

## **Happiness in Hell: A Controversy in the English Catholic Discourse (1892–1893)**

### **Simon Mayers**

I would like to talk to you today about a controversy that arose in the English Catholic discourse in 1892 and 1893. The point of contention was whether a measure of happiness is experienced by the inmates of Hell. Whilst it took on a momentum of its own, the controversy was triggered by an article published by George Mivart in December 1892.<sup>1</sup> Mivart was an English convert to Catholicism, a prominent scientist, and an amateur theologian.<sup>2</sup> In the 1870s, he published a number of articles and books that argued that evolution exists, but operates in accordance to a plan laid down by God.<sup>3</sup> For his reconciliation of evolution and theology, he was awarded an honorary doctorate by Pope Pius IX in 1876.<sup>4</sup> Encouraged, he went on to argue that happiness exists in Hell. The result was a torrent of letters, sermons and articles in various Catholic newspapers and periodicals, including the *Tablet*, the *Month*,<sup>5</sup> the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*,<sup>6</sup> the *Franciscan Annals*<sup>7</sup> and *La Civiltà*

*Cattolica*.<sup>8</sup> Some were sympathetic, though most were ambivalent or hostile.

In July 1893, all of Mivart's articles on Hell were placed on the Index of forbidden works. At the time, Mivart formally submitted to the decision of the Congregation of the Index. However, in 1899, he protested the decision to keep his works on the Index, withdrew his submission,<sup>9</sup> and subsequently published a series of articles that were critical of the Church.<sup>10</sup> The conclusion to the drama was a sad one. In January 1900, Cardinal Archbishop Vaughan circulated a letter which excluded Mivart from receiving the sacraments. Mivart died just a few months later. This sad finale has been examined elsewhere,<sup>11</sup> but the controversy in 1892 and 1893 has received little attention, and the main focus when it has been examined, has been the placement of his works on the Index.<sup>12</sup> My presentation will instead focus on the *Tablet*, the semi-official newspaper of the English Catholic hierarchy, and the property of Herbert Vaughan, the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. Not

only was it the most prominent English Catholic newspaper at the time, it also became a major forum for an intense and bitter debate about happiness in Hell, and it contained a significant variety of responses.

I should stress that as a historian, I will only present the constructions of Hell as they appeared in the English Catholic discourse, without judgment or evaluation of their theological or metaphysical accuracy, or their ethical merit.

### **Mivart**

I will begin by outlining some of the key themes from a series of articles by Mivart on the subject of happiness in Hell, before turning to the responses they provoked. Mivart explained that his goal was to prove that the Church's position on Hell was compatible with right reason. His main argument was based on a distinction between two types of suffering, the *poena damni*, which is to say the loss of the Beatific Vision of God, and the *poena sensus*, which is to say the suffering of the senses, or

punishment by “hell fire.” He pointed out that the Catholic Church is, quote, “definitely committed to the doctrine that the souls condemned to Hell remain there for all eternity.” However, he argued that the majority of souls in Hell were only condemned to the loss of the Beatific Vision, and not condemned to hell fire.<sup>13</sup> According to Mivart, Catholic teaching acknowledges that there are enormous “differences of condition” between those who are “excluded from Heaven.”<sup>14</sup>

Mivart argued that only those in a “higher state” of “grace” can desire direct union with God, and thus only they have the possibility of entering Heaven. However, the condition in Hell for those who were never elevated to this supernatural capacity of “grace,” for example, unbaptized infants, was, he reasoned, very different to those who received the supernatural capacity of “grace” and rejected it.<sup>15</sup> Whilst excluded from Heaven, unbaptized children, according to Mivart, enjoy an “eternity of natural happiness” in Hell. Similarly for virtuous pagans from “heathen nations,” who, quote, “die with their

moral and intellectual faculties so imperfectly developed as to be, in this matter, like children.” Being unaware of the supernatural capacity for union with God, these residents of Hell do not suffer, though their eternal happiness, according to Mivart, is of a much lower order to the supreme bliss experienced in Heaven.<sup>16</sup> A full natural existence, he argued, complete with happiness, health, companionship, love and peace, is thus compatible with being in Hell. Mivart suggested that this has been the fate of the “immense multitude of mankind” that has died unbaptized.<sup>17</sup> It is, Mivart concluded, only “baptized Christians,” who “knowingly and with malice sin mortally and so persist till death,” who are “really condemned to Hell, there to suffer, not only the state of loss, but the *poena sensus* also.”<sup>18</sup> Even then, he contended, the level of suffering varies in relation to the demerits of the individual,<sup>19</sup> and, he suggested, even those who suffer the worst afflictions prefer their sufferings to non-existence.<sup>20</sup> Mivart based this on his reading of St. Augustine, who suggested that for every being, existence is preferable to non-existence.<sup>21</sup> Mivart also argued

that even the most damned of souls may benefit from a “process of evolution,” which takes place in Hell, and which may gradually reduce their suffering, though never to the extent of raising them to the state of grace, “for the tenants of Hell are its tenants eternally.”<sup>22</sup> Furthermore, he argued, the damned may find in Hell a “kind of harmony with their own mental condition,” and find solace in the society of like-minded souls, who together may hug their chains in their shared situation.<sup>23</sup>

### ***The Tablet***

Having outlined the key themes from Mivart’s argument for the existence of happiness in Hell, I would like to turn now to some of the responses it provoked.

