



Kent Academic Repository

Cattermole, P (1984) *John Lingard: The historian as apologist*. Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) thesis, University of Kent.

Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/86255/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

<https://doi.org/10.22024/UniKent/01.02.86255>

This document version

UNSPECIFIED

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives)

Additional information

This thesis has been digitised by EThOS, the British Library digitisation service, for purposes of preservation and dissemination. It was uploaded to KAR on 09 February 2021 in order to hold its content and record within University of Kent systems. It is available Open Access using a Creative Commons Attribution, Non-commercial, No Derivatives (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>) licence so that the thesis and its author, can benefit from opportunities for increased readership and citation. This was done in line with University of Kent policies (<https://www.kent.ac.uk/is/strategy/docs/Kent%20Open%20Access%20policy.pdf>). If y...

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in *Title of Journal*, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).

John Lingard: The Historian as Apologist

**A thesis submitted by Philip Cattermole of Eliot College
the University of Kent at Canterbury, in candidacy for
the degree of Doctor in Philosophy**

Table of Contents

	<u>Page No.</u>
Acknowledgements:	i
Abstract:	ii
List of Abbreviations:	iii
Chapter One: Not quite the English Ranke:	1
Chapter Two: Anglo-Saxons and Nineteenth Century Roman Catholics:	27
Chapter Three: The Pamphleteering 1806-17:	40
Chapter Four: The Anglo-Saxons again and onwards (<u>History</u> , Vols. I, II, and III):	92
Chapter Five: Restructuring the Reformation (<u>History</u> , Vols. IV, V, and VI):	127
Chapter Six: The Methods of Research:	183
Chapter Seven: The Discernment of Bias:	199
Chapter Eight: The Reformation again and onwards (<u>History</u> , 4th and 5th Editions):	229
Chapter Nine: The Character of an Apologist:	255
Appendices:	279
Bibliography:	321

Acknowledgements

I feel particularly grateful towards the following who assisted in my search for Lingardia: the librarians at the British Museum, His Eminence the Archbishop of Southwark, Miss Lee and Mr. Choppen at St. George's Cathedral, Southwark, His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, and Miss Poyser at Westminster, Dr. Robinson at Arundel, Father Francis Whiteside at Hornby, the Rector and Dr. Sharratt at Ushaw College, Mrs. Barbara Smith at Manchester College, Oxford, Dr. Leeming at Skirsgill Park, Penrith, Lord Mowbray and Stourton, Mr. John Howard and Mrs. Veronica Howard at Corby Castle, Carlisle, the archivist at the Lancashire County Records Office, Preston, the English Society of Jesus, Father Edwards and Father Holt at Mount St., London, Dom. Philip Jebb at Downside Abbey, John Ryan at the English College, Valladolid, the Rector of the English College at Rome, His Eminence the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda, Father Metzler and Father Burns.

Without the support of my supervisor Professor Swanston and my parents, however, none of this assistance could have borne fruition in this work. No words can properly do justice to the debt I owe them.

Abstract

The account of Lingard's work which is ambitious to be more than a chronicle of his various publications must address large questions about the influence a historian's beliefs and prejudices may have upon his choice of subject for research, his general structuring of the narrative, and his peculiar emphases on events and persons. A review of Lingard's historical writing from the Anglo-Saxon Church of 1806 to the last volume of the last edition of his History of England in 1849, presents a deal of evidence for more than one motive influencing his enterprise, and for several shifts of balance among these motives. It would certainly be an inadequate reading of his work from which it could be concluded either that Lingard himself remained content with the quite crude propaganda for Roman catholic tenets exhibited in his early pamphlet publications, or that he ever surrendered his first intent to demonstrate that Roman catholics could be trusted with a larger share in the national life than they enjoyed in late Georgian England. His apologetic mode changed during his career and there is a real interest in observing how it changed as he found greater opportunity to express himself.

Through an examination of related narratives in Lingard's writing, particularly those in which he can be shown to have purposely engaged in some significant re writing, and exemplarily those in which he deals with the christianity of the Anglo-Saxons and the disputants of the Reformation in England, an attempt is here made to show what inner consistency there is in his work. A consistency, not of devotion to the common aspirations of any church or sect among christians, but of a gradually expressed personal apologetic for a way of life that should offer Lingard the scope he desired for his talents.

Abbreviations of Archives

B.M.	Manuscript archive at the British Museum.
A.S.G.C.	The Archive of St. George's Cathedral, Southwark.
A.W.C.	The Archive of Westminster Cathedral.
M.C.O.	The Archive of Manchester College, Oxford.
L.R.C.O.	The Archive at the Lancashire County Records Office.
A.D.A.	The Archive at Downside Abbey.
A.S.P.P.	The Archive at Skirsgill Park, Penrith.
A.C.C.	The Archive at Corby Castle, Carlisle.
A.S.J.	The Archive at the Society of Jesus, Farm St., London.
A.V.E.C.	The Archive of the Venerable English College at Rome.
U.C.H.	Ushaw College History.

Abbreviations of Texts

<u>A Charge etc.:</u>	<u>Remarks on a Charge delivered to the Clergy of the diocese of Durham, by Shute, Bishop of Durham, at the ordinary visitation of that Diocese in the year 1806.</u>
<u>D.N.B.:</u>	<u>The Dictionary of National Biography.</u>
<u>A.S.Ch.:</u>	<u>The Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church</u>
<u>Remarks:</u>	<u>Remarks on a charge delivered by the Bishop of Durham to the Clergy of his Diocese.</u>
<u>Gen.Vind.:</u>	<u>A General Vindication of the Remarks on a Charge of the Bishop of Durham.</u>
<u>Grounds:</u>	<u>The Grounds on which the Church of England separated from the Church of Rome, reconsidered,</u>
<u>Documents:</u>	<u>Documents to Ascertain the Sentiments of British Catholics in former Ages,</u>
<u>Review:</u>	<u>A Review of Certain Anti-Catholic Publications</u>
<u>Examination:</u>	<u>An Examination of Certain Opinions advanced by the Right Rev. Dr. Burgess,</u>
<u>Observations:</u>	<u>Observations on the Laws and Ordinances which exist in Foreign States,</u>
<u>Hist. of Eng.:</u>	<u>A History of England from the First Invasion By the Romans to the Revolution in 1688. By John Lingard, D.D.</u>
<u>Hume's Hist. of Eng.:</u>	<u>The History of England, from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Revolution in 1688. By David Hume, Esq.</u>
<u>Reformation:</u>	<u>Burnet's History of the Reformation.</u>
<u>Annal's:</u>	<u>Strype's Annals of the Reformation.</u>
<u>Vindication of Cranmer:</u>	<u>A Vindication of the most Reverend Thomas Cranmer.</u>
<u>Vindication:</u>	<u>A Vindication of Certain Passages in the Fourth and Fifth Volumes of the History of England.</u>

Abbreviations of PeriodicalsBrownson's:Brownson's Quarterly Review.Critic:British Critic.Dublin:Dublin Review.Eclectic:Eclectic Review.Edinburgh:Edinburgh Review.London Rev. and Lit. Journal:London Review and Literary Journal.Monthly:Monthly Review.Orthodox:Orthodox Journal.Quarterly:Quarterly Review.Weekly:Weekly Orthodox Journal.

Chapter One

Not Quite the English Ranke

John Lingard was born in Winchester 5th February 1771 and died in Hornby, Lancashire, 17th July 1851. He was the son of John Lingard, a carpenter and builder,¹ who, after his marriage to Elizabeth Rennell, a member of an old catholic family which had been persecuted on account of its religious beliefs,² became a convert to Roman catholicism.³ In 1780 their unusually intelligent son, having been recommended to Bishop Challoner,⁴ was selected for a burse at the catholic college for the training of priests at Douai in Flanders. There Lingard's academic record was outstanding. The Douai College Documents, record Lingard's consistently distinguished achievements in the quadrivium and the trivium and in his later studies in theology, before he was appointed a teacher of grammar in the college in 1791.⁵

1. Tierney, M. Memoir of the Rev. Dr. Lingard. First published in the Metropolitan and Provincial Catholic Almanack, 1854 and prefixed in the same year to the sixth edition of the History of England pp. 1 - 37. The information is from p.2.
2. Ibid. Rennell 'had more than once been subjected to fine and imprisonment for his faith'. Ibid.
3. Haile, M. and Bonney, E., Life and Letters of John Lingard, p.6.
4. Tierney, Op.Cit., p.3.
5. See 'Douai College Documents' in Catholic Record Society Publications (Record Series), volume 63, 1972/3, pp. 152n, 295, 298, 302, 306, 309, 313, 317, 321, 325, 328, 332, 336 and 412. Lingard took great interest in the history of the college, as a letter in my possession sent to an unknown correspondent 24th February 1840 reveals:

I shall have great pleasure in doing my best to procure for you the information in question. Most of the records at the college at Donai have been destroyed: but there is a book in London (I do not know exactly in whose possession) containing lists of the students at the beginning of each year. Whether it will go as far back as 1730, I cannot say. But I will write immediately to a friend to make enquiries after the book, and to search in it for the name of your ancestor.

The author of the article in the Dictionary of National Biography says that during this time Lingard 'adopted the strongly Gallican views entertained by his teachers', but this may be a surmise on the basis of Lingard's later attitudes.⁶ He left Douai 21st February 1793, when anti-clerical pressures forced the seminary to close.⁷

At Douai Lingard had formed an acquaintance with William, the eldest son of Lord Stourton, and the two left Flanders together.⁸ Stourton took Lingard home to his family's country house at Ollerton near York, and Stourton's father immediately found Lingard employment as tutor to William. This was the first of those many occasions of kindness from members of the English aristocracy, which undoubtedly helped to shape Lingard's peculiar concept of the character of a decent society. He stayed with the Stourton family until the summer of 1794. He then, at the suggestion of Doctor Gibson,⁹ joined with some of his old colleagues from Douai in the attempt at the foundation of a new catholic seminary in the north of England.¹⁰ For a while they settled at Tudhoe, six miles from Durham, then at Pontop Hall, Lanchester, the unusually large residence of the local priest, Thomas Eyre, and then, towards the end of 1794, moved to Crook Hall, eleven miles from Durham, where they remained until

6. See Cooper, T., Dictionary of National Biography, volume II, pp. 1199 - 1202.

7. Tierney, Op.Cit., p.5.

8. Ibid.

9. Lingard later explained the move to a correspondent November 1848:

In summer '95 I asked Lord Stourton to allow me to go before my time was out, because I wished to join the Douations at Tudhoe. How came that? I can only suppose that after seeing Dr. Gibson at York I made the agreement with him.

Lingard to Robert Tate, quoted in Ushaw Magazine vol.xvi., March 1906. Some letters of Lingard to Newsham and Tate (1837 - 1850), pp.1 - 37. The quotation is from p.24.

10. Tierney, Op.Cit., p.6.

1808.¹¹ Lingard, who had been ordained deacon at the end of 1794, and priest on 18th April 1795, taught the rhetoric and poetry grades to the junior seminarians at Crook Hall, and enjoyed the post of Vice-President. Evidently these were happy times for him. He wrote a verse in 1800 that in metre and imagery places him in a tradition of eighteenth century sentiment:

May Crook's blest soil and verdant plains
 Be the retreat of trembling age,
 When warned by Death's approaching pains
 To quit the world's tumultuous stage.

But if stern fate should this refuse,
 To thee, O Pontop, let me fly.
 Before Peru's thy mines I choose,
 And carbon's cheerful flame enjoy.

Here let me live, here let me die,
 Or part my days twixt Crook and thee;
 And to thy coal-pits then will I
 My carcass leave a legacy.¹²

A journal of the same year provides evidence of the historical research Lingard was already prosecuting for his first publication, the History of the Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church, 1806:

Miracles. St. Augustine, etc., are condemned for having introduced that spirit of credulity with respect to miracles, which appears in the history of the Saxon Christians. However, I observe that in Bede almost all the miracles related by him were wrought and celebrated by the Christians who owed their conversion to the labours of the Scottish monks.¹³

11. Ibid.

12. Quoted in Laing, R., Ushaw College: A Centenary Memorial p.30.

13. Quoted in Haile and Bonney Op.Cit., p.77. The original is at Ushaw College Library. XVIII. F.2. IIa.

And a letter from one of Lingard's neighbours, sent to The Times after Lingard's death, describes an excursion Lingard made to Paris to further that research:

Dr. Lingard revisited France when Bonaparte was First Consul. In that journey he was accompanied by Mr. Mawman, the original publisher of his history. The Consul was very civil, and ordered that Dr. Lingard should have access to the documents he wanted.¹⁴

And, also while Lingard was at Crook Hall, he became embroiled in a controversy with local protestant clergy after Shute Barrington, the bishop of Durham, made a set of anti-catholic remarks in his 1806 Charge.¹⁵ It was through this controversy that he first attained some notoriety as a Roman catholic apologist in the north country. Lowndes' Biographical Dictionary of Living Authors of 1816, thought Lingard worth including in this list of worthies as one who, in this controversy, 'displayed considerable acuteness, not unmixed with virulence and artifice, in the defence of his communion'.¹⁶

Crook Hall was only a temporary residence for the Douai professors. From 1800 work had been going forward to erect a permanent building for the northern seminary on Ushaw Moor. By the summer of 1808 it was sufficiently ready for the Crook faculty to transfer to Ushaw and from that time it has remained the Roman catholic seminary for the northern dioceses.¹⁷ It was in expectation of being appointed President, or at least Vice-President, that Lingard went with the rest to the new college but Bishop Gibson, Vicar-Apostolic of the Northern District, 'seems to have been reluctant to give Lingard either dignity. It is unlikely that the Shute Barrington affair had given offence, so perhaps Lingard did indeed have a reputation

14. Lomax, M.F., letter to The Times, July 28th 1851.

15. A Charge etc., 1807 ed., pp. 1 - 14.

16. Lowndes, T., Biographical Dictionary of Living Authors, p.216.

17. Tierney, Op.Cit., p.7.

for 'gallicanism' among the Roman catholic clergy.¹⁸ Or perhaps Lingard was making such demands that he be given time and resources to continue his historical studies that Gibson could not sanction.

Charles Butler wrote to Lingard in December 1809 in an evident attempt to boost Lingard's morale:

Probably you would have excaped my troubling you with another letter if it were not for the concern I feel at the information you give me of the persecution you have sustained on account of your work and your fears that your continuing it might prove injurious to the establishment at Ushaw. I have heard it vaguely mentioned that Dr. Milner had found parts of your work reprehensible.¹⁹

Butler urged Lingard to continue his work:

I hope you will summon (sic) courage enough to favour us with the much

18. See Milburn, D., A History of Ushaw College, 1962:

Admittedly John Lingard had not only proved himself an able assistant in the management of the college but also had begun to make his name known to scholars, by his writings, but his views were altogether too independent. Bishop Gibson would appoint him as temporary president until he could find someone more amenable to his own way of thinking.

The quotation is from p.115.

19. Butler to Lingard, Correspondence B.M., Letterbooks, 25, 127, p.176. Charles Butler 1750 - 1832, Roman catholic lawyer and historian. He was very fond of Lingard and gave him much encouragement in his writings. Butler's high regard for Lingard is expressed in a life of Lingard written by Gradwell for the German edition of the History of England:

Lingard's work on the Anglo-Saxon Church is the best I have seen.

Gradwell's Life, A.V.E.C.

John Milner, b.1752 d.1826. Vicar Apostolic of the Midland District 1803 - 26. See Joseph Gillow's biography of Milner in Bibliographical Dictionary of the English Catholics, 1885, vol.V, pp. 15 - 53, and Thompson Cooper's article in the D.N.B., vol.XIII, pp. 461 - 465.

desired continuation of your history. At all events I hope you will favour us with a second edition of the first part.²⁰

A letter from a third year divine, Ralph Platt, to his friend John Briggs July 14th 1810, suggests the atmosphere of the place at this time:

All that we know here is that a President is expected in a short time. But who this President is or whether he be a Russian Bear, a wild Irishman or a Welsh Nanny-Goat, we know nothing at all. Mr. Bradley and indeed Mr. Albot, say that if anybody besides Mr. Lingard be appointed they will quit the place. The Bishop is ill humoured in the affair and has expressed himself to Mr. Lingard on certain subjects in such a manner of personal reproach that Mr. L. conceived him greatly insulted and thinking himself rather an unwelcome guest had some idea of bidding goodbye to the place. I cannot quite vouch for the accuracy of all this, it being only report. But I think something has passed betwixt the Bishop and Mr. L. which has affected the latter sensibly.²¹

20. Butler to Lingard, Correspondence B.M., Letterbooks 25, 127, p. 176.

21. Platt to Briggs, quoted in Milburn, Op.cit., p.115. Lingard wrote to Bishop Poynter b.1762 d.1827, Vicar Apostolic of the London district, February 26th 1817, about this unhappy time:

For more than a year I was acting president of Ushaw. It was to me a time of anxiety and misery. Bp.Smith and Mr. Gillow employed every inducement to prevail on me to stay with the latter. Though it hurt me to refuse, I did so, because I was convinced that my health, my comfort, and even more than that was at stake. I resolved never more if possible to involve myself in a situation to which I was so ill adapted.

Lingard to Poynter, Correspondence Poynter Papers, no.5.

It is interesting therefore to discover Lingard drawing up the following memorial dated by the Archivist at the Lancashire County Records Office, Preston 1821:

We the undersigned request and authorize you to present in our names a memorial to his eminence the Cardinal prefect of Propaganda, stating that the Rt. Revd. Dr. Gibson is now in his eighty-third year, that he has for many years been paralytic, that for some months he has been unable to move from his chair without the support of two men, that the

That Lingard, who had been engaged in a deal of pamphlet controversy during the years immediately preceding the move to Ushaw,²² and who for the rest of his life was a prolific author, published scarcely anything between 1809 and 1811 might suggest this was a particularly unsettled time for him. He left Ushaw 11th September 1811 to become a parish priest at Hornby, Lancashire where he lived for the rest of his life.²³

At Hornby, a tiny hamlet in the Lune valley, Lingard had time, after performance of his few priestly duties, to devote to his writing. Lingard's presbytery was situated opposite Hornby Castle, and he made several friends in that great hall particularly Pudsey Dawson, who became deeply fond of Lingard.²⁴ Life was certainly more comfortable than at Ushaw, and Lingard was more productive. Once

faculties of his mind are impaired, no less than those of this body; he can neither act himself nor will allow any other, not even his coadjutor the Rt. Rd. Dr. Smith to act for him, and that in consequence the business of this extensive district has long been at a stand, congregations have been abandoned without priests, letters have been unanswered, and many serious evils have arisen - That therefore they pray his eminence to take the premises into consideration, and apply such remedy; as in his wisdom he may judge proper.

- Lingard to Unknown Correspondence L.C.R.O., A C120 L. no.6
22. During that time he wrote Remarks on the Bishop of Durham's Charge, A Review of a Protestant's Reply, A Vindication of "the Remarks...", A General Vindication of the Remarks and A letter to a Clergyman of the Diocese of Durham.
 23. Tierney. *Op.cit.*, p.10. Lingard maintained a lifelong interest in the college, however, he established several burses for the educating of students there (see Thompson Cooper, D.N.B. Op.cit.).
 24. Lingard conveys his liking for Dawson in a letter to George Oliver 26th March 1844, besides an interest in the gentry:

Mr. Dawson is a kind hearted man, and very vain, but innocently so. He is the head of the Pudsey Family (Pudsey Dawson) the same as the great Pudsey bishop of Durham and claimant, after the Joneses, of the peerage of Scroop of Bolton.

Lingard to Oliver correspondence ASG.C., Package 173 no.54. George Oliver b.1781 d.1862. A correspondent of Lingard's for over thirty years. Lingard and Dawson belonged to the Aelfric society which comprised persons interested in Anglo-Saxon England. See a letter Lingard to W.H. Thoms, 23rd January 1842. Correspondence B.M. 42576. p. 143.

settled into the pleasant house provided by the patron he produced a series of political and theological tracts, and was able to apply himself to the research for his History of England from the first invasion by the Romans to the Revolution of 1688, of which the first volume appeared in 1819 and the last in 1830.²⁵ The History made Lingard perhaps the best known of the small number of contemporary English catholic intellectuals. Besides being published in five English editions in the author's lifetime,²⁶ the History was quickly published in the United States,²⁷ and translations were made into German, French and Italian.²⁸ It was reprinted several times²⁹ after his death until in 1915 this triumph was brought to an end with Hilaire Belloc's continuation of the History up to the reign of George V.³⁰ Greatly impressed by the History, Pius VIII created Lingard a doctor of divinity in 1821, and, when Lingard came to Rome for further researches in 1825, Leo XII presented him with a gold medal, usually granted only to cardinals and princes, in recognition of the good done for the Roman church by the History which is now at Ushaw College.³¹ The diary of

25. A History of England 1st ed. 1819-30. It has begun as a text book for use in schools. NB Tierney Op.cit., p.11.

26. Second ed. 1823-31, third ed. 1825-31, fourth ed. 1837-9, fifth ed. 1849.

27. In Philadelphia 1827-31, Boston 1853-55, New York 1855, 1860 and 1879, Boston 1883, New York 1887, Manchester, Ainsworth 1888 and Boston 1915.

28. In Germany at Frankfurt Gesichte von England 1827-31 tran. W.L. Wesche; in France at Paris Histoire d'Angleterre 1825 - 38, trans. de Roujoux, Paris 1833, trans. Amedee Pichot, Paris, 1843-44, trans. Camille Baxton, Paris 1844, trans. Leon de Wailly; in Italy at Rome Storia d'Inghilterra, trans. Gregori, 1828-33.

29. In the United Kingdom 1854, 1883 and 1902.

30. The History of England from the first Invasion By the Romans to the Accession of King George the Fifth, By John Lingard D.D. and Hilaire Belloc, B.A. 1912-15.

31. Tierney, Op.cit., p15. Though curiously, Gradwell's Diary entry August 15th 1825 reads:

Presented Dr. Lingard to the Pope. Admitted without delay. The Pope complimented him on his works, said he wished he could stay in Rome, presented to him three medals, two of gold, one of silver;

Gradwell's Diary, AWC. In Ushaw College, however, only one gold medal is preserved.

Robert Gradwell b.1777 d.1833. Rector of the English College in Rome 1817-1827, Vicar Apostolic of the London District 1828-1833.

Robert Gradwell the rector of the English College at Rome at that time, preserved in the archive of Westminster cathedral, suggests a more signal mark of papal favour. For October 14th 1826 Gradwell wrote:

Wrote to Dr. Smith but dated the letter 16 of Oct giving an account of Mr. Turner, Dugdale and Regan, of the state of the college, the want of more students, next year's report, of Dr. Lingard's promotion.³²

And December 28:

(Dr. Lingard) is alarmed at the report sprung out of the late consistory at his being in petto.³³

Gradwell seems certain that Lingard was actually made a cardinal in petto³⁴ by Leo XII in 1826. Writing to Lingard 11th November 1826 Gradwell said:

About a month ago the Pope held a consistory in which he made the nuncios of Paris, Madrid, Lisbon and Moscow, Cardinals, besides eleven reservati in petto. Who these chosen eleven are is a profound secret,.....In his allocution which has not been printed his Holiness said (I speak from the report of Cardl. Zurla) that one of the reservati in petto was a man of great talents, industry, a most accomplished scholar, whose writings, drawn ab authenticis fontibus, have not only rendered great service to religion, but have delighted and astonished Europe.³⁵

Gradwell wished to scotch any idea that the Frenchman De Lamennais was the recipient of the honour and was evidently keen that it should be supposed to have gone to his English friend:

At first it was supposed to be Mgr. Mai, or Marchetti, some bigots thought La Mennais, though the last has almost surfeited Rome. The report most prevalent at Rome at present is that the Pope had the

32. Gradwell's Diary Op.cit., AWC.

33. Ibid.

34. Meaning literally 'in the pope's breast'.

35. Gradwell to Lingard, Correspondence A.S.J., No.13.

Historian of England in his eye, and this is considered the more probable, as it is known that the Pope has a very great esteem for him, and told him last year that he wished he resided at Rome.³⁶

Controversy surrounds Lingard's hat. Wiseman, for example in his Recollections of the Last Four Popes³⁷ said that he was convinced De Lamennais rather than Lingard was the Pope's choice.³⁸ Pope Leo died in 1828, taking whatever secret there was, to his grave. There can, therefore, be no absolute authority for any assertion of Lingard's elevation. However, I found some new evidence relevant to this diverting matter at Manchester College, Oxford in an unpublished life of Lingard by Mrs. Hannah Ridyard, who had been a friend of Lingard in his old age.³⁹ She wrote of this Roman episode as if, in 1863, she were remembering a conversation with Lingard, or even had some letter from him to sustain her account. Her story is replete with circumstantial details of an amusing sort. She begins with the papal offer of the cardinalate:

36. Ibid.

37. See the account of this incident in Wiseman, N., A Recollection of the Last Four Popes, 1858, Chapter VII.

38. Tierney ~~contradicted~~ Wiseman in a letter to the Rambler vol. IX (N.S) June 1858. entitled 'Was Dr. Lingard Actually A Cardinal'. The original printed text is with the original of Tierney's memoir of Lingard, A.S.G.C. no. 114. Wiseman replied in the unpublished Letter to the Canons of the Cathedral Chapter of Westminster In Reply to One Published in the Rambler for June 1858. Tierney responded with an unpublished tract A Reply to Cardinal Wiseman's Letter to this Chapter, 1858.

39. A Life of John Lingard. See it with The Shepherd Papers, MCO, pp.1-27 and interpolated MS of 10pp. Hannah Ridyard (nee Joyce) b. early nineteenth century d.1892 was the adopted daughter of the Rev. William Shepherd b.1768 d.1847, a Unitarian minister, correspondent and friend of Lingard. It was through Miss Joyce's position as amanuensis to Shepherd in his later years that Lingard struck up a friendship with her. For a description of this most valuable archive see the Unitarian Historical Society vol. II, no.4, 1919-22.

In 1825, when he was again in Rome, the Pope was desirous of conferring on him a Cardinal's hat - the following is his own account of the matter, to a friend many years afterwards. "Cardinal Litta called on me one morning at the English College & told me that it was the Pope's wish that I should be a Cardinal. Now this was not at all in my way, so I said I could not accept it, as it was my intention to return to England & go on with my history. He said that probably his Holiness might overcome that resolution, & that I was to go to the Vatican the following day. I did so, & after going through many large apartments, was shown into a smaller one, where seated in such a position with respect to the door that I did not perceive him on first entering, was his Holiness, Leo the 12th. He received me very kindly, seemed amused at my walking into the middle of the room & then suddenly turning round & perceiving him & immediately broached the subject.⁴⁰

Mrs. Ridyrd's account of this papal audience is so lively that it must be either a reworking of Lingard's own memorandum, or a work of imagination. She continues as if repeating a record of an actual conversation:

He said he wished me to become Cardinal Protector of the English missions. I told him that I possessed none of the qualifications necessary for such an office & that I could not undertake anything of the sort, & that it would quite put a stop to the progress of my history. His Holiness replied that I must live in Rome, but that whatever could only be got in England should be procured & that whatever influence he possessed in other countries should be at my service in procuring MS & c., for my purpose. I then said that I did not possess means that were, in my opinion, necessary properly to maintain that dignity, to which he replied that that objection could be easily obviated.⁴¹

40. Ibid.

41. Ibid.

Whatever her source, Mrs. Ridyard's account does explain how doubt could have arisen in that matter:

Still I remained obstinate but even at our parting interview he returned to the subject, & said I should be a cardinal in petto. This I did not care about, so long as it was to remain there, a secret in the Pope's breast.⁴²

So even Lingard did not know whether he was a cardinal in the pope's breast, and his friends and enemies might make their guesses and assertions.⁴³

Lingard returned to Hornby and worked so determinedly that he completed the first edition of the History of England in 1830. He immediately determined upon collecting material for a second edition, but he could not prevent himself from being distracted by other ideas for literary work, and there were some among the English Roman catholics to wish that he were more single-minded. In 1836 for example, he prepared a Translation of the Four Gospels,⁴⁴ of which Henry Cotton,⁴⁵ after perusal of the book's reception amongst catholics said, in his Rhemes and Doway 'it becomes evident, that Dr. Lingard had here meddled with a forbidden subject'.⁴⁶ Four years later he again put aside his researches for the History in order to put together a Catechism which, ostensibly for the use of Roman catholic children, was intended by Lingard to be a short exposition of the Roman beliefs for the instruction of interested protestants.⁴⁷ At least the Catechism was not so disapproved as the Gospels. And

42. Ibid.

43. Not all catholics were not so pleased as the Pope with Lingard's work. Husenbeth's Life of Bishop Milner records references to passages that incensed Milner NB chapter 23 of the 1862 ed. pp 406-7. In 1828, Father Ventura, a Theatine monk, published a pamphlet Bastia, which attacked Lingard as unorthodox, pushed it under the doors of catholics in the capital warning them that Lingard was a dangerous enemy to the rights of the church. NB Gradwell to Lingard, Correspondence A.S.J., no.14.

44. A Translation of the Four Gospels by A Roman Catholic.

45. Henry Cotton b.1789 d.1879. Protestant clergyman, biblical scholar. NB Bever Blacker's article about him in the D.N.B. vol IV, pp.1229-30.

46. Cotton, H., Rhemes and Doway: 'An Attempt to show what has been done by Roman Catholics for the diffusion of the Holy Scriptures in English', p.138.

47. Lingard wrote to a friend John Walker December 1839 that he had written the work 'that we may have a book to put into the hands of protestants as an exposition of our doctrine as we teach it to our people'.

Lingard actually gained some favourable fame among the English Roman Catholics by controversies with Protestants that he conducted in the Lancaster press. With his friends, John and James Whiteside,⁴⁸ in 1839 Lingard engaged in an anonymous correspondence with a local Protestant clergyman, Green Armytage, concerning the extent to which the Bible should be the sole rule of faith. Lingard's letters on the subject, published under the pseudonym 'A Lancaster Idolator', appeared as a pamphlet in the same year from a local printing press.⁴⁹ A cache of letters in the house in Penrith of John and James Whiteside's surviving relatives⁵⁰ reveals the tone Lingard took in theological controversy. He advised the Whitesides to send the following to the newspaper:

It is with surprise and pain that I perused the communication from Mr. Armytage in your last number. The tone which he assumes, and the spirit which he displays, are not such as we might expect from a successor of the apostles. I find nothing in his letter to remind us of the harmlessness of the dove; but much, far too much, that savours of the venom of 'the serpent'. What can we conclude, but that it was composed in a moment of irritation, when the writer unfortunately forgot that he is a disciple and a minister of him, who has said to his followers "learn of me, for I am meek, and lowly in heart".⁵¹

That his controversial writing did not prevent his historical efforts obtaining a recognition outside the Roman Catholic community is demonstrated by the eminent judges of the northern circuit, Brougham, Scarlett and Pollock, at assize time in Lancaster regularly visiting Lingard at Hornby.⁵² It is also demonstrated by Lord and

- 48. They attended Lingard's church and looked after some of his financial affairs.
- 49. The Bible, the only Rule? or Doubts and Queries, respectfully addressed to the Rev. J.H. Green Armytage.
- 50. The archive is in possession of the Whiteside's descendants at Skirsgill Park, Penrith, Cumbria.
- 51. Lingard to John and James Whiteside, Correspondence A.S.P., Section One, no.3.
- 52. Tierney. Op.cit., p.21.

Lady Holland urging Mr. Edward Blount in 1838, to secure from the prime minister, Melbourne, a state pension for Lingard.⁵³ What transpired in this negotiation is evident in a letter from Lingard's banker Mr. Coulston:

I repeated my visits to Holland House, and found them active and anxious as I could wish them to be, and I saw Lord Melbourne again; and was shortly after, informed by Lady Holland that something was to be done for you. The rest you know. The sum is too small (£300 granted from the Queen's privy purse), but allow me to say that if it not be larger, the blame falls on Dr. Lingard, who was too high minded to canvass and supplicate, and thus to become regularly qualified for the pension list.⁵⁴

Lingard had thus a pleasant benefice and a not insubstantial income, and all the while his academic reputation gradually increased until in 1831 the Edinburgh Review gave the task of reviewing volumes VI, VII, and VIII of the History to Henry Hallam, the influential author of Europe in the Middle Ages and the Constitutional History of England.⁵⁵ Hallam praised Lingard's History as exhibiting merits 'of a high class',⁵⁶ though he hinted at some particular declension from that height:

He generally discusses controverted facts with candour (except on one subject;) acuteness, and perspicuity.⁵⁷

And, again giving praise with a hint of an exception, Hallam felt himself able to declare:

He selects, in general, judiciously, arranges naturally, relates without prolixity or confusion.⁵⁸

Lingard had not always enjoyed such commendation. He had gradually achieved critical favour through a long process of reviewers comparing his work with that of other English historians. A reviewer of the Anglo-Saxon Church in the

53. Ibid., p22ff.

54. Coulston to Lingard (undated). Quoted in Haile and Bonney. Op.cit., p271.

55. Hallam, Henry, b.1777 d.1859. Distinguished protestant lawyer and historian.

56. 'A History of England, from the Invasion by the Romans. By John Lingard D.D.', Edinburgh, vol. LIII, No. CV. March 1831; the quotation is from p.18.

57. Ibid.

58. Ibid.

Quarterly Review for March 1812 had given him some praise as a 'mannerist' and 'a copyer of Gibbon', and had even allowed that 'he is no servile copyer', remarking that 'he has simplified the style of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire'.⁵⁹ But if this commendation of Lingard's prose is somewhat surprising to the modern reader, readers of every age might recognize the ambivalence of this critic's remarks about Lingard's scholarship and the use he made of it:

His knowledge of the Saxon language, though he has not always used it fairly is very considerable, and the industry of his research into original authorities is greatly to be commended.⁶⁰

This notice of unfair employment of his materials, which recurs in Hallam's 1831 appraisal, is one that will require further attention but it was not a predominant feature of most contemporary reviews of Lingard's work. On reading the History some reviewers felt obliged again to compare Lingard with Gibbon, but with a less grudging tone. The critic of the Monthly Review of August 1819⁶¹ wrote first of Lingard's researches that 'through the whole of it, the writer has consulted the original historians, is evident; and this, even standing singly; is no small praise',⁶² then of his command of structure, 'it has, however, other claims to our approbation; the arrangement of it is good, the narrative is clear',⁶³ and then of Lingard's prose style:

It is obviously formed on that of Mr. Gibbon: but, while it does not possess the richness of the point of that historian, it has little of his affectation, and nothing of his obscurity. On the contrary, it is evidently perspicuous, and we do not recollect an instance, in which we have found a second reading of a sentence necessary to comprehend its meaning.⁶⁴

59. 'The Antiquities of the Saxon Church. By the Rev. John Lingard'. Quarterly, vol. VII, no. XIII, March 1812, pp. 92-105; the quotation is from p.105.

60. Ibid.

61. 'A History of England, from the First Invasion by the Romans to the Accession of Henry VIII. By the Reverend John Lingard'. Monthly, No.89, August 1819, pp.43-51.

62. Ibid., p.51.

63. Ibid.

64. Ibid.

And others were again ready to applaud Lingard's energy in research. The reviewer in the London Review and Literary Journal for September 1819⁶⁵ found another historian for his comparison; he too remarked Lingard's resort to original sources, but he did not suppose them unfairly used:

It is composed without any reference to modern compilers and may therefore be justly regarded as a new History. If compared with the History of Hume, it will be found to set in a new and clearer light many doubtful and obscure points on which the Scottish Historian either from prejudice or inattention, has formed an erroneous judgement.⁶⁶

And, in an otherwise hostile review, the British Critic of January 1820⁶⁷ thought the comparison almost proper:

Mr. Hume is a rival with whom it is no small honour to compete; and in saying that Mr. Lingard comes into comparison with him, we consider ourselves as paying him no small compliment; we feel, however, less hesitation in saying, that at all events, his talents are very superior to those of Rapin and Henry.⁶⁸

Writing in his Political Register,⁶⁹ William Cobbett managed to praise Lingard over Hume and to hedge his bet:

Then, again, as to Dr, LINGARD'S History, though I think it, as far as I have read, an excellent work, far superior to HUME, I must see the end of it before I speak of it in a very confident manner.⁷⁰

65. 'A History of England, from the first Invasion by the Romans to the Accession of Henry the VIIIth. By the Rev. John Lingard'. London Rev. and Lit. Journal, Sept. 1819, pp.224-246.

66. Ibid, p.245.

67. 'A History of England from the First Invasion by the Romans to the Accession of Henry VIII. By the Rev. John Lingard'. Critic, January 1820, pp.41-59.

68. Ibid, p.42.

69. Register, 1824, pp.272-288.

70. Ibid., p.272.

In 1825 Dibdin could forsake all caution and write in his Literary Companion⁷¹ that 'Lingard is among the most eminent of those of our living historians'.⁷² By this time Lingard's reputation was so established that the later volumes of the History were sent to Dr. John Allen, 'the best informed and one of the ablest men' that Lord Byron ever knew.⁷³ Allen paid Lingard a glowing compliment in the Edinburgh Review for April 1825.⁷⁴ Allen's review exhibits the process of Lingard's literary career and his gradual acceptance by the English intellectual establishment. He first referred to Lingard's earlier writing, both historical and controversial:

Dr. Lingard is already known to the world by several valuable publications. His Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church display much research and erudition. His reply to the Bishop of Gloucester (Dr. Huntingford) is an able, temperate, and judicious vindication of the Catholic Church.⁷⁵

Allen then acknowledged that the History was enjoying a deserved success in the bookshops:

His present work will not detract from the reputation he had acquired: and indeed the success it has already obtained, is a proof at once of its merits, and of the good taste and judgement of the public. It has deservedly placed him among the most eminent of our English historians.⁷⁶

Allen returned to the earliest of those comparisons in his assessment of Lingard's achievement, and brought in another name to go with Gibbon and Hume and with Rapin and Henry. Describing the History as 'the fruit of great industry, learning and acuteness, directed by no ordinary talents',⁷⁷ Allen remarked:

71. Dibdin, T.F., The Literary Companion or, the Young Man's Guide and the Old Man's Comfort in the Choice of a Library.

72. Ibid., p.237.

73. Courtney, W.P., article in the D.N.B., vol. 1, pp.309-310.

74. 'A History of England from the First Invasion of the Romans. By John Lingard D.D.'. Edinburgh, vol XLII, no. 83, April 1825, pp.1-31.

75. Ibid., p.1.

76. Ibid.

77. Ibid.

if it want those careless, inimitable beauties', which in Hume excited the despair and admiration of Gibbon, - there is no other modern history with which it may not challenge a comparison. The narrative of Dr. Lingard has the perspicuity of Robertson, with more freedom and fancy.⁷⁸

Henry Milman, who was to write a History of Christianity⁷⁹ which few now read and a History of the Jews⁸⁰ which is still of considerable use, made nothing of the distinction between the two great British historians, and simply asserted in the Quarterly Review of 1825⁸¹ that Lingard had 'studied the art of composition in the school of Hume and Gibbon'.⁸² To Milman it seemed more important to identify the particular scope of Lingard's enterprise. The old art had been employed for a new purpose. Lingard had 'used the consummate artifice' which they employed against Christianity, to the disparagement of the protestant religion of the country.⁸³ The reviewer in the Monthly Review for September 1825⁸⁴ was even more careful than Cobbett not to get caught up in modern controversy, certainly more careful than Milman to avoid religious dispute, and went further back than Hume and Gibbon to find historians with whom he could safely compare Lingard:

Livy's copiousness of detail, the musical cadences of Thucydides, and the pellucid narrative of Herodotus, seem to have been combined by Dr. Lingard in this historical model which he wished to emulate, and which he has entirely followed with the greatest success.⁸⁵

Not everyone rushed to make such comparisons. Macaulay to whom religious matters counted for less than to Dean Milman, but who scented something of Lingard's liking for the ways of remote country gentlemen, supposed the History to aim at another,

78. Ibid.

79. A History of Latin Christianity down to the Death of Pope Nicholas V, 1855.

80. History of The Jews, 1830.

81. 'Lingard's History of England. Vols. 3 and 4'. Quarterly, vol. XXXIII, no. LXV, 1825, pp.1-37.

82. Ibid., p.5.

83. Ibid.

84. 'A History of England from the First Invasion by the Romans to the Commonwealth'. Monthly, vol. CVIII, September 1825 pp.1-10.

85. Ibid., p.2.

if it want those careless, inimitable beauties', which in Hume excited the despair and admiration of Gibbon, - there is no other modern history with which it may not challenge a comparison. The narrative of Dr. Lingard has the perspicuity of Robertson, with more freedom and fancy.⁷⁸

Henry Milman, who was to write a History of Christianity⁷⁹ which few now read and a History of the Jews⁸⁰ which is still of considerable use, made nothing of the distinction between the two great British historians, and simply asserted in the Quarterly Review of 1825⁸¹ that Lingard had 'studied the art of composition in the school of Hume and Gibbon'.⁸² To Milman it seemed more important to identify the particular scope of Lingard's enterprise. The old art had been employed for a new purpose. Lingard had 'used the consummate artifice' which they employed against Christianity, to the disparagement of the protestant religion of the country.⁸³ The reviewer in the Monthly Review for September 1825⁸⁴ was even more careful than Cobbett not to get caught up in modern controversy, certainly more careful than Milman to avoid religious dispute, and went further back than Hume and Gibbon to find historians with whom he could safely compare Lingard:

Livy's copiousness of detail, the musical cadences of Thucydides, and the pellucid narrative of Herodotus, seem to have been combined by Dr. Lingard in this historical model which he wished to emulate, and which he has entirely followed with the greatest success.⁸⁵

Not everyone rushed to make such comparisons. Macaulay to whom religious matters counted for less than to Dean Milman, but who scented something of Lingard's liking for the ways of remote country gentlemen, supposed the History to aim at another,

78. Ibid.

79. A History of Latin Christianity down to the Death of Pope Nicholas V, 1855.

80. History of The Jews, 1830.

81. 'Lingard's History of England. Vols. 3 and 4'. Quarterly, vol. XXXIII, no. LXV, 1825, pp.1-37.

82. Ibid., p.5.

83. Ibid.

84. 'A History of England from the First Invasion by the Romans to the Commonwealth'. Monthly, vol. CVIII, September 1825 pp.1-10.

85. Ibid., p.2.

though neighbour, target. He was content to put aside all talk of Hume and Gibbon, and simply remarked that Lingard, though 'a very able and well-informed writer', seemed to make it his fundamental rule of judging that 'the popular opinion on an historical question cannot possibly be correct'.⁸⁶

In the Eclectic Magazine of Foreign Literature for November 1854⁸⁷ the reviewer put Lingard in direct parallel with Hume:

As a mere writer, Lingard is certainly not equal to Hume, whose style, so easy, so simple, so idiomatic, is inimitable, and perhaps hardly to be excelled; but it is no small praise of Dr. Lingard, that in the higher qualities of an historian, in his "knowledge of the spirit of antiquity, in exactness and circumstantiality of narration", he is immeasurably superior to the great Scotchman.⁸⁸

Other obituary writers were equally ready with 'no small' or 'no light' praise as they made their comparisons with Hume. In the Tablet of July 26th 1851⁸⁹ the Roman catholic obituarist remarked with a surprising assurance:

It is not light praise to say that he has written the only History of England which may be depended on, and that he has in a great measure dispelled the delusions which the ignorance and self-sufficiency of Hume spread over the growing minds of the country.⁹⁰

The Tablet writer saw a strange happiness for Lingard in the moment of his publishing the work:

He wrote a History of England which is read by heretics, and which they appreciate more than Catholics. It made its appearance at a favourable moment, when Church of Englandism was unpopular as a whole, and when liberalism was the fashion of the day.⁹¹

86. Macaulay, T.B., in 'Hallam's Constitutional History of England', Edinburgh, no. XLIV, October 1826, p.54.

87. 'The Late Dr. Lingard', Eclectic, pp.350 -354.

88. Ibid, p.353.

89. 'The Late Dr. Lingard', Tablet, vol. XIII, no.588, July 26th 1851, p.474.

90. Ibid.

91. Ibid.

There is certainly something not wholly generous in this Roman catholic estimate of the fortuitous character of Lingard's success:

Dr. Lingard's history wonderfully harmonised with the popular feeling, and supplied the enemies of the State religion with a ready weapon. People who were thorough heretics praised it out of mere spite to the dominant Establishment, and its circulation was considerably helped by the prevailing desire of being reputed unprejudiced and candid.⁹²

The writer seems content to account for the popularity of Lingard's History by adducing merely negative reasons:

Whigs and Radicals recommended the Catholic historian, because he was not of the Tory school, and the unexpected result of their interested praise was the diffusion of a truer knowledge of past events, and the scattering here and there of those seeds of truth which afterwards sprung up, nobody knew why, and ended in the conversion of many to the Catholic church.⁹³

It seems a trifle mean in the religious obituarist to make such an estimate of events and to refrain from describing Lingard as the instrument of Divine Providence. His refraining is explained by a later paragraph in the article in which, as if from a moderate distance, the writer supposes that:

The Ultramontane will say that the History of England has not yet been written, and that the principles of Dr. Lingard were effectual impediments in the way of a true and philosophic account of eight centuries of sin.⁹⁴

92. Ibid.

93. Ibid.

94. Ibid. Literally defined 'ultra' means 'beyond' or 'on the other side of'. Hence for English people 'ultramontane' suggested a looking beyond the Alps for directives in matters of religion. By 'ultramontane' I take the Tablet author to mean that sort of catholic who held that the pope occupied a monarchical position with supreme authority and jurisdiction over all catholic subjects, who were to believe in the infallibility of his teaching ex cathedra.

The criticism is being made, evidently, that Lingard, while he may be 'depended on' for the facts, is not sound in his general view of events. The Ultramontane would know better how a history is to be composed:

He will deny that it can be written upon other principles than his own, and will maintain that Gallicanism and nationalism are not the lights by which a man may thread his way through the dark lanes of modern history.⁹⁵

The obituarist then comes to what must be for a Roman catholic a very serious charge against Lingard:

The absence of sympathy with the Holy See - keen, lively, and penetrating -grates harshly upon his feelings and prejudices are therefore roused which no skill can remove, and no accuracy can conciliate.⁹⁶

Others in the Roman community felt differently about Lingard. The jesuit, George Oliver, replied to the reviewer in the next issue of the Tablet⁹⁷ with a spirited defence of Lingard's History:

Lingard shows a sharp antipathy to clerical government from Rome in a controversy concerning himself, Wiseman and Bagshawe, deputy editor of the Dublin Review. Wiseman had protested at Lingard's review of Tierney's edition of Dodd's Church History of England. Writing to Bagshawe May 14th 1839, Lingard scoffed:

(Wiseman) cannot expect that others should mould their opinions by his, or consult him at a distance of 1000 miles.

Lingard to Bagshaw, Correspondence A.S.G.C., Package 173, no.30.

And Lingard wrote to Tierney the same day:

I shall never more write for the review, if I must be guided by the supposed opinions of one who is a thousand miles distant.

Lingard to Tierney, Correspondence A.S.G.C., Package 173, no.31.

95. Ibid.

96. Ibid.

97. 'Facts of Dr. Lingard's Life. By the Rev. Dr. Oliver'. Tablet, August 2nd, vol. XII, no. 589, p.484.

It can be read with a perfect security. Its lucid order, its fluence and purity of style - its singular felicity in eliciting truth from conflicting evidence - its clearness from the mist of prejudice of preconceived opinions - its candid independence of all authorities but truth - (amicus Socrates, amicus Plato, sed magis amica Veritas) manifest the master mind of the author, and to foreigners of every language, as the very best history of our country.⁹⁸

Oliver was estimating Lingard's achievement not according to whether his 'philosophy' was that of a sound and loyal papist but according to Lingard's capacity to deal with facts and present a clear narration. He took it to be a virtue that Lingard wrote without 'preconceived opinions'.⁹⁹ It is unlikely that the original Tablet writer was much moved by his remonstrance. It may be that he felt himself the truer representative of Roman catholic orthodoxy. He was certainly not alone in his notion of what was required of a Roman catholic historian. Orestes Brownson also thought Lingard's work was 'not written from the Catholic point of view'.¹⁰⁰ To him, also, it seemed that 'the Catholic point of view' was that of the ultramontanist. He took the true faith to be the preserve of those who entertained a particular interpretation of doctrines and was thus able to suggest that those who held the same doctrine, but interpreted them differently, were not true believers:

The author writes as a disciple of the lowest Gallican school, and gives to his history from beginning to end a colouring extremely offensive to a genuine, whole-hearted Papist, who is deeply impressed by the fact that our Lord founded his Church on St. Peter.¹⁰¹

98. Ibid.

99 Ibid.

100. 'A History of England from the Invasion of Julius Caesar'. Brownson's, 3rd ser, I, October 1853, p.544.

101. Ibid.

It was with a peculiar notion of an unholy alliance of ideas that Brownson concluded by admonishing the reader to beware of Lingard's 'Gallicanism, Whiggism and ultra-rationalism'.¹⁰²

Contrariwise, the protestant Gentlemen's Magazine of September 1851,¹⁰³ describing the History as the composition of 'one who has opened fields of inquiry previously unexplored', and 'has given a new and often correct turn to facts of moment',¹⁰⁴ complained of the author's too-evident Romanism:

There is not a chapter throughout his many volumes in which to Protestant feelings a Romanist bias is not manifest, and as a general history the work is on many points extremely defective and imperfect; but still Dr. Lingard's work will continue to be read and studied as the Romanist version of an important story.¹⁰⁵

In view of the diversity of assessments of Lingard's work by his contemporaries it is singular that his later biographers have been in agreement both as to the kind of man he was and the sort of work he accomplished. Each one writes of Lingard's scholarly immunity to the plagues of partizanship. Mark Tierney who wrote the first notice of Lingard's life which appeared in the Metropolitan and Provincial Catholic Almanac for 1854, issued by Lingard's publisher, and placed there, no doubt, in the hope that it would boost the sales of the sixth edition of the History which appeared that same year, was effusive in praise on Lingard and his History. He risked the partisan assertion, in a volume intended as a directory for the Roman catholic community, that:

As a polemical and controversial writer, it is but trifling praise to say that Dr. Lingard stands immeasurably above every other Catholic author of the same class in England,¹⁰⁶

102. Ibid.

103. Gentleman's Magazine., Sept. 1851, pp.323 - 325.

104. Ibid., p.324.

105. Ibid.

106. Tierney, Op.cit., p.28.

and he was just as effusive about the History of England:

Of this great work it may be fearlessly asserted, that it is at once the most complete, the most unbiased, and therefore the most perfect, of all the histories of this country that have ever yet appeared..... In impartiality it stands alone. Never did a writer come forward more fearlessly to expose error, and by the simple power of truth, to destroy the theories, and dissipate the prejudices, of ages.¹⁰⁷

These views were expressed again by Martin Haile, the pseudonym of Marie Hallé and Edwin Bonney. Referring to the journal Lingard kept at Crook Hall in 1800 they wrote:

Every sentence in the journal foreshadows the future historian, and shows that Lingard at the age of twenty-nine was already in the possession of that calm sense of even-handed justice, of open-mindedness, of surely balanced judgement, which distinguished his maturer years: the two sides of every question - in their right proportions - appearing to present themselves simultaneously to perceptions unbiased by prejudice of preconception.¹⁰⁸

And in the rather excessively titled The English Ranke: John Lingard,¹⁰⁹ Donald Shea repeats these sentiments, singling out for especial note Lingard's treatment of sixteenth century events:

Lingard presents not a synthesis or interpretation but an unembellished narrative, largely chronological and political, of the sixteenth century. He succeeded with amazing consistency in adhering to his promise: "I shall narrate the facts with impartiality; the reader must draw his own conclusions."¹¹⁰

107. Ibid.

108. Haile and Bonney Op.cit., p.76.

109. Shea, D., The English Ranke, John Lingard, 1969.

110. Ibid, p.86.

Shea in the attempt to justify his placing Lingard with Ranke drew attention to Lingard's searches for original material, his modest presentation of the facts of each incident he treated, and his innocence of party bias:

What Lord Acton said of Ranke may without substantial change be applied to Lingard: "He has obtained so much new matter at Paris, Oxford, in the British Museum, and the Record Office, that he is entirely free from conventional influences."¹¹¹

Perhaps those who write biography may be allowed an enthusiasm in their estimate of a heroine or hero. It is certain that those who write historiography must be somewhat more distanced from individual authors.

It may, therefore, be a sign of Joseph Chinnici's inability to distinguish the historiographer's task from that of the biographer, that in his The English Catholic Enlightenment, John Lingard and the Cisalpine Movement 1780 - 1850,¹¹² he writes chiefly of Lingard's 'passion for objectivity' and of Lingard applying a Rational influence to the History of England to further a 'nonpolemical point of view'.¹¹³ Lingard is, in Chinnici's view as clearly as in Tierney's, an 'unimpassioned narrator' who 'simply stated the case that was before him' and 'allowed the narrative to tell its own tale, and to make its own impression'.¹¹⁴ Others who have lately assessed Lingard's place among the Roman Catholics of the nineteenth century have been readier to advert to Lingard's use of the History for purposes not peculiarly those of an historian. In his doctoral thesis, Joseph Berington and the English Catholic Cisalpine Movement,¹¹⁵ Dr. Eamonn Duffy does not hesitate to allege Lingard's composing his historical materials with contemporary disputes in mind:

111. Ibid., p.101.

112. Chinnici, J.P., The English Catholic Enlightenment, 1980.

113. Ibid., p.111.

114. Ibid., p.114.

115. Duffy, E., Joseph Berington and the English Catholic Cisalpine Movement, 1974.

Lingard's view of papal prerogative and power were made abundantly clear in his Anglo-Saxon Church.¹¹⁶

Dr. Duffy feels able to suggest from his reading of Lingard's work that contemporary readers, both protestant and Roman catholic missed properly identifying the character of Lingard's presumptions:

His attitudes were the attitudes of his generation, little more than the insular conservatism which had always been inherent in English Catholicism, and which, although a source of strength to the Cisalpines, in their first battles with the vicars, were not properly Cisalpine at all.¹¹⁷

That Lingard was expressing in the Anglo-Saxon Church attitudes which had a 'conservative' tone is, as I hope to demonstrate, indeed the case, and that these attitudes were 'not properly Cisalpine', but I am not ready to attribute his peculiar conservatism so entirely to the general character of the English catholics of his generation. Again when John Bossy in English Catholic Community 1570 -1850¹¹⁸ declares that Lingard's History reveals him to have been the rear-guard of a quaintly old fashioned regiment, and makes the final assessment that 'when Lingard died in 1851, the state of mind and the way of life which he embodied were in retreat, a defensive minority opinion in a community which was being inwardly as well as outwardly transformed',¹¹⁹ he, too, has, I think, observed an aspect of Lingard's work, but has not been able to place Lingard with sufficient accuracy. But at any rate Dr. Duffy and Professor Bossy have seen that Lingard was up to something.

116. Ibid., p.312.

117. Ibid., p.311.

118. Bossy, J., The English Catholic Community, 1570 - 1850, 1975.

119. Ibid., p.382.

Chapter Two

Anglo-Saxons and Nineteenth Century Roman Catholics

Lingard published his History of the Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church in 1806. A second edition was published in 1810. In his short biography of Lingard that appeared in the Metropolitan and Provincial Almanack of 1854, the Reverend Mark Tierney, F.R.S., F.S.A., Canon of St. George's Cathedral Southwark, described the Ushaw faculty circumstances that led to its composition and publication:

In the evenings of winter, when each, according to his ability, was ready to bring in his contribution of amusement, they not infrequently assembled for the reading of some original paper, produced by the industry of one or other of their body. From an early period, the mind of Lingard had been accustomed to dwell on the antiquities of his country..... For the amusement of his companions, and in moments snatched from the various duties of his office, he embodied his thoughts on this subject in a series of detached papers. These papers were read by him to his friends at the evening fireside..... the extent of his reading and the depth of his research struck them at once with surprise and admiration: and when, at length, the series drew to a close, they united in one accord in urging him to mould the detached parts into a regular form, and publish them as a connected history. At length (the work), was committed to the press in Newcastle.¹

That 'connected history' eventually covered the period from the introduction of christianity to Britain, which Lingard places at about 180 A.D. to the Norman conquest. The book opened with the arrival of St. Augustine, and what Lingard took to be the conversion of the whole country. The missionaries encountering the civil establishment of the day allowed Lingard to shape this chapter so that it dealt with political events in tandem with ecclesiastical. His second chapter, which described the emergence of an episcopate in Anglo-Saxon England, tracing the formation of

1. From the reprint in the sixth edition of the History of England, Op.cit., p.8.

archbishoprics, bishoprics, monasteries and parishes, made it plain that not everything in English christian life had come fully formed from the divine hand. The institutional structure of the church had been worked out with reference to the social realities of Anglo-Saxon England. This was evidently an idea which, if applied, might lead to a confrontation with much of the talk of contemporary ultramontane theorists. Chapter three treated the ways in which the church in Anglo-Saxon society lived out its accommodation with the secular institutions, and in this, too, there was a hint of what Lingard expected of his church in the nineteenth century. The monastic institution had almost perforce to be treated in some detail, but Lingard's description of the disciplines, practices, revenues, architecture and charities of the monks does not suggest that they much excited the historian. He is on more congenial ground when he returns to the episcopate and its hierarchic structure in the fifth chapter. This introduces the Roman pontiff for the first time in the Anglo-Saxon story. And he is introduced as an arbiter in an administrative dispute. Lingard reviews Wilfred's experience when Bishop of York to illustrate the tone of the relationships between king and bishop and pope at that time, and he inevitably raised questions in the reader's mind about the proper tone of such relationships in his own time. Within this hierarchic structure Lingard places his very Roman catholic descriptions of the religious practices of the Anglo-Saxons: their modes of celebrating the sacramental liturgy, their communion rite, their practice in the confessional, their penitential canons, their ways of mitigating penances and of absolution. He thus arrived easily at the protestant suspicion of nineteenth century Roman penitential practice, and after a reference to the Anglo-Saxon Theodore who, like later Roman casuists, 'published a penitentiary, or code of laws, for the imposition of sacramental penance',² went on to risk a defence of indulgences, making it clear that this was a practice of the ancient English church:

The more pardonable sins of frailty and surprise might be expiated by a less rigorous fast often, twenty, or thirty days: but when the crime was of a blacker die, when it argued deep and premeditated malice, a longer course of

2. A.S.Ch., 2d. ed. p.203.

mortification was required and one, five, seven years, or even a whole life of penance, was deemed a cheap and easy compensation.³

The Anglo-Saxons' use of Latin language in these rites, and the Anglo-Saxon clergy's recitation of the Roman breviary are nicely placed to demonstrate the early English kinship with later Roman catholicism and form a persuasive prelude to Lingard's accounts of eulogical ceremonies, benediction of knights, consecration of virgins, coronations of kings and dedications of churches, and a longer account of the Anglo-Saxon veneration and invocation of the saints, attitudes to relics, miracles, images and pilgrimages. Lingard seems to delight in an analysis of the significance of Rome and Latin for English society which issues in a claim that only by the church's persistence in the Latin liturgy could the culture so prized by civilised Englishmen, including Lingard's own discipline, have survived to their present times:

The practice has been severely reprobated by the reformed theologians: but it was fortunate for mankind, that the apostles of the northern nations were less wise than their modern critics. Had they adopted in the liturgy the language of their proselytes, the literature would probably have perished with the empire of Rome. By preserving the use of the Latin tongue, they imposed on the clergy the necessity of study, kept alive the spirit of improvement, and transmitted to future generations the writings of the classics, and the monuments of profane and ecclesiastical history.⁴

Clearly Lingard was fascinated by the likeness of the old Anglo-Saxon culture, to that of his present church. And, most personally, by the possibility of engaging the early Anglo-Saxon christian interest in scholarly clerics as a justification of his own way of life. Perhaps he had Bishop Gibson as well as protestants in mind when composing these pages. He enlarges upon the extent of the learning of the Anglo-Saxon clerics in theology and philosophy, astrology and meteorology, and purveys some enthusiastic portraits of Theodore, Adrian, Aldhelm, Bede and Alcuin as respectable predecessors and models for present clergy.

Two matters are given especial emphasis. The scriptural character of Roman

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., p.199.

catholic scholarship and the English character of Roman catholic priests. On the one point Lingard may have surprised Roman catholic and protestant readers equally. He maintains that it was the especial delight of the Anglo-Saxon priests and scholars, and should by inference, be still the especial delight of Roman catholic priests and scholars, to entertain a large reverence for the scriptures and to express this reverence at the very centre of their cultural activity. He takes this quite daring apologetic right into the local habitation of the protestant establishment by reviewing the history of one copy of the Gospels as it was passed from one Roman priest to another:

In the library belonging to the dean and chapter of Durham, are two very fair copies of the four gospels, written about the year 700 (A.11.17). In the British Museum (nero D4) is another MS of the gospels, beautifully written about the year 686, by Eadfrid, who was afterwards bishop of Lindisfarne. Ethelwold, his successor, illuminated and ornamented it with several elegant drawings. By the anchorite Bilfrith, it was covered with gems, silver gilt, and gold, in honour of St. Cuthbert; and Aldred the priest afterwards added an interlineary version.⁵

And, immediately upon this, Lingard is delighted to suggest that the Anglo-Saxon church is carefully preserved in Roman catholic as in Anglican libraries:

In the possession of the Rev. Mr. Stone, at Stonyhurst, is another and still more ancient MS. of St. John's gospel, believed to be the same which is said by Bede to have belonged to St. Boisil, the master of St. Cuthbert. An inscription in a more recent hand, states it to have been taken out of the tomb of the Saint: but this is probably a mistake. The contemporary history of the translation of St. Cuthbert says, that the MS. buried with him was a book of the gospels (Act.SS. Bened. Saec. iv. p.296): and that the copy of St. John,

5. Ibid., p.517, note R.

which had belonged to St. Boisil, was preserved in the church in a case of red leather, and was held by the bishop in his hand, while he preached to the people during the translation. (ibid. p.300).⁶

Thus not only does he portray the Anglo-Saxons, whom he is presenting as the English predecessors of the present English Roman Catholics, as civilized and evangelical, but also he impresses the reader that he, Mr. Wanley, and the Rev. Stone, are maintaining the traditional care of Roman Catholics for the scriptures.

Having shown the glory of the ancient English culture to have been the learning of priests of the Roman church, Lingard now emphasises that there was a foreign threat against such priests. He writes of the wrecking of their achievements by the Danes and the struggles of the Anglo Saxons to defend their English Christian and, indeed, it appears, clerical culture during the Danish invasions. 'Christianity among our ancestors'⁷ was expressed in a happy harmony of 'religious worship', and the 'pursuit of science',⁸ but 'the invasions of the Danes summon us to witness the horrors of barbarian warfare, the conflagration of churches, the downfall of the monastic, and the decline of the clerical orders'.⁹ He made much of the Danes' spoliation of the religious communities as the work of a national enemy. Thus, in his treatment of the attack on Lindisfarne, Lingard was quick to produce a rhetoric of patriotic distress:

The news of this calamity filled all the nations of the Saxons with shame and sorrow.¹⁰

And, in his account of the death of a Saxon king, Lingard harnessed English monarchy with monasticism with evident satisfaction:

6. Ibid. There are indications in this passage of Lingard's residence in the Durham area. At Crook Hall, where the Anglo Saxon Church was written, he was about ten miles from Durham.

7. A.S.Ch., Op.cit., p.358.

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid.

10. Ibid., p.362.

The subjection of East Anglia was secured by the captivity of its monarch: and his unprovoked murder shewed, that to the barbarians the blood of kings was as grateful a spectacle as that of monks.¹¹

Lingard's thesis is laid quite open in chapter twelve which deals with an English renaissance upon the 'restoration of ecclesiastical discipline',¹² and leads into a celebration of the Anglo Saxons bringing culture to the rest of Europe through the clerical efforts of Wilfrid, Ecbert, Willibrord, Boniface, Willehad and Sigifrid. By his management of this account of the achievements of these men, Lingard suggested that far from being a foreign mode of religion, those doctrines and practices which were in his own time deprecated as peculiarly Roman were actually exported by these priests from England to other countries.

That Lingard was sensitive to the controversial nature of his subject and the tensions that any discussion of the history of English religion created between catholics and protestants, is evident in those prefatory remarks, which, as is the custom, he composed as the justification of the narrative he had already written, upon the general influence of the Reformation disputes on the writings of the learned men who had made earlier attempts to describe the Anglo-Saxon history:

Controversy pervaded every department of literature: and history, as well as the sister sciences, was alternately pressed into the service of the contending parties. By opposite writers the same facts were painted in opposite colours: unfavourable circumstances were carefully concealed, or artfully disguised: and the men, whom the catholic exhibited as models of virtue and objects of veneration, the protestant condemned for their interested zeal, their pride, their ignorance, and their superstition.¹³

11. Ibid., p.376.

12. Ibid., p.xii.

13. Ibid., p.iii.

He did not, however, think himself called to admit any such fault in his own proceedings. Professing himself unsympathetic to 'partial advocates' and 'religious polemics'¹⁴ Lingard declared that he has followed a cautious programme:

My object is truth: and in pursuit of truth, I have made it a religious duty to consult the original historians. Who would drink from the troubled stream, when he may drink at the fountainhead?¹⁵

A topic that had been made the stalking horse for opinions about religion in later times, is without any great show of reluctance, to be such a stalking horse again. Presenting his view as the 'truth' revealed in the unsullied original testimony of original documents, Lingard seems confident in his capacity to establish a platform from which he could declare his own religious opinions.

