapleton, trans., Bede's History of the Church of England, Antwerp: 1565.

Strype, John, Annals of the Reformation in England from the Accession of Queen Elizabeth to the Commencement of the Reign of James I, London: 1709: London: 1735-37 ed.

----, Memorials of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1694.

Thiers, Jean Baptiste., Dissertations Ecclesiastiques sur Les Principaux Autels des Eglises ("Dissertation on the Principal Altars of Churches"), Paris 1688.

----, Dissertation Sur La Clôture des Religieuses ("Dissertations on Monasteries and Religious Orders"), Paris 1681.

----, Treatise Sur l'Exposition du Très Saint Sacrement de l'Autels ("Treatise on the Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament of the Altars"), Avignon: 1777, Books 1 & 2.

----, Dissertation Sur les Jubés des Églises ("Dissertation on the Roodscreens of Churches"), c. 1700.

----, Dissertation Dans la Clôture du Choers des Eglises ("Dissertation on the Enclosure of Choirs of Churches"), c. 1700.

----, Dissertation Sur les Superstitions ("Dissertation on Superstitions"), c. 1700.

----, Dissertation Sur Perukes ("Dissertation on Wigs"), Paris: 1690.

----, Dissertation Sur un Inscription dans une Eglise de Rheims en Honneur de St. François ("On an Inscription at a Church at Rheims in Honour of St Francis"), c. 1700.

Vert, Dom Claude De, Lettre à Jurieu, Paris 1690.

----, Explication simple, littéraire, et historique des cérémonies de l'Eglise, Paris: 1709.

----, Sur les Mots de Messe et de Communion, Paris: 1694.

Wood, Anthony, Athenæ Oxinenses: and exact history of all the writers and bishops who have had their education in the University of Oxford, London: 1691.

----, Historia et antiquitates universitatis Oxiensis, Oxford: 1674.

vi) Nineteenth century: Books:

D' Agincourt, Jean Baptiste I. G. Séroux, Histoire de l'Art par les Monumens, depuis sa déadence au I<sup>ve</sup>. Siècle jusqu'à son revouellement au XVI<sup>e</sup>., Paris: 1823 ed.

Britton and Bayley, Antiquities of the Old Palace of Westminster: The History of the ancient palace and late houses of parliament of Westminster, 1836.

Britton, The Architectural Antiquities of Great Britain, London: 1807-26.

Gilbert, A. P. M., Histoire de l'Église de Saint-Ouen de Rouen, Paris: 1822.

Hasted, Edward, The Canterbury guide, or travellers' pocket companion by an inhabitant, Canterbury: 1807.

Hope, Thomas, An historical essay on architecture, illustrated by drawings, London: 1835.

Jacob, Charles, ed., History of the Cathedral Church of Peterborough, Peterborough 1813.  
----, History of Faversham, date unknown c. 1815.

Langlois, Eustache Hyacinthe, Essai sur l' Abbaye de Fontenelle ou de Saint Wandrille, Normandy, Paris: 1821.

Lathbury, Rev. Thomas, Protestantism the Old Religion, Popery the New, London: Painter & Leslie 1839.

----, Strictures on a Letter addressed by Mr. Pugin to the Supporters of the Martyrs Memorial at Oxford, c.1839.

Montalembert, Count C. F., De l'État Actuel de l'Art Religieux en France, Paris 1839.

----, "Account of the Destructive and Revived Pagan Principle in France", Report to M. le Minister of the Interior on Monuments, c.1839.

Neale, J. M. and B. Webb, eds., A Few Words to Church Builders: A Few Hints on the Practical Study of Ecclesiastical Antiquities, The Cambridge Camden Society 1840.

----, A Few Words to Church Wardens, Nos. 1 & 2, The Cambridge Camden Society 1841.

Parton, John, Some account of the hospital and parish of St Giles in the fields, Middlesex, Bloomsbury: 1822.

Pistolessi, Erasmo, Il Vaticano descritto ed illustrato, Rome: con disegni dal pittore C. Guerra (T. de Vivo) 1829-38.

Poole, G. A. Rev., Two Lectures on the Structure and Decoration of Churches, unidentified c. 1840.

Pricket, Marmaduke, An Historical and Architectural Description of the Priory Church of Bridlington, Cambridge: C. J. G. and F. Rivington 1831.

Repton, Humphry (sic), Observations on the Theory and practice of Landscape Gardening; including some remarks on Grecian and Gothic Architecture, London: J. Taylor 1803.

Rio, Alexis-Francois, De la poesie chrétienne dans son principe, dans sa matière et dans ses formes (de l'art chrétien) ("Christian poetry: its origin, subject and form (of Christian art)"), Paris: 1836-55.

Willis, R., Remarks on the Architecture of the Middle Ages, Cambridge: Pitt Press 1835.  
----, Architectural History of Canterbury Cathedral, London: Longman And Co., 1845.

Winkle, Benjamin, French Cathedrals from drawings by R. Garland, with an historical and descriptive account, London: 1837.

Wiseman, Nicholas Patrick S., Archbp. Of Westminster, Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church, London: 1835-36.

#### **4. Primary literature: Nineteenth century: Books:**

Barthélemy, Charles (trans.), Durandus: Rational ou manuel des divins offices, Paris: 1854.

Church, Mary C. (ed.), Life and Letters of Dean Church, London: Macmillan & Co., 1894.