The earliest response in the *Tablet* was an editorial that appeared in the paper on the 3rd December 1892.<sup>24</sup> The editorial, though critical of most of his arguments, was polite and reasonably sympathetic. According to the editorial, Mivart was operating on “a strictly orthodox basis” and on “solid

theological ground” when he argued that “the state of unbaptized infants in the next world is, ... one of [natural] happiness,” even though they are excluded “from the Beatific Vision, ... outside of Heaven, and therefore in a place which theologically cannot be described by any other name than Hell.”

The editorial was however critical of his other arguments. In arguing that unbaptized adults from heathen lands experience a state of natural happiness in Hell, and furthermore narrowing the range of “Hell-deserving” sins for the baptized, he was, the editorial concluded, an advocate for the sinner. The editorial suggested that Mivart’s article moved from the frontier of Catholic teaching to the “territory of personal opinion.” Examining Mivart’s engagement with Augustine,<sup>25</sup> and in particular the ontological claim that “it is always better to be than not to be,” the editorial countered that it might “be better for the general harmony of being as a whole,” that sinners “should exist in Hell rather than pass into nothingness,” but not at all better for the sinners as individuals. Despite its critical reception of Mivart’s article, the editorial did conclude that there

was “much that is good and beautiful and true” in it, and that it had been loyally conceived, “with the admirable intention of smoothing the path to faith for those who find in the terrible truths of Eternal Punishment a constant and crucial religious difficulty.”<sup>26</sup>

The issue of the 10th December contained a number of letters on the subject of happiness in Hell. John McIntyre, a Catholic priest who in later years would go on to become Archbishop of Birmingham,<sup>27</sup> submitted a letter which criticised the editorial from the previous week for being overly sympathetic towards Mivart’s article with regard to the fate of unbaptized children. “Theologians of greatest weight,” McIntyre observed, “from St. Augustine onwards, teach by no means the more lenient doctrine [with regard to the fate of unbaptized children].” How then, he asked, “can it be said” that “it is undoubtedly the accepted teaching of the Church that unbaptized children ... enjoy a state of natural happiness?” McIntyre refused to venture an explicit opinion as to the actual

fate of the souls of unbaptized children, but he certainly objected to any attempt to invoke the teachings of the Church to support the claim that they would experience a measure of happiness in the afterlife.<sup>28</sup>

A letter submitted under the pseudonym of “Viator,” compared and contrasted Mivart’s claims with the propositions laid down by St. Aquinas, on the grounds that Aquinas is widely accepted as a “safe guide” to acceptable theology. According to Viator, Aquinas, unlike Mivart, argued that it is “a mortal sin” for adults, who have reached the age of reason, even if unbaptized, not to use their reason to orient themselves to God.<sup>29</sup> In response to Mivart’s claims that the damned prefer their existence in Hell to non-existence, Viator argued that whilst according to Aquinas it is natural and good to desire to exist, some people override this natural inclination. This, Viator suggested, applies especially to the eternally damned, as to be eternally miserable is a fate worse than ceasing to exist.<sup>30</sup>

On the 11th December, Edward Bagshawe, the Bishop of Nottingham, submitted a 15 page pastoral letter to the priests of his diocese. This was then printed in the *Tablet*. It argued that Mivart's article perverted "to a most grievous extent, and in a most dangerous way, the doctrine of the Catholic Church." Referring to the Council of Florence, which occurred in the 15th century, and the Council of Trent, in the 16th century, the bishop declared that in the case of unbaptized infants, "we are bound by the faith to say that they have sinned in Adam, have truly inherited sin from him, have lost their innocence, have been made unclean, and by nature children of wrath. We are also bound by the faith to say that their souls after death go down immediately into the lower regions." "It is heresy," the bishop concluded, "to deny that the souls of unbaptized babies are guilty of sin, or that they are punished for their guilt."<sup>31</sup>

Several more letters on the subject were published in the *Tablet* on the 17th December. These were mostly critical of claims that unbaptized children might experience happiness in

Hell. For example, a letter from a priest published under the pseudonym “a Priest on the Tremble,” submitted a letter that was not directly critical of Mivart, but rather critical of a letter written by Canon James Moyes, the secretary of the Archbishop of Westminster, which had been published in the *Daily Telegraph*. Canon Moyes had argued that children who died unbaptized experienced some measure of happiness in Hell, on the grounds that “there can be no future punishment awarded to the innocent.”<sup>32</sup> “A Priest on the Tremble” disagreed. He observed that according to the declaration at the Council of Florence, all souls who died in sin, even if “in original sin alone” and not mortal sin, “go down into Hell, to be punished,” albeit to suffer different levels of pain. “A Priest on the Tremble” stated that “the Church defines a future punishment in Hell for those who depart this life with the original stain upon them, as unbaptized infants do,” and he expressed shock at a representative of the Archbishop holding the opinion that “souls infected with original sin” were innocent and would enjoy a “future happiness.”<sup>33</sup>