The general structure of his history is repeated in its several instances. Many examples might be alleged here, but none perhaps so immediately revealing of his method as Lingard's quite short attempt at demonstrating that the nineteenth century Roman notion of the 'real presence' of Christ in the consecrated elements of the eucharist was a belief of the early English christians. The shape of this attempt is a paradigmatic for a range of others of the like intent. First he states his conviction boldly enough. Then he proceeds to the necessary clearing of earlier commentators from his ground. He achieves this by an appeal to his own presentation of 'facts' in contrast to the imaginative resorts of earlier writers. By 'facts' he again means what can be referred to the testimony of witnesses contemporary with events:

To the reader, who has formed his notions of antiquity on the credit of modern writers, it may, probably, create surprise, that I have dared to pronounce the doctrine of the Anglo Saxon church. What! he will ask, have not Parker, and Lisle, and Usher, and Whelock, and Hicks, and

14. Ibid.

15. Ibid.

Collier, and Carte, and Littleton, and Henry, shewn that the ancient belief of our ancestors, respecting the sacrament of the eucharist, perfectly coincides with that establishment by the reformed Churches? But facts are to be proved, not by authority, but by evidence: and to this formidable phalanx of controvertists, philologists, and historians, may be opposed a still more formidable array of contemporary and unquestionable vouchers.¹⁶

Lingard makes his claim to be presenting the 'truth' of the matter appear the more justified by his next conducting a detailed examination of one of these early witnesses. The best one for his purpose, of course. In the discussion of 'real presence' the idiosyncratic eucharistic speculation of Aelfric which had been variously noted by Henry and Whelock¹⁷ is given an extended treatment in a bravura attempt to demonstrate the general thesis. Lingard goes to work in a way that both discredits the accepted version of Aelfric's history put about by protestant historians and suggests such a largeness of Roman theological freedom on this particular matter that the reader must distrust more generally any who allege a narrowness of orthodoxy in the Roman schools. Lingard begins with a statement of affairs which must dispose of protestant versions:

It is perpetually inculcated by modern writers, that the doctrine of Aelfric was the national belief of the Anglo-Saxons.¹⁸

That national English belief was certainly recognizable:

In one respect this assertion is true. Aelfric, as well as his countrymen, believed, that in the mass the bread and wine were made, by the divine power, the body and blood of Christ.¹⁹

16. Ibid., p.491, note N.

17. Henry, R., The History of Great Britain, from the Invasion of it by the Romans under Julius Caesar, 1771-93.

Whelock, A., Historical ecclesiastical gentis Anglorum libri edited by A.W., 1643.

18. A.S. Ch., Op.cit., p.504.

19. Ibid.

And so is the continuing Roman freedom within faith:

But ingenious men have always assumed the privilege of speculating on the mysteries of christianity: nor have their speculations been condemned, as long as they have not trenched on the integrity of their faith.²⁰

Lingard quotes from Bede, Egbert of York, and Bertram to suggest that whatever the case of Aelfric the generality of Anglo-Saxons believed in a doctrine of the eucharistic that coincided with what Lingard takes to be the Tridentine doctrine of transubstantiation:

These instances appear to me to prove, not only that the real presence, but also that the identity of the natural and the eucharistic body of Christ, was believed by the Saxon church.²¹

Roman catholic apologetic has been given the authority of English historical sources.

If Aelfric can be so completely brought to back Lingard's account of the Anglo-Saxon church a reader may suppose every other disputed figure may be as truly placed in a Roman catholic apology. Having dealt with the most difficult case raised by those historians Lingard moved on to discredit these writers as useful guides to Anglo-Saxon belief.

The eucharistic example shows in short form what is extended in other descriptions of Anglo-Saxon religious attitudes. Lingard is always alert for occasions of presenting such likenesses of Anglo-Saxon and Roman practice and belief. Thus he made a spacious place in his history for the persuasion of his readers that the beliefs of the Anglo-Saxons about religious images were just those of the contemporary Roman catholic church. He makes first a reference to Bede as a witness of Anglo-Saxon veneration of the mother of Jesus, then to Mary's general praises being sung by the Saxon poets, and then to the more Roman of mariological

20. Ibid.

21. Ibid., p.506.

doctrines being extolled by Anglo-Saxon preachers, and the principal incidents of her life being 'commemorated by the four solemn festivals of the nativity, the annunciation, the purification, and the assumption'.²²

Having stated his conviction and presented his witnesses, Lingard attends to the assertions of other historians. He manages this matter with a nicely pointed politeness:

On the subject of images, the learning of the two Spelmans has enabled them to make some curious discoveries. Alfred the great, in the preface of his laws, inserted an abridgement of the decalogue, in which were omitted the words - "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven thing."²³

This omission was certainly a 'fact'. Lingard addressed himself to the elucidation of this rather unpleasant example of early witness:

Now what could be the cause of this omission? Sir Henry Spelman gravely assures us, that it was made out of compliment to the church of Rome, which from the time, when she first adopted the worship of images, had expunged the second commandment from the decalogue. The king, however, appears to have felt some compunction for the fraud, and, to compound the matter with his conscience, added the following prohibition: "Thou shalt not make to thyself gods of silver, nor gods of gold."²⁴

Lingard, in the manner of a man reeling out rope for a suicide's hanging, enlarges upon the protestant historian's discovery and explanation:

Thus far Sir Henry Spelman pursued his father's discoveries, and informed the public, that the addition irritated the court of Rome, and was one of the offences, which deprived the king of the honour of canonization. Spelm. Life of Alfred, p.220. edit. Hearne.²⁵

22. Ibid., p.272.

23. Ibid., p.515, note Q.

24. Ibid.

25. Ibid.

At this point the protestant discoveries are demonstrated to have a place with protestant polemics by the historian who has no such bias. The whole set of protestants has rushed to repeat Spelman's assertions:

These most important discoveries have been gratefully received, and carefully re-echoed by the prejudice of ignorance of later historians.²⁶

He thinks himself to be in a position to poke fun at the lot of them:

Fortunately, however, the Spelmans did not grasp at universal praise: and if any modern antiquary wish to dispute with them the palm of absurdity, he may still exert his sagacity to discover why the king committed another very important prohibition, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife."²⁷

Lingard does not, evidently, think that anyone would be uncivil enough to suggest that this prohibition, too, was omitted in delicate concern for the Court of Rome.

These examples certainly declare Lingard's linkage of the study of English history with the establishment of a Roman apologetic. And this was, indeed, to be a major element in all his work. Lingard is properly read as aiming at the establishment of early English religion being much like that of later Roman catholicism. Upon this element many contemporary and later critics have, as I have suggested in my first chapter, concentrated their attention. His Anglo-Saxon Church met with the following response from the Quarterly Review²⁸ of March 1812:

This is the work of a catholic priest, a man not unequal to his undertaking either in intelligence or research, but abounding in all that professional bigotry, which, after being suppressed in this country for a season by fear and caution, is now directing its attacks against the protestant world with a confidence excited by the possession of independence and the hope of power.²⁹

26. Ibid.

27. Ibid.

28. 'The Antiquities of the Saxon Church. By the Rev. John Lingard', Quarterly, vol. VII, no. XII, pp.92-107.

29. Ibid., p.92.

The reviewer had clearly seen some part of what Lingard was attempting and he did not like it:

It was manifestly not the author's object to give a simple narrative of the Anglo-Saxon church, which during the whole of this period was unquestionably more or less dependant upon Rome; but to exalt the character of Augustine and his followers, to sink that of the primitive British churches, to prove the marriage of the secular priests a mere usurpation, to extol the monks and their patrons, to identify the most extravagant tenets of his own establishment with the doctrines of the Saxon church, and finally, to insult and vilify the church of England, and the most venerable of her prelates, for their departure from the faith and discipline of their ancestors.³⁰

His response to the short discussion Lingard presented of eucharistic belief and practice is typical of this reviewer's appreciation of what Lingard was doing and of his entirely unsympathetic response:

Be it then, that transubstantiation was the faith of our Saxon ancestors. Who were they? A set of pirates just emerging from barbarianism, and scarcely capable of comprehending their own wretched systems.³¹

And again:

The doctrine of the Real Presence, in opposition to an host of Protestants, he boldly maintains to have been held by the Saxon church. Here again we are compelled to assert our perfect indifference to the matter in controversy, farther than as a subject of speculation. Englishmen in the nineteenth century will scarcely lend their understandings to the cloudy metaphysics of Paschasius, Radbert, Hincmar, Alcuin and Rabanus Maurus.³²

30. Ibid.

31. Ibid., p.93

32. Ibid.

There is something attractive in such a sweeping way with history and the establishment of doctrinal orthodoxy. It has good protestant energy to commend it.

It is to be noted however, that in these volumes and in the later History of England, at least as great emphasis of the writing is placed on the persuading of the reader that English Roman catholics might be accepted as respectable and trustworthy members of the nation. They represent elements of a national tradition. Lingard took upon himself not only the function of an apologist for the doctrines and practices of his church but also that of an apologist for the loyalty of the English Roman catholic community.³³ In those functions Lingard became engaged in controversies which were to lead him to a reappraisal of his gifts and vocation, and which brought him to a new understanding of what his historian's work was. To those controversies I shall now turn.

33. Quite how seriously Lingard took the study as a work of a apologetic is hinted at in a letter to John Walker, 23rd October, 1849:

When I first published the Anglo-Saxon Church, I meant to continue with the Anglo-Norman Church. 'Why did I not? I found that there was more to disedify than to edify in such a continuation. But what deterred me entirely was the process against the Abbott and Monks of St. Albans (in vol. iii of Wilkins' Councils, where it occupies a dozen or two folio leaves) in the Archbishop's court by order of the Pope. The charge was that the nunnery within the walls or precincts of the Abbey into which the Abbott and his officers had free ingress, but no others, was in reality a nest of prostitutes. All the depositions in proof of the charge were entered in the Archbishop's register, and reprinted in the volume. The Abbott might probably have refuted them, but nothing is said of any answer, nor of the result. When I read these depositions, I said to myself, If I proceed lauding the monastic orders and clergy of these ages I shall provoke some-one to publish all this to the world.¹

Bonney, E., 'The making of Lingard's History', Ushaw Magazine, vol. XIX, 1909, p.277n.

Chapter Three

Pamphleteering, 1806 - 1817

The Anglo-Saxon Church was oftentimes a stalking-horse for Lingard's presenting his contemporaries with two ideas whose acceptance he took to be a necessary preliminary to the emancipation of his co-religionists: that the social attitudes encouraged by Roman catholic religious beliefs should be judged according to the evidence provided by primary historical sources and that Roman catholics could form a loyal community within the English nation. The controversies that engaged Lingard in the years 1806-1817 made him consider these two preliminary ideas further and, his having to separate them in order to present a persuasive apologetic brought Lingard to appreciate which of the two he was the better fitted to defend.

In 1806, Shute Barrington, the bishop of Durham,¹ published his Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Durham in the year 1806. That Lingard should choose to reply to the Charge must have staggered the bishop, for no catholic had noticed any of his previous Charges in this way. Even his more avowedly anti-catholic Charge in 1799,² to which both he and Lingard, referred in their pamphlets of 1806, had not provoked an answer. Perhaps Lingard, in his eagerness to prove to those Roman catholics who were critical of his lack of bias in the Anglo Saxon Church that he was wholly devoted to catholic causes, took the first chance that offered itself in his locality to become embroiled in a controversy about religion. The Durham matter was to occupy him four years.

Barrington's charge was delivered in bold and confident style. The bishop, as assured that he was a distinguished member of the establishment, as one might expect the son of a Viscount to be, was confident that, when writing of Roman

1. Shute Barrington, b. 1734 d. 1826, successively bishop of Llandaff, Salisbury and Durham. He was bishop of Durham from 1791 until his death.
2. Barrington, S., A Sermon preached before the Lords spiritual and temporal, on Wednesday, February 27, 1799.

catholicism, he was dealing with a minority religious faction unpopular with that establishment. Barrington was not so well informed about catholicism as he seems to have supposed, and if he did indeed identify in contemporary Roman catholicism precisely those elements which Lingard had spent energy in defending in his history of the Anglo-Saxon Church this was simply because these were the accepted topics of such disputes. In an opening remark typical of the tone that was to prevail in the Charge, Shute Barrington declared that:

The Romanists have oppressed the simplicity of the Gospel, under a load of ostentatious pageantry,³

and, more rhetorically, that:

They have carnalized the ordinance of God by impure and unauthorised admixtures.⁴

Then he got down to the business of his Charge with an efficient statement of his accusations against the Roman Church:

Our Church separated from the Romanists, because the doctrines and ordinances of their Church were derogatory

1. From the honour of God the Father;
2. From the mediatorship of the Son; and
3. From the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit;
4. Because by authorising the sale of indulgences and pardons they encouraged the most scandalous irregularities of Life;
5. Because both by performing the services of the Church in Latin, and by locking up the Scriptures in the same language, they violated the express command of the Holy Writ, and obstructed the diffusion of Christian Knowledge.⁵

3. Charge, p.4.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid., p.5.

Shute Barrington, clearly confident that he understood the theology of the catholic church, went on to elaborate these accusations with some enthusiasm. Thus, he declared that the Roman church derogated from the honour of God most evidently in the use of images, pre-empting the kind of defence that Lingard had, equally conventionally, employed in an obiter dictum of the Anglo-Saxon Church:

The Romanist may allege that images were used by them only to excite strong religious feelings, and are never intended as objects of worship. But the experience of every age and nation, in which images have been introduced, abundantly demonstrates that idolatry is the inevitable consequence.⁶

Like Lingard, too, Barrington esteemed Roman catholicism a coherent set of beliefs and practices. The bishop connected this 'idolatry' with the doctrine of transubstantiation:

To us it cannot be surprising that the same superstition, which could induce any one to believe, that bread and wine (mere bodily elements, or earthly manufacture) were converted into the real body and blood of Christ, should without much difficulty, worship a creature image instead of the Creator.⁷

At this point in the charge, Shute Barrington reaches the accusation that Lingard had already hoped to meet in his treatment of the popular protestant story of Alfred:

To disguise such repugnance to the letter of God's Commandments, an artifice was adopted in Romish books of religious institution, as contrary to the honour of God, as image worship itself. In the enumeration of the Ten Commandments the second is wholly suppressed, and the number ten completed by dividing the tenth into two; and this in direct violation of

6. Ibid.

7. Ibid., p.6.

the injunction which was given to Moses for the entire observance of the Decalogue: "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you; neither shall ye diminish ought from it; that ye may keep the Commandments of the Lord which I command you."⁸

Shute Barrington went on to connect the Roman doctrines of images, transubstantiation and the Roman alteration of the Decalogue with the Romanists' intercession of saints, practice of confession and teaching about Purgatory:

Praying to the Virgin Mary, to Angels, and to Saints, is derogatory from the one mediatorship of Jesus Christ, from the one only name under heaven, whereby we must be saved.... The imposition of penances, as purchases of pardon, and remedies of past sin, was a denial of the efficacy of the great sacrifice which Christ made for us by his death.... That one propitiation once made, to require other means of expiation, by penances here, and by purgatory hereafter, was to seduce from the grace and truth that came by Jesus Christ.⁹

The subject of Purgatory once raised, led the bishop to stray from his scheme of theological discussion to make an historical observation:

Another great corruption in the Romish institution was the sale of indulgencies (sic) and pardons. This disgraceful practice had a powerful effect in demonstrating the necessity of a Reformation, and forwarding the means of its completion.¹⁰

And thus historically emboldened, from the matter of indulgences the bishop felt enabled to pass, by way of the use of Latin in catholic services, to the accusation that the availability of the scriptures exclusively in Latin violated the express command of Holy Writ:

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid., p.7.

10. Ibid., p.9.

It is a striking abuse in the ordinances of the Romish Church, that the public services of Religion should be administered in an unknown tongue. This usage is so inconsistent that the ends of public devotion, and the direct precepts of an inspired Apostle, that it would be matter of astonishment how such an unscriptural practice could have so long subsisted, in any Church, if the authority of Scripture had not been superseded by their traditions.¹¹

His appalled reaction to catholic attitudes to the written word was seconded by another reference to Reformation history:

In conformity to the same system, the Scriptures themselves, which ought to be to all men both the rule of their faith and the guide of their practice, were at the same time of the Reformation removed from the reach of the common inquirer, and concealed in the obscurity of an unknown language. Thus were the great mass of mankind forbidden to have recourse to the oracles of God.¹²

And with paralleling reference to the kind of claims for a large Roman catholic share in the advancement of western culture that Lingard had made in the history of the Anglo-Saxon church, Shute Barrington disallows present Roman claim to the scholarly study of the disciplines of scriptural exegesis and classical commentary:

How little the Romish Church contributes to the cultivation of the original Scriptures, is evident from the depressed state of sacred and ancient literature in the Romish Universities;¹³

Whether it was indeed in an attempt to assuage the ill humour of Milner and regain some reputation among Roman catholics, or in a rather unhappy conviction that good might come from engagement in such disputes, or in a weary sense of his being the only Roman catholic available for the business and that it had to be done, Lingard composed his Remarks on a charge delivered to the clergy of the diocese of Durham in ferocious style:

11. Ibid., p.10.

12. Ibid.

13. Ibid.

A pamphlet has lately been published under a title calculated to command respect, and ensure popularity: A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Durham, by Shute, Bishop of Durham. It is, or would seem to be, the dying exhortation of a venerable prelate, "Whose years have already exceeded the ordinary age of man." His last instructions to his reverend brethren, the clergy of his dioceses: a legacy of love, which, in the fervour of affection, he has bequeathed to his spiritual children. With eagerness I opened the book and my wishes anticipated the moderation, the liberality, the benevolence of an aged prelate, who was unwilling to sink into the grave without leaving to posterity a lasting monument of his piety and pastoral solicitude. I saw him, like the Saviour of mankind, entertaining himself for the last time with his disciples; and anxiously enforcing, by his example and discourse, those sentiments of universal charity so beautifully described in the charge which Christ delivered to his apostles on the eve of his passion. I must confess I was most grievously disappointed. The Christian bishop had dwindled into the angry polemic; and the object of the publication appeared to be, not to draw nearer the bands of unity and affection, not to exhort his clergy to a conscientious discharge of their respective duties; but to misrepresent the creed of a most numerous class of his majesty's subjects. I treated it with the inattention which I conceived it to deserve; and, till I learned that it had been presented to the King by the zealous Prelate himself, I almost persuaded myself that it was the fabrication of some obscure controvertist, who, to exalt his own insignificancy, had assumed the name of Shute, Bishop of Durham.¹⁴

At the close of this satiric opening paragraph there are, perhaps among the religious gibes, signs of Lingard's professedly English concern that his fellow Roman catholics, all 'his majesty's subjects', have been maligned to their King, but the hints in the next

14. Remarks, 2d. ed., p.7.

paragraph of Lingard's characteristic notion of how an historian should deal with such malignity are of greater importance as indicators of what Lingard is hoping to accomplish. The bishop's Charge is to be refuted by an appeal to the evidences of a 'truth' declared by 'fact':

The champion of truth will disdain the petty artifices of substituting assertion for proof, and misrepresentation for fact.¹⁵

Lingard sends the bishop to the actual texts produced by those he is attacking:

Had he opened a Catholic Bible, Catholic Prayer Book or Catholic Catechism, he would have found this commandment expressed in the same words as in Protestant books of religious institution. He would have learned that the Decalogue in both was the same; that the only difference consisted in the division; and that the Reformers had been pleased to separate the first precept into two, and to condense the ninth and tenth into one.¹⁶

The champion of truth, does not, evidently, disdain the artifices of personal insult. Referring first to 'the herd of minor and hungry writers' who have found 'the most certain road to reputation, and, what they probably valued more than reputation, to wealth and preferment', Lingard supposes the Bishop of Durham to be placed far about such paltry temptations:

The reputation which he enjoys, may satisfy his utmost ambition; and the ecclesiastical dignity which he fills, if not the first in rank, is at least the first in opulence in the United Kingdom.¹⁷

With a reference to the opinion of Archbishop Grindal, the 'Protestant Archbishop', Lingard suggests to the richest of the contemporary Anglican bishops that, when he is talking about Roman clergy making money out of indulgencies, he might remember 'the sale of indulgences, if sale it must be called, was common to the clergy of the Protestant as well as the Catholic church; and the impartial reader,

15. Ibid., p.8.

16. Ibid., p.23.

17. Ibid.

while he condemns the avarice of those who may have converted this practice to their private emolument, will acquit each of the two churches, because each in her public canons expressed the highest disapprobation of so heinous an abuse'.¹⁸ Indeed, Lingard adds, Shute Barrington ought to be no enemy to indulgences: 'For his doctrine, that works of penance are a denial of the efficacy of Christ's passion, offers to sinners a more extensive indulgence than any Pope, in the plenitude of his power, has yet ventured to grant'.¹⁹ Lingard shifts easily from topic to topic as the Charge invites him. The man who is first in opulence is sent to the innocent for instruction:

Let him interrogate the first catholic child of ten years of age, whom he may chance to meet in the streets, whether it be lawful to worship images? and he will receive for answer: "No, by no means; for they can neither hear, nor see, or help us."²⁰

So Lingard proceeds with some snide remarks, some doctrinal discussions, and some historical examples, to deal with Shute Barrington's observations upon various christian topics. On communion under one kind: 'So learned a Prelate as the Bishop of Durham knew, or ought to have known, that the custom of communicating under one kind, is sanctioned not only by the practice of the Latin, but also of the Greek Church, on several days of the year; and he should have hesitated before he condemned on his own private authority nine tenths of the great body of Christians, as violators of the command of Christ, and mutilators of the sacrament'.²¹ On the use of Latin in the Roman liturgy. 'If the Bishop of Durham conceive himself and his colleagues the most proper judges of the language which is best adopted to their service',²² he ought to allow the same privilege to the catholic Prelates with respect to theirs, though Lingard allows that since 'the English Church is a modern church', its language therefore should be modern, 'that its liturgy may announce to posterity

18. Ibid., p.40.

19. Ibid.

20. Ibid., p.19.

21. Ibid., p.29.

22. Ibid.

the era in which it was framed'.²³ And then, as is common amongst historians, Lingard evidently feels that his command of his discipline allows him to undertake a prophecy:

I do not believe that history can furnish an instance of a people, who ever change the language of their liturgy and did not at the same time change their religion.²⁴

At this not every present Roman catholic liberal will count Lingard an ally.

It is in the character of the historian, certainly, that Lingard sets out most determinedly to defend the Roman catholic church. The rhetorical question, so favoured by preachers in pulpits, is brought into use to assert a tradition of Roman catholic clerical scholarship:

I would ask, from whom it was that the first reformers acquired the knowledge of the oriental languages, if not from the catholic monasteries and catholic universities? I would ask, who published the Complutensian Polyglott? A Catholic Cardinal. The Antwerpian Polyglott? A Catholic King. The Parisian Polyglott? A Catholic Gentleman. All these were published before the English Polyglott; and are we to be told that Catholics are enemies to biblical learning? The first editions of the Samaritan Pentateuch and of the Greek Testament were given by Catholics: the Greek, Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopian versions of the Bible, and the Chaldaic paraphrases, were first edited by Catholics.²⁵

Lingard's Remarks on a Charge evidence an ambition to be esteemed the quick apologist of his community but, as in the History of the Anglo-Saxon Church, Lingard's attempts to deal with doctrinal disputes in a polemical style has but a limited effectiveness. He has not the sensitivity to his own use of language, or to others' habitual modes of thought, required for the persuasion of an opponent, and he

23. Ibid.

24. Ibid.

25. Ibid., p.25.

indulges too often his liking for the bluntest controversial weapons. Priding himself on representing Roman catholic scholarship, he has not yet learnt how to deploy his undoubted historian's expertise in a theological argument. Or, more precisely, he has not yet learnt to shift a theological argument on to historical ground. The controversy with Shute Barrington is never ^{enough} far removed from the bishop's original doctrinal position to give scope for Lingard's peculiar talents. The irritation exhibited in Lingard's theological apologetic in great part derives from his frustration at having to conduct an argument in a manner not quite his own and ^{from} his being as yet inexpert in the removal of the debate to more congenial ground. The only section of his argument in this pamphlet conducted with the required restraint and, therefore, the only section which is at all persuasive, is that in which Lingard makes his appeal to documentary evidence. He is well able to review the witness of the actual texts of the catholic prayer books and catechisms. Generally, this attempt at apologetic must be reckoned a failure. It cannot have confuted any opponent. It cannot have persuaded any undecided well-wisher. Perhaps Lingard himself was vaguely aware that he had not the necessary command of the controversialist form. At any rate he did not attempt a like enterprise again.

But Lingard did not, evidently, lack encouragement to re-engage in conflict with protestant opponents. He was in regular correspondence with Charles Butler throughout this period and a letter of November 1812 from Butler to Lingard demonstrates the kind of encouragement Lingard is likely to have received frequently from the older man. On this occasion Butler urged Lingard to write again:

I wish both the Review and the Pamphlet had an able answer; and after your victorious conflict with the Bishop of Durham, I know of no one to whom we so naturally look on this occasion as yourself.²⁶

In this second controversial situation Lingard was compelled to sharpen his appreciation of what he meant by the national loyalty of Roman catholics, Barrington's Charge of 1806 had expressed a general sense of the self-excluding

26. Butler to Lingard, Correspondence B.M., Letterbooks, 25, 128, p.149.

character of Roman catholic belief from the common culture of christian society. Henry Cotes' adoption of the pseudonym 'A Liege Subject' at once declares him to have rather more interest than Shute Barrington in the political structure of the nation and his letters exhibit this interest in a discussion of the constitutional exclusion of Roman catholics. Lingard took up this challenge to the position he had already sketched in the sub-text of the Anglo-Saxon Church.

In his controversy with "A Liege Subject", Lingard wrote three letters to the Newcastle Courant newspaper which were published as Letters on Catholic Loyalty²⁷ in the same year. Henry Cotes in his election address published in the Newcastle Courant 23rd May 1807²⁸ had been prompted to comment on the civil rights petition of catholic bishops published prior to the election of 1807. Cotes was convinced that, since the Roman catholic bishops and their co-religionists did not acknowledge themselves to be subjects of King George III, it would be foolish to give them the rights of liege subjects. He began by asserting a general principle:

Where one class of the people acknowledges a foreign power superior to the power of the state, under the protection of which that class lives, to admit its individuals to an equal participation of the rights of citizens with the other classes, who acknowledge no foreign power to exist in the state under which they live, would be a continued act of public injustice, because the admission of such a description of people to an equal participation of the rights of citizens, would remove the characteristic distinction between subjects and aliens-between those who have sworn allegiance to the state, and those who acknowledge themselves bound to pay undefined obedience to a foreign power existing within the state, and presumed superior to it.²⁹

27. Letters on Catholic Loyalty; Originally published in the Newcastle Courant, pp.1-36.

28. Reprinted in Letters on Catholic Loyalty, Op.cit., pp.5-7.

29. Ibid., p.5

Then he came to the particular case:

The Roman catholics are that class of British subjects, who, according to the principles by which they hold themselves bound, do acknowledge a foreign power superior to the power of the state under which they live, and by such an acknowledgement, derogate from the dignity of that government whose subjects they are.³⁰

Cotes made his appeal not to those protestant reformers whose zeal for religion had lurked behind Barrington's accusations but to those Whig Lords whose principles were, as the British Constitution showed, 'so forbearing, so truly catholic, that these half subjects are tolerated in the united kingdom'.³¹ Roman catholics should yet remember that 'they are only tolerated' and not sue for privileges which it would be unconstitutional to grant them. Indeed, he insists that such privileges, consistently with their own principles, 'cannot be insured to them'. He takes it that 'being dependent on the will of a presumed superior foreign power', were the Roman catholics to be admitted to all the privileges of liege subjects, 'even upon their own unqualified terms',³² they could not 'enjoy those privileges longer than the will of that foreign power, to which they pay implicit obedience, may proscribe'.³³

The editor of the newspaper added to Cotes' first letter the petition of the General Committee of the Irish Roman catholics, 17th March 1792, with its protestations of loyalty to the English constitution. This even-handed mode of proceeding prompted Cotes to repeat his former assertions in a second letter. He now supported his arguments with reference to a catechism that had been published in 1686. These, he thought, made it quite clear that protestants should be on their guard against granting further privileges to catholics. Several persons, including Bishop Douglas, Vicar Apostolic of the London District, wrote to the Newcastle

30. Ibid.

31. Ibid.

32. Ibid.

33. Ibid., p.6.

Courant protesting their catholic loyalty. 'A Friend to Peace and Unity' attacked Cotes in a letter to the paper for his 'intolerate spirit of party violence'.³⁴ 'A Loyal Freeholder' claimed that Cotes had misrepresented 'the principles of the Roman catholics in order to render them the objects of public hatred'.³⁵ By referring to the catechism Cotes had entered upon an historical topic, and placing the debate in the area of texts and what Lingard would call 'facts', Cotes provoked Lingard or, better, gave him necessary excuse, to enter the debate.

Lingard went to work with some pleasure, for Cotes had in his reliance on the 1686 catechism as representing the views of the present catholic community committed a costly blunder. The document was not quite what Cotes supposed it. Lingard grinned happily at the thought of the mistake he was, teasingly, to reveal:

His credulity has been caught in a trap, which was first laid one hundred and twenty years ago. It certainly was not necessary to consult the controvertists of the seventeenth in order to learn the political sentiments of the catholics in the nineteenth century. He had better have permitted these antiquated champions to sleep in peace. But he was determined to disturb their repose: and old John Williams has punished his curiosity by playing him a trick, which he will probably long remember.³⁶

John Williams' trick was, indeed, a delightful one for Lingard:

In 1685, Mr. Goter, a catholic clergyman, published a small treatise entitled "The Papist misrepresented and represented". Its object was to oppose the real doctrines of catholics to those falsely imputed to them by their adversaries. The work caused a great sensation, and several protestant writers undertook to refute it. In controversy as in war every species of the strategem have been employed. Mr. John Williams, a

34. Ibid., p.23.

35. Ibid., p.24.

36. Ibid., p.26.

protestant and I believe, a clergyman, wrote in opposition to Mr. Goter, a catechism, which he described as truly representing the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome, but which in reality made the catholics profess the very doctrines that had been disclaimed and refuted by Mr. Goter.³⁷

Lingard then proceeded to tie the noose around Cotes:

How many liege subjects of the seventeenth century suffered themselves to be duped by this artifice, I am unable to inform you; but there is too much reason to fear that the Liege Subject, who has lately displayed so much controversial learning in your paper, has run blindly into the snow. That the catechism which he quotes is not catholic, must be evident to every person acquainted with the language of catholic divines: and as far as I can judge, both from the date and the extracts with which he has favoured us, it is the identical catechism of John Williams.³⁸

This was careful, polite and devastating. Cotes was in a mess from which he could not extricate himself due entirely to Lingard's management of historical evidences. Cotes, in the next letter he sent to the newspaper, took proper refuge in the evidences John Williams had adduced for his catechism:

Should J.L. or any other of your correspondents, desire further satisfaction of the "Liege Subject", pray assure him that if he will undertake to defray the expense of a new edition of the Roman catechism before alluded to, the whole of that work, with its notes and references, shall be faithfully, verbatim et literatim, reprinted.³⁹

But Lingard wrote about the spurious character of the catechism again in a letter 20th June. Cotes attempted to regain ground, asking 'Are the tenets in it such as the Roman church disavows?'⁴⁰ This prompted Lingard to write his third and final letter

37. Ibid., p.27.

38. Ibid.

39. Ibid., p.29.

40. Ibid., p.33.

to the Newcastle newspaper. Lingard pays no heed to what Cotes declares to be the question in dispute. He puts aside the doctrinal question in his delight at the mistake about a text:

That the book, which he so triumphantly quoted in the commencement of the controversy, is not a catholic catechism, and that he knew it to have been written by a protestant, he has, at last, reluctantly confessed.⁴¹

He concentrates the readers' attention not on the avowals of the Roman church but on the mis-representations:

It was to extort his confession, that I was originally induced to engage in the dispute. The first letters of the Liege Subject were calculated to countenance an idea, that principles incompatible with catholic loyalty were inculcated in the catholic catechism: his avowal that they are contained, not in the catholic catechism, but in a treatise written by a protestant controvertist, has done away the mischief, which might have arisen from so erroneous a notion.⁴²

Lingard sees that his having discredited Cotes in the textual matter makes it appear that there had been nothing of substance in his main argument. He has caught the controversialists' spirit. He is arguing for whatever victory is available. Whatever may have been the substantive evidence in Williams' footnotes, ^{it is outside} the apologetic terms he has adopted. The result for Lingard is a resounding success.⁴³

41. Ibid., p.34.

42. Ibid.

43. Lingard's conduct in this controversy met with the approval of some conservative elements in the catholic church. A writer in Andrew's Weekly Orthodox Journal, for example, wrote:

In the year 1807, the country was placed under great excitement by the dismissal of the Whig ministry to make room for the ultra Tory administration of Mr. Spencer Perceval. During this ferment and the subsequent dissolution of parliament, the Rev. Henry Coates, vicar of Bedlington, made a rude and calumnious attack upon the principles of Catholics in the Newcastle Courant, under the signature of "A Liege Subject". He was replied to by a series of

In view of the way in which Lingard employed his historian's instruments upon "A Liege Subject" one might have expected him to have let doctrinal apologetic rest and to have pursued his investigation of history in order to discover further 'facts' that would help confute the opponents of his church. He must have had some sense of his greater efficacy in the second of his two engagements with protestant disputants. It must have become apparent to him by 1807, if it was not apparent to him before, that he was not so suited to dogmatic as to historical controversy. However, he became trapped by dramatic developments in the Shute Barrington controversy. Several Anglican clergymen in Barrington's diocese produced pamphlets in opposition to Lingard's reply to their bishop. As one angry dependent of the bishop after another dragged the controversy on, each demanding a reply from the catholic champion, Lingard must have become immensely tired of the whole business. That Lingard acknowledged the demand to reply to one after another of the protestant clergy suggests that even if he had begun to doubt that he should function as a doctrinal apologist, he realised that there was no immediately available substitute among the Roman catholics to take his place in the debate. And indeed it may well be that when these other men were demonstrating their faith that their own talents were large enough to tackle every sort of controversy, Lingard was tempted to make a like immodest estimate of his own powers.

"Letters on Catholic Loyalty", in the same paper under the signature of "A Friend to Peace and Union"; "A Loyal Freeholder"; and "J.L." The writers of these letters were Mr. Gibson, who then lived at Stagshaw; Mr. Thomas Selby of Biddlestone; and the Rev. J. (now Dr.) Lingard. these letters threw a new light upon the subject of Catholic principles, and revised considerable in the Northern counties. The "Liege Subject" was clearly convicted of fraud and insincerity, and consigned to the reproach of every honest and upright mind. The person afterwards came forward under the mantle of Elijah Index, in the ever memorable Durham controversy, and experienced still deeper disgrace. Weekly, vol.III, no.19, July 26th 1834.

The first to support the bishop with a tract was Henry Cotes, the "Liege Subject", writing this time under the pseudonym "Elijah Index".⁴⁴ Lingard replied in a pamphlet entitled A Review of a Pamphlet entitled 'A Protestant's Reply.⁴⁵ He again defended the customary list of controverted catholic doctrines. He went again over the whole range of the use of images, the invocation of saints and mariology, transubstantiation, the second commandment, penances and indulgences, the use of Latin in the services of the church and its policy towards the scriptures. Arguments were repeated in repetitive language. The defences urged here were just those of the reply to Shute Barrington's Charge and in just the same language. The small Roman catholic child, catechism in hand, is again led on to the stage, only to be snatched away this time with a sarcastic grin:

In this state of the controversy, Elijah comes forward with an air of importance, and informs us - of what? That the catechism does teach the worship of images? That he has interrogated some Catholic child, and discovered him to be an idolator? No: but that sometimes in Catholic countries images are carried in public processions.⁴⁶

Lingard's rhetoric becomes louder here than ever before. He is eager to crush Cotes:

Let him condemn Joshua of idolatory, for having caused the ark to be carried in procession across the Jordan, and David for having danced before it in procession at its entrance into Zion; let him proclaim the Mayor of Newcastle an idolator, whenever the mace is borne before him; the free-masons idolators, when they carry their mystic emblems in

44. Index, E., A Protestant's Reply to the Remarks on a Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Durham, 1807.

Lingard teased Elijah about his pseudonym:

of this I am certain, that from the accuracy of his statements, and the urgency of his reasoning, he must be twin brother to a liege subject.

A Review of a Protestant's Reply, p.8.

45. A Review of a Pamphlet entitled "A Protestant's Reply", 1807.

46. Ibid., p.14.

public; the king, the lords, and commons of Great Britain, idolators, when they decree, in honour of the illustrious dead, the pomp of a national funeral. In reality, the carrying of images in procession has no more to do with the Catholic creed, than the carrying of them at the interment of Lord Nelson had to do with the thirty-nine articles.⁴⁷

In his response to the man who had boasted himself "A Liege Subject", Lingard has introduced a loyalist element with his allusion to the Mayor of Newcastle, the Parliament of Great Britain and, at that time most resoundingly of all, the great national hero, but he has not found an opportunity in this controversy to develop further this patriotic element of his apology. The limited character of the debate raised by Shute Barrington's Charge confined him, however much this was against his own desire, to the defence of Roman catholic doctrines, even when he was dealing with Cotes. In his reply to the first of two tracts from Henry Phillpotts in Barrington's controversy, Lingard had to go over all the same ground.⁴⁸ He evidently felt somewhat exasperated at Phillpotts's discussing images in the same old way:

47. Ibid., p.16.

48. This was the first part of a general vindication published under the title A General Vindication of the Remarks on a Charge of the Bishop of Durham containing a reply to a letter from a clergyman of the Diocese of Durham, (second edition), A reply to the observations of the Rev. Thos. Le Mesurier, Rector of Newnton Longville; A reply to the Strictures of the Rev. G.S. faber, Vicar of Stockton upon Tees. And some Observations on the more fashionable methods of interpreting the Apocalypse.

Phillpotts, H., b.1778 d.1864 eventually became bishop of Exeter in 1830. He met Lingard's friend George Oliver there. Referring to Lingard's controversy with Phillpotts January 24th 1834 Oliver wrote. 'You may say of him what Joland used jestingly to say of Peter Brown "I made Brown a Bishop." Oliver to Lingard, Correspondence A.S.G.C., Package 173, no.13.

Here I may be allowed to ask two questions. 1. By what system of casuistry can a sincere and ingenuous adversary reconcile it with his conscience, to accuse a church of suppressing a particular doctrine, because, though he has discovered it in the majority, he has not discovered it in a few books written by members of her communion? 2. By what laws of reasoning can a fair disputant attempt to shew that a church endeavours to conceal a doctrine from the eyes of the people, when she publishes it in almost every book, which she exhorts them to read?⁴⁹

To what has been said before he replies as before. What is new in his deployment of his arguments in this response to Phillpotts is a plain historical explanation of the Decalogue divisions:

It is well known, that for many centuries before the birth of the reformation, the Catholics were accustomed to arrange, on the authority of St. Augustine, the decalogue in such manner, that whatever regarded the worship of God should be comprised under one division. Thus, what protestants called the first and second commandments we call the first.⁵⁰

Lingard's controversial writing reaches a degree of irritation here beyond that he allowed himself before at the 'repeated though feeble efforts' of the protestant accusers. He remarks with a nice ferocity:

It was therefore a duty to display our innocence, and to remind our adversaries, that besides the prohibition of idolatry, the decalogue contains another precept: Thou shalt not bear false witness against th y neighbour.⁵¹

49. Gen. Vind., Op.cit., p.21.

50. Ibid.

51. Ibid., p.22.

However satisfying such remarks may have been to him at the moment of writing, Lingard himself must have realised on reflection that this sort of thing would not much assist in the persuading of readers to his view of things. At any rate the next piece he produced in the Barrington controversy was composed in a significantly different manner.

In his response to the Rev. Thos. Le Mesurier's⁵² attack on the catholic doctrines on penances, Lingard resorted to that allegation of textual criticism which had so well served him with Cotes in his guise as a Liege Subject. The response was conducted by means of an examination of the Liber Taxae Cancellariae Romanae, with which Le Mesurier had made some play. Lingard here employed a less argumentative or abusive style than in his dealings with earlier opponents in this controversy, he employs indeed almost an anecdotal style:

should Mr. Le Mesurier, or his friend, stray far from Rome, I would not have them rely with too much confidence on the Liber Taxae Cancellariae; they might find themselves in the same unpleasant situation as the Roman nobleman, mentioned by O'Leary, who, when he was accused of having three wives living at the same time, attempted to justify his conduct by observing, that he had not been able to meet with one with whom he could be happy. "Since it is so difficult," replied the pontiff, Sixtus Quintus, "to please you in this world, you shall go try your fortune in the other. There women are more numerous, and you may find one to your liking." The Taxae Cancellariae Romanae could not save him. He was tried for polygamy, and executed.⁵³

Whatever the precise meaning of this anecdote in this context, and that is not as apparent as Lingard seems to have supposed, it must be unlikely that Lingard could

52. Lingard gave a hint of how deeply he felt about these protestant clergymen in a remark about le Mesurier to the Rev. Ed. Walsh, 4th March 1813:

What a positive lying scoundrel he is.

Quoted in Haile and Bonney, Op.cit., p.122.

53. Gen. Vind., Op.cit., p.65.

have found such a ready incident to aid his presentation of each issue in the debate with Le Mesurier and his friends. And when dealing with the Rev. G.S. Faber's⁵⁴ Answer to Bicheno during this same Barrington controversy on the Roman catholic practice of asking for the intercession of saints, he has to return to a more sober mode of historical argument:

The custom of soliciting the intercession of the saints is, in my opinion, as old as christianity: our adversaries acknowledge that it was generally established in the beginning of the fourth century. It was then, even by their own account, practiced by many of the martyrs, who laid down their lives in the cause of the gospel; by all the holy and zealous missionaries, who, by their preaching, converted to the faith our barbarous forefathers, the Saxons, the Franks, the Goths, the Lombards, etc., by all who, during the eleven centuries preceding the reformation, had learned to bend the knee at the name of Jesus; and, with the exception of a few protestant churches, by every christian in the world, who has existed since that period.⁵⁵

There is an easy transition here from 'as old as christianity' to 'the beginning of the fourth century' and from 'the cause of the gospel' to the conversion of 'our barbarous forefathers', which, together with the sudden thrust in the reference to the unscriptural behaviour of 'a few protestant churches'. *frankly argues for the intercession of saints having long been a British religious practice.* The ease of the writing in this lengthy period suggest that Lingard was feeling perfectly at home while engaged in this particular piece of polemic. He had history on his side. Alas, he could not often remain polite once he thought himself proven in the right. He was an ungracious victor. He had derided Barrington himself for condemning 'on his own private authority' about 'nine tenths of the great body of Christians', he was now ready to rebuke Faber in the name of 'every Christian in the world' and to express his surprise

54. Faber, G.S., b.1773 d.1854, Rector of Long Newton 1811-32.

55. Gen. Vind., Op.cit., p.86.

'that any individual should presume, on his private authority, to cut off so large a portion of mankind from the fold of Christ, by pronouncing all of them to have been apostates from the faith of the gospel'.⁵⁶ Sarcasm comes easily to Lingard in such circumstances. He had noted once that the bishop of Durham offered a 'more extensive indulgence than the Pope'. He now asks 'What pontiff ever assumed a power equal to that of the vicar of Stockton!'⁵⁷ There is, perhaps, in both these witticisms something that leaves the Pope's own dignity rather less intact, but Lingard cannot have meant his readers to have paused to consider this aspect of his sallies. But certainly, after that it was a short step, which Lingard duly took, to make fun of his protestant adversary's exegesis of the Apocalypse in ways which must have declared themselves to be amusing only to certain kinds of Roman catholic readers:

Mr. Whitaker discovers that the two horns of the beast are the two monastic orders of the Dominicans and Franciscans. Why they should claim the preference before their brethren, of greater antiquity or more general diffusion, I know not: but it is certainly unfortunate that the beast has not four horns; then you, ye sons of Benedict and Loyola, might have had the honour of being seated on the remaining two.⁵⁸

Meanwhile Phillpotts had returned to the fray with A Second Letter to the Author of Remarks on the Bishop of Durham's Charge⁵⁹ and so Lingard had to return also. In a second pamphlet of 1808 addressed to Phillpotts, Lingard dealt with the same subjects yet again:⁶⁰ image worship, alleged suppression of the second

56. Ibid., p.87.

57. Ibid.

58. Ibid., p.98.

59. A Clergyman of the Diocese of Durham (pseudonym of Phillpotts, H.) A Second Letter to the Author of Remarks on the Bishop of Durham's Charge, 1808.

60. A Letter to A Clergyman of the Diocese of Durham

commandment, transubstantiation, intercession of saints and catholic attitudes towards penances, scriptures and Latin. Phillpotts had in this pamphlet again concentrated his attack on the subject of images and the second commandment. But this time, better aware of what he could do well, Lingard varied his mode of offence. He has gone looking for new material among the reformation sources, and new occasions for sarcasm:

After a long search I have,.... discovered two, which though not written by catholics, are still worthy of notice. The first was the work of a gentleman "famous in his generation," and a particular favourite with the reformed writers, John Huss, the father of the Bohemian religionists. The second is a legacy bequeathed to us by no less a man than the great patriarch of the reformation, Martin Luther.⁶¹

With a sudden reversal of the whole situation Lingard adduces a set of texts against Phillpotts:

What was my surprise when in reading their editions of the commandments, I found that they had suppressed the prohibition in question: that they, the most ardent enemies of the catholic doctrine, they whose whole study was to detect and expose the abominations of the Romish harlot, had not only discovered the artifice of which she is now accused, but had themselves been guilty of it.⁶²

Again in his triumph, Lingard risks a sort of joke:

The Romans were accustomed to place in the third line the Triarii, soldiers of tried and approved valour. They formed the strength of the army, the best hope of the general. But our episcopal Field-Marshal has studied tactics in a difference school. His third line is formed after the levy-en-masse act. His troops are a confused medly of all ages, sexes and conditions.⁶³

61. Ibid., p.31.

62. Ibid.

63. Ibid., p.50.

After this taunt the bishop must have thought it time again to engage himself in the controversy.

In 1809, under the description of an introductory letter to the clergymen of the diocese of Durham, followed by a pamphlet called The grounds on which the Church of England separated from the Church of Rome, reconsidered, Shute Barrington recommenced his attack upon the doctrines of Roman catholicism. 'I am anxious to shew you,' he told his clergy, 'that I have not been indifferent to the important subjects, which I recommended to you in my last Charge; or to the controversy, in which some of you have been engaged with a member, or members of the Romish Church.'⁶⁴ Shute Barrington then outlined the cause of his returning to the matter in this charge:

I do not think there is any danger of popery gaining ground among persons who, by reading and reflection, possess the means of judging for themselves. But, I think, there is some danger, lest, under a misconstrued indulgence to the Popish petitions, we should, by an appearance of indifference to our own Church, give countenance to doctrines and usages, which, as sincere Protestants, and readers of our Bible, we must ever hold to be IDOLATROUS, BLASPHEMOUS, and SACRILIGEOUS.⁶⁵

Lingard, in shaping his reply,⁶⁶ would not let pass among many of the old accusations Shute Barrington's suggestion of the Reformation being in England a separation of christians from a wicked institution in Rome. It was not a matter of doctrinal, liturgical or spiritual differences but of a distinguishable historical event:

The true ground of the separation was the passion of Henry the Eighth for the accomplished, but unfortunate, Ann Boleyn. Paul, of a persecutor, became an apostle of the gospel: and the lust of Henry generated the independence of the English church.⁶⁷

64. Grounds, 1811 ed. p.3.

65. Ibid.

66. Remarks on a late Pamphlet, entitled "The Grounds, on which the Church of England separated from the Church of Rome, Reconsidered".

67. Ibid., p.10.

Lingard nicely turns the language of protestant abuse in his quick account of the process of Reformation in England:

Henry continued to sue for a divorce in the court of Rome; and, strange as it must appear to everyone, who knows that the Roman church is the mother of harlots, she, for some reason or other, hesitated to comply with his request. The passion of the king was irritated by delay; and he soon discovered the means of cutting the Gordian knot. He declared himself the supreme head of the church.⁶⁸

But, even while managing this alteration of the character of the debate, Lingard seems to lack the necessary enthusiasm for controversy. When in 1809, Nathaniel Hollingsworth, Curate of Hartlepool, attempted to sum up the whole of the Shute Barrington controversy in A Defence of the Doctrine and Worship of the Church of England, in Five Letters addressed to the author of a Letter to a Clergyman of the diocese of Durham, Lingard merely acknowledged it in a footnote to his reply to Shute Barrington's tract of the same year.⁶⁹ And this reply was itself a tired affair.

The Shute Barrington controversy had prevented Lingard from pursuing that theme of catholic loyalty which he had begun to explore in the Anglo-Saxon Church. He had allowed himself to become less than his powers suggested he might be. And all to no avail. The controversy did not result in any cessation of the appeal to the old arguments about the old topics. No one changed opinion. Not even when he had produced an historical fact. It must have seemed to Lingard that it was time to give up that enterprise.

He retired from the immediate scene of controversy. He did not, however, give up those motives which had brought him into the controversies. Lingard's next tract: Documents to ascertain the Sentiments of British Catholics in former ages, respecting the power of the Popes, published in 1812, was still an apologetic work.

68. Ibid., p.11.

69. Quoted in a collection of Lingard's tracts, 1826, p.258.

The tract was the result of his search for sources suggesting that catholics were loyal to the English monarch from the time of William the Conqueror onwards. The Newcastle Courant controversy witnesses to protestants' fear that catholics considered their allegiance to the Roman pope to be more commanding than to their English monarch. In this tract Lingard attempted to dissuade them from this opinion. He divided the collection between documents concerned with England before the Reformation and those concerned with times after. He was always looking for justifications of contemporary Roman catholics, at least those not wholly committed to ultramontane views, in the activities and writings of earlier English catholics. For the period before the Reformation Lingard, thinking perhaps that he ought to know rather more than he yet did about the period after that which he had already made his own in his researches for the Anglo-Saxon Church examined documents from the reigns of William the Conqueror, Edward I, Edward II and Henry VII, he found what he wanted. From a letter from the Conqueror to Gregory VII, Lingard concluded that 'William and his council, though they acknowledged the spiritual supremacy of the pope, did not believe that supremacy to confer any temporal superiority on its possessor'.⁷⁰ While from the reaction of the English barons to pope Boniface's letter declaring Scotland to be a fief of the Holy See, Lingard was able to declare that 'the distinction between the spiritual supremacy and the temporal power of the pope is not a discovery of modern catholics, but was perfectly understood by our ancestors'.⁷¹ It must seem, therefore, to the protestant reader, and to the catholic, that present Roman catholicism may imitate those who 'five centuries ago, while they admitted the one, in the most public and determined manner rejected the other'.⁷²

If the pre-Reformation period showed how Roman catholics might view the papacy, Lingard has examples in the post-Reformation period to show how they might view the monarchy. He tackles the most sensitive matter of the Armada head on:

70. Documents, p.2.

71. Ibid.

72. Ibid., p.5.

In 1588, Philip II, of Spain, irritated by the assistance which Elizabeth had afforded to the inhabitants of the Netherlands, and the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots, determined to attempt the invasion of England. On this trying occasion, the English catholics gave the most convincing proofs of their loyalty:

"The catholics," says Hume, "generally expressed great zeal for the public service. Some gentlemen of that sect, conscious that they could not justly expect any trust or authority, entered themselves as volunteers in the fleet or army: some equipped ships at their own charge, and gave the command of them to protestants: and others in animating their vassals and neighbours to the defence of their country."⁷³

Lingard had evidently been reading secondary as well as primary sources. He had become full of such boldnesses. Having touched on the Armada, he was brave enough, headstrong enough it may well be, to come very near the events of the 1688 Revolution and risk arousing the sentiments of patriotic protestant horror that many of his readers had been encouraged to feel at the mention of that wonder. Lingard with characteristic reference to a contemporary piece of writing paid large attention to a tract called Catholic Principles to which Lord Stafford had referred his peers for an account of his religious creed at his trial in 1680.⁷⁴ From several passages which revealed the catholics as having every intention of being loyal to the English monarch, he cited the most telling example:

The subjects of the king of England lawfully may, without the least breach of any catholic principle, renounce even upon oath the teaching, maintaining, or practising the doctrine of deposing kings excommunicated for heresy by any authority whatever, as repugnant to

73. Ibid., p.12.

74. See The Speech of William late Lord Viscount Stafford, on the Scaffold, 1780.

the fundamental laws of the nation, injurious to sovereign power, destructive to peace and government, and, by consequence, in his majesty's subjects impious and damnable.⁷⁵

And:

As for the king-killing doctrine, or murder of princes excommunicated for heresy; it is an article of faith in the catholic church, expressly declared in the general council of Constance, that such doctrine is damnable and heretical, being contrary to the known laws of God and nature.⁷⁶

He made his conclusion an appeal:

I shall therefore content myself with asking whether the oaths and protestations contained in the preceding pages do not fully bear me out in the assertion, that the British catholics have never been accustomed to acknowledge in the pope any temporal authority, or to consider the deposing and dispensation powers as parts of their religious creed.⁷⁷

If not before at least by the end of this Barrington controversy, Lingard was beginning to think of himself as the Roman catholic who would rewrite the protestant version of English history. There is evidence in this little tract of the kind of reading in which he was now engaged: for example, Collier's History of the Church, Burnet's Documents of the Reformation, Hume's History of England and Dodd's Church History of England. It was reading which took him all the way from William the Conqueror to the settlement of 1688. He had the general prospect of that history already in mind. He was collecting materials which would assist in a presentation of crucial events that would suggest a more favourable view of modern Roman catholicism than his contemporaries usually entertained. He was abandoning the doctrinal apologetic which other Roman clergy might manage better than he and engaging on a project

75. Documents, Op.cit., p.32.

76. Ibid., p.53.

77. Ibid., p.37.

that he was more properly qualified to attempt. From this time onward those protestant attacks on Roman catholics which he thought warranted a reply became occasions for his further researches into historical questions. He seized on opportunities for such research and left other disputes alone.

The charges that promulgated his best tract, A Review of Certain Anti-Catholic Publications, provided him with an opportunity to expound incidents of English history in a way that would promote the notion of catholic loyalty. Huntingford⁷⁸ had been provoked by the 1810 petition of catholic bishops, who had claimed:

That at the time of His Majesty's Accession to the Throne, the laws in force against his English Roman Catholic subjects, deprived them of most of the rights of Englishmen, and of several of the common rights of mankind.⁷⁹

The Roman catholic bishops seem to have been less interested in the rights of all their community than those of a certain class of Englishman:

They are not equally entitled with their fellow subjects, to vote at the election of any Member of your Honourable House; they are excluded from a seat in either House of Parliament; they are not admissable into Corporations; every civil and military office is denied them; every laudable object of ambition, all that elevates a man among his fellow subjects, all hopes of public distinction, all means of attracting the notice of their country, or the favour of their Sovereign, are placed without their reach.⁸⁰

They then made that appeal to history which was to engage Huntingford's attention and, in turn, display for Lingard, an inviting controversial prospect:

78. Huntingford, G., b.1742 d.1832, successively bishop of Gloucester and Hereford.

79. Quoted in Huntingford's Charge to his clergy 1810, 3rd ed., p.44.

80. Ibid.

Yet the Roman Catholics form more than one fourth of the whole mass of the subjects of the United Empire.....the whole creed of your petitioners was once the Creed of the three kingdoms. It is the actual creed of four fifths of Ireland, and of much the greater part of Europe. It was the Creed of those who found British Liberty at Runnymede, who conquered at Crecy, Poitiers and Agincourt; among those who repelled and annihilated the Spanish Armada, none bore a nobler part than those by whom this Creed was professed.....Your Petitioners humbly pray, for a total repeal of every test, oath, declaration, or provision, which has the effect of subjecting your petitioners to any penalty or disability whatsoever on account of their religious principles.⁸¹

In just the way to encourage Lingard in his own assessment of what he might usefully do, the bishops were presenting an argument that past catholic loyalty suggests a like loyalty in the present community. It was clear to everyone what they were doing. To prevent this grab at English History was a main concern with the bishops.

In reply to the petition of the catholics, Huntingford claimed that it proceeded on three fallacies:

That laws made for the protection of some must in themselves be acts of oppression to others: That every member of Civil Society has an unconditional and unqualified Claim to power, That the Legislature is to be perfectly indifferent whether the Candidate for power entertains Principles favourable or unfavourable to the Constitution.⁸²

Of these three, the third was most particularly relevant to the present position of protestant and Roman catholics. The linkage of Principles with shares in the Constitution to which Huntingford adverts here is elaborated later in his tract:

81. Ibid.

82. Ibid., p.6.

As principles are the springs of Action; and the more particularly, as Religious Principles are the most energetic springs of Action; the Legislature would be instrumental to its own disadvantage; and as such criminal because not attentive to the welfare of the States; if it encouraged Civil and Religious Principles unfavourable, as much as Civil and Religious Principles favourable to every part of the Constitution.⁸³

Huntingford then proceeds from the elucidation of the general to its particular application:

There exists in the Community certain Principles which derogate from the prerogative of a Protestant King and are unfriendly to the prevalence of Reformed Christianity. The Legislative provides against the Political Influence of these Principles even in its most remote operation. Such precaution is adopted, lest that Influence, if suffered to exert itself with success in one instance of Political Power; till by accession of Strength it might become formidable and ultimately endanger the Supremacy of the Crown, and the independence of Protestants in the free exercise of their Religious Worship.⁸⁴

In order to prove these points Huntingford soon found himself appealing to history. He recognized the force of the Roman catholic bishops' adducing a set of historical contexts for Roman catholic loyalty:

It was not therefore without good judgement that the Petitioners brought these places to our recollection. We shall never cease to honour the memory of those illustrious persons who there signalised themselves.⁸⁵

But Huntingford had in mind a larger range of contexts than those alleged by the Roman catholic bishops:

83. Ibid., p.7.

84. Ibid., p.10.

85. Ibid., p.21.

The Creed professed by the Catholics petitioning, was indeed that of their Forefathers, who in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries acted nobly at Runnymede, Crecy and Poitiers, and Agincourt. But we cannot forget; it was also Creed of those, who massacred the Protestants, on the day of St. Bartholomew.⁸⁶

Huntingford proceeded to turn this argument against the Catholics:

It was the Creed of Mary, who on principles of Conscience devoted Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and Bradford, to the flames. It was the Creed of those Insurgents, who in the reign of Charles the First went far towards obliterating the name of Englishmen in the kingdom of Ireland; and who against Protestants exercised cruelties, which an eminent Historian asserts "would shock the least delicate humanity." It was the Creed of the Second James; who under the semblance of mildness and of equality in privileges to all his subjects (the very plea now urged by the advocates for Romanists) dispensed with Laws, imprisoned Bishops, and filled the highest departments with Men of his own persuasion.⁸⁷

Huntingford concluded this passage by referring to an historical incident which some at least of his more ancient readers might remember and most of them have at least a vivid impression. Referring to Bonnie Prince Charlie's invasion of 1745 he declared:

It was the Creed of those, who but fifteen years before the reign of His present Majesty, within this Kingdom encouraged a War, which had for its object the total overthrow of the Protestant Government and the utter exclusion of the Protestant Sovereign then existing, on whose head a price was set by the foreign enemy whose cause they favoured.⁸⁸

And Huntingford made an even larger ranging appeal to history to make his climatic point:

86. Ibid.

87. Ibid.

88. Ibid., p.23.

If we were to form our judgement from the Catholic Petition only, we might be led to imagine the introduction of tests and oaths was, comparatively speaking, novel in politics, and sanctioned by Law under no other Government, than that of the British Empire.⁸⁹

Huntingford makes a familiar criterion in the matter:

An appeal to History will give us ample information, and suggest to us more correct ideas. Refer to the usages of Antiquity. Recollect the oaths, which were taken by the Young Men; by the Archons; by the Senators; by the Heliastic Judges: at Athens. At an early age, the Athenians swore to defend the sacred rites and holy institutions of their Country. On admission into Office, the Archons, Senators, and Judges bound themselves by Oath to observe the Laws, and be directed by them in their decisions. What do we learn from these facts? In the first we see an instance of solemn engagement immediately applicable to the Religion of the State. From the three others we collect, the Ancient Legislators did not conceive there was any infringement on Natural Right in prescribing conditions to those who were to be entrusted with the exercise of Public Power.⁹⁰

This catalogue enabled Huntingford to conclude there was something disloyal in the Roman catholics' refusal to take the prescribed oaths of the Commonwealth unless they are hedged about by their own clauses:

The Catholics will not submit to be so bound. They will accede only to an imported obligation. They will promise and pay obedience to the King and Legislative in Temporalities alone.⁹¹

Huntingford has thus employed the evidence of history to demonstrate that the enactments which keep Roman catholics from larger participation in the life and government of the nation are thoroughly justified and should not be repealed.

89. Ibid., p.26.

90. Ibid.

91. Ibid. p.30.

A like appeal to the large sweep of western history was made by Tomline, bishop of Lincoln,⁹² in his Charge that same year.⁹³ A glance at the large history Huntingford had invoked showed Tomline the horror of granting emancipation;

If we search into the Annals of the civilized world from the remotest Antiquity to the present time, we shall find that in all the varied forms of Government which have prevailed, there have been Institutions of a religious as well as of a political nature. Every national Constitution, with perhaps a single exception, has had its religious as well as its political part; and these parts are generally, if not always, so blended and entwined together, that the one cannot be destroyed without imminent danger to the other.⁹⁴

His line of argument was brought to touch nearer institutions than those of Antiquity:

A review of the History of the Protestant Church is always interesting and useful to its Members, but it is peculiarly so in consequence of attempts which have been lately made to admit Roman catholics into all offices and situations of trust and confidence, without any exception.⁹⁵

Tomline's review is introduced by a paragraph that strikes quite against the sort of thing the Roman catholic bishops had been declaring about Roman catholic participation in Runnymede and Agincourt and the repelling of the Armada. He simply assumes that none of this is relevant when discussing the past belief and conduct of the catholics. He declares that 'those who have of late undertaken the cause of the Papists, and urged the removal of all the restraints, framed by the wisdom of our Ancestors, to prevent a repetition of those horrors and miseries which were fresh in their memories, assure us, that Popery now is different from what Popery was.'⁹⁶

92. Tomline, Sir George Pretymann, b.1750 d.1827, tutor to the Younger Pitt, Bishop of Lincoln 1787-1820.

93. A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Lincoln at the Triennial Visitation of the Diocese in May, June and July, 1812.

94. Ibid., p.15.

95. Ibid., p.5.

96. Ibid., p.6.

Tomline put some large emphasis on the events and agents of 1688:

At the revolution, more than a century had elapsed since the Reformed Religion was established in these kingdoms; and the knowledge of the dangers to which it had been exposed, during this period, from the restless and hostile spirit of those who still adhered to the Church of Rome, enabled the great and wise men, concerned in settling the Revolution, to make such provisions, as would secure the Protestant Establishment against future attempts of Papists.⁹⁷

Tomline was satisfied that the constitution was a tolerant instrument of government because it allowed catholics the exercise of their consciences in their mode of worship; the order of English life seemed to him justly dependent on a necessary distinction:

Persecution proceeds from a bigotted and sanguinary spirit of Intolerance: Exclusion from Power is founded in the natural and rational principle of self-protection and self-preservation, equally applicable to Nations and to Individuals.⁹⁸

It was from his study of the nation's history that Tomline felt himself able to come to just conclusions about Persecution and Exclusion:

History informs us of the mischievous and fatal effects of the one, and proves the expediency and necessity of the other.⁹⁹

That history he divided, for the practical purposes of nineteenth century Englishmen, at 1688; English history since that time constituted a continuing justification of the Glorious Revolution:

We appeal to the sufferings of Protestants in every country of Europe where Popery has been predominant, to the dangers to which our Protestant Establishment was exposed under the two last Kings of the

97. Ibid., p.12.

98. Ibid., p.19.

99. Ibid.

House of Stuart, and to the internal peace and entire freedom from all religious feuds and animosities which this kingdom has enjoyed since the Revolution.¹⁰⁰

On this matter he can even adduce the witness of Hume, 'whose partiality to the House of Stuart is as well known as his indifference to all religious tenets'.¹⁰¹ Tomline cites that historian's opinion that James II was deficient in 'a regard and affection to the Religion and Constitution of his Country';¹⁰² and 'when this was wanting', the Historian had properly declared, 'every excellency which he possessed became dangerous and pernicious to his kingdoms'.¹⁰³ At this point Tomline allows himself a rhetorical question: 'And what was the mode that King James adopted to subvert the Religion and Constitution of his Country?' And provides the desirable answer in the form of another such question: 'Was it not by endeavouring to remove all religious tests respecting the admission of persons into offices of Power and Confidence?'¹⁰⁴

Tomline concluded his review of Roman catholic wiles by admonishing his clergy to look to the history of their country in order that they should better appreciate how it was that the catholics constituted so great a danger to the protestant establishment. It was incumbent upon the Minister of the established church, 'while Papists and their Advocates are making every exertion in their power for the attainment of their purpose', which was the realization of their Church's power, to remind their fellow Englishmen of 'those evils-the invariable consequences of its Power-which a long tranquility has nearly effaced from the Public remembrance'.¹⁰⁵ At this point Tomline's anxiety to produce a clinching sentence overwhelms any ambition he may have had for consistency and putting aside the

100. Ibid., p.20.

101. Ibid., p.21.

102. Ibid., p.22.

103. Ibid.

104. Ibid.

105. Ibid., p.33.

assurances 'that Popery now is different from what Popery was'¹⁰⁶ he declares that watchfulness is required: 'especially too when we are told that Popery remains the same it ever was, and is absolutely incapable of change'.¹⁰⁷

In these two tracts, the protestant bishops confirmed by example Lingard's judgement that a Roman catholic who would be an apologist in English society would be best advised to attempt an historical demonstration of Roman catholic loyalty to the principles popularly thought to shape that society. He was encouraged in this opinion, and in his being a likely apologist himself by another letter from Charles Butler just at this time. After perusing a review of the Bishop of Gloucester's pamphlet Butler wrote, in November 1818, convinced that Lingard was the most suitable catholic to reply to it:

I know of no one to whom we so naturally look on the occasion as yourself -May I therefore request you would turn this in your mind. An Answer in two sheets of the size and Tipe of the Durham Pamphlet wd do the cause infinite good.¹⁰⁸

Butler seems to have been partial enough to think Lingard had come off rather well in the Barrington controversy. Lingard had certainly taken on the curious colour of a controversialist and adopted some strange ways of dealing with opponent's arguments. Noting that 'At first we were accused of favouring the claims of the Stuarts' he remarked complacently that 'the extinction of that family has put an end to the charge',¹⁰⁹ as if the lack of present occasion made an historical charge any less viable. Perhaps this is the nicest example of his having only the present state of affairs in mind while he was professedly treating only the past. A more academic mode of rebuttal had not however, given him success in debates about mediaeval catholicism, and he was rather querulous in his account of the matter:

106. Ibid.

107. Ibid.

108. Butler to Lingard, Correspondence B.M., Letterbooks, 25, 128, p.149.

109. Review, p.4.

the fathers of the great council of Lateran were marshalled against us; as if the men were to be punished at the present day, because Protestants will not understand the regulations of feudal prelates six centuries ago.¹¹⁰

It may be that Lingard was especially irritated about this Lateran example because it had just been resurrected by Lord Kenyon¹¹¹ in 1812 who told his readers that in the great Lateran council of 1215, 'it was declared, that the pope may depose kings, absolve their subjects from their oaths of allegiance, and give away their kingdoms'.¹¹² And Lingard had had a pleasant piece of textual evidence to counter Kenyon's suggestion. He had produced it with a touch of his old sarcasm:

What may be the feelings of the reader, it is not for me to predict; but truth compels me to inform him, that the canon, to which the noble lord alludes, (he cites none,) contains not a single word respecting the transfer of kingdoms, the deposition of kings, or the absolution of their subjects from the allegiance owing to them.¹¹³

He had had Kenyon on the hip again when he found him asserting that at the Lateran and Tridentine Councils: 'it is declared, all are excommunicated, of what degree soever, whether regal, imperial etc., who impose any tax on ecclesiastics, without express licence from the pope, (even though they may be willing to pay it) and this immunity is declared to be established by the ordinance of God, and the sanctions of the canons'.¹¹⁴ Lingard observed at this that the canon 'bears no resemblance to the description which has been given of it'. He demonstrated this lack of resemblance:

1. The canon, in question, does not pronounce excommunication against either kings or emperors. It does not even mention them. The excommunication is directed against mayors, boroughreeves, and the other annual magistrates of towns and cities.