Colquhoun, John Cambell, Scattered Lives of Biography, London: W. Macintosh 1864.

Dickens, Charles (ed.), The Life of Charles James Mathews, London: Macmillan & Co. 1879.

Drummond, A. L., Edward Irving and his Circle: including some consideration of the 'tongues' movement in the light of modern psychology, London: James Clarke & Co. Ltd. c. 1840's.

Eastlake, Charles Locke, A History of the Gothic Revival: an attempt to show how the taste for mediæval architecture ... has been encouraged and developed, London: 1872.

Faber, Frederick William, The Spirit and Genius of St. Philip Neri, Lectures, London: Burns and Lambert 1849-50.

Ferrey, Benjamin, Recollections of A. N. Pugin and his father Augustus Pugin, London: Edward Stanford 1861; London: The Scholar Press 1978.

Gasquet, J. R., Mr Purcell's Life of Manning, London: London Truth Society 1896.

Guéranger, Abbé de Solesmes, Institutions Liturgiques, Paris: Au Mans 1840-51.

Hogg, A. M. M. (ed.), Remains of the Late Rev. Henry Francis Lyte, London: Rivington 1850.

Husenbeth, F. C., The Life of the Right Reverend John Milner, Dublin: James Duffy, Wellington-Quay 1862.

Keble, John and John Henry Newman (eds.), Remains of Hurrell Froude, London: J. G. & F. Rivington 1838, 1839.

Liddon (Johnston, J. O. and R. J. Wilson eds.), The Life and Times of Edward Bouverie Pusey, London: 1893-97.

Merivale, J. A., ed., Autobiography & Letters of C. Merivale, Oxford 1898.

Montalembert, Count C. F., (trans. Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle) Life of St. Elizabeth of Hungary, Paris 1836: London: Booker and Dolman 1839.

----, The Monks of the West, London and Edinburgh: Blackwood and Son 1861-79.

Mozeley, Anne, Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman during his Life in the English Church: with a brief autobiography, London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1891.

Newman, John Henry, The Arians of the Fourth Century, London: J. G. & F. Rivington 1833.

----, Essays Historical and Critical, 1828-42: London: Basil Montagu Pickering 1872: 1967 ed..

----, Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church viewed relatively to Romanism and popular Protestantism, London: J. G. & F. Rivington 1837.

----, Tract 71, "On the controversy with the Romans", London: 1836.

----, Tract 83, "Advent sermons on antichrist", London: 1838.

----, Tract 90, "Remarks on certain passages in the Thirty-nine articles", London: 1841.

----, The Via Media of the Anglican Church illustrated in lectures, letters and tracts written between 1830 and 1841, London: 1877.

----, A letter Addressed to the Right Reverend Father in God, Richard, Lord Bishop of Oxford on the Occasion of the Ninetieth Tract, Oxford: 1841.

----, Essay on the development of Christian Doctrine, London: 1845.

----, Loss and Gain, London: James Burns 1848.

----, Select Treatises of St. Athanasius, Archbishop of Alexandria, in Controversy with the Arians, translated with Notes and Indices, Oxford: Parker 1842. (Vol. III of The Library of the Fathers).

----, The Second Spring, The Catholic Truth Society 1852. Republished as A Second Spring: A sermon Preached in the Synod of Oscott on Tuesday, July 13th. 1852 by John Henry Newman D.D., London: Thomas Richardson and Son 1852.

----, Apologia pro vitâ suâ: a reply to a pamphlet [by C. Kingsley] entitled 'What, then, does dr. Newman mean?', Oxford and London: J. H. & Jas. Parker 1864: New York: 1865.

Oliver, G., Collections Illustrating the History of the Catholic Religion in the Counties of Cornwall, Devon, Dorset, Somerset, Wiltshire and Gloucestershire, London: Charles Dolman 1857.

Palmer, William, Origines Liturgicae, or Antiquities of the English Ritual and a dissertation on Primitive Liturgies, Oxford: 1832, 1836.

----, A Narrative of Events connected with the publication of the Tracts for the Times, with reflections on existing tendencies to Romanism, and on the present duties and prospects of members of the Church, Oxford: John Henry Parker 1843.

----, A Treatise on the Church of Christ: designed chiefly for the use of students of Theology, London: Rivington 1838.

Pascal, Blaise, Provincial Letters: containing an Exposure of the Reasoning and Morals of the Jesuits, (Translated from the French) London: Gale and Fenner 1816 ed.

Purcell, E. S., Life of Cardinal Manning, New York: De Capo Press; London: Macmillan & Co. 1895.

----, The Life and Letters of Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle, London: Macmillan 1900.

Pusey, Edward Bouverie, Parochial Sermons, preached and printed on various occasions, London: 1884.

Robertson, J. B., trans., Möhler's Symbolism, London: Charles Dolman 1843.

Sainte-Marie, Honoré de, Reflexions on the rules and use of criticism, Paris: 1713.

Savonarola, G., Prediche italiane ai Fiorentini: Novembre e Dicembre 1494, Bologna: 1515; Perugia – Venezia: La Nuova italia 1930.

Talichet, M., M. de Montalembert et le Père Hyacinthe, Paris: E. Dentu 1877.

Todd, James Henthorn, Discourses on the Prophecies relating to Antichrist in the writings of Daniel and St. Paul: preached before the University of Dublin, at the Donellan Lectures 1838, Dublin: 1840.