Not all of the letters were hostile to the idea that the fate of unbaptized children in the next world included some measure of happiness. One letter responded to John McIntyre, stating that the proposition that unbaptized children would not only be “deprived of the sight of God,” but also receive “an eternity of torment,” was, quote, “a proposition so horrible and so utterly revolting to the natural sense of justice implanted in us by God, ... that if it was asserted by an angel of light as a fact, I would rather believe that I beheld a devil in disguise, who uttered a blasphemy against the mercy and justice of the Almighty.” The letter suggested that if such was to be the fate of unbaptized infants, then God may as well have “created them already in Hell.”<sup>34</sup>

The author of the original editorial that had appeared in the *Tablet* on the 3rd December also responded to some of the hostile letters. In response to McIntyre’s argument that important theologians from St. Augustine onwards have taught

“by no means the more lenient doctrine [with regard to unbaptized children],” he produced a list of Church Fathers and theologians who argued that the fate of unbaptized children in the next world is not one of suffering, even though they would spend eternity deprived of the vision of God. “That God should inflict ... actual positive pain upon myriads of helpless children for a sin which they had no actual share in committing, ... and that God should go on inflicting it endlessly and hopelessly during all eternity, is,” the author concluded, “a view, which no name, however respectable, can save from the stigma of being irredeemably coarse and repulsive.”<sup>35</sup>

The *Tablet* was again full of letters on the 24th December. In response to the suggestion that unbaptized children were innocent, and that God would therefore not inflict them with “positive pain,” John McIntyre offered two points for consideration. Firstly, he implied that such a proposition was contradicted by the amount of “infant misery and suffering that is found the whole world through.” Secondly, he observed that

at the Council of Trent, it was decreed that anyone who asserts that Adam injured himself alone, and not all those who followed him, or that Adam's "sin of disobedience" had not "transfused" sin into the "whole human race," should be anathematized. This declaration, McIntyre observed, is inconsistent with the idea that unbaptized children are perfectly and helplessly innocent.<sup>36</sup>

The rest of the letters selected for publication on the 24th December supported the argument of the original author of the editorial. One letter expressed astonishment at "how some good people seem anxious to magnify the dominion of the devil at the expense of Christianity." The letter concluded that "when the Holy Roman Church ... shall have defined that all those poor little Innocents are all suffering eternally, it will be time enough for the "priest who trembles" to ask us to tremble with him."<sup>37</sup> A letter from Archbishop Vaughan's youngest brother, John Stephen Vaughan, who subsequently went on to become the auxiliary Bishop of Salford, also criticised "A Priest on the Tremble." While extremely critical of Mivart's article,<sup>38</sup> he did

agree with him that the declaration at the Council of Florence was compatible with the proposition that unbaptized infants in the next world only suffer the pain of loss and not the pain of sense. He observed that “inequality of pain, ... does not here mean that the little unbaptized darlings are to be punished by the fire of Hell,” albeit “less severely than souls dead in actual sin,” but rather that they will suffer “the pain of loss only.”<sup>39</sup> Canon Moyes was also critical of “A Priest on the Tremble,” repeating the argument that the term “punishment” in the declaration at the Council of Florence was compatible with unbaptized children suffering merely the pain of exclusion from the Beatific Vision, without the further infliction of physical suffering. He did however clarify that he did not deny that newly born children are marked by the stain of original sin, and that when he had used the term “innocent” in an earlier letter,<sup>40</sup> he had intended it only in a non-theological sense.<sup>41</sup>

Father Robert Francis Clarke, a friend and colleague of Mivart’s, waded into the controversy on the 31st December.

Robert Clarke observed that according to Aquinas there are multiple varieties of Hell, including the “Hell of the damned,” “Purgatory,” and the “limbo of little children [who died without baptism].” In limbo there was, he suggested, the absence of grace and the beatific vision, but no pain and suffering. He concluded that in the wider sense of the term Hell, there must be “Happiness in Hell.” He even suggested that the hell fire experienced by the damned might mean “condemnation to fire,” without necessarily meaning “suffering caused by fire.” The purpose of fire was to cleanse sin, he suggested, but not necessarily with “a sensation of burning.”<sup>42</sup>

The controversy rolled on into 1893. A series of letters in the first three weeks of January, heatedly debated whether the fires of Hell are metaphorical or real, whether it is permitted or illicit for a parish priest to teach his flock that they are only metaphorical, and whether “happiness is compatible with eternal burning.”<sup>43</sup> However, on the 21st January, the editor of the

*Tablet* decided that the controversy had gone on long enough, and he stated that “this correspondence must now cease.”<sup>44</sup>

### **Conclusion**

The controversy did not however cease. Despite the editor’s declaration, there were still occasional letters and articles on the subject in the *Tablet* and other periodicals throughout 1893.<sup>45</sup>

In summing up. Overall, most of the letters and articles in the *Tablet* can be divided into two camps.<sup>46</sup> Those that agreed with Mivart on just one point, that unbaptized children experience some happiness in Hell, and those that expressed contempt for any suggestion that any happiness may be experienced in Hell. One letter even described Mivart’s original article as “the most dangerous and pernicious article that was ever traced by the hand of believer or infidel.”<sup>47</sup> None of the letters or articles argued that the destination of unbaptized children was anywhere other than eternal Limbo or Hell.