110. Ibid.

111. Kenyon was the only surviving son of Kenyon, Lloyd, first Baron Kenyon 1732-1802.

112. Review, Op.cit., p.63.

113. Ibid.

114. Ibid., p.67.

2. It does not forbid taxes to be imposed on ecclesiastics, in the sense which we now attach to such words; it only observes, that the council of Lateran had excommunicated those municipal officers, who aggrieved churches and churchmen, by tollages, collections, and other exactions.

3. It does not say, the "this immunity was established by the ordinances or God, and the sanctions of the canons." It assigns not its origin. If it had, it would, probably, have stated, that churches were anciently founded with an exemption from the feudal services; and that churchmen were permitted, by the laws, to tax themselves separately, as was then the privilege of every distinct order of men, the military tenants the burghers, and the merchants, in all the kingdoms of Europe.¹¹⁵

It was exceedingly annoying, therefore, that, after all this demonstration the catholics were still being 'reproached with the deposing power and temporal pretensions of the Pope'.¹¹⁶ Lingard was, however, complacent in his confidence that the discipline of history would in the end prevail against such stories:

The Catholic, however, when he looks back on the past, will learn to hope well of the future. He will observe that the irritating objections of former times are now almost shamed out of parliament, and can hardly support their credit among the suspicious and least informed protestants.¹¹⁷

Indeed, despite his sense of so many men being the captives of their prejudices he could yet say of the deposing power debates among professional historians: 'Each of these arguments, in its day, was deemed unanswerable; each has yielded to discussion'.¹¹⁸ That he could say such things even when he had before him the

115. Ibid., p.68.

116. Ibid., p.4.

117. Ibid.

118. Ibid.

Charges of the bishops voicing the very uninformed notions that he was saying had died out among English protestants, suggests something of the enthusiasm he indulged when contemplating the possibilities of the apologetic he was proposing for himself.¹¹⁹

The enthusiasm of Tomline for the Revolution had been expressed in terms of its securing the protestant establishment against future attempts of papists, and Lingard took this to be typical protestant enthusiasm:

Driven from these outworks, the anti-Catholics now seek to entrench themselves round the constitution; and under the shelter of that venerable name, keep up a fierce and protracted opposition. It is not, however, for the constitution in reality that they fight, but for the tests and disqualifications with which it was hedged around, in a period of religious animosity and distrust.¹²⁰

Whether Roman catholicism in the early nineteenth century was exactly as it had always been or mightily changed, Tomline ought to be more aware of the general alteration of society since 1688, and that the Constitution itself needed to be presented in modern terms. Lingard begins carefully enough with a reference to the tests and disqualifications accompanying the political settlement of the country:

For whatever purpose these were planted originally they may be safely eradicated. They serve not to protect, but to disfigure.¹²¹

It is an essential element of Lingard's enterprise that the religious tests be distinguished from the constitutional arrangements of 1688. Lingard will himself teach them, since they need such teaching, how now to express a proper esteem^{for} the principles of British Society:

The British Constitution is not a constitution of restraints and penalties. It was framed to preserve the rights of free men. It was made for the

119. Ibid., p.5.

120. Ibid.

121. Ibid.

122. Ibid., p.11.

whole, not for a part. It was designed, like the sun, to shed its benign influence upon all: not to disfranchise one-fourth of the population of the empire, seven-eighths of the people of Ireland.¹²²

The tone of this passage suggests that the present protestants are meanly attempting to deprive a section of English society of the benefits of a constitution whose generosity they do not themselves understand. Remarks expressing disappointment of this kind had then, as, indeed, now, rather more charm than the abrasive doctrinal apologetics which he had once attempted.

Lingard could not allow his readers to view the 1688 Protestant Revolution as the establishment of a secure life for the protestants from the deprivations of catholicism, as the protestant bishops had suggested. It was no part of his enterprise to criticise the constitution itself. He was simply developing a view that the protestant apologists, Tomline in particular, had misunderstood the significance of the constitution within the pattern of English history. Lingard insists that the events of 1688 be understood within the context of a much longer period than was usual with disputants on this matter:

If he means to attribute the existence of the penal code to the period of the Revolution, he is refuted by the whole tenor of our history. It required more than two centuries to rear that immense pile of restraints, qualifications and punishments. Its foundations were laid in blood by Elizabeth; and, though additions were made by almost every succeeding monarch, it is hardly fifty years since it was completely finished. Of these oppressive statutes, many, indeed, since the accession of his present majesty, have been repealed: but, if the Bishop of Lincoln meant to confine his assertion to those only which remain, history will show that he is incorrect.¹²³

122. Ibid., p.11.

123. Ibid.

Lingard is thus attempting the demonstration that the origins of present catholic disabilities could only be appreciated by someone who had a knowledge of a span of English history leading from the Restoration to the Glorious Revolution. And in the midst of this period the reader must identify the influence of a scoundrel:

Of the disabilities from which we now pray to be relieved, the principal, those which the prelate is so anxious to perpetuate, were imposed before the Revolution. They owe their existence to one of the most disgraceful periods of our history: they were enacted when the prejudices and passions of the people had been wound up to an almost inconceivable degree of phrenzy by the impostures of Titus Oates. Oates was afterwards convicted of perjury, and his evidence was declared a tissue of the most improbable falsehoods; yet the disqualifications to which it gave birth have never been removed; they are still hung round the necks of Catholics, after the revolution of more than one hundred and forty years.¹²⁴

By arguing here that it was the penal laws enacted after the Titus Oates plot in 1678 and not the 1688 settlement from which the catholics wished to be released, Lingard was making a distinction which will shape apologetics in a new way, and demand some new response from those who would maintain the catholic exclusion from civil government. Lingard had grasped the potential of writing a history of this period which would put this distinction clearly before the reader. Lingard and Charles Butler were in agreement that catholic authors had not yet done this necessary job. And they were agreed, too, that, for the job to be done properly, the apologetic historian would have to tackle a lengthy span of English history. On the 25th of July, 1812, Charles Butler had written, in reply to what seems to have been a suggestion from Lingard that he should set about the writing of a History of England:

124. Ibid.

I agree with you in thinking that the strange misrepresentations of Dr. Milner and others, should not go down to posterity, uncontradicted; and I think the best contradiction they can receive is, by a history, on the plan you mention.¹²⁵

Others, too, were voicing their approval of Lingard's way with protestant antagonists. The Catholic Board, who were generally disposed to adopt themselves to the manners of the protestant establishment in return for catholic emancipation, minuted their approval:

Rt. Hon. the Lord Dormer in the Chair.

Resolved unanimously

That the thanks of the Board of Catholics of Great Britain be given to the rev. J. LINGARD for his zealous and successful defence of the Catholic Church in his many literary productions, and more particularly in his last able work, entitled

A Review of certain Anti-Catholic Publications.¹²⁶

And, again in reference to this work, Lingard boasted in a letter to the Rev. Ed. Walsh written on the 4th March 1813, that 'Lord Holland has requested me to allow him to have a thousand copies printed for distribution'.¹²⁷ Of course, those who were expressing their content with Lingard's pamphleterring were not yet entertaining the larger notion Lingard had proposed to Charles Butler, and, almost immediately, Lingard's skill was demanded for the composition of two more controversial pamphlets.

The first was produced in 1813, the same year as the publication of Lingard's reply to the bishops of Lincoln and Gloucester. Dr. Thomas Burgess, Bishop of St. David's,¹²⁸ an amateur antiquarian who had attempted to prove over a number of years the independence of an ancient British church from Rome, prompted Lingard's return to tract controversy in a pamphlet entitled: An Examination of Certain Opinions.

125. Butler to Lingard, Correspondence B.M., Letterbooks, 25, 128, p.54.

126. Quoted in Haile and Bonney, Op.cit., p.123.

127. Ibid., p.122.

128. Burgess, T., b.1756 d.1837, Bishop of St. David's 1803-1825.

Burgess, like many antiquarians, distrusted historians. Especially those protestant historians who, for some scruple about primary sources and proofs, gave room for the untruths of Roman catholicism:

Some of our most valuable Ecclesiastical historians have no scruple in acceding to the general testimony of the Fathers, that the Gospel was preached in Britain by some of the Apostles soon after the middle of the first Century, but shrink from the particular evidences of time and person, as fables, which would discredit and accuracy of history. In which caution there is more, perhaps, to regret than to censure. They are unwilling to affect the general credit of their narratives by the admission of particulars, however interesting, which they think they cannot substantiate. But unfortunately they reject the probable on account of the improbable. And in this rejection, it is certainly much to be regretted, that they have given some advantage to the advocates of popery.¹²⁹

But Dr. Burgess knew how to outflank any such person. He had pushed his studies further back than the Revolution and the Reformation, further even than the Anglo-Saxon church. He had reached the Apostolic Age. And then he had retraced his steps for the benefit of English readers. He made an easy way through christian scriptures and the early tradition of the universal Church into an Anglican history, until christianity prepares for modern English enlightenment:

that Christ, and not St. Peter, is the rock of the Christian Church; that the first Christian Church was the Church of Jerusalem, and St. James the first Christian bishop; - that St. James, and not St. Peter, presided at the first Christian Council;- that St. Paul was the first founder of the Church of Britain; that the Church of Britain, was established before

129. Christ: And not St. Peter, the Rock of the Christian Church; and St. Paul, the founder of the church in Britain, p. 11.

the Church of Rome;- and that the natives of Wales, during the dark ages, professed exactly the same doctrines as are now professed, in a more enlightened period, by the Church of England.¹³⁰

The review is nicely constructed for its task. It begins with Christ and those revered characters and places of the New Testament upon which christian doctrine is erected. St. Paul is then linked with the British church of Wales, in order to undermine the claims of the Romans that their doctrines only were based on apostolic authority. And then Burgess, with a quick notice of twelve centuries of Anglican heritage, comes to his happy celebration of the present age of English christianity.

If it were indeed his desire to compose a thorough history of England in its relation to the Roman church, Lingard could hardly have designed for himself a more helpful occasion than Burgess' tract. The bishop could not be answered with less than a review of the whole of British history from the arrival of the first christian mission to the nineteenth century. The only drawback in this opportunity for a controversy based upon research was that Burgess had insisted on beginning rather further back than Lingard had thought necessary. His scriptural expertise was not great enough to substantiate any extended treatment of the Petrine position or the Pauline mission.

Lingard's reply to Burgess moves carefully through the elements of the bishop's list. He has been into areas of scriptural exegesis and doctrinal dispute which must be cleared before he can engage in his proper historical response to Burgess' construction:

The present tract will in consequence be divided into three parts. The first will inquire, what is the real meaning of the passage: Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church; the second, what authority there is to induce a belief that St. Paul preached in Britain; and the third, whether it has been proved that the creed of the Welch christians, in the dark ages, was the same as that of the established church at present.¹³¹

130. Ibid., p.6.

131. Examination, p.8.

Lingard, as might be expected, manages these three parts unevenly. There is nothing particular about Lingard's remonstrance that Peter was determined by Christ to be the rock upon which the church would be built. He is more at his own work in his examining all manner of ancient historical sources in order to take the reader with him in his asserting that Paul could not have visited Britain. In the third part he is wholly at home. Lingard analyses a set of eleventh century documents about the career of John Sulgen, whom Burgess had reckoned 'a true and orthodox protestant'. Lingard determined to refute what he considered to be Burgess's claim that since Sulgen had four children 'he held the doctrines of the present established church'.¹³² Lingard proceeded to interpret Burgess's source for saying this, an eleventh century poem by Sulgen's son, rather differently:

The proof of John Sulgen's orthodoxy is twofold, negative and positive. The negative is the following. "He begins his verses with an address to Christ. Here are no addresses to departed saints, nor even to St. David; Nor a thought expressed of any other intercession but the prayers of the living for the living."¹³³

Lingard countered this argument with the following:

But why should there? Is there any law obliging poets to enumerate in all their compositions that articles of their religious belief? If there be, the orthodoxy of Sulgen himself will become very problematical. For may not I also say; here are no addresses to the Trinity, none to the holy Spirit, no mention made of the redemption of man, no thought expressed of a belief in any of the thirty-nine articles? And may I not thence infer with equal reason, that Sulgen rejected these doctrines?¹³⁴

Lingard most impressively refutes Burgess on the subject when he deploys his undoubted historian's flair for primary sources:

132. Ibid., p.43.

133. Ibid., p.45.

134. Ibid.

Before I conclude, I may be allowed to notice one or two other observations, which have been hazarded by the learned prelate. He tells us, that the British "church did not sink under the horrors of Saxon extermination, but retired to her mountains and fortresses in the west, and subsisted there for many centuries, not only independently of the church of Rome, but in a state of resistance to her authority. It is unfortunate that the passage in italics is not supported by the authority of some ancient writer: it might then have been known on what foundation it rested.¹³⁵

Lingard adduced a challenging source:

It is still more unfortunate that the bishop of St. David's did not consult the records of his own see, he would then probably have found reason to doubt the accuracy of what he has asserted. From the annals Menevenses he would have learned that the protestant princes of the Britons, at this period, were as anxious to shew their devotion to the Roman harlot, as were their enemies and neighbours, the popish princes of the Saxons. Like them they made pilgrimages to the apostolic see: and like them many remained at Rome, that they might have the fortune to expire near the tomb of St. Peter. Cadwallar is recorded to have died at Rome in 689, Eygen in 853, Howel in 885, and Howel, the son of Cadil, in 928. (8).¹³⁶

Lingard duly relates this historical evidence with attempting to prove a theological matter, asking: 'Is this fact very reconcilable with the idea, that the British church protested against the doctrines, and rejected the authority of the church of Rome?'¹³⁷

135. Ibid., p.48.

136. Ibid.

137. Ibid., p.49.

For a few years Lingard refrained from such controversy.¹³⁸ He must have been pursuing his larger researches into English history. But in 1817 Lingard had accepted the invitation of William Poynter, the Vicar Apostolic of the London district, to respond on behalf of the Roman catholic community to a government report composed by Sir J.C. Hippisley.¹³⁹ The report purported to describe 'first the appointment or election of the Roman Catholic clergy, and principally those of the episcopal order: secondly, the restraints imposed upon the intromission of papal rescripts, by submitting them to the inspection of the civil government previous to their publication'.¹⁴⁰ Hippisley's report intended to prepare the government to legislate some form of catholic emancipation; Its conclusion was that 'in every country, the government exercised a control over the interference of the papal authority; and that, in no case, the bishops enjoyed their rank, without the direct sanction of their respective governments'.¹⁴¹

138. Curiously, in Lingard's penultimate tract, published in the same year, entitled Structures on Dr. Marsh's 'Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome', he was dealing with doctrinal apologetics again. This is surprising since it is the only tract he produced after the conclusion of the Shute Barrington controversy in 1809, which did so. It may be he was forced to produce it - it is a diversion.

139. Hippisley, Sir. J.C., b.1748 d.1825, political writer and supporter of catholic emancipation.

Lingard wrote to Poynter:

I shall always be most happy to render any small service to the cause of religion and shall therefore at your Lordship's suggestion chearfully (sic) make the attempt to answer Sir John's report,

Lingard to Poynter, Correspondence A.W.C., Poynter Papers 1817-27, no.1.

140. Quoted in the 1851 edition of Lingard's Observations p.iii, in Tierney's Preface. In that Preface Tierney quotes Joseph Berington b.1743 d.1827 as saying of it 'there is a very excellent little pamphlet published in reply to the Report by Keating and Brown, but by whom written I have not heard'. Ibid.

For Lingard's suggestions for the 1851 edition see the Lingard letters that I discovered at Downside Abbey (unindexed) from Lingard to his publisher Charles Dolman.

141. Tierney's Preface, Op.cit., p.iii.

In a letter to Poynter, 28th of January 1817, Lingard makes clear his requiring help with the collection of primary sources if he were to deal properly with the historical questions. This is the first recorded incident of what became the many demands Lingard made on Roman Catholics in diverse places to procure the documents he required for his historical writing:

It seems to be desirable to ascertain both how far the statements in it (the report) are correct and how far they can apply to this country. The first of these two objects is not in my power; for the second (at least, to elucidate the subject satisfactorily) I ought to know what is the real nature of the bulls and rescripts, etc., to which the regium exequatur applies. On both heads I should hope your lordship may acquire information from some of your friends in London, in Paris, in Lisbon, and elsewhere.¹⁴²

It is a characteristic of Lingard's History that it is founded at almost every place on such researches by his friends, and his friend's friends in London, in Paris, in Lisbon and almost every elsewhere. Lingard was convinced by the reflection of popular prejudice in the writings of even the most civilized of his pamphleteering opponents that only by a careful and faithful presentation of relevant documents could a persuasive historical case, and, therefore, a useful apologetic, be constructed. Lingard's response to the Hippisley report is the first of his writings to be composed in this way, and has, therefore, a large importance for an understanding of Lingard's method of establishing his version of historical events. In a further letter to Poynter, postmarked 10th February 1817, Lingard insists again that he must have some new and baffling evidence to put against Hippisley's demonstration that 'every powerful Catholic state, with the exception of Bavaria, has been for some centuries at least in the possession of the placet'.¹⁴³ No sensible apologist would deny this fact. His old

142. Lingard to Poynter, Correspondence A.W.C., Poynter Papers, 1817-1827, no.1.

143. Ibid., no.3.

critic had already been discredited in precisely the manner Lingard was determined to avoid 'The contrary assertion in Bishop Milner's pamphlet is completely refuted by the documents in the report'.¹⁴⁴ His friends and their associates did their part. Lingard wrote to Poynter 16th February 1817:

I write to acknowledge the receipt of the parcel which you were so good as to send me, and to assure you that its contents shall be carefully returned. The pamphlet on the 'Placet' will be very useful.¹⁴⁵

One assistance rendered provoked a new demand:

I have also to request that you will send me the 'Memoirs' from the year 1750.¹⁴⁶

Lingard studied the sources sent to him which might challenge Hippius's conclusions. He had found himself bound to accept some of the foreign facts attested in Hippius's work; for example:

It appears to me useless and imprudent to undertake the refutation of the principles laid down in the Enchiridion of Rechberger. It would be useless, as no arguments could probably persuade protestants of the falsehood of principles so nearly akin to their own: and imprudent, as the attempt might perhaps induce some catholic to undertake their defence.¹⁴⁷

To this he attempted to provide a contrary theory:

Might it not then be as well to observe that the decrees of Joseph, the work of Rechberger, the congress of Embs &c. are of no authority among catholics.¹⁴⁸

Again, though he felt he had to admit that almost all catholic countries were in possession of the Placet, he was ready with the patriotic suggestion that 'nothing of

144. Ibid., no.4.

145. Ibid.

146. Ibid.

147. Ibid.

148. Ibid.

this can apply to England' because 'bishops here have nothing more than their spiritual character: there they are temporal lords',¹⁴⁹ and further 'the sovereigns there claim the nomination on the right of patronage, as the bishoprics were founded by their predecessors; here there are no foundations at all'.¹⁵⁰

And thirdly:

there the sovereigns are catholics: here he is a protestant. Now it is unreasonable that the head of one religion should be the person to appoint the chief pastors of another; and it is against the spirit of English law, which deprives catholic patrons of the exercise of their right to present to protestant benefices.¹⁵¹

So happy was Lingard with the results of his researches that in the resulting pamphlet, Observations on the Laws and Ordinances which exist in foreign states,¹⁵² he could ask with rhetorical confidence:

Are the regulations contained in the report and documents of such a nature as to be applicable to the Catholic Church in this kingdom? It is apprehended that they are not, because they all, with one or two trifling exceptions, relate to churches placed in very different circumstances from those of the Catholic church in the British islands.¹⁵³

Each piece of evidence that Hippisley had assembled was quietly turned and examined within the theory outlined in the Poynter correspondence, and further documents brought forward to be placed with those cited in the Report which encouraged a different construction to be placed upon the whole matter. His method was established by this success. It worked. Poynter's help with the Placet parcel for example had enabled Lingard present a set of new cases and to conclude from these that:

149. Ibid.

150. Ibid.

151. Ibid.

152. Observations on the Laws and Ordinances which exist in Foreign States, relative to the religious concerns of their Roman Catholic subjects, 1817.

153. Ibid., p.7.

These were the two causes which gave birth to the "Placet:" causes which no longer exist, as far as regards the United Kingdom. The times, in which the popes pretended to depose sovereigns, are gone by: and the Catholic Church of these islands possesses no benefices with which they can interfere.¹⁵⁴

By this time Lingard had been involved in writing occasional tracts in response to protestant controversialists for eleven years (1806-17), and he had, his letters show, grown more and more impatient with the piecemeal manner of dealing with historical difficulties that this mode of writing forced upon him. He had as early as 1812 decided upon a larger enterprise, but it was the business of the government report and the support he had from other Roman catholics in his composing a reply, particularly their willingness to discover, sift and copy documents, that presented the immediate occasion of his deciding that he would give up pamphleteering and embark on the writing of a general history within which all the individual questions of the pamphlet wars might find their most persuasive context. And their most persuasive expression. Lingard had learnt the limited use of that ruder polemical writing which he had employed in the tract controversy. After working for some time on the History, Lingard pointed out this moderation of tone to Robert Gradwell:

I have written in a different manner from that observed in the Anglo-Saxon Church. I have been careful to defend the catholics, but not so as to hurt the feelings of protestants.¹⁵⁵

How far that change of manner effected a change of apologetic can only be judged after an examination of the History of England to which I must now turn.

154. Ibid., p.18. Out of the research Lingard composed a petition 'at the request of Dr. Poynter' which emphasised the independence of the English catholic church.

NB. Correspondence, A.S.G.C., Package 173.

155. Lingard to Gradwell, Correspondence A.V.E.C., Section one, no.6.

Chapter Four

The Anglo-Saxons again and onwards (History, Vols. I, II and III)

Lingard began his History of England with the invasion of Britain by Julius Caesar in 54 B.C. and finished with the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688. He discovered in the writing of the History that he required eight volumes to make the kind of comment on this period that he intended. But this length was probably not of his first design. Things, it may be, revealed themselves to be more complex than he had supposed. Or it may be that his enthusiasm for the task and its attendant researches grew as the work proceeded. At any rate he covered the great period of 54 B.C. to 1135 in his first volume, and only 1674 - 1688 in his last.

However gradually he came to recognize the demands of length, the extent to which Lingard had from the first deliberately effected a change in his mode of apologetic in the writing of his History of England is revealed in the June 1819 letter to Gradwell, and that this had seemed suspicious not to the protestants who were to be persuaded but by some fellow Roman catholics:

it was secretly whispered, before it (the history) was published, that I had sold my principles with my MS.¹

Lingard suggested in this letter just where the whisperers might suppose their criticisms justified. So far as he admitted the nearness of their suspicion to his intention and the way he hoped to effect it, it was in his general delicacy of protestant feeling; but that delicacy was intended to be a Roman catholic weapon in the general struggle for men's minds that Lingard had in view:

my object has been to write such a work, if possible, as should be read by Protestants: under the idea, that the more it is read by them, the less Hume will be in vogue, and consequently the fewer prejudices against us will be imbibed from him.²

1. Lingard to Gradwell, Correspondence A.V.E.C., Section One, No.6.

2. Ibid.

The Anglo Saxon Church could not but have been observed by an intelligent reader to have had an overt catholic bias. Reviewers and readers had noted this. Lingard was determined to avoid any justification for such charges being made against the History of England. His hope was to gain for himself such a reputation as would encourage protestants to read his work with the anticipation of fairness and pleasure. Writing to John Kirk on December 18th 1819, he again asserts his plan, method, and covert adversary:

Through the work I made it a rule to tell the truth whether it made for or against us: to avoid all appearance of controversy, that I might not repel protestant readers; and yet to furnish every proof in our favour in the notes; so that if you compare my narrative with Hume's, for example, you will find that, with the aid of the notes, it is a complete refutation of him without appearing to be so.³

While Lingard was conscious of the delicate relationship between his pursuit of the discipline of historical literature and his interest in the political progress of Roman catholic emancipation, he was at least as conscious of the delicate relation of his professional aims and the more conservative assumptions of powerful members of the Roman catholic community in Britain. This is clear from a letter he wrote to Charles Butler 15th March 1818. Butler had written an history of Roman catholics of eminence since the reformation⁴ and proposed to send a copy to Lingard. Lingard commented ruefully on the double danger threatening any Roman catholic who made the attempt at writing such a work:

When I receive your history of the English Catholics; I will give you my candid opinion. It is periculosae plenum opus alea. You will, I fear, raise up enemies against yourself amongst Catholics, and may furnish our enemies with arms against emancipation.⁵

3. Lingard to Kirk. Quoted in Haile and Bonney, Op.cit., p.166.
4. Historical Memoirs respecting the English, Irish and Scottish Catholics from the Reformation to the present time, 1819-21.
5. Lingard to Butler, Correspondence A.W.C., Poynter Papers.

He himself went treading carefully. If in a letter he wrote to Kirk in 1819 he stressed that the 'good to be done is by writing a book which protestants would read',⁶ he also added, 'I have not enfeebled a single proof in our favour, nor omitted a single fact or useful observation through fear of giving offence to Mawman',⁷ and, most explicitly:

Whatever I have said or purposely omitted has been through a motive of serving religion.⁸

It became the accustomed paradox of Lingard's career that he had to struggle to retain the approval of his co-religionists, while he was doing his best to persuade their protestant countrymen to think better of Roman catholicism. It was, therefore, personally important for the quiet of his life, as much as for the effectiveness of his apologetic that he should continue to enjoy among protestants a reputation for impartiality in his writing. This was the only way to persuade protestants of the congenial character of the Roman catholic community in England and the least in way of direct apologetic that those Roman catholics would generally accept as properly forwarding the views of their church. He knew what he was doing with that reputation whether his fellow catholics appreciated his mission or not. He wrote to Robert Gradwell in a letter of 17th May 1820:

In a word you see what I want-whatsoever may serve to make the catholic cause respectable in the eyes of a British public. I have the reputation for impartial (sic)-therefore have it more in my power to do so.⁹

Lingard's announcements in these letters about his intentions for the history show him to be responding to an idea that had been growing in Lingard's own mind during the Burgess-Hippisley debates. He had been brought to realize that an apologetic for modern Roman catholicism was not to be divorced from a

6. Quoted in Haile and Bonney, Op.cit., p.167.

7. Ibid.

8. Ibid.

9. Lingard to Gradwell, Correspondence A.V.E.C., Section One, No.8.

reconsideration of a quite large number of characters and events and that, consequently, political questions of emancipation would not be settled by those who talked only of present conditions.

Precisely how far his writing had indeed a different tone in the History of England from that he had used in the Anglo-Saxon Church may be appreciated by some quick comparisons of the two accounts of the same period in English history. In the Preface to the History of England he announces that he is not a mere annalist but an observer of the course of culture:

The historian ought not to confine himself to the barren recital of facts. It is his duty to trace the silent progress of nations from barbarism to refinement; and to mark their successive improvement in the arts of legislation and government.¹⁰

His interest in this History is, he says, not only in political questions but in all aspects of the nation's development, and he proceeds to describe his researches into the manners, polity and institutions of the nation's ancestors. The wide ranging economic, political and social interest suggested by that introduction contrasts with the limited study announced at the start of the Anglo-Saxon Church. In that earlier work his aim to simply 'describe the ecclesiastical polity and religious practices of our ancestors, the discipline, revenues, and learning of the clerical and monastic orders, and the more important revolutions, which promoted or impaired the prosperity of the Anglo-Saxon church'.¹¹ This is evidently a piece of ecclesiastical history. Though he was certainly writing then of 'our ancestors' it is of their activity in a single sphere of life. In the History of England generally it is with those aspects of our past culture which continue in English society that Lingard is chiefly concerned, and so when he writes in this later work of the Anglo-Saxons it is particularly to these that Lingard directs his readers' attention:

10. Hist. of Eng., 1st ed., vol.I,p.iii.

11. A.S.Ch., 2d. ed., Op.cit., p.iii.

We still speak their language, still retain many of their institutions. On this account, the writer considered it a duty to study the genius and manners of that people; and to describe, with accuracy, their ranks and services, their courts of law and judicial proceedings, their system of government and spirit of legislation.¹²

The whole tone of the work is of a nineteenth century patriot looking back to find by hindsight the significant aspects of earlier phases of his nation's history. There is something charmingly anachronistic in Lingard's estimate of his country's importance in the eyes of the world even in the time of the Anglo-Saxons:

the conqueror of Gaul aspired to the glory of adding Britain to the dominion of Rome.¹³

He suggests that the Roman Senate was as conscious as great Julius of the significance of Britain in those primitive times:

at Rome (the invasion) was hailed as the forerunner of the most splendid victories; and the mere invasion of Britain was magnified into the conquest of a new world¹⁴

All seems to have been 'sweetness and light' in Britain. What there was of civilization in Roman manners found its proper welcome in the British enthusiasm for civic virtue, custom, and language at the time of Agricola:

The Britons were charmed with the mildness and justice of his government, and publicly pronounced him their benefactor. At his instigation the chieftains left their habitations in the forest, and repaired into the vicinity of the Roman stations. There they learned to admire the refinements of civilization, and acquired a taste for improvement. The use of the Roman toga began to supersede that of the British mantle; houses, baths, temples, were built in the Roman fashion: children were instructed in the Roman language;¹⁵

12. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.I,p.iii.

13. Ibid., p.1.

14. Ibid., p.3.

15. Ibid.

But Lingard's intention in the History is not to suggest that the foreigner, even the foreigner from Rome, was a fit tutor to our ancestors. No one could be that. It was not good for the British to be too welcoming to the foreigner. Native virtue might be diluted: 'with the manners were adopted the vices of the Romans'.¹⁶ The spirit of independence and the brave temper of the British was diluted. The hardy warriors of an important centre of civilization, 'who had so long braved the power of the emperors',¹⁷ insensibly dwindled into soft and effeminate provincials. There was a lesson in all this for Britons but it was not a lesson that would have been learnt by the reader of the Anglo-Saxon Church. It had little to do with monks.

At the conclusion of the first chapter of the History of England there occurs a passage that makes quite clear the different approach even to peculiarly religious topics between that work and the earlier one. In the Anglo-Saxon Church Lingard had been eager to take any opportunity to align the church of his readers' ancestors with that of the present Roman catholics. Thus Lingard had thought it right to refer to the stiffening given to the orthodox Anglo-Saxon clergy in the Pelagian crisis by 'the bishops of Gaul' and 'the Roman Pontiff' who had intervened 'to support the declining cause of catholicity'.¹⁸ There can be no doubt that the notion of either the pope or bishops from another country influencing the theological development of the English was not one to please English protestants in the nineteenth century. When he came to deal with this story again Lingard's sense of this sensitivity and his unwillingness to arouse thoughts of Roman catholicism being a foreign aggression led him to go rather carefully. He had also, as ever, to exercise equal care for the sensibilities of his co-religionists who would not have approved any lessening of Papal significance in the telling of the incident. His narrative in the History shows him to be aware of both kinds of critic. This second account begins with a placing of the Pelagian controversy in the midst of political and social events, and even suggests that it arose only in

16. Ibid.

17. Ibid.

18. A.S.Ch., Op.cit., p.5.

some moments of relaxation from these events: 'Amidst these calamities, the Britons found leisure to attend to theological disputes'.¹⁹ Lingard sets about maligning Pelagius, his followers and his opinions:

About the commencement of the fifth century, Pelagius a Briton, and Celestius a Scot, had advanced several new and heterodox opinions respecting the nature of original sin, and divine grace. Agricola, one of their disciples, made an attempt to diffuse their doctrine among their countrymen.²⁰

These men were dangerous to British religious peace. So British bishops took action. While in the Anglo-Saxon Church Lingard had said that the Pope 'commissioned'²¹ the French to deal with the matter, in the History of England he says that the British prelates 'solicited the assistance of their neighbours'²² and that they did so 'with the concurrence of Pope Celestine'.²³ The result of all this activity must be entirely satisfactory to nineteenth century British minds: 'the new doctrines were condemned and suppressed' and 'schools for the education of the clergy were opened in several dioceses'.²⁴ This passage exhibits considerable diplomatic skill. Lingard charts a course between anglican prejudices in favour of British bishops looking after their own pastoral affairs and those of the right wing members of the Roman catholic church who would not want to hear of any doctrinal matter being settled without the authority of the Holy See. Both might make what they wished out of the condemnation of 'new' doctrines, and both would approve the educational interest of the clergy. Those signs of overt and indeed aggressive catholicism that characterised the account in the Anglo-Saxon Church have been nicely obscured in this piece. And they have been obscured again when Lingard describes a further exploit of Germanus of Auxerre during this visit of the Gaulish bishops to the Anglo Saxons:

19. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.I,p.62.

20. Ibid.

21. A.S.Ch., Op.cit., p.5.

22. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.I, p.62.

23. Ibid.

24. Ibid., p.63.

One one occasion the Gallic prelate resumed a character, in which he had distinguished himself during his youth. A party of Picts and Saxons were plundering the coast. Germanus put himself at the head of the Britons, led them against the enemy, and inflicted a severe punishment on the invaders.²⁵

In the 1806 account Lingard wrote easily of 'a miracle'²⁶ confirming the arguments of Germanus. But Lingard avoids every expression of that sort in a history of England written to counter, by its civilized and reasonable impartiality, the work of Hume:

the disciples of Pelagius, who was himself a native of Britain having increased to a great multitude, gave alarm to the clergy, who seem to have been more intent on suppressing them, than on opposing the public enemy.²⁷

His doing so compounded his weakening of the pontiffical part in the condemning of Pelagius and got him into a huge row with the catholic right wing.

In the Orthodox Journal, of June 1819²⁸ John Milner, who had not thought Lingard's tone sufficiently Roman catholic in his Anglo-Saxon Church lamented that Lingard had generally in the History of England:

not sufficiently refuted the calumnies, nor dissipated the misrepresentations of a Bale, a Barker, a Godwin, an Echard, a Hume, a Smollett, a Littleton, a Goldsmith, and a score more of protestant or infidel writers; nor has he displayed the beauty of holiness, irradiating the doctrines and heroes of catholicity, in the manner that he might have done.²⁹

In short the History of England 'is not a catholic history, such as our calumniated and depressed condition calls for'.³⁰ Milner particularly attacked Lingard's treatment of

25. Ibid.

26. A.S.Ch., Op.cit., p.5.

27. Hume, D., Hist. of Eng., 1848, vol.I., p.13.

28. Othodox, vol.VII, pp.228-331.

29. Ibid., p.228.

30. Ibid., p.230.

the Germanus event as exemplifying Lingard's timid, and indeed apostasising, tone throughout the History of England. He went very closely through the offending passage and identified just those expressions with which Lingard must have been most pleased as stepping between dangers. 'In the first place', Milner declared 'it is not by any means accurate to say, that the saint visited this island with the concurrence of pope Celestine.³¹ He had a ready reference here to the Chronicle of Prosper and the record that Germanus of Auxerre 'was sent thither by the pope as his delegate VICE TUA'.³² Milner had more to allege. 'The same writer elsewhere says, adversus Collat, that pope Celestine by his order excluded the heresy of Pelagianism from Britain'.³³ Milner turns the whole matter of Germanus against Lingard's account of independent British pastoral care. 'Indeed how could this French bishop have exercised the high acts of jurisdiction, which he did exercise in this island, particularly in giving new jurisdiction to some of its prelates, had he not been a legate of the chief pastor?'³⁴ Milner is anxious, too, that nothing of the 'miracle' should be omitted. 'Secondly, each of the other quoted historians, besides several others, describes the victory of the christians over the pagans as being a bloodless victory, without the infliction of any punishment at all, or so much as rushing upon them, obtained by the blessing of God at the mere sound of Allelujah'.³⁵ Milner even

31. Ibid.

32. Ibid. The controversy continued throughout 1819 and 1820. Some, possibly Lingard himself, (it is not proveable) came to Lingard's aid, others supported Milner. This was not the first time, however, that Lingard had been thought unorthodox by Milner. Lingard wrote to Bishop Poynter:

About 20 years ago Dr.M. accused me to Dr. Gibson on the authority of some Irish bishops of holding heretical opinions respecting the eucharist. I insisted on seeing the original charge which turned out to be no more than a postscript in a letter from Dr. Troy, saying that I had attributed to Asseline the bishop of Boulogne an opinion which to him appeared new and indefensible.

Lingard to Poynter, Correspondence A.W.C., Poynter Papers 1817-27, no.16.

33. Orthodox, Op.cit., p.230.

34. Ibid.

35. Ibid.

managed to suggest that Lingard's motives in all this were not of the purest by a reference to the History appearing in the list of the protestant publisher Mawman.

Milner was a man of some influence in the Roman catholic community and his appraisal of Lingard's work cannot have done Lingard any good. But Lingard had seen such a review coming and was resigned to its effect. In December 1819 he wrote to John Kirk:

I feel rather indignant that it should be said by him in the Orthodox that I have sacrificed the cause to temporal motives. But he said as much of the Anglo-Saxon Church, and accused me of heresy in the bargain.³⁶

Lingard's distress at Milner's attack is perhaps a sign of his feeling that he had indeed been detected in just that deployment of the diplomatic mode by which he had hoped to deal with all such persons.³⁷ At any rate, in the second edition of 1823 he altered the text to make some concession to catholic critics of the previous version:

Germanus put himself at the head of the Britons, and led them to a defile, where they waited in ambush the approach of the invaders. On a sudden, by his command, they raised a general shout of Hallelujah: the cry was reverberated from the surrounding hills; the enemy fled in amazement, and numbers perished in an adjoining river. By our ancient writers this action was celebrated under the name of the Hallelujah victory.³⁸



36. Lingard to Kirk. Quoted in Haile and Bonney, Op.cit., p.171.

37. Lingard's distress drove him to write to Poynter, July 1st 1822:

When Dr. M. wrote against my history in the orthodox I collected some passages from the history of Winchester and, maintaining that they were more reprehensible than any of mine, sent them through Mr. Lee to Andrews, who refused to insert the communication on the grounds that "it was unfit for orthodox ears".

Lingard to Poynter, Correspondence A.W.C., Poynter Papers 1817-27, no.16.
W. Andrewes b.1773 d.1837, was editor of the Orthodox Journal 1813-20.

38. Hist. of Eng., 2d. ed., vol.I, p.85.

Evidently he could not bring himself, even by the persuasion of Prosper, who after all came near to being, on Lingard's own criteria, an authoritative source for the 'fact', to declare that the victory had been a 'miracle'. He had protestant readers too largely in mind for that.

If, in the History of England, Lingard seemed to some Roman catholics to have abandoned the forthright forms of religious apologetic, not every protestant thought him to be making an honest assessment of events. In the Anglo-Saxon Church, Augustine, Wilfred, Bede, Alcuin and Dunstan had been treated as the saintly notables of ecclesiastical history. In the History of England they occupy rather different roles, they are seen in a more political and cultural light. But that did not prevent a protestant critic discerning in the new accounts merely a more careful mode of Roman catholic propaganda. His treatment of these four personages exemplifies the diversity of Lingard's dealing with such figures. Augustine, for example, is no longer presented as taking the leading part in events attributed to him in the Anglo-Saxon Church but is rather seen as a minor participant in the larger political affairs described in the larger work. Augustine is now presented as interesting only in so far as he has a part in the constitutional struggles of the period. He is introduced as an establishment bishop within the protection of a decent king:

As soon as the interpreter had explained the object and motives of their mission, Ethelbert replied, that he had no wish to abandon the gods of his fathers for a new and uncertain worship, but that, as the intention of the strangers was benevolent, and their promises were inviting, they might preach without molestation, and should be supported at his expense.³⁹

Lingard, is indeed careful to show him as the sort of clergyman that the Roman catholics could also accept:

Would Augustine have required the British clergy to join in the conversion of the Saxons, if they had taught doctrines, which he

39. Hist. of Eng., 1st ed., Op.cit., vol.I, p.80.

condemned? Bede has related with great minuteness all the controversies between the two parties. They all regard points of discipline. Nowhere does the remotest hint occur of any difference respecting doctrine.⁴⁰

But that Lingard confined this theological point to a footnote indicates a shift from the religious emphases of the Anglo-Saxon Church. It is a shift which is emphasised even more in the sentence which introduces Wilfrid:

Religious prejudice has conferred an adventitious interest on the reign of Egfrid: and his quarrel with Wilfrid, the celebrated bishop of York, occupies a distinguished but disproportionate space in our modern histories.⁴¹

A further step in the direction of the secularisation of interest is taken in Lingard's treatment of Bede and Alcuin, who in the work of 1806 had been presented as men of catholic renown. In the History of England, they are described mainly in terms of their relation to cultural conditions of the country. They are northern scholars, 'to whose writings and exertions Europe was principally indebted for that portion of learning which she possessed from the eight to the eleventh century'.⁴² The two men are presented in the role of civilised patriots. Bede at least gives Lingard a pretext for such an evaluation, and for the presentation of 'the historian as hero':

Of his works the most valuable is the "Ecclesiastical History of the Nation of the Angles" which while it treats professedly of the establishment of christianity in the different Saxon kingdoms, incidentally contains all we know, of the history of the more early princes. This learned monk died in Jarrow in 733. His works were

40. Ibid., p.84, footnote 42.

41. Ibid., p.112.

42. Ibid., p.121.

quickly transcribed and the applause with which they were received, induced the Anglo-Saxons to consider him as the ornament and pride of their nation.⁴³

Lingard uses the figure of Bede to advertise a Roman catholic's being wholly committed to the national interest. And in this celebration of the civilised historian among the Roman clergy of England there must be something too of an immodest hint to both protestants and catholics that Lingard is performing the same office in the nineteenth century.

Alcuin, too, is portrayed in the History, as he had not been in the Anglo-Saxon Church merely as a national hero of immense European fame, bringing glory to the British; whilst his catholicism receives but passing acknowledgement:

His reputation attracted crowds of students from Gaul and Germany to his lectures, and recommended him to the notice of the emperor Charlemagne. He accepted the invitation of that prince to reside in his court: diffused a taste for learning through all the provinces of the empire; and numbered the most distinguished prelates and ministers among his scholars.⁴⁴

In the description of Alcuin's intellectual interests theology is simply one among several, and certainly not the most important:

His works are numerous. They consist principally of poems, elementary introductions to the different sciences, treatises on a variety of theological subjects, and an interesting correspondence with the most celebrated characters of the age.⁴⁵

This is in contrast to Lingard's effort, in the Anglo-Saxon Church, to present Alcuin's scholarly greatness together with his devotion to a Roman catholic clergyman's life:

43. Ibid., p.122.

44. Ibid.

45. Ibid.

Had he been able to obtain the consent of Charles, it was his intention to end his days among his brethren, the clergy of that city: and when this was refused, he requested permission to retire to the monastery, which is countryman St. Boniface had founded at Fulda.⁴⁶

At Fulda, Lingard depicts the man obedient to the monarch, devoted to his religion:

There he resigned his benefices to his favourite disciples; and spent in exercises of devotion, and his usual occupation of teaching, the remaining years of his life. His diet was sparing, his prayer frequent, and he assisted daily in quality of deacon at a mass, which was celebrated in his private chapel, by one of his disciples.⁴⁷

Like Bede, Alcuin is presented as an ideal of the Roman catholic scholar, orthodox, educated and making his contribution of the nation's cultural life. To this ideal others may, even in his readers own time, approximate.

But when Lingard comes to treat of Dunstan he cannot simply place him at the side-lines of political history as he had Augustine, or dismiss him to the uninteresting reaches of ecclesiastical controversy as he had Wilfrid, or present him as a national hero of whom present English people might be proud as he had Bede and Alcuin. Dunstan was recalcitrant. He was not patient of any obscuring device. He was himself unbiddable and he had already been recognised as a figure of importance for later religious debate.

Dunstan could not be presented as either a decent bishop or an ideal scholar. The portrait of Dunstan that Lingard offered engaged him in a controversy which exhibits most plainly the kind of apologetic work that he conceived himself to be conducting, and the oppositions which were roused against it, and, it is, therefore, useful to treat this matter rather more extensively than others, though it will remain an exemplar of the generality of cases. A review of the treatment Lingard gives to Dunstan may illustrate the difference of Lingard's ambitions for the History of

46. A.S.Ch., Op.cit., p.352.

47. Ibid., p.353.

England, from those he entertained for the Anglo-Saxon Church. It may exhibit also Lingard's response to Thomas Burgess's premise that doctrinal controversy can be decided only by recourse to the examination of historical sources. And it will show, in the process of Lingard's clash with the protestant Dr. Allen about the portrayal of Dunstan's activity, how he hoped to use those historical sources to promote catholic apologetic. It will certainly demonstrate what kind of victory Lingard was seeking in such a controversy.

In the Anglo-Saxon Church Lingard had been very much on the defensive when dealing with Dunstan, aware that 'since the era of the reformation, his fame has been repeatedly assailed by a host of writers, who, if we may believe their confident assertions, have torn away a veil, which he had artfully thrown over his real character, and have proved it to be a compound of fraud, ambition, and injustice'.⁴⁸ He had been denigrated even by Sharon Turner 'the recent historian of the Anglo-Saxons'.⁴⁹ Lingard is happy in his criticism of Turner: 'As in other parts of his history he excels all his predecessors in industry and accuracy; so in his account of St. Dunstan, he has improved their incoherent fables into a well-connected romance'.⁵⁰ In the place of romance, Lingard had offered a laudatory history:

He was long revered as the ornament and pride of the Anglo-Saxon nation: and the laurels, which the gratitude of his contemporaries had planted on his grave, were during more than six centuries, respected by the veneration of their posterity.⁵¹

In the History of England, Lingard spent less time defending Dunstan's character and more in presenting the Anglo-Saxon situation as a reverse image of the redistribution of land among the gentry during the Reformation of England. Dunstan, with Oswald and Ethelwold, are described as setting about a restoration of monastic life, assisted by the good will of the king, and with the economic support of penitent barons:

48. Ibid., p.394.

49. Ibid., p.394, n.1.

50. Ibid.

51. Ibid., p.394.

To them Edgar was induced to sell, or grant, the lands of the monasteries, which had fallen to the crown: and of those which remained in the hands of individuals, a portion was recovered by purchase, and still more by the voluntary resignation of the possessors.⁵²

This is a charming chronicle of good men and has about it, surely, something of that irradiating holiness which Milner had thought absent from Lingard's history of the heroes of catholicity.⁵³ Nothing of such an idyll remains in the History, and nothing of the hagiological. The most obvious element in the second telling of Dunstan's story is that Lingard is demythologising all the way:

I have omitted the miracle of the crucifix speaking at Winchester, as well as Dunstan's nocturnal conflict with the devil, which modern writers have numbered among the imaginary artifices of the archbishop.⁵⁴

But it was not by his references to royal favours to the monks, or to nocturnal visitations to the archbishop that Lingard's account of Dunstan in the Anglo Saxon Church raised most opposition. In 1815 a protestant reviewer John Allen had attacked Lingard's estimate of Dunstan, on the authority of the account of a particular incident in Hume's History. It is an incident that does not now rouse the debating talent of many christians, but seems in Lingard's time to have been a matter of moment. That the story of how Dunstan attempted to check what he thought to be the wild behaviour of King Edwy, with a noblewoman and her daughter, which brought about his exile by Edwy should have inspired such partisan enthusiasm, is an impressive testimony to Lingard's having correctly appreciated contemporary circumstance. The old story was thought by a great number of intelligent persons to have a general relevance in the proper assessment of the reputation of the Roman

52. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.I, p.244.

53. That some parts at least of the History of England pleased Milner is suggested by his letter to the Catholic Miscellany, March 1822. When complaining to the editor that amongst the principal works he had noted of late 'you have said nothing concerning the Rev. Dr. Lingard's splendid History of England'.

Nb Catholic Miscellany, vol.1, no.3. p.116.

54. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.I, p.250. n.47.

clergy, and a particular relevance in the discussion of the relationship of clergy and king in Britain at that time, at the Reformation, and at the present. Allen was right to refer the reader to the delightful prose of Hume in the expectation that no one should think Lingard's less happy prose conveyed anything of the truth:⁵⁵

The story of Edwy and Elgiva has been told by Hume with his usual felicity of narration; and no one, we will venture to say, has ever perused the history of their misfortunes, in the pages of that inimitable writer, without being influenced with indignation against the rude violence of Dunstan, and the savage ferocity of Odo.⁵⁶

While accepting that 'Mr. Lingard has somewhat dispelled the charm' and that 'after the minute investigation he had bestowed on the subject, little remains of the romantic story of Edwy and Elgiva that is deserving of credit',⁵⁷ Allen went on to deny Lingard's version of Dunstan's conduct:

in the first place, he ought to have told us, that, according to the testimony of many respectable historians, Dunstan was exiled, not for his rudeness and violence to Edwy, but on a charge of having embezzled the treasures of King Edred, which had been entrusted to his care.⁵⁸

Allen is keen to show Dunstan as an unpleasant Roman catholic, who had, he avers on the authority of Turner, achieve 'a fine victory of the monks over the secular clergy'.⁵⁹ He tackles Lingard on his use of primary sources. Lingard's bias among these seemed to him obvious. 'To confirm the impression he wishes to give of this transaction', Lingard has quoted 'the simple narrative of the Saxon Chronicle, the most faithful register of the times'.⁶⁰ But, asks Allen 'why does he suppress the account of Osbern?', and, if Osbern were unworthy of credit, being, as Lingard terms him, 'an injudicious biographer, whose anile curiosity collected and embellished every

55. 'The Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church', Edinburgh, vol. XXV, pp.346-354.

56. Ibid., p.347.

57. Ibid.

58. Ibid., p.343.

59. Ibid., p.352.

60. Ibid.

fable', Allen urges that Lingard cannot make the same objection against Eadmer, whom he has judged to be 'one of the most sensible of the monkish historians'. A reading of Eadmer inclines Allen to the opinion of Archbishop Parker, who ascribed what Lingard terms 'the misfortunes at Calne, "to a conspiracy between the devil and the monks." '61

The necessity of returning to these matters in the History gave Lingard the opportunity of tackling Allen's objections to his account of Dunstan. He was, characteristically, irritated by Allen's suggestion that he had not consulted the primary sources for this incident. Allen's reference to Osbern and Eadmer rankled. Since Lingard's description of this incident of Dunstan and his monks offers an example of Lingard's deployment of original sources, it may be useful to set out his account of this incident at length. Lingard begins with Allen's damaging suggestion about his deliberate neglect of the original documents of Osbern and Eadmer. He discredits both chroniclers:

it is plain that both these writers compiled from the same materials, which were, as Osbern informs us, p.88 Anglo-Saxon documents believed to be translations from Latin originals consumed in the great fire at Canterbury, and which, as Eadmer adds, p.2II, were rejected by some critics on account of their opposition in several instances to known historical facts. Materials of this description can only deserve credit, when they are supported by more ancient evidence.⁶²

He becomes even louder when he is dealing with the interpretation Allen had put on the facts of the case in a note at the back of the volume:

On what account, and at whose solicitation, was Dunstan driven into banishment? A writer in the Edinburgh Review for October 1815, pretends, that according to many respectable authors he was accused and convicted, probably unjustly, of having embezzled the royal treasures.⁶³

61. Ibid.

62. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.I, p.250, n.47.

63. Ibid., p.544, note A.

He is ready to bandy primary sources in order to deal with this tale of Dunstan as embezzler:

In proof of this statement he quoted Florence, Simeon, Hovedon, and Wallingford. But the three former do not contain the remotest allusion to any charge or conviction. The passage which he transcribed from them, "exilic pro justitia ascriptus, mare transiit" is meant to praise his conduct not to censure it. They copied it from the eulogium of the archbishop, composed by Adalard about twenty years after the decease of the prelate, and appointed to be read every year in the church of Canterbury on the anniversary of his death. It describes him as suffering persecution not for peculation, but "for righteousness sake: pro justitia." Adalard, Blandin. MS. Nero, c7. Lect.7.⁶⁴

Lingard is getting into his stride. He comes nearer the origin of the accusation:

Neither does Wallingford anywhere say that the abbot of Glastonbury was accused or convicted of peculation. He only tells us that the king all along had entertained suspicions of Dunstan, because he had been entrusted with the custody of the royal treasure. Suspectus erat Eadwino Dunstanus omni tempore eo quod tempore Eadredi thessuros patrum suorum custodisset. Walling.542.⁶⁵

Lingard is ready, having reviewed the available evidence, with a direct rebuttal of Allen's theory:

But what was the real nature of these suspicions, he has not informed us. Edwy regarded all the friends of his uncle invidoculo (ibid.): and it is not improbable that he blamed Dunstan for the loss of those sums which Edred had given to the poor and the church. But the obscure language of Wallingford cannot outweigh the positive testimony of all the more ancient historians.⁶⁶

64. Ibid., p.545.

65. Ibid.

66. Ibid.

The sources have been realigned, the embezzlement having been dismissed, Lingard turns to deal with Allen's accusation concerning the death of the lady. Lingard's analysis of the available sources on this subject displays a technique which has all the appearance of single-minded scholarship and all the effectiveness of skilful advocacy. Lingard first states the known fact, 'on her return Ethelgiva was put to death at Gloucester'.⁶⁷ Then the question about the fact, 'To whom should her death be attributed?' and the ancient answers:

Malmsbury (p114), and Gervase (1645), say in general terms that she was banished and hamstrung by the archbishop. Eadmer in his life of Odo says: "ab hominis servi sui comprehensa, et, ne meretricio more ulterius vaga discurreret, subnervata, post dies aliquot mala morte presenti vitae sublata est" p.84. Yet in his life of archbishop Dunstan, he attributes her death to the Mercian insurgents. Misertus Deus gentis Anglorum, excitavit quosque potentes a terminis magni fluminis Humbrae usque ad terminos fluminis Thamisiae contra impietatem regis Edwini, et eum, quia talem se fecerat, qualem, uti diximus, regem neutiquam esse decebat, unanimiter persequi, et aut vita aut regno privare moliti sunt. Et ipsum quidem ultra Thamisiam fugaverunt: nefandam vero meretricem ejus juxta civitatem Glavorniensem mala morte, quod breviter et summatim dictum accipiatur, perdiderunt. Ead. apud Sur. p.237,238. Osbern gives the same account. Ab Humbro fluvio usque ad fluvium Tamisim- omnes quasi in unum hominem translatis regem cum adultera fugitantem persequi non desistunt. Et ipsam quidem juxta Claudium civitatem repertam subnervavere, deinde qua digna fuerat morte, multavere. p.106.⁶⁸

67. Ibid., p.547.

68. Ibid.

At this point the historian is called to make between Eadmer and Eadmer: 'Which of these different narratives may be the true one, it is perhaps impossible to decide'. So he simply trusts his own feeling: 'The latter wears the appearance of greater probability'.⁶⁹ Having managed the primary sources to the point at which he may make this suggestion to the reader, he can now, with some confidence, put the whole question into the readers' hands:

Perhaps I should apologise for the length of this note. The subject has exercised the ingenuity of several modern writers, and I thought that the reader would be best enabled to inform his own judgement, by perusing the original passages, which were previously locked up in manuscripts, or in books which cannot be readily procured.⁷⁰

The tenor of Lingard's remarks in this episode is undoubtedly that of an advocate. By his careful selection for the reader of passages which assist in the vindication of Dunstan he could both appear to be taking up the particular challenge of Allen, and prevent his opponents' claim to present an unprejudiced account of the matter.

Allen noticed what was going on and said so in a further review of the History of England in the Edinburgh Review of 1825.⁷¹ He was in no doubt as to the apologetic pretensions of Lingard's account of the incident:

Dr. Lingard has a wonderful talent for quoting as much of a passage as suits his purpose, and omitting whatever makes against him. In vindicating Dunstan from the charge of peculation, he informs us that Wallingford "only tells us that Edwy had all along entertained suspicions of Dunstan, because he had been instructed with the custody of the royal treasures. But what was the real nature of these suspicions, he has not informed us." In proof of this statement he quotes from Wallingford the

69. Ibid.

70. Ibid., p.548.

71. 'A History of England, from the first Invasion of the Romans. By John Lingard, D.D.^fEdinburgh., vol. XLII, no.83, pp.1-31.

following words - 'Suspectus erat Eadwino Dunstanus, omni tempore, eo quod tempore Eadredi thesauros patrum suorum custodisset', - but he forgets to add what the historian has subjoined - 'sub cujus suspicionis obtextu' - the property of Dunstan was sequestered. The suspicions of Edwy may have been unfounded; but it is not difficult to guess of what nature they were.⁷²

Allen felt that Lingard was not dealing honestly with the reader:

No one will dispute his right, to take that version of the story which seemed to him the most credible. But candour and fair dealing required of him, not to admit the objections to it, not to conceal the difficulties with which it was attended, and not to suppress the facts at variance with it, or calculated to throw discredit on its truth.⁷³

The concern for these Anglo-Saxon details results from the story of Edwy, Ethelgiva and Elgiva offering the nineteenth century reader an interesting pre-echo of the story of Henry VIII, Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn. If Dunstan's persuading Edgar to restore the monkish property touched on one aspect of English Reformation history, the home life of Edgar touched on another which was much more lively in the public mind. Allen noted a difference in Lingard's tellings of the tale. Again Lingard's peculiar boast that he is an historian who has gone back to the original accounts of events is impugned:

In this Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon church, Dr. Lingard was less on his guard about names. He had not then discovered the passage in the life of St. Oswald, which has induced him to alter his former account of these transactions. He there ingeniously relates the evidence he had found for the marriage of Edwy with Elgiva, and expresses his belief, that 'after the banishment of Ethelgiva, Edwy either took Elgiva to his

72. Ibid., p.19.

73. Ibid., p.10.

bed as his mistress, or married her within the prohibited degrees'. Why is this evidence suppressed, - why is the name Elgiva totally omitted in the History of England?⁷⁴

Allen has an answer for this rhetorical question. It is not one which will enhance Lingard's reputation as an historian careful of the sources:

He knows, that the divorce of Edwy and AElfyge or Elgiva is related in the Saxon Chronicle. He is aware of the existence of a charter where AElfgiva is called the King's wife, and AEthelgiva her mother; and, when he wrote his Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church, he had no doubt of the accuracy of the names. Mr. Turner, it is true, had expressed some faint suspicion that this charter might be a forgery of the monks. Has Dr. Lingard examined into the grounds of that suspicion? If he had, we are convinced he would have been satisfied, that the suspicion was unfounded; and whatever it might cost him, we are persuaded he must have admitted Elgiva to have been the wife of Edwy, and Ethelgiva to have been her mother.⁷⁵

Allen's comparison of Lingard's treatment of the subject in the History leads him to accuse Lingard of ignoring a source of whose existence he was clearly aware since he had used it in the earlier work. The facts had been suppressed. Allen certainly supposed he had discovered Lingard cheating. And he had his explanation ready. Lingard had made the deliberate choice to sacrifice his character as an historian in order to continue in his profession as an apologist for his church. It seemed to Allen that Lingard had observed the implications of the Edwy story for the Reformation questions were so great that he had deliberately accepted the risk of being caught out in this sleight of hand. That Lingard never replied to Allen's allegations of 1825 may give some credence to Allen's construction of the affair. Lingard was certainly much more careful after this to offer no such hostages to the reviewers.

74. Ibid., p.12.

75. Ibid.

Whatever he was going with Edwy, Ethelgiva and Elgiva Lingard had certainly begun to see that there was no considering people of the past either as wholly of the past, quite different from himself and his contemporaries, or as immediately relevant and easily manageable paradigms for his use in making statements about the present. What he had done in the pamphlet wars was usually a defensive piece of pleading to out-smart an opponent's interpretation of some isolated incident of the past. In the Anglo-Saxon Church he had often simply made a response to a challenge he supposed his church ought to answer. What was now opening for him was an entirely more generous activity. The gradual revaluation of ecclesiastics and their affairs which he achieved through the re-writing of Augustine, Bede and Dunstan constituted a training for the larger consideration of their successors. The critical mess he had got into by his apologetic account of Dunstan and the Edwy scandal may well have been the last spur for Lingard to set out upon a new phase of his History. He was now to chronicle a set of characters and events which he had not treated before and, more importantly, he was now to chronicle characters and events in a new way. He enjoyed an opportunity not only to look at English history with less clerical eyes, and to note the political character of incidents in which saints had some part, but also to appreciate much more thoroughly than before, if he had appreciated it at all when writing the Anglo-Saxon Church that common humanity which links men and women of the past to those of the present and which is the fundamental justification for any deduction about the present from the study of the past. He had a chance to understand just why it was that he, his catholic opponents, and his protestant reviewers, and all their readers, had a shared sense of the Anglo-Saxons as forerunners of those who took part in Reformation events and of those who were now arguing about the forms of contemporary society. He might understand the whole of the historical periods with which he was now for the first time to deal as more complexly declaratory of his own times than he had seen before. He might appreciate that their declaration must assist the advocates of his kind of catholicism within the nation's tradition.

Since Lingard's changing attitude to the study of history and to what might be expected from the discipline has been exhibited by a review of his treatment of a range of ecclesiastics, and since the differences between the Anglo-Saxon Church and the History have been said to be reflected in the differences between the two accounts of Dunstan, it may be useful, and most readily conclusive to appreciating what ever is new, to persist in taking examples from among his accounts of churchmen and theologians. In this next review of Lingard's modes in the construction of a narrative of events after the Anglo-Saxon period, whether on methodological grounds or simply those of generally acknowledged interest and importance it is certainly appropriate to begin with the examination of Lingard's treatment of another archbishop of Canterbury.

Thomas à Becket was a man to divide opinion even in the nineteenth century. The account of the archbishop in the History reveals as much of Lingard's aim in writing his History of England as that he presents of any man or woman. The immense importance of Becket arose from his being regarded as a martyr by the catholics. He was held to have lain down his life for principles which were dear to a great many members of the nineteenth century Roman church.⁷⁶ But in the opinion of many protestants, he was a man of vaulting ambition who did not sublimate that ambition when Henry II made him archbishop. Hume gave some impression of this in his history; describing Becket as 'a prelate of the most lofty, intrepid, and inflexible spirit, who was able to cover the world, and probably himself, the enterprises of pride

76. Charles Butler conveyed his thoughts on the importance of Becket to Lingard 23 November 1809. Evidently Lingard had thought of continuing his Anglo-Saxon Church, (NB chapter two, footnote 33):

We hear you are engaged in a continuance of your history: I most sincerely wish this to be the case. You must have fallen on the memorable contest of Henry the Second with his Archbishop. This is one of the many subjects, that remains to be cleared up

I have often thought the life of St. Thomas, is the worst written account in the lives of the saints.

Butler to Lingard, Correspondence B.M., Letterbooks 25, 127, p.166.

and ambition under the disguise of sanctity and of zeal for the interests of religion'.⁷⁷ Lingard therefore knew, when he approached the subject, that he was entering dangerously sensitive territory. His writing testifies if not to his own apprehension of the complexity of the topic at least to his appreciation of the diversity of responses to Becket. He balances phrases to please the Roman catholics with those to please the protestants. Becket both suffers from the 'misrepresentations' of his enemies and is himself guilty of 'Precipitate and unfortunate' action which was 'the occasion at least' of the 'catastrophe'⁷⁸ which followed, spurring his enemies to demand redress from what Lingard described, in paradigm phrase of his most impartial manner, as 'the justice or resentment of Henry'.⁷⁹ This avoidance of judgement was maintained when Lingard came to sum up the archbishop's character:

Thus at the age of fifty-three, perished this extraordinary man, a martyr to what he deemed to be his duty, the preservation of the immunities of the church.⁸⁰

The language here is precisely calculated. The 'fact' of Becket's age is agreed. No one would argue with a description of Becket as 'an extraordinary man'. And if a protestant might not care for Becket being described in a Roman catholic phrase as a 'martyr' he might yet be mollified by Becket's cause being described not as 'the honour of God' but as what he thought to be 'his duty'. The Roman catholic might be found to rejoice in Becket's dying for 'the immunities of the church', though that must have sounded rather antique in any nineteenth century British ear, while the protestant would note that in identifying his cause Lingard simply suggested his reader applaud anyone ready to die for so protestant a virtue as the sincere following of conviction.

It is clear that Lingard is now seeking to avoid any obvious connection between himself and those who held any particular opinion in theology or ecclesiology. This

77. Hume's History of Eng., vol.I, Op.cit., p.350.

78. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.II, p.86.

