Northern Catholic History

No. 47 ISSN 0307-4455 2006

Contents

William Warrilow and the Jesuit Mission in Newcastle upon Tyne
The Revd Geoffrey Holt, SJ, MA, FSA, FRHist.S

Francis Harvey
Mrs Mary Connor

Charles Newsham, Henry Hemy, John Richardson and the Rise of Benediction Music in Nineteenth-century Catholic England
Dr Thomas E. Muir

Northumbrian Jacobite Novels
Dr Leo Gooch

Common Stock and Brethren Fund – A Right Yorkshire Mix Up!
The Revd Dominic Minskip

'An Exhortation To Decent Behaviour In Chapels'

Caveat for a Cardinal: The Public Life of Ushaw's Merry del Val Part 2: Relationship with the Church in England,
The Revd David Milburn

The Fate of the Durham Chapter in 1559
Edward Stephens

Bibliography

Review

WILLIAM WARRILOW AND THE JESUIT MISSION IN NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE

Geoffrey Holt, S.J.

In his historical Notes on the secular mission in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, James Rae Baterden included notes about the Jesuit mission in Gateshead and Newcastle from c.1680 till 1807 but first mentioned John or Hugh Whitfield, a Jesuit, who was arrested after saying Mass in Newcastle at some date between his arrival on the English mission in 1648 and his death in 1686. Baterden names: Philip Leigh who arrived in Gateshead about 1681 and in whose time the Jesuits opened a school in Newcastle but which did not survive the revolution of 1688; George Brown, *alias* Pippard, who was at Gateshead before 1701; John Walsh who was at Gateshead in 1746 when the chapel was destroyed by the mob and who removed the chapel to Newcastle to a house in the Close; and William Warrilow who succeeded at Walsh's death in 1773 and who was missioner until he died in 1807. In a footnote, Baterden added the names of the following Jesuit priests who were at Gateshead on the dates he gives: William Riddell (1711), Francis Anderton (1723), Richard Molyneux (1724-33 and Thomas Maire (1731-36). Other priests at Gateshead or Newcastle included Henry Haggerston (1714), Henry Widdrington (1714), Francis Clifton (1741), Alexander Leigh (1741) and Richard Murphy (1766).?

James Baterden had little to record about William Warrilow. He was informed that there were at the time no known papers about the Newcastle mission 'bearing upon the subject of your research'. He also mentions that James Worswick, the secular missioner in Newcastle, complained that the Jesuits gave him no financial help when he took over the Jesuit mission on Warrilow's death: 'not one farthing have I received for the additional burden of their congregation".

William Warrilow was born in Dublin on 13 July 1738 and was a student at Douai from 1751 until 1759 when he left having finished one year's study of theology. He entered the Jesuit novitiate on 11 September 1760, studied theology for two further years and was ordained about 1766. For a year or two he lectured in philosophy at Liege and was then appointed chaplain at Ellingham in Northumberland in 1769.' On John Walsh's death in 1773 he was moved to Newcastle. He transferred the house and chapel from the Close to Westgate Street, the chapel being on the upper storey of the house. The Jesuit accounts show that he was granted by the district in 1773 £18 a year for house and stable rent in addition to an annual allowance which by 1779 was £40 a year. In 1783 his annual allowance (like that of his colleagues in the district) was raised to £60. All his income was from the district; there were no funds attached to the mission. From 14 December 1790 he was agent, appointed by

his colleagues in the district, and for this he was granted £20 a year. He kept the district accounts carefully and in detail. An example taken at random reads

> To journey to Ellingham and back with a partner in a post chaise, the weather being very bad and the business, of the district of the most pressing nature £3-3.0d.

Little can be gathered from these accounts about his life and work in Newcastle. The few letters that have survived in the Jesuit province archives are hardly more informative but do throw some light on his character and opinions. Three of his letters, perhaps a fourth, were written to William Strickland, a suppressed Jesuit living in London who had once been missioner at Alnwick and on the eve of the suppression had been appointed superior of the Jesuit Durham district.[11] In the first letter, dated 28 March 1801, Warrilow wrote:

> The day after I received, the first of your two last two letters, Mr P[lowden]'s production was delivered to me... 1 am informed that he is of the opinion that I am in no wise an abettor of his reasoning, his conduct and of his principles. He is perfectfully right. I really am not, and to the last moment I will abide by former councils, former deliberations and former decisions... When the hurry and business of this holy time is over 1 will read the circular letter of this worthy and well-intentioned man. In the meantime I will bet you a bottle of port that the passion sermon which I am now writing contains more sense, more reasoning and even more spirituality than any production of Mr R.Plowden...

Robert Plowden, a suppressed Jesuit who was stationed at Bristol as missioner from 1787 till 1815 [n], had written a 'Letter to the Gentlemen of the late English Providence of J—ts' dated 12 December 1796[14] which was followed by a pamphlet printed by Keating, Brown and Keating in February 1801.[5] Plowden, an able but, many thought, eccentric priest, disapproved at considerable length of the management of the finances of the English suppressed English Jesuits. As the Jesuit districts (with their own funds) ceased to be with the death of their last members, their funds, he said, were put into the hands of the president of Stonyhurst and his trustees for the education of priests. This, in view of the belief of many that the Society would one day be restored seemed a sensible policy but Robert Plowden disapproved. The property, he said, belonged to all and when the last man in a district died its funds should be committed to the management of neighbouring districts. There had been, he argued, encroachments on the rights and property of the districts. William Warrilow would have none of this and wrote to William Strickland:

> In my supposition that you are at the head of the Northumberland district act therefore for us in a manner which you think the best calculated to secure our property... as our circumstances admit of... Whatever may be the result of Mr P's intentions or endeavours I am determined that with

> your concurrence & approbation his design should not extend its influence or take place here... Stonyhurst is the great object before us and that is the object 1 shall always wish to serve, I have with difficulty stolen these few moments to communicate this much of my sentiments? & to assure you that I am with the greatest respect...

In 1803 news arrived from the Jesuits in Russia, where the Society had not been suppressed, that Cardinal Consalvi, the papal Secretary of State, had informed the Jesuit General, Fr Gruber, that those who wished might enlist in the Society with their Russian brethren. William Warrilow replied to the invitation from other suppressed Jesuits to do so.[1'] To those who replied positively, his personal response must have been disappointing

> I am in no wise prepared to return you a satisfactory answer... It matters little whether the flag of Loyola fly in the great city of Petersburg or in that of Rome, whether it be displayed in the frozen regions of White Russia or the softer clime of France, the cause is me same & truly noble & the service highly honourable...

But he then gave his reasons for not rejoining: his health, the decline of his intellectual powers, his inability to respond to the rules and customs of the Society, his 'drooping spirits as he drops down the eventide of life'. He was not satisfied about the 'secret' negotiations between Fr Gruber and Cardinal Consalvi. He finished his letter

> You are certainly embarked in a most arduous cause, your motives are truly religious, your object honourable and such [are] your endeavours as to entitle you to the good wishes of every good, virtuous & well-meaning man. I am with the greatest respect...

In a third letter he wrote an indignant response to what seems to have been a complaint that as agent he had made some error in the district accounts. In the course of his reply he made a remark which might suggest that he had by then rejoined his lesuit brethren in the Society. Writing of one who had been concerned in the complaint, he added

> The application seems to me to come rather awkwardly in favour of a man, who not having thought proper to unite himself to the old body now sufficiently reestablished...[17]

Would he have written thus if he had himself not rejoined?

His last letter to have survived was dated just a few months before his death. He was, he wrote, in poor health. All he could do was to say Mass with difficulty and was in danger of falling. He asked 'What will you be able to allow me ... when I am laid upon the shelf which I have reason to believe may take place every Sunday I officiate?'[18] He died on 13 November 1807. His burial was in St John's Anglican churchyard. At his death, the *Newcastle Chronicle*

described Warrilow as 'most esteemed by a numerous circle of friends for his extensive information, his urbanity as a gentleman and his erudition as a scholar' but Dr Lingard made a rather different judgement: 'He lived here at great expense; besides other servants, he kept a footman and two horses'.[20] It is also recorded that he was the only Jesuit in the north to protest publicly about the suppression of the Society which he did in a letter to the press in Newcastle. He was reprimanded for this by Charles Cordell, the secular priest missioner in Newcastle but, as was remarked at the time, 'they do not often see one another, for light and darkness are scarce more opposite than these two singular characters...'[21] Warrilow was mentioned in a letter from the Reverend Henry Rutter to his uncle the Reverend Robert Banister:

> I have lately accompanied Mr Silvcrtop as far as North Shields to dine on board the *Good Luck,* a new ship, ready to sail, in which he has no small share. The place is the port of Newcastle and consequently a very great trade is here carried on. I wish there was a good foundation made for a chapel, for there is a rising congregation which, if properly encouraged, would soon become very numerous. Mr [James] Johnson indeed attends there, but only now and then, for he has business enough on his hands at home; whereas one of the Gentlemen at Newcastle might easily be spared.

After William Warrilow's death the Jesuit mission was merged with the secular one in Pilgrim Street under James Worswick. In his will Warrilow left all his property toMarmaduke Stone, the president of Stonyhurst, requesting that his debts be paid and £50 given to the poor in Newcastle.[23] James Worswick had to enlarge his chapel and requested that the proceeds of the sale of the lease of the Jesuit chapel and house be paid to him together with £25 annually which he claimed was the property of the Jesuit Newcastle mission. The Committee of Newcastle Catholics supported his claim. The demand was made that the deeds of the property and other papers should be produced to prove ownership. The reply of the Jesuits was that if there had ever been any deeds they had been lost when Gateshead was burnt or when the English Jesuit archives which were kept on the continent were seized at the suppression. There were no funds belonging to the Jesuit Newcastle mission; the priests had always been supported by the Society.

After much correspondence James Worswick was given £200, the proceeds of the sale of the lease of the Jesuit house and chapel, and £50 for the poor of Newcastle. His receipt, dated 9 December 1808, for '£200 for the enlargement of the chapel in Pilgrim Street, Newcastle upon Tyne this 9th day of December 1808 and also £50 for the Cath^{e} poor, the legacy of the late Mr Warrilow, signed James Worswick^{1}, is in the Jesuit province archives.[24]

Thus the statement attributed to James Worswick in the Historical Notes on Newcastle-upon-Tyne and mentioned earlier in this article needs correction. But

James Worswick did not give up. In December 1833 Nicholas Sewell, who had been the provincial superior, wrote to Richard Norris

> Being informed by Mr Tristram that Mr Worswick of Newcastle has again made a claim on the Society for some money which he says we have and which he says belongs to his mission, think it proper to give your Rev[cc] all the information I can on the subject. - Mr Worswick pretends that the papers concerning the money were kept at Gateshead which chapel we served; he was answered that Gateshead chapel & house were burnt down, & if any such papers were there they were likewise burnt; that in our memorandum books we have no mention of any such money; that our predecessors have always denied the knowledge of any such money and therefore it was a claim made without any proof.[25]

Notes and References

1. J.R. Baterden, 'Notes on the Early Jesuit Missions in Gateshead and Newcastle 1688-1807 &c', *Miscellanea* (Catholic Record Society 1936), pp. 199-200, 206; T.M. McCoog, *English and Welsh Priests, 1555-1650,* Part II, (Catholic Record Society 1995) p. 331.

2. G. Holt, *English Jesuits 1650-1829* (Catholic Record Society 1984), names in index.

3. Baterden p. 206.

4. P.R. Harris, *Douai College Documents 1639-1794* (Catholic Record Society 1972) p. 428.

5. Holt p. 259.

6. Baterden, p. 206

7. Jesuit Province Archives JPA): Residence of St John District Account, ff. 124v,198v, 256-7.

8. JPA: Notes by Robert Johnson: Papers of the Residence of St Michael, f. 2

9. JPA: Residence of St John District Accounts, f. 238.

10. JPA: Residence of St John District Accounts, f. 250 11 Holt, pp. 238-39.

12. JPA: English Province Correspondence, f. 252. According to H. Foley, *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus,* VII, p. 819, Warrilow was a distinguished preacher: 'Mrs Siddons after hearing him remarked that had he taken to the stage instead of the priesthood he would have realized a splendid fortune'.

13. Holt, p. 197.

14. F. Blom, *English Catholic Books, 1701-1800,* N° 2327.

15. Copy in JPA:'Varia 1706-1815', ff. 173-197

16. JPA: English Province Correspondence, f. 301. 17.Ibidf.368.

18. Ibidf.371.

19. Holt, p. 259

20. Ushaw College Manuscripts, 'Lingard Letters' No.27, 9 Jan 1808. I am grateful to Dr L. Gooch for this and the next two references.

21. L. Gooch (Ed.) *The Revival of English Catholicism,* (North West Catholic History Society 1995), p. 64n.

22. Gooch, p. 65

23. JPA: 'Stone Letters', f. SI a; Residence of St John papers, f. 206.

24. Residence of St John papers, ff.201-24; JPA: 'Province Memorandum' pp. 110-11

25. Ibid f.251; Holt, pp. 181,225-6,249

FRANCIS HARVEY
Mary Connor

Francis Harvey was born in 1838 at Gortnagarn in the parish of Pomeroy, County Tyrone in Northern Ireland. He came to England with his family when he was ten years old. The 1861 English Census shows that Francis was living with Sarah, his first wife, and their three children: John, Sarah and Catherine in Pit Row, Thornley, County Durham. Later, after the early death of his wife Sarah, he left Thornley and moved to Wellington, a small colliery village in south west Durham. In 1870, he married his second wife, Sarah Crich in St Michael's Church, Esh Laude. They raised a family of four sons and four daughters. From there he moved, first to Billy Row and then to Howden, two Durham colliery' villages, before finally settling in Stanley, Crook. He remained in this village until his death on 31st October 1908. From 1871, he and his family were faithful members of the parish of Our Lady and St. Cuthbert, Crook. His working life was spent in the mines of County Durham. For most of the time he was a coal hewer, which was a relatively skilled job for an Irish immigrant at this time.

During his life, Francis kept a notebook in which he recorded his interests. Throughout the book he sets down a number of mathematical calculations which suggests that he intended to improve his position at the colliery. It is interesting that his son, John, did gain the position of checkweighman in 1901. Francis also quotes part of Daniel O'ConneM's famous Tipperary speech of 1828. On a lighter note, recipes and household hints as well as a number of addresses are recorded, as are details of the housekeepers that he employed during his time as a widower. Francis must have had an artistic bent as his examples of decorative lettering demonstrate. Extremely interesting are his attempts at the writing of poetry. One poem is of special interest to those of Irish ancestry. It was written in Willington on 21st June 1869 and is entitled 'The Warning -by a working man'. In it, Francis gives advice to an Irishman who was 'expelled from a public house, without giving offence, after spending ten shillings'. Francis realises the position of the Irish immigrant in English society at that time. He reminds the reader that he or she is responsible to God for the way in which they use His gifts. He stresses that drunkenness is degrading and that drunkards arc a disgrace to their families, their creed and their country. He admonishes them to regain their self- respect. It is plain that this poern sums up the essence of the author. Francis retained a love of his native land, whilst also assimilating into the life of the mining community of Stanley, Crook. Most of all, throughout the poem Francis displays a deep knowledge of and a firm belief in his Catholic faith, a faith which he passed on to his large family, who remained practising Catholics throughout their lives.

Six years after Francis' death, at the outbreak of the First World War, two of his sons, Michael and James, joined the Tyneside Irish Brigade together with his

son-in-law John Cross and his grandson Jimmy. Another grandson, Francis, joined the Durham Light Infantry. All lost their lives with the exception of Jimmy who was invalided out of the army in 1918. These events are a good indication that the family had been greatly assimilated into English culture.

The notebook came into my possession after the death of Francis's youngest daughter Ann, my great-aunt. The family had preserved it because it belonged to their beloved father. I decided to give the book, on loan, to Durham County Record Office, because it is an excellent primary source, written by a nineteenth-century Irish immigrant into the county. ['Copy Book of Francis Harvey 1838-1908', Durham County Record Office, D/X 1194, Ace. 2501(D)]

THE WARNING. By a working man
You true sons of Erin attention,
The truth unto you I'll display
It being my utmost intention
To keep you from going astray
Since to work the Almighty decreed you
And grants to you means for to toil
Why spend it with men who deceive you
And detests the Irish exile.
You know the landlord wants your money
For which you in hardship did toil
He's civil he's cheery and funny
While he is extracting the spoil
But when he has emptied your pocket
You are shoved to the door with disdain
Avaunt now you mere Irish blockhead
Else I'll send for the Bobby amain.
Your health and your earnings are given
Express by celestial decree
The deed is recorded in Heaven
And you must accountable be
To keep you or those that's depending
Or sent you by God to maintain
Then hard is the judgement impending
When you omniscience disdain
Drink not to the drowning of reason
Nor denude yourself to the foe
Be ready in time and in season
To pay God the debt that you owe.
The Holy Ghost's temple defiling
The destroying angel is sent
Then do not yourself be beguiling

But of this great evil repent.
Your free will your highly ilusing
When spending what should you maintain
God's bounty your grossly abusing
When his gifts you lavish in vain
To yourself you are false and deceitful
To God in the highest degree
Then who can but deem you most unfaithful
When false to your own family.
So now to conclude and to finish
Give not the base landlord the chance
Your hard earned bread to diminish
His daily supply to advance
Your creed and your country remember
No more as a glutton offend
Of temperance sons be a member
And hearken humanitys friend.