The Bishop of Nottingham denounced Mivart's articles to the Congregation of the Holy Office.<sup>48</sup> Whilst seven years later, Cardinal Archbishop Vaughan decided to exclude Mivart from the sacraments, on this occasion he defended him in a letter to the Holy Office.<sup>49</sup> Nevertheless, the result was that all of Mivart's articles on Hell were condemned by the Holy Office on the 19th July, and by the Congregation of the Index two days later.<sup>50</sup> In August, Mivart claimed in a letter to one of his friends, that he had been informed that his views on Hell were not condemned as such, and that he was entitled to hold them, but that they were inopportune.<sup>51</sup> Convinced that his articles were placed on the Index merely because the time was not ripe for them, Mivart agreed to submit to the censure on the 10th August.<sup>52</sup> In an article published in December, Mivart defended his decision to submit, but he alluded to his hope that his articles would one day be removed from the Index.<sup>53</sup> He never saw that day.<sup>54</sup>

## Archival Sources

### Birmingham Archdiocesan Archives, Birmingham, UK

Appeal to the Cardinal and the Bishops of England by several priests of the Diocese of Birmingham, [9 February] 1893.

## Bibliography

### Primary Sources

#### Books and Articles

- Father Anselm, "Happiness in Hell?," *Franciscan Annals* XVII (January 1893).
- S. Brandi, "The Happiness in Hell – Mr. Mivart's Retrospect," *Tablet*, 24 June 1893.
- [S. Brandi], "Professor Mivart's 'Happiness in Hell,'" *Tablet*, 25 March 1893.
- T. E. Bridgett, "Professor Mivart and St. Alphonsus," *Tablet*, 4 March 1893.
- Richard Francis Clarke, "Happiness in Hell: A Reply," *Nineteenth Century* XXXIII (January 1893).
- Richard Francis Clarke, "Is the Fire of Hell a Material Fire?," *Month* LXXVIII (June 1893).
- Richard Francis Clarke, "The Verdict of Rome on 'The Happiness in Hell,'" *Nineteenth Century* XXXIV (September 1893).
- George Mivart, *Contemporary Evolution: An Essay on Some Recent Social Changes* (London: Henry S. King, 1876).
- George Mivart, "The Continuity of Catholicism," *Nineteenth Century* XLVII (January 1900).
- George Mivart, "Happiness in Hell," *Nineteenth Century* XXXII (December 1892).
- George Mivart, "The Happiness in Hell (A Rejoinder)," *Nineteenth Century* XXXIII (February 1893).
- George Mivart, "The Index and my Articles on Hell," *Nineteenth Century* XXXIV (December 1893).
- George Mivart, "Last Words on The Happiness in Hell (A Rejoinder)," *Nineteenth Century* XXXIII (April 1893).
- George Mivart's *On the Genesis of Species* (London: Macmillan, 1871).
- George Mivart, "The Roman Catholic Church and the Dreyfus Case," *Times*, 17 October 1899.
- George Mivart, "Scripture and Roman Catholicism," *Nineteenth Century* XLVII (March 1900).
- George Mivart, "Some Recent Catholic Apologists," *Fortnightly Review* LXVII (January 1900).

[John Snead-Cox?], "Happiness in Hell," Topics of the Day, *Tablet*, 3 December 1892.

[John Snead-Cox?], "Happiness in Hell," Topics of the Day???, *Tablet*, 10 December 1892.

John Stephen Vaughan, "Mr. Mivart on 'Happiness in Hell,'" *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* XIV (January 1893).

Wilfrid Ward, "Professor Mivart on the Rights of Conscience," *Dublin Review* 27 (July 1876).

*Under the Ban: A Correspondence Between Dr. St. George Mivart and Herbert Vaughan, Archbishop of Westminster* (1900).

### **Letters (arranged chronologically)**

James Moyes to a correspondent, *Daily Telegraph*, 6 December 1892.

John McIntyre, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 10 December 1892.

Achilles Daunt, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 17 December 1892.

"A Priest on the Tremble," Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 17 December 1892.

James Glancy, D.D., Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 17 December 1892.

The author of the editorial, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 17 December 1892.

F.T.A.E, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 24 December 1892.

James Moyes, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 24 December 1892.

John McIntyre, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 24 December 1892.

John Stephen Vaughan, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 24 December 1892.