79. Ibid.

80. Ibid., p.89.

did not mean, however, that in his writing about Becket, the historian wanted to be neutral in his opinions and even-handed in his judgements. His writing betrays a definite sympathy with Becket. The archbishop is a man for whom Lingard feels some admiration. He is described as an honourable man exhibiting the courage and fortitude in the moment of death that all men would esteem: 'he alone remained cool and collected, and neither in his tone or gesture betrayed the slightest symptom of apprehension'.⁸¹ He is both brave and pious, on hearing the doors of the cathedral close behind him, 'he instantly ordered them to be re-opened, saying that the temple of God was not to be fortified like a castle'.⁸² It would be difficult for any reader to regard such a man as less than a hero. Becket is certainly presented here, in tones which might seem to belong with Lingard's earlier apologetic; the saint might seem to be presented as a paradigm for Roman Catholics. He could be standing as an example of their present loyalty to their church and their nation:

To the vociferations of Hugh of Horsea, a military subdeacon, "Where is the archbishop?" he replied: "Here I am, the archbishop, but no traitor".⁸³

But he is, more importantly, as the excitement of the writing testifies, a man with whom the historian would have every reader, Catholic or Protestant, feel in a moment when the calibre of his humanity is tested. Lingard creates a fearsome image of violent death:

As he felt the blood trickling down his face, he joined hands, and buried his head saying: "In the name of Christ and for the defence of his church I am ready to die." In this posture, turned towards his murderers, without a groan and without a motion, he waited a second stroke which threw him on his knees: the third laid him on the floor at the foot of St. Benet's altar. The upper part of his skull was broken in pieces: and Hugh

81. Ibid., p.88.

82. Ibid.

83. Ibid.

of Horsea planting his foot on the archbishop's neck, with the point of his sword drew out his brains, and strewed them over the pavement.⁸⁴

The difference between Lingard's accounts of Becket and Dunstan in the History is significant. The difference between Lingard's treatments of these archbishops reflects his new sense of freedom. As he contemplated the character and the event Becket has evidently ceased to be for Lingard an example of a distinguished cleric in earlier times, he has ceased to be a martyr of the Roman church, he has become a man with whom all sensitive men may sympathise. He is no longer writing history in order to make an apologetic point. The writing of history has become in itself an absorbing occupation which reveals to the historian the stuff of which he is himself made. He can move in history with a confident step, liking and disliking those who suit well and ill his conception of what human beings should be.

It is indicative of the unyielding demands of sectarian historiography that, just as if this were the same sort of writing as his account of Germanus, Roman catholic reviewers berated Lingard for the manner in which he presented Becket in the History. In a letter of 19th June 1819 to the editor of the Orthodox Journal, Milner attempted to give Lingard the character of an apostate:

If this, Mr. Editor, is not sacrificing the cause of the church in the person of one of its canonized martyrs, (whose cause Bossuet says, God himself has espoused by numerous miracles) and the patron-saint of the historian's own ecclesiastical body, I know not what is.⁸⁵

Milner then developed his thesis with reference to several incidents in Lingard's account of Becket until, at the conclusion he hit on the careful construction of Becket's career: 'the cause itself, for which the holy martyr died, was a bad one: and all that can be said for St. Thomas is, that he "perished for what he thought to be his duty".⁸⁶ Milner had divined something of Lingard's intention, and he did not like what he had divined.

84. Ibid., p.89.

85. Orthodox, Op.cit., p.230.

86. Ibid., p.231.

No one wishes to suffer such a public indignity as Milner was offering. Especially when it was offered with all the confidence of ^{it being} a majority opinion. No one wishes to be accused of sacrificing a cause which he holds dear. Lingard must have been greatly pained by such a criticism. It is not surprising that he should have looked about him for some way of satisfying such a critic which would not entail his abjuration of what he deemed his duty. It must have been plain to him what device would serve in in this situation. He might hope with some assurance to recover some of the lost Roman catholic ground by treating some notorious heretic with plain distaste and censure. He had not so wholly shifted from his earlier stance as to be unable or unwilling to do so. He would have to select, of course, someone who was not in the mainstream of Anglican tradition if he were not to offend just those readers he was hoping to persuade but the Middle Ages are replete with such characters. Of John Ball, who preached heretical notions during Wat Tyler's revolt, Lingard wrote contemptuously of his 'infatuated hearers' and 'cant expressions'.⁸⁷ In the same tone he described the heretic William Sawtre, in the reign of Henry IV, having the 'satisfaction to fall a victim to his own folly'.⁸⁸ For John Oldcastle, the Lollard in Henry V's reign, Lingard reserved the broadest ridicule:

By his partisans he would have been revered as a martyr, had not their faith been staggered and scandalised by the non-accomplishment of a prophecy, which he was said to have uttered at the gallows, that he would rise from the grave of the third day.⁸⁹

A more complex example of this sort of thing in the early volumes of the History is that of Lingard's treatment of Wycliffe. Lingard begins in the most candid manner with a reference to Wycliffe's denunciations of the clergy:

That many among them, as must always happen in old and wealthy establishments, may have deserved some of these appellations, is probably true;⁹⁰

87. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.III, p.178, n.17.

88. Ibid., p.328.

89. Ibid., p.363.

90. Ibid., p.194.

But Wycliffe's own social tone is deplorable, and Lingard can understand how it was that the clergy detested him:

It will not excite surprise, if invectives so coarse, and doctrines so prejudicial to their interests, alarmed and irritated the clergy.⁹¹

His readers would understand a curate's discomfort at vulgar abuse. They would not approve the vulgarian. Wycliffe is thus distanced from contemporary Anglicanism, and, indeed, from every form of respectable protestantism. And Lingard's own distaste for the heretic as is expressed, significantly, in social as well as doctrinal categories.

So, while Becket had been shown as a sincere, plain, doer of duty, Wycliffe is shown as a theorist of obscure and perhaps deliberately concealed opinions: 'On many points of doctrine it is not easy to ascertain the real sentiments of the reformer'.⁹² He is nothing more than a religious huckster, a positive enthusiast. 'In common with other religious innovators, he claimed the twofold privilege of changing his opinions at will, and of being infallible in every change'.⁹³ Wycliffe is not a good Roman catholic, a courageous Lutheran, or a decent Anglican, he is simply a rogue who 'when he found it expedient to dissemble, could so qualify his doctrines with conditions, or explain them away by distinctions, as to give an appearance of innocence to tenets of the most mischievous tendency'.⁹⁴ Having poisoned the wells, Lingard was ready to discuss Wycliffe's religious tenets in terms of the manipulation of language, describing his doctrines as 'verbal quibbles', and he selects an illustration calculated to shock gentlemen in the early nineteenth century:

Take for example his argument against the contract. No woman is a man's wife till she has given her consent: but in the marriage ceremony the man says, "I take thee to wife", before the woman has given her consent; therefore he says what is false: and consequently the contract is null. See Trial. iv. 20.22. Woodford, 214.⁹⁵

91. Ibid.

92. Ibid., p.195.

93. Ibid.

94. Ibid.

95. Ibid., p.196, n.57.

There are signs throughout Lingard's lively account of the undesirable Wycliffe that he has by now abandoned whatever particular attempt he may have been making to conciliate Roman catholic readers by the denunciation of a heretic and his heresies, and is intent on putting Wycliffe at a great distance from any reader, catholic or protestant, who entertained a proper sense of respectable behaviour. A man who swore at the clergy and let women out of their marriage contracts is socially undesirable. And even when Lingard comes to deal with Wycliffe's most famous achievement, he keeps to this bourgeois tone, employing a quotation from Sir Thomas More to demonstrate that long before Wycliffe's time an English bible was available to the right sort of person, being 'by good and godly people with devotion and soberness well and reverently read'.⁹⁶ The account of Wycliffe's death testifies to Lingard's coolness towards him as he records the following as a matter of fact:

Two years afterwards, as he was assisting at the mass of his curate on the feast of the innocents, at the moment of the elevation of the host, a stroke of apoplexy deprived him of the use of his tongue, and of most of his limbs. He lingered two days, and expired at the close of the year 1384.⁹⁷

What is happening in Lingard's accounts of Becket and Wycliffe is an exciting development from what he had done in his account of Dunstan, but of course it is not a development that cancels all his previous attitudes. Lingard does not cease to be aware of the apologetic value of historical studies as he gradually becomes aware of the human interest of his discipline, and if he is readier that he was to make judgements in terms of his own temperament, those he makes of Becket and Wycliffe still fit the general Roman catholic view of those persons. He is not giving up his Roman catholic assessment of an heretic, if he adds vulgarity to his demonstrable vices. What is observable in Lingard's writing in this volume is an increasing confidence in his personal judgements and an increasing willingness to exhibit his own

96. Ibid., p.198, n.64.

97. Ibid., p.193.

social prejudices within his generally consistent presentation of Roman catholic interpretation of events and characters.

There might come a character in history, of course, in which Lingard's religious loyalty might be at odds with his personal temper. He might find an heretic to be quite charming. He might find a saint to be not his sort at all. Joan of Arc suggests herself as a person patient of such ambivalent an assessment. Whether or no derived from a reading of Shakespeare's Henry VI the picture of Joan generally received among the English was certainly of such a loose living witch as he described. And Lingard opens his description of the Roman catholic heroine with a reference to her social impropriety:

In the beginning of March, a female in man's attire, attended by two esquires and four servants, arrived at his (the king's) palace and announced herself as the deliverer of France.⁹⁸

Lingard presents this as a preposterous scene, likely to convince the reader that Joan was insane. His emphasis when he does come to talk of Joan's religious vocation is not the reality of Joan's mission but on the reality of her belief in her mission, an altogether different matter. Milner would have relished this as little as he did the earlier play Lingard had made with such objective and subjective distinctions in relation to Thomas à Becket. 'Her mission', he says, 'so at least she believed, had been dictated to her from heaven'.⁹⁹ Lingard is prepared to attempt a quite modern psychological analysis of Joan. He explains, even explains away, the figures of her visions:

In her former occupation she had listened to travellers describing the insolence of the English, the oppression of her countrymen, and the wrongs of the native sovereign. These subjects had taken strong hold of her mind: her imagination insensibly became exalted: the enthusiast

98. Ibid., p.409.

99. Ibid.

persuaded herself that her country might yet be saved by the arms of a woman.¹⁰⁰

And he comes by degrees to a position from which he is actually ready to write of Joan in such a way as to deny the reality of her visions:

she fancied that the saints Margaret and Catherine had actually commissioned her, in the name of the Almighty, to take upon herself the glorious enterprise.¹⁰¹

From this it is an easy step to presenting Joan as a foolish young person, impressing only the gullible, who was used by clever Frenchmen:

To most of the courtiers her arrival afforded a subject of mirth and ridicule. The council was divided. The credulity of a few indulged a hope that there might be something supernatural in so extraordinary an event; the prudence of the others foresaw that much advantage might be derived from the delusion of the girl and the superstition of the people.¹⁰²

The nineteenth century reader, accustomed to the ways of Hume, was perhaps less surprised than a modern reader by Lingard's reliance in this instance of the maxim that 'men consented to believe that, which it was so much in their interest should be true'.¹⁰³ By this time Lingard has certainly done enough to please any English reader, but he maintains his tone of disbelief right to the last description of Joan's career:

she proudly maintained that she had been the inspired minister of the Almighty; and repeated her conviction, that she was often favoured with visits from the archangel Michael, and the saints Margaret and Catherine. The fatal day, however, arrived, and the captive was arraigned at the bar; but when the judge had prepared to pronounce

100. Ibid.

101. Ibid.

102. Ibid.

103. Ibid.

sentence, she yielded to a sudden impulse of terror, acknowledged with tears her delusion, and, having promised upon oath never more to wear male attire, was remanded to her former place of retirement. Her enthusiasm, however, revived in the solitude of a prison: her cell was again peopled with celestial visitants, and new scenes of military glory opened to her imagination.¹⁰⁴

The process here from a proud claim to be of God, through delusion and enthusiasm to glory solely in the imagination is peculiarly sharp in its dismissal of Joan, and managed in just those terms which would make an appeal to the prejudice of Lingard's readers. A decent, reasonable, man would have nothing further to do with such a girl. He is thus telling his readers exactly what they should feel about the matter. What they should feel is just precisely what a sane and sympathetic human being would feel: 'an impartial observer would have pitied and respected the mental delusion with which she was afflicted'.¹⁰⁵ With a final flick of most surprising vigour against the mediaeval clergy Lingard compares the sense of his readers, impartial observers all, with 'the credulity of her judges'.¹⁰⁶

It appears from this example that when there is a contradiction between the Roman catholic estimate of an historical figure and Lingard's own inclinations of temperament, he is ready to surrender the Roman view. Joan certainly does not appear as a saint in this narrative. Of course she was not canonized until 1920, and only beatified in 1909, but she has been thoroughly rehabilitated in 1456 and was received by Roman catholics as a venerable and holy maid. Lingard goes against all this. If there is any community view of Joan expressed in his narrative it is that of literate English protestants. Joan is presented as very much a Frenchwoman and very much a deluded enthusiast. Whatever Lingard felt about the French, he does seem to have shared English suspicions of enthusiasm, and to have felt it proper to express such suspicions in his history.

104. Ibid., p.420

105. Ibid.

106. Ibid.

The volumes of the History which treat of the Middle Ages, therefore, exhibit Lingard as coming to assess historical figures according to his own middle class English tastes. What begins in the narratives of Thomas à Becket and John Wycliffe is taken much further in the narrative of Joan. While Becket and Wycliffe are treated in ways which are still within the bounds of that estimate generally made of them by the Roman church, Joan is treated in a much freer manner. It may be expected, therefore, that Lingard's account of later events and characters will be conducted entirely according to the criteria suggested as much by his personal temper as by his ecclesiastical allegiance. It is not clear how far his contemporaries adverted to those middle class and English traits exhibited in the History, for most of them shared such characteristics, but some at least of his contemporaries entertained an expectation of ecclesiastical bias and prepared themselves for the next expression of Lingard's peculiar view. Lingard wrote to John Kirk, his priest friend at Lichfield, on 10 December 1820, of just such preparations:

Mawman wrote to me on Thursday that the British Quarterly Review contains a very favourable critique on the first three volumes with some censure..... merely to pave the way for a greater disagreement on the subject of the Reformation: but that I ought to be aware and to be prepared for a host of orthodox critics, who will assail me on the subject of the fourth volume.¹⁰⁷

It is to those volumes that we shall now turn.

107. Quoted in Haile and Bonney, Op.cit., p.185.

Chapter Five

Restructuring the Reformation (History Vols. IV, V and VI)

That Lingard devoted volume four entirely to the forty-four years 1509-53 and volume five to the next fifty after that, suggests he supposed the religious and political controversies of the sixteenth century to be of greatest interest to his contemporaries, and that he was quite prepared to indulge an interest which he himself certainly shared. But the subject matter of these critical volumes created new problems for him. For the first time in the History he was treating an extended period of English history about which the most part of his readership already entertained decided views. The period might well seem to him a morass of controversial theological and political dangers, among which, a priest, if he wished to continue on his inoffensive way, must tread extremely carefully. Lingard had now come to deal with matters which were immediate to his earlier pamphleteering subjects, and if he knew little in his northern village of the kind of anti-Romanist sentiment described in George Rudé's Hanoverian London¹ his own memories of the Gordon Riots of 1780 must have enabled him to come quickly to anticipate George Rudé's conclusion that:

Popery remained, two hundred years after Philip of Spain and the Spanish Armada, associated in the popular mind with "wooden shoes" and foreign enslavement. There had been a dread of a massacre of Protestant Englishmen by Irish Catholics on the eve of the Civil Wars; again, there was the panic aroused by James II's reputed Catholic army of 1688, following hard on the heels of the scare fomented by Titus Oates at the time of the Popish Plot.²

Dr. Rudé points to a detestation of catholicism being not only the stock-in-trade of protestant bigots, who in great numbers joined Lord George's Protestant Association but also part of the political tradition of the ordinary English people. He traces a tradition of Republican, Whig or 'Patriot' agitation, leading to the new Radicalism in

1. Rudé, G., Hanoverian London 1714-1808, 1971.

2. Ibid. p.220.

late eighteenth century London, exhibited for example, in the popular agitation against the Quebec Act and the denunciation of the 'French Laws' by Chatham, the Whigs and the City. He thinks it significant that England was in 1780 at war not only with the American colonists but also with the catholic powers of France and Spain. He refers to the presentation by the Common Hall and Common Council, prompted by Wilkes and Bull, of a strong petition against the catholic relief Bill of 1778 as 'unduly favouring Roman Catholics',³ and begging the King to withhold his assent after the Bill had been accepted by both Houses. There was little popular reaction in favour of the Roman catholics even after the Gordon Riots though the passage of relief acts for the catholics in 1791 and 1793 witnesses to some reappraisal of the situation by the educated class. This strident anti-catholicism continued into the nineteenth century. A ministry fell in 1807 because it could not agree a package that would persuade the king to accept catholic emancipation.⁴ Between 1812 and 1827, the question was, on account of the division of opinion, made 'open' in the cabinet.⁵

Inevitably, such anti-catholic feeling was reflected in the publishers' lists of the period. Foxe's book of martyrs, the aggressively propagandistic apology for the protestant church, was reprinted on eight occasions between 1771 and 1820, the year that Lingard published his volumes on the Reformation. Most importantly, David

3. Ibid., p.221.

4. The Catholic Relief act of 1791 abolished the illegality of catholic worship. It was extended to Ireland in Hobart's Irish act of 1793.

5. A Whig move to open the more senior offices in the army and navy to catholics was opposed by George III and conservative persons in the coalition cabinet. The king insisted on having 'positive assurance' that the matter would not be discussed again. Grenville refused to withhold 'under the various circumstances which may arise, those Councils which may eventually appear to them indispensably necessary for the peace and tranquility of Ireland' and the coalition government fell. NB. Asa Briggs The Age of Improvement, p.194 ff.

Hume's History of England, which was reprinted in twenty different editions, gave in a few words, 'some account of the Roman Catholic superstition, its genius and spirit',⁶ which was generally received. Hume's practice was generally not coincident with the nice claims he made for his discipline:

History addresses itself to a more distant posterity than will ever be reached by any local or temporary theology; and the characters of sects may be studied when their controversies shall be totally forgotten.⁷

It might be supposed, from the horror in which he was held by its members he entertained a particular dislike for the Roman church. And certainly he expressed nothing but contempt for that Church in his Natural History of Religion first published in 1757, and which was reprinted twice in 1779. There Hume concluded his review of the Romanists' religion in ironic terms:

Such are the doctrines of our brethen the Catholics. But to these doctrines we are so accustomed, that we never wonder at them: Though in a future age, it will probably become difficult to persuade some nations, that any human, two-legged creature could ever embrace such principles.⁸

But that Hume was in fact quite even-handed in his discussion of religion, and not proceeding to some special malice towards Roman catholics, appears in his following sentence: 'And it is a thousand to one, but that these nations themselves shall have something full as absurd in their own creed, to which they will give a most implicit and most religious assent',⁹ but the generality of Hume's readers were likely to stop at his discussion of Roman catholic doctrine. Hume's History was read in so many editions, that, by the time Lingard's history appeared, a great many of the English would have received as not requiring proof a view of English history wholly

6. Hume, Op.cit., Quoted in J.J.Y. Greig's David Hume, p.196.

7. Ibid.

8. Quoted in H.E. Roots' edition of Hume's Natural History of Religion, p.56.

9. Ibid.

unflattering to the catholic church. That Lingard, just prior to writing his Reformation volumes, was sensitive at every point to the effect of Hume's work is shown in a letter he wrote to Gradwell in October 1819:

even where I acknowledge the exactions of the Court of Rome, on examination it will be found that my narrative is a refutation of the more exaggerated accounts of Hume etc., though it is told as not to appear designed for that purpose.¹⁰

Those who preferred the playhouse to the library might have gained a like impression of catholicism's part in the national history. Professor R.A. Foakes has shown that Shakespeare's Henry VIII, frequently acted during Lingard's life, reflected a protestant tradition, and does indeed sometimes express simply the original protestant apologetic in its suggestion of character, motivation and event.¹¹ Professor Foakes remarks, for example, that 'the story of Cranmer in Act V was taken from Foxe's Acts and Monuments'.¹² The play was generally thought to make its way to the grand scene of Elizabeth's christening and Cranmer's prophecy of national glory under the reign of a protestant queen. The variety of popular anti-catholic sentiment, and especially its focussing on the Reformation period might well have given Lingard pause before setting out on the fourth volume of the History. But only eighteen months elapsed between the publication of the first three volumes and the fourth, so Lingard must have been already, shaping the Reformation volume whilst he was engaged upon the first three. The tone of those volumes does in some way prepare for the treatment of the polemical matters of the sixteenth century, but it was incumbent upon Lingard to become, or at least to seem, more scientific the more he dealt with contentious issues. If he were going to come off successfully in his attempt to contradict a view patronised by Shakespeare and Hume he would have to be both precise and tactful in his allegations of primary sources for his novel view

10. Lingard to Gradwell, Correspondence A.V.E.C., Section one, no.7.

11. Foakes, R.A., Introduction to the Arden Shakespeare's Henry VIII, pp.xv - lxxv.

12. Ibid., p.xxxiii.

of events. A comparison with the introductions to the first three volumes reveals that in the fourth Lingard thought it necessary to emphasize his continual use of demonstrable facts in the writing of this part of the History. The quick claim in the former introduction that his work 'was, in the first instance, composed without any reference to modern historians',¹³ and that 'the author religiously confined his researches to the original, and, whenever possible, to contemporary writers',¹⁴ was now greatly elaborated. What was a small part of the whole introduction, becomes, in volume four, nearly the whole of the preface:

In composing it (the History) I have faithfully adhered to the rule, which I prescribed to myself in the preceding volumes, to take nothing upon credit, to distrust the statements of partial and interested writers, and to consult every authentic document within my reach.¹⁵

After informing the reader that 'Fidelity and research are the indispensable duties of the Historian', Lingard went on to develop his theory about the relationship between history and primary documents:

While the novelist enjoys the privilege of being always acquainted with the motives of those, whose conduct he delineates, the writer of history can know no more than his authorities disclose, or the facts themselves suggest. If he indulges his imagination, if he pretends to detect the secret springs of every action, the real origin of every event, he may embellish his narrative, but he will impose upon his reader, and perhaps upon himself.¹⁶

For this reason he had written in a certain manner:

This remark must account for my occasional ignorance of motives and causes, my inexperience in that which is termed the philosophy of history but which has often appeared to me the philosophy of romance. Where

13. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.I, p.v.

14. Ibid.

15. Ibid., vol. IV, p.v.

16. Ibid.

the ancient authorities are silent, I have preferred to leave the reader to the exercise of his own judgements, than to palm upon him my own conjectures for real facts.¹⁷

It becomes, therefore, a question how far Lingard fulfilled this pledge.

An early indication of the kind of tact that Lingard meant to employ when dealing with the Reformation period is given in his treatment of the activities of Luther as being very much a foreign affair. Henry VIII's interest in Reformation ideas is represented as a concern for religion against this foreign heretic; and his mode of proceeding is introduced as a charming reminder of mediaeval jousting:

Henry himself was anxious to enter the lists against the German: nor did Wolsey discourage the attempt, under the idea that pride no less than conviction would afterwards bind the royal polemic to the support of the ancient creed. That the treatise in defence of the seven sacraments, which the king published, was his own composition, is forcibly asserted by himself: that it was revised and improved by the superior judgement of the cardinal and the bishop of Rochester, was the opinion of the public.¹⁸

In Lingard's account, the English monarch and the Pope are united in the matter and Henry is yet again described in the sword-wielding terms of the chivalric age:

Clarke, dean of Windsor, carried the royal production to Rome, and in a full consistory submitted it to the inspection and approbation of the pontiff, with an assurance, that as his master had refuted the errors of Luther with his pen, so was he ready to oppose the disciples of the heresiarch with his sword, and to array against them the whole strength of his kingdom. Clement accepted the present with many expressions of admiration and gratitude.¹⁹

17. Ibid.

18. Ibid., p.111.

19. Ibid.

Lingard accentuated the foreignness of the whole business and the wiliness of the German preacher and the German Elector making much of an incident in which 'Cajetan complained in vain of the deception which had been practised upon him'.²⁰ His representation of the Reformation as a dispute between a foreign cardinal and a foreign prince was clearly intended to make the English reader more aware of the conservative religious views of the English king. It was a natural part of his enterprise to make much of the divorce as the primary cause of the king's turning to protestant advisors. This enabled him to assume a distant and apparently neutral position in a controversial issue between catholic and protestant. But, clearly, Lingard could not continue to avoid exhibiting his religious predilections in a century so controversial as the sixteenth. His readers felt that it was a period too polemical for that. The pressures upon Lingard to declare his Roman catholic bias would become greater as controversial incidents and persons arose. Lingard could not always preserve the apparent neutrality of the first three volumes when treating with a period many of his readers believed to be the battleground for determining important issues in their own lives. As more controversial incidents arose Lingard's aim to seem impartial would become impossible to maintain and the more controversial a topic the greater was the chance of Lingard exhibiting his Roman catholic biases. Lingard begins this English narrative with a discussion of Catherine's betrothal to Prince Arthur and, on his death, her betrothal to Henry. Lingard puts his material together with some care. He begins with a simple rehearsal of the debate:

to the objection drawn from the affinity between the parties were opposed the force of papal dispensation, and the solemn assertion of Catherine, which she was ready to confirm by her own oath, and by the attestation of several matrons, that her former nuptials with Arthur had never been consummated.²¹

20. Ibid., p.102.

21. Ibid., p.6.

He now produces the important admission: 'Henry acknowledged the truth of her assertion to her nephew the emperor, as is observed by Cardinal Pole in his letter to the King, entitled, pro unitatis ecclesiasticae defensione. "Tu ipse hoc fassus es, virginem te accepisse, et Caesari fassus es, cui minime expediebat, si tum de divortio cogitares, hoc fateri".²² Having made the king say what was always alleged by the catholics, Lingard suggests that the protestant hero, Peter Martyr was as convinced of the Roman view as were Catherine's own friends:

Peter Martyr, in a letter dated May 6th 1509, before the marriage, tells us that the same was the belief in Spain. Est opinio sponsum primum intactam, quia invalidus erat aetate non matura, reliquisse.²³

Every witness agreeing Lingard concludes: 'On this account she was married with the ceremonies appropriated to the nuptials of maids. She was dressed in white, and wore her hair loose'.²⁴ Lingard now steps out from his narrative part to address his contemporaries directly:

Perhaps I should apologize to the reader for this long and, in some respects, tedious detail. But the important controversy to which the marriage of Henry and Catherine gave birth, and the still more important consequences to which that controversy subsequently led, have imported an interest to every circumstance which originally impeded or facilitated their union.²⁵

Although this all seems to be done on the basis of primary sources there is a definite shift between sources. In the first the emphasis is not on the reporter, Pole, but the originator of the assertion, Henry himself. In the second this is reversed. Lingard's readers will care more for the witness of Peter Martyr than that of the Spaniards, so the emphasis is placed on the reporter.

22. Ibid., p.7, n.11.

23. Ibid.

24. Ibid.

25. Ibid., p.7.

Lingard was enthusiastic in his praise of Catherine, and he insinuates that Henry was likewise always ready to admire her:

When Henry married the princess Catherine, she was in her twenty-sixth year. The graces of her person derived additional lustre from the amiable qualities of her heart: and the propriety of her conduct during a long period of trial and suspense, had deserved and obtained the applause of the whole court. She bore him three sons and two daughters - all of whom died in their infancy, except the princess Mary, who survived both her parents and afterwards ascended the throne. For several years the King boasted of his happiness, in possessing so accomplished and virtuous a consort: but Catherine was both older than her husband, and subject to frequent infirmities: the ardour of his attachment gradually evaporated: and at last his inconstancy or superstition attributed to the curse of heaven the death of her children, and her subsequent miscarriages. Yet even while she suffered from his bad usage, he was compelled to admire the meekness with which she bore her afflictions, and the constancy with which she maintained her rights. The queen had lost his heart: she never forfeited his esteem.²⁶

Though this is a most friendly portrait it is certainly not out of line with the general English view of Catherine. It is much like that conveyed in Shakespeare's Henry VIII:

That man i'th'world who shall report he has
 A better wife, let him in nought be trusted,
 For speaking false in that, thou art alone
 (If they rare qualities, sweet gentleness,
 Thy meekness saintlike, wife-like government,
 Obeying in commanding, and they parts
 Sovereign and pious else, could speak thee out)

26. Ibid., p.117.

The queen of earthly queens: she's noble born,
 And like her true nobility she has
 Carried herself towards me.²⁷

So Lingard could speak well of Catherine without feeling that he was affronting public opinion. Of course he took what opportunities presented themselves to enhance whatever reputation Catherine possessed for virtue among the English.

Anne Boleyn, on the other hand, enjoyed a reputation that he would wish to diminish. The generally received view of her character is evident in Hume's History of England:

The innocence of this unfortunate queen cannot reasonably be called into question. Henry himself, in the violence of his rage, knew not whom to accuse as her lover; and though he imputed guilt to her brother, and four persons more, he was able to bring proof against none of them. The whole tenor of her conduct forbids us to ascribe to her an abandoned character, such as is implied in the king's accusation: had she been lost to all prudence and sense of shame, she must have exposed herself to detection, and afforded her enemies some evidence against her.²⁸

Hume's sympathy for Anne as an innocent unfortunate, a princess mauled by a raging beast, is in marked contrast to Lingard's handling of her story. From his first introduction, her conduct is shown in as unfriendly a light as Lingard can manage:

She artfully kept her lover in suspense: but tempered her resistance with so many blandishments, that his hopes, though repeatedly disappointed, were never totally extinguished.²⁹

Without any reference here to the promised primary sources, Lingard presents Anne as an indecently knowing coquette.

27. Foakes' edition of Shakespeare's Henry VIII, Op.cit., Act II, Scene IV.
28. Hume's Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol. III, p.134.
29. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol. IV, p.121.

Having established the contrasting characters of the two ladies, Lingard is freer in suggestion: 'Henry was aware that some objections had been formally raised to his marriage with Catherine: but the question had been set at rest by the unanimous decision of his council; and seventeen years had elapsed without a suspicion of the unlawfulness of their union', but 'his increasing passion for the daughter of lady Boleyn, induced him to reconsider the subject: and in the company of his confidants he affected to fear, that he was living in a state of incest with the relict of his brother'.³⁰ It is the King's 'passion' for Anne Boleyn that is the cause of his putting Catherine aside. Lingard's language is carefully chosen. He places formal objections against increasing passions, the decision of the council against an affectation of fear, the lawful union against the unnatural incest, so that Catherine is associated with the due order of society, and Anne is set in the midst of ungoverned and individual passion. Lingard is at his boldest in this passage when he makes his impertinent claim to know the mind of the king. Perhaps he appreciated his own impertinence. At any rate he immediately admitted some ignorance in the matter:

Whether the idea of divorce arose spontaneously in his mind, or was suggested by the officiousness of others, may be uncertain: but the royal wish was no sooner communicated to Wolsey, than he offered his aid, and ventured to promise complete success.³¹

There is a nice revelation of the way Lingard came to structure his account of the whole subject in his wanting to attribute the suggestion of the divorce to the 'officiousness' of others. The story has captured him. He has been brought into the Tudor court and he has taken sides. Those who oppose his wishes of what should happen are impertinent in their interference. And those whom he dislikes have to bear his personal abuse. He makes a very snide remark at the close of his account of Anne:

30. Ibid.

31. Ibid.

The records of her trial and conviction have mostly perished, perhaps by the hands of those who respected her memory.³²

This is a particularly damaging suggestion. If Anne's friends thought her innocent they would have wanted the records preserving as vindicating Anne's claims to innocence. Lingard has shaped the narrative so that a reader must infer Anne's guilt and must distance himself from those artful persons who respect her memory. It must therefore surprise that Lingard thinks himself yet able to stand as an unbiased observer of others' apologetical histories, but he evidently does think himself so able. He sums up the work of his predecessors with every appearance of evenhandedness:

The question soon became one of religious feeling rather than of historical disquisition. Though she had departed no further than her husband from the ancient doctrine, yet, as her marriage with Henry led to the separation from the communion of Rome, the Catholic writers were eager to condemn, the Protestants to exculpate her memory.³³

But however quaint his enjoyment of the assurance that he is continuing to write that scientific history he had proposed in his introduction, it is at least remarkable that he was prepared, once he had established the view that all decent men must take of Anne, to supply even the want of primary source material:

In the absence of those documents which alone could enable us to decide with truth, I will only observe that the King must have been impelled by some most powerful motive to exercise against her such extraordinatry and, in one supposition, such superfluous rigour.³⁴

What in others he would have denounced as partizan guessing, he allows himself as logical deductions:

Had his object been (we are sometimes told that it was) to place Jane Seymour by his side on the throne, the divorce of Anne without her execution, or the execution without divorce, would have effected his

32. Ibid., p.239.

33. Ibid., p.245.

34. Ibid.

purpose. But he seems to have pursued her with insatiable hatred. Not content with taking her life, he made her feel in every way, in which a wife and a mother could feel. He stamped on her character the infamy of adultery and incest: he deprived her of the name and the right of wife and queen: and he even bastardized her daughter, though he acknowledged that daughter to be his own.³⁵

By this time Lingard is ready to suggest unmentionable horrors in Anne Boleyn's life:

If then he were not assured of her guilt, he must have discovered in her conduct some most heinous cause of provocation, which he never disclosed.³⁶

35. Ibid., p.246.

36. Ibid. Lingard discussed one of these horrors with Mrs. Ridyard, writing January 5th 1843: 'I have a notion about her (A.B.) that I have never ventured to make public. That she was murdered as you say, I believe'. On 10th of the same month Lingard elaborated this:

My suspicion, as I called it, is not a secret but I meant to say that I never published it. Look at the letter from Gontram in my notes to Henry VIII. You will find that Anne before her marriage was in great trouble about something well known to Francis of France: that about the end of 1534 for a month or two she was in disgrace with Henry and looked upon herself as next to a lost woman without the help of Francis, which help was not forthcoming though she expected it - and that all this distress arose from the King's doubts and suspicions. Now what is my suspicion? That before her marriage some one had whispered in Henry's ear that while she was in France she had a favourite lover - that the tale was renewed again at the end of 34 and beginning of 35 and that at last the King's jealous mind convinced him of its truth. He sacrificed her because he believed that she had misconducted herself before her marriage - as he did afterwards that very little girl, parvissima puella, Catherine Howard.

Lingard to Ridyard, Correspondence M.C.O., Shepherd Papers, vol.1, nos. 16 and 17.

A note in the back of the volume actually summons the conduct of Elizabeth to support Lingard's view of her mother:

In the hypothesis that Anne was innocent there is something very singular in the conduct of her daughter queen Elisabeth. Mary no sooner ascended the throne, than she hastened to repeal the acts derogatory from the honour of her mother. Elisabeth sate on it five-and-forty years; yet made no attempt to vindicate the memory of her mother. The proceedings were not reviewed; the act of attainder and divorce were not repealed. It seems as if she had forgotten, or wished the world to forget, that there ever existed such a woman as Anne Boleyn.³⁷

The history of the two queens seemed to Lingard to offer opportunity for the kind of apologetic he was attempting in this work. If his bias seems greatest when he is diminishing Anne rather than when he is promoting the reputation of Catherine, this is of a piece with the scheme he had worked out for his treatment of a range of Tudor notables. Lingard's dismissal of Anne, the protestant heroine, is managed so that it will stand in deliberate contrast with his treatment of Wolsey, who was to the protestant readers Lingard had in mind, as to the protestant chroniclers of the Tudor age, as Professor Foakes observed in his preface to Henry VIII 'one of the arch villains of the Tudor period'.³⁸ Anne in disgrace is of unblessed memory, her character stamped 'by some most powerful motive' with 'the infamy of adultery and incest'.³⁹ Wolsey who had once exercised a 'superior judgement'⁴⁰ about sacramental theology, and ventured to promise 'complete success'⁴¹ for the king's divorce design, is in disgrace a most piteous character:

His health would not allow him to travel with expedition: and at Sheffield park, a seat of the earl of Shrewsbury, he was seized with a

37. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., p.488, n.1.

38. Foakes' Ardened of Shakespeare's Henry VIII, Op.cit., p.xxxvii.

39. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol. IV, p.246.

40. Ibid., p.111.

41. Ibid., p.122.

dysentery which confined him a fortnight. As soon as he was able to mount his mule, he resumed his journey: but feeling his strength rapidly decline, he said to the abbot of Leicester, as he entered the gate of the monastery, "Father abbot, I am come to lay my bones among you". He was immediately carried to his bed.⁴²

He is depicted too, as a cardinal who was a British patriot:

the second day seeing Kyngston, the lieutenant of the Tower, in his chamber, he addressed him in these well-known words: "Master Kyngston, I pray you have me commended to his majesty, and beseech him on my behalf to call to mind all things that have passed between us, especially respecting good queen Catherine and himself: and then shall his grace's conscience know whether I have offended him or not."⁴³

Lingard presents Wolsey as profoundly devoted to the English monarchs careful of the reputation of the good queen, and as superbly in command of the 'well-known words'⁴⁴ of the English language as Shakespeare had suggested:

He is a prince of most royal courage: rather than miss any part of his will, he will endanger one half of his kingdom: and I do assure you, I have often kneeled before him, sometimes for three hours together, to persuade him from his appetite, and could not prevail. And, Master Kyngston, had I but served God as diligently as I have served the King, he would not have given me over in my grey hairs. But this is my just reward for my pains and study, not regarding my service to God, but only my duty to my prince".⁴⁵

All this must have raised an echo for those who had seen Shakespeare's play, and, perhaps more surprisingly for those who had read Hume:

42. Ibid., p.164.

43. Ibid.

44. Ibid.

45. Ibid., p.164.

when we consider, that the subsequent part of Henry's reign was much more criminal than that which had been directed by Wolsey's counsels, we shall be inclined to suspect those historians of partiality who have endeavoured to load the memory of this minister with such violent reproaches.⁴⁶

Lingard has certainly profited from a reading of Hume on this topic. He has taken the hint from the reference to Henry's criminality and developed the chroniclers reference to 'will' and 'appetite' into a display of limitless royal concupiscence:

The best eulogy on his character is to be found in the contrast between the conduct of Henry before, and after the cardinal's fall. As long as Wolsey continued in favour, the royal passions were confined within certain bounds; the moment his influence was extinguished they burst through every restraint, and by their caprice and violence alarmed his subjects, and astonished the other nations of Europe.⁴⁷

Wolsey thus becomes the defender of good English sense and even of something akin to the protestant morality.

In view of popular anti-catholic prejudices Lingard's effort to portray Roman catholic heroes as particularly patriotic has something about it of a champion taking up a challenge. After the kind of treatment the unpromising Wolsey received, it cannot surprise that the lives of John Fisher and Thomas More were seen by Lingard as offering the most welcome opportunity to write of loyal, catholic heroes of England. The bishop of Rochester had first appeared as assisting Henry in his writing against a foreign heretic, but it is again in disgrace that Lingard finds him most interesting. Lingard seems ever to enjoy the prospect of a human being bereft of human help: Lingard opens his account of Fisher's fall from favour with an effective description of the height from which he was to fall:

46. Hume's Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.III, p.87.

47. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.IV, p.165.

Fisher was far advanced in age, the last survivor of the counsellors of Henry VII, and the prelate to whose care the countess of Richmond recommended on her death-bed the youth and inexperience of her royal grandson.⁴⁸

Fisher had been accepted as the guardian of the proper exercise of English monarchy:

For many years the king had revered him as parent; and was accustomed to boast that no prince in Europe possessed a prelate equal in virtue and learning to the Bishop of Rochester.⁴⁹

But then the folly and criminality of Henry's irregular appetite took over, Fisher's opposition to the divorce 'gradually effaced the recollection of his merit and services',⁵⁰ and Henry 'embraced with pleasure this opportunity of humbling the spirit, or punishing the resistance of his former monitor'.⁵¹ Appetite begets tyr any. All this language of 'parent', 'grandson' and 'monitor', is intended to bring the reader to see Fisher as a proper judge in any of Henry's doings, even that of the question of the divorce. Henry becomes in this account a spoilt and wilful child:

That veneration that he formerly bore the aged prelate, seemed now to be changed into the most unrelenting hatred. Not content with the execution of Fisher, he ordered the dead body to be stripped and exposed for some hours to the gaze of the populace.⁵²

That kind of speculation Lingard was prepared to indulge when writing of Anne Boleyn's alleged guilt and the lack of trial papers is abjured in favour of a set of tolling phrases which rebuke all petty interest in the proceedings against a man for whom 'neither innocence nor eloquence could avert his fate',⁵³ as Lingard remarks in one of his asides of psychological privilege. The account is replete with appropriate gravitas:

48. Ibid., p.207.

49. Ibid., p.208.

50. Ibid.

51. Ibid.

52. Ibid., p.218.

53. Ibid., p.220

Of the trial of Fisher we know only that he was accused of having maliciously said that the king was not head of the church: that he was found guilty on the depositions of the men who had been sent by the council to discuss with him the question of the supremacy: and that he received the usual judgement in cases of treason.⁵⁴

It is of interest to compare Lingard's account with that Hume gave of the same events in his history:

John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, was a prelate eminent for learning and morals, still more for the high favour which he long enjoyed with the king. When he was thrown into prison on account of his refusing the oath which regarded the succession, and his concealment of Elizabeth Barton's treasonable speeches, he had not only been deprived of all his revenues but stripped of his very clothes, and without consideration of his extreme age, he was allowed nothing but rags, which scarcely sufficed to cover his nakedness. In this condition he lay in prison about a twelve-month; when the pope, willing to recompense the suffering of so faithful an adherent, created him a cardinal; though Fisher was so indifferent about that dignity, that even if the purple were lying at his feet, he declared that he would not stoop to take it.⁵⁵

In both versions of Fisher's character and conduct, he is portrayed as a good man in degrading circumstances. But while Lingard has made of Fisher's final nakedness a spectacle of a christian martyr in the image of Christ upon the Cross, Hume has taken the stripped Fisher as a sign of human integrity, a man living in such justice that he could not need papal robes to cover him. Hume has found a human sympathy in Fisher, and it is remarkable that Lingard, having discovered the mediaeval men and women to be so immediately affecting, should have been content to reduce the

54. Ibid., p.217.

55. Hume's Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.III, p.115.

individuality of Fisher to such a commonplace of piety. It is the more remarkable that he should be so content once Hume had shown the possibilities of Fisher for present moral meditation.

However that may be, Lingard took every opportunity to bring such an imitatio Christi to mind when he came to describe the king's dealings with Thomas More. Of course he had great scope for such an interpretation of events. The opening of his description of More's trial is designed to place the accused in just the position of Christ before Pilate. The one who should have authority in the court is the prisoner at the bar. And this scene leads into one which has several aspects of the via dolorosa:

After the condemnation, but before the execution of Fisher, Sir Thomas More was placed a prisoner at the bar of that court, in which he had formerly presided as judge with universal applause. To make the greater impression, he was conducted on foot through the most frequented streets, from the Tower to Westminster hall. He appeared in a coarse woollen gown: his hair, which had lately become grey, his face which, though cheerful, was pale and emaciated, and the staff, with which he supported his feeble steps, announced the length and rigour of his confinement: and a general feeling of horror and sympathy ran through the spectators.⁵⁶

The details of More's physical condition, are calculated both to excite a natural sympathy for the accused and to suggest in whose image the enfeebled More is walking through the streets. If there is any reader who is not brought by this description to accuse Henry of unnatural injustice and of unchristian violence, Lingard has missed his purpose. The apologetic is perfectly managed here. And Lingard seizes the opportunity with More, which he had strangely missed with Fisher, to present a humanly attractive, modest, loyal English catholic:

He met his fate with constancy, even with cheerfulness. When he was told that the King, as a special favour, had commuted his

56. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.IV, p.218.

punishment to decapitation, "God," he replied, "preserve all my friends from such favours." On the scaffold the executioner asked his forgiveness. He kissed him saying: "Thou wilt render me today the greatest service in the power of any mortal: but (putting an angel into his hand) my neck is so short that I fear thou wilt gain little credit in the way of thine profession." As he was not permitted to address the spectators, he contented himself with declaring that he died a faithful subject to the King, and a true catholic before God.⁵⁷

Hume had seen as clearly as Lingard the attractiveness of More's character and the wonder of his final jocularly, but he was not as anxious to allow such a trait of individual character to persuade others that they might find something to admire in the generality of the Roman church. He shifted the wonder from the misguided papist to the honest man:

Nothing was wanting to the glory of this end, except a better cause, more free from weakness, and superstition. But as the man followed his principles and sense of duty, however misguided, his constancy and integrity are not less the objects of our admiration.⁵⁸

Hume was evidently anxious to separate More's admirable behaviour from his deplorable superstition. Lingard's account of More insists on the unity in one man of loyalty to the king and devotion to catholicism. Thus More may become not simply the object of peculiar catholic veneration but an example to the whole of English society acceptable according to the declared principles of the establishment.

By attempting such extreme presentations of these two English, catholic, heroes at a time when readers would be more likely to recognize their christomorphic character than perhaps now, Lingard ran the risk of inviting a more sensitive regard of his treatment of every other important sixteenth century catholic figure. Readers might be made already suspicious of what for example, he was going to say of

57. Ibid.

58. Hume's Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.III, p.115.

Gardiner? Foxe was plain in his dislike of Gardiner: 'as he was of a cruel nature, so was he no less of a subtle and crafty wit'.⁵⁹ So too was the protestant Gilbert Burnet. His history of the Reformation is unequivocal in its distaste for Gardiner:

But the king was resolved to let all his subjects see there was no mercy to be expected by any that denied his being supreme head of the church; and therefore made him (Fisher) and More two examples for terrifying the rest. This being much censured beyond the sea, Gardiner, that was never wanting in the most servile compliances, wrote a vindication of the King's proceedings.⁶⁰

Hume shared these sentiments. Discussing Mary I's religious policy he felt it entirely appropriate to snipe at Gardiner:

the severe manners of Gardiner inclined him to support by persecution that religion which at the bottom he regarded with great indifference.⁶¹

The general reputation of Gardiner for 'crafty wit', 'servile compliances' and 'indifference', therefore, created a problem for any who would attempt a defence of Gardiner and his proceedings. And Gardiner's notoriety as a Roman catholic persecutor in Mary's reign made it imperative for any with Lingard's apologetic purpose to find new ways of talking about Gardiner.

Lingard dealt with this difficult situation with some skill. There is scarcely a mention of that de Vera Obedientia of which Burnet made so much. Rather we observe Lingard turning from Gardiner's particular writings and endeavours to the general theme of catholic loyalty to the crown and devotion to the national interest. Those who identified Gardiner with the Spanish party in the reign of Mary I must have got a shock at Lingard's account of Gardiner's activity in that period:

The emperor from Brussels, and the imperial faction in the council, strongly urged the expediency of bringing her (Princess Elizabeth) to

59. Foxe, J., Book of Martyrs (n.d), p.118.

60. Burnet, G., Reformation, vol.I, pt.I, p.709. (1829 ed.)

61. Hume's Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.III, p.335.

trial and execution: she was saved by the firmness of one, who has been often, but falsely, described as thirsting for her blood. Gardiner, while he pleaded the cause of Elizabeth and Courtenay, acknowledged that both had been privy to the design of the rebels; that they would willingly have accepted the crown, had the insurrection proved successful; and that they both deserved punishment for the treason which they had cherished in their hearts: but he contended that they had not implicated themselves by any overt act; that there was no sufficient evidence to include them within the letter of the law.⁶²

It might surprise a protestant reader that Gardiner was in this matter presenting an opposition to the wishes of Mary I with whom he was traditionally regarded as enjoying a close relationship. By presenting so friendly a portrait of the controversial Gardiner, Lingard was undoubtedly playing a dangerous game. If he failed to convince his readers of Gardiner's care for the princess Elizabeth in this incident, he would merely have encouraged their view of Mary as a persecuting catholic for no gain at all. But he evidently felt that he had to risk something and that he could make good Mary's reputation once he had secured some moderation of general protestant distaste for Gardiner. So he endeavours to show that Elizabeth and Courtenay, who were high favourites of contemporary protestants' mythology had, in all probability, behaved traitorously, and then to present Gardiner as the one man at Mary's court urging clemency on their behalf:

His enemies grasped at the opportunity to ruin him in the estimation of the queen. They objected that he still retained his former partiality for Courtenay and his adherents: that he had secretly sent instructions to the earl to prepare him for examination: and that he had refused to hear witnesses, who would have clearly established the guilt, both of that nobleman and of Elizabeth. Though Mary was irritated against the two prisoners, she was willing to listen to reason. Gardiner convinced her

62. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.V, p.59.

that he had been faithful in the discharge of his duty, and was correct in his exposition of the law: she compelled Paget, his chief adversary, to ask him pardon: and the next day Elizabeth was released from the Tower.⁶³

Gardiner having put himself in some danger on behalf of Elizabeth, but still 'faithful in the discharge of his duty',⁶⁴ is presented as a catholic loyal to the English monarchy, assisting his queen to hear reason, observe law and practise mercy. Lingard must have confirmed Gardiner in the sympathy of all English readers by his remarking that his death 'was hailed with joy by the French ambassador'.⁶⁵

Lingard's account of the deaths of these several Tudor notables establishes each Roman catholic to have been a man of humour and piety, and if Gardiner cannot be made a saint he can certainly be reckoned a man of pleasant virtue:

During his illness he edified all around him by his piety and resignation, often observing, "I have sinned with Peter, but have not yet learned to weep bitterly with Peter." By his will he bequeathed all his property to his royal mistress, with a request that she should pay his debts, and provide for his servants. It proved but an inconsiderable sum; though his enemies had accused him of having amassed between thirty and forty thousand pounds.⁶⁶

There is a nice contrast of the impecunious Gardiner and the wealthy manners of Somerset and his associates whose zeal for reformation 'was the more active, as it was stimulated by the prospect of reward'. Though these protestant champions 'were the depositaries of the sovereign authority, they had yet to make their private fortunes; and for that purpose looked with eagerness to the possessions of the church, from which, though much had been torn during the havoc of the last reign, much still remained to be gleaned'.⁶⁷

63. Ibid.

64. Ibid., p.60.

65. Ibid., p.106.

66. Ibid.

67. Ibid., vol. IV, p.384.

If the guardians of Edward VI made poor figures in comparison with Gardiner in their lust for money, that princess whom Gardiner laboured to save from execution made a poor figure in comparison with him in her confrontation with death; Lingard is alert to every element of the scene of Elizabeth's dying moments which will discredit the queen and lessen her stature in the reader's eye:

Elizabeth now spent her days and nights in sighs and tears: or, if she condescended to speak, she always chose some unpleasant and irritating subject; the treason and execution of Essex, or the pretensions of Arabella Stuart, or the war in Ireland, and the pardon of Tyrone.⁶⁸

After portraying Elizabeth as wandering amongst memories and expectations of fearful kind, Lingard points to her greatest fear:

As soon as she recovered, she ordered cushions to be brought and spread on the floor. On these she seated herself, under a strange notion, that if she were once to lie down in bed, she would never rise again.⁶⁹

No humorous remark of christian wit, no kindly thought for those around her, no careful consideration of guilt or debt, simply the selfish and absurd anxiety not to lie down in the face of the inevitable.

Such a death scene is presented at the end of a reign that Lingard has hoped to narrate in ways that will enable his readers to make a general reevaluation of the queen in the hope that they will thus be readied to entertain new notions of those who opposed her and who had by their opposition earned continuing protestant enmity. And he made the same apologetic effort at a management of history in his narratives of Ridley, Latimer and Cranmer, being clearly intent on diminishing their protestant fame. Ridley is introduced as a clergyman who conformed 'to the theological caprice of the monarch', but who, on the accession of Edward, 'openly avowed his sentiments'.⁷⁰ That a vacillating conformism and ultimate acknowledgement occurs at the close of Ridley's career:

68. Ibid., vol. V, p.611.

69. Ibid.

70. Ibid., p.88.

there (in the Tower) he (Ridley) had the weakness to betray his conscience by conforming to the ancient worship: but his apostacy was severely lashed by the pen of Bradford; and Ridley, by his speedy repentance and subsequent resolution, consoled and edified his afflicted brethren.⁷¹

In this mean description the distasteful image of a fickle personality is hardly compensated by the return to the language of a resolution and edified apostacy. The account as a whole does not suggest that Ridley was a man of unswerving principle. A similar point is made in Lingard's very opening remarks about Latimer who, 'at the commencement of his career, displayed little of that strength of mind, or that stubbornness of opinion, which we expect to find in the man, who aspires to the palm of martyrdom'.⁷² Offering 'stubbornness of opinion' as the proper alternative to 'strength of mind' in this case, Lingard had already quite effectively besmirched Latimer. He goes on to suggest that the protestant had never been even stubborn in an opinion:

He first attracted notice by the violence of his declamations against Melancthon and the German reformers then professed himself their disciple and advocate; and ended by publicly renouncing their doctrine, at the commencement of Cardinal Wolsey. Two years had not elapsed, before he was accused of re-asserting what he had abjured. The archbishop excommunicated him for contumacy; and a tardy but reluctant abjuration saved him from the stake. Again he relapsed; but appealed from the bishops to the king. Henry rejected the appeal; and Latimer on his knees acknowledged his error, craved pardon of the convocation, and promised amendment.⁷³

71. Ibid., p.89.

72. Ibid.

73. Ibid.

Lingard wishes to present Latimer as someone who bowed to political pressure whenever religion demanded a sacrifice of courtly comfort. This view of him is reinforced when he introduces Latimer's worldly protectors:

He had, however, powerful friends at court, Butts the king's physician, Cromwell the vicar general, and Anne Boleyn the queen consort. By the last he was retained as chaplain.⁷⁴

To political wisdom Latimer added a politically useful scurrility: 'Henry heard him preach; and, delighted with the coarseness of his invectives against the papal authority, gave him the bishopric of Worcester'.⁷⁵ Lingard describes Latimer's language as 'seasoned with quaint conceits, low jests and buffoonery'.⁷⁶ And to these he added a not quite great enough subtlety:

he was cautious not to offend by too open an avowal of his opinions: but the debate on the six articles, put his orthodoxy to the test; and with Cranmer he ventured to oppose the doctrine, but had not the good fortune of Cranmer to lull the suspicion of the royal theologian.⁷⁷

The unsavoury tone of the accounts concerning Ridley and Latimer, however, pale in comparison with that of Cranmer. Lingard takes every opportunity to depict the archbishop as a weak and political individual. At several moments of the last part of the account of Cranmer he is shown to be as unstubborn as any other of the protestant martyrs; after seeing Ridley and Latimer led to execution 'his resolution began to waver';⁷⁸ he then 'let fall some hints of a willingness to relent',⁷⁹ and then the intelligence of Roman sentence awakened the terrors of the archbishop, who 'had not the fortitude to look death in the face'.⁸⁰ Lingard is unrelenting in his account:

74. Ibid.

75. Ibid.

76. Ibid., p.90.

77. Ibid., p.89.

78. Ibid., p.92.

79. Ibid.

80. Ibid., p.93.

To save his life he feigned himself a convert to the established creed; openly condemned his past delinquency; and stifling the remorse of his conscience, in seven successive instruments abjured the faith which he had taught, and approved of that which he opposed.⁸¹

The reader may well have a sense of that fear which Lingard wished him to think motivated Cranmer's actions and, furthermore, he may well suppose that he would not himself have held out in such a situation. But then, human as such wavering would be, it is something a martyr would not do. He would certainly not stifle 'the remorse of his conscience'. Lingard does not let up: 'He had undoubtedly flattered himself that this humble tone, these expressions of remorse, these cries for mercy, would move the heart of the queen'. And the queen is certain deceived: 'She indeed, little suspecting the dissimulation which had dictated them'. So were others. 'Entertaining no suspicion of his sincerity, Garcina submitted to his consideration a paper, which he advised him to read at the stake, as a public testimony of his repentance'. Cranmer is always ready to act in character: 'Cranmer having dissembled for so long, resolved to carry on the deception'.⁸² If the reader turned back, at this point, to compare the accounts of the deaths Wolsey, Fisher and More with that Lingard provides of Cranmer's execution he would have seen Lingard's Roman catholic bias quite plainly. Lingard's account minimises the pain of the punishment ordered by the catholic party: 'His sufferings were short; the flames rapidly ascended above his head; and he expired in a few moments'.⁸³ Lingard manages a final sentence which seems to establish himself as a careful and even-handed historian:

The catholics consoled their disappointment by invectives against his sincerity and falsehood; the protestants defended his memory by maintaining that his constancy at the stake had atoned for his apostacy in the prison.⁸⁴

81. Ibid.

82. Ibid., p.95

83. Ibid., p.97.

84. Ibid.

But Lingard's bias here is suggested by a comparison with Hume's account of the same event:

He was thence led to the stake, amidst the insults of the Catholics: and having now summoned up all the force of his mind, he bore their scorn, as well as the torture of his punishment, with singular fortitude. He stretched out his hand, and, without betraying, either by his countenance or motions, the least sign of weakness, or even of feeling, he held it to the flames till it was entirely consumed. His thoughts seemed wholly occupied with reflections on his former fault, and he called aloud several times, This hand has offended! Satisfied with that atonement, he then discovered a serenity in his countenance; and when the fire attacked his body, he seemed to be quite insensible of his outward sufferings, and, by the force of hope and resolution, to have collected his mind altogether within itself, and to repel the fury of the flames.⁸⁵

Hume is evidently impressed with Cranmer, attributing to him a variety of what Hume reckoned to be superior qualities:

He was undoubtedly a man of merit; possessed of learning and capacity, and adorned with candour, sincerity and beneficence, and all those virtues which were fitted to render him useful and amiable in society. His moral qualities procured him universal respect; and the courage of his martyrdom, though he fell short of the rigid inflexibility observed in many, made him the hero of the Protestant party.⁸⁶

The courage which Hume attributes to Cranmer adds its weight to the view that he was sincerely attached to his protestant principles. That is in complete contrast to Lingard's account which dismisses the scene of Cranmer's burning as quickly as possible. Its poignancy would inevitably confer sympathy upon Cranmer and his views. The final sentence of Hume's account, acknowledging that 'he fell short of the rigid

85. Hume's Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.III, p.439.

86. Ibid., p.440.

inflexibility observed in many', treats Cranmer's recantation as something with which ordinary sensible men may sympathize, nothing 'fanatical' about the archbishop.

For the first time, however, a reader might suspect that there was something fanatical about Lingard. What Lingard himself wishes a reader to think of Cranmer comes to clearest expression in his comment that 'His political offences it was said, might have been overlooked, but he had been the cause of schism in the reign of Henry, and the author of the change in religion in the reign of Edward'.⁸⁷ Protestant religious offences are as heinous to Lingard as to Mary I. Like those who ruled England at that time, Lingard made a distinction between political and religious offences, and like Mary's advisers, Lingard regarded Cranmer's religious activities as warrant for his burning. And he has no horror at what was going on at the burning of Ridley and Cranmer:

It is said that the spectators were reconciled to these horrors, by the knowledge that every attempt had been previously made to save the victims from the stake.⁸⁸

Lingard, remarking that 'it is said', distances himself from the burning of the archbishop. But this mean remark does seem to imply a view that the Reformers' adherence to their principles was a trifle peevish, and even that they brought their burning on themselves. It raises the ugly question whether Lingard was generally interested in the sincere exercise of religious principles, or whether he was indeed concerned for catholic interests only and wholly indifferent to any exercise of protestant principles.

Having observed Lingard's treatment of protestant martyrs, a way to answer the question of how Lingard regarded other men's religious principles, may be deduced from an analysis of his account of one who might be taken for a catholic martyr. His intention to treat catholic persons in the history as loyal to the monarchy and constitution, and not a threat to the protestant establishment, made

87. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.V, p.93.

88. Ibid., p.92

Mary queen of Scots a person to be treated very carefully. All the while Lingard was mindful of that protestant hatred, in the present as in the past, of the papal sanction of assassination as a lawful weapon against a heretic ruler, which conditioned their view of the Roman catholic who was thought to have attempted to have made just such an attempt in the pope's name and favour.

The Scottish queen was a Roman catholic, imprisoned by Elizabeth for twenty years lest she instigate a catholic revolution, and it was but general protestant opinion that John Strype expressed in his Annals of the Reformation when he wrote of 'the imminent danger the whole nation was in, as well as the queen's life and safety',⁸⁹ by Babington's plot. Hume was almost equally sure that Elizabeth was right to distrust the Roman catholic Mary:

while her impatience of confinement, her revenge, and her high spirit concurred with religious zeal, and the suggestions of desperate bigots, she was at last engaged in designs which afforded her enemies, who watched the opportunity, a pretence or reason for effecting her final ruin.⁹⁰

Clearly any attempt by Lingard to attempt to engage sympathy for a person judged a traitor by the English protestants might be rather quickly recognized by his readers as a crude example of Roman catholic apologetic. That Lingard proceeded in the attempt to redeem the reputation of the catholic queen amongst protestants is evidence both of his eagerness to do something for catholicism in his time and of his confidence that he could manage this revision of history.

It was particularly in his account of the character of Walsingham, the discoverer of Babington's plot, that Lingard attempted to promote his view of Mary:

Morgan employed his time in meditating schemes of revenge; and for this purpose, sought out agents and associates in every part of England.

89. Strype, J., Annals, first published in 1709, the quotation is from the 1824 edition, vol.III, pt.1, p.537.

90. Hume's Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.IV, p.44.

But he was opposed by one more artful than himself, by the secretary, Walsingham, who corrupted the fidelity of his agents, supplied them with the means of correspondence, and secretly encouraged the intrigues of the Welshman, that he might connect the Scottish queen herself with the plot, and finally conduct his victim to the scaffold.⁹¹

and:

The next two agents whom Morgan employed, were Gifford and Greatly, two traitors, who had studied in the English seminaries, had taken orders, and had consented to become panders to the artful and intriguing secretary.⁹²

This explicit blackening of Walsingham and his activities, with the words 'corrupted', 'traitors' and 'panders', is particularly striking when comparison is made with Hume's estimate of Walsingham. Noting the charge that Walsingham forged letters to unfairly convict Mary, Hume observed that:

The great character, indeed, which Sir Francis Walsingham bears for probity and honour, should remove from him all suspicion of such base arts as forgery and subornation; arts which even the most corrupt ministers, in the most corrupt times, would scruple to employ.⁹³

There is not much of what is 'honourable' and a great deal of the 'base arts' in Lingard's portrayal of Walsingham. After he had inveigled Babington's colleagues in his system of counter-espionage we read of Walsingham:

That artful minister, while he smiled at the infatuation of the youths, who had thus entangled themselves in the toils, was busily employed in weaving a new intrigue, in planning the ruin of a more illustrious victim.⁹⁴

91. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.V, p.436.

92. Ibid.,p.437.

93. Hume's Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol. IV, p.58.

94. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.V, p.439.

At this point Lingard brings that high estimate he usually has of original documents into play. He is superbly distrustful of copies:

Of the real contents of these two letters there may be some doubt: by the copies, which were afterwards produced, Walsingham was able to implicate Mary with the conspirators, and to make her liable to the penalties of death.⁹⁵

Lingard is all the while hoping to persuade others to share his sympathy for the catholic queen by displaying the unscrupulous devices of the chief among those who were prosecuting Mary. Lingard is distracting attention from the question of Elizabeth's safety. And as the reader is brought to concentrate on the unhappiness of Walsingham's victim they may imperceptibly come to accept Lingard's version of Mary's involvement in the whole sorry business. Thus he details the restrictions on Mary's captivity, he even suggests that the opportunities she has of defending herself in court were rare and short and he makes a clear suggestion that she was bullied by the numbers of protestant lawyers:

A single and friendless female, ignorant of law, unpractised in judicial forms, without papers, or witnesses, or counsel, and with no other knowledge of the late transactions than could be collected within the walls of her prison, or of the proofs to be adduced by her adversaries than her own conjectures might afford, she could be no match for that array of lawyers which sat marshalled against her.⁹⁶

And in his account of Mary's final letter to Elizabeth, after her fate had been announced to her, Lingard was obviously reaching for as much sympathy for Mary as possible. He concluded: 'To this eloquent and affecting letter no answer was returned.'⁹⁷ This prepared the ground for readers to sympathize with Mary at her execution:

95. Ibid., p.440.

96. Ibid., p.445.

97. Ibid., p.454.

Beal, after a short preface, read aloud the warrant for the execution. Mary listened, without any change of countenance. Then, crossing herself, she bade them welcome: the day, she said, which she had long desired, had at last arrived: she had languished in prison near twenty years, useless to others, and a burthen to herself: nor could she conceive a termination to such a life more happy, or more honourable, than to shed her blood for her religion.⁹⁸

Lingard, evidently, thinks he need no longer hesitate in displaying his sympathy for so unhappy a lady. A decent protestant will by now be ready to weep for her, especially when she makes her protestation upon the New Testament:

She next enumerated the wrongs which she had suffered, the offers which she had made, and the artifices and frauds employed by her enemies; and in conclusion, placing her hand on a testament which lay on the table, "As for the death of the queen your sovereign, said she, "I call God to witness, that I never imagined it, never sought it, nor ever consented to it. ⁹⁹

A new theme emerges with the introduction of Mary's religion. Innocence and catholicism are united:

"This is not a time to weep but to rejoice. In a few hours you will see the end of my misfortunes. My enemies may now say what they please: but the earl of Kent has betrayed the secret, that my religion is the real cause of my death. Be then resigned, and leave me to my devotions."¹⁰⁰

Mary is now a martyr for her religion, Lingard is now the overt supporter of this Roman catholic heroine. Bishop Milner must have been pleased. The debate with the protestantism of the 'Fanatical earl of Kent' is conducted not about Elizabeth's right to reign but a version of the New Testament. By effecting this account Mary had been

98. Ibid., p.460.

99. Ibid.

100. Ibid.

drawn far from Babington's plot by Lingard. Lingard has drawn Mary out of the political sphere, the woman executed on the charge of seeking to murder Elizabeth is forgotten, as Mary is presented as a religious martyr. Lingard altogether ignores that question of Mary's political threat to the English queen which had occupied earlier historians. If readers did indeed find this to be a convincing account of Walsingham, Mary, and Elizabeth Lingard had helped his church immensely. What Lingard is doing in this passage is highlighted if we contrast his description with that of William Robertson's in his History of Scotland.¹⁰¹ The oath is merely incidental to the scene, Mary simply 'laying her hand on a Bible, which happened to be near her'. Robertson does not wish to make this a matter of religion. Of the final moment of the story Robertson wrote:

The executioner held it (Mary's head) up still streaming with blood, and the dean crying out, "So perish all queen Elizabeth's enemies," the earl of Kent alone answered "Amen." The rest of the spectators continued silent and drowned in tears; being incapable, at that moment, of any other sentiments but those of pity or admiration.¹⁰²

But Lingard presents this religious confrontation:

When the executioner held it (the head) up, the muscles of the face were so strongly convulsed, that the features could not be recognized. He cried as usual "God save queen Elizabeth."