Ward, Bernard, The Sequel to Catholic Emancipation: The Story of English Catholics continued down to the re-establishment of their Hierarchy in 1850, London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1915.

Ward, Wilfrid Philip, William George Ward & the Oxford Movement, London: Macmillan & Co. 1889.

----, William George Ward and the Catholic Revival, London: 1893.

----, The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman, London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1897.

----, The Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman, London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1927.

Wordsworth, William, Poems in Two Volumes, 1807. Reproduced in Alun R. Jones, ed., Wordsworth's Poems of 1807, N.J.: Humanities Press International 1987.

##### **5. Primary literature: Nineteenth century: Articles:**

Newman's review of Wiseman's Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church, *The British Critic Quarterly Theological Review and Ecclesiastical Record*, No. XL, Article VI (December 1836), London: Booker 1836.

Editorial article, "Oxford ashamed of Mr. Sewell", in *The Tablet* (30 January 1841), No. 38, Vol. XXXVIII, p.67.

The editor, "Bishop Jewel", *The British Critic*, No. LIX, (July 1841).

The editor, "The Tamworth Reading Room", *The British Critic*, No. LIX (July 1841).

The editor, Article III on Newman's Select Treatises of St. Athanasius, *The British Critic*,

No LXIV (October 1842).

Dalgairns, letter in support of Pugin, *The Univers* (10 January 1843).

The editor, "Intrigue at Balliol College", *The Oxford Chronicle* (15 April 1843).

*The Civil engineer and architect's review* 5 (April 1843), pp.117-118; 6 (May 1843), p.180.

Anon. Architect (possibly Hakewell), "Reply to Contrasts", *Fraser's Magazine* (November 1843), p.604.

G. G. Pace, "Pusey and Leeds", *The Architectural Review*, Vol. 98 (December 1945).

Brownson, the editor, review of Newman's Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine, *The United States Magazine and Democratic Review*, Vol. XVIII (February 1846).

*Brownson's Quarterly Review* (July 1846).

F. Lucas, ed., "The opening of St. Giles's, Cheadle", *The Tablet* (5 September 1846), Vol. VII, No.331, p.565.

F. Lucas, ed., "Church of St. Thomas of Canterbury, Fulham", *The Tablet* (3 June 1848), No. 422, Vol. IX, pp.355-356.

A. W. N. Pugin, "Church of St. Thomas of Canterbury, Fulham", *The Tablet* (1 July 1848), Vol. IX, No. 426, p.419.

'X' (William George Ward), "The Opening of St. George's Catholic Church", *The Rambler* 2 (8 July 1848), p.228.

'X' (W. G. Ward), "Rood-Screens", *The Rambler* (29 July 1848), pp.293-297.

'X' (W. G. Ward), "Rood-Screens", *The Rambler* (5 August 1848), pp.316-320.

'Q' – Article defending Rood screens and expressing support for Pugin, probably written by Pugin or Frederick Lucas, *The Rambler* (12 August 1848), pp.344-346.

William George Ward, "On Rood-screens: Their real history and modern origin", *The Rambler* (19 August 1848), pp.366-368.

A. W. N. Pugin, "Catholic Church Architecture", *The Tablet* (2 September 1848), Vol. IX, No. 435, p. 563.

The editor, "A Common-sense Church", *The Builder* (23 March 1850).

Editorial article (possibly written by Pugin), "Catholic Architecture", *The Tablet* (19 January 1850), Vol. XI, No.510, p.45.

J. M. Capes and M.E. Hadfield, "Town Churches", Part I, *The Rambler* (January 1850), pp.12-18.

W. W. Wardell, "Town Churches", Part II, *The Rambler* (February 1850).

'An Archaeologist' (either Pugin or the editor Frederick Lucas), "Church Architecture", *The Tablet* (2 February 1850), Vol. XI, No.512, pp.76-77.

A 'Catholic Priest', an article about Pugin's An Earnest Address on the Establishment of the Hierarchy (1850), *The Rambler* (8 March 1850).

A. W. N. Pugin, "How shall we build our Churches?", reply to "A Common-sense Church" published in *The Builder*, (23 March 1850), *The Tablet* (30 March 1850), Vol. XI, No.520, pp.199-206.

J. M. Capes, "Mr. Pugin and the Rambler", *The Rambler*, Vol. 5 (April 1850), pp.367-375.

Charles Parker, "Town Churches", Part III, *The Rambler* (June 1850).

'X' - William George Ward, "Popular Services" - a review of Faber's The Spirit and Genius of St. Philip Neri, *The Rambler* (October 1850), pp.315-351.

Editorial article by A. J. Beresford Hope, "Oratorians and Ecclesiology", *The Christian Remembrancer and Quarterly Review* (January 1851), pp.141-164.

Editorial article, possibly by A. J. Beresford Hope, "The Influence of Christian Art", *The Christian Remembrancer and Quarterly Review* (January 1851), p.175-199.

The editor, "The Rambler – Mr. Pugin's Comment on the Oratorian Church", *The New York Ecclesiologist*, Vol. 3 (March 1851), pp.55-58.

J. M. Capes, a review of Newman's Lectures on Certain Difficulties, *The Rambler* (March 1851).

J. M. Capes, ed., "The Church and Antiquarianism", *The Rambler* (April 1851).

*The Catholic Standard*, Vol. IV, No. 83 (10 May 1851), p.8.

F. Lucas, editor, review of Pugin's Treatise on Chancel and Rood-Screens *The Tablet* (17 May 1851), Vol. XII, No.579, pp. 314-315.