Willington June 21^{s1} 1869
On an Irishman being ignominously expeled a Public-house in Willington
(without giving offence) after spending ten shillings, [*sic*]

CHARLES NEWSHAM, HENRY HEMY, JOHN RICHARDSON AND THE RISE OF BENEDICTION MUSIC IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY CATHOLIC ENGLAND.

T. E. Muir

If you any examine any pre-Vatican II collection of Catholic music you will usually find that between a fifth and a third of its contents consist of settings of *O Salutaris,* the Litany, and *Tantuin Ergo,* the basic staples of English Catholic music at Benediction. In addition, other motets and antiphons, notably settings of *Ave Verum,* Ave Maria and *Adoremus In Aetermim,* were often performed during the same devotion; and usually the service was bracketed by vernacular hymns, a genre that underwent substantial growth within the English nineteenth-century Catholic community. The most basic cause of this phenomenon was the enormous rise in popularity of Benediction and other related devotions at the expense of the Office services usually performed at the beginning of the century. This has been charted by Mary Heimann using data extrapolated from annual issues of the *Catholic Directory.* For example, in the diocese of Hexham and Newcastle no Benediction services were advertised in any Catholic mission in 1851; but by 1875 fifteen of the ninety-four churches and chapels offered the service, and by 1900 this figure had risen to 112 of 148 centres.

Due to the nature of her sources, Heimann's picture relates mainly to the late nineteenth century; but musical evidence (as well as the survival of monstrances) shows clearly that the process was already well underway in the period 1801-1850. For example all the Masses by Samuel Webbe the elder (1740-1816) and Vincent Novella (1781-1861) have *O Salutaris* and *Tantum Ergo* settings added on at the end. Novello also published *A Complete Collection of Tantum Ergosfor every Sunday of the Year*[2] In addition to fifty-one settings of *Tantum Ergo,* this has thirteen settings of *O Salutaris* and nine other motets; but, as with the Masses, no Litanies. In the early nineteenth century, then, Benediction music had not acquired a fully defined form; perhaps because, as the Masses of Novello and Webbe indicate, the service was usually added on after High Mass. This may also explain why none of the London embassy chapels, where Novello and Webbe worked, advertised Benediction in Catholic directories of that time. In fact, the true development of Benediction music as a distinct musical form was mainly the work of northern musicians and clergy based ai or trained in Ushaw College under the presidency of Charles Newsham (b. 1791, President 1837-1863).

Newsham was President when the Catholic community was experiencing rapid expansion and transformation after the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829. It was his job, then, to train a cadre of clergy able to cope with such changes, not just in the northeast, but in Lancashire, the heartland of English Catholicism, where many of his priests were stationed. The most significant development was the shift in the centre of gravity from a rural community dominated by the

landowning upper class to a predominantly urban proletarian or lower middle class society with a strong Irish element. For example, at St Cuthbert's church in Durham the congregation grew from an estimated 1,220 people in 1848 to 2,425 in 1861.[3] This created a potential crisis. The great danger was 'wastage'; or the possibility that Catholic immigrants, left to their own devices, might abjure the Faith in favour of Protestantism or atheism. Such fears, and the necessary response, are articulated in the hymn 'I am a faithful Catholic' published by Henry Hemy in *The Crown of Jesus Music*[4]

I am a faithful Catholic,
I love my Holy Faith,
I will be true to Holy Church
and steadfast unto death.
I shun the haunts of those who seek
To ensnare poor Catholic youth;
No Church I own, no schools I know,
but those that teach the truth.

In short, the strategy was to create a separate Catholic ghetto, where a complete spiritual and social infrastructure 'from the cradle to the grave' could be established. It was not enough, then, to build churches and say Mass. What was needed were schools, hospitals (both often staffed by nuns), sodalities, guilds and confraternities. In such circumstances the traditional Offices were not necessarily the most suitable means for fostering religious devotion. It was much better to use more flexible extra-liturgical devotions, often with a strong Marian flavour and where concessions to vernacular texls could be more readily countenanced. The most popular of such services was Benediction.

The training of seminary priests therefore required some induction into the new services and the music that went with them and this was what Ushaw undertook. For example, in 1842 a Confraternity of the Rosary was established, followed in 1847 by an Archconfrateraity of the Immaculate Heart of Mary; and May Devotions were introduced in 1846.[5] Musical evidence can be found in two major publications: Hemy's *The Crown of Jesus Music* and Newsham's *A Collection of Music suitable for the Rile of Benediction* in the form revised by John Richardson. *The Crown of Jesus Music* was the first hyrnnal aimed at a national Catholic constituency.[7] The term 'hymnal', though, is something of a misnomer, not least because it does not appear in the title. It is really a collection of music for all religious functions: the Mass (including Newsham's *Missa de Sancto Cuthberto),* Offices, extra-liturgical devotions, processions and religious education in schools. The material is divided into four parts, each of which could be obtained separately; indeed, the double system of page numbering suggests that this was how the music was originally presented. Its consolidation into a single volume (initially, the first three parts in 1864) may therefore have been a later development. Moreover it is not difficult to see how certain sections are likely to have been compiled from material assembled as an

immediate response to devotional demands at Ushaw. Part 2 has sections entitled 'Crown of Jesus Rosary' (Nos. 118-120), 'Holy Rosary B.V. Mary' (Nos. 160-167) and a 'Little Office B.V. Mary' (Nos. 160-169) at the end of which arc appended items designed for May Devotions.[8] En Part 3 there are twenty 'Benediction Services', all containing settings of *O Salularis,* the Litany of the Blessed Virgin Mary and *Tantum Ergo* (Nos. 206-271).-The first service though also includes settings of the *Te Deum, Quam Dilecla, Partge Lingua,* O Godhead Hid, *Adoremus in Aeternutn,* and *Laudate Dominum.* In addition there are six 'Litanies of BVM for Processions' and four other Litanies in Fart 2 (Nos 272-277, 95, 177 (two settings) and 124).

Altogether, then, there are seventy-six pieces associated with Benediction: fifteen use plainchant, four are directly associated with London embassy chapels.[111] There are, however, also thirty-two other pieces by composers of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century Classical mainstream promoted by such establishments, usually as arrangements from other compositions." Eleven other pieces come from composers connected with Ushaw: four by Hemy, five by Newsham, and one each by Richard Gillow and Thomas Youens. " Embassy chapel taste, then, predominates, producing a strong continental inflexion. Moreover, with the exception of the plainchant and single items by Cimarosa and Handel, the content is, for its day, fairly up to date. Indeed one item of plainchant, No 288 *(Tantum Ergo* in Bb) is not the genuine article, because it is actually a composition by Caspar Ett (1788-1847). Moreover, all the plainchant settings are equipped with modern diatonic note for note harmonisations making them more compatible with the other settings. The continental input is of special interest first, because it touches on questions of English Catholic identity given the suspicion of Catholic loyalties still held by many non-Catholics at that time. In effect it shows just how much English Catholics were linked with the religious-musical scene outside Britain.

On the other hand the appearance of a smaller body of native work from Ushaw may be of some significance, not least because, starting with Newsham's publication, Benediction music in England came to be dominated by the output from native composers. Secondly, it should be observed that very little of the continental music comes from Italy. Therefore its presence in *The Crown of Jeans Music* is not the result of ultramontane pressures to adopt 'Roman' and therefore papal fashions, despite the fact that the Rosary and other extra-liturgical devotions were often promoted by the Holy See. In this context Hemy's titles for some of the Benediction services are revealing. Seven are dedicated to specifically English saints and another to St Patrick.'[3] Some - St Bede, St Cuthbert, St Oswin and St Wilfrid - have specifically northern Anglo-Saxon connections. Hemy, then, seems to be appealing directly to northern Catholic historical origins. On the other hand two other services have specifically Roman connotations: St Peter and St Gregory. The latter, though, was responsible for sending the Roman mission to England, and St Wilfrid was

a champion of 'Roman' ways of doing things, as Bede makes clear. These two saints, then, bridge the gap between the native and the Roman. Despite this, Hemy's choice of compositions for each service often seems incongruous. 'St Peter's Service' consists entirely of music by Mozart; St Patrick has music by Haydn, Shield and a 'German Air[1]; St Bede is associated with Gluck and St Athelstan with Haydn. Appropriately enough, though, the 'St Gregory's Service', uses nothing but plainchant.

In many cases what seems to determine the title of a 'service' is its Litany. For example 'St Benedict's Service' has a Litany specially composed by Hemy. Similarly, the St Andrew and St Ignatius services have Litanies specially composed by Newsham; and that for St George one by Richard Gillow. What, therefore, seems to have happened initially is that special Litanies were composed or arranged for particular feast-days. Hemy then took each of these, added matching settings for the *O Salutaris* and *Tantum Ergo* and named the resulting service from the Litany. ; In short Hemy's Benediction Services are not complete through-composed original works; they are agglomerations of mainly pre-existing music, much of which had been rearranged. This applies even to 'St Cuthbert's Service'(Nos. 260-263). True, all the music is by Newsham, and the 'St Cuthbert's Litany' was almost certainly composed in 1837, the first year of Newsham's presidency, when St Cuthbert was formally adopted as the patron saint of the college. Not only arc the three pieces in different keys, however, but the old page numbering system shows that the *Tantum Ergo* was originally placed in a different part of Hemy's collection.[16]

Newsham's *Music for the Rite of Benediction* (as revised by John Richardson) is a very different sort of publication. Firstly, unlike *The Crown of Jesus Music,* all the music is devoted to this kind of service. Secondly, the quality of print, musical type and general layout is superior to the cramped, slovenly and sometimes careless approach used by Hemy and his printers. Yet it was produced at almost exactly the same time. No publication date is given, but Ihe range can be narrowed to a couple of years by a process of elimination. In the first place Newsham himself is unlikely to have done any further work after his paralytic seizure in 1859, so at this point Richardson probably took over.[17] Secondly, there survives in the Talbot Library at Preston an organ book belonging to Roger Taylor, a priest at St Augustine's, Preston. In it are items directly copied from the volume by Newsham and Richardson. Taylor, an ex-Ushaw student, worked at St Augustine's between 1857 and 1862, after which all references to him disappear from issues of the *Catholic Directory"'* This suggests then that *A Collection of Music* was published between 1860-2.

The main body is divided into three parts, consisting of twelve *O Salutaris,* thirty-two Litany and seventeen *Tantum Ergo* settings respectively. There is also an Appendix with two more *O Salutaris* and *Tantum Ergo* settings apiece, followed by an *Adoremus In Aeternum* setting by Gregorio Allegri (1582-1652). This was almost certainly added by Richardson since three items come directly

from Part VI. section 3 *of Easy Music for Church Choirs* of 1854, which he edited. The principal musical components of a Benediction Service have therefore been clearly isolated; but the music is not grouped into integrated settings for a particular day as is attempted by Hemy. This, though, does not exclude the possibility that originally some of the music was through-composed as a 'Benediction Service'. On the contrary some settings of a given *O Salutaris,* the Litany, and *Tantum Ergo* not only have the same composer, but are set in the same key and use the same instrumental and vocal forces.[2]

Only four items can also be found in Hemy.[21] Using the same source, however, it is possible to identify other works by Newsham that may have been included in his original edition, of which so far I have been unable to find a copy. These are the 'St Ignatius Litany' in Eb (No. 252 in Hemy}, the 'St Cuthbert Litany' in C (No. 261 in Hemy) and the *Tantum Ergo* in C from the 'St Cuthbert Service' (No. 262 in Hemy). In addition there survive other works in a manuscript copied by William Brown from 1823 onwards at Ushaw that may have been included in the original publication.[22] Eight other compositions that may also come from Newsham's original edition can be found in Roger Taylor's Organ Book. As has been seen, though, this contains more works thar are taken directly from the Newsham-Richardson publication.[23] Analysis of the contents reveals important differences from Hemy. Firstly, there is no plainchant; but there are four pieces from the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries plus two others in the same style by Caspar Ett in the Appendix.[24] These reveal the influence of Cardinal Nicholas Wiseman, to whom Newsham dedicated the volume. As Rector of the English College of Rome in the 1830's Wiseman became an ardent protagonist of ultramontane causes, Cuthbert's Litany' was almost certainly composed in 1837, the first year of Newsham's presidency, when St Cuthbert was formally adopted as the patron saint of the college. Not only arc the three pieces in different keys, however, but the old page numbering system shows that the *Tantum Ergo* was originally placed in a different part of Hemy's collection.[16]

Newsham's *Music for the Rite of Benediction* (as revised by John Richardson) is a very different sort of publication. Firstly, unlike *The Crown of Jesus Music,* all the music is devoted to this kind of service. Secondly, the quality of print, musical type and general layout is superior to the cramped, slovenly and sometimes careless approach used by Hemy and his printers. Yet it was produced at almost exactly the same time. No publication date is given, but Ihe range can be narrowed to a couple of years by a process of elimination. In the first place Newsham himself is unlikely to have done any further work after his paralytic seizure in 1859, so at this point Richardson probably took over.[17] Secondly, there survives in the Talbot Library at Preston an organ book belonging to Roger Taylor, a priest at St Augustine's, Preston. In it are items directly copied from the volume by Newsham and Richardson. Taylor, an ex-Ushaw student, worked at St Augustine's between 1857 and 1862, after which

all references to him disappear from issues of the *Catholic Directory"'* This suggests then that *A Collection of Music* was published between 1860-2.
The main body is divided into three parts, consisting of twelve *O Salutaris,* thirty-two Litany and seventeen *Tantum Ergo* settings respectively. There is also an Appendix with two more *O Salutaris* and *Tantum Ergo* settings apiece, followed by an *Adoremus In Aeternum* setting by Gregorio Allegri (1582-1652). This was almost certainly added by Richardson since three items come directly from Part VI. section 3 *of Easy Music for Church Choirs* of 1854, which he edited. The principal musical components of a Benediction Service have therefore been clearly isolated; but the music is not grouped into integrated settings for a particular day as is attempted by Hemy. This, though, does not exclude the possibility that originally some of the music was through-composed as a 'Benediction Service'. On the contrary some settings of a given *O Salutaris,* the Litany, and *Tantum Ergo* not only have the same composer, but are set in the same key and use the same instrumental and vocal forces.[2]
Only four items can also be found in Hemy.[21] Using the same source, however, it is possible to identify other works by Newsham that may have been included in his original edition, of which so far I have been unable to find a copy. These are the 'St Ignatius Litany' in Eb (No. 252 in Hemy}, the 'St Cuthbert Litany' in C (No. 261 in Hemy) and the *Tantum Ergo* in C from the 'St Cuthbert Service' (No. 262 in Hemy). In addition there survive other works in a manuscript copied by William Brown from 1823 onwards at Ushaw that may have been included in the original publication.[22] Eight other compositions that may also come from Newsham's original edition can be found in Roger Taylor's Organ Book. As has been seen, though, this contains more works thar are taken directly from the Newsham-Richardson publication.[23] Analysis of the contents reveals important differences from Hemy. Firstly, there is no plainchant; but there are four pieces from the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries plus two others in the same style by Caspar Ett in the Appendix.[24] These reveal the influence of Cardinal Nicholas Wiseman, to whom Newsham dedicated the volume. As Rector of the English College of Rome in the 1830's Wiseman became an ardent protagonist of ultramontane causes, including the promotion of renaissance polyphonic music by 'Roman' composers as performed in the Sistine Chapel. Newsham was a personal friend and there survives at Ushaw a bundle of music manuscripts by Italian composers forwarded to him from Rome by Wiseman. Another link lies with James Burns the publisher, who in 1848 had dedicated *The Ecclesiastical Choir Book: Selections from the Great Masters of the Sixteenth Century* to Wiseman. who at that time was rector of Oscott and was a motive force in the promotion of that style of music, along with plainchant under the aegis of Johann Benz, and later John Lambert, at St Chad's Cathedral, Birmingham. The presence of such music then, is an early indication of the effects of ultramontane attempts to impose uniform 'Roman' styles and discipline on the English Catholic Church.

It is clear though that, as far as Benediction music in the 1860s is concerned, this only had a limited impact. Moreover, it is curious that there is no plainchant, given the great emphasis placed on that style by ultramontanes including Wiseman. Perhaps this was because Benediction was an extra-liturgical devotion, and therefore could escape the pressure to incorporate plainchant applied to music for the Mass or the Office. In any case relatively little piainchant for Benediction can be found in late eighteenth and nineteenth century liturgical musical books. On the other hand, given ultramontane concerns about secular and operatic influences in contemporary music, it may be significant that virtually all works by mainstream classical composers of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries found in the publications of Hemy and Vincent Novello have been eliminated. Only seven such works are offered by Newsham and Richardson, five of them by virtually unknown composers. Any such doubts though do not seem to have prevented the inclusion of five works by composers connected with the London embassy chapels of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries and three other anonymous works directly associated with the same centres.[27] The resulting shortfall is made up by a much larger contribution by Ushaw composers, especially Newsham, than appears in Hemy.

Music Settings bv Ushaw-based	composers in		Newsham's *Music*	*for the Rite of Benediction*
Composer	O Salutaris	Litanies	Tantum Ergo	Total
Chas. Newsham	6		3	15
Richd. Gillow (d. 1867)	0	4	I	5
Robt.Gillow (1812-1847)	0	1	0	1
Thos.Youens (1790-1848)	0	1	0	1
Grand Total	6	15	4	22

These account for roughly a third of the music in the entire collection; and in addition Richardson contributed eight Litanies, two *O Salutaris* and three *Tantum Ergo* settings. This then, represents a real surge in the composition of new music for Benediction by native English composers.