"So perish all her enemies!" subjoined the dean of Peterborough.

"So perish all the enemies of the gospel!" exclaimed in a still louder tone, the fanatical earl of Kent.

Not a voice was heard to cry amen. Party feeling was absorbed in admiration and pity.¹⁰³

If Lingard was indeed conforming the deaths of Fisher and More to that of Christ, then he may also, in the reference to the unrecognizability of Mary's features, be

101. Robertson, W., History of Scotland, 1759, from the works of Robertson, with a life of the author by the Rev. R. Lynam, 1826.

102. Ibid., p.103.

103. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol. V, p.468.

suggesting that in her death she was like that disfigured Servant of Isaiah 52.14 who seemed to the evangelists and others in the early christian communities to be a prefigure of their crucified lord.

J.B. Black in his Reign of Elizabeth¹⁰⁴ suggests that once Mary felt her execution to be inevitable she contrived to die in the role of a religious martyr.¹⁰⁵ It could be that Lingard anticipated Black in this and delighted to use the machinery that Mary offered him regardless of whether he actually believed her to be innocent, sincere in religion, and martyred. The full extent of Lingard's efforts to portray the queen of Scots as a good catholic however foolish as a politician occurs in a note at the back of the volume:

I do not think that the charge against the Scottish queen carries with it any great appearance of improbability. It is very possible that a woman who had suffered an unjust imprisonment of twenty years, and was daily harassed with the fear of assassination, might conceive it lawful to preserve her own life and liberty by the death of her oppressor. But the real question is, not what she might have thought, but whether she actually gave her consent and approbation to the scheme of murder, submitted to her in the name of Babington.¹⁰⁶

Lingard passes from this sympathetic psycho-analysis of Mary, to the adoption of the stance of the impartial historian:

It must be confessed that her accusers made out apparently a strong case against her. They produced the copy of a letter, said to have been written by her order, in which she approved of the projected assassination; the confession of Babington that he received such a letter with her signature; and the attestations of her secretaries, that they had written such a letter by her command.

104. Black, J.B., Reign of Elizabeth, 1936.

105. Ibid., p.333.

106. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.V, p.657, n.Z.

When, however, we recollect the artful manner in which Walsingham had conducted the whole intrigue, and the disadvantages under which the Scottish queen laboured at her trial, we shall see abundant reason to doubt the validity of this proof.¹⁰⁷

Lingard then proceeds to list eight reasons to doubt it, among them Mary's consistent denial of the approbation of murder, even on oath, the fact that the original letter was never produced, that Mary kept rough copies of her letters but none was found of the letter of Babington, and his belief that to unravel the mystery Nau and Curle should have been confronted with her. This last matter was a useful mystery for him. Elizabeth had ordered them to attend, the ministers kept them back; Lingard concludes: 'There was something in the business, which Walsingham was conscious would not bear the light'.¹⁰⁸ Lingard is using that argument from silence that he had found so useful in the dismissal of Anne Boleyn and the enhancement of Fisher.

A comparison with Hume's summing up of the event reveals Lingard's determined apologetic purpose:

Her reply consisted chiefly in her own denial: whatever force may be in that denial was much weakened by her positively affirming, that she never had any correspondence of any kind with Babington; a fact, however, of which there remains not the least question.¹⁰⁹

Hume, too, has his footnote:

The volume of State Papers, collected by Murden, prove beyond controversy, that Mary was long in close correspondence with Babington, p513.516.532.533. She entertained a like correspondence with Ballard, Morgan and Charles Paget, and laid a scheme with them for an insurrection and for the invasion of England by Spain, p528.531. The same papers show, that there had been a discontinuance of Babington's

107. Ibid.

108. Ibid.

109. Hume's Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., p.56.

correspondence, agreeable to Camden's narration. See State Papers, p513, where Morgan recommends it to Queen Mary to renew her correspondence with Babington. These circumstances prove, that no weight can be laid on Mary's denial of guilt.¹¹⁰

And Hume has his uses for the argument from the silence of the sources. He takes a reliable man's view of the interests of the State:

Her correspondence with Babington contained particulars which could not be avowed.¹¹¹

When treating Campion, who was more generally than Mary Queen of Scots taken to be a catholic martyr Lingard may on the evidence of earlier elements in his writing be expected to use quite a different tone from that he employed when treating Cranmer. Campion's reputation amongst catholics was immense and he was equally known to protestants as a signally traitorous Roman catholic.¹¹² From

110. Ibid., p.657, n.G.

111. Ibid.

112. Strype, for example, wrote:

Concerning this Campion, I have one thing more to add, which a learned man that lived in that very time related of him: there were despatched into the realm, under the conduction of one more presumptuous than learned, (meaning this Jesuit) a whole swarm of boy-priests, disguised, and provided at all assays with secret instructions how to deal with all sorts of men and matters here; (in England) and, with commissions from Rome, to confess and absolve such as they should win, with a pretence or policy, to mislike the state, and affect novelty; and to take assurance of them by vow, oath, or other means, that they should be ever after adherent and obedient to the church of Rome, and to the faith thereof, &c. Religion sounded often in their mouths, and the faith of their fathers. And yet that passion they carried covertly in their hearts, and cunningly in their books; that her majesty's beguiled and deceived subjects, by the very sentence of their Romish faith and absolutism, were tied to obey the pope, depriving her majesty of the sword and sceptre, and bound to assist him, or whom he should send, to take the same by force of arms out of their hands.

Strype Op.cit., vol.III, Pt.1, p.53.

Lingard's first mention of Campion we may discern an attempt to undermine any view that he arrived in England from Rome with treasonable intentions. This, he says, is an old invention:

It was believed, or at least pretended, that they had come with the same traitorous object as Sanders, who in the preceding year had animated the insurgents in Ireland to oppose the Authority of the sovereign:¹¹³

Lingard will have nothing to do with the view that Campion was guilty of political offences. All is religion. Campion is to be regarded as a christian missionary against whom unfounded charges have been made. Campion was the victim of some premeditated plot. Any device would suffice in order to catch the government's prey. The overriding impression given by Lingard's introduction to this part of the story is that whatever Campion actually did in England the government was determined to arrest him from the beginning. And equally determined that he should be charged with false accusations of political activity. Lingard's boldness must not be underestimated here. Lightly avoiding any reference to Campion being a Jesuit, which would have aroused especial prejudices in a protestant reader's mind, Lingard insists on the absolute invention of political offence in Campion's behaviour:

At length Campion, twelve other priests and one layman, collected from different prisons, were arranged in two separate bodies. They had come prepared to profess their religious belief; to their astonishment they were indicted for a conspiracy to murder the queen, to overthrow the church and state, and to withdraw the subjects from the allegiance due to the sovereign. Even the particulars were specified; the places,

Hume's account conveyed no doubt that Campion had been a traitor:

Campion was afterwards detected in treasonable practices; and being put to the rack, and confessing his guilt, he was publicly executed.

Hume's Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol. IV, p.8.

113. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol. V., p.379.

Rome and Rheims; the time, the months of March and April in the preceding year; and their very journies from Rheims to England, supposed to have been begun on the 8th of May last.¹¹⁴

Lingard has his comment ready. Both the general charge and the particular details are brusquely rebutted:

It is not difficult to account for the surprise of the prisoners. Several among them had never visited Rheims or Rome in their lives: some had not even seen each other before they met at the bar.¹¹⁵

Lingard's own view of the matter is contained in a simple reflection, which entirely parallels his view of the Mary Queen of Scots matter:

They declared, that whatever might be pretended, their religion was their only offence.¹¹⁶

It is an instructive exercise to recall to mind, at the intimations of sympathy here, and the unquestioning repetition of the accused's assertion that it was their religious principles alone that cost them their lives, the manner in which Lingard had dealt with Ridley and Latimer. Lingard is, it begins to appear, anxious that catholics be esteemed to be martyrs but determined to prevent a like honour being given to protestants. Answers of a tentative kind may now be made to those questions provoked by his account of Cranmer's burning. First, the general notion of a human being's accepting that his principles must be defended even to the shedding of his blood does not seem to be of any real interest to Lingard. Secondly, Lingard is evidently capable of writing a history animated by a dislike of the protestant religion

114. Ibid., p.381. Lingard spelled Campion with two 'a's. The spelling of Persons name affected him similarly as is shown in a letter to Joseph Gillow (undated):

Mr. C. Butler in his memoirs says that we should write Father Persons not Parsons. I know he called himself Personius in Latin: but how did he subscribe his name in his letters? There must be letters of his in English and Stonyhurst. Could not you procure for me the information of the manner in which his name is spelt in them?

Lingard to Gillow, Correspondence A.S.G.C., contained in an edition of Dodd's Church History of England, reference number 106.

115. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.V., p.382.

116. Ibid.

that he is oblivious, whether deliberately so or not is probably indeterminable, of the courageous virtue of a fellow human being. He is prepared to be, at least on occasion, not much more or less than a sectarian apologist. There is something in all this which goes quite against that sense of a humanity he shared with all sorts of men and women in our history which was making its appearance in the latter part of his account of mediaeval events and characters.

There is something, too, in this writing that goes ill with the appeal Lingard is making to the reader's nineteenth century sense of reasonable behaviour. Only when it is a Roman catholic who is on trial does Lingard declare that 'the report of their trial must convince every man of their innocence'.¹¹⁷ Lingard is sure that the reader will share his stated belief that matters should be judged according to their evidences. In saying that 'Campian, Sherwin and Brizot were selected for execution',¹¹⁸ Lingard attributes their deaths to a tyrannical determination to disregard that sense of justice which his readers hold in esteem. This appeal to a sense of fair play is continued in a note at the back of the volume. This begins with a clear statement of uncomfortable facts:

Campian and Persons had obtained from Gregory XIII a declaration that that part of the bull of Pius V which forbade any person to pay obedience to Elizabeth, should not bind the English catholics in existing circumstances, or till the sentence should be put in execution (Camden, 348. Philopater, 169.).¹¹⁹

Lingard then acknowledges the ease with which such a situation may be misjudged:

From this it was inferred, with some appearance of reason, that both missionaries admitted the deposing power; and that, in an attempt to enforce the bull, they would join the enemies of the queen.¹²⁰

117. Ibid.

118. Ibid., p.383.

119. Ibid., p.652, n.v.

120. Ibid.

But then Lingard enters a plea for a suspension of juried judgement while the difficult position in which these catholics were placed is elucidated and their patriotic devotion to Elizabeth unveiled:

It is, however, fair to hear what they and their friends said in their behalf; that they disapproved of the bull; and would have procured its revocation, if it had been possible; but, according to the custom of the court of Rome, no censure could be revoked, except at the petition of the party censured. They endeavoured, therefore, to do the only thing in their power; they procured it to be mitigated in the manner mentioned above; and they trusted that in this, they had done an acceptable service to the queen.¹²¹

What must be acknowledged as reasonable and fair has been performed by Campion as a loyal assistance to his queen. By relating of what 'their friends said', Lingard distances Campion from the deposing doctrine and himself from the professedly apologetic position. The reader, while being given little help to see the matter plain is asked to make a plain man's assessment of what was going on.

The account Lingard gave of Campion's meeting with the queen also suggests that he thought it possible to place Campion as at least as loyal to the monarch as to the pope:

She asked him if he acknowledged her for queen. He replied, not only for queen, but for his lawful queen. She then inquired, if he believed that the pope could excommunicate her lawfully. He answered that he was not sufficient umpire to decide in a controversy between her majesty and the pope. It was a question which divided the best divines in christendom. In his own opinion, if the pope were to excommunicate her, it might be insufficient, as he might err. By his ordinary power, he could not excommunicate princes. Whether he could by that power, which he

121. Ibid.

sometimes exercised in extraordinary emergencies, was a difficult and doubtful question, to which some persons had answered in the affirmative.¹²²

Campion's suggesting that the excommunication 'might be insufficient' and his unforced admission that the pope 'might err', could not be construed as robust affirmations of the doctrine that heretical monarchs could be lawfully assassinated. It may be that not every Roman catholic would delight in Campion's opinion or agree with Lingard's presentation of the case but Lingard has presented them with a martyr who could be counted among ultramontanists. He then returns to an assertion with which the greater number of his co-religionists would agree. Politically Campion and his fellows had done nothing wrong. Everyone knew it at the time:

The innocence of the sufferers as to the treason for which they had been condemned, was believed by numbers. Their death was attributed to hatred of their religion; and, to relieve the government from the odium of persecution, lord Burleigh published a tract, entitled; "The execution of justice for maintenance of public and christian peace against the stirrers of sedition, &c."¹²³

At this point Lingard has located the origin of that lengthy protestant tradition in which Campion was traduced as a traitor. Burleigh's tract is the fons et origo of that mishandling of history as propaganda. In an attempt at redressing the balance of propaganda Lingard produced a catholic source, which disputed what Lingard perceived was Burleigh's claim that 'all were spared, who were willing to renounce their treasons':¹²⁴

Dr. Allen replied by "A true, sincere, and modest defence of christian catholics, that suffered for their faith at home and abroad, &c." It was easy for him to show, that many had been put to death, to whom no other treason had been objected, but that of exercising the

122. Ibid., p.381.

123. Ibid., p.653, n.v.

124. Ibid.

functions of the priesthood; and that thousands had been fined, imprisoned and despoiled of all their property, for no other offence but the practice of religious worship.¹²⁵

Lingard was anxious to clear the reputation of Campion. He seems to have thought him a sympathetic character. He did not, it is clear from the History, have anything of this anxiety or supposition of sympathy when he came to consider Fr. Persons. Indeed that Lingard himself was not entirely free of that anti-Jesuit feeling which he lamented in Burleigh's dealings with Campion is suggested at several places in his correspondence. Haile and Bonney noted that while negotiations were proceeding in 1817 for the appointment of a new Rector of the English College in Rome that Lingard urged 'secrecy and despatch' in his letter to Dr. Poynter expressing his fears that before any president arrived in Rome 'either Dr. Milner or the Jesuit will obtain some information respecting the business, and endeavour to thwart us'.¹²⁶ In the event Lingard's friend Robert Gradwell was appointed. In Gradwell's first years as Rector attempts were made at Rome and elsewhere to put the college into Jesuit hands, and on April 18th 1818, having evidently received news of the final establishment of Gradwell's position Lingard wrote to him: 'I cannot refrain from congratulating you on your late triumph over the attempts of your opponents', adding that it was 'a circumstance which has afforded me as much satisfaction as I ever experienced'.¹²⁷ Lingard could not, however, even after this

125. Ibid.

126. Quoted in Haile and Bonney, Op.cit., p.151. Lingard was particularly sharp in his criticism of the Jesuits when corresponding with Tierney. The latter was researching for an edition of Dodd's Church History of England during the 1830's and 40's. Lingard believed the jesuits would not like it. He wrote to Tierney April 9th 1840:

I hope you are getting forward in defiance of theological, or rather, religious bigotry.

Lingard to Tierney, Correspondence A.S.J., Tierney Papers, no.26.

127. Lingard to Gradwell, Correspondence A.V.E.C., Section One, no.3.

triumph, rid himself of the fear that the jesuits might take over the English college on the death in 1824 of Cardinal Consalvi, who had been sympathetic to Gradwell's aim:

I was attached to him on account of his kindness to me when in Rome, on account of his great talents, etc., and on account of his friendship to you and your establishment. What the consequences may be it is folly for me to predict. Whom will you have for protector?¹²⁸

He proposed that Gradwell thwart the jesuits, whom Lingard supposed to be plotting at Stonyhurst, by enlisting the Roman catholic bishop of England against some of the English partizans of jesuit influence:

Throw yourself on the protection of his Holiness. Will any attempt be made to your prejudice by my zealous neighbours in this county? I have no doubt you will be able to defeat them: much may be done I should think by gaining time, i.e., by requiring time if need be to consult the bishops.¹²⁹

That he could rely on at least some of the English bishops to use what influence they had against the jesuits had been evident in a quite different matter which had disturbed the Ushaw common room. He wrote, 19 May, 1818, to John Kirk:

I was lately at Durham. A letter, of which you will have heard, came from Cardinal Litta, saying that he understood the Bishop would not ordain jesuits, because the bull of restoration had not been officially notified to him. He therefore informed him it was the Pope's will that they should be restored everywhere, and consequently in England - which notification he hoped he would receive amico animo.¹³⁰

Lingard had jumped into dispute with alacrity. He was quite ready to treat with a cardinal on behalf of a bishop against the jesuits. He was ready, too, to assume an

128. Ibid., Section Three, no.24.

129. Ibid.

130. Quoted in Haile and Bonney, Op.cit., p.161.

expertise in the matter of the Roman catholic community's delicate accommodation with protestant society. In this instance, at least, Lingard thought himself a man of affairs:

I prevailed on the Bishop to let me write in his name to the Pope, to be presented by Gradwell, complaining that the Cardinal should decide on subjects of so much consequence to the English Catholics on the representations of interested individuals at Rome, (Grassi, Tempest, Weld) instead of consulting the bishops, the persons from whom he could get the best advice, and telling His Holiness that if it were known in parliament it would have bad consequences:¹³¹

It is not surprising, therefore, that Lingard did not make any great effort to present Persons, as he had Campion, as a loyal nationalist. He was not alone in being wary of this jesuit. In a letter to Lingard on 12 March 1818, Butler made a significant admission about the generality of English catholic clergy:

Talking to you confideny., I cannot help acknowledging that in the reign of Elizabeth some measure of rigour against the Caths. were excusable. The Depositing Doctrine appears to me to have (been) universally acknowledged by all Seminary Priests religious; and their influence over the general body of the Caths. was very great. The sentence of deposition had been sanctioned by 3 Popes, the King of Spain, by far the most powerful monarch of the time, was preparing to execute it. Under these circumstances some, strong precautions, were certainly. necessary.¹³²

He had gone on to single out Persons as making things more difficult both for his contemporary catholics and for the later catholic apologist:

The grounds of distrust were naturally increased by the intrigues of Father Parsons in Spain.¹³³

131. Ibid.

132. Butler to Lingard, Correspondence B.M., Letterbooks, 25,129 p.138.

133. Ibid.

Butler knew himself not to be alone among Roman catholics in making this judgement:

I think Mr. Berington is justified in calling him the calamity of the times.¹³⁴

Lingard was certainly at one with him in this judgement. He replied on 15th March 1818:

Of Father Parsons I never entertained any other opinion than that which you express.¹³⁵

He was confident that what he and Butler and Berington thought of the Society of Jesus was entirely congruent with what was thought by their predecessors among the Roman catholic clergy:

When the oath or rather form of oath printed in my 'documents' p. had been approved by Charles II it was submitted to the heads of all the religious orders in England except the Jesuit. In the minutes of the chapter it is stated that on the question being put, that it be communicated to the superiors of the Jesuit, it was unanimously decided in the negative because the Jesuits by their obstinate adherence to the ultramontane doctrines had brought on the English catholics all the privations they suffered and had uniformly opposed every attempt to obtain relief.¹³⁶

From this minute Lingard draws that general conclusion suggested by Butler in his letter:

This, entered as it was in the journals of the chapter, made a strong impression on my mind when I saw it, and made me believe that much of what protestant writers objected to our forefathers might be true.¹³⁷

134. Ibid.

135. Lingard to Butler, Correspondence A.W.C., Poynter Papers, 1817-27.

136. Ibid.

137. Ibid.

And he even included, in the privacy of his correspondence, Campion in the general condemnation of the Society of Jesus' part in English history. He wrote to his catholic colleague, the Rev. E. Price, January 10th 1847:

certainly the conduct of Fathers Campion and Persons furnished a very plausible pretext for the first murderous law against us, and the gunpowder plot for the second batch under James.¹³⁸

The opinion expressed that Campion, Persons and the Gunpowder plotters gave a pretext for the penal laws, is certainly very different from that manifest in the version of events that he offered in the History.

However controversial and dangerous was Lingard's support for Mary Queen of Scots, the fact of her guilt being unproveable gave him some opportunity of making his defence of the Roman catholic lady as a maligned and romantic victim of a Tudor tragedy. It was otherwise with the Gunpowder plotters.¹³⁹ There was no possibility

138. Quoted in Haile and Bonney, Op.cit., p.26.

139. Few subjects, evidently, occupied Lingard's time so much as the Gunpowder plot. In the Shepherd Papers at Manchester College, Oxford, I discovered a rare surviving ^{letter} of Butler to Lingard, 13th December 1823, where Butler conveys his excitement at discovering new information about the plot:

Yesterday morning Mr. Gage and I spent some hours at the Parliament Paper Office, in examining the Depositions respecting the Gunpowder conspiracy. We found much that appeared to us of consequence. Of all this, we made minutes, and Mr. Lemon, most obligingly promised us copies, of some depositions which we thought particularly interesting- some further documents we hope to obtain. The whole will be sent to you within 10 days from the present time. It is clear, that Cecil had no communication with the Conspirators: that Tresham dissuaded the conspirators from the attempt, and gave them 100l. to take them abroad: that Gerard when he administered the Sacrament to them, which was to be their pledge of secrecy, was not aware of the circumstance, that, the Sherriff summoned the Conspirators several times, to surrender; that Father Oldcorne justified the attempt that there was some communication with the Spanish government for landing their troops in England, & that Sir Edward Boynham was sent by the Conspirators to the Pope- I have seen nothing

of his suggesting some doubt of the guilt of the Jacobean catholics. It had been proved that they were guilty of attempting to blow up the protestant king and parliament, and thus constituted an exceptionally difficult set of persons for a historian who wished to demonstrate the loyalty of catholics to the English throne and constitution. Any attempt at lessening hostility to the catholic plotters, therefore, would be itself immediately indicative of a keen catholic bias in the one who made the attempt. Lingard's account exhibits none of the doubts that he must have entertained of his coming safely off from this enterprise. He launched into a description of the event which was nicely designed not to prove the innocence but to rouse some sympathy for the conspirators.

At the start in an effort to protect the image of catholics in the 1820's, Lingard made a separation of catholics from the conspirators which was of a kind with that separation he had made of Mary's religion from her political activity. What he says as to the inconceivability of anything worse than the Gunpowder plot may seem now a trifle exaggerated:

At length there suggested itself to his (Catesby's) mind a plan, which required not the help of foreigners, nor the co-operation of many associates, but a plan so atrocious in principle, and so sanguinary in execution, that it is difficult to conceive how it could be harboured in the mind of any human being: to blow up the parliament house with gunpowder, and to involve in one common destruction, the king, the lords, and the commons.¹⁴⁰

that proves Garnet to have been privy to the powder part of the conspiracy but it is quite clear that he knew some strong attempt in favour of the catholics was in agitation. It is also clear that both he & Oldcorn confessed that they had equivocated on their Examination, & declared that the lawfulness of Equivocation under such circumstances was a tenet of their church. Fawkes was examined several times. The printed examination is the last but one of his examinations. Tresham's examination is long; but amounts to no more than what I have mentioned.

Butler to Lingard, Correspondence M.C.O., Shepherd Papers, Vol.1, p.43.

140. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.VI, p.31.

Here Lingard wants to make it clear that the constitution and the monarch are sacrosanct to Roman Catholics as to Protestants. There is not much in the expression of detestation to choose between what Lingard wrote and the following remark of Hume though they differ in their judgement of motive:

It was bigotted zeal alone, the most absurd of prejudices masked with reason, the most criminal of passions covered with the appearance of duty, which seduced them into measures, that were fatal to themselves, and had so nearly proved fatal to their country.¹⁴¹

In view of the general acceptance of an account such as this it is perhaps not surprising that Lingard felt the need to stress that the conspirators' actions were 'reasonable' in men of Christian religion.

Before any discussion of the plot there is a detailed account of the penal laws enacted by the new Stuart regime and their effects on Catholics, which leads to a conclusion that makes its appeal to all Englishmen Catholic or Protestant:

Had the money been carried to the royal coffers, the recusants would have sufficient reason to complain: but that Englishmen should be placed by their king at the mercy of foreigners, that they should be stripped of their property to support the extravagance of his Scottish minions, this added indignity to injustice, exacerbated their already wounded feelings, and goaded the more moderate almost to desperation.¹⁴²

Lingard has come near to a salacious phrase in the sequence of 'stripped', 'minions' and 'indignity', and placed it nicely between 'moderate' and 'Englishmen'. Lingard creates the idea that normal, rational men were right to feel the utmost frustration against the monarch. Catesby thus becomes a representative of decent national resentment:

141. Hume's Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.IV., p.248.

142. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol.VI, p.29.

Among the sufferers was Robert Catesby, descended from an ancient and opulent family, which had been settled during several generations at Ashby St. Legers, in Northamptonshire, and was also possessed of considerable property in the county of Warwick. His father, Sir William Catesby, more than once had been imprisoned for recusancy: but the son, as soon as he became his own master, abandoned the ancient worship, indulged in all the licentiousness of youth, and impaired his fortune by his follies and extravagance.¹⁴³

So here was a lad who was possessed of a proper amount of spirit, sowing some oats, and then taking his place in the political life of the country:

In 1598 he returned to the religion of his more early years; and, from that moment, it became the chief subject of his thoughts to liberate himself and his brethren from the iron yoke under which they groaned. With this view, having previously stipulated for liberty of conscience, he joined, together with several of his friends, the Earl of Essex; and in the ill-directed attempt of that nobleman was wounded, taken, and committed to prison. He had, indeed, the good fortune to escape the block; but was compelled to purchase his liberty with the sum of three thousand pounds.¹⁴⁴

Whatever the dangers of references to Catesby's associations with the ill-directed Essex, the mention of 'liberty of conscience' would be appreciated by protestants. Lingard continues with his apologetic. Catesby's career is not all Lingard would have wished for his purposes, but he does his best:

After his discharge he attached himself, through the same motive, to the Spanish party among the catholics, and bore a considerable share in their intrigues to prevent the succession of the Scottish monarch. When these had proved fruitless, he acquiesced in the general opinion of his brethren,

143. Ibid., p.30.

144. Ibid.

and cherished with them the pleasing hope of indulgence and toleration. But the delusion soon vanished: and in every quarter it was easy to discern the gathering of the storm, which afterwards burst over their heads: and Catesby, reverting to his original pursuit, revolved in his mind every possible means of relief.¹⁴⁵

Lingard could not leave out Catesby's traitorous associations with the Spaniards but he could direct attention from it by again pointing out that James was a foreigner: not English but Scottish. Lingard portrays the reasonable man's hopes of toleration as being turned by James' actions to a 'delusion' which somehow suggests that the King deluded his subjects, and thus contributes to the reader's sense, as he leads up to the events of the plot itself, that there might be some kind of justification for Catesby's behaviour. Percy, too, is depicted as loyal to the government until deceived by the King's false promise, for which Lingard produces evidence, that catholics would be tolerated if he came to the throne. Catesby had been deluded by James, Percy had been duped:

Subsequent events induced Percy to look on himself as the dupe of royal insincerity; he presented a remonstrance to the king, but received no answer; and while his mind was agitated by resentment on the one hand, and by shame on the other, Catesby seized the favourable moment to inveigle him into the conspiracy.¹⁴⁶

Lingard intends the reader to think of Percy's behaviour as wholly understandable and rational in the subject of an insincere King. There is even, perhaps, a hint in the talk of Percy's 'remonstrance' of later events and good men's remonstrance against a Stuart tyrant.

Lingard was building up the idea that the plot was a natural, sane, reasonable, act provoked by the sufferings of the conspirators. This is a theme he never abandoned. After delineating the characters of the chief plotters and relating details

145. Ibid.

146. Ibid., p.33.

of the plot, drawing it to the most dramatic place, where all is completely ready for a light to the gunpowder, and the reader completely attentive to his narrative, Lingard abruptly reverted to the subject of the plight of recusants:

In the mean time the persecution, which had commenced in the preceding year, daily increased in severity. Nocturnal searches for the discovery of priests were resumed with all that train of injuries, insults and vexations, which characterized them in the reign of Elizabeth. The jails were crowded with prisoners; and some missionaries and laymen suffered, more were condemned to suffer death for religious offences. The officiating clergy were bound under ecclesiastical penalties to denounce all recusants living within their respective parishes; and courts were held every six weeks to receive informations, and to convict offenders.¹⁴⁷

The reader is further prompted to right feelings by a claim that this persecution is of a new kind:

The usual penalties were enforced with a rigour, of which former persecutions furnished no precedent; and the recusants, in the middle classes of life, were ground to dust by the repeated forfeiture of all their personal estates, with two thirds of their lands and leases.¹⁴⁸

To mitigate hostility to the catholic plotters Lingard interrupts with this account of the government's policies towards the catholics that is not without its own dramatic qualities. There is a telling sequence of sinister nocturnal searches, crowded jails, and executions. After this reminder of the cause, Lingard continued with the narrative of the plot.

So embarrassing was the subject of the Gunpowder plot to him, because of his theme of catholic loyalty, that when it came to the actual plot he made an attempt to show that Francis Tresham, one of the catholic conspirators, discovered it to the

147. Ibid., p.39.

148. Ibid.

protestant authorities in hope of defusing some of the anti-catholic hostility inevitable when protestants considered the plot. And when Fawkes is caught the historian ingeniously sounds a nationalistic tone, which, again, is an effort to stem the flow of anti-catholicism:

A Scottish nobleman asked him for what end he had collected so many barrels of gunpowder: "To blow the Scottish beggars back to their native mountains," was the reply.¹⁴⁹

At this point he begins undermining some protestant prejudices about another aspect of the Plot:

The ministers had persuaded themselves, or wished to persuade others, that the Jesuit missionaries were deeply implicated in the plot.¹⁵⁰

Lingard is thorough in his apologetic. The controversy that Gerard and Greenway might have evoked amongst nineteenth century protestants by their suspected parts in the plot is neatly circumvented. Garnet was caught and in the account of his trial and execution Lingard returns to the manner of the historian sifting evidences:

On the scaffold, according to the ambiguous language of the official account, he confessed his guilt; but if we may credit the letters of spectators, he denied all knowledge of the plot, except by confession; and though he begged pardon of the king, he was careful to add that it was not for any participation in the treason, but for the legal offence of having previously concealed the grounds of those suspicions which he had formed within his own breast.¹⁵¹

Lingard's correspondence with his Jesuit friend Oliver shows how Lingard designed his careful account of Garnet. Oliver had forwarded to Lingard a critique of his characterization of Father Garnet, sent to Oliver by a catholic, in February 1839. Lingard replied on 5th March:

149. Ibid., p.54.

150. Ibid., p.55.

151. Ibid., p.63.

I am however, sorry that my account of F. Garnet has given offence to Mr. Kenney. Living here like a hermit, seeing no stranger, and corresponding with few catholics, I have never heard any remark on that part of my work till I received your letter. I was really disappointed: for though I was aware that my narrative would not fully satisfy the expectations of his admirers (F. Garnet's) yet I flattered myself that I had done much to extinguish the principle prejudices against him.¹⁵²

Lingard refers to the little ground he thought he had surrendered to the adversary:

All that I have conceded to them is that F. Garnet knew of a plot (but not of the plot) and did not reveal it - which I do not consider a very great crime: for I am sure that in like case I should act in that respect as he did - and that on two occasions he made use of equivocation to escape the acknowledgement of the truth against himself - which, whatever might be thought of it now, was a common and admitted practice in those days of persecution both among catholics and dissenters also - I suspect so of the latter - I do not think that either of these things detract from the character or sanctity of F. Garnet. Even those I wished to deny - but the proofs were so manifest, the documents so irrecusable that I did not think that I could conscientiously do it.... All through I speak of him (F.G.) without the least respect: I endeavour to appear perfectly indifferent - but that is my jesuitism, in the sense so often given to the word.¹⁵³

We must take the word 'disappointed', which suggests that Lingard's anxiety that his fellow catholics should be pleased with the History, with the phrases 'yet I flattered myself that I had done much to extinguish the principal prejudices of protestants against him'. The reference to 'jesuitism' reveals that he very well knew what he was doing.

152. Lingard to Oliver, Correspondence A.S.G.C., Package 173, no.27.

153, Ibid.

This letter is a demonstration of how Lingard, when he is dealing with an embarrassing incident like that of Garnet's association with the Gunpowder plotters, will select his material and arrange it in a manner best likely to commend the offending catholics to protestants.¹⁵⁴ The question about Lingard's social assumptions which presented itself when his accounts of Becket and Wycliffe and Joan of Arc were under review, is certainly not so insistent here. Whatever opinion Lingard held of the individual Tudor and Stuart worthies he was evidently dealing with a group almost entirely upper middle class or upper class in character. Neither Walsingham nor Persons, whom he terms an Englishman of 'distinguished merit and ability'¹⁵⁵ could be dismissed, as Wycliffe and Joan had been dismissed. What indications there are in this section of the History of Lingard's social prejudices occur within the limits of his religious apologetic. He refers to the social tone and behaviour of his characters only in the furtherance of his religious estimate. Thus he rebuts, in a footnote, the tradition that Wolsey was the son of a butcher, representing his father as rather 'a burgess of considerable opulence',¹⁵⁷ rather than as an officer,

154. Privately, Lingard felt freer to say how he honestly felt about the plot, writing to Walker, October 1839: 'In the intervening period between Elizabeth and the present time there is much that is in reality disgraceful to us, particularly the gunpowder plot'. Quoted in Haile and Bonney. Op.cit., p.281., and to a friend Joseph Dunn, in an undated letter, he wrote:

The King called Nov: 5 Cecil's holiday, not because Cecil devised the plot, but because the discovery of it gave him so plausible an opportunity of satisfying his hatred of cath.

Lingard to Dunn, Correspondence A.S.G.C., contained in Dodd's Church History of England, no.106.

155. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., vol. V, p.377.

156. Ibid., vol. IV, p.38, no.50.

157. Ibid., p.176.

in the Italian wars. Even the more extended treatment given to Latimer's vulgarity in the pulpit which places him at a remove from every decent reader is wholly conducted as part of a religious polemic.

Again it is a natural question Lingard composed in the history at least in some significant places, versions of events and characters that he knew to be not true to those primary sources of whose use he made such a boast. In a letter written to his publisher Joseph Mawman, 21st December 1820, Lingard replied to Mawman's suggestion that in the fifth volume Lingard 'give a dissertation of the consequences of the Reformation'.¹⁵⁸ Lingard replied:

were I to write such a dissertation ex professo and to say what I think, I should probably displease the majority of my readers, both protestants and catholics, and rather injure than promote the sale of the book¹⁵⁹

So it must seem that Lingard was less than candid in his account of the general structure of the Reformation, and that either to promote the cause of Roman catholicism or the sale of his History, or both perhaps, he fitted the past to some present thesis which was not quite his own. His history cannot, therefore, be taken to be, not at any rate in any simple manner, an honest appraisal of his material. The general conduct of the History and the admission in the letter to Mawman both prompt a closer inspection of Lingard's working method.

158. Quoted in Haile and Bonney, Op.cit., p.186.

159. Ibid.

Chapter Six

The Methods of Research

I have now to enquire more carefully into the possibility that the immense research Lingard had made for the History was in order to create as convincing as possible a piece of propaganda for a certain kind of catholicism. The first hint of Lingard's working method in his history is given perhaps in a remark of Charles Butler:

Mr. Lingard's work is certainly the most valuable publication written by a Catholic since Mr. Phillip's life of Cardinal Pole.¹

A 'valuable publication' must in such a context convey something of 'propaganda.' Butler had personal experience of the tug between the historian's profession and the apologist's enterprise. Referring to his Historical Memoirs respecting the English, Irish and Scottish Catholics, November 1818, Butler wrote:

I found my history of the English catholics a work of greater delicacy. The claim of truth in a historian, is imperious, - on the other hand, one does not like to expose failings, which in some degree affect the whole body.²

Lingard may be expected to have something of the same experience. But he does not always seem to nervous as Butler in the nice arrangement of truth. His letter to Bishop Poynter 28th October 1822 giving instructions for Poynter to pass on to his contact at Besancon on how to conduct research in an archive of sixteenth century documents plainly expresses an interest in apologetic:

I wish to shew in opposition to our historians 1. that Mary chose the prince of Spain at the persuasion of the emperor. 2. that it was in opposition to the advice of Gardiner. 3. that she was kind to Lady Jane

1. Butler to Basil Barrett, 22nd December 1808. Correspondence B.M., Letterbooks, 25127, p.3.
2. Butler to Lingard, Ibid., p.135.

Grey. 4. that Elizabeth became in appearance at least a sincere catholic. 5. that Elizabeth and Courtenay were privy to the conspiracy of Wyat. 6. that the object of the conspirators was to place the two on the throne.³

After this declaration of intent Lingard turned to the presentation of apologetic as history:

I would wish to have one or two short passages from the original, that I may prove to my readers that the originals have been really consulted.⁴

What is contained in little in this letter is writ large in Lingard's correspondence with Robert Gradwell, rector of the English college at Rome, and suggests how far he shared Butler's sense of a two-handed situation. Lingard was fortunate that so close a friend should have been sent to Rome, and thus be conveniently near so many documents unavailable to English protestant historians. His presence offered a singular opportunity to get hold of original material, which might be used to portray characters in the History in a new way, if that seemed desirable.⁵ If indeed Lingard

3. Lingard to Poynter, Correspondence A.W.C., Poynter Papers, no.17.

4. Ibid.

5. Details of Gradwell's research for Lingard's history can be seen in Gradwell's diary in the Westminster Archive. Gradwell seems to have concentrated his efforts on the Vatican library and archives, Corsini, Augustinian, Minerva, Anglican and Barberini libraries. He employed M. Marini as a copyist from time to time. Gradwell outlined the archives at his disposal in a letter to Lingard 31st July 1819:

There are three great collections of papers here which afford materials of history for the period you are now treating of: the Archivium of the Vatican, till about the year 1590; the Archivium at the Holy Office, which had the management or rather mismanagement of the English Catholics till they were put under the direction of the newly initiated Congregation of Propaganda, about 1638, and the Archivium of Propaganda down to the present time. I say nothing here of the Barberini & other collections, which are very accessible. To the Archivia of the Vatican Propaganda I have access, & only want time to dig up treasures. To that of the Holy Office I could get permission by presenting a petition to the Pope.

Gradwell to Lingard, Correspondence A.S.J., no.2.

was anxious to present a case, by putting forward facts in ways flattering to catholics, then Gradwell's help would be of immense importance to Lingard. And such being his intention, Gradwell proved to be so helpful, though, of course, even a friend's help, even in a Roman Curia, may cost money, as Gradwell's letter to Lingard August 1st 1818 reveals:

I informed you (via Preston) that for about £150 (Louis) I could have everything yet unpublished relating to England transcribed and attested.... To what extent would you wish me to go? or do you think that the English Catholics would bear me out in the expense of getting the whole?..... I have a more ample licence and better means of getting these instruments copied than any Englishman ever had, but I cannot run the risk of getting into a scrape about the expense. ⁶

Gradwell's question as to whether the English catholics would pay for the copying of the documents is most revelatory. It suggests that at least in Gradwell's estimate Lingard's work might be for and on behalf of the catholic church.⁷ If it were a private project, there could be no question of the church paying for it.

More to the immediate purpose of discovering Lingard's own view of his work is a letter to Gradwell of May 17th 1820. In this Lingard makes absolutely clear the kind of book that he wished to write by his advice to his friend on the collection of documents:

6. Ibid., no.1.

7. Others in the catholic establishment expressed great interest in the work, which confirms the idea that Lingard's intention was for a broad Roman catholic interest. This is nicely illustrated in a letter of Lingard to Poynter - 26th March 1817:

I have now a request to make to your Lordship. I lately received a letter from Lord Stourton saying that he in company with Lady Stourton and his younger brother, was going to make a rapid tour of Italy, and that there was a place for me in the carriage, if I chose to accept of it. That he should set off immediately after Easter and return in August. Bp. Gibson and Smith think I should accept the offer, which I have accordingly done: and have to request that your Lordship would give me a letter of introduction to Mr. Macpherson at Rome, or Car. Litta or any other

I hope you will keep a look out, and procure for me what you can. I do not so much want information respecting squabbles among ourselves, as documents to prove that the catholics were not persecuted so much for their devotion to the principles of the Court of Rome, as for their religion. If you meet with any papers inculcating obedience to government, any tending to show that Rome abhorred the gunpowder plot, or did not approve of insurrections &c against the government I shall be much obliged to you for them.⁸

By some standards of fairness this request for documents qualifies the notion of his being evenhanded. It reveals that Lingard's most fertile source merely provided material of an apologetic kind. Clearly both men entertained no wish to allow

person, who might be useful in getting me admission to the MSS of the Vatican. Indeed Lord Stourton wishes me to procure letters of introduction to as many persons as I can at Paris, Rome, Florence and Naples, as he observes they may do much good, and can do no harm possibly.

Lingard to Poynter, Correspondence A.W.C., Poynter Papers no.8. Mrs. Ridyard's Life gives another example of the establishment busily facilitating Lingard's work for the wider interests of catholicism:

He obtained permission from his Superior to reside for many months on the continent that he might examine minutely the archives of foreign nations. At Rome, the State papers of the Vatican were freely opened to him, and there, as in France, and Belgium, he obtained from the respective governments every concession and assistance that could tend to facilitate his investigations.

From Mrs. Ridyard's Life, Shepherd Papers, M.C.O.

Even the Pope, according to a letter of Gradwell to Lingard, 9th May 1827, thought Lingard's work a great boon to catholicism:

The Pope told me a little time ago that he is inclined to have Gregori's translation of your History published at the Vatican.

Gradwell to Lingard, Correspondence A.S.J., no.24.

8. Lingard to Gradwell, Correspondence A.V.E.C., Section One, no.8.

documents generally to speak for themselves, only those selected for the purpose.⁹ He evidently was ready to believe that this was the usual method of historians. Lingard wrote to Gradwell May 17th 1820:

I have some time ago wished you to look at Henry VIII's letters to Anne Boleyn. I have since examined them as they are printed by Hearne at the end of his edition of Avesbury, and by Walpole in the Harleian Miscellany. Now my only doubt is whether they have printed the whole of them. I have them not by me. But the first is a letter sent by him during the sweating sickness -the last one to excuse the legate Campeggio for not waiting on her on account of his being ill of the gout - I could wish you to look them over, when you visit the Vatican library: and if you find any expressions which seem to denote any improper liberties to have passed between them, to notice such passages for me.¹⁰

Lingard evidently hoped Gradwell could supply the information to buttress his preconceived theory:

9. Another example of Lingard's calculated use of sources in order to create a decided impression occurs in a letter to Mawman, of 1823:

You observed in a note some time ago that Elizabeth did not appear a very amiable character. I can assure you, I have not set down ought in malice, nor am I conscious that I have ever exaggerated. On the contrary, I have been careful to soften down what might have appeared too harsh to prejudiced minds: and not to let any severe expressions escape, that I may not be thought a partial writer. I should be sorry to say anything that might hurt the sale of the book, and on that account have been particularly guarded in the conclusion, where I touch upon her character. However, if there be any expression which you may think likely to prove prejudicial, I shall be ready to change it.

Quoted in Haile and Bonney Op.cit., p.195.

10. Lingard to Gradwell, Correspondence A.V.E.C., Section One, no.8.

My idea is, that before Card. Campeggio came, Anne, to irritate the King's passion, had allowed him many liberties, but always refused to satisfy him entirely. From what are published, I have copied some such passages: thus in 1st or 2nd letter he requires her to give herself up to him corps et coeur, in another "I would you were in my arms and I in yours. I think it long since I kist you" - In another he send her hart's flesh with indecent allusions -Another Il souhaite d'etre privement aupres de vous - again "wishing himself especially in an evening, in his sweetheart's arms" &c. - I am not sure that the copiers published correctly: and am desirous to expose that mirror of chastity Anne Boleyn in her true colours.¹¹

It is plain that Gradwell was willing to acquiesce in this kind of historical inquiry.¹² In a letter to Lingard 22nd March 1821 about Mary Queen of Scots, Gradwell wrote to inform his friend he had discovered just the kind of letter unhelpful to the History's plan:

Since I have wrote (sic) the above I have seen the copy of Queen Mary's letter to the Pope. It was made for Mr. Howard, who shewed it me. It is very pretty and fills three sheets. It is not made in facsimile, this being contrary to the style used in the Vatican. But towards the end of the letter there is a paragraph which I conceive will make it prudent not to publish the letter. I had not observed this paragraph before.¹³

11. Ibid.

12. And in another example Gradwell showed himself willing to assist Lingard in this way in writing to inform Lingard, 23rd September 1826:

The translator of Cobbett's history is in contemplation to translate your history, at least from Henry VII, into Italian, and print it at Rome. His name is Gregori. I am intimate with him. He wd. gratefully listen to any advice where to soften a few passages, where too much is told in the original, to please bigots.

Gradwell to Lingard, Correspondence A.S.J., no.12.

13. Gradwell to Lingard, Correspondence A.S.J., no.4.

The drawback is, evidently that the letter did not support the general thesis that catholics were persecuted merely on account of their religion:

In her distraction the queen, lamenting that she was the last Catholic of either royal family, for the sake of preserving the Catholic faith in the two kingdoms suggests to the Pope to recommend to the Catholic king the adoption of forcible measures against the kingdom. Now this might injure the memory of Queen Mary and induce the Protestant Historian to throw the blame of Babington's conspiracy and the Armada on the secret plots carried on between Mary & the Pope.¹⁴

In his zeal to protect Mary Queen of Scot's memory from 'injury' Gradwell was certainly agreeing to the conditions set for primary sources by Lingard in his letter of May 17th 1820. Others had been of the same mind of the dangers of publicising this letter. May 19th 1821 Gradwell had already reminded his friend of the incident:

The letter of Queen Mary to the Pope was honourably returned to Card. Consalvi by Mr. Howard, as he thought the publication of the last paragraph would be very undesirable.¹⁵

Eminent catholics, interested in the history of their country and church, saw nothing wrong in selecting material that would help it whilst suppressing unhelpful sources. The name of Cardinal Consalvi¹⁶ appears suggesting that these disingenuous notions were shared by some of the most important people in the Vatican. Lingard might have considered that he could yet have made use of the letter. He expressed disappointment at not being able to receive it, his reason appearing to be that a part of it might have been useful in an apologetic for Mary. His reply, October 19th 1821, suggests the particular cause of disappointment:

You know how sorry I am that it was determined not to let me have a copy of Queen Mary's letter. One thing, however, you can do for me.

14. Ibid.

15. Ibid.,no.5

16. Consalvi, Ercole, b.1757 d.1824. Secretary of State in the Papal States 1800-24 except for a brief period when he was dismissed by Napoleon Bonaparte.

Among the arguments employed against her, me, and in the estimation of some persons a powerful one is, that at her death she did not proclaim herself innocent of the crimes imputed to her, especially of Darnley's murder.¹⁷

Lingard was anxious lest in not having a sight of the letter in the Vatican archive he might miss some phrase to set against this telling argument:

I think it, however, possible that in his (sic) letter to the pope she may say something of her innocence; and, if she does, I have no doubt you will copy the passage for me, as it may go far to do away the objection against her, which I mention above.¹⁸

Lingard and Gradwell's collaboration in this apologetic continued throughout the writing of the first edition of the history. In a letter postmarked 30th December 1823 Lingard wrote the following curious piece:

I see in Berchetti that Gregory XIII ordered a jubilee to thank God for the massacre of St. Bartholomew. Can you send me a good reference to prove that he was deceived, and that the thanksgiving was on the supposition that the king of France had escaped from a conspiracy of the Huguenots (sic) against his life.¹⁹

17. Lingard to Gradwell, Correspondence A.V.E.C., Section Two, no.15.

Lingard appealed to other friends for assistance in an apologetic for Mary. He wrote to Daniel Rock b.1799 d.1869, Chaplain to Lord Shrewsbury at Alton Towers, February 4th 1832:

If you have an opportunity of reading over Bagot's account of Mary's execution, notice what he says of her prayer. I have a French account sent to the king of France, stating that in that prayer she solemnly declared in the presence of God that she never desired, consented to, or contrived the death of Elizabeth. I want a confirmation of this, but I have never found it in any of our English accounts.

Lingard to Rock, Correspondence A.S.G.C., Package 172, no.10.

18. Lingard to Gradwell, Correspondence A.V.E.C., Section Two, no.15.

19. Ibid., no.18.

The word 'prove' again witnesses to Lingard's starting from apologetic conclusions on an historical subject. He is instructing Gradwell to find a source verifying an idea rather than waiting for an account to arise out of his study of the sources. And in another instance in a letter November 27th 1830, from Lingard to Gradwell, Lingard is by now better aware of the kind of danger encountered by Butler. He too has been attempting a work of great delicacy:

My last volume will appear in a few days. I have ordered the usual number of copies to be sent to your house. The book, will, I fear, in some passages give offence. The zealous in the time of James knew no more how to accommodate themselves to the public feeling than the ultras lately in the reign of Charles X. I am disposed to believe that in both cases they trusted to some supposed revelation.²⁰

But Lingard is not so worried as Butler had been about the claim of truth. He is more worried about failings which affect the whole body. He knows what the Whig protestants have at their command:

There are things that I could have wished to suppress: but I dared not. Ld. Holland has Barillon's dispatches as well as I. Of course they are at the command of Dr. Allen, who, if he can find any pretence for a charge of partiality, will not suffer it to escape him. I have therefore mentioned the follies or madness of James and Jesuits, but at the same time omitted nothing which I could discover in their favour. You will see that I have availed myself of the papers you were so good as to send from Rome.²¹

The contemporary reference to Charles X of France shows that Lingard was quick to see the present in any elucidation of the past. But whatever he has learnt of the past he makes plain here his anxiety to control other people's knowledge.

20. Lingard to Gradwell, Correspondence A.W.C., Gradwell Papers, no.3.

21. Ibid.

He determined to avail himself of the same source and to employ him in the same way when he put together the second edition of the History. In a letter to Gradwell dated October 17th 1831, Lingard outlined a plan to exhibit Usher and Laud in ways that must weaken the confidence of protestants in their own church, and asked Gradwell to do some more devilling for him:

I find from Nicoletti's account of the agency of Rosetti, that Usher, the archbishop of Armagh, offered to become catholic, to go and reside in Rome, and to spend his time in writing in defence of our religion, if the Pope would grant him a pension of 2000 crowns, and that archbishop Laud, after he was first imprisoned, proposed, in the event of his escape or discharge, to do the same, if he might have a pension of 1000 crowns: that Barberini answered with respect to Usher that 2000 crowns was a large pension, but that with a dispensation he might perhaps be made bishop, and thus have a competent maintenance: but as for Laud, he had been too violent an enemy and persecutor to promise him anything till he had given proof of the sincerity of his conversion and repentance. These are things that I shall be sorry not to insert in the next edition of my history.²²

Then, delighting in the embarrassing nature of these revelations Lingard proceeds to self congratulation:

How the orthodox will stare to see two pillars of their church, two of their greatest lights thus offering to become idolators for money, or at least for a certain maintenance!²³

Sadly for Lingard, however, his readers will need proof before believing this calumny and he does not hide his disappointment:

But the misfortune is, I know not how to prove it. Nicoletti seems to think little of it. He does not as usual refer to any despatch either of

22. Ibid., no.5

23. Ibid.

Rosetti or the cardinal even by their dates; he does not say how the application was made, whether by messenger, or letter, or in person. In fact his account is so very meagre and unsatisfactory, that I should like to have if possible a copy of the original. Do his dispatches, and Barberini's exist? If they do, the original passages will be found under the date of April, May or June 1641. as far as Rosetti; it is possible the cardinal's answer may be later. If not in the dispatch the particulars may be in his (Rosetti's) "relatius" (?) which he completed after he left Engd. and sent to the cardinal: but I think it more probable that they are contained in the dispatches, because Barberini's answer is mentioned.²⁴

Lingard, then, identifies a place where historical scholarship and apologetic meet:

If your Lordship can aid me in procuring copies, only of these passages you will render me a great service, and also some benefit to the cause of religion.²⁵

This is a remarkable passage. It is clear that if a secondary source suggested ideas which Lingard liked, he would set out to discover primary sources for their support. Lingard's boasted reliance upon primary material seems in this case to be based on nothing more impressive than a search for proof texts. That this was his common way with documents, that Lingard involved others in his unrelenting search for historical material unflattering to Anglicans is further suggested in a letter to Tierney in April 1831. On this occasion the topic might be supposed ever more sensitive to protestants' ears. Lingard first recalls Tierney's earlier assistance and then asks him to set to work again:

You will recollect that you sent me copies of twelve letters to and from Lord Surrey, written in the year 1523. Taking up one of them the other day I observed a passage "The marraige of my lorde Percy shulbe wt: my lorde Steward's daughter, whereof I am right glade, and so I am sure ye

24. Ibid.

25. Ibid.

be. Nwe the cheff Baron is Wt. my lorde of Northumberlande to concludde the same." (sep.12). This passage will go far to shew at which time Lord Henry Percy married lad. Mary Talbot, and is therefore of importance for the following reason. Cavendish, who was present at the court, informs us that Ld. Percy fell in love with Anne Boleyn, that Henry ordered the lovers to be separated, and that in consequence he was married to Mary Talbot, Lord Shrewsbury's daughter. Of course it follows that, if this marriage took place in 1523, Anne Boleyn must have been in England, and at court in the previous part of that year.²⁶

Tierney is being enlisted for the proof of a notion Lingard had put forward in the first edition of the History, though he had then no proof of it:

I have maintained that it is probable that she came to England in 1522, when Henry sent a peremptory order for her to quit France, and come to England. As, however, she might have disobeyed, and as Spelman says that after the death of Queen Claude (it happened in 1524) she entered into the service of the Duchess of Alencon, protestant writers are all positive that she returned to England in 1527. Why 1527? Because then she could not have been the cause of Henry's wish to be divorced, as he had before that publicly mentioned it. Now what authority Spelman had for saying that she entered into the service of the duchess, we know not: but were it true, it is as possible that she might return in 1525 or 1527: and Le Grand observes that she was at court in 1525 when the bishop of Tarbes was ambassador here. But for this he does not give any authority, and therefore I have always wished to discover the real date of lord Percy's marriage. Lord Shrewsbury can give me no information; though he has plenty of proofs that when the parties were children, the two earls their fathers, entertained the project of marrying them to each other.²⁷

26. Lingard to Tierney, Correspondence A.S.J., Tierney Papers, no.5.

27. Ibid.

It is at this point that Lingard needs Tierney's help in proving his existing theory:

The letter from Ld Surrey which you sent me goes far, as I said, to fix the marriage to the autumn of 1523. Yet it does not prove it entirely for, though the chief baron was with Lord Northumberland "to conclude it," there is a possibility that the negotiation may have been suspended, and never revived at a late period. On this account I could wish to discover some document mentioning the actual celebration and I cherish a hope that some notice of it may be contained in some of the other letters of Lord Surrey, which you do not copy for me. If these are still accessible to you, may I beg of you the favour to peruse them at your leisure, and to notice any passage that has any reference to the subject.²⁸

The emphasis in this enquiry is on Tierney's discovering a fact of interest to the catholic church whilst the notion of a precise presentation of historical sources is quite secondary. He is now experiencing his own sense of how delicate a business it is to write a catholic history of England. In a letter to George Oliver written between December 14th 1831 and January 23rd 1832, Lingard returned to the subject of James II, Barillon and Dr. Allen in a way which suggests he had more than Butler's care to preserve Roman catholic solidarity:²⁹

28. Ibid. So anxious was Lingard to prove this point that he wrote a lecture entitled When did Anne Boleyn leave France? to be delivered to the French Academy in honour of his membership. It was delivered by M. Mignet 28th March 1840. I discovered Lingard's original manuscript of it in the Southwark Archive in a scrapbook which I assume to be part of the Lingard material Tierney lost whilst he was writing his Memoir of Lingard. See it in the Howard Papers, A.S.G.C., Package 174.
29. Oliver had complained, Dec. 8th 1831, that Lingard had been 'too severe' on the character of Petre. Oliver to Lingard, Correspondence A.S.G.C., Package 173, no.11.

Before you condemn me for the character which I have given Fr. Petre, consider the delicate situation in which I was placed, with so many eyes upon me, and so many adversaries eager to discover some pretence on which to ground the charge of partiality and misrepresentation. The character which I have given is that which might be found in the memoirs of James, and in the dispatches of Barillon. The first one open to the public, the latter exist in copy at Holland house and are at the service of my friend Dr. Allen.³⁰

Lingard had been busy among several correspondants in an attempt to present Petre's failings in a way that should not reflect upon the whole body of Roman catholics:

In my letter to Mr. Norris I desired him to furnish me with any information in his power, which might be favourable to the character of Fr. Petre: but all he could send me was, that it appeared from the letters of the consultors of the college of St. Omers, and of the provincial to the general, that as Rector he displayed "great prudence, wisdom and zeal" - If you can supply me with any passage from the letters you mention, I shall be happy to insert it in the next edition. I have been careful to say whatever I could with truth in his favour, particularly with respect to the prosecution of the bishops, and the refutation of the calumny that he then said "I will make them eat their own dirt."³¹

Evidently Lingard was careful about presenting a case that looked as though it could carry conviction. There are certainly echoes here of that design for which Lingard had enlisted the aid of Gradwell, Lingard felt his history to be safe from critics of several kinds provided he adhered to his plan of presenting material that he could show to be obtained from a primary source. The disingenuousness of his mode of writing the History lies in his choosing not to use whatever primary material he discovered not to be helpful to his case.

30. Ibid., no.12.

31. Ibid. Norris was an acquaintance of Oliver.

That this attitude of Lingard to his history pervaded the work of revision throughout the thirties and forties is evident in his regular correspondence with Henry Howard at Corby Castle in Northumberland.³² Strangely, the letters between them have not been examined by those interested in Lingard's historical enterprise. The correspondence contains some revealing examples of Lingard's method. That Lingard thought it usual for a researcher or even a translator to work with an eye to the apologetic value of his historical work is apparent in a letter he wrote on 3rd May 1835 discussing the Simancas material published in 1832 by Don Tomas Gonzales:³³

I cannot point out to you any proper person as a translator. Is there no priest in London who was educated at Valladolid. I would not recommend Panizzi, at the B. Museum even to be consulted, for I have been assured by a friend, an unitarian clergyman, that though a pretended catholic, he is in reality an enemy and happy to take any opportunity of injuring the Cath: Church. This may not be true: but I have my suspicions of him.³⁴

From every aspect the making of the History looks an ambiguous enterprise. The careful research for factual detail is always prosecuted in tandem with the careful representation of each discovery as wholly supportive of Lingard's thesis concerning

32. Henry Howard b.1757 d.1842, antiquary and historian.
33. The full title of the work was Apuntamientos para la historia del Rey Don Felipe Segundo de Espana, por lo tocante a sus relaciones con la Reina Isabel de Inglaterra desde el ano 1558 hasta el de 1576, formados con presencia de la Correspondencia Diplomatica original de dicha epoca por Don Tomas Gonzalez, Canonigo de Plasencia. See a recent article about Lingard and Simancas archive in Edwin Jones' 'John Lingard and the Simancas Archives' in the Historical Journal, 1967, vol.X, no.1, pp57-76.
34. Lingard to Howard, Correspondence A.C.C., Box 3, Bundle T. no.15. The minister referred to was William Shepherd. Panizzi, Anthony, b.1797 d.1879, sub librarian in the British Museum 1831-56, appointed chief librarian 1856.

Roman catholic loyalty and the groundlessness of protestant suspicion. Whatever sits uncomfortably with this thesis is either ignored or if unignorable, re-interpreted until it coincides with the rest of the design. And all the while Lingard is assuring those very correspondents who were set to find apologetic material that he was being held more and more among protestants as a reliable and fair recorder of events and characters.³⁵

It is a question to what extent Lingard adverted to the ambiguous character of his enterprise. It is curious to observe a sensitive and intelligent scholar thinking it proper for so many years to request from those of his co-religionists who shared his opinions and had access to archives only that material which would support their pre-conceived notions of what ought to have happened in history. Lingard cannot have been oblivious to the apologetic motive of the various demands he was making upon his friends. He did indeed claim to do all out of a motive of 'serving religion' and his experience in writing the History cannot have left him wholly ignorant of the manner which this service might conflict with an attempt to recount what had actually happened. It may be that he was not always equally ready to serve of the demands of Roman apologetic, and there is some evidence in the later volumes of the History of England that Lingard was anxious that he had by then 'served religion' enough.

It is another question how far contemporary readers of the History of England were indeed as convinced as Lingard maintained of his lack of distorting prejudice.

35. He wrote to Tierney, for example, December 26th 1826, of the reception of his Vindication of Certain Passages in the History of England:

Sir Wm. Hamilton professor of history, in the university of Edinburgh, Mr. Petre, keeper of the records in the town and Dr. Kay bishop of Bristol, have pronounced me victorious.

Lingard to Tierney, Correspondence A.S.J., Tierney Papers, no.4.

Chapter Seven

The Discernment of Bias

Certainly some contemporary reviewers did not notice Lingard's apologetic design at all. The London Review and Literary Journal for September 1819¹ first praised Lingard for being factual:

The plan of Mr. Lingard's History is peculiarly luminous and judicious. His detail of facts is plain and unvarnished. These are all derived from the most authentic sources which contemporary writers can supply. It is not a history of conjectures, of fallacious deductions and reasonings.²

The reviewer then remarked that the work had no religious bias whatever:

Though the writer is a Catholic, the work is free from all religious prejudices. Mr. Lingard, even on subjects which relate to the church, never suffers his creed to mislead his judgement or pervert his narrative.³

And concluded that the work could be read by the most impressionable of protestant children:

thus, therefore, in this valuable publication, we have the advantage of possessing a history which may safely be entrusted to the perusal of the juvenile reader, without any danger of infecting his mind with superstition on the one hand, or infidelity on the other.⁴

1. 'A History of England, from the first Invasion by the Romans to the Accession of Henry VIIIth'. By the Rev. John Lingard. London Rev., and Lit. Journal, Sept.1819, pp. 244 - 247.
2. Ibid., p.244.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.

Likewise Patrick McMahon in the Dublin Review⁵ did not notice any dangerous element of liberal catholicism in Lingard's History, though his own review was not without an element of ambiguity. After stating in the early part of his critique that 'no one would say that Tacitus was scrupulously truthful historian', he went on to say:

As Greece was her Thucidides, and Rome her Tacitus, so England will have her Lingard.⁶

However there was nothing ambiguous in his final estimate of Lingard's achievement:

that this work is the best history of any country that it has ever been our fortune to peruse, and that it is our deliberate conviction, that a combination of all the literary men in the universe could not produce a better.⁷

Tacitus and Thucidides were defiantly literary men, and this reviewer is suggesting that Lingard's history has a literary character, a structure, shape, and plot. This is not however the impression received by the reviewer in the British Critic:⁸

Mr. Lingard appears not to be aware of any other dependence between events, than those of time and place. He states his facts, in general, with fidelity, and paints them often with singular vividness of effect; but they are like blows struck in the dark; whence they came, by what hand they are given, is a secret which Mr. Lingard seems to consider of small importance. This omission, from whatever cause it arises, detracts greatly from his work.⁹

5. 'A History of England, from the first Invasion by the Romans. By John Lingard D.D.', Dublin, vol.XII, no. XXIV, May 1841, pp.295 - 362.
6. Ibid., p.301.
7. Ibid., p.360.
8. 'A History of England from the first Invasion by the Romans to the Accession of Henry VIII. By the Rev. John Lingard', Critic January 1820, pp. 41 - 59.
9. Ibid., p.43.

The cause, in the work of so intelligent and diligent an author must be that he wants to keep the reader in the dark about something, and the reviewer has lighted upon it:

In the particular department of ecclesiastical affairs, it is indeed so striking as to create a suspicion of its being almost intentional. We can easily understand the feeling which might induce a Roman catholic even as enlightened as Mr. Lingard, to hurry over this part of the subject.¹⁰

The reviewer has no intention of concealing his own theory of English history:

From the time of our first Henry, until the death of our last, one of the most striking and curious parts of our annals, is the constant and vigorous opposition, which both the king and people were making to the usurpations of the papal power.¹¹

The reviewer concludes that such a recitation of the facts alone as Lingard provides may obscure the truly anti-papal character of events:

Now we have no wish whatever to charge Mr. Lingard with the dishonesty of falsifying the facts; on the contrary, his fidelity in this respect does him credit; but by omitting almost entirely any notice of the nature and pretensions of that enormous power, against which this country had to bear up, he certainly leaves the reader in the dark as to the real nature of the contest.¹²

The reviewer went on to provide several papal instances at which Lingard might be accused of designing a history in order to deceive.

We have dwelt the longer on the usurpations of the popes, only to justify our expression of admiration, that Mr. Lingard should have neglected altogether to notice them in an history of England.¹³

10. Ibid.

11. Ibid.

12. Ibid., p.50.

13. Ibid., p.48.

What the reviewer in the British Critic suggested in 1820 the Eclectic Review¹⁴ said more distinctly in 1821. This review is exactly, at its start, the sort of praise Lingard had been aiming at; he is accorded just those virtues he admired in Thomas a Becket:

Mr. Lingard is, we have no doubt, a person of upright and honourable intention,¹⁵

And other virtues appropriate to the historian:

His knowledge and his ability are signally evinced in his performance.¹⁶

It continues however, in a way he had hoped to escape:

But the influence of his professional prejudices as a Roman Catholic clergyman, is visible at every step.¹⁷

The reviewer has an appreciation of how unlike Lingard's view of English history is to that generally received by protestant laymen:

This history of England in his hands, assumes, in many parts, an aspect altogether novel. Instead of the encroachments of unprincipled ecclesiastics, we have presented to^{us} the patient and unmerited sufferings of aggrieved and innocent men; and where we have been accustomed to track the footsteps of the persecutor and the oppressor, we are invited to witness the movements of the benignant instructors and benefactors of mankind.¹⁸

That the reviewer has seen that Lingard is managing facts but cannot at once bring himself openly to attack Lingard in his character as a man of honour has its own fascination:

14. 'The History of England from the first Invasion by the Romans to the Accession of Mary. By the Rev. John Lingard', Eclectic, vol XVI, New series, July 1821, pp. 1 - 23.