James Moyes, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 31 December 1892.

Robert Francis Clarke, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 31 December 1892.

"U. E. U.," Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 31 December 1892.

George F. Hobson, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 7 January 1893

Parochus Limericensis, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 14 January 1893.

Robert Francis Clarke, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 14 January 1893.

T. Lloyd Coghlan, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 14 January 1893.

Sacerdos Hibernicus, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 21 January 1893.

### **Pastoral Letters**

Edward Gilpin Bagshawe (Bishop of Nottingham), pastoral letter, 11 December 1892, reproduced in the *Tablet*, 17 December 1892.

### Secondary Sources

Mariano Artigas, Thomas F. Glick and Rafael A. Martínez, *Negotiating Darwin: The Vatican Confronts Evolution 1877-1902* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2006).

Jacob Gruber, *A Conscience in Conflict: The Life of St. George Jackson Mivart* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960).

*Who Was Who, 1929-1940* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1941).

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> George Mivart, "Happiness in Hell," *Nineteenth Century* XXXII (December 1892), 899-919. For Mivart's responses to the controversy provoked by his initial article, see George Mivart, "The Happiness in Hell (A Rejoinder)," *Nineteenth Century* XXXIII (February 1893), 320-338; George Mivart, "Last Words on The Happiness in Hell (A Rejoinder)," *Nineteenth Century* XXXIII (April 1893), 637-651.

<sup>2</sup> George Mivart was born on 30 November 1827. His father was closely associated with a number of prominent naturalists. If Mivart acquired his passion for science from his father, his mother, a pious evangelical, was probably responsible for the fervour of his theistic beliefs. To the consternation of his parents, Mivart decided that Anglicanism did not represent a valid continuity with the "original" Church. He converted to Catholicism at the age of 16. As a result, he was unable to study at an English university. He instead studied law at Lincoln's Inn. He was called to the bar in 1851, but chose to return to the study of science. For a good introduction to Mivart, see Jacob Gruber, *A Conscience in Conflict: The Life of St. George Jackson Mivart* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960).

<sup>3</sup> George Mivart's *On the Genesis of Species* (London: Macmillan, 1871), was his first book to attempt to reconcile (non-Darwinian) evolution with (Catholic) theism. The bulk of the book developed arguments to refute the idea that natural selection could alone account for the evolution of man. One of his most significant arguments was that "natural selection utterly fails to account for the conservation and development of the minute and rudimentary beginnings, the slight and infinitesimal commencements of structures, however useful those structure may afterwards become" (23). This argument echoes the arguments of "irreducible complexity" advanced by contemporary advocates of Intelligent Design. The final chapter of the book made explicit the reconciliation of evolution and theology. He argued that man has a "double nature" with "his soul arising from direct and immediate creation, and his body being formed ... by derivative or secondary creation, through natural laws." The corporeal body, he argued, was formed by natural laws, "for the most part as yet unknown," but controlled by "the subordinate action of 'Natural Selection.'" According to Mivart, the process of natural selection unfolded in "obedience to a creative fiat originally imposed on the primeval Cosmos, 'in the beginning,' by its Creator, its Upholder, and its Lord." According to Mivart, the second half of our nature, our soul, arose not from a derivative creation (i.e. divinely guided evolution) but from a "direct and immediate creation" (287-288).

<sup>4</sup> Though there were also protests by Catholics against his attempts to reconcile evolution with Catholicism. In the same year that he received his doctorate from Pius IX, he published a collection of essays, *Contemporary Evolution: An Essay on Some Recent Social Changes* (London: Henry S. King, 1876), which argued that the Church progresses towards its perfection through a process of gradual evolution under the watchful eye of God. Wilfrid Ward expressed dismay that Mivart was now presenting opinions which have more than a "superficial resemblance to that 'Liberal Catholicism,' against which the Holy Father has of late been speaking with such singular energy." Wilfrid Ward, "Professor Mivart on the Rights of Conscience," *Dublin Review* 27 (July 1876), 32.

<sup>5</sup> See Richard Francis Clarke, "Is the Fire of Hell a Material Fire?," *Month* LXXVIII (June 1893).

<sup>6</sup> See John Stephen Vaughan, "Mr. Mivart on 'Happiness in Hell,'" *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* XIV (January 1893), 2-16.

<sup>7</sup> See Father Anselm, "Happiness in Hell?," *Franciscan Annals* XVII (January 1893).

<sup>8</sup> See [S. Brandi], "Professor Mivart's 'Happiness in Hell,'" *Civiltà Cattolica*, reproduced in *Tablet*, 25 March 1893, 445-448; S. Brandi, "The Happiness in Hell – Mr. Mivart's Retrospect," *Civiltà Cattolica*, 17 June 1893, reproduced in *Tablet*, 24 June 1893, 977-979.