Richardson's role as a revising editor is all important and his connections with Ushaw throw an interesting light on the tensions between that institution and the Lancashire clergy. A Preston man, he trained in Liverpool and he went on to carve out a career as an organist-choirmaster in that city, serving first at St Mary's and then for some twenty years at St Nicholas, the pro-cathedral. In 1860 he moved to St Alban's, Warrington after which, in 1864, he retired to Preston, possibly in response to the arrival there from Douai of the monk-

composer Cuthbert Murphy OSB.[28] *A Collection of Music* was produced while Richardson was at St Nicholas or at St Alban's. A clear contact with Newsham can be found in 1858, when he composed music for the Ushaw College Ode to a text prepared by Cardinal Wiseman, This was part of the college jubilee celebrations held that year.[29] Another connection may have been through Thomas Newsham (1809-1868), an ex-Ushaw student who worked at St Anthony's, Scotland Rd, Liverpool, and who became a canon at St Nicholas in 1853. In 1863 he moved to Fleetwood on Wyre and he replaced Taylor at St Augustine's, Preston, the following year.[3] Although no reference to him is made in Gillow's *Biographical Dictionary of English Catholics,* it is quite possible he may have been a relative of Charles Newsham.

A third link between Richardson and Ushaw involves Robert Gillow and his nephew Richard Gillow. Both wrote compositions that appear in the collection; both were trained at Ushaw and both became canons at St Nicholas. Richard Gillow, in fact, after a spell at the English College in Rome, returned to Ushaw as Professor of Theology in 1825.[3'] It is at this point, though, that inconsistencies start to appear. David Milburn has noted the hostile relationship between Richard Gillow and Charles Newsham. Gillow slated Newsham's pupils in *viva voce* examinations, opposed his appointment as president in 1837 and even accused him of heresy. The upshot was that he left Ushaw and eventually established himself at St Nicholas. There he and his brother played a leading part in efforts by bishops George Hilary Brown and Alexander Goss to establish St Edward's College there, a foundation that some suspected would eventually become a separate seminary siphoning off Lancashire students from Ushaw.[32] In this context any collaboration between Richardson and Ushaw seems very strange; and perhaps Richardson's departure from Liverpool to Warrington in 1860, when disputes between Goss and Ushaw came to a head, may have something to do with ail this. Certainly, as has been seen, this was when *A Collection of Music* was being prepared.

At all events, what is obvious is that Richardson adapted a collection originally developed in seminary conditions for general Catholic usage as understood at St Nicholas, where Benediction services were held on Sunday and Thursday evenings.[33] Thus his edition states that he was responsible for adding organ parts. This means that much of the music was originally meant to be sung either unaccompanied *(a capella)* or, especially in the case of embassy chapel compositions, with the organist playing off a figured bass, something that Vincent Novello from his first publication in 1811 recognised that many Catholic musicians could not do. [4]

This in turn throws light on other aspects of Catholic performance practice. For this purpose the music can be broken down into three groupings: music reflecting embassy chapel practice, music reflecting practices at Ushaw, and music (notably Richardson's compositions) showing the techniques employed at St Nicholas, Liverpool. Ushaw compositions invariably require an SATB choir,

which means that they used boy singers from its school to cover the top (and possibly the second) line as a matter of course. Given the usage of straight block harmony, for which Richardson supplied segue organ parts, it seems equally certain they were sung *a capella',* and it is clear that some Catholic missions did the same. For example there are pencilled annotations in Miss Oldfield's copy from St Ignatius[7], Preston, indicating that no organ accompaniment was expected in part or all of two *O Salutaris* settings, five *Tantum Ergo* settings and nine Litanies. Richardson specifies the same in parts of his own compositions and in the arrangement of Allegri's *Adoremus In Aeternwn* in the appendix.[36] Richardson, though, was prepared to use larger forces. His *Tanlutn Ergo* settings Nos. 10 and 17 require SATE solo voices, an eight voice choir and a full organ. An eight voice choir is also specified for his *O Salutaris* No. 12. However the layout of the eight-voice choir (SSAATTBB instead of SATBSATB) suggests that it was deployed in a single block in a 'West Gallery'; and this fact may be confirmed by James Leigh's picture of what St Nicholas looked like from the outside. It is clearly an early nineteenth century example of 'Gothick' architecture; but apart from a very small and low structure at its east end, which may simply be the sanctuary, there is no sign of any chancel.[37]

If the main choir was stationed in a west gallery this implies that Richardson may have used female singers, given the growing campaign at that time to exclude them from the altar areas. The high first alto part (rising to the 'C' above 'middle C') suggests the same thing; so it seems unlikely that he had male altos, as might have been the case at Ushaw (and certainly was at Stonyhurst in the 1930s) where the parts do not rise above the 'A' over middle 'C'. However in his Litany No. 5 he specifies a conventional SATB choir, a small choir by the altar, and a cantor. This suggests that, despite the architectural [imitations at St Nicholas, he was not immune from ultramontane pressures for chancel choirs and that therefore he might have had some boy singers as well. Embassy chapel compositions are different again. For example, Rowland Davies in the *O Salutaris* No. 5 specifies SSB solo voices followed by the usual SATB chorus. This alone shows that organ accompaniment was the norm in such places; and in this instance it is semi-independent. We also know that opera singers (female for the upper lines) were recruited to cover major solo parts there.

Such distinctions also apply to the organ writing. For example, as has been seen with Rowland Davies, embassy chapel solo parts have independent organ accompaniments. The parts on the lower stave reflect the fact that their organs in the early nineteenth century did not have pedal boards. .Richardson's compositions however reflect the changes that had taken place by the 1860s. In the *Tantum Ergo* No. 17 a pedal board is essential. Moreover he sometimes requires sudden dramatic changes in the dynamics that could only be performed by switching between two manuals with couplings linking them together. This, of course, was standard fare in the early nineteenth century. Vincent Novello actually specifies what combinations of stops to use for each dynamic level in

his publication *Twelve Easy Masses; but* Richardson adds 'crescendo[1] and 'diminuendo' markings.[41] These show he was using the swell pedal in a different way. In those days swell boxes had horizontal slats, rather like Venetian blinds; and this meant that a notched pedal had to be used to prevent them automatically closing when it was released."[2] This was fine forNovello's system of terraced dynamics; but was much more difficult to use if gradual nuanced increases or reductions in volume were required over individual phrases, as Richardson demanded. Such practices then prepared the way for the development of the more modem swell box with vertical slats.

Richardson's approach to dynamics extended to his choral writing, (n virtually every other composition no indications are supplied. " Richardson's *O Salutaris* No. 12 and *Tantum Ergo* No. 17 have *pp, p, mf,* and /f markings. Likewise he supplies *p, mf,* and/ markings in the *Tantum Ergo* No. 10. Richardson was able to ask for this partly because he is writing in eight parts, and therefore had access to a very large choir with a wider dynamic range; but it also shows that the choir of St Nicholas had a much greater degree of musical proficiency and control than was usually the case elsewhere. This point is confirmed by the dynamic markings on Allegri's *Adoremux In Aeternum;* these must have been added by Richardson, since the work appears in the appendix and early seventeenth century part books never had such markings.

A further set of distinctions can be made about tempi. No tempo indications are given in any of the Litanies: but they are supplied with six of the *O Salutaris* and seven of the *Tantum Ergo* settings.[44] In three cases a slow tempo is followed by a faster one; otherwise slow speeds are specified.[45] Almost invariably the instruction is either *'Adagio'[1], 'Largo',* or *'Andante"'.* The same sort of thing happens with Hemy, where he writes 'Slow', 'Very Slow' or just 'Devoutly'. In some central sections of his Litanies, however, (when different saints are appealed to) he writes 'Cheerfully', implying a faster tempo. All this begs the question about what these terms actually meant in practice. A single tantalising glimpse is supplied in Newsham's publication with De Weigl's *O Salutaris* No. II. This is in 3/4 time and is marked *Andante J~* = 84. This means a crotchet = 42! In other words the basic pulse is a third slower than a crotchet per second. This is just for an *'Andante';* so the pulse for an *'Adagio'* and a *'Largo'* would be even slower. This, however, fits m with prevailing practice in plainchant. Novello in his *Convent Music* (1822) specifies a basic minim pulse of 66 (half the speed of a crotchet).

The overall effect of most Benediction music then must have been quiet and slow; something well suited to the devotional atmosphere aimed at in the service. Naturally :his inhibited congregational participation. Indeed only one piece - Litany No. 5 by Richardson - actually specifies their involvement. In eighteen other cases the Soprano line rises above a top 'E[:], the extreme limit of what any congregation can be expected :o reach, although here the issue may be complicated by questions concerning the general rise or fall of pitches in

relation to the actual notes written on a page. With Hemy the picture is more ambivalent. In only six cases does the upper line rise above an 'E', and none of them are in die s'ection marked 'Litanies of the BVM for Processions'.[47] The layout of the score also presumes that unison singing was generally expected, something that at least permitted congregational participation. This is because curing a given piece Hemy often changes the number of parts he is using, generally placing three of them in the upper stave, and where four-part harmony Is attempted he arbitrarily moves the tenor line up or down a stave. He is, in fact, writing for a keyboard. This does not mean though thai choral harmony was necessarily excluded, since in many cases it is possible to perform the pieces that way despite such technical obstacles. Indeed sometimes he actually specifies a solo quartet of singers. Nevertheless his haphazard editorial practices imply a decidedly rough and ready approach to choral performance.

The impact of Hemy and Newsham's publications on the Benediction service was considerable. Even now copies of *The Crown of Jesus Music* are not that hard to come by. Newsham's *Music for the Rite of Benediction* is rarer, but by no means unavailable. In north-east England 1 have seen copies at St Cuthbert's church, Durham, and at St Mary and St Everilda's chapel, Everingham, East Yorkshire. St Cuthbert's copy (formerly one of four) was originally owned by St Godric's church, in the same city; but extracts were copied into St Cuthbert's part books; so it is certain the volume was used in both places. The copy at Everingham, where the Constable Maxwell family lived, shows that the rise of Benediction music was not confined to urban industrial working class centres.[49] In EveringhairTs case it is explained by the fact that Matthew Newsham (1789-1848), another ex-Ushaw student, was chaplain there from the mid-1820s to 1848. Everingham also had Jesuit connections, since the male members of the Constable Maxwell family were all educated at Stonyhurst No copy of the volume though survives at the college; and it seems likely that the Jesuits there preferred 'home grown' products by William Maher.[50] On the other hand copies survive at St Mary's, Chipping, nearby and from St Ignatius, Preston, now in the Talbot Library. Both were Jesuit missions. Items from *The Collection of Music* were also added into an organ book originally prepared for Miss Oldfield at St Ignatius by J. Handcock in 1873. This volume was later owned by a Miss Lizzie Buckley, of St Gregory's, Weld Bank, Chorley. Another copy survives at Holy Martyrs, Whalley. Originally this belonged to T. Mulvey of 'Clifford St.' The only Clifford Street in the Preston area is in the centre of Chorley, not far from St Gregory's, but this may not have been Mulvey's church given that manuscript copies were taken there by Miss Buckley. Instead it might be better to associate him with St Mary's, Mount Pleasant, in the same town. Although this church is considerably further away from Clifford Street it was built by none other than Richard Gillow, who worked there from 1851 onwards. Moreover, since this copy was printed by Burns and Gates, it must be a reprint dating later than 1866, when the amalgamation of the two publishers took place. Furthermore

this shows that there was a significant continuing demand for the Newsham-Richardson collection. In addition we have seen that Roger Taylor at St Augustine's, Preston, must have had access to a copy.

The indirect effect - well into the twentieth century - can be measured from the contents of Alfred Edmonds Tozer's *Complete Benediction Manual* (1898) and Richard Terry's *The Benediction Choir Book* (1937).[52] Tozer has no Ushaw material at all and this may be because he drew heavily on southern sources instead. In 1931, however, Robert Hasberry, organist and choirmaster at Spanish Place, London, produced a revised edition incorporating six items from Newsham's volume.' Two other Litanies by Newsharn also appear. Hasberry, then, may have had access both to Newsham's original as well as the revised edition by Richardson. Terry also must have had a copy of the Richardson-Newsbam edition; for not only does his *Benediction Choir Book* contain Allegri's *Adoremus In Aeternum,* it also has six Litanies, four *O Salutaris* and six *Tctntum Ergo* settings from that publication."[5] It is quite possible, then, that Terry encountered the volume when he was choirmaster at St Dominic's, Newcastle, in 1896, immediately after his conversion to Catholicism and before he moved down to Downside the following year.

Notes and References

1. Mary Heimann, *Catholic Devotion In Victorian England,* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1995) p.42.
2. London, Novello, Ewer and Co., n.d. This edition, which I found at Alstone Lane Church, Preston, is almost certainly a reprint, and in this instance is simply an offprint from the enlire collection, although listing its entire contents. I have yet to find copies of the complete original,
3. The figures for Easter communicants are 411 in 1848 and 1100 in 1861. J.M. Tweedy, *Popish Elvet: The History of St Cuthbert 's, Durham.* (Durham, privately published n.d.) Part 1, pp.332-135 and graphs on pp.126, 128. For further discussion of the Irish dimension see pp.156-163.
4. (Ed.) Henry Hemy, *The Crown of Jesus Music,* (London, T. Richardson, 1864) Part I, No. 62.
5. David *Mi\b\im, A History of Usknw College,* (Ushaw, 1964) pp,175-6
6. (Ed.) Charles Newsham, revised John Richardson, *A Collection of Music suitable for the Rite of Benediction,* (London, Burns and Lambert, n.d.)
7. For further, more general discussion of its contents and significance see Brian Plumb, 'Hymnbooks revisited', *North West Catholic History,* 27 (2000), pp.68-91.
8. These consist of Hemy's setting for 'Sweet Month of May' (No. 168) and three settings of 'The Image of Mary' (No. 169), one by Hemy, a second by Haydn and a 'Spanish Air'.
9. Hemy usually uses the term 'Gregorian'; but in part 2 no such indication is given apart from the actual way the music is notated.
10. These are settings by Webbe the elder, Samuel Wesley, the 'Venetian Air' and the 'Spanish Air'.
11. The composers are Beethoven (ten pieces), Haydn (four), Mozart (four), Gluck (three) Mendelssohn (three), Cherubini, Neukomm, Rinck, Romberg, Spobr, Weber, Winter (one each). Single pieces by Cimarosa and Handel can also be added.
12. There are also some miscellaneous items: two pieces by the Anglican composer Bartishall. four denoted as an 'English Air', one 'German Air', one 'Russian Air' and single works by a 'Fr Ayhvard' and Shield.
13. These are St Alban, St Athelstan, St Bede, St Cuthbert, St George and St Oswin. There is also a 'St Godric's Litany' in the section of BVM Litanies for Processions. It is unclear whether the 'St Augustine Service'/efers to St Augustine of Canterbury or St Augustine of Hippo.
14. The other saints referred to are St Agnes, St Alphonsus, St Bernard, St Christopher, St Francis Xavicr, St (gnatius, and St Vincent.
15. Arrangements of existing music for the Litany on a particular feast day include the following: St Alban's Service: 'English Air'; St Christopher's Service: Litany by Beethoven; St Oswin's Service: Litany by Mendelssohn; St Patrick's Service: Litany by Haydn.