F. Lucas, editor, "St. Philip's Day at the Oratory – important Sermon of Cardinal Wiseman", *The Tablet* (31 May 1851), Vol.XII, No.581, p.346.

*The Lamp*, 7 June 1851, p.364.

J. M. Capes, ed., "'Churches' versus 'Rooms'", Vol. 8, *The Rambler* (July 1851), pp.41-45.

F. Lucas, ed., "Death of Mr. Pugin", *The Tablet* (18 September 1852), Vol.XIII, No.649, p.596. Obituary notice.

F. Lucas, ed., "Death of Mr. Pugin", *The Tablet* (25 September 1852), Vol.XIII, No.650, p. 620.

F. Lucas, ed., "Funeral of Mr. Pugin", *The Tablet* 13 (25 September 1852), Vol.XIII, No.650, p.612.

Father Thomas Doyle, "Welby Pugin", *The Tablet* (25 September 1852), Vol.XIII, No.650, pp.617-618.

Talbot Bury, "Pugin's Obituary", *The Builder* (Saturday 25 September 1852).

The editor, Pugin's obituary, *The Morning Chronicle* (October 1852).

The editor, "The late Mr. Pugin", *The Ecclesiologist* (October 1852), pp.352-357.

F. Lucas, ed., "Funeral of the late Mr. Pugin – Sermon of the Lord Bishop of Southwark (from our own Correspondent)", *The Tablet* (2 October 1852), Vol.XIII, No.651, pp.629-630.

*The Athenaeum* (15 July 1843), p.109.

Mrs. O. W. Oliphant, "Augustus Welby Pugin", *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* (December 1861), No.DLIV, VOL.XC, pp.670-689.

E. S. Purcell, "Pugin and Turner" and a review of Benjamin Ferrey's Recollections, *The Dublin Review* (February 1862). Vol. 1, p.262.

Edward Pugin, "Augustus Welby Pugin – Note", *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* (February 1862). Letter to the editor.

*The Westminster Gazette*. Founded by Manning in 1866 & edited by E. S. Purcell.

The editor, obituary of Edward Pugin, *The Kent Argus* (10 June 1875).

## 6. Reference works:

Archives biographiques français, London and Paris: K.G. Saur 1988.

The Apostolic Constitutions - 2<sup>nd</sup> - 4<sup>th</sup> century. These are the Canonical Books of the New Testament on Christian Laws and Constitutions.

Holy Bible – The New International Version, London, Sidney and Auckland: Hodder and Stoughton 1994.

The Encyclopædia Britannica, 11<sup>th</sup> edition, 1911.

The New Encyclopædia Britannica, 15<sup>th</sup> edition, 1997.

Attinger, Victor, ed., Dictionnaire Historique et Biographique de la Suisse, Neuchatel: Administration du Dictionnaire historique et Biographique de la Suisse 1930.

Coggins, R. J. and J. L. Houldens, eds., A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation, London: SCM Press 1990.

Fink, Peter E. (ed.), The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press 1990.

Davies, J.G. ed. A New Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship, SCM Press Ltd. 1986.

Hofer, J. C. F., Nouvelle biographie générale, Archives biographiques français, Paris: 1852: London and Paris: K. G. Saur 1988.

Larousse, Pierre, ed., Grand Dictionnaire Universel du XIX Siècle, Paris: Arlâ c.1993.

Livingstone, E.A., ed., The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, Oxford: Oxford University Press 1997.

Richardson, Alan and John Bowden, eds., A New Dictionary of Catholic Theology, London: SCM Press 1983.

Stephens, Leslie and Sidney Lee, eds The Dictionary of National Biography (DNB), Oxford: Oxford University Press 1900.

Wace, Henry and William C. Piercy, eds., A Dictionary of Christian Biography and Literature, London: John Murray 1911.

Murray, Peter and Linda, eds., The Oxford Companion to Christian Art and Architecture, Oxford: Oxford University Press 1996.

Microfilm HLRO Historical Collection No. 304/127.

Records of Religious Orders, List 29.

Catalogue of books and MSS in Salisbury Cathedral Library compiled by Rev. John Greenly 1849.

The Bard Center for Studies in the Decorative Arts, A. W. N. Pugin: Master of Gothic Revival (Catalogue), New York 1995.

Wedgwood, Alexandra, A. W. N. Pugin and the Pugin Family (Catalogue), London: V. & A. 1985.

The Report of the Nineteenth Eucharistic Congress, held at Westminster from 9<sup>th</sup> to 13<sup>th</sup> September 1908, Edinburgh: Sands and Company 1909.

*The Proceedings of the Second (and also the Third) International Colloquium of historical, canonical and theological studies on the Roman Catholic Liturgy*, organised by the Centre International d'Etudes Liturgiques, The Veneration and administration of the Eucharist, Southampton: The Saint Austin Press 1997.

The Decreta Ouatuor Conciliorum Provincialium Westmonasteriensium (1852-1873), London: Burns and Oates.

The Code of Canon Law of the Roman Curia, 1917. Canon 1164.

The Council of Trent, Session XXII, '*Doctrine on the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass*' c.8.

Coriden, James A., Thomas J. Green & Donald E. Heintschel (eds.), The Code of Canon Law, London: Geoffrey Chapman 1985.

The Bull of Pope Pius IV, Professions of the Catholic faith according to the Council of Trent 1545 - 63.