<sup>9</sup> According to Mivart, he wrote to the Cardinal prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Index in August 1899 to "say that, since my article has been freshly placed on the 'Index' (in a new edition of that publication), if I did not receive answers to certain questions I should feel compelled to withdraw my submission." Mivart did not receive a satisfactory reply, and thus withdrew his submission. George Mivart, "Some Recent Catholic Apologists," *Fortnightly Review* LXVII (January 1900), 26n2.

<sup>10</sup> See George Mivart, "The Roman Catholic Church and the Dreyfus Case," *Times*, 17 October 1899, 13-14; George Mivart, "Some Recent Catholic Apologists," *Fortnightly Review* LXVII (January 1900); George Mivart, "The Continuity of Catholicism," *Nineteenth Century* XLVII (January 1900); George Mivart, "Scripture and Roman Catholicism," *Nineteenth Century* XLVII (March 1900). His short article in the *Times* severely criticised French Catholics for their role in the Dreyfus Affair, and the Pope for his silence.

<sup>11</sup> For the final correspondence between Vaughan and Mivart, and two of Mivart's final articles which were critical of the Church, see *Under the Ban: A Correspondence Between Dr. St. George Mivart and Herbert Vaughan, Archbishop of Westminster* (1900).

<sup>12</sup> Certain aspects of the controversy in 1892 and 1893 have been examined, albeit briefly. For the heated exchange that occurred between Richard Francis Clarke and George Mivart, and the condemnation of Mivart's articles by the Holy Office, see Mariano Artigas, Thomas F. Glick and Rafael A. Martínez, *Negotiating Darwin: The Vatican Confronts Evolution 1877-1902* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2006), 248-255. See also Gruber, *A Conscience in Conflict*, 181-182.

<sup>13</sup> Mivart, "Happiness in Hell," 900, *passim*.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid*, 901.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid*, 904-905.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid*, 914.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid*, 915. Mivart contended that even for baptized Christians who depart this world in sin, there are mitigating factors which will be taken into account, such as heredity and environment (915).

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid*, 915.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid*, 906-907, 915.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid*, 907. Mivart cites St. Augustine, *The City of God*, XI, ch. 26-27.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid*, 906. See also Mivart, "The Happiness in Hell (A Rejoinder)," 324-325. According to Mivart, "many of the Fathers held that a mitigation was vouchsafed to the damned from time to time. St. Augustine distinctly allows this opinion; St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. John Chrysostom, and various others down to Petrus Lombardus, Petrus Pictaviensis, &c., also favoured it." Mivart, "Happiness in Hell," 906. For Augustine, Mivart (906) cites *Enchiridion*, §110, §112.

<sup>23</sup> Mivart, "Happiness in Hell," 916.

<sup>24</sup> [John Snead-Cox?], "Happiness in Hell," *Topics of the Day, Tablet*, 3 December 1892, 885-886. This article was described by Canon James Moyes as a "further and fuller statement of the Catholic position." Letter from James Moyes to a correspondent, *Daily Telegraph*, 6 December 1892, 3.

<sup>25</sup> St. Thomas Aquinas discussed the preference or goodness of being over non-being, and it is probably for this reason that the editorial stated that Mivart leaned on Aquinas for "the philosophical dictum ... that it is always better to be than not to be." [John Snead-Cox?], "Happiness in Hell," *Topics of the Day, Tablet*, 3 December 1892, 885. Mivart however cited Augustine rather than Aquinas to support this claim. See Mivart, "Happiness in Hell," 907.

<sup>26</sup> [John Snead-Cox?], "Happiness in Hell," *Topics of the Day, Tablet*, 3 December 1892, 885-886. For a second editorial on the question of happiness in Hell, see [John Snead-Cox?], "Happiness in Hell," *Topics of the Day???*, *Tablet*, 10 December 1892, 928-929.

<sup>27</sup> John McIntyre (1855-1934) was Archbishop of Birmingham from 1921-1928. He was also an assistant and close friend to Edward Ilsley (1838-1926), the previous Archbishop of Birmingham, for many years. Ilsley was Bishop (1888-1911) and Archbishop of Birmingham (1911-1921). For John McIntyre, see *Who Was Who, 1929-1940* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1941), 861.

<sup>28</sup> Letter from John McIntyre, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 10 December 1892, 941.

<sup>29</sup> St. Thomas, ii, I., Q. 89, art. 6, cited by Viator, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 10 December 1892, 940. The letter also states that Aquinas (*De Veritate* Q. 14. Art. II. Ad. I.) argued that "if any one brought up in a wood follows the lead of his reason in the pursuit of good and the avoidance of evil, *it is most certainly to be held* that God would either, by an internal inspiration, reveal what is necessary to him, or send him a preacher." Viator suggested that even if someone was raised by a beast in the forest, they would be responsible for the right use of their natural reason.

<sup>30</sup> St. Thomas, *Supplementum*, Q. 98, Art. 3 and *Sum*, Pars. i. Q.5., Art. 2. ad 3, cited by Viator, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 10 December 1892, 940.