16. Milburn.p.165,
17. ibid, p.246.
18. *Catholic Directory \951,* p.141; 1862, p.120.
19. (Ed.) John Richardson, *Easy Music For Church Choirs,* (London, Burns and Lambert, 1854) pp.67, 68, 72, The items in question are Ett's settings of *O Salutaris* and *Tantum Ergo* and an arrangement of a motet by J.S. Bach to fit the *Tantum Ergo* text.
20. Two examples can be clearly identified: The Litany No 2, *O Salutaris* No. 3 and *Tantum Ergo* No. 10, all in E, by Richardson; and the Litany No. 24, *O Salutaris* No. 8 and *Tantum Ergo* No. 8, all in G, by Newsham. Partial examples are the Litany No. 31 and *Tantum Ergo* No. 16 by Richard Gillow (1811-1853). However the *O Salutaris* No. 9 and *Tantum Ergo* No. 6, both in $E\flat_T$ by Webbe are simply taken from his Mass in that key. This is also true of Webbe's *Tantum Ergo* No. 5 in A. In the original Mass there is also a *Tantum Ergo* which Newsham or Richardson omitted.
21. These are Litany No. 8 in A by Newsham (No. 255 in Hemy), Litany No. 28 in F by Robert Gillow (No. 264 in Hemy), Litany No. 9 in C by Thomas Youens. (No. 275 in Hemy), and *O Salutaris* No. 6 by Newsham (No. 260 in Hemy).
22. These are two anonymous *O Salutaris* and *Tantum Ergo* settings, a Litany by John Crookhall (1821-1887) of St Edmunds, Ware, an *O Salutaris* in F by Friedrich Himmel (1764-1819) and a *Tantum Ergo* in D by Novello (probably taken from his *Mass in D).* The *O Salutaris* in F by Newsham in the same collection appears in Newsham and Hemy's publications {Newsham *:O Salutaris* No. 6, Hemy: No. 260).
23. These are a Litany in C by Youens (p. 169), an *Adoremus* in F (p. 71). two Litanies in F (p. 167), two more in D (p. 184) and one in G by Newsham (p. 185), and two Litanies by Richardson (p. 185). A Litany in F by Richard Gillow also appears in Hemy (p. 189) (Hemy No. 264: from the 'St George's Service').
24. These are an *Adoremus* (Final in F) by Gregorio Allegri (1582-1652), and *Tantum Ergos* (Final in F) by Palestrina (1525-1594). Felice Anerio (1560-1630) and Giacomo Perti (1656-1721). Ett's settings of *O Salutaris* and *Tantum Ergo* probably corne from his *Cantica Sacra* of 1842 refracted though the *Cantica Sacra* of 1844, rev. 1849, (London. T. Richardson, J.A. Novello) edited by J. Benz, choirmaster and organist at Oscolt College and St Chad's Cathedral, Birmingham.
25. Newsham even published a book on the subject: *Four Lectures on the Office and Ceremonies of Holy Week as Performed in the Papal Chape,! Delivered in Rome in the Lent of 1837,* (London, Charles Dolman, 1839). Lecture No. 2 gives extensive details of the music performed.
26. These are an O *Salutaris* setting and the *Tantum Ergo* setting adapted from works by J. S. Bach in the Appendix. Litanies No. 29 and 30 by J. Cafferata, the Litany No. 11 by Heineken, the O *Salutaris No 11* by De Weigl and Litany No. 3 by Francesco Pascoli [Ricci] (1732-1817).
27. These are the *Tantum Ergo* No. *5 by* Rowland Davies (1740-1797), the *O Salutaris* No. 9 and *Tantum Ergox* No. 5 and six by Samuel Webbe the elder, the *Tantum Ergo* No. 12 by Thomas White (1764-1826) and adaptations of the Italian. Spanish and Portuguese Chorales to the *Tantum Ergo* text (Nos. 2, 13 and in the Appendix). These are associated with the Sardinian, Spanish and Portuguese embassy chapels.
28. Joseph Gillow: *Bibliographical Dictionary of English Catholics ....* (London Burns and Dates, 1885), Vol. 5, pp.412-13. For Cuthbert Murphy's arrival see *Catholic Directory* 1864, p. 181.
29. Milburn, p.268 citing an article by F. *Oskslsy, Dublin Review,* XLV (1858), p.131.
30. *Catholic Directory,* 1853,p.l01; 1863,p.l92; 1864, pp.169, 174; 1868, p.244 (the last reference to him).
31. Gillow, Vol. 2,pp.485-88.
32. Milburn, pp. 160-2, 198-214,230-53.
33. *Catholic Directory,* 1857, p.69.
34. (Ed.) Vincent Novello, *A Collection of Sacred Music,* (London, 1811). Unlike previous English Catholic collections, it incorporates fully realised organ parts.
35. These are *O Saivtans* Nos. 7 and 8; Litany Nos. 1, 3, 7, 9, 13, 15, 16, 28 and 30; *Tantum Ergo* Nos. 2, 9, 11, 17, and the setting by Ett in the Appendix.
36. The unusually low tessitura of the alto and soprano parts in this composition reflects the fact that Allegri was writing for the all male Sistine Chapel choir with male alto voices.
37. James Leigh: *A Map of Lancashire divided into Hundreds exhibiting Catholic Chapels,* 1828. I owe this information, and a copy of the illustration, to Mrs Margaret Pannikar.
38. A single exception can be found in the alto part of *O Salutaris No. 7.*
39. For a useful introductory survey of music in the London embassy chapels see Philip Olleson, 'The London Roman Catholic Embassy Chapels and other music in the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries', (Ed.) David Wyn Jones, *Music in Eighteenth Century Britain,* (Aldershot, Ashgate, 2000), pp. 101-118.
40. See for example the *O Salutaris* settings by Rowland Davies (No. 5) and De Weigl (No. 11), the latter with a very characteristic wide-ranging Baroque continue bass line. Details of the Sardinian embassy chapel organ are given in Rosemarie Derby, *The Music of the Roman Catholic Embassy Chapels in London 1765 to 1825,*

(Manchester University Mus. M. Dissertation, 1984), p.148 citing an account in *Musical Standard,* 1890,pp,31/5, 1519-1520.
41. (Ed.) Vincent Novello, *Twelve Easy Masses,* (London, 1816),
42. Examples of this kind of setup still exist with the organs at St Mary's, Chipping, and St Mary's, Burnley.
43. The *O Salutaris No. 7* and *Tantum Ergo No. I* by Newsham are exceptions that prove the rule, since he specifies *piano* for the first verse by soloists and *forte* or *fortissimo* in the second, when the whole choir is used.
44. These are *O Salntaris* nos. 3-7, 10, 11 and *TantumErgo* nos 1-3, 9, 10, 13 and 14.
45. The faster tempi occur in *O Salutaris* No. 1 by Rowland Davies ('Andante' followed by 'Vivace'), *Tantttn Ergo* No. 1 by Newsharn ('Largo' followed by 'Allegro Moderato') and the anonymous *Tantum Ergo* No. 9 ('Andante' followed by 'Allegro Moderato').
46. These are in Litany nos. 4 ,5, 7, 13-16, 26 and 30; *O Salutaris* settings nos. 3, 11-13 and the adaptation from J.S. Bach in the Appendix; *Tantum Ergo* settings nos. 3, *9,* 16 and 17
47. The exceptions are the plainchant *Pange Lingua,* Gluck's *O Salularis* in F (No. 233), Newsham's *O Salularis* in F (No. 260) and Litany in C (No. 261), and Romberg's *O Salutaris in F (No.* 263).
48. See for example his footnote to 'St Mary's Litany' (No. 207 p. 267) and the *Tantum Ergo* by Peter Von Winter (1754-1825) in the [L]St Vincent's Benediction Service' (No. 244 p. 293).
49. This is now at the Bar Convent, York, with all the other music from Everingham.
50. See for example Maher's *Nineteen Benediction Services,* (London, R. Butler, n.d.)
51. Gillow.Vol. 2,pp.485-87; *Catholic Directory,* 1857, p. 130.
52. (Ed.) Albert Edmonds Tozer, *The Complete Benediction Manual,* (London, Gary and Co. 1898), Revised by Robert Hasberry, (London, Gary and Co. 1931). (Ed.) Richard Terry, *The Benediction Choir Book,* (London, Burns and Gates. 1937, abridged version).
53. These are Litany No. 8, by Ncwsham (Hasberry No. 33), *O Salutaris* No. 8 by Newsham (Hasberry No. 3), *O Salutaris* No. 12 by Richardson (Hasberry No. 15), *O Salutaris* No. 9 by Webbe (Hasberry No 29), *Tantum Ergo* No. 6 by Wehbe (Hasberry No. 31) and *'TantumErgo* No. 13', based on the 'Spanish Chorale' (Hasberry No. 18).
54. These are Litanies in A and E (Nos. 33 and 42 in Hasberry).
55. These are Litany No. 8 (Terry No. 20), 10 (Terry No. 19), 21 (Terry No. 21), 22 (Terry No. 23), 27 (Terry No. 22), 32 (Terry No. 25); *O Salutaris* No. 1 (Terry No. 17), 10 (Terry No. 1) 12 (Terry No. 30), 16 (Terry No. 31); *Tantum Ergo* No. 7 (Terry No. 7), 11 (Terry No. 36) 12 (Terry No. 30), 16 (Terry No. 31), 17 (Terry No. 37} and one in the Appendix (Terry No. 3). Palestrina's *Tantum Ergo* setting, though clearly the same music, was obtained by Terry from the Breitkopf and Haertel version edited by Franz Haberl.

NORTHUMBRIAN JACOBITE NOVELS

Leo Gooch

From Mary Queen of Scots to Prince Charles Edward, the Stuarts have always been attractive subjects for novelists, whereas the Hanoverians have not. Indeed, the monarchy itself virtually disappears from the pages of English fiction with the defeat of the Bonny Prince. A large number of novels have been written on Jacobitism (the movement which sought the restoration of the Stuart dynasty); it is, for example, the subject of what is widely considered to be the finest historical novel in the language: W.M. Thackeray's *The History of Henry Esmond* (1851), Insofar as England is concerned, the only realistic setting for a Jacobite novel is the north, either Northumberland, Cumbria or Lancashire, and having written a forma] history of Northumbrian Jacobitism *[The Desperate Faction? The Jacobites of North-East England 1688-1745* (1995 rep. 2000)], I would now like to attempt a study of the fictional treatment of the subject.
The majority of novels in the genre deal with the rising of 1715 (the 'Forty-five is less relevant) and therefore introduce James Radcliffe, Earl of Derwentwater, of Dilston Castle in Tynedale, his lusty younger brother Charles, and other Northumbrian participants, Thomas Forster in particular. The purpose of this note, then, is to list those novels known to rne which have a substantial, sometimes primary, Northumbrian-Jacobite-Catholic content and to ask for information about any that I have missed. I would be delighted to correspond with anyone interested from the address given in this journal.

Northumbrian Jacobite Novels (in order of publication date).

Walter Scott, *Rob Roy(1817*). Set in the Cheviots and Scotland in 1715 and deals with the eponymous outlaw and hislove affairs.

Robert Trotter, *Derwentwater; or. The Adherents of King James, a Tale of the First Rebellion* (1825). An imagined love affair between the earl and Eliza Brougham.

Author unknown, *Derwentwater, A Tale of 1715* (1831).

W. Gresley, *Coniston Hall (*1846). The 'Fifteen seen through a Cumbrian's eyes with an emphasis on the role of the Northumbrians.

W.H. Ainsworth, *Preston Fight* (1875). A full treatment of the 'Fifteen in which Forster is execrated and Derwentwater lauded.

Percy T. Lee, *A Northumbrian Rebel: A Romance of the Jacobite Rising of 1715* (nd). Charles Radcliffe at large.

Howard Pease, *The Burning Cresset* (1908). A full account of the 'Fifteen and its aftermath with a romantic attachment of the earl of Derwentwater.

Dorothea Moore, *Under the Wolf s Fell (1912).* A story for juveniles set in the north in 1715-6 with all the main Northumbrian Jacobites.

R.H.Foster, *The Little Maister* (1913). Set on the Northumberland coast and Carlisle, mainly in 1745 and the early part of the rising.

Frederick Arthur, *The Great Attempt* (1914). Set in north around 1733.

H. Robswood Cooke, *Outlawed (1914).* A South Shields man relates how he became involved in the 'Forty-five, Culloden, &c.

J.G. Sarasin, *The Red Curve (*1927). A romance of the 'Forty-five set in Scotland and Newcastle.

Walter Besant, *Dorothy Forster* (1928). Deals fully with the 'Fifteen and Derwentwater's supposed romance with the eponymous heroine.

George Preedy, *Tumult in the North* (1929). About a Cumbrian and Northumbrian Jacobite family.

Robert Neill, *Black William* (1955). The subject is William Cotesworth of Gateshead, the leading anti-Jacobite in the region in 1715.

Anya Seton, *Devil Water* (1962). The story of the Radcliffe family.

COMMON STOCK AND BRETHREN FUND -A RIGHT YORKSHIRE MIX UP!

Dominic Minskip

In an article for this journal in 2001 I raised the question of the relationship between the Yorkshire Common Stock Fund and the Yorkshire Brethren Fund since there seemed to be some confusion between them in the written record.[1] I had a clear idea that the Yorkshire Brethren Fund existed to help maintain clergy of the Yorkshire dioceses who were sick or invalided or retired, but I had no real notion of the Yorkshire Common Stock Fund and its purpose and workings. It did not particularly help that the Trustees Report for the Diocese of Middlesbrough for 2001 lists Common Stock as a fund 'to meet payments on behalf of retired clergy'. Why were there two funds with the same purpose and how did they come to exist side by side? The question has again been raised by other researchers and I have therefore felt bound to try and investigate further.

The standard histories of post-Reformation Catholicism in England make clear that the establishment of clergy funds, at district or local level, was greatly encouraged by the Old Chapter after 1667 and by the four Vicars Apostolic after 1688. The aim was to increase the missionary efficiency of the secular clergy, to try to provide against the deaths and defections of gentry patrons, and to give them 'something of the corporate strength and stability, and the flexibility in the use of resources, of the Jesuit districts and Colleges'.[2] Such funds were created around the country: the 'Hampshire Hogg', (founded in 1683), Northumberland and Durham (the Northern Brethren Fund, 1660), Lancashire (c.1672) and in Staffordshire and the Midlands (1676). The Staffordshire example is one of the most interesting in that more than one fund existed: the 'Common Purse' (1676) and the 'Common Fund' (1701-2). Richard Turner has recently written on the Staffordshire funds and noted the 'confusion and acrimony which were to arise where distinct funds with overlapping, but not identical, rules and aims came into conflict'.[3] In Staffordshire, some of the tension arose from the attempts of the vicars apostolic of the Midland District to claim an interest in the direction and use of money in the funds. Most of the funds carefully laid down the purposes for which they were intended - whether exclusively to support the clergy, or for the benefit of clergy *and* laity, or to help in the establishment of missions - and also specified those who were to be trustees. Sometimes this meant that the vicars apostolic were excluded from the control of funds which they felt they badly needed in the maintenance of their districts and the founding of new missions. Naturally, there was some episcopal resentment that many of the funds 'remained in principle [in the possession of] benefit societies of narrow membership and horizons'.

Another issue facing the funds was how their capital should be invested. Turner has written that, in the Midlands, 'administrators preferred property and other

vehicles covered by little or no security to public funds, because of distrust of the governments of the day, attachment to the Stuarts and fear of incurring the charge of usury. Unfortunately, capital loses were all too 'often the result'.[5] Bossy suggests that the clergy, as trustees, 'may not have administered their funds with the greatest competence'.[6] In Yorkshire, the procurators of the Brethren Fund 'had charge of the endowment capital of some mission-stations as well as the money belonging to the Brethren and accounted for everything in the same set of books'. This system seems to have worked in its own time, even if it would not be recommended today. What it also reminds us is that there were individual endowments attached to various Yorkshire missions and that these contributed to the maintenance of the clergy, at least when healthy and active. So also, of course did gentry patronage, persona! bequests and family wealth in some cases. The needy times for secular priests came with illness, invalidity or retirement.

The history of one of the two funds operating in Yorkshire, the Brethren Fund, has been told in some detail by David Kirkwood." Its origins lie in donations of £60 by Peter Vavasour of York in 1660 and £100 subsequently by Lady Mary Dunbar. These two sums were combined in 1663 and established as a fund which would make proper provision for the maintenance of the secular clergy in Yorkshire, wherever they were in need, so that their pastoral work should not be impeded. Rules were drawn up in 1667 to the effect that three superiors were to be chosen by leading members of the clergy meeting together and that one of the superiors was to be appointed treasurer. The fund was open to ongoing benefactions and to changes of rule decided upon by its members.

There are two points to be made. Firstly, the Brethren Fund was *not* established specifically to help the sick or retired: any priest-member in need could be helped and, as well as single payments to meet urgent need or distress, the fund offered a 'general distribution' or shared dividend. Secondly, payments could be made to lay people in time of distress as well as to priests. Only secular priests working in Yorkshire could be members but the founders recognised their debt to and common cause with the laity and were willing to respond to their need. The same spirit of mutual commitment was evident in the rule that each priest was required 'at least at his death' to bequeath some of his goods to the Fund.

The rules of the Northern Brethren Fund, drawn up in 1691, offer a slight variation on those of Yorkshire. They laid down that the first care must be the relief of the necessitous brethren - those 'out of place'; the sick, the imprisoned, those enfeebled by old age, and so on. After this, however, a general dividend was payable.[9]]n the Midlands, the Common Fund obliged its members to leave to it one third of any net gains from the exercise of their priestly functions 'for the maintenance of the subscribers of the district and chiefly of such as are in prison, disabled, unfit, in case of need, and one quarters allowance [to those] who want by being out of place'. Thereafter a dividend was permitted among the subscribers with an allowance of a tenth to the vicar apostolic if he needed it.

The other Midland fund, the Common Purse, also obliged members to leave something in their will 'to be employed for the relief of [priests] in this District w[ho] by any accident are in real want, and have shown themselves true clergy men'.[10] One might argue that these three funds put greater emphasis than the Yorkshire Brethren Fund on those who were sick, disabled, elderly or otherwise out of place. The Yorkshire rules of 1667 talked in general terms of the 'relief of ourselves and others especially in all contingent wants and emerging necessities'. Kirkwood points to an evolution of the rules of the Brethren Fund over time in favour of the sick, disabled and retired which was 'allowed for [by the founders] for they were practical and pragmatic men. Nonetheless, when an account °of the Yorkshire Brethren Fund came to be drawn up in 1842, its conclusion was that the nature of the fund had been changed and its scope narrowed *in contravention of the* original purpose and function. This, the report argued, had happened when a new set of rules had been devised in 1812 and further revised in 1836. Under these new rules the emphasis was all on relieving members in sickness and old age and the other applications of the fund had disappeared."

The priests who researched and drew up the account of the Brethren Fund in 1842 were John Glover and Robert Hogarth, Glover was Treasurer of the Brethren Fund and served all his priestly ministry in Yorkshire at Houghton Hall, Brough Park and Whitby. Robert Hogarth was the elder brother of William (future Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle) and served in Yorkshire at Carlton Towers and at Marton. Seemingly he had a hand in the financial affairs of the district under Bishop Briggs but also was one of the superiors of the Brethren Fund. In the conclusion to his account. Kirkwood states that he feels Glover and Hogarth to have been wrong in their complaint that the rule changes of 1812 and 1836 had changed the nature of the fund. It was evolution not revolution and a response to changed needs. He adds that 'the charge of Glover and Hogarth can only be understood in the context of the struggle between the priests and their superiors for the control of the mission funds and the fact that the common funds were a vehicle for the expression of clergy opinion, but lacking further evidence it is not possible to draw any conclusions'. " Kirkwood necessarily limited himself to considering the Yorkshire Brethren Fund, but his statement hints at a broader perception. What was the catalyst for devising new rules for the Brethren Fund in 1812? The answer may lie in the practice of the other Yorkshire fund, the Common Stock Fund, and in the question of episcopal control, the evidence for which lies in the Leeds Diocesan Archives, much of it in Robert Hogarth's own hand.