Pope Pius XII's encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu*, 1943.

The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, The Second Vatican Council (S.C. 10).

### **7. Secondary literature: Twentieth century: Books:**

Abbo, John A. and Jerome D. Hannon (eds.), The Sacred Canons, St. Louis and London: B. Herder Books Co. 1952.

Addington, Raleigh (Priest of the London Oratory), The Idea of the Oratory, London: Burns and Oates 1966.

Aigrain, Abbé R., Liturgia: Encyclopédie Populaire des Connaissances Liturgiques, Paris: Librairie Bloud et Gay 1835.

Alfonso, Cardinal Capecelatro, The Life of Saint Philip Neri, London: Burns and Washborne 1926.

Altholz, Josef L., The Liberal Catholic Movement in England: The 'Rambler' and its Contributors 1848-1864, London: Burns & Oates 1960.

Anson, Peter F., Fashions in Church Furnishings 1840-1940, London: Studio Vista 1965.

Austin, R.W.J., Rites of Durham: Material selected and rendered from the Rites of Durham into modern English, Chester-le- Street: The City Printing Works 1986.

Bacchus, Joseph (ed.), Correspondence of John Henry Newman with John Keble and Others, London: Longmans & Green 1917.

Bacci, Father, The Life of St. Philip Neri, Rome: Marini 1937 (Translated by Frederick Ignatius Antrobus), London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trober Co., 1902 ed.

The Bard Graduate Center for Studies in the Decorative Arts, A.W.N. Pugin: Master of Gothic Revival, New York: Yale University Press 1995.

Barmann, Lawrence F., Baron Friedrich von Hügel and the Modernist crisis in England, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1972.

Basset, B., SJ, The English Jesuits from Campion to Martindale, London: Burns and Oates 1967.

Beck, G.A. (ed.), The English Catholics 1850-1950, London: Burns & Oates 1950.

Belcher, Margaret, An Annotated Critical Bibliography, London: Mansell 1987.

---, The Collected Letters of A. W. N. Pugin, Vol. I, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2001.

Betjeman, John, Ghastly Good Taste, London: Anthony Blond Ltd. 1933.

-----, First and Last Loves, London: Century in association with the National Trust 1987, John Murray 1952.

----- (ed.), Collins Guide to English Parish Churches, London: Collins 1958.

Bøe, Alf, From Gothic Revival to Functional Form, Oslo: Oslo University Press and Oxford: Basil Blackwell 1957.

Bolgar, R. R., ed., Classical Influences on European Culture A.D. 1500-1700, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1976.

Booth, Bradford Allen, The Letters of Anthony Trollope, Oxford: Geoffrey Cumberlege: Oxford University Press 1951.

Bossy, John, The English Catholic Community 1570-1850, London: Darton, Longman and Todd 1975.

Bouyer, Louis, Life and Liturgy, London: Sheed and Ward 1956.

-----, The Liturgy Revived: A Doctrinal Commentary of the Conciliar Constitution of the Liturgy, London: Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd., 1964.

Brilioth, Yngve, Eucharistic Faith and Practice, London: New York: Toronto: The Macmillan Co. 1930.

Bullard, J. V. and H. Chamber Bell, eds., Lyndwood's Provinciale: The Text of the Canons therein contained, reprinted from the translation made in 1534, London: The Faith Press 1929.

Butler, Cuthbert, The Life of Bishop Ullathorne, London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne 1926.

Carpenter, S. C., Church and People 1789-1889, London: S.P.C.K. 1933.

Casel, Odo, Der Begriff des Mysteriums Bei Johannes Chrysostomus, Bonn: Hanstein 1953.

-----, Mysterientheologie: Ansatz und Gestalt, Regensburgh c. 1986.

Chadwick, Owen, The Mind of the Oxford Movement, London: Adam & Charles Black 1960.

-----, The Popes and the European Revolution, Oxford: The Clarendon Press 1981.

-----, From Bossuet to Newman, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1987.

-----, The Spirit of the Oxford Movement, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1990.

-----, Catholicism and History: The Opening of the Vatican Archives, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1978.

Champ, Judith F., Oscott, Birmingham: Archdiocese of Birmingham Historical Commission 1987.

Chaussy, Dom Yves, Les Bénédictines et la réforme Catholique en France au XVIIe. Siècle, Paris: Éditions de la Source 1975.