15. Ibid., p.2.

16. Ibid.

17. Ibid.

18. Ibid.

We will not impute artifice and disingenuousness of intention to the dexterity with which this colouring is given to the facts alluded to.

However he comes to it:

But the good faith and veracity of the Historian cannot be conceded without implicating his competency to the task he has undertaken.¹⁹

The reviewer is fully in his stride by now: the language is sharper as the History of England is considered as a work of scholarship:

Perversions of historic verity so palpable, not to be chargeable on design, must have originated in a most lamentable strength of prejudice. It would be an interminable task, to point out all the misrepresentations which we have found in those sections of the work which relate to ecclesiastical affairs; and we must, perforce, content ourselves with a few illustrations of this sympathetic sacrifice of candour to the spirit of party.²⁰

In this passage, the reviewer, through 'the influence of professional prejudices', 'artifice', 'disingenuousness', 'strength of prejudice', 'misrepresentations', and 'sacrifice of candour' and 'spirit of party' has led the reader to be wholly suspicious of Lingard's work. Lingard's facts may be accepted by the reviewer, but he is clearly unhappy with the manner in which they have been presented in the history. Lingard is evidently felt to be too clever to appear as an open apologist for the more aggressive aspects of the papacy. But the reviewer thought it proper to express his suspicions of Lingard in that matter:

Mr. Lingard does not, however, put himself forward as the defender of the Pope's temporal authority. Though, as we firmly believe, that claim is only in abeyance, it is not likely, under present circumstances, to find open advocates among the enlightened partisans of the Holy See;

19. Ibid.

20. Ibid.

and Mr. Lingard is too skilful a writer to entangle himself in unprofitable controversies.²¹

Those last phrases are less praise than accusation. But the phrase 'only in abeyance' intimates that Lingard held opinions that he was not willing to expose for fear of antagonising his protestant readers. His general tone was not satisfactory.

The reviewer was more particular in his attack on 'Mr. Lingard's contemptuous estimate of the labours and character of Wycliffe'.²² Here the facts as well as the tone are brought under criticism:

He has evidently found it difficult on this subject to preserve his usual moderation, and to keep his language from running into invective. In representing him as entering, in the year 1360, into a 'fierce but ridiculous controversy' with the mendicant friars, he studiously conceals this fact, that he was advocating the cause of the University against men who were constantly infringing on its statutes and privileges and inveigling the younger students from the college to the convent. He omits also to state, that, as a reward for his zealous services, he was, in the following year, elevated to the dignity of Master of Balliol College, and, in 1372, to the divine chair..... Mr. Lingard's statement of Wycliffe's doctrines is not less disingenuous, and his attempt to deprive him of the honour of having been the first to undertake a complete English version of the Old and New Testament, is contemptible. What does he mean by "several versions of the 'sacred writings' previously extant?" If he intends by this expression, parts of the Scriptures, his language is calculated to mislead. If he means to assert that there were extant several versions of the whole Bible in the vernacular tongue, it behoved him to adduce further evidence than the bare assertion contained in Sir Thomas More's Dialogues.²³

21. Ibid., p.6.

22. Ibid., p.8.

23. Ibid.

The reviewer attributes Lingard's antagonistic assessment of Wycliffe entirely to his sectarian prejudice, so it may be that Lingard, even in the midst of a bourgeois expression of distaste, was still operating within a Roman catholic prejudice; it certainly seemed to this reviewer that the bourgeois abuse of Wycliffe was employed by Lingard simply as a language for religious animosity:

How pitiable the prejudices which could lead a Christian clergyman in the nineteenth century, to employ the language of depreciation and displacency in reference to the vast and noble undertaking by which the Holy Scriptures were first rendered accessible to our countrymen in their own language! But, for Wycliffe's labours, Mr. Lingard has no gratitude, and for his genius and elevation of mind, no admiration.²⁴

The reviewer has focused upon the manner in which Lingard has carefully selected among the source material, and not always choosing what he must have known to be the best. Who would take More as an authority on mediaeval literature?

In April 1825, Dr. John Allen reviewed Lingard's history for the Edinburgh Review. It was not a friendly critique. Allen, too, saw the design behind the text of the Roman catholic's work:

Dr. Lingard has little talent for pathetic description. His humanity is apt to slumber where none but laymen suffer; and his indignation against oppression is seldom warm, unless when churchmen are wronged.²⁵

Allen immediately establishes in his readers' minds that Lingard's prejudices lay with the church and most particularly with the clergy. He developed this into an observation upon Lingard's use of source material which was cast in a form very unlike that of the British Critic. Allen thought that there certainly was a philosophy of history in the History but that it was not expressed in properly philosophic terms:

Not withstanding his petulant rebuke of those he terms philosophic historians, we find him colouring facts, assigning motives, and dealing in

24. Ibid., p.10.

25. Edinburgh, Op.Cit., p.4.

characters, epithets and innuendoes, with as much freedom as any of them. He is continually at variance with philosophic historians and Protestant divines; but it does not follow, on that account, that he never 'indulges his imagination,' nor gives way to 'prejudice.'²⁶

Lingard's mode of proceeding was found out from the text itself. Allen proceeded to be ironical in his attack on the History, quoting Lingard's professed intentions in the preface to the second edition:

We have found omissions, we had almost said suppressions, in Dr. Lingard's works, that destroy, or at least weaken, 'our reliance on the fidelity of his statements.' We have observed with sorrow, that in his eagerness to establish a 'favourite theory,' he overlooks every troublesome or adverse authority, distorts facts in order to form a foundation for his system, and borrows from his own fancy 'whatever is wanting for its support and embellishment.'²⁷

Allen allows that 'the devotedness of Dr. Lingard to his church, is an amiable and laudable feeling', but he cannot agree it should have quite such scope:

when he dissembles what might injure her reputation, while he emblazons whatever tends to her honour and credit, he weakens our confidence in his truth as an historian, and sinks himself into a common polemic.²⁸

Allen is able to identify the elements of what he conceives to be Lingard's bias:

Dr. Lingard, we need scarcely say, is a decided partisan of the Church of Rome. That he should be devoted to her doctrines, was to be expected from the faith he holds, and the profession he has embraced. But he is not only a believer in the creed, and advocate for the discipline of his church; he is the defender of all her saints and confessors, the

26. Ibid., p.8.

27. Ibid.

28. Ibid., p.22.

eulogist of all who have laboured or suffered in her cause, the decrier of all who have resisted her usurpations.²⁹

That Allen thinks the workings of Lingard's historical bias result in a history which 'from the days of Austin to the dawn of the Reformation', the measure for personal merit 'is of spiritual manufacture' and in which he evidences that he 'prefers the regular to the secular clergy',³⁰ certainly proves that the history can be read in more than one way as an expression of Roman catholic attitudes.

More strictures followed in The Quarterly Review of 1825, which contained an article about Lingard's reformation volumes written by Henry Milman. He was well qualified to provide a scholarly opinion. It has been observed that his own History of the Jews and History of Latin Christianity gained for him a large reputation as an eminent man of letters. His preface to Gibbon's history made him an acknowledged authority on the subject for fifty years until Bury's revision in 1903. He opened his review with the following percipient remarks:

His purpose is effected rather by the general tendency of the whole narrative, than by particular mis-statements, which, as they are open to contradiction and unanswerable detection, are infinitely less dangerous, than the system, long and constantly pursued, of perceptible, yet scarcely definite mis-representation.³¹

Like the British Critic before him, Milman believes that Lingard's general design in the History of England is promoted by careful selection:

He wears away the foundation rather by the perpetual droppings of insinuations, than a bold and regular attack, which may be fairly met and repelled. Undue consideration, in one part, is attached to particular incidents; in another a partial shifting and delusive light is thrown upon important facts, so as to fling them back into obscurity. Here all is told, there a plausible excuse is given for compression or omission.³²

29. Ibid., p.6.

30. Ibid.

31. Quarterly, Op.Cit. p.5.

32. Ibid.

It appeared to Milman that the most dangerous element in the historian's method was Lingard's attempt to convince the reader that he had let reason be the judge of historical likelihood:

While he is captivated by a specious appearance of fairness, the argument on the one side is completely neutralized by an insidious qualification, while on the other, the warmth of admiration or the emotion of pity is left unallayed, or cherished with new excitement.³³

What is general may be illustrated most particularly from Lingard's treatment of Anne Boleyn. Milman is sensitive to that aspect of Lingard's researches exhibited in his request to Henry Howard to search the Simancas archive for 'remarks on the dissoluteness of manners in the English court', but Milman does not have any great respect for the way in which Lingard handles his new material:

It is, indeed, not a little curious to observe the manner in which Dr. Lingard details the whole progress of the amour during five years, with the precision and accuracy of one of Marivaux's novels. He appears as familiar with the scandalous chronicle of Henry's court as if he had a Grammont or an Angleterre galante for his guide. His authorities for all this are a few dateless letters and a furious invective by Henry's enemy, Cardinal Pole. But neither is the story, as told by him, quite consistent. The finished coquette, who coldly and with ambitious calculation for two years refused a less price than a crown for her affections; who, by consummate artifice, wrought the amorous monarch to divorce his wife, and wed herself; is stated, nevertheless, to have lived as Henry's concubine during three years; for Dr. Lingard is particular in his dates.³⁴

Milman presents a different interpretation:

Now, in the absence of all authentic evidence, would it not have been more natural, undoubtedly more charitable, to attribute her long

33. Ibid., p.6.

34. Ibid., p.12.

resistance to her virtuous principles, perhaps to her previous attachment to Lord Percy? her weakness, to the seductions of Henry's ardent attachment, and to her confidence in the fulfilment of his promises when the supposed impediment to marriage should be removed? For Henry was then in the zenith of his glory and his power, with everything to captivate; nor had the cruelty of his character been developed, she herself being reserved for its first victim. All that is proved against her in this part of her history is, that she was married on the 25th of January, (in a garret, as Dr. Lingard, with due regard to probability, asserts,) and that Elizabeth was born about the 13th of September.³⁵

The references here to Marivaux and Grammont, particularly when placed with a 'an Angleterre galante' suggest that there were times when Lingard's work resembled nothing other than the gossip sheets. And it must be admitted that Milman was not altogether wide of the mark in his description of that aspect of Lingard's work. Milman, no doubt to Lingard's great irritation, made a comparison of Lingard's account of Anne Boleyn with that of Mary Queen of Scots:

observe the manner in which the more questionable guilt of the former is impressed upon the reader, that of the latter softened, doubted, obscured; look to the execution of each, equally just and barbarous; with what equity is the demand upon our commiseration advanced? with what fairness is the latter elevated into a heroine and martyr; the former degraded to a criminal, suffering indeed a cruel fate, but with little claim upon our sympathy.³⁶

Milman has been made aware of what Lingard was doing throughout his account:

The general leaning to the authority of Popish writers is occasionally qualified by a partial distrust or even total rejection of their testimony.

35. Ibid., p.13.

36. Ibid., p.6.

Probabilities are weighed on each side with scrupulous exactness, but while all our attention is concentrated on the accuracy with which the weights are adjusted in the separate scales, we scarcely perceive that the author has given a latent inclination to the beam.³⁷

And Milman made a particular example of Lingard's presentation of Allen's pamphlet against Elizabeth and points to a designed omission:

the fourth part, which is to show by what laws of God and man her punishment is to be pursued, he passes lightly over; the last, the treasonable division, which would display his own party in the darkest and truest colours, and which fully confirms their designs against the queen's life and the nation's independence, he omits entirely.³⁸

Milman here referred to a piece that Lingard had, indeed, been anxious to prove a forgery,³⁹ and what Lingard was brought to do with Allen's Admonition showed how nervous he had been of just such accusations of bias in the History of England as Milman was making. Lingard had referred to the Admonition in a letter to Gradwell, dated by the archivist of the English College in Rome, 17th October 1822:

It is so different from his other publications that I would boldly assert that it was not his composition, but that of some of the exiles in the Spanish army, could I but discover that Allen had ever denied it.⁴⁰

37. Ibid.

38. Ibid., p.30. Yet Lingard was still attacked by some catholics. To John Bradley, a former pupil, Lingard wrote:

The last volume.....is not so popular as the others. Protestants cannot bear that a word should be said derogatory from the virgin queen. Dr. Milner is equally hostile.

Quoted in Haile and Bonney, Op.Cit. p.203.

39. Even though it is the source Lingard brought forward to counter Lord Burleigh's tract against the catholics. NB. Chapter five.

40. Lingard to Gradwell, Correspondence A.V.E.C., Section Two, no. 17.

A reading of Milman's review invites the question whether or not Lingard, when he boasted his reputation for impartiality, was capable of understanding what his critics were saying, even about his collecting facts and the reasonableness in argument which were his especial boasts. Milman concluded his review in the most damning manner:

After all, the whole work is by no means so effective as might be expected; the overstrained pretension to candour excites distrust, the tone appears dispassionate, not because the mind of the author is naturally temperate, or is resolved to be impartial, but because it is full of suppressed rather than subdued passion: the very speciousness and elaborate plausibility have in them something suspicious; and while the author strains every nerve to convince us of his indifference to all but truth, it is impossible not to feel as we read, that we are occupied only with the artful statements of a very zealous partisan.⁴¹

By far the longest critique of any individual aspect of Lingard's history was John Todd's Vindication of Archbishop Cranmer.⁴² Todd,⁴³ 'Chaplain in ordinary to his majesty, and rector of Settrington, County of York' published the work in 1825. He offered twelve objections to the way in which Lingard had treated Cranmer, and like Milman, he concentrated on the contrast between the way in which Lingard deals with Cranmer and with Gardiner in the matter of their attitudes during the crisis of the king's claiming supremacy in the Church. Todd remarked that while he is clamorous against Cranmer's part in the establishment of Henry's claim Dr. Lingard 'has not here informed the reader, that Gardiner even wrote a book, violent against the supremacy of the pope'⁴⁴ and Todd then refers to Herbert's remarking: 'Particularly Stephen Gardiner in his Latin Sermon De Vera Obedientia, with the preface of Dr. Bonner'.⁴⁵ From this primary witness Todd continued:

41. Quarterly, Op.Cit., p.6.

42. Todd, H.J., A Vindication of the Most Reverend Thomas Cranmer, 1826, pp.i - 147.

43. Todd, H.J., b.1762 d.1834.

44. Vindication of Cranmer, p.6.

45. Ibid., p.63.

Dr. Lingard indeed ingeniously observes that Henry 'called on the most loyal and learned prelates to employ their talents in support of his new dignity; and the call was obeyed by Sampson and Stokesley, Tunstal and Gardiner: by the former, as was thought, from affection to the cause, by the latter through fear of displeasure'. Stimulated by fear, "as was thought", behold Gardiner then, as well as Cranmer, giving an example to his brethren, and to the whole kingdom; and introduced, with a commendatory analysis of the product of his fear, by the obsequious Bonner;⁴⁶

This is the man, Todd remarks, who is represented by Dr. Lingard as merely 'consenting in order to avoid the royal displeasure, to renounce the papal supremacy; not as reprobating it with all the learning and accuracy which he possessed, and which he well knew were rightly so employed'.⁴⁷ Having dealt with a fact, Todd goes on to an interpretation:

amongst the many partialities of Dr. Lingard, none can be more revolting than his pretence, by way of contrast to the character of Cranmer, of an unpersecuting temper in Gardiner, and of a mild demeanour in Bonner: men, who have been hitherto regarded with national disgust, and of whom the mention in the pages of Dr. Lingard disclaims as it were the notice of them as persecutors, either in combination or apart.⁴⁸

'And whom has Dr. Lingard introduced to bear him out in the presence of Gardiner's innocence?'⁴⁹ At this point we are back with Persons whom Lingard himself had thought difficult to defend. Todd describes him as:

one of Cranmer's slanderers; an Englishman who dishonourably left his own country, and became a Romanist;⁵⁰

46. Ibid.

47. Ibid., p.65.

48. Ibid., p.104.

49. Ibid.

50. Ibid., p.105.

and thus certainly not to be trusted. Todd offers his own facts. To Lingard's request for 'real information'⁵¹ as to the innocence or guilt of Gardiner, he quotes from Sir John Harington:

"Gardiner and his fellowes did condemne to the fyre a number of poore harmlesse soules that profest to beleue as they were taught three yeares before:-"⁵²

And then Todd can offer his own opinion:

for his sharp persecuting or rather revenging himself on Cranmer and Ridley, his too great cruelty cannot be excused. And the plots he laid to entrap the lady Elizabeth; his terrible usage of all her followers; I cannot yet scarce think of him with charity, nor write of with patience.⁵³

It must have discomfited Lingard when he saw that the writer now adduced to back Todd's view was his great friend Charles Butler:

"There appears to be reason to think," Mr. Butler observes, "that Mary's bishops in general did not promote the persecution. Little blame seems imputable to Cardinal Pole, or bishop Tunstal; more is chargeable on Gardiner; the greatest part of the odium fell on Bonner."⁵⁴

More virulent censure along these lines followed in the Eclectic Review⁵⁵ which also had a general criticism illustrated by a Reformation example. After referring to the 'thorough-going partizanship of Dr. Lingard', the reviewer clearly felt that he must make it seem that the critique was considered and not merely a partizan attack upon the historian:

51. Ibid.

52. Ibid., p.106.

53. Ibid., p.108.

54. Ibid., p.109.

55. 'A History of England from the first Invasion by the Romans by John Lingard, D.D. vol. the Fifth, containing the reigns of Mary and Elizabeth'. Eclectic 1827, vol.XXVII, New Series, pp. 237 - 254.

We have given his volumes a fair examination, and we have risen from their perusal with the conviction that he is, of all writers on English history, the most deeply prejudiced. And when, always keeping in view his extensive knowledge and his singular acuteness, we have compared the evidence that lay before him with the inferences which he has felt himself justified in deducing from it, we have found it impossible to resist the conclusion, that his prejudices are deliberate. His devotedness to his Church seems to have an injurious effect upon his understanding with the entire consent of his will.⁵⁶

Yet again a reviewer stops short of accusing Lingard of premeditated disingenuousness:

Without meaning for a moment to impute intentional falsehood to such a man, we cannot help expressing our unfeigned astonishment at the system of unscrupulous and unhesitating advocacy which he has seen fit to adopt.⁵⁷

And again, a reviewer who discusses specific instances of bias in Lingard's writing on the Reformation period:

Dr. Lingard exhibits, throughout, a spirit of determined hostility to Anne Boleyn; and, in order to fix a character of greater odium on her marriage with the king, both affirms her previous concubinage and qualifies it as incestuous on the ground of a former cohabitation asserted to have taken place between Henry and her sister Mary Boleyn. Without the smallest hesitation, he inscribes Mary on the list of the king's mistresses, and assigns as his authority, the 'repeated assertions' of Cardinal Pole, in his 'private letter to Henry, written in 1535.'⁵⁸

The reviewer, evidently, was suspicious enough of Lingard's selecting among source materials to compare his account with that of a protestant historian:

56. Ibid., p.238.

57. Ibid.

58. Ibid., p.240.

This rancorous accusation is the subject of a masterly note by Mr. Turner, who proves, by a reference to Pole's own context, that the charge is unworthy of credit. An imputation of this kind, unless supported by positive or circumstantial evidence, cannot claim a moment's notice; and even had there been no corrective supplied by the very terms of the charge, Dr. Lingard would be without justification in adopting it on the mere allegation of a single and hostile individual.⁵⁹

As a result of this inquiry the reviewer has no confidence in Lingard at all:

This is but a specimen (and by no means the worst) of the spirit in which Dr. Lingard's volumes are written. As a history of England, they are worthless in all that, however remotely, pertains to ecclesiastical matters; and this pervading taint renders it impossible to read with that frank and fearless confidence, without which reading becomes irksome and precarious.⁶⁰

Lingard must have been disturbed if he read that the Eclectic Review considered his work constituted an example for 'Whoever may wish to ascertain with how much dexterity history may be made to subserve the purpose of party'.⁶¹

Four years later Lingard received perhaps from his Whig friend William Shepherd the pleasing information that the immensely eminent historian, Henry Hallam, had been given the job of reviewing his history for the Edinburgh Review.⁶² For so distinguished a man to be allotted this task implied Lingard's importance. Another sign of that importance was that this was the third review of the work by that organ. The previous two had been unfavourable. In the first Allen had snubbed Lingard generally:

Mr. Hume has been accused of a childish partiality for Kings. Dr. Lingard worships a more jealous idol - the Church.⁶³

59. Ibid., p.241.

60. Ibid.

61. Ibid., p.248.

62. Shepherd was a close friend of Hallam.

63. Edinburgh, Op.Cit. p.4.

In the second Allen had launched into a particular attack upon Lingard's treatment of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, which exhibited, he considered, Lingard's bias in favour of Roman catholics:

zeal for his order had made him forgetful of his duties as an historian.....
We do not deny, that, from the specimen we had already had of Dr. Lingard's talents for ecclesiastical controversy, we were prepared for many errors and misrepresentations in this part of his work. And certainly we have not been mistaken in our anticipations.⁶⁴

Hallam's review was undoubtedly milder in tone. He began altogether differently:

we sincerely congratulate our author, as well as the public, on the manifest signs of increased candour and impartiality which distinguish his three quarto volumes on the reigns of the four Stuarts in England, especially the two latter. Not that we do not detect priscae vestigia fraudis; but the objections we could raise on this score are much less frequent.⁶⁵

In a letter April 31, 1831 Lingard wrote to George Oliver his opinion of the third review:

I have just read the critique in the Edinburgh, and, considering the offensive tone of the former critiques, think I have good reason to be satisfied with it. I was told beforehand that I should be so; that it was to be so written as to make me some amends without at the same time compromising the infallibility of the reviewers.⁶⁶

Another reader might have noticed that Hallam's careful language suggests a sense of the Roman catholic's work being managed rather more carefully than was proper in a history. But Hallam begins with a singular comment which nullifies much of what Lingard had been saying about the acceptability of his History to protestant readers.

64. Ibid., p.14.

65. Ibid., p.21.

66. Lingard to Oliver, Correspondence A.S.G.C., Package 173, no.8.

Hallam takes it as evident that Lingard was being deliberately provocative and that he had achieved his aim:

It is impossible to deny that the celebrity of this work has been in some measure owing to the hostility it was calculated, or perhaps designed, to excite.⁶⁷

Hallam too acknowledges the greatest interest to be in Lingard's handling of the Reformation material:

In the first three volumes, though Dr. Lingard was known to be a Catholic priest, little was found that provoked much controversy; nor indeed were they much read before the publication of the fourth.⁶⁸

Hallam does not get so anxiously worked up about the early hints of Lingard's policy as did Allen though he does see that the whole course of the History is concerned with the status of the Church of England in England:

It might be observed, that he disposed of the story of Edwy and Elgiva, and of the dispute between Henry II and Becket, rather differently from most of his Protestant predecessors; but such matters have been reckoned open ground, and not very important to the Established Church.⁶⁹

This dismissal of Anglo-Saxon and Norman matters may be construed either as exhibiting Hallam's robust good sense in the face of Lingard's subtle scheme to prepare for more important matters, or as itself an instance of the success of that scheme. Hallam is either right in regarding those early matters as of indifference in contemporary controversy, or lulled into accepting a view of them which will serve Lingard later. However this may be, Hallam certainly did realise what was going on in the Reformation passages:

67. Edinburgh, Op.Cit. p.18.

68. Ibid.

69. Ibid.

It was quite otherwise when, in descending to the Tudor dynasty, he exhibited the fathers of the Anglican reformation, and all the circumstances of that great revolution in the laws and opinions of England, so unfavourably, and yet to all appearance so dispassionately, and with so perpetual an appeal to authority, that, while many were startled to find their ancient prejudices disturbed without much power of resistance, the champions of orthodox Protestantism were quick to take up the gauntlet, and expose, if they could, the misrepresentation and sophistry which was dimming the lustre of its historical glory.⁷⁰

Hallam is also quick to acknowledge contemporary references to their own times and situations, particularly to the debates leading to the passage of the 1829 Roman catholic emancipation act:

The time drew more than usual attention to such a contest. The great question, since so happily terminated, had begun to assume far more the character of a religious dispute, than it had done at the outset; an activity in proselytism was perceived, or strongly suspected, on both sides.⁷¹

And he acknowledges the rightness of any, and Lingard is certainly among these, who suggest that the political and religious questions are muddled together in most men's minds and that both are somehow muddled further with the varying reputation of select historical personages:

though no rational and cool-headed men were disposed to rest the merits either of Catholic Emancipation, as a political measure, or of the Reformation, as a theological one, on the personal characters of Mary and Elizabeth, of Pole and Cranmer, yet it is certain, that nothing is more common than to measure the truth of doctrines by the honesty of their professors; nor had any argument been more efficacious, in the

70. Ibid.

71. Ibid., p.19.

seventeenth century, to withdraw members of the Anglican Church from its tenets, than to raise unfavourable notions of those who, in the preceding age, had established it.⁷²

Hallam is led on to discuss the idea of historical truth and apologetic in history precisely because the idea was raised by Lingard's evidently apologetic design. Hallam is particularly percipient when discussing Lingard's mode of dealing with Reformation folk. The same figures appear as in earlier reviews:

aware of the propensity of mankind, and perhaps of the greater ease of the undertaking, he prefers lowering his adversaries, to exalting his friends; and if he can degrade the memory of Cranmer, or taint the fame of Anne Boleyn, or darken a shade in the character of Elizabeth, is not comparatively solicitous to interest us for the virtues of Gardiner, or to palliate the cruelties of Bonner.⁷³

And he acknowledges that Lingard has indeed an appearance of the engaging reasonableness which ^{he} rightly supposed would make it appeal to English readers:

the conclusions are always left with the reader, while the facts seem related with so much simplicity and fairness, that, when they are unfairly represented, it is not a slight acquaintance with authentic history which enable us to detect their fallaciousness.

L'arte che tutto fa, nulla si scuopre.⁷⁴

Hallam is indicating that Lingard's mode of operation seems to him distinctly apologetic and political and dishonest. The unacquainted reader has been warned. Hallam suggests that Lingard is frequently guilty of 'going beyond the meaning of the authorities which he vouches, and of still more frequent suppression of the truth'.⁷⁵

72. Ibid.

73. Ibid.

74. Ibid.

75. Ibid., p.20. This is consistent with Hallam's assessment of Lingard quoted in the Constitutional History where Hallam observes Lingard was a writer 'whose acuteness and industry would have roused him to a very respectable place among our historians, if he could have repressed the inveterate partiality of his profession'. Quoted in the Gentlemen's Magazine, Sept. 1851, Op.Cit. p.324.

This is a terrible charge from such a man and the more damaging in such a periodical. It is odd that Lingard should have been 'satisfied' by it.⁷⁶ His comment suggests he was quite content to be thought the presenter of a case. This same contentment is intimated in a letter postmarked 25th March 1826 to Gradwell, commenting upon two reviews:

Since my return (from Rome) my history has been noticed in two reviews, the quarterly in an article entitled "the reformation" by Millman and in Blackwoods last number in an article entitled "Dr. Lingard." The first charges me with being an artful writer, but fixes on no particular passage as proof of falsehood and misrepresentation: the second is nothing but rant about minds debased by superstition &c, and an exhortation to protestants to be on their guard, for the crisis is approaching, and British papists maintain a weekly correspondence with the pope. I have reason to be content with each. For both shew that they would bite, if they could!⁷⁷

This is a private letter to a friend, and Lingard evidently felt free to smile smugly to himself in the strange conviction that he had not been caught by his critic. That he rejoiced that Milman 'fixes on no particular passage', suggests that Lingard felt safe as long as no one suggested he was misquoting sources. That he should be attacked for using primary sources in a biased manner seems never to have worried him.⁷⁸

76. Wiseman's assessment of it is less surprising. Writing to Lingard from Rome February 4th 1832 he said: 'I was glad to find the last article in the Edinburgh upon your History more inclined to be good humoured if not good natured'. Wiseman to Lingard, Shepherd Papers, M.C.O., vol.1, p.43.

77. Lingard to Gradwell, Correspondence A.V.E.C., Section Three, no.29.

78. Lingard wrote in this same conspiratorial tone to Walker 5th January 1845:

In his last work he (Lord Brougham) looks upon my history as the most surprising phenomenon of this age. Why so? because no one could possibly expect that a work so fraught with popish partiality and prejudice, could have been published in the 19th century.

Quoted in Haile and Bonney, Op.Cit., p.313.

However, Lingard did reply to several reviewers in his Vindication of Certain Passages in the Fourth and Fifth Volumes of the History of England, published in 1826.⁷⁹ In this tract he set out his defence of the working method of his history. It is interesting to notice just what kind of charges Lingard thought demanded a public reply from him. The title of the defence exhibits Lingard's intention in composing it. He does not usually concern himself with general criticisms. He deals mostly with allegations of misrepresentation of some particular incident. For example he notices first the charge that he had protected Gardiner by suppressing information about him:

I am charged with suppressing the fact that Gardiner wrote a book in defence of the king's supremacy. Now this is plainly intimated in the passage quoted by Mr. Todd, and is expressly stated in pages 426 and 482 of my sixth volume.

"Henry called on the most loyal and learned of the prelates to employ their talents in support of his new dignity; and the call was obeyed by Sampson and Stokesley, Tunstal and Gardiner." Hist.vi.284.⁸⁰

This is clearly an unsatisfactory answer to the charge of Todd which had a more general application that Lingard admits. Todd's point was that Lingard was unfair in the treatment he gave to protestants and catholics. Lingard was being less than honest if he thought that by intimating that Gardiner might have written the work and by merely mentioning it on two other occasions, he was rebutting an accusation of treating catholic partisans differently from the protestants. His answer smacks of casuistry. However, Lingard does see that if he avoid the general question, he has yet to answer the particular second charge of Todd that the treatment of Gardiner in

79. Much of the Vindication concerned Lingard answering the considerable charges made against him by Dr. Allen concerning his interpretation of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. There Lingard had a strong case (see, for example, David Knowles' comments in his chapter on the massacre in 'Man on his Past', especially p.191). Perhaps, confident he was right, Lingard used the episode as the major feature of the Vindication in order to deflect attention from the other areas where he felt far less safe.

80. Vindication, Op.Cit., p.82.

comparison to that of Cranmer gave an example of the ways in which Lingard was unfair. Lingard's reply is carefully put together. In the course of making his defence Lingard seems happy to allow that he has no 'philosophy' of history, and that he just tells in sequence as it happened. He is making a claim to sincere straight forwardness in his dealings with the reader:

In which of these pages is this wonderful contrast to be found? I have spoken, indeed, of Cranmer, and Gardiner, and Bonner. It was my duty to speak of them, as their actions passed in review before me. But I never brought them into comparison with each other, nor did the idea so much as suggest itself to my mind. Of Bonner I have said little: but that little was taken from Mr. Todd's favourite authority, Fox. With respect to Gardiner, I had so often seen the epithet "bloody" attached to his name, that I looked on him as a most cruel persecutor; and, having repeatedly seen the mild and charitable Cranmer sitting on the trial, and pronouncing the condemnation of heretics in the reign of Edward, I expected to find the bloody Gardiner daily employed in similar atrocities during that of Mary.⁸¹

Lingard characteristically directs the reader to a review of primary sources in the expectation that this will persuade the reader that his argument is properly founded:

It, therefore, excited my surprise, when I could discover but one instance in which he had taken any part in such proceedings, and that was on the first prosecution after the revival of the statutes, when it was expected that he, as the chief law magistrate, should attend. On this account I ventured to remark, that "the charge against the chancellor was not supported by any authentic document, and was weakened by the general tenor of his conduct." The remark has astonished the prejudices of Mr. Todd: my readers, I trust, will think, that, with due regard to truth, I could not have said less.⁸²

81. Ibid., p.92.

82. Ibid.

With regard to the truth in his reply, Lingard might have noticed Todd's evidence from other sources, Sir John Harrington's witness against Gardiner for example, or Strype's suggestion in his Ecclesiastical Memoirs that Persons was not a reliable source for information on Gardiner's character. Later, however, Lingard was ready to defend even Persons from Todd in a general defence of Lingard's handling of documents:

It is not by abusing this writer that Mr. Todd must expect to put down this testimony. Let him, if he can, produce some instance that contradicts it.⁸³

Lingard sets out to show that he was quite justified in assessing Persons to be both a reliable witness himself and in accord with other reliable witnesses:

Let him remember that Persons wrote of the public conduct of one, who had exercised the office of prime minister, and wrote at a time, when thousands were alive to convict him of falsehood, if what he asserted were not true.⁸⁴

Lingard trundles out a particularly protestant witness to bolster his usage of Persons:

Let him compare the testimony of Persons, papist as he was, with the testimony of that sound orthodox protestant, old Roger Ascham, preceptor to queen Elizabeth, who thus writes, in the reign of that princess, to the earl of Leicester: "Noe bishop in queene Mary's days wold have dealt so with me: for such estimac'on e'n those (even the learnedst and wisest men, as Gardiner, Heath, and cardinal Poole) made of my poore service, that although they knew perfectly, that in religion, by open writing and privy talk, I was contrary unto them, yett that, when Sir Francis Inglefield by name did note me specially at the council board, Gardiner would not suffer me to be called thither, nor touched

83. Ibid., p.93.

84. Ibid.

elsewhere, saying such words of me as in a letter, though letters cannot blushe, yet should I blushe to write therein to you Lo'pp- Winchester's good will stood not in speakeing faire, and wishing well, but he did indeed that for me, whereby my wife and children shall live the better, when I am gone".⁸⁵

Something of the characteristics of his dealings with Todd recur in his reply to the charges Lingard notices in Milman's review. Milman's main point was that Lingard was careful in his selection of both sources and interpretative language in order to give 'a latent inclination to the beam' whilst readers are persuaded to watch the precise adjustment of the weights. This general argument was exemplified in his particular suggestion that Lingard had gone beyond his sources in his description of Anne Boleyn in order to present her as a coquette. Lingard chose to ignore the general character of the argument and makes it appear that Milman was merely concerned with a fact in the history of Anne Boleyn - a fact that Lingard can suggest that Milman got wrong:

He is evidently at a loss, whether he ought to admit or deny the alleged connexion between Henry and Anne. In one part he admits it, where he wishes her weakness to be attributed to the seductions of Henry, and her confidence in her promises: in others he may be said to deny it, for he affirms the absence of all authentic evidence, and that nothing has been proved against her but her marriage on the 25th of January and the birth of her child on the 13th, he should have said the 7th, of September.⁸⁶

Milman was more careful in his assessment of evidences than Lingard allows. Lingard's response to this critic amounts to nothing more than an attempt to direct the readers attention away from the discussion of his habitual artfulness towards the review of a single set of facts. He proceeds to discuss matters which are bound to show him as trustworthy:

85. Ibid.

86. Ibid., p.101.

I shall answer, that I have related nothing respecting the conduct of Henry and Anne, which is not founded, in my opinion, on evidence beyond cavil or suspicion. One letter, indeed, is dateless. But that letter is unfavourable to Anne, as it proves that Henry, when he wrote it, had in vain solicited her chastity for more than a twelvemonth. But, if the reviewer had consulted the other letters, which I have quoted, he could not have said that they are "dateless". All of them, and they are numerous, have their accompanying dates.⁸⁷

Lingard then proceeds to explain why he wrote the account of Anne as he did:

We find the king attempting to seduce a young and beautiful female. To overcome her objections, he promises her marriage, as soon as he can obtain a divorce from his wife. The case is brought into court: but the delay of the judges irritates his impatience. He expels his wife; he sends for the object of his affections from the house of father; he allots her apartments contiguous to his own; he orders his courtiers to pay to her all the respects due to the queen; he suffers her to interfere in matters of state, and to claim a share in the distribution of favours. Thus they live for three years under the same roof. We find them taking their meals together; if the king ride out, we are sure to discover her by his side; if he hunt, he places her in a convenient station to partake of the sport; if he change his residence, she accompanies him; and, when he crosses the sea to meet the French king at Calais, he cannot leave her behind him.⁸⁸

The reader is then invited to join Lingard in his management of the facts:

Let the reader couple this with the amorous temperament of Henry, with his impetuous disposition, with his indelicate allusions and anticipations in his correspondence with her, and he will not want evidence to teach

87. Ibid., p.102.

88. Ibid., p.103.

him in what relation they lived together, nor feel any surprise, if her child was born more than seven months after the clandestine celebration of their marriage.⁸⁹

Two questions remain. One, the particular question about Lingard's treatment of the facts of Anne Boleyn's case which may fairly stand for his treatment of facts in other cases. Two, the question whether a general accusation is properly dealt with by particular refutation. Lingard has certainly achieved the appearance of a victory in this tract but the reader may well not feel entirely comfortable with what is offered. Clearly Lingard did not wish to discuss the suggestion made by Milman that his history was in general disingenuously written, but it is not a suggestion that goes away while Lingard is defending his account of the Boleyn with assertions of the correctness of his facts.

In the final part of the Vindication, Lingard addressed Milman's accusation that he had used Cardinal Allen's Admonition too selectively, clearly intending to use only that part which should show catholics in a good light and to suppress whatever might be to their disadvantage. This of the Vindication section may afford a final illustration of both Lingard's lawyer-like presentation of a brief, and the brief itself:

Had I been the partial and interested writer, whom the reviewer is pleased to represent me, instead of analyzing any part of this tract, I should have allowed (sic) to remain in the obscurity in which it lay unconcealed. Nothing called on me to detail its contents. But the book has always been extremely scarce: though I can enumerate twenty writers who have mentioned it, I do not believe that any one of them had seen it: and on that account I thought I should gratify the curiosity of my readers by giving an analysis of it in my notes. But then I had but little space: the volume had already reached the six hundredth and sixtieth page, a bulk which I had not anticipated: and for that reason I

89. Ibid.

confined my description to the part of the book, which was unknown, and for the remainder referred the reader to the accounts already published. This is the partiality of which I have been guilty.⁹⁰

This is an extremely skilful manoeuvre. Lingard has put himself in the position of an injured party and made it his appeal that he was only doing his best to gratify the harmless desire of his reader. It comes as a rhetorical shock that the account of such a course of action should be concluded with any reference to guilt. Milman's account of Lingard's proceedings had suggested that Lingard's partiality was such as to lead him to identify with England's enemies because he took it for granted that a Roman catholic would necessarily be of the Spanish party. Lingard is quick to complain again. He is very skilful in exploiting any situation in which he can assume the figure of injured innocence. Milman had presented him with such a situation. Lingard makes the reader his trusted judge:

But may I ask what is the meaning of the passage, "which would display his own party in the darkest and truest colours?" Why am I to be identified with the Spanish party? Where have I approved of their intrigues and designs? The Spanish party composed not the great body of English catholics. The former projected and promoted the Spanish expedition: the latter rose to oppose it with an energy and unanimity, which extorted from their very adversaries the praise of loyalty and patriotism.⁹¹

That Lingard was indeed playing something of a part in all this, and that he was especially leading his readers away from their curiosity about the Admonition and towards their interest in his own sincerity is apparent from a reading of the letter to Gradwell, dated by the archivist at the English College at Rome 17th October 1822 in which Lingard admits the Admonition to be 'perhaps the most virulent libel ever

90. Ibid., p.111.

91. Ibid., p.100.

written⁹² and goes on to declare 'I would give anything to prove it a forgery for his honour and that of catholics'.⁹³ Milman has got him right. Lingard identified with the Spanish party because whether he liked it or not, the prevailing prejudices of his protestant and Roman catholic contemporaries had made it impossible for him to do otherwise without seeming to concede to the one or to betray the other. But in making his answer to the reviewers of the History of England it is clear that Lingard had no intention of admitting what he was about. In the Vindication he sought to shore up the case that he had made in the History by recourse to even more citations of early sources. He seems to have been working consistently on the supposition that if the facts were as he alleged and the quotations from primary material were accurate, the account he was giving would have to be admitted even if it were not the whole truth.

That he had attempted a reconstruction of history in ways that were particularly sectarian, and had, as his correspondence exhibits, done with the avowed intent of leading along those protestants whom he had persuaded until they should make a more favourable judgement of contemporary Roman catholicism in England, surprises only because Lingard persisted in presenting himself as a model of the historian who simply tells a straightforward tale. That contemporary reviewers should be discovered to have discerned what Lingard was attempting surprises only because Lingard persisted in claiming that his readers were happy in their estimate of him as a teller of such a tale.

There remains, therefore, a question whether Lingard ever became better aware of what was being said about the History, and whether he did anything to prevent the increase and spread of that criticism in the reception of later editions of the History. To that question I shall now turn.

92. Lingard to Gradwell, Correspondence A.V.E.C., Section Two, no.17.

93. Ibid.

Chapter EightThe Reformation again and onwards (History 4th and 5th Editions)

After 1823, the three remaining volumes of Lingard's first edition, published 1825, 1829 and 1830 respectively, and the second (1823 - 31) and third (1825 - 31) editions of the whole history were published in quick succession. Most of the latest information that Lingard had collected for the last period covered by the history therefore, must have been included in the first edition. There is little to be expected, therefore, from a comparison of these editions in hope of discovering very much more of Lingard's researches into matters covered in these last volumes. He did not have time enough to make any significant change in his narrative from edition to edition.

A fourth edition of the History of England was produced between 1837 and 1839, and a fifth appeared in 1849, two years before Lingard's death. And for these editions, particularly for the fourth edition, there is indeed evidence that Lingard continued to look for further primary material to support the case he had presented in the three earlier editions. Lingard's search was most often conducted along the old lines. He got his friends to rummage in archives for pleasant pieces of information that would assist in the assertion of previously prepared opinions. But the search was now conducted rather less energetically. The history having been completed at the 'Glorious Revolution' of 1688¹, Lingard, shortly after his sixtieth birthday, on April 30th 1831, wrote to George Oliver in very relaxed tone explaining his plans for future occupation with the work:

I now amuse myself in reviewing my work, and correcting errors, in which your communications have been to me of the greatest service. Any remarks additional, which you have to make, will be received as great favours. Whenever a fourth edition may be called for, it will

1. Lingard's reasons for stopping his narrative at 1688 are connected with his sense of the History fulfilling his controversy with Shute Barrington, Tomline of Lincoln and Huntingford of Gloucester.

appear in a more correct form; but this Baldwin does not wish to be made public, as it may prevent the sale of the present edition. I of course, labour at it when it suits my convenience.²

At that convenience Lingard seems to have become more aware of a need to answer those reviewers who had noticed in his History of England incidences of special pleading of a Roman catholic case and a deliberate ignoring of the more obvious meaning of the sources at his disposal. He seems to have come to esteem the Vindication as an attempt to ward them off for a while. It came to have for him the aspect of a merely temporary measure. There is not enough evidence to allow any firm demonstration of how this realization occurred but a letter to Mawman, 24th February 1824, witnesses to his awareness of the temptations of the party historian and of the results, at least in another's work, of yielding to such temptations:

I have lately looked through Southey's Church, and think it will add little to his reputation as an historian. It has plainly been written for a purpose, to please the high-church party; it was therefore unnecessary to be at the trouble of much research; he has consulted party writers before him, and selected from them what he thought would be most pleasing to those whose approbation he sought. He may talk of having sufficient authority for his statements in his collections: but I suspect

2. Lingard to Oliver Correspondence A.S.G.C., Package 173, no.8. It had always been Lingard's intention at the close of each edition to wait a while and produce a further version of the History which would, so far as he could manage it, answer the criticisms levelled at the previous stages of the work. He had written to Gradwell May 17th 1820 that he would not hurry to start a second edition:

till I learn what the Edinburgh and quarterly reviews may say of it, that I may make corrections if necessary, or vindicate myself.

Lingard to Gradwell, Correspondence A.V.E.C., section one, no.8. He would have wanted to wait as long as possible before committing himself to a final version.

that, had he given these authorities, they would have proved to be not original documents, but statements made by persons heated with controversy and stimulated by prejudice.³

Lingard is as confident as ever that the consultation of primary material is a sure way to avoid the imputation of being a merely party historian, and even while seeming to have no consciousness of what others charged against his own dealings with characters of that period, he takes particular note of Southey's manipulations in his account of the Reformation period:

In his reigns of Henry, Edward and Mary, he has done little more than make a compendium of Fox, and has related without the least semblance of a doubt as to their accuracy the hearsay stories collected by that writer.⁴

The only way, that Lingard knew of dealing with accusations of the sort he was making against Southey, and therefore the only way of dealing with the accusations made against his own History, was to demonstrate the wide base an assertion had in primary material. Southey's mistake, which rendered him vulnerable in controversy, was to have relied on what Foxe had collected. Lingard was aware of the need to get many others to collect for him. The new editions of the History thus became extended versions of the Vindication. Neither in the fourth nor the fifth edition did Lingard offer a 'philosophy' of history, but he did offer more and more facts. All through this period he continued to appeal to his friends to keep up their searches. George Oliver at St. Nicholas Priory in Exeter, Henry Howard at London and Rome, Nicholas Wiseman in Rome,⁵ Thomas Sherburne in Valladolid, Robert Gradwell the new vicar

3. Quoted in Haile and Bonney, Op.cit., p.204. The reference is to Robert Southey's Book of the Church, 1824.

4. Ibid.

5. At Manchester College, Oxford, I discovered one of the few surviving letters of Wiseman to Lingard testifying to Wiseman's assistance. Wiseman expresses his pleasure to Lingard 'of receiving your commission to search the pontifical Archives for the documents referred to by Chateaubriand'.
Wiseman to Lingard, Correspondence M.C.O., Shepherd Papers, vol.1., p.43.

Apostolic of the London district, and John Gage Rokewode⁶ in London, Mark Tierney at the Duke of Norfolk's library at Arundel, Daniel Rock in Lord Shrewsbury's library and Robert Tate at Ushaw and others were put to go through their archives again for further material of a helpful kind.⁷ The uses he made of the first two of these may exhibit his uses of the rest.

George Oliver had met Lingard as early as 1806, but the two men only corresponded regularly from 1827 until Lingard's death.⁸ Though he had let Oliver, at St. Nicholas Priory in Exeter, know of the rather gentlemanly way he intended to proceed with the fourth edition, Lingard was insistent that his informant should himself keep hard at his research work. Oliver was a prolific writer of little works most of which dealt with local matters of the Devon district, but he had also made

6. Rokewode, John, George, b.1786 d.1842. Lingard conveyed his shock to Oliver when he heard the news of Rokewode's death; 2nd October 1842:

He will be a great loss to me; for he was always ready to execute any commission for me at the British Museum and other repositories.

Lingard to Oliver, Correspondence A.S.G.C., Package 173, no.52.

7. 'Palgrave, Macintosh, Petrie, Ellis, Upcott, Hamilton; Poynter, Kirk, Oliver, Hodgson, Husenbeth; Lord Stourton, Sir Henry Lawson, Lord Shrewsbury, Charles Butler; Curr, Tate and Youens at Ushaw, his old pupils then scattered to every part of England, Sherburne at Valladollid, Gradwell at Rome, Lythgoe at Stonyhurst, Langan at Paris and Besancon, Cameron at Simancas- these are only a few of the names that strike the eye'.

Quoted from E.Bonney's 'The Making of Lingard's History', Ushaw Magazine, vol. XIX 1909, p.282

A typical instance of Lingard involving his friends and acquaintances in gaining access to documents for historical subjects can be seen in Lingard's preparation for an account of Father John Huddleston b.1608 d.1698 whom Lingard alleges helped Prince Charles to escape and, when he became Charles II, was appointed the chaplain to Charles' queen. This was published in Leath Ward's History of Westmoreland, 1842. See the letters Lingard sent out in hope of information contained in Dodd's Church History of England, A.S.G.C., no.106, also, on the same subject in the A.D.A. K299, and K317.

8. N.B. Oliver to Lingard, Correspondence A.S.G.C., Package 173, no.1.

general Collections towards illustrating the Biography of the Scotch, English, and Irish members of the Society of Jesus.⁹ Lingard asked Oliver to criticize his history and to suggest improvements, and on several occasions Lingard changed things in later editions according to Oliver's suggestions.¹⁰

Oliver's greatest discovery had been of some original letters that threw light upon Babington's plot, and, since Howard also assisted Lingard in putting together his final version of the Mary Queen of Scots episode, and, since it was an episode that Lingard thought important in his general strategy of apologetic in the History, it may be a proper example from which to begin some elucidation of Lingard's relation to his helpers.

George Oliver first wrote to Lingard about this find on November 13th 1834:

A Mr. Leigh, a respectable Lawyer of Bardon in Somersetshire has recently discovered 6 original letters of the Lord Treasurer Burleigh (or so he spells it) to Sir Christopher Hatton, written before the 4th & 15th of Sept. 1586. They relate to Babington's Conspiracy & the Trial of Mary Q. of Scotland; & place the character of Elizabeth in a very unamicable light; & prove how she thirsted for the blood of her Cousin & Rival. She thought that the horrible tortures usually inflicted on Traitors ought to be exercised on her person -that even these were not enough. It is clear from these letters, that her Ministers found her very difficult to manage. I shall see Mr. Leigh again shortly, & will beg him to give you accurate information & extracts.¹¹

Oliver's exciting hint of Elizabeth appearing in an unamicable light, and especially her urging the hanging, drawing, and quartering of Mary, prompted an immediate response from Lingard:

9. Collections towards illustrating the Biography of the Scotch, English, and Irish members of the Society of Jesus, 1838.
10. See for example, Oliver's suggestions in Correspondence A.S.G.C., Package 173, particularly nos. 3, 5, 10 and 11.
11. Ibid., no.15.

For your last I beg to thank you, and I hope that you will be able to procure for me from Mr. Leigh copies or extracts of the interesting letters from Lord Burleigh to Sir Chris: Hatton.¹²

Lingard was ready to print anything that tended to a derogation of Elizabeth's dignity. He wrote in happiness that his discovering just one proof of scandal against her should be so speedily followed by Oliver's coming upon a more incriminating correspondence:

Have you seen the edition of the "Poetical Rhapsody" lately given by Sir N. Harris Nicolas. In the biographical notices which he has prefixed, he has published a letter of advice from Sir Ed: Dyer to Hatton which proves that the queen had called him from the study of the law to the court to be her bed-fellow, as was always suspected, but that tiring of him she had substituted another in his place, which he resented in such a manner, as to make his friend fear that he would mar his fortunes.¹³

All this would be prepared for a further edition of the history: 'I hope to make great use of this letter hereafter'.¹⁴

But George Oliver was tardy. By the time that Lingard had reached the Mary Queen of Scots affair in his revision in November 1836 there was still no sign of the Leigh letters. Lingard wrote to Oliver on 9th November:

Necessity causes me to write. You will remember that a Mr. Leigh was once mentioned to me by you as possessed of some documents relating to the trial of Mary, Queen of Scots. He afterwards wrote to me two or three times from London on the subject. Now I have never heard of the result. He may have published something on the subject either separately, or in some periodical work, which has escaped my notice.

12. Ibid., no.16.

13. Ibid., The reference is to Nicholas Harris Nicholas' Poetical Rhapsody, 1826. Writing to Daniel Rock in 1833 Lingard was equally gleeful:

No one after the publication of this letter can boast of the maiden queen.

Lingard to Rock, Correspondence A.S.G.C., Package 172, no.1.

14. Lingard to Oliver, Correspondence A.S.G.C., Package 173, no.16.

Can you give me any information on that head. I could have written to him at once, but I have no knowledge of his address.¹⁵

Lingard was anxious to offer as damaging an account of Elizabeth as the Tudor sources would allow him:

I of course, desirous to make this, the last edition that I shall ever see, as perfect as possible, am employed in revising the whole of it. I am now in the reign of Elizabeth, and therefore could wish to know what was the result in Mr. Leigh's mind after the research that he had made in London, and the comparison there of his documents with others. I could also wish to know whether he would be willing, supposing he has not published and intends not to publish, to allow me the inspection of his documents, or copies of them, or at least would inform me on what points they may contradict any part of my statement.¹⁶

But, on this occasion, Oliver disappointed him. He seems not to have been able to help Lingard further in the matter. Lingard, once on such a scent, however, was not easily to be diverted. He turned to Henry Howard. He too had been engaged to look for any tit-bit of scandal that Lingard could cite in his appraisal of Elizabeth. He too had to bend his mind to the Hatton affair. In the summer of 1838 Lingard wrote:

I trouble you once more to inquire whether you have ever seen or can contrive to see, the five letters of the correspondence between Sir Christ. Hatton and Queen Elizabeth. They are in the State Paper office, under the custody of the Commission for publishing the State Papers, which commission if it proceeded at its present pace, will publish them about this time in the next century.

These letters (I have been informed (whether all are written by Hatton, or some by the queen, I know not) are composed in a style which evidently shows the nature of the intimacy between the two parties. In

15. Ibid., no. 17.

16. Ibid.

one Hatton signs or styles himself "your majesty's black mutton." Lemmon, the former keeper of the office, has said that the duke of Sussex, when he read them, exclaimed, that the point was settled: it was impossible to doubt.¹⁷

It is not clear whether Howard contrived to see these letters, and even Lingard might have found it difficult to persuade himself that every decent reader would jump to the Duke of Sussex' conclusion at Hatton's confession of being a black sheep, so perhaps Lingard gave up his attempt to employ these State Papers. Howard certainly did obtain extracts from the Leigh letters which he passed on to Lingard. The text of the fourth and fifth editions of the History of England witnesses that these were employed in the strengthening of Lingard's thesis about the Mary Queen of Scots affair. Lingard's final treatment of the executions of some of Babington's colleagues contains references to 'the harrowing detail of their sufferings, in Howell, i. 1127 - 1158; Camden, 483'.¹⁸, and to 'two letters from Burghley to Hatton, in possession of Mr. Leigh'.¹⁹ And the Leigh material was also brought in to support Lingard's assessment of protestant assumptions of Mary's guilt. In his discussion of the government's evaluation of Mary's letters during the period just before the arrests of the conspirators Lingard wrote that the correspondence of Babington and Mary show that Babington had read a minute purporting to come from Mary and was aware that it could prove nothing against Mary Stuart, because whatever might be its meaning, it was not in her handwriting.²⁰ The narrative is conducted along lines which his correspondents have indicated as quite within the bounds of possibility. Lingard has made of a few phrases in the Leigh letters, identified by Oliver, extracted through the Howard connection, an impressive addition to his apology for Mary Queen of Scots.

17. Lingard to Howard, Correspondence A.C.C., Box 3, Bundle T, no.20.

18. Hist. of Eng., Op.cit., 4th ed. 1838, vol. VIII, p.216. The references are to Thomas Howell's State Trials 1809-26 and William Camden's History of Elizabeth 1719.

19. Ibid., p.698, n.5.

20. Ibid.

Meanwhile Lingard had kept Oliver busy about Mary Queen of Scots and the Babington plot. Lingard wrote on the 18th November 1836 a letter which shows him carefully arranging the guilts of those concerned:

I have no doubt that Babington was also a traitor, not perhaps at first, but certainly in the course of the business: but I cannot believe the (sic) Curle was. I have given in my work the testimony of Fr. Clifford of the solemn manner in which he denied it on his death-bed: and Verstigan's correspondent only says that it has been credibly reported.

Again have you any reason to suppose that the writer had seen the letter in which he says the name appeareth?

As to Nau, in his apology he stoutly maintains his innocence. I believe, however, that Mary thought him guilty. A little before the correspondence with Babington, she had sent Nau with a message to Elizabeth, and he was all the while accompanied by Walsingham's emissaries, who were ordered to keep him from communication with others. I should not be surprised if he, during that time, allowed himself to be caught in the act; though I do not meet with anything to justify the charge of downright treachery to his mistress. If you can help me to any elucidation of the matter, I shall be grateful.²¹

Lingard nicely contrasts the report of Curle's death-bed assertions of innocence with the report of others' assertions of Curle's guilt, as if the one had a quite different and better sort of authority than that of being only 'credibly reported'. Whatever the guilt or innocence of her servants, Lingard is here preoccupied with finding evidence that would suggest that Mary never had any detailed knowledge of the plot, and he therefore puts that construction of the other's actions which will assist this main intent. Curle has to be innocent, Nau has to allow himself to get caught, Babington has to be guilty.

21. Lingard to Oliver, Correspondence A.S.G.C., Package 173, no.19. The reference to Father Clifford is in Lingard's History, ^{1902 ed., vol. VI,} Op.cit., p.461. Verstigan was a Dutch diplomat who corresponded with some of the English court.

Whatever assistance Oliver gave Lingard in this matter, he seems to have become a trusted friend from whom advice on the furtherance of Lingard's design might be sought. That Lingard was anxious to preserve certain innocencies and guilts in his account of the Gunpowder plot is clear from a letter he wrote to Oliver, March 2nd 1837. This shows how careful Lingard was in his treatment of Garnet and how delicate was his mature way with primary material. Some things must just not be published as they stand:

You wish me to publish part of F. Garnet's letter to the council. You will find that I have mentioned it & its object generally, but on consideration I think that it would be imprudent to do more, and leave you to judge. There is still extant in his own hand in the State Paper office a letter from him to the King of the date of March 3, the contents of which I shall introduce in my new edition. In it he professes his detestation of the powder action, his constant opinion that it was unlawful to oppose the king after his accession to the crown, and proceeds thus: "I acknowledge that I was bound to reveal all knowledge that I had of this or any other treason out of the sacrament of confession. And whereas, partly upon hope of prevention, partly for that I would not betray my friend, I did not reveal the general knowledge of Mr. Catesby's intention which I had by him, (he had previously confessed that Cat. had told him he was engaged in a plot against the government, but he (G.) would hear no more) I do acknowledge myself highly guilty, to have offended God, the King's majesty and estate, and humbly ask of all forgiveness, exhorting all Catholics whatsoever that they no way build on my example, but by prayer and otherwise seek the peace of the realm."²²

22. Lingard to Oliver, Correspondence A.S.G.C., Package 173, no.21. The reference is to Garnet's letter to the council, Hist. of Eng., 4th ed., Op.cit., vol. IX, p.59. The reference to the letter to James is Ibid., p.65.

Lingard commented:

This avowal made him legally guilty of misprision of treason but no overt act was proved against him and consequently he was not by law liable to punishment of death.²³

Lingard will introduce a version of the contents of this statement that stops short of a full representation of the text. This is not unlike his handling of Allen's Admonition. It is the method, which he had by this time perfected, of making an 'extract'. It would seem that his correspondents, Oliver and Howard and Gradwell certainly, were wholly sympathetic to the work that Lingard proposed. Their letters show that they were entirely proud of their extraction of useful phrases and sentences from an unhelpful context. Lingard may be observed employing that method again in his attempt to undermine Carlyle's Life and Letters of Oliver Cromwell, which had been published in 1845. In a letter to Oliver, 1st September 1848, by which time he was revising his account of the Protectorate, Lingard requested further material to shore up the view of the man and his achievements that he had chosen to take in the history. He had again, as with the Leigh letters, come back to a note he had made to remind himself of what he must do when he reached a particular point in his revision. He remembered 'the printed memorial of 9pp'²⁴ that was once, at any rate, in Oliver's desk:

Have you still that memorial in your possession? I fear not. But it strikes me that it will probably contain much respecting the sufferings of Ireland from the cruelty and tyranny of Cromwell which I might victoriously oppose to Carlyle's defence of that rascal.²⁵

23. Ibid.

24. Lingard refers to a pamphlet Oliver had mentioned:

A Memorial from the Irish bishops addressed to Pope Innocent X, and the Cardinals, Prelates, and Clergy of the Catholic Church.

25. Lingard to Oliver, Correspondence A.S.G.C., Package 173, no. 65. Lingard's lack of sympathy with Carlyle's work is expressed in a letter in my possession. He wrote to Benjamin Dockray, a local author, 8th August 1848:

I return Carlyle's lectures with my best thanks. They are still, as they were formerly, beyond my comprehension.

Lingard describes what he wants done with the pamphlet:

If you could read over the document, or instruct me, how I could get any one to read it, that person might easily extract for me, what might be of service in this respect.²⁶

Lingard then specifies the kind of material he needs, and suggests that Oliver should keep on looking out for him:

if you have from other documents any testimony respecting the massacre committed by Cromwell in 1649 & 50 at Drogheda, Wexford or other places, you will do me a great favour by communicating the substance to me with as little inconvenience as possible to yourself.²⁷

Howard was still being called to find material for Lingard. His help for the fourth edition of the History is acknowledged in the following letter, written probably on May 23 1836:

I am extremely grateful to you for the interest, which you take in my work, and your trouble in making extracts for me. I should have acknowledged receipt of them before this, but I have been of late really overwhelmed with the correction of letter press for Baldwin & Co.²⁸

But it was for the fifth edition that he was of greatest service. He had been set to extract sentences about a subject of immense importance to his own family. In 1570 a plot had been devised by the Italian banker Ridolfi that was to lead quite against its own design to the execution of the Duke of Norfolk, Howard's ancestor, in 1572. This was an incident which might well have seemed an embarrassment in Lingard's attempt to present catholics as loyal and indeed nationalist members of Elizabethan society.

There is a great difference between the account of this affair in the first edition of 1823 and that of the fifth of 1849. Lingard had somewhere acquired

26. Lingard to Oliver, Correspondence A.S.G.C., Package 173, no.65.

27. Ibid.

28. Lingard to Howard, Correspondence A.C.C., Box 3, Bundle T., no.16. There is no date on the letter. Lingard refers here to his publishers Baldwin and Cradock.

information about this affair in the meantime. In the first edition he says of Mary queen of Scots association with Ridolphi:

despairing of redress from the injustice of Elizabeth, she gave to Rudolphi, as her ambassador to foreign courts, a letter of instructions, subject to the approval or correction of the duke. From these it appeared that she despaired of assistance from France during the civil wars which convulsed that kingdom; and had determined to rely on the promises of the king of Spain.²⁹

And Norfolk's involvement in all this is narrated in that edition as follows:

Rudolphi found the duke at Howard house, still a prisoner, complaining of the wrongs which he had suffered, and irritated at the refusal of his petition for leave to attend his duty in parliament. The Italian laid before him two projects: one that he should intercept the queen on her way to the house of lords, by the junction of his friends with certain noblemen and knights, of whose names he held a list in his hands: the other, that he should agree to assemble the greatest force in his power, and join the duke of Alva, who would land at Harwich with ten thousand veterans. In either case it would be easy to extort from the queen her consent to the removal of her ministers, the marriage of Norfolk with Mary Stuart, and the repeal of those laws, which affected the rights of conscience.³⁰

In the fifth edition of 1849 Lingard presented a rather different account of the incident:

Norfolk had been released from the Tower in the month of August, and was now in his own house, but under the custody of Sir Henry

29. Hist. of Eng., 1st ed. vol.V, Op.cit., p.323.

30. Ibid.

Neville. To him, therefore, the conspirators had no access; but Ross had made a friend of a gentlemen of his household, named Barker, through whom he forwarded messages to the duke.³¹

The correspondence of Lingard with Henry Howard reveals that great energy had been invested by the antiquary at the historian's behest into discovering more about the Ridolphi plot. Unfortunately by no means all of this correspondence is extant. But what survives makes clear that Howard assisted Lingard towards a new understanding of the subject. But Lingard wanted to get his facts straighter than Howard had understood. In a letter, probably dating from May 23 1836, Lingard wrote to Howard in his customary apologist's mode:

Of Ridolphi I think as you do. But you send me a paper of pretended instructions from the duke. Have they his signature? If they had, it might be forged but if they have not, they must be rejected of course.³²

By June 10 Lingard has been able to deal with that awkward set of instructions:

I have plenty of documents to shew that the letter of credit and the instructions of Ridolphi are forgeries. They were concocted between him and the bishop of Ross, and sent to the duke of Norfolk, who refused his signature.³³

He is now searching about to support the Howard family's notion of events. Indeed by June 30th (probably 1835) the mere hint of such things will suffice as a useful extract:

You tell me that Philip looked upon Ridolphi as an emissary of the English cabinet or an imposter. Can you furnish me with a single line of quotation to prove? I do not want many words: two like the gran proclamation of Alva, will suffice.³⁴

31. Hist. of Eng., 5th ed., 1902, vol. VI, Op.cit., p.254.

32. Lingard to Howard, Correspondence A.C.C., Box 3, Bundle T., no.16.

33. Ibid., no.17.

34. Ibid.

Sometimes too many words were to be found. On July 17 1838 Lingard wrote to Howard of his intention to dispose of some uncomfortable phrases in the papers of the French ambassador:

In general I do not attach much credit to the despatches of foreign ambassadors, when those despatches do not regard matters of which they possess personal knowledge. I have learned frequently to suspect that they can rely on the report of the day, or the representations of interested persons. Thus I have a great notion that Fenelon was deceived by the bishop of Ross as well as others.³⁵

A comment Lingard wrote in a scrapbook of Henry Howard now in the archive of the Archbishop of Southwark,³⁶ shows how such 'a notion' may be expected to shape the researcher's expectations:

The more documents you find of Ridolphi, the more plainly I expect you will see that he and Ross acted without express authority, and as they judged best for the interests of their employers, perhaps for their own.³⁷

Lingard comes thus to the suggestion that only a misguided, though contemporary, foreigner like the ambassador would have supposed the Ridolphi plot to be an English catholic conspiracy in the cause of religion. Lingard can explain 17th July 1838 just how the bishop came to employ this particular deception:

It is plain that much of his information was derived from the Bp. who had it in charge to procure the consent of the French king to the marriage of Mary with the duke. Now one of the best means to persuade the king as well as the Pope and Philip to come forward, was to represent the duke as a catholic, the duke's associates as catholics, and their object to be the restoration of catholicism. Fenelon certainly writes under that

35. Ibid., no.22.

36. A.S.G.C. Package 174. The scrapbook contains notes of Lingard testifying to the collaboration of the two in the affair.