The first document to concern us supports Kirkwood's case and also introduces the Yorkshire Common Stock Fund. It is a letter dated November 12, 1800 at Dodding Green, from John Lonsdale (former Procurator of the Yorkshire Brethren and Yorkshire mission funds while missioner at York from 1771 to 1775 and at Linton on Ouse from 1776 to 1795), to William CroskelL (the

priest with responsibility for Church finances in Yorkshire from 1795 to 1824) and concerns financial and mission affairs, mostly to do with York. Lonsdale writes:

The Brethren's Fund was instituted for the support of Sick & Indigent Brethren. It has indeed been customary of late years to apply the Common Stock, which, when able never refused its assistance, but as this is a more General Fund to assist poor places and answer every Exigency of the Clergy, left entirely to the disposal of the Bishop, who must be best acquainted with these exigencies, it may happen not be able to do much. It is a very useful Fund and has been of great relief to many that would otherwise been destroyed. Mr. Stephenson of this place laid the foundation

Here, then, are the first clues about the Yorkshire Common Stock Fund. It is, in Lonsdale's opinion, a more general fund than the Brethren Fund, assisting impoverished missions and offering vital help to clergy in need, but not, he feels, as appropriate to supporting the sick as the Brethren Fund. In addition, he believes it to be entirely at the hishop's disposal. He also gives us the name of the founder, Mr. Stephenson (also rendered 'Stevenson'} of Dodding Green.

Robert Stephenson of Dodding Green was a man of great charity and generosity. He was born into a recusant yeoman family near Dodding Green in the late 1620s and followed his brother Myles in the role of agent to the widow of Sir Thomas Braithwaite of Dodding, who had died in York Castle as a recusant. Through inheritance and marriage, the Stephensons acquired considerable land and wealth and, in 1687, Robert bought Dodding Green and its estate from the Braithwaites. He maintained and sheltered a priest there and was regularly fined for non-attendance at church, but he escaped imprisonment because of the respect he earned amongst all his neighbours irrespective of creed. His charity seems to have been prompted by the deaths of his three children either in early childhood or in youth. His diary and accounts record innumerable charitable gifts during his life and he made George Leyburne of Skelsmergb Hall and William Thornburgh his trustees for various bequests. One deed provided for the future maintenance of a priest to serve the Catholics and poor of the district: another for the provision of alms to be given at his door to any who should call for assistance; and a third for educating the children of the poor, providing for the needs of the sick and aged, and also for the procuring of decent rooms and all necessities for the celebration of Mass wherever it was possible. Two, at least, of these trusts involved sums of £1,000. Many years before his death, he handed over his house at Dodding for the use of a resident priest and when he died in April 1723 at a great age he was universally mourned.[14]

The exact terms on which Robert Stephenson 'laid the foundation' of the Common Stock Fund are laid out in two more documents. The first is an appendix to a submission or, better, petition to Bishop Briggs from the members of the Yorkshire Brethren Fund. The second is a commission of enquiry into the

Common Stock Fund made up of two clergy members appointed by Bishop Briggs (John Walker and Richard Browne), two members appointed by the Brethren (Robert Hogarth and John Glover) and a fifth member (Robert Tate) chosen by the four others.[16] The commission of enquiry is clearly a very belated response to the petition and the grounds on which the petition were brought will become evident shortly. In 1859 the original deed concerning Stephenson's gift was in the possession of the Bishop of Hexham (William Hogarth, Robert's brother). It is quoted in full in both documents and is dated 13 January 1702 (according to the commission report; the petition leaves it undated). It is too lengthy to quote in full here, but the preamble is perhaps the key:

Whereas it seems a matter of the greatest Charity to contribute to the Salvation of Souls. And whereas there are in these Northern Counties many poor Catholics not able to maintain a Priest among them, and the Priests are commonly destitute of any annuity or patrimony of their own and through the iniquity of the times are liable to many hardships, I the said Robert Stephenson out of a deep sense of these necessities, for the love of God and my neighbour do freely give, and bequeath one thousand pounds for the uses following. That is to say for and towards the maintenance of Priests amongst the poor not able to maintain such for themselves. For and towards the support of indigent Priests newly come over till they can be conveniently settled in the Mission. For and towards the supply and relief of Priests who by reason of old age, infirmity, sickness, imprisonment, or accident, are disabled, and having nothing of their own become worthy objects of charity. And in fine for any other important exigence of the poor Mission in general whereof the Bishop for the time being, so and so qualified as is after required, is to be the chief Judge. But with this intention and strict obligation that the sum given be wholly and unchangeably annexed to the sole use benefit and necessity of the Secular Clergy, so that it shall not be in the power of the Bishop or other Trustees either jointly or apart to apply any part of the profits of the said thousand pounds to any other subject, necessity or use but only those of the Secular Clergy...

Stephenson goes on to specify that Bishop James Smith is to be the 'first, principal and standing Trustee' as Vicar Apostolic of the Northern District; two other trustees, Edward Barlow (Vicar General of Lancashire) and Thomas Roydon (of Westmorland, priest), arc personally appointed by Stephenson. These three conjointly are to choose a fourth trustee, from the ranks of the secular clergy of the Northern District, 'to succeed at the death or disqualification [by movement out of the Northern District or into a religious order] of the first deceased, or disqualified of the latter Trustees' and the system to perpetuate itself in this manner, always selecting from the secular clergy. If a religious be appointed bishop, he cannot serve as a trustee; his place is to be taken by the 'Chief Superior' of the Northern Secular clergy. The 1859 Commission report cites two other documents signed by Robert Stephenson: the deed of a second gift of £1,000 'to Clergy and poor' executed on 13 November

1706, and a declaration of 9 June 1712 by which he states that half of this second £1,000 was designed as alms wholly for the poor, but that, by Mr. Roydon's 'advice, direction and persuasion', he is now happy if some of it now 'branches to the benefit, relief and comfort of the Clergy'. [17]

A comparison between what we know of Stephenson's 1702 deed and John Lonsdale's description of Common Stock in 1800 suggesting that it was a general fund assisting poor missions and answering every exigency of the clergy seems to be accurate: Stephenson's mention of priests needing chanty by reason of 'age, infirmity, sickness, imprisonment, or accident' being only one among several specified objects. Similarly, the bishop, as 'first, principal and standing Trustee', as 'chief Judge [of] other important exigencies' and able to 'in his own Person act' without the limitations of the other trustees, seems to have had the greater degree of control, though whether one could say, as Lonsdale does, that the Common Stock was 'left entirely to the disposal of the Bishop' is arguable. One question, of course, is whether the Common Stock Fund actually adopted all the provisions of the trust deed. The 1S59 Commission quotes a letter of Bishop Dicconson, dated 5 April 1743, stating that donations from other people and stock arising from vacant funds meant specifically for Yorkshire were added to Stephenson's money and accounted for by the 'Yorkshire Procurator' or 'Clergy Agent' at York (Thomas Daniel from the 1740s, John Lonsdale from 1771, and William Croskell from 1795).'[8] Two hundred pounds had been lost from Stephenson's gift before 1708, but the second gift of £1,000 had clearly been attached to the first, since Dicconson's letter of 1743 describes a total fund of £1,800, denoted by the bishop as 'for the support and exigencies of the Secular Clergy of the Northern District'. (Stephenson might not have been happy with the absence *altogether* of mention of alms to the poor!). According to the Yorkshire Procurator's account book, examined by the 1859 Commission, the Common Stock Fund's capital stood at £1,478.13.4 in 1750 and in 1795 at £3,739, plus a house in Lop Lane, York, (rented at £25 p.a.) as well as certain loans to missions.. Clearly, therefore, the Fund was in regular use.

One further document relating to the capital of Common Stock was transcribed by Edward Wilcock in 1967.[19] He dated the document to c.1850, though its content does not correspond either to the 1842 petition or the 1859 Commission report. It shows money from the fund being lent out on mortgages and other loans and various stocks being traded. The total seems to be around £2,719, of which only £450 (one quarter of £1,800) is stated to come from Mr. Stephenson's gift. (Perhaps this is explained by the territorial divisions of the vicariates in 1840 and 1850.) The largest amount described as gift is '£850, the gift of Mr. Addison's money-Mr. Langdale'.

Thus we have some idea of the capital of the Yorkshire Common Stock and how it was managed but we need to examine how it related to the clergy and their 'exigencies' Wilcock's transcription mentions loans to the missions at Hull,

Bradford (St Mary). Burnley, Leyburn, Hedon and Halifax. There is no mention of payments to individual priests, though presumably they would have been made from the interest on capital rather than from the capital itself, or, possibly, the individual needs of the clergy may have become rhe business solely of the Brethren Fund by 1850. Here we reach the nub of the matter and the reader will already have guessed at the contents of the petition of June 1848 from the members of the Yorkshire Brethren Fund to Bishop Briggs. Tt describes its genesis in a resolution unanimously passed at the annual meeting of the secular clergy in 1847:

That a Deputation be appointed to wait upon the Bishop, to offer to his Lordship their and our cordial co-operation in any arrangement that may be mutually devised and considered best calculated to insure readily and without trouble and inconvenience, to our aged and infirm Brethren, such provision as may be sufficient to supply their wants and procure them moreover reasonable comforts.

The deputation seemingly called on the bishop and he asked the superiors of the Brethren Fund (Robert Hogarth, John Walker and Michael Ellis) to present a written statement of their objects.

In a respectful tone (but with clear undercurrents), the petition expressed the clergy's desire to assist the bishop in providing for sick and infirm clergy. And such records as existed of the Common Stock founded one hundred and forty years previously, 'expressly and directly applicable, among other purposes, to the support of the incapacitated among the Clergy', showed that fund to have relieved the wants and necessities of missionaries from 1738 at least. The bishop is the

chief and most influential of the three Trustees, to whom the preservation and application of [that fund] are committed: and it is to a share in this Fund that in accordance with the express wishes of the Founders, in accordance with ancient records, the practice of the Trustees, and Your Lordship's Episcopal Predecessors, we now lay, and have been laying a claim, on behalf of Your invalided clergy.

This is quite a bold gambit but the phrase 'have been laying' indicates that this was not the first time the issue has been raised. In fact, the petition exists also in draft form, minus the final paragraph and signatures. The draft and the final copy arc identical but for one passage; in the final copy it reads boldly: 'It was for this that we addressed Your Lordship in 1842 and the subsequent years; our letters and our addresses are in the hands of Your Lordship as well as ours, they will prove that the settlement of this question has not been either delayed, or prevented by any want of zeal or perseverance on our part.' The draft is bolder still: 'It was for this that we addressed Your Lordship in '42, '43, '44, '45, '46, '47. In so doing we performed a duty which we owe to ourselves, to our constituents, to your Lordship - but above all to the Being to whom we shall all alike have to give an account of our stewardship'. [n] The significance of the year

1842, the first year in which the bishop was addressed, of course, is that that was when John Glover and Robert Hogarth had drawn up their account of the Yorkshire Brethren Fund and had concluded that its purpose and function had changed.

The petition continued by raising the question of how the Brethren Fund and Common Stock related. From its inception until comparatively recent times the Brethren Fund had provided an *equal,* periodical distribution of the annual interest arising from capital to *both* the sick and the healthy among its members [emphases added]. No other type of grant or allowance to any invalided party whatsoever could be discovered within the first one hundred and thirty years of the fund's existence. Up until 1790 the only special assistance given to invalided clergy shown in the Procurator's accounts came from the Common Stock Fund.[21] From 1790 to 1815, special grants began to be made from the Brethren Fund concurrently with continued grants from Common Stock, though tlie £1,020 distributed from Common Stock far outweighed the £250 granted from Brethren Fund. From 1815 to 1836 (the year of Briggs' consecration as Vicar Apostolic), the Brethren Fund advanced £230 concurrent with grants of unknown amount from the Common Stock. But from 1836 onward grants from the Common Stock wholly ceased, save for £20 given recently to Thomas Holden, Thus the whole position of Brethren Fund and Common Stock had been reversed with the result that the amount of yearly dividend from the Brethren Fund had decreased to the point where it hardly covered the expenses of the yearly meeting and failed to meet the agreed remuneration for the celebration of Masses due under the rules. The healthy had lost but the sick still could not be sufficiently supported. Indeed, the Brethren Fund itself was even threatened with dissolution. All of this was largely because Common Stock had 'wholly ceased to perform one of its original, as it certainly is one of its noblest functions, namely, the relief of the sick and aged'. The petition stressed that many sick and retired clergy were now in deep financial anxiety and made three proposals. Firstly, that the bishop and clergy should cooperate in supporting aged and invalided clergy. Secondly, that trustees be appointed from among the clergy to apply and administer the Common Stock, 'in accordance with the practice of ancient times and the Founder's will'. Finally, that even if it was deemed necessary to raise an altogether new fund to support the infirm clergy, Common Stock might still be drawn upon.

It is probable thai with the petition, and certainly in support of it, the superiors of the Brethren presented their copy of Stephenson's deed, together with schedules giving individual names, dates and amounts of grants from the Brethren Fund and from Common Stock for the period 1739 to 1848 to illustrate the points made in the petition. Here the petitioners alluded additionally to John Lonsdale's November 1800 letter, though only to establish Stephenson's gift as the foundation of the Common Stock and conveniently ignoring his other comments! They do, however, notice a reply from William Croskell to John

Lonsdale, dated 9 January 1801 wherein the senior clerics William Danson and Thomas Ferby testified that, previously, as superiors of the Brethren Fund, they had 'refused to grant any other allowance to the Clergy Agent, for the use of an incapacitated member of the Brethren Fund, than the usual general distribution or dividend, common to all the Members'.

May be this was a struggle between bishop and clergy for control of funds, something akin to the disputes Turner noticed in the Midlands. That was what Kirkwood suspected in looking only at the Brethren Fund and is certainly supported by the second of the petitioners' proposals - that trustees be appointed from among the clergy to apply and administer the Common Stock, ostensibly to comply with Stephenson's deed but clearly also to give themselves an element of influence and control. [2] Alternatively, there may have been some truth in the statement that the Brethren Fund could not adequately provide for both sick and healthy clergy and was, indeed, in danger of dissolution. Only a detailed examination of the contemporary accounts could settle that question.

Bnggs was a bishop accused by some of 'solemn dawdling' and 'strange proceedings ... in everything'[23], but his obvious prevarications over this issue may have had a deliberate purpose. An increasing number of missions needed ever greater funds and Common Stock was one precious resource over which he had seemingly total control. We have seen that some few loans were made to missions from the capital of Common Stock and perhaps the interest on the capital benefited the mission more. We do not know if he did anything immediately to address the petition though there is one tantalising piece of evidence. In a note to his financial secretary, Canon Robert Thompson, dated 16 March 1853, Briggs wrote, 'My Dear Sir, I will thank you to tell me what Common Stock can afford, this year, towards meeting Mr Hogarth's application.' Whether this was an application - an annual one to judge by the phrasing -made in respect of the infirm clergy by Robert Hogarth we cannot be sure since it could also relate to his mission expenses at Marion. But if it is an application regarding help for infirm clergy, it cannot have satisfied for very long. We can state this confidently because the 1859 Commission of investigation into the Common Stock recorded the words of Briggs' Letter of Commission, dated 4 June 1859:

My Dear Sir - In consenting to the investigation of the amount of Common Stock, my intention is that the amount shall alone be examined in my Agent's Books. I have instructed the Very Revd. Robert Thompson, rny Agent, to lay before the Investigators all books giving information about Common Stock, and to explain what refers to his administration of Common Stock. I consider the main object of this investigation is to see what right, if any, the Brethren have to have their Sick Fund assisted from Common Stock, and at whose discretion the awards of that assistance ought to be rendered .. ,[2*]

That sounds like a rather disgruntled bishop! He is 'consenting[1] to the investigation, therefore the initiative in seeking it had not been his. Perhaps he

had told the clergy that Common Stock is too impoverished to offer any help to the infirm, since the amount within the fund seemed to have been an issue. In referring to the Brethren's 'Sick Fund' was he making a very definite statement of what purpose he thought their own resources should serve, or had a separate, new fund been established in response to the third proposal made in the petition? Whichever the case, Briggs seemed ready to contest the right of the Brethren to receive any money from or to have any say in the administration of Common Stock.

In order to fulfil its remit, the Commission, which met at the Station Hotel in York on 18 October 1859, began with Stephenson's deed and examined all the evidence with which we are familiar. They do not seem to have arrived at a figure for the capital of the Common Stock beyond the £3,739 quoted in 1795 in 'A Short Account of Funds' handed over by Lonsdale to Croskell, his successor. The only financial issue raised concerned the sale of the house owned by the Fund in Little Blake Street, a sale which we know from other sources benefited St Wilfrid's, the new pro-cathedral church, but for which the Common Stock Fund seems to have gone uncompensated. On the wider issue, however, they were far more definite. They considered that the right of sick clergy to help from (he Common Stock was clear both from the preamble of Stephenson's deed and from the record of disbursements from the Stock itself. Furthermore, they quoted the case of John Taylor which they felt proved the point beyond doubt. It had arisen in 1800 and had provoked the correspondence between Lortsdale and CroskeU. They cited the entire correspondence, between 9 October 1800 and 9 January 1801. in which CroskeU put the case for helping Taylor from Common Stock and Lonsdale questioned it. (Included in this correspondence of course, was the letter from Lonsdale considered above. It appears to be the only survivor in the Leeds archives of the scries viewed by the Commission). Taylor had been invalided at Beverley but the person with whom he had lodgings was willing to let him stay on if payment were made of £47.10.0 p. a. CroskeU and Lonsdale debated the merits of paying this from the Common Stock or the Brethren Fund and CroskeU finally apportioned £30 from Common Stock and £20 sent by the bishop (William Gibson) 'so that I have now supplies for the year without troubling the Brethren's Fund', (In truth, the case is not conclusive, but the Commission took it as such).