- Clark, Kenneth, The Gothic Revival, London: John Murray 1928.
- Clarke, Basil Fulforth Lowther, Church Builders of the Nineteenth Century, Newton Abbot: David and Charles 1969, 1938.
- O'Connell, Marvin R., The Oxford Conspirators: a history of the Oxford Movement 1833-45, London: Macmillan & Co. 1969.
- Crichton, J. D., Saints or Sinners? Jansenism or Jansenisers in seventeenth century France, Dublin: Veritas Publications 1996.
- Danielou, S.J., From Shadows to Reality, London: Burns and Oates 1960.
- Dessain, Charles Stephen (ed.), The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman, London: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd. Vols. XI, XII, XIII & XIV.
- Dickens, A. G., The Counter Reformation, London: Thames and Hudson 1968.  
----, The Age of Humanism and Reformation: Europe in the Fourteenth, Fifteenth and Sixteen Centuries, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall 1972.
- Dillenberger, John and Jane, eds., Paul Tillich: On Art and Architecture, New York: The Crossroad Publishing Co. 1989.
- Dix, Dom Gregory, The Shape of the Liturgy, London: Adam and Charles Black 1945.
- Duffy, Eamon, The Stripping of the Altars c. 1400-c.1580, London: Yale University Press 1992.
- Dyson, R. W., ed. and trans., Augustine: City of God against the Pagans, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1998.
- Edwards, David L., Christian England, London: Collins: Fount 1989.
- Evans, Gillian R., Augustine on Evil, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1982.
- Fisher, E. A., The greater Anglo-Saxon Churches, London: Faber and Faber Ltd. 1962.
- Fothergill, Brian and J. Mordaunt Crook (eds.), Nicholas Wiseman, London: Faber & Faber 1963.
- Freiherr, Pastor Ludwig Von, History of the Popes, London: St Louis: Herder: Routledge & Kegan Paul 1936-53.
- Germann, Georg, Gothic Revival, London: Lund Humphries 1972.
- Gilley, Sheridan, Newman and his Age, London: Darton, Longman and Todd 1990.
- Gough, Austin, Paris and Rome: The Gallican Church and the Ultramontane Campaign 1848-1853, Oxford: The Clarendon Press 1986.
- Grant, R. M., The Letter and the Spirit, London: S.P.C.K. 1957.
- Gray, Robert, Cardinal Manning: A Biography, London: George Weidenfield & Nicholas

Ltd. 1985.

Guiney, Imogen, Hurrell Froude: memoranda and comments, London: 1904.

Gwynn, Denis, The Second Spring, London: Burns & Oates 1942.

----, Lord Shrewsbury, Pugin and the Catholic Revival, London: Hollis and Carter 1946.

Haigh, Christopher, ed., The English Reformation Revised, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1987.

Hanshell, Deryck, Devoutly and Reverently: Hints for Priests Celebrating Mass, Liverpool: Print Origination (NW) Ltd. 1991.

Harper, John, The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy from the Tenth to the Eighteenth Century, Oxford: The Clarendon Press 1991.

Harries, John Glen, Pugin, Princes Risborough: Shire Publications 1973.

Haskell, Francis, Patrons and Painters, London: Chatto and Windus 1963.

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

Hennell, Michael, Sons of the Prophets: The Evangelical Leaders of the Victorian Church, London: S.P.C.K. 1979.

Hitchcock, Henry-Russell, Early Victorian Architecture in Britain, London: Trewin Copplestone 1954.

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

Holmes, G., The Florentine Enlightenment 1400-1450, New York 1969.

Krautheimer, Richard, Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae, Rome: Città del Vaticano 1937.

Ker, Ian, John Henry Newman: a Biography, Oxford: The Clarendon Press 1988.

----, ed., Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine, 1982 ed.

Krailsheimer, A. J., (Translation and Introduction), Pascal Pensées, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books 1966.

Lethaby, W. R. and Harold Swanson, The Church of Sancta Sophia Constantinople: A Study of Byzantine Building, London: New York: Macmillan and Co. 1894.

Lindbeck, George A., The Nature of Doctrine, London: S.P.C.K. 1984.

Macauley, James, The Gothic Revival 1745-1845, London and Glasgow: Blackie 1975.

Mathew, Bp. David, Catholicism in England 1535-1935: Portrait of a minority, its Culture and Tradition, London: Longmans & Co. 1936.

Mitchel, Natham, OSB, Cult and Controversy: The Worship of the Eucharist Outside Mass, New York: Pueblo Publishing Co., 1974.

Moisy, Pierre, Les Eglises des Jésuites de l'ancienne assistance de France, Rome: Institutum Historicum 1958.

Munby, A. N. L., ed., Sale Catalogues of the Libraries of Eminent People, Vol. 4 (Architects), London: Mansell, Southeby and Park-Bernet 1971.

Murray, Peter, The Architecture of the Italian Renaissance, London: Thames and Hudson 1963; London: 1986.

Newsome, David, The Parting of Friends, London: John Murray 1966.

---, The Convert Cardinals: John Henry Newman and Henry Edward Manning, London: John Murray 1993.

Nockles, Peter, The Oxford Movement in Context, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1994.

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

---, Roman Catholicism in England, Oxford: Oxford University Press 1985.

Pastor, Ludwig Freiherr Von, History of the Popes, London: St. Loius: Herder: Routledge & Kegan Paul 1936 – 53.

Pierre-Marie, Gy, O.P., ed., Guillaume Durand: Évêque de Mende 1230-1296, Paris: Central National de la Recherche Scientifique 1992.

Ponnelle, Louis and Louis Bordet, St Philip Neri and the Roman Society of his Times 1515-1595, London: Sheed and Ward 1932: 1979 ed.

Randell Keith, The Catholic and Counter Reformation, London: Toronto: Sidney: Hodder and Stoughton 1990.

Reekie, Bruce, The Glory and Power of His Presence, Tonbridge: Sovereign World 1996.

Rovoir, G. T., Lombardic Architecture, Oxford: The Clarendon Press 1933.

Scarbrick, J. J., The Jesuits and the Catholic Reformation, London: The Historical Association 1988.

Schiefen, Richard J., Nicholas Wiseman: and the Transformation of English Catholicism, Sheperdstown: the Patmos Press 1984.

Schememann, Alexander, Introduction to Liturgical Theology, London: The Faith Press 1966.

Scott, Geoffrey, The Architecture of Humanism, London: New York: Norton and Co. 1969: 1999.