<sup>31</sup> Edward Gilpin Bagshawe (Bishop of Nottingham), pastoral letter, 11 December 1892, reproduced in *Tablet*, 17 December 1892, 968-970. According to Artigas et al, the pastoral letter was fifteen pages, which suggests that the three page reproduction in the *Tablet* was but an extract. See Artigas, Glick and Martínez, *Negotiating Darwin*, 248-249. Much of Mivart's third article on Hell was in response to the Bishop of Nottingham, who he described as "a prelate singularly impulsive, not to say rash, so that he

may, without disrespect, be called the *enfant terrible* of the English Catholic Episcopate.” Mivart, “Last Words on The Happiness in Hell (A Rejoinder),” 638, *passim*.

<sup>32</sup> Moyes did not support Mivart beyond this one point. He stated that “as to those mitigations which the article suggests as applicable to the punishments of hell, viz., the hell of those who were baptized but lost on account of sin unrepented of, they must be taken as personal views put forward by Mr. Mivart and other writers on their own responsibility, but to which the authority of the Catholic Church is no wise committed. Letter from James Moyes to a correspondent, *Daily Telegraph*, 6 December 1892, 3. Moyes subsequently explained that the letter in the *Daily Telegraph* was intended as a private correspondence to an individual who had written to the Archbishop to ask about “the tenability of Mr. Mivart’s views as expressed in *The Nineteenth Century*.” The individual forwarded it to the *Daily Telegraph* without his permission. “The Archbishop’s share in the matter,” Moyes explained, “consisted solely in passing this letter to me and authorizing me to send a suitable reply. Here his Grace’s part began and ended.” Moyes explained that the letter was written over his own name and was not seen by the Archbishop until it was published. Letter from James Moyes, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 24 December 1892, 1020.

<sup>33</sup> Letter from “A Priest on the Tremble,” Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 17 December 1892, 980. Another letter on the 17th December, this time by James Glancy, a Doctor of Divinity, stated, with a measure of sarcasm, that with regard to the happiness of unbaptized children in the next world, he had been “until now, utterly unaware that the Church teaches anything of the kind,” and he asked the author of the original editorial to state where “his proposition” can be found in the Church’s teaching. Letter from James Glancy, D.D., Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 17 December 1892, 980.

<sup>34</sup> Letter from Achilles Daunt, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 17 December 1892, 980.

<sup>35</sup> Letter from the author of the editorial, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 17 December 1892, 980-981.

<sup>36</sup> Letter from John McIntyre, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 24 December 1892, 1019.

<sup>37</sup> Letter from F.T.A.E, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 24 December 1892, 1019-1020.

<sup>38</sup> For his criticisms of Mivart’s article, see John Stephen Vaughan, “Mr. Mivart on ‘Happiness in Hell,’” *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* XIV (January 1893), 2-16. John Stephen Vaughan accepted that the fate of unbaptized children and certain classes of unbaptized adults (i.e. those who “have acted up to their lights and followed the dictates of conscience, but to whom the Gospel has never been preached” and who “remain in invincible ignorance of God”) would be Limbo rather than Hell (2-4). But he disagreed with Mivart’s views about the fate of “souls who die in wilful mortal sin,” and his arguments about the symbolic nature of language used to describe Hell, the preference that the damned souls have for existence in Hell rather than non-existence, and the harmony they may find in Hell with their own mental condition and like-minded souls (2, 5-16).

<sup>39</sup> Letter from John Stephen Vaughan, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 24 December 1892, 1020. John Stephen Vaughan referred to the *Theologia Wirceburgensis*, an eighteenth century Jesuit work, in this letter.

<sup>40</sup> Moyes had in mind the letter that appeared in the *Daily Telegraph* on 6 December 1892 (see footnote 32).

<sup>41</sup> Letter from James Moyes, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 24 December 1892, 1020. See also Letter from James Moyes, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 31 December 1892, 1060.

<sup>42</sup> Letter from Robert Francis Clarke, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 31 December 1892, 1061-1062. See also Letter from Robert Francis Clarke, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 14 January 1893, 60-61. According to Gruber, Rev. Robert F. Clarke had been Mivart’s “erstwhile colleague and collaborator” (at Catholic University College, Kensington). Gruber, *A Conscience in Conflict*, 166. According to Mivart, Robert Clarke was a Fellow of the Linnean Society, and together they had published a joint paper on the “Sacra Plexus of Reptiles.” Mivart, “The Happiness in Hell (A Rejoinder),” 321-322.

<sup>43</sup> Letter from George F. Hobson, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 7 January 1893, 19; Letter from T. Lloyd Coghlan, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 14 January 1893, 61; Letter from Parochus Limericensis, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 14 January 1893, 60; Letter from Sacerdos Hibernicus, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 21 January 1893, 95-96.

<sup>44</sup> Note by editor of the *Tablet*, *Tablet*, 21 January 1893, 96.