The commissioners commented relatively little on the situation after 1800, except to note continued disbursements from the Common Stock Fund to the sick and infirm. From their examination of the contemporary accounts, however, they noted that 'interest on Chapels absorbs the larger portion of the Common Stock proceeds, a charge which your Commissioners do not meet with previous to the year 1836. Nor do the other items there entered appear to be in accordance with the object of Stephenson's bequest'. In addition to their conviction that 'the relief of the sick and infirm, and superannuated, is a sacred trust vested in your Lordship's hands as one of the Trustees for the due

administration of Common Stock', they requested Briggs' attention to 'the provision in Mr Stephenson's deed of gift, directing that in the administration of his gift the Bishop should have the advice of two other Trustees, members of the Secular Clergy'. On all fronts, therefore, the Commission came down on the side of the clergy and against the bishop. But did it make any practical difference? Bishop Briggs resigned in 1860 (he would die a few months later) and he may have had neither time or inclination to respond to the Commission's findings. So far, no documentation detailing how Bishop Corntfrwaite or any of his successors dealt with the issue has been found.

In spite of the concerns raised by Glover and Hogarth in 1842 about the changed nature and scope of the Brethren Fund and in spite of the subsequent struggle to shift at least part of the burden of supporting infirm clergy back to the Common Stock Fund, there is no record of any changes to the Brethren Fund's rules in the second half of the nineteenth century. In fact, by 1904, its purpose is clearly stated as 'to furnish aid to clergy in temporary sickness ... and to provide a maintenance in old age, or chronic infirmity'. The distribution of a dividend to all members also ceased, though it is impossible to say at what date.[2] The Common Stock Fund has also ended up today being solely for the benefit of retired clergy. This must be due chiefly to the fact that the system of funding for parishes has been totally transformed in the modern era.

One question remains; did the Brethren Fund begin to give special grants to its sick and infirm members from 1790 because jt was becoming more difficult to extract money from Common Stock, or did the grants from Common Stock diminish from that date because the Brethren Fund had begun to give assistance? Only the Brethren themselves could have voted in the new set of rules for their Fund in 1812, but the bishop might have applied pressure. The question is made more tantalising by the fact that Bishop Briggs succeeded as Vicar Apostolic in 1836, the same year in which the Brethren Fund's rules were further revised and from which the Common Stock ceased altogether to assist infirm clergy. The possibility, then, is that in 1842 the Brethren suddenly realised how much ground they had ceded to the bishop and what the consequences were for their fund. If I have proved nothing else by this exploration of the Yorkshire Common Stock and the Yorkshire Brethren Funds, I have, 1 hope, at least justified the second part of my title - 'A Right Yorkshire Mix Up!'

Notes and References

1. Dominique Minskip, 'How Many Houses? A Lop Lane Mystery, York', AO/No. 42, 2001, pp.20-28
2. John Bossy: *The English Catholic Community, 1570-1880(1975)* p. 245ff.
3. Richard H. Turner, 'Clergy Funds & Episcopal Control - Was John Stanford Maligned?', *Recusant History* Vol 27 No. 1, May 2004, p.52.
4. Bossy, p. 248.
5. Turner p. 55. The Northern Brethren's Fund owned ten houses in Old Elvet, Durham, at one time as investments of their capital and only relinquished property as their main investment when Catholic

Emancipation offered the opportunity for acquiring stocks. Cf. 3. W. Thompson & W. V. Smith, *The Northern Brethren's Fund, 1660-1960* (Newcastle, undated), p. 11.
6. Bossy, p. 248.
7. Leo Gooch: *Paid at Sundry Times* (St Laurence Papers X, Ampleforth Abbey, 1997), p. 8
8. David Kirkwood: *A History of the Society of Yorkshire Brethren,* (Leeds Diocesan Archives, Occasional Publications, No. 2, 1990).
9. Thompson & Smith, p. 6.
10. Turner, pp. 51 & 53-4.
11. Cf. Kirkwood,pp. 13, 17/8, 31/2, Appendix 1
12. Ibid, p. 25.
13. Lonsdale's letter is at Leeds Diocesan Archives: William Gibson Papers, Doc. 481.
14. Stephenson expressed a wish that the district of Skelsmergh should be the first to benefit from this fund should Dr George Leyburn's pension in favour of the priest of that place fail. Sister Agnes, 'The Story of Skelsmergh', *Westmorland Gazette,* Kendal, 1949, pp. 40-53. (My thanks to Michael Delan, Lancaster Diocesan Archivist, for this reference.)
15. Leeds Diocesan Archives: Briggs Papers, Old Series, 1761A.
16. Ibid, Old Series, 2012.
17. The original deed is, once again, said to be with the Bishop of Hexham while the source for the declaration is given as 'My copy p.83 Stephenson's papers, vol. I. RJobert] Hfogarth]'. It would seem that these two deeds must equate to the two £1,000 gifts described by Sister Agnes, though she focuses on their benefit for Skelsmergh. The originals of the deeds may still be extant, though they have not as yet been traced, nor has Hogarth's volumes of Stephenson's papers.
18. For the complications involved, however, cf. Gooch's comment on the accounting methods of the Yorkshire Procurator: *Paid at Sundry Times* p. 7.
19. The transcript is in Leeds Diocesan Archives, with a copy in Middlesbrough Diocesan Archives; the original document has not been traced, but seems to have been within the records of the finance department of the Leeds diocese in Wilcock's time as treasurer.
20. Leeds Diocesan Archives: Briggs Papers, Old Series, 1764A; draft at 1638.
21. See note 18.
22. Coincidentally, another dispute had arisen between 1800 and *1840* over a different bequest of Robert Stephenson's relating to Dodding Green itself. By 1846, the dispute was between Bishop Mostyn (in succession to Bishop Gibson and, later, Bishop Briggs) and Mr Riddell of Cheeseburn Grange together with Mr Bingham, priest, over Bingham's right to reside and minister at Dodding Green. Essentially, the bishop wanted to treat the mission as a benefice at his disposal, rather than a trust administered according to the wishes of the founder, Stephenson, in his bequest. (See Francis Trappes: *,4 Statement of the Doddin [sic] Green Dispute, Proving the Necessity of some Legal Enactment to protect the Temporal Rights of the Lay Patrons of Roman Catholic Chapels in England,* London, E. Lumley, 1846. (I owe this reference to Leo Gooch). Though this was between bishop and laity, rather than bishop and clergy, one wonders if the resolve of Robert Hogarth, a son of Dodding Green, was in any way stiffened by events he must have been aware of. On the other hand one has to say that Hogarth seems to have been a trusted and valued member of Briggs' clergy over many years and to have served as his Vicar General in the Yorkshire District during the 1840s. (Cf. Martin Craven: *Faith in Adversity: the Story of the Early Catholic Missions in Holderness in the East Riding of Yorkshire,* (privately published, Hedon, 2004) p. 64,
23. Robert Tate to Thomas Augustine Slater, 18/06/[I853] and 24/05/[1858], 'Tatc-Slater Correspondence', Ushaw College Archives.
24. One further stipulation made by Briggs was that, during the investigation, the account books were to be kept in the safe at Blake Street Chapel House in York, 'in which safe the Missionary Deeds etc are deposited'. The Little Blake Street Chapel was the traditional financial and administrative hub of the mission in Yorkshire; the Yorkshire Procurator usually lived there and its chief pastor usually filled the office of Grand Vicar or Vicar General. St Wilfrid's church occupies the chapel site today.
25. Kirkwood,pp 20-21.
26. Diocese of Middlesbrough: Trustees Report & Accounts, Year Ended 31 December 2001, p. 22.

An EXHORTATION to DECENT BEHAVIOUR in CHAPELS

By the late Rev. F. Francis Blyth, D.C., S.T.P.

This exhortation, taken from the *Catholic Directory* for 1798, may have been first exhibited in (hose country-house chapels attended by estate workers and others (note the reference ro 'common people' and 'their betters'). The injunctions doubtless gained wider currency following the rise in the number of" public chapels permitted by the Catholic Relief Act of 1791. Father Blyth (71704-1772) was a convert who studied in Malta; he became a Discalced Carmelite [O.D.C.] and worked in the London District. Pattins (or pattens) were overshoes having the sole set in a metal ring to lift the wearer's feet clear of the mud on paths and streets. Obviously, they would be very noisy.

Ye shall keep my Sabbaths, and treat mv Sanctuary with reverence: I am Lord. (Leviticus, XIX,30).

Such is the express command of God. It is then to be hoped, that all who frequent this sanctuary. will suit their behaviour to the holiness of the place, and scrupulously avoid all indecencies here for the time to come, but particularly the following ones:

1st. The [female] sex are prayed to forbear the unbecoming freedom of approaching to COMMUNION with HATS or BONNETS on. For, besides its being a confidence too gross for persons of any rank to use in so solemn an act, It exposes God's minister either to the danger of dropping the sacred Host, or to the unseemly appearance of stooping to peep in their faces. St.Paul orders their heads to be covered, but not to be muffled. If modesty then be their plea, a HOOD will equally answer that purpose; and if it should be less modish, it will at least be more respectful and fitter for the occasion.

2dly. The more than masculine boldness of stalking into church with PATTINS on (a liberty not allowed in places of divine worship even by sectaries or loudly slinging them on the floor when in it; or any CLATTERS with their persons or chairs, to the common disturbance of priest and people; also the shameful act of SEE-SAWING in their chairs, as if to court a nap. Which last two articles regard both sexes, as well as the following ones.

3dly. The unclean trick of HAWKING, SPITTING, of SPAWEING about the chapel; which is a foul irreverence to God's temple, and a coarse breach of fraternal chanty; being extremely nauseous to others, and detrimental to their apparel. Nor can it admit of any legitimate excuse, since if infirmity compel them to spit, they may and ought to appropriate a handkerchief to thai use.

Lastly. The shameful arrogance of STAMPING up and down stairs, or BOUNCING into, or about church, as if they were to storm it, or if at least they wanted to shew how much more rudely they can behave in their Maker's house than they would dare to do in that of a fellow-worm, who were ever so little above them on this cannon dung-hill of the earth.

INDECENCIES like these may be overlooked in a play-house, but are scandalous in a church. To avoid them then, the common people are exhorted to mind the decent behaviour of their betters; who, being in general too pious and well-bred to stumble into such profanations, will doubtless set them a very opposite example.

NEVERTHELESS, if any {misled perhaps by the senseless sneer of such as ought to be the first in joining to discourage the like abuses) should perversely continue their irreverencies , it will be justly suspected that parade has more share than piety in their frequenting the church; and while they thus treat the house of prayer, in some measure, like a den of thieves, they will have eause to fear, lest, instead of the blessing, they come to solicit, they draw on themselves the wrath of that Lord, who never once laid aside the outward marks of his god-like meekness, but to chastise the disrespect shewn to his temple. St. John ii, *15.*

CAVEAT FOR A CARDINAL: THE PUBLIC LIFE OF USHAW'S MERRY del VAL Part 2, RELATIONSHIP WITH THE CHURCH IN ENGLAND

David Milburn

In a previous edition of this *Journal* (No. 45, 2004) I attempted, in the absence of a definitive biography, to assess the role of Cardinal Rafael Merry del Val as Secretary of State to Pope Pius X (1903-1914) without, however, finding the space to cover his relationship with England, a country that undoubtedly occupied a special place in his heart, and for whom the wellbeing of the English Catholic Church was paramount. From his vantage point in Rome, writes Adrian Hastings, Merry del Val became 'personally enormously important both because of the great power he long possessed and because of the fascination he exercised over devout English Catholics.'[1] Hastings' further comment that Merry del Vai 'always kept his eye on England' conjures up his being some kind of foreign inquisitor. Given his brief, by the pope, Merry del Val likely as not revelled at being called an inquisitor by the liberal press — it was proof of his effectiveness in protecting what he regarded as unchangeable truth, but no doubt he resented being referred to as the Spanish inquisitor. He was quite touchy about his nationality. From very early on in his life he regarded himself as English: 'thoroughly English', he said, 'English to all intents and purposes[1]. Those who knew him best appreciated that his interest in English affairs arose from his deep association with England, and it was both natural and genuine. But to this day, the world at large has definitely regarded him as Spanish, the 'Spanish diplomat' of the current dictionaries and encyclopedias and indeed of Roman circles in his own lifetime. He was turned down for the archbishopric of Westminster after the death of Cardinal Herbert Vaughan in 1903 on the grounds of being thought too Spanish, though the real reason probably was that he was too valuable to the Vatican for it to release him. Spanish or not, there can be little doubt that had he been offered Westminster, he would have packed his bags at once, for England was where he had always wanted to be. He felt completely at home there (which he did not in Rome) and he always regretted his missed opportunity to serve the Catholics of Eondon as a humble priest. As it was, tied more and more to his Vatican desk and, from 1903, a cardinal of the Roman Curia unable to leave Rome, he made it his constant care not only to keep abreast of English affairs, but also to find the time to welcome countless English speaking pilgrims to Rome, invariably impressing them with his affability and courtesy, whilst his fluency in the language proved a heaven sent gift to all the Italian popes from Leo X1I1 to Pius XI in their handling of English affairs.

Anglican Orders

From birth, Merry del Val had been reared within an intensely conservative wing of English Catholic society which, for historical reasons, had shunned contact with the prevailing Protestantism. Though the icy relationship had begun to thaw, most English Catholics still continued to live in isolation from 'their neighbours next door' as Mgr Ronald Knox once wittily put it. So the raising of such an issue as the validity of Anglican Orders in the 1890s as a first step towards a re-union of the two Churches, was to prove far too premature and might have remained on the back-burner, if it had not been for the fact that when it was raised, the much respected French church historian Louis Duchesne let it be known that in his opinion such Orders were valid. In Rome, both the Cardinal Secretary of State Mariano Rarnpolla and the up and coming canon lawyer Mgr Pietro Gasparri showed sympathy for this view, as did Pope Leo XIII for a short while. In England, however, most Catholics shared Cardinal Vaughan's revulsion at the very thought of Anglican clergy being in any way priests and, as archbishop, he used the pages of *The Tablet* of which he was the proprietor to fight tooth and tail to prevent any possible recognition. For him, it was all a trick of the devil to keep the English people in heresy. On the other hand, an outright denial of their validity, he argued, would have the benefit of creating a stampede from Canterbury to Rome, a view which he soon persuaded the pope to accept.

Sharing as he did Vaughan's temperamental aversion to Protestantism, Merry del Val aided and abetted him at every turn. He referred to the poisoning of men's minds by the Abbe Fernand Portal, the French priest who with Charles Lord Halifax had first raised interest in the subject, and he attacked those English Catholics sympathetic to the Anglican cause as 'liberals swelled by ill-instructed converts'. As for Gasparri, he thought him to be hardly orthodox: 'I don't know where he has learnt or unlearnt his theology... Happily the Holy Ghost is here, and overruling everything'. Merry del Val, incidentally, had learned *his* theology at the feet of the French theologian Louis Billot, who later on became a foremost protagonist of the ultra-conservative *Action Francaise.* 'For all his exposure to European diplomatic life', writes one authority, Merry del Val 'could never shake off the quasi paranoia which permeated the English Catholic Church in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries'."

A commission of enquiry met in Rome (the place determined by Vaughan to prevent the Vatican being misled) in conditions heavily weighted against a favourable verdict. Cardinal Camillo Mazzella, an active opponent, presided over it, and Merry del Val, its influential secretary, unconditionally supported the English Catholic representatives, all of whom Vaughan had handpicked to prevent the least concession. Much depended on the historical evidence which, it has been alleged, was presented in a very tendentious way by the English Benedictine historian Aidan Gasquet. Even the voting seems to have been rigged. Be that as it may, on the evidence handed to it, the Holy Office had little

option but to declare Anglican Orders invalid. A jubilant Merry del Val then proceeded, on the pope's orders, to draft a formal condemnation which Leo Xfll promulgated in his 1896 encyclical *Apostolicae Curae.* Naturally, this verdict was received ecstatically by all those who had opposed recognition. The handful of Anglo-Catholics who had promoted the debate were left disappointed but were fully aware that they had been out of step with most Anglicans who, on the whole, were greatly relieved to think that that their clergy were after all true blooded Protestant pastors, not Roman priests. Edmund Gosse blamed Vaughan for the failure of the talks: he was the 'villain of the piece. And I think he was a villain, a holy villain of course, one of those strange people who employ for sacred ends methods which applied to civic ends would be seen to be infamous'.[3] If the young Merry del Val had anything to do with it, the outcome would not have been any different had Cardinal Manning survived until 1896.