Selby, R.C. The Principle of Reserve in the writings of John Henry, Cardinal Newman,

London: Oxford University Press 1975.

Simpson, F.S.W., The Church of the Holy Trinity, Long Melford, Gloucester: The British Publishing Co., 1957.

Smith, Christine, Architecture in the Culture of Early Humanism: Ethics, Aesthetics, and Eloquence 1400-1470, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press 1992.

Stanton, Phoebe and Nikolas Pevsner, Pugin, London: Thames and Hudson, 1971.

Steinberg, Ronald M., Fra Girolamo Savonarola, Florentine Art, and Renaissance Historiography, Athens and Ohio: Ohio University Press 1977.

Srawley, J.H., The Early History of the Liturgy, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1947.

Summerson, John, ed., Concerning Architecture: Essays on Architectural Writers and Writing Presented to Nikolas Pevsner, London: The Penguin Press 1968.

Svaglic, Martin J. (ed.), The Apologia pro vitâ suâ of John Henry Cardinal Newman, Oxford: The Clarendon Press 1967.

Taft, Robert F., The Great Entrance: A history of the Transfer of Gifts and other Pre-anaphoral Rites of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, Rome: Pontifical Institutum Studiorum Orientalium 1975.

Tracey, Gerard (ed.), The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman, Oxford: Oxford University Press 1995. Vol. VII.

Trappes-Lomax, Michael, Pugin: A Medieval Victorian, London: Sheed & Ward 1932.

Wainwright, Clive and Paul Atterbury, eds., Pugin: A Gothic Passion, Newhaven and London: Yale University Press 1994.

Watkins, David, Morality and Architecture, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1977.

----, Morality and Architecture Revised, London: John Murray 2001.

Wedgwood, Alexandra (ed.), The Pugin Family: Catalogue of the Drawing Collection of the Royal Institute of British Architects, London: The Royal Institute of British Architects 1977.

----, A. W. N. Pugin and the Pugin Family, London: V. & A. Catalogue 1985.

White, James F., The Cambridge Movement: The Ecclesiologists and the Gothic Revival, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1962.

Williams, Guy, Augustus Pugin versus Decimus Burton: A Victorian Architectural Duel, London: Cassell Publishers Ltd., 1990.

Williams, Raymond, Culture and Society 1780-1950, London: Chatto & Windus 1958.

Wittkower, Rudolph and Irma B. Jaffe, Baroque Art: The Jesuit Contribution, New York:

Fordham University Press 1972.

Wittkower, Rudolph, Architectural Principles: in the Age of Humanism, London: Academy Editions 1949.

Yates, Nigel, ed., Faith and Fabric: A History of Rochester Cathedral, Woodridge: The Boydell Press 1996.

#### **8. Secondary literature: Twentieth century: Articles:**

Bright, Michael, "A Reconstruction of A. W. N. Pugin's Architectural Theories", *Victorian Studies*, Vol. 22, no. 2 (Winter 1979), pp.151-172.

Butler, Father Emmanuel de, "Le Celebrant et l'Autel Avant et Après Vatican II", The Veneration and administration of the Eucharist, Southampton: The Saint Austin Press 1997. *The Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium of historical, canonical and theological studies on the Roman Catholic Liturgy*, organised by the C.I.E.L.,

Chanut, Father Christian-Philippe, "Concerning Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament", The Veneration and administration of the Eucharist, Southampton: The Saint Austin Press 1997. *The Proceedings of the Second International Colloquium of historical, canonical and theological studies on the Roman Catholic Liturgy*, organised by the C.I.E.L.

Clark, Alexander Gordon, "A. W. N. Pugin", *Victorian Architecture*, ed. Peter Ferriday, London: Jonathan Cape 1963.

Davenport, Nancy, "Fortress Catholicism: The Art of Ultramontanism at Notre Dame de Fourvière", in Linda Woodhead, Reinventing Christianity: Nineteenth Century Contexts, Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Company 2001, pp.45-55.

Davies, Michael, "Veneration of the Eucharist in the sixteenth century Anglican Reformation", 1996, The Veneration and administration of the Eucharist, Southampton: The Saint Austin Press 1997, *The Proceedings of the Second International Colloquium of historical, canonical and theological studies on the Roman Catholic Liturgy*, organised by the C.I.E.L.

Hanson, R.P.C., "Disciplina Arcani", in A. Richardson and John Bowden, eds., A New Dictionary of Christian Theology, London: SCM Press 1983, p.158.

Holl, K., "Die Entstehung der Bilderwand in der griechischen Kirche", *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, 9 (1906).

Krailsheimer, A. J., "Jansenism", New Dictionary of Christian Theology, London: SCM Press 1983, pp. 305-306.

Manning, H. E., "The Grounds of Faith: Four Lectures delivered at St George's, Southwark" (1852) quoted in Newsome's Convert Cardinals 1993.

Mathew, Bp. David, "Old Catholics and Converts" quoted in G. A. Beck, ed., The English Catholics 1850-1950, London: Burns & Oates 1950.

Meara, David, "The Catholic Context", The Bard Center, A. W. N. Pugin: Master of

Gothic Revival, 1995.

Patrick, James, "Newman, Pugin, and Gothic", *Victorian Studies* Winter 1979 Vol. 22; Winter 1981 Vol. 24, pp.185-205.

Powell, John Hardman, "Pugin in his Home", *Architectural History*, Vol. 31, 1988.