<sup>45</sup> For the *Tablet*, see for example: T. E. Bridgett, “Professor Mivart and St. Alphonsus,” *Tablet*, 4 March 1893, 324-325; [S. Brandi], “Professor Mivart’s ‘Happiness in Hell,’” *Civiltà Cattolica*,

reproduced in *Tablet*, 25 March 1893, 445-448; S. Brandi, "The Happiness in Hell – Mr. Mivart's Retrospect," *Civiltà Cattolica*, 17 June 1893, reproduced in *Tablet*, 24 June 1893, 977-979.

<sup>46</sup> The main exception being Father Robert Francis Clarke, who seemed to sympathise with Mivart's suggestion that even the damned souls of Hell may experience some happiness in Hell.

<sup>47</sup> Letter from "U. E. U.," Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 31 December 1892, 1062.

<sup>48</sup> Artigas, Glick and Martínez, *Negotiating Darwin*, 250. Richard Francis Clarke, not to be confused with Mivart's friend, Robert Francis Clarke, also condemned Mivart's articles to the Congregation of the Holy Office. Richard Clarke argued that whilst there is "a great deal that is true" in Mivart's article, "there are certain passages in it to which all the rest is subordinated." These passages, Richard Clarke contended, represent the article's true "*raison d'être*," and are "the kernel of which all else is the protective shell." This "kernel," Richard Clarke argued, was "at variance with the teaching of the Church, and calculated to do immeasurable mischief to the souls of men." Richard Francis Clarke, "Happiness in Hell: A Reply," *Nineteenth Century* XXXIII (January 1893), 83, 92. See also Richard Francis Clarke, "Is the Fire of Hell a Material Fire?" *Month* LXXVIII (June 1893).

<sup>49</sup> Letter from Cardinal Archbishop Vaughan to the Holy Office, 2 May 1893, cited by Artigas, Glick and Martínez, *Negotiating Darwin*, 252. Significantly, some of the less hostile (though still somewhat ambivalent) responses to Mivart, were by people close to Cardinal Vaughan, such as the editor of the *Tablet* (the editor, John Snead-Cox, was his cousin), Canon J. Moyes (his secretary) and John Stephan Vaughan (his youngest brother). According to Vaughan's letter to the Holy Office, there were only two participants at a meeting of the Bishops two weeks after Easter, who dissented from his view that Mivart's articles should not be formally condemned. Considering the views expressed in his pastoral letter, it seems likely that the Bishop of Nottingham was one of the dissenting voices. Edward Ilsley, the Bishop of Birmingham (and Archbishop of Birmingham from 1911), may have been the other dissenting voice. In February 1893, an appeal was written to Archbishop Vaughan and the Bishops of England by several priests of the diocese of Birmingham (including John McIntyre, the Bishop's secretary), seeking condemnation of the opinions expressed in Mivart's December article on happiness in Hell. See Appeal to the Cardinal and the Bishops of England by several priests of the Diocese of Birmingham, [9 February] 1893, Z4/2/1/8/71/119, Birmingham Archdiocesan Archives.

<sup>50</sup> The decree of the Congregation of the Index, which makes reference to the decree of the Holy Office, was quoted in full in Richard Francis Clarke, "The Verdict of Rome on 'The Happiness in Hell,'" *Nineteenth Century* XXXIV (September 1893), 500. The Holy Office Dossier on Mivart's articles and Mivart's response to the condemnation is discussed in Artigas, Glick and Martínez, *Negotiating Darwin*, 250-255.

<sup>51</sup> Letter from Mivart to Edmund Bishop, 6 August 1893, Bishop papers, cited by Gruber, *A Conscience in Conflict*, 185 and Artigas, Glick and Martínez, *Negotiating Darwin*, 253-254.

<sup>52</sup> Mivart wrote to Cardinal Archbishop Vaughan on the 10th August, stating that "I beg leave to request Your Eminence to be so kind as to transmit to Rome, for me, my complete and *ex animo* submission to the recent decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Index in my regard." Letter from Mivart to Cardinal Archbishop Vaughan, 10 August 1893, cited by Artigas, Glick and Martínez, *Negotiating Darwin*, 254.

<sup>53</sup> George Mivart, "The Index and my Articles on Hell," *Nineteenth Century* XXXIV (December 1893). Mivart pointed out that no retraction was demanded of him and that none of his assertions were individually picked out for censure (987-989). He also observed that "books that have been so placed, even after a condemnation of the Holy Office, are often, sooner or later, removed from the list" (987).

<sup>54</sup> Reflecting back on the drama in his final months, Mivart observed that "as I was called upon to make no retraction and as not a single position put forward by me was condemned, I thought it well, out of respect for Leo XIII, and for other reasons, to submit to the decree, and I submitted. I did not, however, withdraw or renounce any one of the opinions I had maintained, and certainly I do not withdraw them now. I still regard the representations as to Hell which have been commonly promulgated, in sermons and meditations, as so horrible and revolting that a Deity capable of instituting such a place of torment would be a bad God, and, therefore, in the words of the late Dr. W. G. Ward, a God 'we should be under the indefeasible obligation of disobeying, defying, and abhorring.'" Mivart, "Some Recent Catholic Apologists," 26.