English Catholic Modernism

In the simplest of terms the Modernist movement can be regarded as an uncoordinated series of attempts to reconcile contemporary advances in knowledge with Catholic belief. The earlier Catholic liberal movement in England had actually responded positively to growing problems in this domain, discussing them in an open and technical way and, though repulsed by the growing body of conservatism, the liberal attitude lingered on, manifested for example by Adrian Gasquet's praise for the high standard of scholarship of the French Modernist Abbe Albert Loisy which English writers lacked, and Cardinal Vaughan's invitation to Loisy to lecture to the Catholic undergraduates at Cambridge University. When scholarship became more daring, however, that initial cautious welcome by the Church authorities turned to hostility. Prior to the Modernist crisis itself, St George Jackson Mivart, the foremost English Catholic scientist, was the first to feel their wrath. Several of the articles in which he tried to reconcile science and religion had been placed on the Index by the time Vaughan succeeded to Westminster, and thereafter a not inconsiderable battle of words took place between the generally affable and conscientious archbishop, an able Church administrator but weak theologian, and the theologically well read and brilliant scientist. Pope Leo XIII's encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* of 1893 which emphatically rejected Darwin's theory of evolution appalled Mivart who concluded that Catholic doctrine and science were irreconcilable. The long dispute ended with Mivart's being accused of heresy and he was denied the sacraments until he had proved his orthodoxy. He rejected this demand and died unreconciled early in 1900. According to Derek Holmes Merry del Val intervened at least in the later stages of this sorry saga to encourage Vaughan to take a strong line. He had watched it unfold with increasing alarm and had already rounded on the Catholic Union of Great Britain {a group of influential Catholic laymen headed by the Duke of Norfolk) for criticising the negative tone adopted by the *Osservatore Romano* in its

dealings with English (and other) affairs, describing their action as foolish as it was deplorable and lamenting their lack of enthusiasm for a restoration of the pope's temporal power. The Mivart affair had proved to him that this was something more than Liberal Catholicism and it was 'dreadful to thus sec one's worst fears confirmed'.

By this time Vaughan himself had grown so hostile to the beginnings of Modernism that, with the connivance of Merry del Val and (it has been claimed) the Jesuit General, he entrusted the drafting of a strongly worded letter on the perils of 'Liberal Catholicism' to two Jesuits in Rome which he persuaded (without much difficulty) the English bishops to issue as a joint Pastoral Letter at the end of December 1900.[4] Condemning the spread of private judgement, it urged virtually total submission to the teaching laid down not just by the pope but also by the bishops in their letters, and those issued by the Roman Congregations, Another version makes it the work of Merry del Val assisted by the Jesuit General.[3] In content and style the joint Pastoral Letter undoubtedly anticipated by several years Pius X's *Pascendi,* and it would be invaluable to know just how far Merry del Val was behind both publications. Its vehemence brought to the fore the best known of the English modernists, George Tyrell.

By the turn of the century, Tyrell, an Irishman who had joined the English Jesuits, troubled the Church authorities in England to SHch an extent that Merry del Val had advised his Jesuit superiors to get rid of him, and Tyrrell became even more of a headache from 1904 when he defended Loisy's attack on the right of the Church to demand assent in matters such as the decrees issued by the Pontifical Biblical Commission established two years previously. Merry del Val, while admitting that such decisions were not infallible, insisted that all loyal Catholics could be expected to abide by them. Tyrrell, however, continued to object to such a restriction, condemning it as based on a scholastic tradition long outmoded, and perhaps even a theological conspiracy which 'parasitically gripped and strangled the Church as ivy does the oak' . Leaked extracts from his correspondence led at last to Tyrell's expulsion from the Society of Jesus in January 1906. He riposted by publishing later that year 'A Much Abused Letter' in which he developed his arguments, going as far as to denying the Church any authority to control the substance and definitions of Christian revelation. Some of (he Church's formulations, he argued, might well contradict the 'unformulated ideas and sentiments of the People of God' The visible Church, he stressed, could only be thought of as a means and a way 'to be used where it helps, and to be left where it hinders, since it was not the kingdom of heaven but only its herald and servant'.

With the battle-lines now firmly drawn, Rome in 1907 fired its first shot with its Syllabus of Errors, *Lameniabili,* closely followed by Pius X's encyclical *Pascendi.* Tyrrell, who had already raised the question of the authority *of Lumen/ah Hi* in the pages of *The Tablet,* now proceeded to air his views about *Pascendi* in a two-part article in *The Times* which drew down on his head the ire

of many English Catholics: 'To answer the pope at all was audacious. To answer him in the columns of a Protestant newspaper was an unpardonable affront'. Undaunted, Tyrrell had the satisfaction of seeing published just at this time in a well-respected French journal the text of an article which he had written in 1904 entitled 'Beati Excommunicati' calling into question the whole juridical apparatus of the Church, maintaining its authority to be purely spiritual. As for excommunication, there was no way in which a Catholic could be totally and absolutely separated from the Church. Could good men be driven out of the Church? The great Augustine, he recalled, had foreseen just such a question and had answered it in the negative. Hence the *beati excammitnicati.*

There are several indications in Merry del VaPs letters that he personally urged the pope to take severe action against the modernists and, as I have suggested, he may even have had a hand in preparing the documents. Certainly Tyrrell's 'scandalous rebellion' riled him, 'that man who was looked upon abroad as one of the leaders of the heretics, and perhaps the chief of them'.[8] What was to be done with him? On 22 October of that momentous year 1907, the Bishop of Southwark, Peter Amigo, in whose diocese Tyrrell resided, passed him the news that the Vatican had ordered his exclusion from the sacraments, and had reserved to itself any lifting of the ban. It was in that context that a short time afterwards Archbishop Francis Bourne of Westminster, writing to congratulate the pope on the publication of his encyclical, assured Merry del Val that the English modernist movement encompassed a very small number of Catholics. 'The circumstance that one notorious exponent of modernism - although he is known here as a highly nervous eccentric and erratic person - happens to be an Englishman (or more strictly an Irishman), has perhaps given people abroad a notion that his views are more widely accepted than is really the case'. For Merry del Val, however, one modernist was one too many.

We now know from Amigo's correspondence with the Vatican (mislaid at the outset of the second world war but recovered fifty years later) that the reason for Tyrrell's excommunication had been his temerity in writing his *Times'* article. This article Merry del Val had passed to the pope, who then gave Merry del Val the task of informing Amigo of his decision. Before the year was out. Tyrrell defiantly explained his reason for writing to the newspaper. Tt was to left the public at large know that Rome would stop at nothing, however reckless, to hang on to its absolute power. The root of the trouble, he argued, lay in the 1870 decree on papal infallibility, placing as it did all power into the hands of one man who may be a fool or a knave. 'And what do you expect? It would be a miracle if things were otherwise — and miracles do not happen'.[9]

Tyrrell died unreconciled after a short illness in July 1909 at the age of forty-eight. Refused a Catholic funeral, he was buried in the Anglican churchyard at Storrington, mourned only by a few faithful friends, only one of whom was an English Catholic priest. The Abbe Henri Brcmond gave a short address, for which Amigo suspended him from exercising his priesthood in the diocese of

Southwark. A week later, Merry del Val made the suspension universal. Although Merry del Val advised that the mourners too should perhaps be banned, Bourne followed the advice of the majority of the English bishops and took no further action. As a sign that he still passionately adhered to the Church despite its faults, Tyrrell requested his grave-cover to carry the insignia of his priesthood.

Gary Lease, on whose article I have drawn extensively for this account of Merry del Val's relationship with Tyrrell, gives his own view of the cardinal. His writings, Lease observes, testify to a lack of creativity yet his intellect was a nimble one. He was able to listen to and understand the position of others while always convinced that he was in the right. He possessed a narrow but penetrating intellect, energetic but not original, perceptive but inflexible. His chief virtues were obedience and loyalty which saw him through difficult times, but were the least able to deal with the intellectual challenges that faced the Church.[1] Lease never doubts the immense influence that Merry del Val exercised over the Church in England as Secretary of State to Pope Pius X, but of course as the whole issue of the validity of Anglican Orders proves, his influence actually pre-dated by some years that pope's election.

Before moving on to examine Cardinal Merry del Val's later dealings with the English Catholic Church, it is worthwhile mentioning two other English Catholics who, though not modernists in the accepted sense of the term, nor perhaps even liberal, aroused Merry del Val's suspicions. The first was Baron Friedrich von Hiigel. Always Tyrrell's close friend and defender of his Catholicism, von Hiigel came to acquire a reputation among many on both sides of the divide as the father or even the bishop of the modernist movement in Europe. Like Tyrrell he ended his days isolated and disowned by the Church authorities but because of his social rank, his evident piety, his outstanding scholarship, and not least his lay status which allowed him a freedom to express his views in a way which his many clerical friends, bound by the rules of censorship, did not enjoy, he never incurred public censure. Son of an Austrian Catholic father and Scottish Presbyterian mother turned Catholic, he was educated privately by tutors of differing religious persuasions, and from an early age he developed an ecumenical breadth of vision unknown among English Catholics at the time. In addition, he possessed a genuine mysticism which dated from his encounter with the 'mysterious divine Presence' during his youthful visits to the Florentine churches and which led to his life-long exploration of the strong mystical dimension in Catholic spiritual life. In 1908. shortly after the condemnation of modernism by Pope Pius X, he published his most memorable work *The Mystical Element in Religion,* the content of which to some extent at least had been inspired through written and personal contact with Tyrrell for over ten years. In its preface he spelled out what he thought to be his particular contribution to Church life. Describing himself as 'a proudly devoted and zrareful son of the Roman Church' he nevertheless recognised

many different kinds and degrees of light both within and outside the Christian and Catholic Church. As a layman he acknowledged the official Church's exclusive right and duty to formulate for the Church at different periods in its history 'normative forms and expressions of the Church's deepest consciousness and mind', but concluded that such formulations depended on what he called the Church's unofficial members, whose own consciousness had already prepared the ground. This line of thought certainly came in part from Tyrrell but surely also in part from his friend the eminent historian of the early Church, Louis Duchesne. Such views cost him, according to the temper of the time, the support of the majority of English Catholics who thereby deprived themselves of an earlier valuable English Catholicism lost in the defensive war against Protestantism. Nevertheless, though much of von HiigeFs writing gave offence to the anti-modernists, he had the protection of Cardinal Bourne (who was raised to the Sacred College in 1911J whose own training in Paris and Louvain made him more sympathetic towards this wider view of Catholicism, and averse to any witch-hunt. Writing in 1912, von Huge) expressed his hope that the Church would one day come to work out a fruitful relationship between authority and freedom, and to the end of his life he remained publicly committed to free scientific and historical investigation. Increasingly marginalized, he died in 1925 and was buried at Downside, where his friend Abbot Cuthbert Chapman, another victim of the anti-modernist camp, lauded the deceased's 'acute, massive, highly trained metaphysical mind which compelled attention'. The Anglican Dean William luge went further still, naming him 'our greatest theologian and apologist for Christianity in our time'.

Wilfrid Ward, son of the distinguished convert philosopher of the previous generation, also gave Merry del Val cause for concern. Ward did not possess anything like the stature of von Hugel, but like him he was religiously liberal-minded, also a man of integrity, and one of the foremost lay Catholics in England at that time. Reared in an ultra-conservative household within St Edmund's College in Hertfordshire, (Ushaw's sister college) where his father lectured, he received his early education at Downside, whence he migrated to Cardinal Manning's abortive Catholic University in Kensington, profiting greatly from its course in philosophy. In 1877, at Cardinal Vaughan's suggestion, he began studies for the priesthood at the English College in Rome, moving to Ushaw a year later because of ill health. There his appointment as choirmaster allowed him to exercise his considerable musical talents. Its course of theology he found wanting but, like so many able students before and after him, he made good the deficit by avid reading. His daughter Maisie Ward records thai he enjoyed life at Ushaw very much, admiring in particular the manly spirit of the place, thinking at one time he would like to be ordained priest and stay on to teach philosophy. With his own growing doubts about his vocation, confirmed by his superiors, he left Ushaw during 1881, but all his life he retained a strong affection for the college.

Continuing his interest in philosophy and theology, Ward returned to Ushaw in 1884 at the request of the English bishops to lecture on 'Modern Infidelity'. Among the students in the lecture room would have been the young Raphael Merry del Val. Ward came back to the college again in April 1890 to give a second course of lectures. By this date he had found his niche as a freelance writer with a vocation to drag English Catholic intellectual life from its obscurantism, his main inspiration coming from the works of John Henry Newman, much to the annoyance of his father who had parted company with Newman several years before over the latter's coolness towards the growing centralisation of the Church. Ward's evocative two part biography of his father (1889, 1893) brought him such acclaim that, with von Hiigel, he founded the Synthetic Society, or the London Society for the Study of Religion. Though largely Catholic in composition, the free exchange of views within the Society enabled Ward to be seen as a bridge between his own Church and other religious traditions. All this was bad enough news for Merry del Val, but Ward's growing friendship with Tyrrell and von Hiigel exposed him more than ever to criticism from the ultra orthodox Catholics, an unpleasant situation worsened m 1906 when he assumed the editorship of the *Dublin Review.* Like von Hiigel, Ward received a measure of protection from Cardinal Bourne, but this he supplemented by a personal caution which is evident in his works. Merry del Val's distrust of Ward first surfaced in 1900 and continued thereafter. In January 1908, for example, when he had to turn down an invitation from Ushaw to attend its centenary celebrations, he noted with relief that Ward had not been invited to be one of the speakers: he was 'so unsafe. He is an acrobat and performs the trick of teaching or insinuating unsound doctrines and wriggling out of them within twenty-four hours, and tells everybody that it is Newman. We don't want this humbug at Ushaw, where we like the genuine article'.'[1]

The Decline of the Vatican Meteor

When Pius X died after a short illness on 20August 1914 shortly after war had broken out, Merry del Val felt that a part of himself had also died and he suffered this loss acutely ever after. His tenure at the Secretariat of State over, the new pope, Benedict XV, confirmed his appointment as Archpriest of St Peter's, a position he had held briefly after the death of Cardinal Rampolla a few months previously. Having suffered at the hands of Pius X and his Secretary of State, the new pope, it is said, hoped to move Merry del Val out of Rome by offering him the post of commendatory Abbot of Subiaco, and later the bishopric of Albano, both of which the diplomatically skilful Merry del Val managed to turn down. Thus he continued with much of his previous work. Answering a query in 1921, he explained that his chief work was at the Holy Office of which he was Secretary and involved him in two long sittings every week. In addition, he attended a fortnightly meeting of the Consistorial Congregation, as well as monthly meetings of the Congregation for the

Propagation of the Faith. Matters concerning the Eastern Churches, political affairs such as concordats, and seminaries and studies also passed through his hands. Asked whether he enjoyed all this, he replied, 'I cannot say the work is naturally congenial, but it interests me because it is my duty'. He was determined to maintain this 'rigid sense of stewardship' which he had shared with the late pope to the last. He did enjoy some occasions such as the visit of several European crowned heads to Rome in 1923, including King George V and Queen Mary, whom he received at St Peter's. He was particularly busy during the Holy Year of 1925, during which he went out of his way to meet English-speaking pilgrims, astonishing them by his friendliness as well as his devotion and attention to detail during the ceremonies in St Peter's. Particularly memorable for him seems to have been the twelve-hundred-strong English pilgrimage under the leadership of Cardinal Bourne. That same year people were reminded of his comparative youthfulness when, not yet aged sixty, he celebrated his episcopal jubilee. Clearly, then, post-1914 Merry del Val was far from being a spent force, and if proof were needed of the continuing though moderated anti-modernist campaign, one could note that he gained a number of votes in the conclave held in 1922 which elected Pius XI. In 1926 he represented the pope at lengthy celebrations in Assisi, the papal delegation having earned formal recognition by the Italian government for the first time since 1870. This was probably the fruit of the on-going discussions in which Gasparri and Merry del Val were engaged in with the Italian authorities leading to the series of agreements which created the Vatican State. Merry del Val's contribution to the discussions is not clear. At least one author maintains that he refused to compromise, urging the return of the Papal States as part of any solution.

The Malines Conversations

Despite his heavy work-load and his advancing age, Merry del Val continued to keep an eye on England, always making sure that the Catholic community there trod the straight and narrow path of orthodoxy. He had good reason, then, to be on the alert during the course of the Malines 'Conversations' of the 1920s, seeing in them an unsubtle attempt to resurrect issues which had been definitively settled in the 1890s. It is a rather long and complicated story which arose from the 1920 Lambeth Conference's desire to seek recognition of its ministry by other, principally non-episcopalian, churches. This prompted the now much older Lord Halifax and his friend Portal to attempt a revival of interest in the corporate re-union of the Catholic and Anglican Churches. Determined to avoid any meetings in Rome because of Merry del Val's all-pervading influence, and aware that Pope Leo XIII had initially contemplated holding the earlier (1895-6) discussions on Anglican Orders in Brussels, where for a time he had been papal nuncio, Portal rather cleverly turned for help to the Belgian primate Cardinal Desire Joseph Mercier who had gained worldwide

respect and admiration during the war for his stand against Germany. Mercier also happened to be one of the most intellectual of the European bishops. Unknown to Portal, however, Mercier had just been reprimanded by Merry del Val on the orders of Benedict XV who, like Merry del Yal, had taken great exception to Mercier's greeting of the Anglican Episcopalians on his fund-raising visit to America as 'brothers in the service of common ideals, brothers in the love of freedom and, let me add, brothers in the Christian Faith'. Called to Rome to explain himself Mercier managed to persuade the pope of the importance of ecumenical dialogue and, before leaving the Vatican, he handed in, at the pope's suggestion, a memorandum which ended with a request that he might be allowed to embark on a subject which embraced 'all that concerned the Christian well-being of Europe.' Not having received a reply, he plaintively enquired on 25 January 1921 whether the document had perhaps gone astray: 'His Holiness did say he intended to give me a written reply'.] [2]

It was at this very time that Mercier received Portal's letter of 24 January detailing the discussions of 1895-6 and asking the cardinal's help to re-launch the dialogue which, he claimed, had been sidetracked by the arguments over Anglican Orders. In bad odour at Rome, Mercier trod carefully enough, receiving Halifax and Portal after Halifax's October tour of the major battle sites of the Great War in such a way as to make it plain that they had initiated the visit. In the course of an afternoon's discussion, both sides made it clear that any conversations would be private, since neither side had a mandate to negotiate on behalf of their respective Churches, and went on to state that their aim would be not re-union as such, but to clear away the obstacles to re-union. On the Anglican side, two theologians were chosen to accompany Halifax and Portal, while Halifax himself called on Cardinal Bourne to explain what was afoot.