O'Reilly, Séan, "Roman versus Romantic: Classical Roots in the Origins of a Roman Catholic Ecclesiology" *Architectural History*, Vol., pp.40-41 (1997-98).

Schiefel, Richard J., "The English Catholic Reaction to the Tractarian Movement", a paper given at a joint session of the Canadian Historical Society and the Canadian Catholic Historical Association, Toronto, Summer 1974.

Spencer-Silver, Patricia, "George Myers, Pugin's Builder" in *Recusant History*, October 1990, Vol. 20, pp.262-271.

Stanton, Phoebe, "The Sources of Pugin's Contrasts", John Summerson, ed., Concerning Architecture: Essays on Architectural Writers and writing presented to Nikolas Pevsner, London: The Penguin Press 1968.

Walter, J., AA, "The Origins of the Iconostasis", *Eastern Churches Review*, 3 (1971).

*The Thanet Catholic Review*, Vol. I, The Monastery Press 1931.

## **9. Unpublished theses, dissertations, essays, etc.**

Nockles, Peter Benedict, "Continuity and change in Anglican high churchmanship in Britain, 1792-1850", University of Oxford, Faculty of Theology, D.Phil. thesis 1982.

Pantus, Willem Jan, "Aspeke des Briefwechsels Reichensperger – Thijm" given at a conference called "Gothic Revival" at the Catholic University of Leuven 7-10 November 1997.

Picket, Richard James, "The Churchmanship of A. W. N. Pugin", MA Thesis for the University of Durham 2001.

Powell, John Hardman, "Pugin in his Home", MS. SEC.Box 21/4, "St. Edmund's College" Box, Westminster Diocesan Archives.

Pugin correspondence relating to Lives of the Saints, MS. 7, in the "Pugin File", the Birmingham Oratory Archives.

Stanton, Phoebe, "Pugin", University of London, Ph.D. thesis 1950.

Weinstein, Donald, Prophecy and Humanism in Late Fifteenth Century Florence, D.Phil. Thesis University of Iowa 1957.

**10. Supplementary reading:**

Benoit, J. D., Liturgical Renewal: studies in Catholic and Protestant Developments on the Continent, London: SCM Press 1958.

Bossuet, J. B., An Exposition of Doctrine of the Catholic Church, Tracts on Christian Unity, 1853.

-----, History of the Variations (Translation by S. Musson) Antwerp: 1742.

Burgon, John William, Lives of Twelve Good Men, London: John Murray 1888.

Formby, Henry, Catholic Christian's guide to the right use of Christian psalmody and of the psalter, London: 1846.

Hughlings-Jackson, John, Cases of Diseases of the nervous system in Patients the subject of Inherited Syphilis, London: 1868.

Holmes, Derek, Triumph of the Holy See, London: Burns & Oates 1978.

Jansen, Cornelius, Augustinus, (Postumous) 1640.

Johnson, Cuthbert OSB, Prosper Guéranger (1805-1875): A Liturgical Theologian, Rome: 1984.

Jones, Alun R., Wordsworth Poems of 1807, New Jersey: Humanities Press 1987.

Jones, Cheslyn, Geoffrey Wainwright, Edward Yarnold SJ, Paul Bradshaw, eds., The Study of Liturgy, London: SPCK & Oxford University Press 1992.

Kavanagh, Aidan, On Liturgical Theology, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press 1981.

Kelley, D.R., Beginning of Ideology: Consciousness and Formation in the French Reformation, Cambridge: 1981.

Kley, Dale Van, The Jesuits and the Expulsion of the Jesuits from France 1757-1765, New Haven and London: Yale University Press 1975.

Kolakowski, Leszek, God Owes us Nothing: A Brief Remark on Pascal's Religion and on the Spirit of Jansenism, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press 1995.

Küng, Hans, Traces of Transcendence: Mozart: Spuren der Transzendenz, London: Grand Rapids SCM Press 1992, 1993.

Davis, D. B., Problem of Slavery in an Age of Revolution 1770-1823, London: Ithaca 1967.

Dyer, J. George, The Denial of Limbo and the Jansenist Controversy, Illinois: Saint Mary of the Lake Seminary 1955.

Herwegen, Abbot Ildefons, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Alten Mönchtums und des Benediktinerordens, Munster: 1912.

Holmes, Derek, Triumph of the Holy See, London: Burns and Oates 1978.

Holmes, W. H. G., The Presence of God: A Study of Divine Immanence and Transcendence, London: S.P.C.K. 1923.

McGrath, Alistair, The Genesis of Doctrine: a study on the foundation of doctrinal criticism, Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans 1997.

Möhler, John Adam, Symbolism: or, Exposition of the Doctrinal Differences between Catholics and Protestants, Translated by James Burton Robertson, London: Charles Dolman 1843.

Placard, William C., The Domestication of Transcendence: How Modern Thinking About God Went Wrong, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press 1996.

La Porte, Jean, La Doctrine de Porte-Royal: La Morale, Paris: Librairie Philosophique: J. Vrin 1951.

Switzerland (Anon.), A Rapid View of the overthrow of Switzerland by an eye-witness, translated from the French 1799 (copy in Bodleian Library, Oxford).

Tyrrell, George, Medievalism, London: Burns and Oates 1994, 1908.

Tyrrell, George and Maude D. M. Petre, George Tyrrell's Letters, London: T. Fisher Unwin 1920.