37. Ibid.

impression, and it must be evident, I think that in that respect he was deceived by some one.³⁸

What 'is plain', like what 'must be evident', is that the plot involved only such alien figures as the deceiving Scot, and was in no way the work of such a representative English Roman catholic as the duke.

Lingard could, in the last edition make a perfect protestation of Norfolk's innocence, saying, as he had said of Mary queen of Scots, that he was the victim of a forgery:

At the same time a letter of credence from the duke of Norfolk was fabricated for Ridolphi, undoubtedly by the same individuals. The duke was made to say, that in the name of the queen of Scots, of himself, and of the greater part of the English nobility, whose names were registered in another paper, he authorized Ridolphi to solicit the aid of the pope and of Philip in favour of the very important enterprise, at the head of which he had been placed.³⁹

On July 8th, probably 1838, he wrote to Howard 'I know not how to express by obligations to you for the trouble which you have taken and the advice which you have given me'.⁴⁰ Lingard is, however, with all the material Howard sent to him at his back, only able to allege internal evidence for his plain statement of Norfolk's being in no way responsible for the paper:

There is much to throw doubt and distrust on the authenticity of this document. The astounding assertion that the duke was deputed by the majority of the English nobility to solicit from the king of Spain an invasion of the kingdom, the vapouring boast that he would join the invaders with an army of more than twenty thousand men, and the geographical errors which place Harwich in Norfolk, and Portsmouth in

38. Lingard to Howard, Correspondence A.C.C., Box 3, Bundle T., no.22.

39. Hist. of Eng., 5th ed. 1902, vol. VI, p.255.

40. Lingard to Howard, Correspondence A.C.C., Box 3, Bundle T., no.17.

Sussex, must certainly be attributed to the three foreigners, the originators of the conspiracy, and the real fabricators of the letter.⁴¹

Lingard must have been very pleased with a paragraph which so neatly brought his odds and scraps together to put the plot wholly at the door of foreigners rather than of English catholic leaders. But he has 'of course' been able to fulfil the promise of the letter of 23 May 1836, and reject the authenticity of those 'pretended instructions from the duke':⁴²

Whether it was ever communicated to the duke in its entirety, is unknown, that it was never subscribed by him is certain. It has no signature, but a promise that the duke will avow the original to the Spanish ambassador.⁴³

Lingard has already voiced his suspicions of ambassadors in the letter of 17 July 1838 and now, in the History he places the word of the Englishman against this foreigner. The duke is to be believed:

That he never made, or authorized any one to make, such an avowal, he solemnly protested.⁴⁴

The ambassadors, having possession of the document, may well have acted in the usual ways of their profession:

Who can prove that it did not even after that receive improvements, or that the Italian and Spanish versions left by Ridolphi in Rome and Madrid - the only copies which we possess - were correct representations of that which is called the original letter?⁴⁵

In all this Lingard is prepared to mistrust the judgement of a man who had at least an access to primary material. Perhaps he was strengthened in his dismissal of the ambassador not only by the Spaniard's being a foreigner but by Lingard's recognition from his own proceedings of just what may be made out of a document or two.

41. Hist. of Eng., 5th ed. 1902, Op.cit., vol. VI, p.257.

42. Ibid., p.254.

43. Ibid.

44. Ibid.

45. Ibid.

Howard was of greater help to Lingard in another matter concerning ambassadorial wives. In his first edition of 1823 Lingard had recorded the reception of the news of Elizabeth's accession at Rome in a way that suggested a Tudor precedent for religious toleration and political emancipation of English catholics:

Carne, the resident at Rome, was ordered to acquaint the pontiff, that she (Elizabeth) had succeeded to her sister, and had determined to offer no violence to the consciences of her subjects, whatever might be their religious creed.⁴⁶

But foreigners came between the queen and the pope. Ambassadors were in their usual lying abroad:

It was the misfortune of Paul, who had passed his eightieth year, that he adopted opinions with the credulity, and maintained them with the pertinacity, of old age. His ear had been preoccupied by the diligence of the French ambassador, who suggested that to admit the succession of Elizabeth, would be to approve the pretended marriage of her parents, Henry VIII. and Anne Boleyn; to annul the decisions of Clement VII. and Paul III.; to prejudge the claim of the true and legitimate heir, Mary, queen of Scots; and to offend the king of France, who had determined to support the right of his daughter-in-law with all the power of his realm.⁴⁷

So the chance of catholic participation in English society was missed; more, an insult of lasting memory was offered the nation:

When Carne performed his commission, Paul replied, that he was unable to comprehend the hereditary right of one who was not born in lawful wedlock: that the queen of Scots claimed the crown as the nearest legitimate descendant of Henry VII.; but that, if Elizabeth were willing

46. Hist. of Eng., 1st ed., vol. V, Op.cit., p.146.

47. Ibid.

to submit the controversy to his arbitration, she would receive from him every indulgence which justice could allow.⁴⁸

During his last years Howard conducted an enquiry into this incident for Lingard's fifth edition. A letter dated as 13 June, but without the year which is probably 1840, exhibits Lingard writing to Howard with just that combination of historian's preciseness and apologist's interest that characterized his earlier correspondence about the duke and Ridolphi, and with that combination of proper formality and easy comradeship that characterised all his correspondence with the duke's descendant:

Dear Sir

Allow me to return you my best thanks for the trouble you have taken in copying the letter from Carne.

It appears to me that there is no mistake in the date of this letter. At Rome the new year began on the 28th of December, so that the 31st of Dec. 1558 in England was the 31 of Dec. 1559 in Rome. He probably adopted the old adage to dates, and read; Romae cum fumeris, Romano scribito more.

I begin to think with you that the reported communication by Carne to the pope of Elizabeth's accession is mere fudge; adopted because probable but without any authority. I should however observe that Pallavicini relates it after her coronation, and therefore as happening after the date of Carne's letter to Cecil.

According to Strype from the council book the following letters past (sic).

Dec. 1. A letter ordered to be sent to Carne that being a public officer, he ought not to plead, as he did, in cases in the Roman courts.

Dec. 31. as you have copied he wrote to Cecil. I conceive that he had not then received the letter of Dec. 1st.

48. Ibid.

Feb. 1. Ordered in council that he be recalled with permission to fix his own time. This I conceive to have been after the receipt of his Dec. 31 in which he prays to be recalled.

Mar. 31. Pope forbids him to go, and makes him administrator of the Eng. hospital.

May 1 & May 18. He writes to Elizabeth.

1559.

Jan. 18. Carne dies.

It is indeed possible that in the letter of the recall, or between Jany. & May he may have received instructions to announce the succession of the queen: but, if it were so, certainly some notice would have remained in the State Paper office or the council book. Where can that council book be now?⁴⁹

This careful discussion about dates which ends with a question that Howard must take as a request for further assistance shows Lingard's aspiring to prove that, at the time when other historians, Hume, for example, had described Carne's audience with the pontiff, the ambassador was, in fact, not authorised to transact any business of that kind since he was Mary's emissary and not the new monarch's.⁵⁰ Since Pallavicini's

49. Lingard to Howard, Correspondence A.C.C., Box 3, Bundle T., no.34.

50. Hume wrote:

The queen too, on her sister's death, had written to Sir Edward Carne, the English ambassador at Rome, to notify her accession to the pope, but the precipitate nature of Paul broke through all the cautious measures concerted by this young princess. He told Carne, that England was a fief of the holy see; and it was great temerity in Elizabeth to have assumed, without his participation, the title and authority of queen: that being illegitimate, she could not possibly inherit that kingdom; nor could he annul the sentence pronounced by Clement VII and Paul III, with regard to Henry's marriage: that, were he to proceed with rigour, he

reconstruction of events coincided with that of Hume, Lingard cannot simply dismiss the story out of hand. He is compelled to search for any new instructions from Elizabeth's government which might have authorised Carne to act as the story suggested. Whether that June letter was written in 1840 or no, by July of that year there had certainly been some intensification of the search for proof of Lingard's assessment of the incident. Pallavicini is to be sent off. He had merely retailed a story from a previous history. Lingard wrote to Howard:

Pallavicini generally quotes official papers. With respect to the passage I have copied on the other half he quotes no authority: but immediately before where he relates the claim to the crown of Mary Stuart, he refers to Belcari, let 28, and to Spondanus anno 1558 n.5 1559 no.5. I suspected that these might be his authorities also for what followed. Belcari I have not, but I looked into Spondanus and found there exactly the same story as he (Pallavicini) has given in Italian.⁵¹

That Lingard had himself a prejudice against foreigners and did not have to strain his heart or mind much when making his appeal to the patriotic readers of his History appears in his conclusion here: 'these two foreign writers appear to me of no weight'.⁵² And being of no weight, they cannot keep Lingard from concluding: that 'the whole story about the offensive answer given by the pope is a fable',⁵³ especially

should punish this criminal invasion of his rights, by rejecting all her applications; but being willing to treat her with paternal indulgence, he would still keep the door of grace open to her: and that, if she would renounce all pretensions to the crown, and submit entirely to his will, she should experience the utmost lenity compatible with the dignity of the apostolic see. When this answer was reported to Elizabeth, she was astonished at the character of that aged pontiff; and having recalled her ambassador, she continued with more determined resolution, to pursue those measures which already she had secretly embraced.

Hume's Hist. of Eng., vol. III, Op.cit., p. 373.

51. Lingard to Howard, Correspondence A.C.C., Box 3, Bundle T., no.11. Feo Belcari, sixteenth century Italian historian. Heride Sponde (Spondanus) seventeenth century Italian historian.

52. Ibid.

53. Ibid.

since Howard had by this time provided coincident evidence:

You have abundantly proved that all that has been written about Carne is a fable: nor is there any reason to believe that Paul declared the queen a bastard.⁵⁴

What Howard had provided seems to be that set of chronological references, or some large part of these, alleged in a footnote of the fifth edition:

This appears from Carne's letter of December 31 to Cecil (State Paper Office, Bundle No.4, Rome and Italian states); and an original letter in Cotton MS. Nero, Bvi.p.9. His letter of recall was dated February 9, and received by him March 10. The same appears also from a Mandamus to Carne from the cardinal secretary of state enclosed in the last letter, stating that huc usque Carne had had no appointment but from Queen Mary. In an extract from a letter of Carne of February 14, 1559, to the queen, he says, that a cardinal had informed him that the pope wished to have some one accredited from her.- Burleigh Papers by Murdin, February 14, 1559.⁵⁵

Thus Lingard could most triumphantly change his text for the edition of 1849. After reiterating the old view of Carne's message and the Pope's reply Lingard produces the results of his researches with Howard:

The whole narrative is undoubtedly a fiction, invented, it is probable, by the enemies of the pontiff, to throw on him the blame of the subsequent rapture between England and Rome. Carne was, indeed, still in that city; but his commission had expired at the death of Mary; he could make no official communication without instructions from the new sovereign. According to the ordinary course, he ought to have been revoked, or accredited again to the pontiff. But no more notice was

54. Ibid. In his scrapbook, Howard prefaced this remark:

Dr. L's opinion on this and on the whole subject of Sir Edward Carne's supposed message and the pope's answer.

Howard's Scrapbook, A.S.G.C., no. 174.

55. Hist. of Eng., 5th ed., 1902, vol. VI, Op.cit., p.5.

taken of him by the ministers, than they could have done had they been ignorant of his existence. The only information which he obtained in English transactions was derived from the reports of the day. Wearied with the anomalous and painful situation in which he stood, he most earnestly requested to be recalled, and at last succeeded in his request, but not till more than three months after the queen had ascended the throne.⁵⁶

Thus Lingard comes to his desired conclusion, which he announces with his favourite phrase in such circumstances:

It is plain then that Carne made no notification to Paul; and if any one else had been employed for that purpose, some trace of his appointment and his name might be discovered in our national or in foreign documents and historians.⁵⁷

Evidently Howard had accepted the charge of rummaging through the State Papers, and, if he did not find the council book, he did find documents enough for Lingard to assume that the council book would not contain instructions for Carne to announce Elizabeth's accession. Everything had certainly been conducted in accord with the letter he had written to Howard during their Ridolfi researches. But it had been conducted with a historian's care also. Lingard is aware of the necessity to prove every apologetic phrase 'furnish me with a single line of quotation to prove it'.⁵⁸

Not every extraction was done precisely enough. In June, probably 1835, Lingard was still troubling Howard about court gossip:

I asked you the other day for the date of his letter about the Duke of Leicester and Eliz's chemisely mistake. You sent me the date but omitted the page⁵⁹

56. Ibid.

57. Ibid.

58. Lingard to Howard, Correspondence A.C.C., Box.3, Bundle T., no.17.

59. Ibid. The year is not specified in the letter.

And even when Lingard had got hold of the necessary information he had to find ways of getting it into his text that did not upset the printer:

I am not sure that my seventh vol. is yet out. I have not received it. The printing was finished more than one month ago: but they were obliged to wait for the plate. One half of the eighth vol. is printed containing all that I could contrive to introduce from the Memorials, and Sir C. Sharp's communications. It was a very difficult matter so to condense and patch the narrative, as to make it appear all written at the same time.⁶⁰

The final version of the Vindication which constitutes the fifth edition of the History is, therefore, intended by Lingard to be read as simply the most efficient version of what he had first put down. The researches of his friends were chiefly prized as confirmations of his original sentence. The idea of development exhibited in the estimate Lingard had of the various stages of his History is thus not particularly logical or biological but rather the gradual unveiling of what was always present in the original formulation. And not every expression, that was modified from the first to the last edition depended for its development on the enlargement of Lingard's information by the efforts of his friends. He had at the start observed a silence on things that he came to express more boldly once he enjoyed the assurance that, being received as a respectable historian, he was not risking much. Something of this is actually acknowledged in a letter he wrote to his publisher's literary manager, Edward Price, 13th February 1847:

I see that you quote my quarto edition (the first). I am sorry. That was the first edition. I had then to acquire credit among protestants, and was therefore extremely cautious-and I believe in that respect successful; for I was held by many to be a moderate, perhaps impartial

60. Ibid., no. 76. Lingard refers to the design of the plate for the new shape of the latest edition of the History of England. Sir Cuthbert Sharp. 1781-1849, historian. Lingard is referring to Sharp's Brief summary of a Manuscript formerly belonging to Lord William Howard, 1819.

writer; this made me bolder in the duodecimo edition (the fourth), which I introduced much respecting the penal laws which I had withheld in the former.⁶¹

The consciousness of being a respected historian, and this was in Lingard, as in others, maintained in defiance of a number of reviewers, prompted a bolder way with events. The researches of his friends provided him with the necessary instruments of this new boldness. But, since the consciousness of respect and the adoption of boldness were aspects of Lingard's personal experience, they are not to be understood simply in terms of their reference to the English catholic community. Though, most evidently, Lingard remained at all times the historian who would be bold in his apologetic management of the instruments for the benefit of that community, he remained also his own self. Though at the start he may have even himself thought he was something of a simple seminary priest anxious to do good and please his bishop, eager to doubt the protestant controversialists, and wholly convinced at the religious justice of his enterprise, he came to appreciate himself as being always rather more than an articulator of what every Roman catholic would wish him to say. He came, as he corresponded with a member of the Howard family, as his writing was noticed in the Edinburgh Review, to appreciate the History as an expression of his own being. Thus it is that any understanding of that History and its making must take into account those characteristics of temperament and those habits derived from nurture and experience which shaped Lingard's approach to life, and thus to historical questions. To these I will now turn.

61. Quoted in Haile and Bonney, Op.cit., p.347.

Chapter Nine

The Character of an Apologist

On reaching the incident of the 'Popish Plot' in his History Lingard seems to have felt assured enough of the confidence of his readers to express his detestation of Titus Oates. It is not of course, at all surprising that Lingard should hate Oates. Hume's History makes clear that the 'Popish Plot' was a main occasion of protestant suspicion of Roman catholics long after it had been shown to be a malicious invention of a rogue. Hume begins by stating his own conviction that Oates' allegations were false, but he thinks it necessary in his own day to rebuke those who cannot even yet rid themselves of a prejudice that they must have some substance:

The loud and unanimous voice of a great nation has mighty authority over weak minds; and even later historians are so swayed by the concurring judgements of such multitudes, that some of them have esteemed themselves sufficiently moderate, when they affirmed that many circumstances of the plot were true, though some were added and others much magnified.¹

And Hume himself is still able to find in his account of these events an opportunity to articulate protestant prejudice:

It is certain that the restless and enterprising spirit of the Catholic church, particularly of the Jesuits, merits attention, and is, in some degree, dangerous to every other communion. Such zeal of proselytism actuates that sect, that its missionaries have penetrated into every nation of the globe.²

Hume thus brings himself to say, with a deft turn of phrase:

In one sense, there is a popish plot perpetually carrying on against all states, Protestant, pagan, and Mahometan.³

1. Hume's Hist. of Eng., vol.VI, Op.Cit. p.121.
2. Ibid., p.113.
3. Ibid.

He reasserts his more candid judgement, however, at the analysis of the grounds for accepting the existence of a plot of this particular sort:

But that the Roman pontiff could hope to assume the sovereignty of these kingdoms; a project which, even during the darkness of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, would have appeared chimerical; that he should delegate this authority to the Jesuits, that order in the Romish church which was the most hated; that a massacre could be attempted of the Protestants, who surpassed the Catholics a hundred-fold, and were invested with the whole authority of the state: that the king himself was to be assassinated, and even the duke, the only support of the party: these were such absurdities as no human testimony was sufficient to prove; much less the evidence of one man, who was noted for infamy, and who could not keep himself, every moment, from falling into the grossest inconsistencies.⁴

It was a sense of this tug between deep-rooted prejudice and acceptance of the facts of the case being quite common in protestant readers that led Lingard to begin his account of Oates with an appeal neither to religion nor history but to the decent temper of the English.

Lingard found, not for the first time in his writing in the History of England, the freedom to express the prejudices of his own temperament. He could here indulge his own social bias and personal judgement just as he had in his mediaeval volumes. Lingard aligns himself with his readers as they sit in familiar, civilized, contemplation of those who have not such advantages of nature and nurture:

From continental politics the reader must now divert his attention to one of the most extraordinary occurrences in our domestic history, the imposture generally known by the appellation of Oates' plot; an imposture which, brought forward in a time of popular discontent, and supported by the arts and declamations of a numerous party, goaded the

4. Ibid.

passions of men to a state of madness, and seemed for a while to extinguish the native good sense and humanity of the English character.⁵ After this invocation of ordinary 'domestic' and 'native' sense, against the extraordinary arts of those who stir the 'passions' of the lower classes, until from 'popular discontent' there arises a 'state of madness', Lingard felt that he could take the reader with him in his personal detestation for the managers of the plot:

Its author and hero was Titus Oates, alias Ambrose, the son of a ribbon-weaver, who, exchanging the loom for the bible, distinguished himself as an anabaptist minister during the government of Cromwell and became an orthodox clergyman on the restoration of the ancient dynasty. Titus was sent to Cambridge, took orders, and officiated as curate in several parishes, and as chaplain on board of a man-of-war; but all these situations he successively forfeited in consequence of his misconduct, of reports attributing to him unnatural propensities, and of the odium incurred by two malicious prosecutions, in each of which his testimony upon oath was disproved to the satisfaction of the jury. Houseless and penniless Oates applied for relief to the compassion of Dr. Tonge, rector of St. Michael's in Wood-Street, a man in whom weakness and credulity were combined with a disposition singularly mischievous and astute. Tonge had proclaimed himself an alarmist: his imagination was haunted with visions of plots and conspiracies: and he deemed it a duty to warn his countrymen by quoting against the pernicious designs of the Jesuits.⁶

There is a heat in these judgements that was not apparent even in the accounts of Boleyn, Cranmer, or Ridley in the Reformation volumes. Lingard begins with a sarcastic snipe at Oates' social disadvantages, and continues with hints of his father being a boorish enthusiast, exchanging the loom for the bible, and anabaptistry for orthodoxy. He then proceeds to trace a like instability in Oates' own worse course of

5. Hist. of Eng., 1st. ed., Op.Cit., Vol.VIII, p.47.

6. Ibid., p.48.

life. Oates is generally a bad lot, a practiser of unmentionable vice, a perjurer. Though this last charge is the only one precisely relevant to anything Lingard might want to say about Oates and his evidence against the Roman catholics, the general view of an unsavoury blackguard must affect the estimate made by mid-nineteenth century readers of any incident in which Oates figures and any allegation he makes. From Oates senior, through Titus, Lingard comes to Tonge. Lingard presents Tonge as one in whom there was none of the 'good sense' of the English, but only 'weakness and credulity', a man of 'arts' whose every act showed him to be 'mischievous and astute'. Such an one would be equipped to goad the passions of others:

In Oates he found an apt instrument for his purpose.⁷

But it is, necessarily, upon Oates himself that Lingard concentrates as he exhibits the character of the plot. Such a man may be left to betray himself even while he is betraying others. At several times in the days of his power Oates 'suffered his real character to pierce the flimsy cover which his hypocrisy had thrown over it',⁸ and it should not occasion surprise that after Oates had read the details of the plot to Parliament 'the character which he gave himself, exhibited such traits of baseness and dishonesty that his hearers were bewildered and amazed'.⁹

Having secured that seventeenth century members of parliament, respectable readers, and himself are at one in their feelings about Oates, Lingard takes a wider freedom of expression, presenting his own prejudices about contemporary nineteenth century English society through his narrative of the seventeenth century affair. Lingard's conservative conviction that the institutions of the country have always to be protected from the forces of unrest and upset is clearly expressed in his account of events at the height of the crisis. He begins by identifying in some detail the 'excitement of the people'¹⁰ with the 'popular delirium'.¹¹ Shaftesbury had taken

7. Ibid.

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid., p.49.

10. Ibid., p.62.

11. Ibid., p.64.

over the prosecution of the investigation, his committees were searching everywhere in the old manner of Elizabethan pursuivants:

The popular delirium had given to his party an ascendancy in the two houses, which they could not otherwise have acquired: and, that he might keep this alive, and direct it in accordance with his own views, he cared little to what perjuries he might give occasion, or what blood he might cause to be shed.¹²

Lingard is here skilfully associating the popular delirium of anti-catholicism with a politician's indifference to truth and justice. He associates these forces again in his account of the king's agreeing to the exclusion of the Roman catholic peers from voting in the upper House of Parliament *which was made law in the second Test Act of 1678:*

Charles gave his assent to the bill but at the same time remarked that he did it with reluctance and merely through deference to those who were alarmed at the extraordinary excitement of the people.¹³

That 'extraordinary excitement of the people' had been increased by the sight of the mangled remains of the protestant martyr, Godfrey:

From this mournful but exciting spectacle the crowd returned to their homes, breathing vengeance against the assassins, and extolling Oates as "the saviour of his country," his fictions, absurd and incredible as they must appear to the thinking reader, were received without hesitation.¹⁴

Here Lingard assumes that his reader is, like himself, quite ready to be distanced from the common people, discontented and delirious as they are. Lingard's concern, in the Reformation volumes, with the activities of the great families and with the wickedness of the lords, gives place in his narrative of late seventeenth century England to a concern with the horrors of the mob. The mob sees the Roman catholics in its own image:

12. Ibid.

13. Ibid., p.72.

14. Ibid., p.68.

The sight inflamed their passions, and prepared their minds to believe in the bloody designs attributed to the papists; individual murders, a general massacre, the burning of the city and the blowing up of Whitehall were hourly expected.¹⁵

As he airs his religious convictions Lingard's social prejudices are persuasively developed:

In a short time the prisons in the metropolis contained two thousand suspected traitors; the houses of the catholics (even that of the earl marshall could not obtain exemption,) had been searched for arms; and all the papists who refused the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, amounting almost to thirty thousand individuals, were compelled to withdraw ten miles from Whitehall.¹⁶

That parenthetical reference to the Duke of Norfolk is a choice example of Lingard's social prejudice in favour of all those whose ownership of land and property makes them the guardians of ordinary order. The reader by this volume of the History is assumed to be entirely of Lingard's mind, sharing his notions of decent behaviour and respectable society, and his lack of astonishment at anything done or felt by those who were not of their class:

It would excite surprise that in the three kingdoms there could be found an individual so simple or so prejudiced as to believe in this marvellous tale of bloodshed and treason. But in times of general panic nothing is too absurd for the credulity of the public.¹⁷

The origins of Lingard's concern that the aristocracy shall not lose their hold on any aspect of English society, and of his prejudices against those ordinary people who are so generally described as 'the mob', may be in an incident which Mrs. Hannah Ridyard describes in her unpublished life of Lingard. Her biographical piece refers to an event that must have left its permanent mark upon Lingard:

15. Ibid., p.63.

16. Ibid., p.68.

17. Ibid., p.76.

In 1793 the violence of the French Revolution had reached its highest point, & the declaration of war by England having deprived the students of the immunity they had up to that period enjoyed, as British subjects, it became adviseable for them to provide for their safety by returning to their native country. This after various difficulties & narrow escapes young Lingard succeeded in doing, & in after years he has been heard to give a graphic account of this anxious journey and of the dangers he has incurred at Douay, long before he decided on leaving the place. During the previous year, the excesses of the democratical party had again intruded themselves within the walls of the College, & its inmates had repeatedly incurred extreme danger, not from the mob alone, but from the soldiery who fraternised with the mob & compelled the terrified students & their superiors to say the "ca ira" at the point of a bayonet. I once heard him mention an anecdote relating to this period (1793) which has dwelt on my memory ever since with great distinctiveness. He said he had wandered into the town at the very moment when the populace were dragging a friend of his to the place of execution. Without reflecting on the danger of interfering between the tiger & his prey he mingled with the crowd, to inquire into the offence which his friend had committed -His dress, & the visible interest of his manner drew upon himself the fury of the rabble & one of them raised the cry of "La Calotte, la Calotte, le Calotin, Le Calotin a la Lanterne!" I darted up a narrow passage followed by the mob, which was headed by one of those viragoes, the douier de la halle: in the passage were some posts, or rather a turnstile, which I bounded over, & reached the end of the passage. On turning the corner, I looked round, & caught a view of my pursuers with their she captain at their head. Fortunately for me, Madame was so fat that she stuck fast between the posts, so that her companions could not advance until she was out of their way, nor turn

round to catch me at the end of the street, on account of the manner in which they were packed and jammed together. So, being a nimble runner, I got clear off, leaving them all in what may truly be called a fix.¹⁸

Lingard's nervous detestation of every combination of common persons could well have sprung from this incident, and it could not have better disposed him towards foreigners. And yet the reader knew that a great many property-owning lords, aldermen, and shopkeepers had joined in a panic that did indeed seem general and that it was not a trick of the foreigner. The anti-catholic riots if they indeed were signs of a 'delirium', were signs of a 'national delirium'. Lingard takes a view of this affair which exhibits his especial interests in contemporary English society.

It was a great part of Lingard's endeavour to demonstrate that the anti-catholic legislation was earlier than 1688 and that it was unfair in its origins and operation. The Titus Oates affair had led directly to the ^{second} Test Act of 1678. That Act ^{which was a more application of the Test Act of 1673} had imposed upon every catholic ^{member of parliament} who wished to hold a civil or military office the obligation of taking an oath of acknowledging the royal supremacy in matters of religion and affirming an allegiance to the protestant establishment which was to be manifested by taking communion after declaration against the Roman catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. Lingard could here point to a repressive piece of legislation antedating the 'Glorious Revolution' and to its being a piece of legislation whose base was mere perjury. Further, Lingard could plausibly depict the passing of the Act as arising out of the enthusiasms of the ignorant masses and thus suggest that its retention or the retention of its attitudes was unworthy of decent thinking readers. Lingard's denunciation of the Test Act and its effect on the Roman catholic population is cast in peculiar terms. He says hardly anything about the notions of toleration, freedom of belief, or conscience, for the Roman catholic community at large, and a great deal about the loss of social privilege by the property-owning and title-bearing section of the Roman catholic community:

18. Mrs Ridyard's Life Op. Cit., M.C.O.

The test act, they maintained, was unjust, because it deprived the catholic peers of their birth right, though guiltless of any crime; because it was founded on the acknowledged falsehoods and forgeries of Titus Oates, and because its real object had been the exclusion of James, while its real victims were those, who had been made subject to its provisions, that through them it might reach him.¹⁹

It is remarkable that Lingard should be so concerned about the rights of peers, and especially that he should go on to say that the 'most valuable privilege' of the Roman catholic aristocrats, 'the right which they derived from their birth', was that 'of sitting and voting in the higher house of parliament'.²⁰ Of course he does not have the long gone peers of the early eighteenth century chiefly in mind; he has been talking with the Howards and their friends of the quite recent history of their families. 'The unjust prescription attached to their descendants during the long lapse of one hundred and fifty years'.²¹ The repeal of the Test Act thus becomes a restoration of certain civic privileges to be enjoyed by very few of the Roman catholics:

It was reserved for the beneficial sovereign, who lately swayed the sceptre of these realms, and an enlightened and liberal parliament to erase the foul blot from the statute book, and by an act of tardy but praiseworthy justice to restore the sufferers to the exercise of their ancient and hereditary rights.²²

In this argument for a particular element in catholic emancipation, Lingard shows that his sympathies are likely to be not with all those who enjoy some land or

19. Hist. of Eng., vol.VIII, Op.Cit., p.430.

20. Ibid., p.72.

21. Ibid.

22. Ibid.

property, but with that group among them which is 'enlightened' and 'liberal', with, that is, the Whig members of both Houses of Parliament.²³ The account of Oates is shaped to say something of the desirability of Roman catholics taking a share in the activities of that Establishment.

Equally demonstrative of Lingard's view of contemporary English society and those in it that he would wish to see enjoying influence and power, is his treatment of events leading up to the 'Glorious Revolution'. His assessment of James II, for example, which might be expected to be wholly sympathetic, is conducted in a more subtle and complex manner in order that Lingard may distance himself and his co-religionists from the less attractive aspects of that monarch. Lingard seems less interested in defending James II because he was a Roman catholic, than in exhibiting him as the kind of person who would be likely to rouse decent folk's disdain. In the incident of the Benedictine, Corker, for example, Lingard expresses a downright contempt at James' stupidity:

The elector of Cologne had appointed for his resident at the English court a Benedictine monk, of the name of Corker, who had been tried for his life during the imposture of the popish plot. There was something sufficiently extraordinary in the appointment itself but James was not satisfied: he insisted that the resident should be introduced at court in the habit of his order, accompanied by six other monks, his attendants in a similar dress. It was a ludicrous rather than an offensive exhibition but while it provoked the sneers and derision of the courtiers, it furnished his enemies with a new subject of declamation against the king, who, not content with screening these men from legal punishment, brought them

23. Privately, Lingard was clear in his lack of sympathy for the Conservative party writing to Mrs. Ridyard, May 15th 1844:

I am all alive with the thoughts of the election at Liverpool. I care not so much about the league: but I shall grow ten inches taller at the defeat of the Tories.

Lingard to Ridyard, Shepherd Papers, M.C.O., vol.I. p.133 Lingard refers here to the Anti-Corn Law League.

forward as a public spectacle, to display his contempt of the law, and defiance of public opinion.²⁴

The language of this description, in its remarking the appointment of Corker as 'something sufficiently extraordinary' echoes the description of the Titus Oates episode as 'one of the most extraordinary occurrences', and the references to 'the most extraordinary excitement of the people' and the 'so general and extraordinary' character of the anti-catholic measures. Lingard, the champion of order, can have nothing good to say of the 'extraordinary'. He evidently cannot approve the foreigner's behaviour. No man of ordinary good sense and native decency could approve it. James not only shows himself not to be such a man, he compounds the folly until his own attitude constitutes a contempt of the law and, climactically, a defiance of public opinion, by which, of course, Lingard means the opinion of those who by position and education have a right to arbitrate the manners of society. It is to be kept in mind that this whole affair is about what an ambassador should wear.

Again, in his account of the Petre affair, Lingard concentrates on the folly of the king's action in making the jesuit a privy counsellor, and describes the reaction of those relatively few Englishmen who have leisure and income enough to take an interest in such things, as a public opinion:

It is difficult to describe the astonishment, the vexation, with which this appointment was beheld by the great body of the people. The enemies of James secretly hailed it as an event most favourable to their wishes: by the catholics it was deplored as a common calamity.²⁵

With thinking protestant readers Lingard can now ally a group of Roman catholics. Sensible Roman catholic peers shared their disgust at the indecent folly of the king. They share, too, a sense of the inevitability of the Revolution:

To prevent their remonstrances, the design had been concealed from their knowledge, and now that the appointment had taken place, it only

24. Ibid., p.437.

25. Ibid., p.412.

remained for them to bewail the infatuation of the monarch, and to await in despair the revolution which he was preparing by his imprudence.²⁶

Thus, in Lingard's account of James, the king is isolated from the Roman catholic peers; the Revolution is not going to be simply the expression of protestant religion, it is going to be an expression of sane men's frustration with a foolish king who got himself into 'that pitiful yet dangerous quarrel'. Folly thus becomes arrogance:

his high and obstinate temper never knew when to yield, and he risked the very existence of his authority, that he might not be thought to have exercised it in vain.²⁷

And arrogance leads the doomed man into greater folly as William made his careful preparations. Louis XIV, having obtained more correct intelligence, 'warned his English brother of the impending danger by repeated messages' and 'at last he sent Bonrepaus to convince him of the design of the prince of Orange, to prevail on him to prepare against the invasion, and to offer him the services of the French fleet'. All in vain. 'The infatuated monarch was deaf to every admonition'.²⁸

Henry Hallam thought that what was said of James might be taken as a test of a Roman catholic historian's ability to deal fairly with events and that 'Dr. Lingard has passed very successfully through this ordeal'.²⁹ Hallam's remarks in the review of the History in the Edinburgh Review of 1831, show that he, and probably other contemporaries, noticed that Lingard's judgement of what was going on in James II's reign was not so largely based, as it had been in the Reformation narrative, on the religious colour of the characters. He congratulated Lingard 'on the manifest signs of increased candour and impartiality which distinguish his three quarto volumes on the reigns of the four Stuarts in England, especially the latter'.³⁰ He commented on the nicer balance of interest in the History in this volume:

26. Ibid.

27. Ibid., p.447.

28. Ibid., p.458.

29. Edinburgh, Op.Cit., p.40.

30. Ibid., p.21.

the fortunes of the Catholics, which occupied a most disproportionate share in the history of Elizabeth, those of the Puritans, though far more important in their political consequences, being reduced into small compass, and many interesting events of the Maiden Queen's story slurred over with very slight notice, are less and less prominent as we advance, till the Popish Plot, and the designs of James II. to restore his religion, bring them naturally into the foreground.³¹

Lingard had had an intimation of this appreciative notice of his work before it came out in the Edinburgh Review. An undated letter from William Shepherd, certainly written before March 1831 suggests that Hallam had been talking to his Whig friends about Lingard's History:

I have the pleasure to tell you that Mr. Hallam speaks in high terms of yr last volume; & Hallam is a preeminent judge in these matters and moreover visits at Holland House.³²

The pleasure of such Whigs is a signal indication of Lingard's success in the enterprise he had undertaken. The appeal to the 1688 Revolution was still felt as a great rallying cry among the great Whig families, expressing as it did their sense of a time when patriotism and self-interest had been so happily indistinguishable that possessing power in England had seemed both their duty and their right. It had become part of the 1688 tradition that these families had preserved the protestant religion in England against the wicked designs of the Roman catholic church. The bishops of Lincoln and Gloucester had taken it as not requiring proof that the 'Glorious Revolution' of 1688 was entered upon by patriotic Englishmen in order to protect the protestant establishment from subversion by Roman catholics; they had argued that the constitutional settlement was necessitated by the pro-Roman catholic measures of James II which, they thought, threatened the liberty of the church of England. The lay members of the great Whig connection might not be so

31. Ibid.

32. Shepherd to Lingard, Shepherd Papers, M.C.O., vol.IV, p.105 no.9.

interested as their episcopal uncles in talk of the Revolution in religious terms, but they would share the general protestant sense of a crisis in which their ancestors had served not only themselves and the nation but God also.

If Lingard could write of such a moment in a way that pleased these families he was proving himself an exceptional Roman catholic indeed. With the Whig magnates, as with the Howard connection, Lingard evidently enjoyed a reverential but easy commerce. He understood their assumptions. He could speak of life in their language. And he was thus, if not always,³³ at least on occasion, able to use their language to persuade them to abandon something of their assumptions. The moment of the Revolution, surprisingly, is employed by Lingard as an occasion for altering the Whigs' understanding of their own tradition. It is even more surprising that he should have brought some of the Holland House set to give serious attention to his version of Revolutionary events.³⁴

Lingard's method in putting together his version of James II and the Revolution requires some scrutiny. An entry upon that method may be affected by a

33. Lingard was not successful with Lord Lonsdale. He complained to Tierney, 7th October 1836:

At the request of a friend, a great favourite of Lord Lonsdale, and on his assurance that the application would be met with an offer of anything in his Lordship's library, I commissioned that friend to ask you for the loan of a single book. What think you was his reply? He would hand it to him but he did not wish to have anything to do with me.

Lingard to Tierney, Correspondence A.S.J., Tierney Papers, no.8.

34. It is, therefore, ironical that the Whigs at Holland House were instrumental in the publication of the History. Writing to Gradwell, April 18th 1818, Lingard explains how they persuaded Mawman to offer him a contract:

I had sent about 300 pages, which (Mawman) had submitted to the inspection of Ld. Holland, Mr. Brougham and Mr. Allen: and after hearing their report consented to give my demand viz: 1000 guineas.

Lingard to Gradwell, Correspondence A.S.G.C., Section One, no.3.

consideration of his accounts of the two kings. Foolish and arrogant though James was, Lingard insists he was still an Englishman, which is more than could be said of William of Orange. Lingard makes this distinction between William's foreign character and James' native right in a paragraph about the English East India Company which had made bitter complaints of the injuries which they suffered from the Dutch at Bantam and Masulipatam: James in firm and threatening language insisted on immediate reparation. By William the States were exhorted to temporise in the face of what every Englishman must have recognized as just demands. The corsair incident takes on the same colour in Lingard's narrative, and his account must have made respectable merchants pause before making any further remarks about the virtue of the Dutchman:

a fleet of Algerine corsairs, commanded by Dutch renegadoes, appeared in the Channel for the purpose of making depredations on the commerce of the United Provinces. The Admiral anchored in the harbour of Plymouth and demanded, in virtue of the treaty between the king and the regency, permission to sell his prizes. His right to enter the port was admitted; but the permission which he sought was refused: and yet the States remonstrated in violent terms against this determination.³⁵

Lingard can now move from expressing his dislike of William as 'evasive or unsatisfactory' and associated with rival merchants and pirates, to attacking him as himself another Captain Blood:

When these weapons of war had united, they found an armament worthy of the splendid prize to which the adventurer covertly aspired.³⁶

The reader is therefore safely left to choose the explanation that better fits with such a character in the incident of Fagel's speech in the Dutch parliament justifying the intervention of the United Provinces in English affairs:

The States, he replied (such confidence did they repose in the wisdom

35. Hist. of Eng., vol.VIII, Op.Cit., p.432.

36. Ibid., p.469.

and patriotism of the prince), had placed their army, their navy, and their treasure in his hands; they had ordered a solemn fast to be observed through the seven provinces for the success of the arms; and they earnestly prayed that God would render him the deliverer protector of the protestant faith. One thing only they begged him in return, that he would not unnecessarily expose his person. The loss of him would be to them a greater calamity than the loss of both army and navy. At these words the old man burst into tears, and his emotion impeded his utterance. On the spectators the scene made a deep impression: but the prince exhibited no change of countenance. His friends affected to admire his firmness and magnanimity; others charged him with selfish apathy, even indifference to every object except his own interest.³⁷

The foreigner, the pirate, and the crafty politician now lands at Torbay and continues on his scheming way. The royal commissioners proposed that both armies should be restrained from coming within a certain distance of the capital, and the Dutchman's response, which might have seemed a courtesy to his Whig enablers, is carefully interpreted to persuade the reader that he is dealing with an ambitious and crafty prince:

William referred their paper to the consideration of his English followers, whose opinion he affected to follow, though they had hitherto been dictated by himself.³⁸

Lingard is now presenting William as a foreigner who, having usurped the crown, merely pretends to have a care of the rightful position of the great men who back him. He is already behaving in a manner which must be destructive of the social fabric of decent English society. This is an impression confirmed in Lingard's description of Feversham's treatment by William:

37. Ibid., p.470.

38. Ibid., p.493.

On the supposition that James had left the kingdom, he had assumed the exercise of the sovereign authority, and had issued orders to the royal army, and the officers of government, in the style of a king or a conqueror; and they, in the confidence of success, had parcelled out among themselves the great offices of state, and the rewards to which they were entitled for their services. But Feversham the moment he had delivered his despatch, was arrested by order of William, and confined in the Round Tower, under the frivolous pretext that he came without a passport, and had disbanded the army without orders; but probably to convince James, as it did in fact convince him, that he would no longer be treated as a king. But, whatever was the motive of the prince, the arrest shook the confidence of many among his adherents.³⁹

Now the English peers begin to see what is in fact happening:

He had been sent for, they remarked, to protect their liberties; and one of the first uses he made of his power was to imprison a peer of the realm without assigning any cause or observing any legal process.⁴⁰

This account is particularly significant for any appreciation of Lingard's concept of the proper social arrangement. He is evidently most concerned that the reader shall be outraged at the treatment of Feversham. His account concentrates on the pained surprise of the English peers. The Whigs are to be seen as wondering what sort of a man they have invited into English society. Every lord is now in the position he described so tenderly when raising sympathy for the Roman catholic peers after the passing of the Test Act. Lingard has turned the traditional protestant view of 1688 on its head. Hume had not made anything like this fuss about Feversham's arrest:

The king having sent Lord Feversham on a civil message to the prince, desiring a conference for an accommodation in order to the public settlement, that nobleman was put under arrest, under pretence of his coming without a passport.⁴¹

39. Ibid., p.501.

40. Ibid.

41. Hume's Hist. of Eng., vol.VI, Op.Cit., p.304.

Hume had then passed on to other aspects of the Dutch settlement of affairs. The incident had not seemed to him to touch upon the rights and liberties of William's subjects, not even upon those of the peerage. Feversham is not seen as a paradigm of the English, simply as a nobleman who got into a scrape. In Lingard's telling, the Feversham incident has been made into an exemplary story which has to be understood if the character of William's rule is to be appreciated.

There is an oddity in this selection of the Feversham arrest for such treatment which reveals something of Lingard's interests in nineteenth century society. Feversham is significant in Lingard's design because he is a Roman catholic peer. He is a Roman catholic who can be set before the reader as the representative of landowning, parliament-attending, power-wielding, gentlemen. The presentation of the Feversham case is designed to further the cause, not of Roman catholics generally, but of those who entertained an ambition to take a larger share in the government of England with the protestant gentlemen. How did Lingard come to be so concerned with the interests of this rather restricted class of Roman catholics? Why should it seem important to him that Roman catholic gentlemen should be more generally accepted by their protestant peers? Isolated moments of Lingard's receiving assistance from a Howard, or praise from a member of the Holland House set, cannot account for such a care for aristocratic matters, rather, an explanation has to be sought in the generality of Lingard's experience of life with the gentry.

If his treatment of the common folk in the History is conditioned by his memories of the Douay virago and her furious rabble, then his treatment of those who lived in the manor is conditioned by a series of experiences after his return to England. Lingard had been tutor to Lord Stourton's boys between 1793 and 1795, immediately after his escape from the revolutionary mob of Douay. He formed, then, a friendship with the elder boy William, who himself inherited the Stourton title, that was to last many years. The two went on a trip to Rome in 1817 which Lingard recorded in a journal.⁴² He was evidently accepted by the more prosperous Roman

42. The Journal was reproduced in the Ushaw Magazine, vol VII, pp. 160 - 178, 248 - 271.

catholics as being their sort of priest. And he was as evidently ready to accept their view of the desirable social graces in a priest. He lamented that:

Sermons are often preached in our chapels calculated to offend persons of any education from their incoherence, both in point of composition and, occasionally, I am sorry to say, of good sense.⁴³

And he looked for some remedy:

Ought not means to be used to give the young men more polish and more knowledge of the world?⁴⁴

Lingard discerned two possible ways of improving the manners of the seminarians:

I could wish that at least, before they go on the mission, they might spend some time under the roof of some priest, who, with manners himself, might occasionally introduce them into better society (than that of their own friends, often in the lower walks of life)⁴⁵

and, hintingly 'If I were a catholic gentleman of fortune, I should think it a great charity to invite young men to stay with me a week or two for that purpose'.⁴⁶ The new generation of Roman catholic priests was to be comfortable in the houses of the better sort.

Lingard at Hornby had himself come to be the friend not only of the catholic Henry Howard but of the protestant Pudsey Dawson. Dawson lived at Hornby Castle in the 1840's, and Lingard established a relationship with him that was precisely manorial.⁴⁷ A letter in my possession to an unidentified correspondent conveys something of their common interests:

43. Quoted in Haile and Bonney, Op.Cit., p.259.

44. Ibid., p.291.

45. Ibid., p.292.

46. Ibid.

47. As on the occasion when, Lingard, writing to Oliver 26th March 1843, enjoyed referring to Dawson as 'the lord of the Castle'. Lingard to Oliver, Correspondence A.S.G.C., Package 173, no.54.

My Dear Sir,

I mentioned the shooting as you desired to Mr. Dawson this morning. When I asked, if he should have any objection, he replied, "objection? no. I would rather give a carte blanche than object. For gentlemen are the best preservers of game." You may, therefore, be satisfied on that head.

I am, Dr Sir,

Most truly yours,

J. Lingard.

If my gloves are in your hall, do not pocket them.

And Lingard noticed happily that Mrs. Murray, his next door neighbour, claimed 'a consul at Smyrna for her grandfather' and 'the principal Greek in Syros for her brother-in-law'.⁴⁸ Lingard was the friend of even more exalted persons. Wiseman records that Lingard was 'much at home with the Bar of the Northern Circuit',⁴⁹ and Haile and Bonney report him to have been among the cronies of a most famous member of that set:

Lord Brougham's elevation caused, in fact, the first break in the excellent company which during the Lancaster Assizes had for years past brought the three great lawyers - Pollock, Scarlett and Brougham - into intercourse with Lingard and William Shepherd. They had no greater pleasure than to spend their leisure hours, when on the Northern Circuit, with the sage of Hornby, whom they appreciated at his true value. Pollock the uncompromising Tory, Scarlett, the equally uncompromising Whig, - until his opposition to the Reform Bill drove him into the ranks of the Tories - and Brougham, the future Chancellor, gathering round the table of the Catholic priest in his village presbytery, afford a picture which makes us sigh with regret that no echoes of their conversation, except the tradition of its excellence, have come down to us.⁵⁰

48. Quoted in Haile and Bonney, Op.Cit., p.113.

49. Wiseman, Op.Cit., p.208.

50. Quoted in Haile and Bonney, Op.Cit., p.242.

Brougham, the nephew of the historian William Robertson, was the most powerful of Lingard's friends with his connections with Whigs at Holland House, amongst lawyers and in government (he was Chancellor 1838 - 1832). Sir Jonathan Frederick Pollock (1783 - 1870) was Attorney-General in Sir Robert Peel's administration of 1834 and became Lord-Chief Baron of the Exchequer in 1844; James Scarlett, first Baron Abinger (1769 - 1844), Attorney-General in 1827, and Chief Baron of the Exchequer in 1834. Lingard evidently sat quite comfortably amongst these figures of the establishment. He moved easily between these protestants and his Roman catholic friends in the country.

Perhaps the clearest indication of the character of Lingard's social round is contained in a list which I discovered in an archive of letters between John and James Whiteside in Penrith, Cumbria, of contributors to the cost of a painting of the historian by Lonsdale in the 1830's.⁵¹ Amongst the names are Lord Brougham, Baron Bolland, Lord Clifford, Sir Gregory Lewin, the Duke of Norfolk, Sir Frederick Pollock, the Earl of Shrewsbury, Lord Stafford, Lord Stourton, Lady Throckmorton, Rear Admiral Tatham and Sir Edward Vavasour. Such a list of subscribers does much to answer questions about Lingard's concern for the relief of upper class Roman catholics. He was concerned for those he had found to be gracious hosts and congenial guests. He wanted such men to have the influence in England which their sense, education and property warranted. Their larger participation in the national life would represent a better settlement of affairs for all Englishmen. If Lucas was 'an infamous fellow'⁵² to advise the Irish that they should petition the pope 'not to come to any agreement with our government',⁵³ then 'our government' was remiss in not giving the energies of the Roman catholics greater scope in English society.

Lingard's History concludes, therefore, with an account of how the predecessors of those Roman catholic gentry with whom he was on such good terms were displaced from the ordinary forms of social action and influence. The

51. From the A.S.P.P.

52. Quoted in Haile and Bonney, Op.Cit., p.318.

53. Ibid.

Feversham case is a significant element for that account. By a careful telling of what happened to a Roman catholic peer in the seventeenth century, Lingard meant to bring his friends among the protestant upper classes to an appreciation of their common interest with his Roman catholic friends. That common interest would be expressed in the reform of social structures, widening the scope of Roman catholicism in the determination of what sort of society there would be in England.

This is evidently a quite different kind of social and political reform than that generally associated with Roman catholic demands in the nineteenth century. It is neither a plea for the restoration of Roman catholic bishops nor a protest about the conditions of Irish workmen. Whatever Lingard thought of these matters they were not uppermost in his mind. He was concerned with obtaining a share for Roman catholics in 'our government' as it existed rather than with specific proposals for changing the structure of national life. It was typical of him to reprobate O'Connell for seeming 'to care for nothing but agitation' and to agitate 'for a point which he shall never carry'.⁵⁴ That 'shall' is an indication of Lingard's commitment to the general structure of English society.

At the end of his long life, Lingard made an assessment of his History to his friend John Walker. Writing July 22nd 1850:

You must know that I have long had the notion - a very presumptuous one, probably - that the revolution in the protestant mind as to the doctrines of popery was owing to my history.

And Lingard's reasons for this boast are that:

Young and inquisitive minds in the Universities were induced to examine my authorities contradicting their favourite religious opinions; and finding me correct, began to doubt of their previous convictions and so forth.⁵⁵

54. Ibid., p.319.

55. Ibid., p.347.

Referring to the general tone in the universities in the 1840's Lingard was led to make an even larger claim to the same friend:

I have little doubt of my having been the original cause of the new feeling in the Universities on that head.⁵⁶

Writing to Walker again in 1850 Lingard pursued the same theme hinting that his view of the future when writing the History included not only the protestant acceptance of Roman catholic notions and the assimilation of Roman catholics themselves into English society, but also of the reception of protestants into the Roman catholic church:

Talbot adds that it is the opinion of many there (in London) that my history had no small share in creating in the universities the spirit of enquiry into Catholic matters, which has led by degrees to the conversion of so many collegians.⁵⁷

What he supposed to have been the effect amongst the middle classes, the educated sort, was, Lingard adds, 'very gratifying'.

Lingard gives a further hint of his conception of what he had achieved in writing the History in a letter in my possession, but probably written about the same time as the Walker letters, to Thomas Flanagan, prefect of studies at Oscott. Explaining why he finished the History at the 'Glorious Revolution', Lingard remarked:

I really am unable to help you through the mists which overhang our history in the last century. All is party work.

Lingard was content to put the work of his predecessors aside in some assurance that he had corrected the record, and the old protestant historians could now be left on the shelves.

56. Ibid. Gradwell had suggested this as long ago as 24th April 1825:

Your history is much spoken of in Rome as one of the great causes which have wrought such a change in public sentiment in England, on Catholic matters.

Gradwell to Lingard, A.S.J., no.11.

57. Ibid., p.344.

Lingard had been happy, on moving to the quiet of Hornby in September 1811, to retreat also from the conduct of controversial pamphleteering, to the less violent but, he had expected, more powerful, apologetic of the History of England, an apologetic not for the peculiarities of Roman catholicism but for a way of life that should be English, catholic and according to the pattern of upper middle class social structures.

Through the History of England Lingard made an attempt to achieve respect for his co-religionists from protestants, presenting decent and loyal catholics in the nation's history. At the same time he endeared himself to upper middle class persons by the recurring hint that the preservation of the interests of landed gentry was essential for the stability of English society. Gradually the History received the form of a defence of a particular view of the English nation and its life. Its importance resides less in the re-writing of accounts of individual incidents, though Lingard's continual reference to original sources allowed him to do some useful work in this line, but in its total presentation of a view of the good society and the way in which it is to be fostered.

Lingard was certainly successful in allaying some of the tensions between catholics and protestant in the first half of the nineteenth century. He did much to assist the emergence of a more tolerant atmosphere in English society. The pension arranged for Lingard by Lord and Lady Holland, negotiated with the prime minister, and granted with the consent of the sovereign, testifies to Lingard's success in pleasing the social establishment. But his general acceptability is perhaps better demonstrated in the invitation to republish The Laws and Ordinances Which Exist in Foreign States in 1851. He was seen by catholics anxious to combat the latest wave of anti-popery, as a scholar to whom protestants would attend.

Whatever those Roman catholics who did not share his enthusiasm for the forms of protestant society thought of his enterprise, his showing that catholics had a part in an English tradition, despite their having a different religious creed, made an impressive effort for national reconciliation.

APPENDICES

Books in the Priest's library at Hornby, most of which were used by Lingard

The Royal Dictionary (abridged), London, 1708

Euripides Hecuba, Orestes et Phoenissae, Londini, 1726.

The History of Francis-Eugene, Prince of Savoy....Compiled from the best authorities....by an English Officer, who served under his Highness in the last war with France, London, 1741.

The History of John Duke of Marlborough....Including the more exact, impartial, and methodical narrative of the late war upon the Danube, the Rhine, and in the Netherlands than has ever yet appear.... By the author of the Prince of Eugene London, 1741.

The Present State of Great Britain and Ireland....By the author of the Prince of Eugene, London, 1723.

The Age of Lewis XIV Voltaire, London, 1752.

M. Manilii Astronomicon a J. Scaligero ex vetusto codice Gemblacensi infinitis mendis repurgatum. Ejusdem J. Scaligeri notae....,Lugd., 1600.

George London - The Retired Gardener, London 1706.

P. Galtruceius (Pierre Gautruche) - The poetical histories, being a compleat collection of all the stories necessary for a perfect understanding of the Greek and Latine poets and other ancient authors....,D'Assigny, 1699.

Stile general des Notaires Apostoliques Cornelii Shrevelii. Lexicon Manuale (Graeco-Latium).

Edward Yates - The Life of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, etc., London, 1773.

Mr. Morgan - A History of the Revolutions in Spain, London, 1724.

Smollett- A Complete History of England, from the descent of Julius Caesar, to the treaty of Aix la Chapelle, London, 1758-60.

The London Magazine for February 1757, London, 1757.

J. Shepherd - A History of Greece, London, 1764.

The Spectator Magazine (4th edition), London, 1715.

The letters of Madam de Maintenon; and other eminent persons in the age of Lewis XIV. To which are added, some characters. Translated from the French, London, 1759.

La Belle Assemble, London, 1732.

Condi, Cardinal de Retz, Archbishop of Paris - Memoirs of the Cardinal de Retz....
To which are added some other pieces written by the Cardinal de Retz, or explanatory to these memoirs, London, 1723.

Carlet de Chamblain de Marivaux - Life of Marianne, London, 1741.

The Iliad of Homer translated by Alexander Pope, London, 1720.

Richard Challoner, Bishop of Debra - The New Testament....Translated out of the Latin Vulgate....With annotations for clearing up modern controversies in religion, and other difficulties of Holy Writ.

The Works of Shakespeare. In eight volumes. Collated and corrected by the former editions, by Mr. Pope, London, 1728.

Thucydidis....De Bello Peloponnesiaco libri VIII. Cum versione Latina, scholiis Graecis, et virorum doctorum animadversionibus, Londini, 1819.

Father Daniel - A History of France, London, 1726

The Tatler, London, 1747.

The First Book of Gil Blas in French, London, 1845.

J. Hardouin - La defense des ordinations Anglicanes refutee, Paris, 1727.

Euripides Hecuba, Orestes et Phoenissae; cum scholiis antiquis ac versione, notisque

J. King..., Londini, 1748.

T. Lucretius Carus - Of the Nature of Things, in six books, translated into English verse by T. Creech..., London, 1714.

Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation....Translated from Mr. Smith's edition. To which is added, the life of the author. Also, explanatory notes by Capt. John Stevens, London, 1723.

Thomas Salmon - The Modern Gazeteer: or A short view of the several nations of the World, London, 1762.

Noel Antoine (Abbe le) Pluche - The truth of the gospel demonstrated, from the dispensations of Providence preparative to it, particularly from prophecy; from the evidence with which it was introduced; and the public testimonials of it; ever since subsisting, London, 1751.

Historia Literaria, London, 1731.

Sacrosancti et Oecumenici Concilii Tridentini...canones et decreta, notis additionibus P. Chiffletii...illustrata Parisiis, 1666.

A Dictionary of the English language, London, 1824.

H. van Bulderen - Relatin de voyage D'Espagne, La Haye, 1692.

Le Combat Spirituel, Paris, 1684.

James Archer - Sermons on various moral and religious subjects for some of the principal festivals of the year, London, 1789.

Instruction sur le Manuel par forme de demandes et reponses familiers. Pour servir a ceux qui dans les seminaries se preparent a l'administration des sacrements..., Rouen, 1675.

P.B. (OSF) - Christian advent or entertainments for that Holy Season

J.W.M. (OSB) The Creed Expanded

M. Le Dauphin - Politique Tiree des Propres Paroles de L'Ecriture Brusselles 1710.

The works of Alexander Pope, London, 1758

Charles Cotton - The wonders of the Peak, London, 1683.

Robert (Bellarmino) Archbishop of Capua - De Scriptoribus ecclesiasticis liber unus, Parisiorum, 1622.

P. Segueri - La Manne, Celeste de L'Ane au Meditations sur les passages..., Brussels, 1714.

Arabian Nights Entertainments: consisting of one thousand and one stories....

Translated into French from the Arabian MSS by M. Galland..., Dublin, 1728.

Les Oeuvres de Moliere, Berlin, 1700.

M. de Scuderi - Artamenes, or the Grant Cyrus, Paris, 1690.

Method of Teaching and Study, Dublin, 1737.

Salignac de la motte Fenelon - Dialogues sur l'Eloquence en General, Paris, 1718.

B. de Sausure - Sketch of a tour through Swisserland, Geneva, 1788.

D. Paterson - A New and Accurate Description of all the Direct and Principal cross roads in Great Britain, London, 1722.

William Loughton - A Practical Grammar of the English tongue, London, 1744.

P. Terentii Comoedae sex.... Accedunt Aelii Dancti commentarius interger, Lugduni Batavorum et Roterodomi, 1669.

A. Butler - Meditations and Discourses on the Sublime Truths and Important Duties of Christianity, London, 1791-3.

G. Bona - Rerum liturgicarum libri duo Romae, 1674.

Charlotte Ramsey, afterwards Lennox - The Female Quixote; or, the Adventures of Arabella, London, 1752.

H. de Balzac - Etudes de Moors au XIX Siecle, Brussells, 1834.

Abrege de l'Histoire de l'Ancien Testaments, Paris, 1773.

G. Gobinet - The Instruction of youth in Christian Piety, London, 1741.

A. Butler - The Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs and other principal Saints compiled from original documents, London, 1824.

The True Church of Christ shewed by Concurrent Testimonies of Scripture and Primitive Tradition Part III, London, 1715.

W. Howell - The Ancient and Present State of England, London, 1724.

T. Mills - The History of the Holy War, began....1095....against the Turks, for the recovery of the Holy Land....in two books. To which is added, a particular account of the present war.... against the Turks, London, 1685.

C. Rollin - The Method of teaching and studying the Belles lettres or an introduction to languages, poetry, rhetoric, history, moral philosophy, physicks etc. London, 1734.

C. Rollin - The History of the Art and Sciences of the Antients, London, 1737.

J. Lingard - A History of England from the first invasion by the Romans..., London 1849.

J. Lingard - A History of England..., London, 1823-31.

- J. Lingard - A History of England..., London, 1819-31
- J. Lingard - A Collection of Tracts on several subjects, connected with the civil and religious principles of Catholics, London, 1826.
- J. Lingard - A Manual of Prayers for Sundays and Holidays, Lancaster, 1833.
- J. Lingard - A Manual of Prayers for Sundays and Holidays, York, 1837.
- J. Lingard - Catechetical Instructions on the Doctrines and Worship of the Catholic Church, London, 1840.
- J. Lingard - The Sacraments (issued by the Catholic Truth Society) London, n.d.
- J. Lingard - A New Version of the Four Gospels, London, 1836.
- The life of Saint Francis Xavier of the Society of Jesus Apostle of the Indies and of Japan.... Translated into English by Mr. Dryden, 1688.
- J. Dryden - Original Poems, Glasgow, 1656.
- Ordo Baptizandi Aliaque Sacramentia, Londini, 1686.
- Ordo Administrandi Sacramentia, Londini, 1831.
- Shakespeare's Works, Glasgow, 1766.
- G. Martyn - Homilies on the book of Tobias being a detailed history of that holy servant of God, York, 1822.
- The New Testament (Rhemes and Doway), 1804.
- Concordantiarum philosophorum de lapide philosophorum tractatus utilis, ab anonimo olim philosopho conscriptus, Paris, 1656.
- G. Leti - The life of Pope Sixtus the Vth, London, 1704.
- History of Don Quixote....revised....by Mr. Ozell, London, 1743.
- The History of Louis XIV - John, Duke of Marlborough, London, 1742.
- T. Sheridan - A Complete Dictionary of the English Language, London, 1789.
- J. Berington - The History of the Reign of Henry the Second, and of Richard and John, his sons; from 1154 to 1216, Birmingham, 1790.
- W. Rider - An Historical and Critical account of the lives and writings of the living authors of Great Britain, London, 1779.
- A Concise Abstract of all the Public Acts passed in the last session of Parliament London, 1782.

Breviarum Romanum Exdereto Sacrosancti Concilii, Romae, 1682.

Catulli, Tibulli, Propertii, Opera ex optimis editionibus sedulo accurata, Londini, 1816.

L.A. Flori Rerum Romanorum libri quatuor, annotationibus...illustratii, auctore J. Min - Ellio, Londini, 1706.

Memoriale Vitae Sacerdotalis; a sacerdote Gallicano (Claude Arvisenet) dioecesis Linconensis exule redactum, Londini, 1800.

J. Milner - The End of Religious Controversy, Derby, 1842.

Berault Bercastel - Histoire de L'Eglise, Paris, 1809.

M. Postlethwayt - Britain's Commercial Interests explained and improved; in a series of dissertations on several important branches of her trade and police..., London, 1767.

T. Smollet - A Complete History of England, from the descent of Julius Caesar to the treaty of Aix la Chapelle, 1748, London, 1758.

M. Tulli Ciceronis opera, Parisiis, 1768.

The letters of Pliny the Consul: with occasional remarks by W. Melmoth London 1747.

Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis Sixtus Clementis VIII, Romae, 1741.

M. Boudier - The History of the Administration of Cardinal Ximenes in Spain, Paris, 1671.

T. Ward - England's Reformation from the time of King Henry the VIIIth to the end of Oates's plot, London, 1719.

G. Marc Antonio Baretti - A Journey from London to Genoa, through England, Portugal, Spain and France, London, 1770.

J. Collier - An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, chiefly of England, from the first planting of Christianity, to the end of the reign of King Charles the Second, London, 1708.

T. Fuller - The Church History of Britain; from the birth of Jesus Christ, until the year 1648, London, 1655.

Eusebius, Pamphili, Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine - The History of the Church from our Lord's incarnation to the twelfth year of the Emperor Mauricius Tiberius, Cambridge, 1692.

Sir R. Baker - A Chronicle of the Kings of England from the time of the Roman government unto the raigne of our souveraigne Lord King Charles etc. With a continuation to the year 1660. By E. Philipps, London, 1730.

R. Smith - Florum Historiae Ecclesiasticae Gentis Anglorum, Londini 1654.

P. de Ribadeneira - Lives of the Saints, with other feasts of the year, according to the Roman Calendar. Translated into English by W.P. Esq., London, 1730.

Letters on the state of Ireland addressed by J.K.L. to a friend in England, Dublin, 1825.

Sir F. Walsingham - Memoirs Par les Ambassadeurs, Amsterdam, 1700.

Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica, Hamburg, 1718.

T. Carte - A general History of England from the earliest times (to AD 1654), London, 1752.

G. Taylor - A Memoir of Robert Surtees, Durham, 1842.

The True Church of Christ; shewed by concurrent testimonies of Scripture & primitive tradition. In answer to a book entitled The Case Stated between the Church of Rome and the Church of England, (By E. Hawarden) 1714.

Humphrey Prideaux, Dean of Norwich - The True Nature of Imposture fully display's in the Life of Mahomet. With a discourse annex'd for the vindicating of Christianity from this charge..., London, 1708.

R. Challoner, Bishop of Debra - The New Testament....Translated out of the Latin Vulgate....With annotations for clearing up modern controversies in religion, and other difficulties of Holy Writ, 1750.

A. Dumetz - Claris Theologicae, Paris, 1684.

P.B. OSF - Christian advent or entertainments for that Holy Season, London, 1759.

J.W.M. OSB - The Creed Expanded..., London, 1735.

B. Orney - A Life of Swift, London, 1752.

J. Thomson - The Seasons, London, 1762.

Supplementum Novum ad Breviarum et Missale Romanum, Romae, 1778.

Subscribers to Lingard's portrait by Lonsdale, from A.S.P.P.

Matthew Atkinson Esq.

Richard Arrowsmith Esq.

Lord Brougham.

Baron Bolland.

Right Rev. Dr. Briggs.

W. Gillison Bell Esq.

Thos. F. Brockholes Esq.

Rev. George Brown.

Mrs. Bary.

Joseph Booker Esq.

Lord Clifford.

Philip Courtenay Esq.

Rev. James Crooke.

Mr. John Coulston.

Pudsey Dawson Esq.

John Dalton Esq.

S.A. Dunham Esq.

Thos. Eastwood Esq.

Rev. Dr. Fletcher.

Sir Jas. Fitzgerald Bart.

John Gage Esq.

John Gradwell Esq.

William Gale Esq.

John Grey Esq.

Thos. Greene Esq. M.P.

Robert Gillow Esq.

Richard Gillow Esq.
Thos. Mee Gorst Esq.
S.H. Haslam Esq.
John Higgin Jun. Esq.
Rev. B. McHugh.
Michael Jones Esq.
Christopher Johnson Esq.
Sir Gregory Lewin.
Rev. Grimshaw Lomax.
Rev. Thos. Lupton.
John Lupton Esq.
John Murray Esq.
Mrs. Murray.
The Duke of Norfolk.
Alexander Nowell Esq.
Charles Orrell Esq.
Rt. Rev. Dr. Penswick.
Sir Frederick Pollock M.P.
Rev. R. Proctor.
Miss Proctor.
Francis Pearson Esq.
Rev. H. Rutter.
Reginald Remington Esq.
Gage Rookwood Esq.
Robert Roskell Esq.
Nicholas Roskell Esq.
Leonard Redmayne Esq.
Hornby Roughsedge Esq.
The Earl of Shrewsbury.

Lord Stafford.

Lord Stourton.

Rev. Dr. Shepherd.

Mrs. Smith.

Thos. Satterthwaite Esq.

Lady Throckmorton.

Rear Admiral Tatham.

Rev. John Tatham.

Rev. Richard Thompson.

Sir Edward Vavasour Bart.

George Weld Esq.

John Wright Esq.

Thos. Worswick Esq.

R.H. Welch Esq.

Mr. John Whiteside.

Mr. Jas. Whiteside.

Replies to my enquiries requesting information about Lingard's correspondence

a) 15 September 1981

Thank you for your letter of 8th September to His Grace the Duke of Norfolk; His Grace's secretary has passed the letter to me to answer.

Dr. Robinson, the Duke's Librarian, is unfortunately away on holiday at present, but I spoke to him on the telephone just before he went and he was most interested in what you say about Tierney and Lingard. First of all, I must tell you that there is nothing in the four published volumes of the Arundel Castle archives catalogue which could refer to any of the missing material which you list. There are bundles of Tierney's notes but they all relate to his History of Arundel. However it is possible that there is something in the as yet unsorted archives which came down to Arundel from Norfolk House just before the Second World War; most of them are catalogued but there are still some boxes which are not. You may be sure that we shall let you know if anything should turn up, but we cannot of course conduct any special search.

I see from the D.N.B. that Tierney wrote a Memoir of Lingard which was printed in the last volume of the sixth edition of his history; unfortunately although there are three sets of the History of England in the library here they are all earlier editions. This Memoir was originally printed in the 'Metropolitan and Provincial Catholic Almanac', 1854. I believe that all Tierney's MSS passed on his death to Bishop Grant and are now in the archives of the diocese of Southwark.

I am sorry that I cannot be more helpful to you, but if I may I will keep your list in case anything should turn up. Thank you for the courtesy of sending a stamped addressed envelope.

Yours sincerely,

(Mrs.) Sara Rodger. Asst. Librarian. Arundel Castle, West Sussex

b) 20 September 1981

I am sorry for the delay in replying to your letter of 9 September. We are not staying in the College at the moment and I had to wait until I went into town to consult index of the archives before writing to you.

I am afraid that there appears to be no reference to any of the people you mention in your letter. I also went through the letters of the Rector at the time and he makes no mention, either. I am sorry not to have been more helpful, though perhaps the negative response is progress.

All good wishes.

Yours sincerely,

Mgr. J. Ryan, Rector. Colegio De Ingleses, Valladolid, Spain

c) 25th November 1981

Thank you for your letter of 9th November and my apologies for not answering it sooner. Alas, although I know most of what you wrote about, I have no letters or personal papers of my gt gt gt grandfather William (18th) Lord Stourton. He left most of his papers to his 3rd brother the Hon. Charles Langdale of Houghton Hall, Market Weighton, Yorkshire. His descendant, Joyce Countess Fitzwilliam, gave Houghton to her nephew the present Lord Manton. Either of them might have some papers. My father's trustees handed most papers to Leeds University. I certainly have no relevant papers and I suspect none exist. I think most of the papers passed to Charles Langdale were relevant to their first cousin Mrs. Fitzherbert, and Charles Langdale utilised these papers to write the first account of that Lady. I am sorry not to be more helpful. The only other place the papers might have got into was Hazlewood, Tadcaster, Yorkshire which went to his second brother the Hon. St. Edward Vavasour Bart - His descendant is now divorced from the property so I think it unlikely you will find honey there: but the Catholic Record Society might just be able to help you either on Hazlewood papers or the other papers.

Yours sincerely,

Mowbray and Stourton. House of Lords, Westminster.

d) 12th January 1982

Thank you for your letter of January 6th concerning possible Lingard documents in the Birmingham R.C. archives.

I am afraid that there is hardly anything relating to Lingard there - but there is a considerable amount of Kirk material, of course, which may be of interest.

You will be welcome to visit the archives (which are open on Thursdays from 10.30 to 4.30), but it would be as well to check in advance, as I cannot get down there every week. As you will know, the main archive material has been listed and the catalogues are available at the British Museum Library, Bodleian Library, Historical Manuscripts Commission, Westminster Diocesan Archives, Downside Abbey, Ushaw College, Leeds Diocesan Archives, Oscott College and the County Record Offices in Stafford, Worcester and Warwick. You will save yourself a lot of time by consulting the catalogues in advance, so that you know what documents you wish to consult.

Yours sincerely,

Rev. P. Dennison, Sutton Coldfield.

e) 5th February 1982

Bishop Foley passed on your letter to me, re John Lingard. The letters mentioned at Greaves House, Lancaster, which belonged to my grandfather, are now held in the library here and you would be very welcome to inspect them here, if they are of interest.

There are some 20-30 letters - dating from 1820 - 40 roughly, mostly in connection with his financial affairs, but often digressing onto more political subjects e.g. emancipation etc.

Please let me know if I can help further.

Yours sincerely,

Anthony Leeming. Skirsgill Park, Penrith, Cumbria.

There is an interesting account of the 'Tablet' riots.

W.E. Gladstone's observations of Lingard's History of England, 3rd.ed. B.M. 44,727,
pp. 141 - 148

W.E. Gladstone's observations on Lingard's History of England

Lingard's History of England

W.G. Fask. 0/14/37

Ch 1

AC 55. Caesar's first invasion.

54 Second. The Cassii give hostages & stipulate for tribute.

No real impression.

Three European families (W. to E.)

1. Celtae

2. Gothi

3. Sarmatae

Britons of (1) chiefly. The Southern tribes comparatively civilised.

Trade in tin, with Cadiz, -Carthage-Marseilles.

Then in hides-lead-iron. Tacitus adds, corn & cattle, gold & silver, slaves and dogs.

Painting and tatoeing.

Religion druidical. Roman gods adored under different names. No temples. pr. from ignorance of architecture.

Human sacrifices held most efficacious. Druids of Gaul studied in Britain. Astrology professed & medicine. Metempsychosis, for the bad? Great political power. Bards?

Some tribes monarchically governed. Much popular influence in all.

A.D. 40 Farce of Caligula.

43. Invasion under Claudius.

78-86 Victories of Agricola. forts from Forth to Clyde.

Marches up the East coast of Scotland - Introduces Roman dress, language.

Thenceforth a prefect or proprietor?

Distinction of legionaries & auxiliaries. Britain furnished many of the latter. All served on the continent.

Six provinces.

No Britain allowed to hold office p37

9 colonies (rewards for veterans) - 2 municipia- 10? Latian? cities- The rest stipendiary towns.

Roman freedom conferred on the nation of Carazalla.

Vallum of Adrian Solway to Tyne.

Of Antoninus Forth to Clyde.

207-11 Severus, reaches the frith of Cromarty. Builds a wall of stone by the Vallum of Adrian.

Carausius,? Allectus, Vesuified? in Britain. Constantius 296. Emperor 306.

Xty had penetrated among the northern tribes 200A.D. spread specy. under Lucius who sent men to Rome for instruction.

314. Council of Arles 3 British Bps. present

(persecution under Diocletian)

Constantine places Britain with Gaulish prefecture, one of four

Export of corn in Julian's time

In this century the name of Picts prevailed over the homogeneous name of Caledonians and that of the Scots from Ireland displaced both.

369. Theodosius expels the Picts and Scots.

Britain separated from the Empire. Confusion Absolute govts

449 Vortigem? invites the Saxons, who had been aided by the Americans to maintain this independence. Hengist Horsa.

429, 446 Doctrines of Pelagius (Britain) & Celestius (Scot) condemned.

Ch. 11 p64

Saxons. Gothic. Angles . Jutes on the peninsular. Lived by piracy & pillage.

Their women laboured. Followed chieftains.

455 Quarrel with the new allies. Hengist founds the Kingdom of Kent 1 Jute?

477-90 Of Sussex, by Alla new

495-519 Of Wessex by Cerdic. Within Thames and Severn

530 Of Essex, by Erkenwin (2-4 Saxon)

5 Of East Anglia, by Uffa. (Norf. Suff. Camb.)

547. Of Bernicia (N. of Tees) by Ida to the Forth and W. Sea

560 Of Deira (Tees to Humber) by Sella. to W. Sea

586 Of Mercia (Central) by Cridda? (5;8 Angle)

Of the whole Empire, only the Briton and Armoricans offered serious resistance to these invaders.

Arthur one of their opponents. Chfly in Lincolnshire.

Retrogression of the Country.

Migration of Amorica- Bretagne- The remaining inhabitants generally enslaved.

Bretwaldas, kings of acknowledged authority in the ochtarchy

Alla the first 480

591 Ethelbert the 3rd- Men of Kent converted 590 of Essex 604.

Conference of Augustine with 7 British prelates doctrinal differences. Proposes.

1. Roman Easter
2. Roman method of baptism
3. Union in preaching to the Saxons. Refused. Ethelbert died 616.
His laws.

Ruined?

Crime payable by the party, for crime to the king,

by the murderer, for his life to the family.

with additional, by the murderer to the King.

Redwald. Br. 4 of East Anglia-

Edwin Br. 5 of Northumbria received tribute for all the Britons, Anglesey & Man.

Converted

Oswald Br. 6. The Northumbrians converted by Aidan.

Oswio. Br. 7 643- ibidem- establishes the Roman Easter and tonsure- agt. the Scots

Dies 670 Wessex & Mercia now rival Northumbria.

Ch. 111

111

Northumbria

678 Appeal of Wilfred Abp. of York to Rome agt Canterbury.

Sussex last converted

A long period of treachery and murder.

Bede of Sunderland. d733 had all the knowledge of his age.

Alcuin of York near 100 years later. Had students from Gaul & Germany.-

Theological schools of Ireland & Canterbury. The latter had Irish in attendance.

Mercia

Offa 757. His conquests. 785. Two synods held by papal legates. He corresponded with Charlemagne (Export of wool).

Wessex

Caedwalla 688 baptised & dies at Rome.

Ina succeeds enacts 79 laws in the Wittengemote. Conquers many of the Britons. Abdicates and repairs to Rome.

800. Egbert. 809- 28 conquers nearly the whole island: & 835 defeats the Danes & Northmen with the revolted? Britons in Cornwall. Dies 836. Eighth Bretwalda No more.

855. Ethelwulf's charter in the church Exempting from secular services the tenth of each manor; or adding it to the existing endowments. Language obscure. Dies 858.

Ethelbald

Ethelbert Wars with the Danes and Northmen

Ethelred

Ch. IV

849. Alfred son of Ethelwulf born. At 5 sent to Rome to be crowned. Again visits it with his father

871 succeeds Ethelred. Purchases peace from the Danes.

Invasion renewed.

877 Builds a fleet & Defeats them on the Exe.

He was guilt at this time of immorality & despotism.

870 Surprised by Guthrun & driven from his throne. Emerges, gains a bloody victory,

Guthrun- one of the condns of peace that G and his chiefs embrace Xty. They are baptised

G returns to his kingdom of East Anglia.

Arranges military service by rotation.

Increases the sizes of his ships.

Constructs a code, inflicts severe punishments on corrupt judges.

Invites scholars- & at 38 commences Latin; wh. at his accession scarcely a man in Wessex understood. Establishes schools. Himself translates Bede-Orosius (abridgement of history) - the Consolations of Boethius- the Pastoral of Gregory.

Query founded Oxford?

His division of time- and revenue.

893. Danish were removed by Haltings?; till 897 where Alfred is completely victorious by land and sea.

900 Dies. Havg. divided his lands, by consent of his thanes, among his two sons, three daughters, 2 nephews, cousins & wife Edward his son an able prince. Dies 925. He subdued all the Danes of Mercia & East Anglia from Thames & Severn who paid Alfred a nominal obedience.

925 Athelstan first king of England - Son of Edward acknowld. by the Scots Cambrians & Britons who all swear fealty to him in the Saxon manner.

Haco of Norway educated at his court. Known as the 'good'. Alan of Bretagne too: came as an infant amg. the fugitives from the northern invasion. Grown up, recovered his country, and 3rdly? his nephew, Louis of France.

940 Dies His chantries - & laws for the preservation of propriety & repression of crime. Edmund; to 946. Edrid to 955 Turketal a priest his chancellor Dunstan about him. Both able.

Ch. IV 231

Edwy to 959.

Edgar to 975 'the peaceful' no war in his reign reinstated monks - who were lost - Enforced clerical celibacy - wh. had prevailed in the two of the Anglo-Saxon Church

Edward Martyr to 978, Dunstan's alleged plot for destroying the Council - really an accident.

Tale of the tong? - not sufficiently supported

Ethelred - invasions of Sweyn & Thurchill One peace purchased at 36,000 lbs weight of silver 1007. Another at 48000 - 1012. Great distress. Commencement of direct taxation - Disastrous period.

1013 Sweyn king by conquest. Dies 1014. Ethelred returns Dies 1016.

Edmund 'Ironside' His wars with Canute. The Thames made the boundary but Danegeld paid on both sides of it.

Reigns 7 months after the pacification. Two infant sons Edw Edm

Ch. IV 276

1016 Canute an impartial monarch. His laws (the Danish essentially akin to the Saxon).

Forbids making Christian slaves - because of the risk of their apostacy when sold to heathen masters. Hig pilgrimage to Rome. Letter to the nation (mentions kirk shot)

Married to Emp? Ethelred's widow. Dies 1035.

Harold Harefoot. Saxon invades England of Alfred & those with him; by Godwin's treachery alleged.

Hardicanute 1040. Dies without issue.

Edward the Confessor 1042 son of Emma - $\frac{1}{2}$ brother to the two last Kings. The rightful Saxon heir, son of Edmund Ironside an exile in Hungary often substituted for nephew. Excessive power of the Carls (Danish - Saxon Ealdorman) Siward, Godwin & C. Delegates of the sovereign.

Removeable & not hereditary of right.

War with Godwin and his family - begs aid from Wm. of Normandy - peace before his arrival.

(1039 murder of Duncan by Macbeth 1054. Rising of Macduff & armament of Siward) Edward sends for his nephew Edmund - who dies suddenly leaving three children - Edgar a son.

There was also purveyance - heriot (- Norm, relief - wardship).

Free Saxons divided into

1. Earl - nobles
2. Ceoil - ignoble

King always elected by the witan. His property (in chief) nearly half the whole. He had military & judicial supremacy: & apptd. county & town officers.

Ealdormen or Earl gov'd. a shire as king's deputy. A kind of prescription right to the office gradually grew.

Geriths cenocites, or socii - household officers -

Thanes - landholders - (of the king or an inferior lord) or merchant havg. made 3 foreign voyages on their own account - Greater & lesser.

Reeves: had judicial executive functions. A court too.

- Ceorls
1. holding boclands under 5 hides -
 2. holding by rent or other inferior? free services

Courts

1. hall - mote 'Sac & Soc?' of the greater & some of the lesser thanes. latest of coquisance various?
2. Hundred motes
 1. to try offences
 2. takes suities? of all for keeping the peace.
 3. attest contracts & payments.

Held by the ealdormen - sometimes > one hundred.

3. Shire mote - twice a year. Under Ealdormen & Bp. dealt with the rights of the church & crown.
2. of individuals
3. recited the laws of the year.

Shires & hundreds - before Alfred. Rule uncertain.

Tything - the families. perpetual bail for each.

4. King's Court held wherever he might be -

5. Witengenotat the Br. great festivals. Probably great vassals only, whose support was need?, had the right to deliberate. Signatures rarely exceed 30: never 60.

Fideles were present & laudaverunt.

Elected the 100th? Made barms with Ethelred when in Normandy.

Sometimes concur - sometimes merely

Had a judicial capacity.

Oaths estimated by laute?

In criminal calls the & 12 thanes held a precognition ... Prognation? was

1. By oath wth.
2. By ordeal.

a. But the bond of lord & vassall ensured abettors to all parties.

b. presents were perpetually given.

Were, for Ceorl 200 shillings royal thane 1200 Ealdormen 2400 Ethelring 3600. King 7200. There was also maubote? to the lord for his vassal and fight with to the kg. or lord of the jurisdiction besides the were to the relations.

Theft very prevalent - even among the clergy. A one time in any form punished with death.

Slaves pr. two-thirds of the population. In classes, villeins those who lived on the lord's land near his house.

The Bp was slave protector. Slave usually - 4

Burghers were

1. free, scuters
2. Villeins - allowed to migrate to towns for trade & to enter guilds.

Ch. VIII 379

(Conquest of Rollo about 900)

The witan elects Edgar in London. - who submits. - when crowned - accepted by the acclamations of both nations - takes the Anglo-Saxon oath. London plundered on that day by his troops - he not privy.

His first measures lenient - Treats Edgar with favour.

Grants lands from his demesnes or the estates of the slain? in order to retain troops in England.

Returns to Normandy Lent 1067 Tyranny of Odo & Fitz-Osborne his deputies. Local insurrections. Wm. returns Dec Acts with severity. Edgar (among others) flies to Scotland.

1069 Invasion of the Danes - invited. Victory at York? Wm. bribes them - lays waste the country from York to Durham over 100,000 said to have perished. Many castles too were now built - the natives terrified - all offices in Church & State, & nearly all the land given to the Normans.

Able men however were apptd. in the Church: who introduced a better discipline & thirst for learning. Lanfranc.

1072 Wm. penetrates to the Tay & Malcom does homage for Scotland. Edgar submits - & receives an establishment in Normandy.

English who retained a part of their land, office held as vassal only.

Wm. held 1432 manors. His half-brother Earl Bp Odo 450. (Manor-villa-tire?, includes lord's house & cottages)

Robert 973. He also gave the Ealdormen - now made hereditary. The chief sub-vassals generally Norman.

Military service for Knight's fees systematized maintainable for 40 days. Binding on Church property - save in the case of franc almoigh?. 60,000 of their fees A passage pr. incorrect. says the monks had 28,000 of these.

Each great lord divided his Estate into:

1. demesne & this he
 1. cultivated by his villeins for himself.
 2. gave out to be holden by (free or villein) service other than military.
2. Knight's fees (Pr. 5 hides each - the hide 64....160 acres)

All including villeins swore fealty & homage By this oath continued the generations that class? rose to copyhold tenure.

(p427) Lingard's England VI Ch. VIII (II)

Wm. altered the laws, by makg. all free tenants swear to the king as well as to the immediate lord.

All military crown tenants were barons & bound to attend the king's court at the three festivals. The poorer ones gradually fell off. & the others became first the 'greater' then the only barons.

The fees were granted in perpetuity: saving failure of heirs, felony or treason when they escheated

Reliefs on succeeding: acc. to some, on ackment. of the king as donor - but qr?

Aids from interior vassals on

1. Succession (payment of relief)
2. Knighting eldest son.
3. Marrying eldest daughter.

Amount fixed by the payers

4. Captivity.

Descents The fee went to the heir at law - independent of the will of the feoffee. Doubted whither his 2nd son or grandson shd. succeed on the death of the eldest son.

Wardships. peculiarly English: during these the lord appropriated the proceeds: & had the education of the heir. No relief, in such case.

Marriages of female heirs cd. only take place at the lord's assent - because the husband became his vassal.

Pleadings (nillgs.) court changed to the Norman tongue.

Amerciaments? (arbitrary) supersede the fixed Saxon fines.

A severe penalty enacted to puttg. a Norman to death, murder was the name by wh. it went.

Wager of battle introduced; Compurgation & ordeal still remaining.

Separate spiritual courts, as abroad, established. But classes, courts & statutes, of

the Anglo-Saxons essenty. remained.

Sources of Royal income

1. rents of crown lands
2. Payments as above from mil. tenants.
3. Escheats & forfeitures.
4. Mulcts & ameriaments - & payments for removal into the king's courts.
5. Bridge, fair, market, tolls. Customs on export & import tallages (aid on demesne lands).
6. Dane Gelt revived.

1075 Norman revolt in England.

Wales reduced.

1085 Canute threatens a Danish invasion.

Robert's revolt in Normandy. Appeased.

1087. Sept. Death at Rouen & same? guipent? Gave Normandy to Robert & willed Wm. to have England.

Good order during his reign. The deposed Bps. Required that no pontiff shd. be acknowld. without his sanctions: nor decrees of the synods: nor of eccl. courts agst. his tenants ni capite.

Ch. IX (457)

1087 William II Chosen Sept 26 by the council of prelates & barons. His succession grounded on his father's havg. acquired & not inherited England.

Norman revolt under Otto & co. for Robert. The nation flock to William. Who suppresses it. 1090 invades Normandy.

Peace 1091; Wm. retainig. the fortresses he had taken. Contract of survivorship.

1096. Robert mortgages Normandy to Wm. for 5 years, receivg. 10,000 marks; in order to gain the crusade.

receivg. 10,000 marks in order to join the crusade.

1091 Malcom invades - repelled - does homage - Edgar again recd. at the English court. War resumed Malcom slain.

1094. Rising in Wales. Wms. invasion ineffectual.

Attempts to check them by a chain of castles.

Revolt of Mowbray in Northumberland 1095.

William's prodigality. Keeps Abbeys and Bprics vacant & exacts fines from successors.

Had at his death & 5B in his hands.

Canterbury vacant 1089 - 93 when in illness he appoints Anselm - His gross debaucheries.

Quarrels with Anselm for havg. acknowledged Pope Urban - he not havg. decided between U. & the anti-pope Clement - Prevents the meeting of synods. Anselm retires to Rome.

1100 His death Buried in Winchr. Cathl. but without service.

No inquiry into the cause or manner.

Built Westminster Hall; this age noted for architecture.

Ch. X p.488

1100 Aug. Henry I Robert was the true heir. He publishes a charter promising

1. To restore church immunities.
2. fixed Anglo-Saxon payments
3. Laws of Edward the Confessor

Robert's invasion. Anselm adheres to Henry. For a pension Robert resigns his claim. But Henry contrives to pretend to extinguish the most powerful Norman nobles - who were partial to Robert. (Under Wm. this private war was repressed)

1103 Robert in England, seized by Henry - obliged to surrender his passion for liberty.

1105 open rupture. Henry invades Normandy, takes Robert - confines him until death.

Henry Duke. (Jesuitical) history of investitures 500. Ancient eletn. of Bps. was by the suffrage of the provincial prelates with the testimony of clergy & people settled

at length by the king's taking fealty & homage - the Pope, the ring & crosier. Wm. son of Robert contends for the Norman succession. The French his partisans, defeated at Breuille.

Mixture of courtesy & ferocity in warfare.

1120 Wm. Henry's only legitimate son drowned. Of a debauched character.

Rising in Normandy for his nephew who becomes Earl of Flanders dies 1128.

1126 Crown settled by H., on his daughter Matilda, Empress, widow of Henry IV - Marries her to Geoffery Count of Anjou.

Justice rigorously administered.

Public punished for debarring? by mutilation and those who had abused purveyance.

Settles money rents for his tenants instead of king.

Danegelt however continued & other heavy exactions

Keeps Bprics & co vacant & exacts relief for them

Dispute at Rome on the legative? power whether in Abp of C.

1135 Death (Grievous forest laws (vol.11.2))

Continental power his political object; at immense expense in wars & bribes. Suspicious dissembling, vindictive, incontinent. Favoured foreigners alone. Left a part of his great wealth.

progress of learning since the Conquest.

trivillia? - grammar, logic, rhetoric.

quadricium - music, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy.

Many visited Spain for instruction from the Arabians.

Gallo Norman poets now superseded Anglo-Saxon tamer?

Romance commences - from the guests? of Alexander - Arthur - & Charlemagne.

Vol. II

Ch. XI P1

1135 Stephen, nephew of Henry.

(On every decease? of the crown "king's peace" held null; all outrages & private feuds revived)

Dec. crowned - without previous sanction of & Bps.

Conditional oath of obedience. So used by the Anglo Saxons.

Generally acknowledged.

The barons now fortify their castles, wh. few of them before had been allowed to do.

Wars in Normandy & with the king of Scots agt. Matilda's cause - Stephen breaks with the Bps who had supported him.

Sept. 1139. Invasion of Matilda

(17 Castles. Keep 5 stories high - family uppermost - wall round it - moat - barbican - drawbridge).

Feb. 1141. Stephen released. He acknowledged by the clergy.

(advantages annexed to the dignity of Earl)

War renewed. Stephen released. He acknowledged genially in the E. She in the W.

Prince Henry acquires Normandy 1150, Anjou 1152 and Aquitaine. Comes to England.

1153 Peace. Stephen takes Henry as his heir.

1154. Oct Stephen dies Miserable state of the country. One might ride in a day without seeing a man.

1154 Henry II had likewise 7 provinces of France with his wife: & 1/3 of the whole.

Issues a pure coinage. Ejects foreign mercenaries from the kingdom. Appoints a justiciary with large powers.

Reduces and demolishes castles.

Adrian IV (Englishman) Pope. Dear.

Henry's pride - actively - craft - passion.

Becket, recommended by Theobald, chancellor. (Not a judicial office till Edw. I). He was a warrior.

1158. Print Henry married to Louis's daughter.

Contends for the duchy of Toulouse. Henry takes a part.

1162 Becket Abp of Canterbury: changes his course of life. Loses favour.

Under Constantine both litigants in a case might carry their cause out of the secular courts before the Bp. Under Theodosius, one might require this. Also the Bp tried his clergy & was tried by his brethren. For both eccleticl., & latterly at least civil offenses. This method regardg the clergy prevailed amg. the Anglo-Saxons: but the Bp. also sat in the County court until the conquest; when "conits chilliau" were established.

From 1151 when Gratiae published his decretum (councils, popes, fathers), of the canon law on the model of the Pandicts, those courts with the advantage of a systematic code came to be preferred greatly in England & a keen rivalry arose: fees & emoluments being on either hand involved.

Henry attacked their criminal jurisdiction as unequal to repressing crime because disabled from judgements of blood & demands that a clergyman degraded by the spl. judge shall be handed over for punishment to the lay.

Obtains from Becket a promise to observe the customs of the realm and exhibits the Constitutions of Clarendon as embodying them.

1. Grants the custody and revenues* of vacant sees &c to the king: the election of the chief clergy with his assent & the advice of such prelates as he may call (*really from William Rufus).

2&7. That the King's justices should determine the jurisdiction & the defendant if convicted in a criminal action lose his benefit of clergy.

3. No Kings tenant in chief or household office to be excommnd. without previous appln. to him.

4. Bps. &c. restrained from quittg. the kgdom. without leave.

5. Appeals to go from the Abp to the King - in civil causes.

Becket repents of his assent and writes to the pope for absolution. The King demands of him 44000 marks for monies received during his chancellorship - he pleads release at his consecration. He appeals - & flies to the Pope at Sens who condemns at his request ten of the Constitns of Clarendon.

War in Wales & Normandy.

Bretagne acquired by negotn.

Becket in exile. 1166 excommunicates the framers of the Constitutions.

Henry allows of appeals by the Bps to the Pope (via the Abp)

1170 Reconciled to Becket. Whose quarrel with three other Bps on account of the late coronation of Prince Henry, leads them to accuse him before the King: his exclamations taken as a warrant by the 4 knights - who demand of him the unconditional absolution of these Bps - & on his declining murder him in the Cathedral.

Two papal legates arrive in France to take cognisance of the cause. Oct. Henry sails for Ireland.

St. Patrick 432-93. General conversion. Relapse under the Danish invasions 738 till Cent 10.

Tanistry - Election of the successor during the chief's lifetime a preference given to his race.

Gavelkind - at the death of each, the whole land of the sept was redistributed by the new confinny.

The church in the 7th cent. used to consult that of Rome. Differed concerning Easter & tonsure. Popes sent legates thither for near a century before the invasion.

Laymen held much of the church land.

First invasion 1169. That of Strongbow, who had married Dermot's daughter Eva & thus claimed the crown of Leinster, 1170. Henry's 1171. Receives submissions including that of Boderie.

(Incestuous practices prevalent).

(1175 treaty between Henry & O'Connor, his Liegeman).

(1171 John Lord of Ireland. Arrival 1185 - recalled in 9 mo)

1172. Henry in Normandy - reconciled with the Pope. consents to hold England from him ace to L.??

1176. In a council at Northampton agreed.

1. Clergymen not to be arraigned in secular courts, unless concerning forest laws or a lay fee -

2. term of vacancies not to go, ordy., beyond a year.

1173 The princes & the queen abscond. Henry's infidelity induced her to stimulate them. Eleanor retaken. France, Scotland & Flanders conspire with his sons. He solicits the pope, as on behalf of St. Peter's patrimony. War.

1174. His pilgrimage to Canterbury & penance. And successful campaign. The King of Scotland becomes his liegeman for liberty. & surrenders five castles.

The King's court was the highest tribunal in the Kdom.

Prelates, earls, barons & household officers were the assessors; but certain of the latter class commonly did the business. It possessed the powers since divided amg. King's bench, Common pleas, Exchequer. The last the oldest & then highest regulated the revenue. But Henry made 6 circuits for that purpose with three Judgs to each. His profit the object.

His tenants in chief were tried in the "King's court".

But 'common pleas', between subjects, were also brought in there.

And the forests had a separate code, magistrates & court.

The King habitually received bribes - but punished them in the judges who did the like.

Glanville justiciary of the north.

Criminal cases presented by a jury - summoned by four knights at the instance of the judgs - & tried by ordeal. If however the party escaped this, he gave securities; or in weighter cases was exiled.

Wager of battle was also used. But Henry allowed in civil cases the appeal to a jury.

He evades the promised crusade.

1187 Jerusalem retaken after 96 years by the infidels.

1188 Henry & Philippe of France take the cross. Feb.

But young Henry & Richard had quarrelled & all the three revolted - Henry & Geoffery die.

Nov 1188 Richard joins Philip of France agt. his father.

1189. July 6 Henry dies

From his daughter Matilda descended the House of Hanover.

His (natural) son Geoffery Bp of Lincoln for 9 years a layman.

He instituted the assize (=assessment) of arms.

Ch XIII

159

1189 Richrd Takes his father's ministers.

Sells lands, offices & the superiority of Scotland, to raise funds havg. the relations of the kingdoms as before.

Excesses of the Crusades agt. the Jews. Case of York. Motive to escape their debts.

Muster at Vezelai. Sack of Palermo. Quarrels with Philip. Subdues Cyprus.

1191. July. Acre reduced by R & Ph Ph retires - leavg. 10,000 to march to Jaffa - Bethania

1192 - return to the coast.

Second march to Jerusalem & retreat - victory of Jaffa. Fever - Treaty. Free access to Jerusalem: for three years.

Dec. 20 Richard's captivity.

Lingard's account of the history of investitures (Vol. 1 ch 10) appears to me very Jesuitical. Likewise his introducing a long and formal character of Henry II at the Commencemnt of his reign - in order as one infers to prepare the mind of the reader for the controversy with Becket Ch.12.

Likewise his history of the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts.

Lingard's History of England

W.G. F.S. 10 39

Ch. XIII

1189 Richard I

1194 Returns

Fitz Osbert - of , England impoverished.

1199 Death.

John Murder of Arthur

Innocent interferes between him & Philip.

'hear the church' p217

Loss of Normandy, Anjou, Maine, touraine.

Election of Bps belonged to the Chapters: with the right

1. Of recommending In the King
2. of approving

With a concurrent right in (2) claimed by the Bps.

Stephen de Langton chosen at Rome by the monks of Canterbury - Refused by John

Interdict (1208) March

1209 Nov. Excommunicated

1213 Declared to be deposed. Philip prepares invasion. May reconciled: & swears fealty to the Pope, reserving peculiar rights of the crown

He followed the example of Henry II, who was feudatory to Pope Alex. III and Richard who consented to hold his crown of the emperor of Germany by a yearly rent. The Scotch did the same under Edw. I claiming to be papal feudatories. The barons concurred in the act; pr to humble & check John.

accommodation with the outlaws.

1214 Fatal battle of Bouvines July.

1215 May, Magna Charta. Its articles were

1. The liberties of the church guaranteed
2. Ancient reliefs restored; wardships & marriages regulated
3. Aids restricted to the three legal cases. Council otherwise to be
4. Court of common pleas fixed
5. Regular legal circuits instituted
6. Justice neither to be sold - refused - nor deferred. The freeman's property to be seized upon trial by his peers.

Americaments limited - necessaries to be left

7. Purveyances to be by permission/
8. Rights of burghs & freemotion of merchants.
9. Liberty to quit the realm.

- 10. Forest laws mitigated - new forests restored.
- 11. Same liberties secured to subvassals.
- 12. temporary articles.
- 25. Conservators appointed

(262) Aug. Innocent annuls the charter. Decr. Excommunicates the barons - & lays a second interdict.

They deny his jurisdiction in temporals. John raises an army of foreign adventurers.

1216. Jan. The barons do homage to Alexander K of Scots? Ap. Offer the crown to Louis whom Innocent excommunicates - July, dies (Conduct of Langton) May Louis invades - receives homages.

Oct. John dies at Newark.

Henry III crowned. Charter revised. Restriction on aids suspended for consn.

1217 Battle of Lincoln May & defeat of Fench fleet.

Sept. Louis retires: promising the restoration of the provinces held by Henry I.

1218 M.C. again confirmed.

1225 Third confirmation - the condition of an aid.

Dispute on the character of Alexander's homage - it was substantially for the Scottish crown.

Two heads. of papal exactions.

- 1. Tallages
- 2. Provisions

1254. Sicilian crown offered to Prince Edmund

1263 To Charles of Anjou who succeeds 1266 by battle of Beneventu & death of Manfred.

Henry's revenue under £40,000. Wm. Conq. £387,000

1258 Commission of ref. chosen in the made parliament of Oxford. 24 persons. Ordain.

- 1. Annual choice of four knights in each county to prevent abuse by the freeholders.

2. eln. of high sherriff annually.
3. rendering of accounts do.
4. Parliaments to be thrice a year - represented however by 12 added to the 24 Commr.

1259 After delay they propose some articles of judicial & administrative reform.

1261 Feb. Henry dismisses his council.

1264 Jan. Award of Louis in Henry's favour.

Rejected by the barons.

May. Leicester's victory at Lewes & treaty placing Henry absolutely in his power.

June. Parlt. establishes a govt. by King's Council wh. Leicester commands.

1265. Mch. Parlt. with representatives of countries & boroughs. (The former had been summoned ni 1213, & on several intermediate occasions)

Aug. Leicester killed at the battle of Evesham.

Henry's power restored. Parlt. of Winchester revokes grants made during its abeyance.

1272. Henry dies.

(365) No representations of towns before this reign.

On ordinary occasions the great council appears to have been composed of

The Bishops & abbots.

The earls & barons

The ministers & judges

The neighbouring knight tenants in chief.

The people were merely chance spectators or clients in attendance.

On great occasions all tenants in chief were summoned

372. But the knights represented all free tenants, whether holding of the king or of a lord.

The inhabitants of boroughs had now acquired in some cases a right of paying rent in common instead of personal services; self assessed. To the King they sometimes rendered a gift in lieu of a tax or tallage.

375. Of Clergy at first only barons paid.

1206 John summoned Abbots & Priors.

H3 issued writs to deans & archdeacons who were to bring powers from their clergy.

Edw I (copying Innocent IV) called them to Convocation, sometimes to Parliament, for taxation.

377. In 1235 the Council of Merton decided for the English custom respecting bastardy.

Trial by ordeal was abolished 1219

Police regulations worthy of note.

(381. 1222 A Clergyman burnt for apostasy to Judaism)

Langton - Rich, abdicated (cf Leighton) - Grossteste - a high Romanist? vid it - if it the pope commands a thing unlawful to obey him is to separate from Christ

He used the cooperation of the friars. Questionable if he died under sentence from Rome

Lingard's History of England V

Mary

27. Au. 14 1553. Mary announces she will compel none to embrace her religion 'till farther order were taken by common consent (L omits previous reply to the men of Suffolk (Blunt 254) which prohibits toleration absolutely)*

*L mentions this in note B makes the first declaration one at St. Paul's Cross, & says she published a proclamation in a few days to correct it

28 Cranmer's intemperate declaration

25 Mary by a court of delegation revises the proceedings against Gardiner Bonner Tunstal Heath & Day, who recover their churches.

32 Oct. Bill legitimizing the queen

Nov. Bill restoring religion to the state of Edward's accession.

40. Gardiner finding opposition hopeless negotiates the terms of the marriage with guards for England

1554 Jan. Suffolk & Wyatt's revolt thereupon suppressed. Lady Jane Grey & her husband executed.

Gardiner saves Elizabeth.

63. Ap. a Parlt. confirms the treaty of marriage.

72. Nov. 30 Pole upon petition from both houses restores England to the Papal communion Dispensation for acts done. Bill.

74 Papal supremacy is restored.

1. The pope chief bishop, with authority to heresies, errors & abuses.
2. To institute or confirm Bishops elect.
3. To grant licences of non - residence & plurality.
4. To dispense in impediments of matrimony.
5. To receive appeals from the spiritual courts.

81. Cranmer was prepared to burn by the Reformatio Legum*

*Hence we see how untrue it is that the whole papal jurisdiction was transformed to the Crown at the Reformation.

Dec. Statutes of heresy revived.

100. In four years near 200 suffered.

Mary's restitution of Church property

Plots of Dudley & Cleobury

Loss of Calais &c

Death Nov. 17 1558. Save persecution, among the best of our princes, not the greatest.

Elizabeth

Answer of Paul IV

149 Dec 27 Proclamn. Stopping preaching; allowing service in English.

Jan. 25 - Pt opened Acts of supremacy (explained in note 7) - and uniformity*; majority only of three (Convocation presents an address in favour of Romish doctrine**

Sixteen bishops remained of whom

1. Kitchen of Llandaff took the oath of supremacy.

2. Tunstal & four more died of the contagious malady

*Heath alleged agt. the Act of Uniformity that it ought to be passed with consent of the clergy in convocation. Neal Ch IV

13 of the 14 Bishops deprived for refusing the act of supremacy.

** 1566. If some of the Puritans had not complied, the reformation must have fallen back into the hands of the papists.

1566 The Puritans form separate private assemblies on account of the habits; but they also disliked the Bishops claiming the sole right of ordination (ChV). Eight heads of offence (Musical instruments used till above 1200 years after Christ) & seven more.

7 leaders of the separation enumerated by Fuller.

Beza wrote to them 'that against the Bps & the prince's will they shd exercise their office, that the minsters of Geneva did much more tremble at it.'

7-9 Three fled to the Continent

10. Heath was allowed to live at Cobham.

11. Bonner 10 years in prison & died there.

12. Watson 23 years in Wisbeach Castle & died there.

13, 14 Thirlby & Bourne in custody of Bps.

15, 16 Turbeville & Pool lived at their own houses on recognisance.

Only nine spiritual peers voted agt. the bill for uniformity.

161. In Jul. 1555 The Scotch Reformers met in the Mearns & instigated by Knox renounced the Established Church again in 1557 The 'Lords of the congregation do the same'

176. Jan. 1560. Elizabeth sends them aid. Feb treaty.

Cecil writes 'the queen's majesty never liketh this matter of Scotland'....'is so evil disposed to the matter.' July 6. Treaty: convention to be called, Sept.

Francis & Mary refuse to ratify. Dec. Francis dies 1561.

Aug Mary returns to Scotland*

*NB In 1560 the General Assembly of Estates of Scotland called under the treaty made reading mass punishable

1. with loss of goods
2. with banishment
3. with death*

313 Mch 1571 Penalties of treason agt. any who should use papal bulls.

Court of High Commission differed from the Inquisition chiefly in the name (1564 Advertisements Act compelling subscription to the 39 Articles).

320 1572 Treaty with France - May. Execution of Norfolk; passed by the ministers & parlt. on Elizabeth.

Aug. Massacre of St. Bartholomew.

341. 1573. Dec. Huguenot League. league of the R.C.s 1576: headed by Henry III

349 1577 Project of Gregory XIII & Don John of Austria govr. of Netherlands whereupon Elis. allies herself with the revolters. 1581. They elect the Duke of Anjou King this contract of marriage with Elizabeth - she breaks it.

*206 1562 Statute making M.P.s & all persons attending mass privately & c liable to the tendri of the oath of supremacy.

248 1567. Ap. Act of Convention of 1560 abolishing the papal jurisdiction confirmed.

295 1569 - After Northumberland's Rebellion Elizabeth's remarkable declaration Dec. Feb. Deposing bull.

1575 Sixty Clergymen of Norfolk & c maintained 'the choice of the people to be the essential call to the pastoral charge' - IV Ch. Vi

Grindal sequestered for refusing to put down prophesyings; till about a year before his death -

1577 Some English go over to take orders at Antwerp.

Whittingham's ordination challenged by Baines, new Bp of Durham, & Sandys Abp of York - he dies while the cause is depending -

1580 Puritan minister 'dissatisfied with several passages in the office of the Lord's Supper'

Statute making a defamatory book &c agt. the Queen capital. Another making it treason to reconcile or be reconciled to the Pope - Rise of Brownson Every church to be a single congregation - the govt. democratical the ministerial office conferred by vote, & revocable 'they were for an entire separation of the ecclesiastical & civil sword.'

Many Puritans received as domestic tutors by the nobility & gentry.

Papists in the north outnumber the protestants.

1582 Wright, presbyterially ordained, charged by Bp of London with being 'no better than a mere layman' & pronounced such & incapable of holding a living.

Yet there were many such & 213 Misc?? 12 Admits?? their orders.

Two Brownist ministers executed for denying the supremacy.

Ch VII 1583 Whitgift Abp. publishes articles: whereof one is 'That none be admitted to preach, or execute any part of the ecclesiastical function, unless he be ordained according to the manner of the Church of England'

The puritanical ministers petition Convocation to get them relieved.

Court of High Commission. Of disputable legality. Empowered to make inquest by all means & ways not only by jury & witnesses: to examine by corporal oath

1584 Whitgift refuses to admit Travers unless reordained

Bill making popular election or consent necessary for induction.

1585. Bp of Lichfield's rules of discipline - rebuked. Travers suspended for being unordained.

1586 Bill omitting Articles 34-6.

1587 It was said the civilians acted as informers, & pushed the Bps forward.

1588. Bannercroft's Sermon: new doctrine; Whitgift 'rather wished than believed it true.'

Ch VIII

1590 Udall dies in prison.

1592 Act enacting banishment, after a conviction for non conformity.

Barrowe & Greenwood tried at O. Bailey for sedition & executed 'when they had only wrote against the church.'

1593 May, Percy do.

Whole reformation endangered early in James I's reign thro' conversions owing to laxity agt. the Romanists.

1594 - 1612 Episcopacy utterly abolished by act in Scotland.

1595 p302. Lambeth Articles. Whitgift desires 'that for as much as they have not the queen's sanction they may not become a public act' in the Universities.

(1602) That the early reformers acknowledged but two orders in the ministry.

1603 King's Speech to Parlt. his mind was ever free from persecution for matter of conscience' - he would meet the Romanists in the midway, if they would but abandon their late corruptions' The puritans differed in their composed?? form of policy & purity' - (James I Ch I)

1604 'Most of the Puritans thought C of E a true church . . unlawful to separate - & were afraid of incurring the guilt of schism by forming themselves into separate communications' They denied Ch of Rome to be a true Church.

1605 Oath of allegiance.

Bradshaw's English Puritanism

BIBLIOGRAPHYManuscript Sources and Printed Books

The Manuscript Archive at the British Museum.

The Archive at Corby Castle, Carlise.

The Archive at Downside Abbey.

The Priest's Library at the Vicarage, Main St., Hornby, Lancashire.

The Archive at the Society of Jesus, Farm Street, London.

The Archive at the Lancashire County Records Office, Preston.

The Archive at Manchester College, Oxford.

The Archive at Skirsgill Park, Penrith.

The Archive at St. George's Cathedral, Southwark.

The Archives and Library at Ushaw College.

The Archive of the Venerable English College, Rome.

The Archive at Westminster Cathedral.

PERIODICALS

- Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine: 1817.
- British Critic: 1793.
- British Press: 1803.
- Brownson's Quarterly Review: 1844.
- Catholic Magazine: 1812.
- Catholic Miscellany: 1822
- Christian Observer and Advocate: 1802.
- Dublin Review: 1836.
- Eclectic Review: 1805.
- Eclectic Magazine of Foreign Literature: 1844.
- Edinburgh Review: 1802.
- European Magazine: 1782.
- Gentleman's Magazine: 1731.
- Home and Foreign Review: 1862.
- London Review and Literary Journal: 1809.
- Monthly Review: 1749.
- North American Review: 1815.
- North British Review: 1844.
- Orthodox Journal: 1813.
- Pamphleteer: 1813.
- Quarterly Review: 1809.
- Rambler: 1848.
- Religious Cabinet: 1841.
- Tablet: 1840.
- Weekly Orthodox Journal: 1835.
- Westminster Review: 1824.

Primary Texts and Pamphlets

- Lord Acton: Letters of Lord Acton to Mary, daughter of the Right Hon. W.E. Gladstone. With an introductory memoir by Herbert Paul. London, 1904.
- Lord Acton: Lectures on Modern History. London, 1906.
- Lord Acton: Historical Essays and Studies. London, 1907.
- Lord Acton: Lectures on the French Revolution. London, 1910.
- Joseph Altholz,
Damien McElrath,
James Holland:(editors): The Correspondence of Lord Acton and Richard Simpson. Cambridge, 1973.
- Sir Archibald Alison Bart.: History of Europe from the Commencement of the French Revolution in MDCCLXXXIX to the Restoration of the Bourbons in MDCCCXV. London, 1833-42.
- John Allen: Reply to Dr. Lingard's Vindication: In a Letter to Francis Jeffray, Esq. London, 1827.
- Thomas Burgess: Christ, and not Saint Peter, the Rock of the Christian Church; and St. Paul, the founder of the Church in Britain: A Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of St. David's. Carmarthen, 1812.
- G. Burnet: History of the Reformation of the Church of England. London, 1679-1714.
- Charles Butler: Historial Memoirs respecting the English, Irish and Scottish Catholics from the Reformation to the present time. London, 1819-21.
- William Camden: Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha. London, 1615.
- William Cobbett: A History of the "Protestant" Reformation in England and Ireland showing how that event has impoverished and degraded the main body of the people in those countries. In a series of letters to all sensible and just Englishmen. London, 1824.

Henry Cotes

(pseud.Elijah Index):

A Protestant's Reply to the Author of 'Remarks on the Bishop of Durham's Charge'. Newcastle, 1807.

Henry Cotes

(pseud.Elijah Index):

Reply to the Review of a Pamphlet entitled, "A Protestant's Reply to the Author of Remarks on the Bishop of Durham's Charge." Addressed to the Author of Remarks, and to the Gentleman who stiles himself the Author's Second. Newcastle, 1807.

Henry Cotton:

Rhemes and Doway: An attempt to show what has been done by Roman Catholics for the diffusion of the Holy Scriptures in English. Oxford, 1855.

John Foxe:

Acts and Monuments of these latter and perillous dayes, touching matters of the Church, ar comprehended and described the great persecution that have been wrought and practised by the Romish prelates speciallye in this realm of England and Scotlande, from the yeare of our Lorde, a thousande, unto the tyme now present. Gathered and collected according to the true copies and writings certificatory. London, 1563.

Spencer Hall(editor):

Documents from Simoncas Relating to the Reign of Elizabeth, (1558-1568). Translated from the Spanish of Don Tomas Gonzalez and edited, with notes and introduction, by Spencer Hall F.S.A., Librarian to the Athenaeum. London, 1865.

Henry Hallam:

A View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages. London, 1818.

Henry Hallam:

The Constitutional History of England From the Accession of Henry VII to the Death of George II. London, 1827.

P.R. Harris(editor):

Douai College Documents 1639-1794. (Catholic Record Society Series). 1972.

- R. Henry: The History of Great Britain, from the first Invasion of it by the Romans under Julius Caesar, London, 1771-93.
- Nathaniel Hollingsworth: Three More Pebbles from the Brook, or the Romish Goliath Stain with his own Weapon, being an answer to "Remarks on the Grounds on which the Church of England separated from the Church of Rome reconsidered by Shute, Bishop of Durham." In three letters to the Remarker. By the Author of "A Defence of the Doctrine and Worship of the C. of England." Durham, 1809.
- Nathaniel Hollingsworth: A Defence of the Doctrine and Worship of the Church of England in five letters addressed to the author of "A letter to a Clergyman of the Diocese of Durham". In Answer to his Second letter. By a Parochial Minister of the Diocese of Durham. Durham, 1822.
- Thomas Howell: A complete collection of State Trials and Proceedings for High Treason and other Crimes and Misdemeanors from the earliest period, to the present time. London, 1809-26.
- David Hume: The History of England, from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Revolution in 1688. Edinburgh 1754-1757.
- George Isaac Huntingford: The Petition of the English Roman Catholics Considered: In a Charge delivered to the Clergy in the Diocese of Gloucester, At the Triennial Visitation of that Diocese in the month of June 1810. London, 1810.
- P. Leath Ward: History of Westmoreland. Manchester, 1842.
- Thomas Le Mesurier: A Serious Examination of the Roman Catholic Claims, as set Forth in the Petition, Now pending before Parliament. London, 1805.

- Thomas Le Mesurier: Supplement to the Reply to the Right Reverend Dr. Milner's Observations: Being an answer to the General Vindication of a Catholic's Remarks upon the Bishop of Durham's Charge, as far as the same affects the Author. London, 1809.
- Thomas Le Mesurier: A Counter Address to the Protestants of Great Britain and Ireland; in Answer to the Address of Charles Butler, Esq. 1813.
- John Lingard: The Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church. Newcastle, 1806.
- John Lingard: Remarks on a Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Durham by Shute, Bishop of Durham, at the Ordinary Visitation of that Diocese in the year 1806. London, 1807.
- John Lingard: Letters on Catholic Loyalty. Originally published in the Newcastle Courant. Newcastle, 1807.
- John Lingard: A Review of a Pamphlet entitled "A Protestant's Reply". Newcastle, 1807.
- John Lingard: A Vindication of the "Remarks on the Charge of the Bishop of Durham". Newcastle, 1807.
- John Lingard: A General Vindication of the "Remarks on the Charge of the Bishop of Durham," containing a Reply to a Letter from a Clergyman of the Diocese of Durham (second edition); a Reply to the Observations of the Rev. Thomas Le Mesurier, Rector of Newnton Longville; a Reply to the Strictures of the Rev. G.S. Faber, Vicar of Stockton-on-Tees; and some Observations on the More Fashionable Methods of Interpreting the Apocalypse. Newcastle, 1808.

- John Lingard: A Letter to a Clergyman of the Diocese of Durham in Answer to His Second Letter to the Author of the Remarks on the Bishop of Durham's Charge. Newcastle, 1808.
- John Lingard: Remarks on a late Pamphlet entitled "The Grounds on which the Church of England Separated from the Church of Rome, Reconsidered by Shute, Bishop of Durham". London, 1809.
- John Lingard: Errata to the Protestant Bible, by Thomas Ward. With a preface by the Rev. J.L. Dublin, 1810.
- John Lingard: Defence of Ward's Errata to the Protestant Bible. By the Rev. J.L. Dublin, 1810.
- John Lingard: Documents to Ascertain the Sentiments of British Catholics in former ages respecting the Power of the Popes. London, 1812.
- John Lingard: A Review of Certain Anti-Catholic Publications, viz. a Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Gloucester in 1810, by George Isaac Huntingford, D.D., F.R.S.; A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Lincoln by George Tomline, D.D., F.R.C., and Observations on the Catholic Question, by the Right Hon. Lord Kenyon. London, 1813.
- John Lingard: Examination of Certain Opinions advanced by Dr. Burgess, Bishop of St. David's, in two recent Publications, entitled "Christ, and not Peter, the Rock of the Christian Church" and "Johannis Sulgeni versus hexametri in laudern Sulgeni patris, Menevensis Archiepiscopi". Manchester, 1813.

John Lingard:

The Faith and Doctrine of the Roman Church Proved, to which is prefixed a preface by J.L. London, 1813. (This work should not be confused with "The Protestant Apology for the Roman Catholic Church". Dublin, 1809. Some people have supposed the long preface to the text by Christianus (William Talbot) which is the same text in the 1813 work, to be Lingard's.

NB Haile and Bonney's Life, Op.cit., Gillow's Biographical Dictionary of English Catholics and Joseph Chinnier's English Catholic Enlightenment). That Preface, however, was written by Dr. Lanigan under the pseudonym 'Irenaeus'. NB Fitzpatrick's Irish Wits and Worthies, 1873, p.136ff and Alibone's Critical Dictionary of English Literature and British American Authors, 1859-71, p.1058. Tierney's Life, Op.cit., p.12 is clear about Lingard's authorship to the small preface to the 1813 work. The colourful and extravagant language of the 1809 publication make it equally clear that that Preface could not possibly have been written by Lingard.

John Lingard:

Strictures on Dr. Marsh's "Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome". London, 1815.

John Lingard:

Observations on the Laws and Ordinances which Exist in Foreign States Relative to the Religious Concerns of their Roman Catholic Subjects. London, 1817.

John Lingard:

Journal on a Tour to Rome and Naples in the Summer of 1817. Published in the Ushaw Magazine, XVII, 1907.

John Lingard:

A History of England, from the First Invasion by the Romans to the Revolution in 1688. London, 1819-30.

- John Lingard: The Charters Granted by different Sovereigns to the Burgesses of Preston, in the County of Palatine of Lancaster. Preston, 1821.
- John Lingard: Supplementum ad Breviarium et Missale Romanum, Adjectis Officiis Sanctorum Angliae. London, 1823. (The MS is with the Gradwell Papers, A.V.E.C.).
- John Lingard: A Vindication of certain passages in the Fourth and Fifth volumes of the History of England. London, 1826.
- John Lingard: The arrangement of the MSS of the Rev. Thomas White's Sermons for the Different Sundays of the Year and some of the Festivals and on other Important Subjects. London, 1828.
- John Lingard: Remarks on the "Saint Cuthbert" of the Rev. James Raine, M.A. Newcastle, 1828.
- John Lingard: A Manual of Prayers for Sundays and Holidays. Lancaster, 1833.
- John Lingard: A New Version of the Four Gospels: with Notes, critical and explanatory. By a Catholic. London, 1836.
- John Lingard: The Widow Woolfrey versus the Vicar of Carisbrooke: or Prayer for the Dead. A Catholic Tract for the Times. London, 1839.
- John Lingard: The Bible, the only Rule? or, Doubts and Queries, respectfully addressed, to the Rev. J.H. Green Armytage, one of the Lecturers against Popery at St. Arne's. By a Lancaster Idolator. Lancaster, 1839.
- John Lingard: Catechetical Instructions on the Doctrines and Worship of the Catholic Church. London, 1840. This was reproduced, in parts, by the Catholic Truth Society after Lingard's death in a publication entitled 'Lingard Papers'.

- John Lingard: The History and Antiquities of the Anglo Saxon Church, containing an account of its Origin, Government, Doctrines, Worship, Revenues and Clerical and Monastic Institutions. London, 1845.
- T. Lowndes: A Biographical Dictionary of Living Authors. London, 1816.
- T.B. Macaulay: The History of England from the Accession of James II. London, 1849.
- George Oliver: Collections towards illustrating the Biography of the Scotch, English, and Irish members of the Society of Jesus. Exeter, 1838.
- Henry Phillpotts: A Letter to the Author or Remarks on a Charge delivered By Shute, Bishop of Durham, At the Ordinary Visitation of that Diocese in the Year 1806. By a Clergyman of the Diocese of Durham. Newcastle Upon Tyne, 1807.
- Henry Phillpotts: A Second Letter to the Author of Remarks on the Bishop of Durham's Charge, Occasioned By the Vindication of these Remarks, lately Republished. By a Clergyman of the Diocese of Durham. Newcastle Upon Tyne, 1808.
- William Robertson: A History of Scotland. Edinburgh, 1759.
- William Shakespeare: The Whole Contention between the Two famous Houses, Lancaster and Yorke. With the tragical end of the good Duke Humfrey, Richard Duke of Yorke and King Henrie the Sixt. London, 1619.
- William Shakespeare: Life of Henry VIII. London, 1732.
- Sir Cuthbert Sharp: Brief Summary of a Manuscript formerly belonging to Lord William Howard. 1819.

- Shute Barrington: A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Durham, at the Ordinary Visitation of that Diocese, in the year 1806. London, 1807.
- Shute Barrington: Grounds of Union between the Churches of England and of Rome considered, in A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Durham, at the ordinary Visitation of that Diocese, in that year 1810. Newcastle Upon Tyne, 1810.
- Shute Barrington: Vigilance, A Counterblast to past Concessions, and a Preventive of Future Prodigality, Recommended in Two Charges and a Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of Durham. Newcastle Upon Tyne, 1813.
- R. Shutte: The Life, Times, and writings of Dr. H. Phillpotts, Lord Bishop of Exeter. London, 1863.
- R. Southey: Book of the Church. London, 1824.
- J. Strype: Annals of the Reformation. Pt.1. London, 1709.
- Richard Thompson: The Case Stated, of the Wigan Catholic Chapels, in two letters. To which are added, (as an Appendix) Mr. Walmsley's Two letters to the Rev. Richard Thompson, as made Public by Himself. Wigan, 1818.
- Richard Thompson: The Case is Altered in a letter to the Roman Catholics of Wigan. Wigan, 1818.
- M.A. Tierney: Memoir of the Rev. Dr. Lingard. Published in the Metropolitan and Provincial Catholic Almanack. London, 1854.
- M.A. Tierney: Dodd's Church History of England From the Commencement of the Sixteenth Century to the Revolution in 1688. London, 1839-43.

- M.A. Tierney: A Reply to Cardinal Wiseman's Letter to this Chapter, to which is prefixed the Letter to "The Rambler", which is the subject of His Eminence's Strictures. London, 1858.
- H.J. Todd: A Vindication of the Most Reverend Thomas Cranmer, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, and therewith of the Reformation in England, against some of the allegations which have been recently made by the Rev. Dr. Lingard, the Rev. Dr. Milner, and Charles Butler Esq. London, 1826.
- H.J. Todd: A Reply to Dr. Lingard's Vindication of his History of England, As far as respects Archbishop Cranmer. London, 1827.
- George Tomline: A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Lincoln, at the Triennial Visitation of that Diocese in May, June and July 1812. London, 1812.
- George Townsend M.A.: The Accusations of History against the Church of Rome, Examined in Remarks on the Principal Observations in Mr. Charles Butler's Work "Book of the Roman Catholic Church". With a Supplementary Letter to Mr. Butler, containing a reply to the "Vindication" of that work, point by point, throughout. London, 1845.
- Leopold von Ranke: Ecclesiastical and Political History of the Popes of Rome during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Berlin, 1836.
- A. Whelock: Historial ecclesiastical gentis Anglorum libri, edited by A.W. 1643.
- Nicholas Wiseman: Recollections of the Last Four Popes. London, 1858.

- Nicholas Wiseman: A Letter to the Canons of the Cathedral Chapter of Westminster, in reply to one published in the Rambler For June 1858, Relative to a passage in the "Recollections of the Last Four Popes". London, 1858.
- Christopher Wordsworth: King Charles Ist, the author of Icon Basilike, further proved in Reply to the Objections of Dr. Lingard. London, 1828.

Secondary Sources and Articles

- Nigel Abercrombie: The early life of Charles Butler (1750-83). *Recusant History*, vol. 14, 1978, pp.281-292.
- J. Aveling: *The Handle and the Axe*. London, 1976.
- R. Bilsborrow: The Lighter side of Lingard, and some trivial articles. *Ushaw Magazine*, vol. XX, 1910 pp.162-181.
- J.B. Black: *The Reign of Elizabeth 1558-1603*. Oxford, 1936.
- Edwin Bonney: *The Making of Lingard's History*. *Ushaw Magazine*, vol. XIX, 1909, pp.276-297.
- John Bossy: *The English Catholic Community 1570-1850*. London, 1975.
- James Brennan: A Gallican Interlude in Ireland. *The Irish Remonstrance of 1661*. *Irish Theological Quarterly*, vol.24, 1957. pp219-237.
- Asa Briggs: *The Age of Improvement*. London, 1959.
- Edwin Burton: *The Life and Times of Bishop Challoner (1691-1781)*. London, 1909.
- C. Butler: *The Vatican Council 1869-70*. 1930.
- Herbert Butterfield: *The Whig Interpretation of History*. London, 1931.
- Herbert Butterfield: *Man on His Past. The Study of the History of Historical Scholarship*. Cambridge, 1955.
- T. Cann Hughes: *John Lingard: A Learned Lancashire Priest*. Lancaster, 1907.
- John Cannon (editor): *The Historian at Work*. London, 1980.
- Owen Chadwick: *The Victorian Church*^(2 vols). London, 1966-70.
- Joseph Chinnici: *The English Catholic Enlightenment John Lingard and the Cisalpine Movement 1780-1850*. Shepherdstown, 1980.

- G.N. Clark : The Later Stuarts 1660-1714. Oxford, 1937.
- R.G. Collinwood and
F.B. Myres: Roman Britain and the English Settlements. Oxford,
1936.
- Gerard Culkin: The Making of Lingard's History. The Month, 1951,
pp.8-18.
- G. Davies: The Early Stuarts 1603-1660. Oxford, 1937.
- E. Duffy: Joseph Berington and the English Catholic Discipline
Movement. 1772-1803. Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, 1974.
- John Fletcher: John Lingard, D.D., F.R.S. (1771-1851), Dublin Review,
1925, pp 36-58.
- Joseph Gillow: A Literary and Biographical History, or Bibliographical
Dictionary of the English Catholics from the breach
with Rome in 1534 to the present time. London, 1885-
1902.
- G.P. Gooch: History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century.
London, 1913.
- J. Greig: The Letters of David Hume. 1932.
- M. Haile and E. Bonney: Life and Letters of John Lingard. Edinburgh (n.d.).
- J.R. Hale: The Evolution of British Historiography From Bacon to
Namier. London, 1967.
- E.E.Y. Hales. Revolution and the Papacy 1769-1846. London, 1960.
- W.J. Hegarty: The Lingard Centenary (1851-1951). Irish Ecclesiastical
Record, 1951, pp.386-398.
- W.J. Hegarty: Was Lingard a Cardinal? Irish Ecclesiastical Record,
vol. LXXIX, February 1953, pp.81-93.
- Gertrude Himmelfarb: Lord Acton. A Study in Conscience and Politics.
London, 1952.
- Christopher Hollis: Lingard. The Historical Bulletin, vol. XI, no.3, March
1933, pp.43-45.

- Philip Hughes: John Lingard 1771-1851. *History Today*, vol.1, no.4, April 1951, pp.57-62.
- F.C. Husenbeth: *The Life of the Right Rev. John Milner, D.D., Bishop of Castabala, Vicar Apostolic of the Midland District of England, F.S.A. London and Cath. Acad. Rome. Dublin, 1862.*
- E.F. Jacob: *The Fifteenth Century 1399-1485. Oxford, 1961.*
- T.G. Jalland: *The Church and the Papacy. A Historical Study being eight lectures delivered before the University of Oxford, in the year 1942, on the foundation of the Rev. John Bampton, Canon of Salisbury. London, 1944.*
- David Knowles: *Great Historical Enterprises. Problems in Monastic History. London, 1962.*
- Lionel Kochan: *Acton on History. London, 1954.*
- Robert C. Laing: *Ushaw College: A Centenary Memorial. Newcastle Upon Tyne, 1895.*
- J.A. Lechmere: *A Great Catholic Historian, John Cardinal Lingard 1771-1851. Ecclesiastical Review, no. 94, 1938. pp.472-482.*
- J.D. Mackie: *The Earlier Tudors. 1485-1558. Oxford, 1952.*
- M. McKisack: *The Fourteenth Century, 1307-1399. Oxford, 1959.*
- David Mathew: *Acton: The Formative Years. London, 1946.*
- David Milburn: *A History of Ushaw College. Durham, 1964.*
- John Miller: *Papery and Politics in England 1660-1688. Cambridge, 1973.*
- Henry Milman: *The History of the Jews. 1829.*
- Henry Milman: *History of the Latin Christianity. London, 1854-5.*
- Alan Nevins: *The Gateway to History. New York, 1938.*

- An Old Alumnus: Records and Recollections of St. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw; with introductory poem, to which are appended copious illustrative, Historical, and Descriptive Notes. Preston, 1889.
- A.L. Poole: From Domesday Book to Magna Charta 1087-1216. Oxford, 1951.
- M. Powicke: The Thirteenth Century 1216-1307. Oxford, 1953.
- B. Reardon: From Coleridge to Gore. London, 1971.
- H.E. Root (editor): David Hume's Natural History of Religion. London, 1956.
- George Rude: Hanoverian London, 1714-1808. 1971.
- George Salmon: The Infallibility of the Church. Lectures Delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Dublin. London, 1914.
- Richard L. Smith: Lingard at Hornby. The Clergy Review, 1851, vol. XXXV, pp.294-301.
- F.M. Stenton: Anglo-Saxon England. Oxford, 1943.
- M.A. Tierney: Was Dr. Lingard Actually a Cardinal? Rambler, vol. IX, June 1858, pp.425-432.
- W. Torrens: Memoirs of Viscount Melbourne. London, 1878.
- A. Vidler: Prophecy and the Ppacy. London, 1954.
- A. Vidler: The Church in an Age of Revolution. London, 1961.
- J.S. Watson: The Reign of George III. Oxford, 1960.
- E.L. Woodward: The Age of Reform. Oxford, 1938.