The success of the first meeting held 6-8 December 1921 brought with it the need not only to keep Rome informed of what was happening, but also to seek official recognition. Some six weeks later Benedict XV died, and was replaced within a fortnight by Cardinal Achille Ratti who took the name of Pius XI. The day after the election Mercier met the new pope in private and mentioned his meetings with the Anglicans to which Pius reacted with pleasure: 'I see nothing but good from these meetings', are the words which Mercier recorded in his diary.' After months of confusion and misunderstandings on the Roman side, during which time which the Anglicans had formally authorised the talks, Mercier sought similar approval from the pope, which was granted remarkably quickly through Gasparri on 25 November 1922. Neverthess, it was painfully obvious that all hearts had not been won over to the cause. Both Anglican archbishops had reservations, and on the Catholic side Bourne, influenced by the negative coverage of the English Catholic press, began to mutter about being kept in the dark on account of Halifax's vagueness and muddled thinking. Portal began to despair, pointing an accusing finger at Merry del Val for this turn of the tide. He wrote to Halifax on 16 January 1923: 'You know as well as I

do that the day Merry del Val thinks he can put a spoke in the wheel he will not fail to do so'.

The second Conversation took place on 13-14 March 1923 and largely occupied itself with the practical issues which the Church of England would have to face if ever doctrinal agreements were reached between the two Churches, a sure sign to many critics that the participants were fast becoming 'dreamers in a dreamland' as one author acidly put it, echoing Merry del Val's view of Mercier being ' in a dream and ail at sea', and for good measure describing Gasparri to be 'mischievous' and the victim of 'extraordinary delusions'.'[5]

The third Conversation took place on 7-8 November that year assisted by Bishop Charles Gore and Mgr Pierre Battifol both of whom had previously engaged in lengthy and heated public debate. Nevertheless, their presence added sufficient formality to the proceedings for those present to begin to think of themselves as representatives accountable to their respective authorities. Despite tensions, it ended, as the previous Conversations had done, in a spirit of hope and friendliness, the anti-Roman Gore in particular leaving with a great respect for Mercier. The content of this third Conversation, untimely released, excited much criticism from English Catholics; especially sour was an article from the Rome correspondent of *The Times* who deplored the meddling of the French and Belgians in English affairs and suggested that the pope should not allow himself to be influenced by such manoeuvres. This prompted Halifax to remark to Portal that the instigators of the Rome dispatch were surely Cardinals Merry del Val and Gasquet.[16] To try to bring about a calmer spirit, in January 1924 Cardinal Bourne made re-union the subject of his Lenten Pastoral Letter in which he took a prudent and balanced view of the subject, attempting to place the Malincs Conversations within the wider search for Church unity, and rejoicing at the recent initiative in Belgium. Cardinal Mercier, in view of the unfavourable reaction in England, published his Letter in which he stressed that the discussions were meant to have been private, though they did have the sanction of the pope. On the whole Mercier's statement was well received even in Rome, with Gasparri congratulating his friend and the pope himself giving a guarded but definite approval in the course of a secret Consistory.[17] Despite all his efforts had Merry del Val begun to lose ground?

Postponed several times, the fourth Conversation took place on 19-20 May 1925 and dealt with episcopacy and papacy. As soon as it ended Lord Halifax turned his mind to another meeting later in the year to finalise agreements and seek to have them recognised officially and then published. His haste led immediately to the renewal of a distasteful controversy with the Jesuit Francis Woodlock, whom Portal regarded as a rabble-rouser, encouraged if not indeed planted, by Merry del Val and Gasquet.'* Mercier, beleaguered by his own domestic issues, soon became embroiled, as did Cardinal Bourne. Negotiations for the fifth Conversation had to be delayed until the beginning of 1926, by which time Mercier was known to be dying of cancer. On Wednesday 20 January he

celebrated Mass in his hospital room with a few friends present, including Portal and Halifax. Two days later he died, with the words 'ut unum sint' on his lips. Six months later Portal also died. In these circumstances it was clear that the fifth Conversation, held 11-12 October *1926,* would definitely be the last and a very summary one at that, simply preparing reports for publication from both sides, Catholic and Anglican. Halifax's biographer later described it as having 'a little of the depressing atmosphere of a liquidation'.[19] His attempt to put the reports into print met with an increasing number of obstacles; his visit to Rome in November 1927 produced little more than a blessing from Pius XI and a good deal of criticism from Merry del Val. In a letter to Woodlock dated January 1928 Merry del Val contradicted Halifax's account of his visit, writing that ^Halifax was not granted a private audience, nor do I believeJbr a moment that H.H. [His Holiness] extended his blessings to his work of reunion'. Pius XI himself soon drew a definitive line under the proceedings of the previous five years when in the course of that same year he issued the encyclical *Monalium Animos,* asserting that such ecumenical ventures could meet with no kind of approval among Catholics.

The Malines Conversations had been aimed at removing the obstacles to re-union. Sometimes, it seems, that aim had been overlooked but in the end the obstacles themselves had proved insurmountable. Remembering that at the outset of his pontificate Pius XI had expressed high hopes for such talks, where, at least on the Catholic side, had things gone wrong? It is of course true that other more pressing concerns occupied the minds of both Anglicans and Catholics during these years; the former being involved in fierce argument over the proposed revision of the Book of Common Prayer and the latter preparing for the 1925 Holy Year. Bur it seems to be agreed that such matters did not themselves bring about the collapse of the Malines discussions. It is nearer the truth to say that the Conversations attracted only a small elitist minority, made up almost entirely of pro-papal Anglicans who had to battle against the strong anti-Roman lobby in the Church of England and the almost universal hostility of the English Catholics. In these circumstances all it needed was for someone of Merry del Val's standing to topple the flimsy house of cards by a wink, a nod and a push in the right direction. For thirty years Merry del Val, this English/Spanish diplomat of the text books, had been a cardinal in the original meaning of the word, the hinge on which all things affecting Catholic England had turned. We do not know for sure whose wink, nod and push led Pope Pius to issue his bruising encyclical *Mortalium Animos,* but if Merry del Val himself had engineered this final *coup,* he would have died a very happy man. And even if he had not, he could still enjoy to the end of his life the personal satisfaction of knowing that from his earliest years in the Vatican he had succeeded in shielding English Catholicism from 'grave, even fata!' contamination. He died unexpectedly in Rome during routine surgery on 26 February 1930 berated by his many critics but bewailed by even more admirers.

Notes and References

1. Hastings, *A History of English Christianity 1920-1985* (1986), p. 146
2. G. Lease, 'Cardinal Merry del Val and George Tyrrell: A Modernist Struggle', *Dublin Review, vol.* 102 (1984), pp. 133-156
3. M. Walsh, *The Tablet,* 21 June 2003, pp. 12-13
4. Walsh, p. 13
5. D. Jodock (ed), *Catholicism Contending with Modernity: Roman Catholic Modernism and Ami-Modernism in Historical Context,* (2000), p. 265
6. Lease, p. 138
7. Lease, pp. 139-40
8. Merry del Val to Bourne, Oct. 1907, Lease, p. 144
9. Lease, p. 147. Much of the foregoing account is based on this article.
10. Lease, p. 134
11. Ushaw Archives, Merry del Val correspondence.
12. B. Barlow, *A Brother Knocking at the Door: The Malines Conversations 1921-26,* (1996), p. 52
13. Barlow, p. 74
14. Barlow, p. 91
15. Hastings, p.210
16. Barlow, p. 125
17. Barlow, p. 136
18. Barlow, p. 162
19. Barlow, p. 171
20. Barlow, p. 176

Further Reading:

J. D. Holmes, *More Roman than Rome: English Catholicism in the Nineteenth Century* (1978)

— 'Cardinal Merry del Val - An Uncompromising Ultramontane: Gleanings from his Correspondence with England', *Catholic Historical Review,* 1974, pp.55-64.

J.J, Hughes, *Absolulelv Null and Utterly Void: The Papal Condemnation of Anglican Orders 1896 (196%). '*

— *Stewards of the Lord. A Re-appraisal of Anglican Orders* (1970)

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography for named individuals.

THE FATE OF THE DURHAM CHAPTER IN 1559

Edward Stephens

[Editor's note. From its inception until its demise, *Ushaw Magazine* contained important articles on the Catholic history of north-east England. Since much of that material is of enduring interest and significance, it is intended to make it available to a contemporary readership by rcpublishing selected pieces in this journal. This (lightly edited) article is from volume 38, 1928]

On the passing of the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, a Royal Commission of Visitation was appointed to visit the Northern and Southern Provinces and to administer to the Clergy the Oath of Supremacy. The Commissioners for the North opened proceedings in the Bishopric of Durham on September 21st 1559. Two days later they summoned the Chapter before them.

The Chapter as constituted by Henry VIII and later regularized by the legatine authority of Cardinal Pole[1] consisted of a Dean and twelve Prebendaries. At the accession of Elizabeth their names were as follows:

Dean. Thomas Robertson Prebendary of the 1st stall, John Crawford Prebendary of the 2nd stall, Roger Watson Prebendary of the 3rd stall, Thomas Sparke Prebendary of the 4th stall, William Bennett Prebendary of the 5th stall, William Todd Prebendary of the 6th stall, Stephen Marleye Prebendary of the 7th stall, Robert Dalton Prebendary- of the 8th stall, John Towton or Tuttyn Prebendary of the 9th stall, Nicolas Marleye Prebendary of the 10th stall, George Bullock Prebendary of the 11th stall, Anthony Salvin Prebendary of the 12th stall, George Cliffe

Of these thirteen ecclesiastics nearly all had been monks of Durham before its suppression and had agreed to its surrender to Henry VIII. They had then been appointed to stalls in the newly constituted chapter and various portions of the abbey buildings were assigned as their home.

Though the old monastic life was broken, yet Mass and Divine Office went on as usual and even to some extent the old community life. The crisis which faced them now faced them not as a community, but individually and it involved issues far different from those which were involved in the surrender. Schism then was the result of their complaisance, should they be equally complaisant now, it would be tantamount to the acceptance of heresy and the denial of the faith in which all their lives had been passed. And yet to resist the will of Elizabeth, meant the loss of their livelihood and the abandonment of the cathedral and the forsaking of its much loved cloisters which they had paced year in and year out, studying and praying and bent on the business of the Lord. It meant even the loss to them of their newly made homes where they were safe at least from the world which they were so ill equipped to face. It was a searching moment for the spirit of any man.

Late in September, the Commissioners met in Durham and summoned the Chapter before them. The Dean was deprived by the restoration of Home, his Edwardian predecessor. Two of the prebends, Roger Watson and Thomas Sparke, took the oath of Supremacy without demur. Anthony Salvin, George Bullock and Nicolas Marleye refused it and were deprived immediately. There was no hope of compromise with them. Dalton, Vicar of Billingham and Norton, was equally steadfast. For the moment his livings were sequestrated. In the following year he was deprived. A similar fate befell John Towton.

in the standard histories of Durham by Surtees, Hutchinson, Fordyce or Mackenzie, nothing is said of the attitude of the remaining five prebendaries, and we might not unnaturally think that they too conformed. Fortunately the registers of the Visitation Commissioners have been preserved[2] and afford evidence to show that these five canons, at least on this occasion, also refused the Oath of Supremacy and suffered sequestration of their living and all its emoluments. This means that they still retained the title but lost all the fruits of their benefice whilst another cleric was appointed to earn' out the functions from which the sequestrated cleric was banned. Of these five, John Crawford died in 1562. William Todd suffered deprivation in 1567, Stephen Marleye was deprived in 1572, William Bennctt remains a problem, while George Cliffe seems to have conformed merely for the purpose of earning a livelihood. Subjoined is a brief notice of each individual prebendary which will enable us to follow his fortune as his attitude to the oath determined it.

The Dean, Thomas Robertson, was a secular priest and an Oxford man. As he had been through life an example for his learning and scholarship, so now he was no less an example for his constancy. When the Commissioners summoned the Chapter before them, they at once deprived Robertson of his Deanery, not by direct sentence, but by the simple restoration of his Edwardian predecessor, Home. The Dean refused the oath. He stoutly affirmed That the Bishop of Rome ought to have the jurisdiction ecclesiastical of this realm'. In consequence he was severely dealt with. Not only did he lose his benefice, but he was bound over in his own recognizances in £500, an enormous sum in those times, and in two sureties of £100 apiece to present himself in London, there to be further dealt with if summoned.[3] It is declared by one writer that he was taken into custody. Strype maintains that, bitter adversary as he was and active in Yorkshire for the Catholic Faith, he was overlooked because of his lameness. On Home's promotion to Winchester, Robertson was offered the vacant deanery, but he refused it.

John Crawford obtained his stall in the Chapter in 1543. He was Spiritual Chancellor under Bishop Tunstal. Having refused the oath of Supremacy, his prebend was sequestrated. Possibly he conformed later, since he was appointed by the Chapter of York along with Roger Watson as guardian of the Spiritualities of Durham.[5] He certainly acted under this commission, for he and Watson admitted Sampson to the seventh stall and Shepherd to the eighth stall.

He died in 1562 and desired to be buried before the Bolton Altar in the Cathedral.[6]

Roger Watson was a former monk of Durham. He accepted the oath of Supremacy and received in addition to his prebend the living of Pittington from which Nicolas Marleye, prebend of the ninth stall, had been driven. Watson died shortly after his apostasy in 1561. That his apostasy was not half-hearted is clear from the fact that he was appointed along with Bernard Gilpin to administer the oath to the clergy. Bernard Gilpin did incalculable harm in this commission.

Thomas Sparke was another of the monks of Durham. At the time of the Dissolution he was Chamberlain of the Abbey and it was his duty to supply the monks with clothing and for this purpose he was responsible for the staff of tailors, etc. In 1537 he became Bishop Suffragan of Berwick. There is no evidence, according to Dom Norbert Birt, that he exercised any episcopal functions under Elizabeth. He was evidently attached to his old monastic home. Probably his attachment proved too much for his conscience. The writer of the *Rites of Durham* tells how when the abbey bells were about to be sold by Whittingham, the Puritan deart, Sparke, by his prompt action and at considerable expense to himself, rescued them.[8] Sparke died in 1571. His request to be buried before Our Lady's altar[9] in the cathedral was not complied with. He was buried instead at Greatham Hospital, the mastership of which was one of his numerous preferments.

William Bennett was the last Prior of Fine-hale. He was appointed to one of the stalls of the chapter under Henry VIII. His history at that time is not edifying and his fall was sung of in ballads over the countryside. He must have made reparation for the scandal otherwise Bishop Tunstal would never have spared him when others were so vigorously dealt with. He refused the oath of Supremacy in 1559 and had his livings sequestrated. Of his subsequent history all that can be gleaned of him in published books is that in 1567 his name occurs amongst the prebendaries who assisted at an installation of a prebendary in the Durham Chapter House. He resigned his stall in 1579, perhaps because an office without emolument was a burden, no longer to be borne. **He** died in 1585.

At the Visitation of the Royal Commissioners William Todd was laid up with a broken leg and could not obey their summons. The Commissioners therefore went to his apartment and offered him the oath of Supremacy which he refused. His prebend was thereupon sequestrated. In December 1560, along withGeorge Cliffe, he was appointed by the Dean and Chapter to act as the official of the Chapter.[1] In 1567 Pilkington, the Protestant bishop, held his first visitation of the cathedral The bishops had now power to exact the oath of Supremacy without assessors. This same year Todd was deprived. No reason is assigned for his deprivation, nor was it necessary to assign one. That his deprivation was connected in some way with this visitation of Pilkington is at least probable. We have to remember that since 1559 the oath had not been tendered to recusant

clergy, though much unofficial pressure was brought to bear on them. This was. Pilkington's chance and he used it. One of the Puritan members also of the Chapter was deprived this year for 'non-conformity'. Considering Todd's previous history and antecedents, he can have been deprived for no other reason than recusancy.

Before the suppression Stephen Marleyc had been sub-prior of the abbey and master of the Fratere, i.e. Refectory. On the setting up of the new Chapter, his name was included in the list of prebendaries. In 1559 he rerused the Oath of Supremacy and his prebend was sequestrated. He was finally deprived in 1572. That date, late as it is, makes it reasonably certain that his deprivation^was due if not to an actual participation in the Northern Rising, then to the savage reprisals taken by the Government in the North on all papists. Deprivations were still taking place, e.g., John Brownc, the Vicar of Witton Gilbert, and a minor canon of the cathedral, was deprived in 1570 for being reconciled to the See of Rome. His last sermon to his people in Witton Gilbert church is still in part extant.[11] Robert Crawford, Vicar of Kimblesworth, was deprived in 1572, soon after the attainder for high treason of Robert and Michael Tempest of whose estate Kimblesworth formed a part.

Quite unconsciously and from lack of knowledge of the evidence of the Commissioners[1] register, a grave injustice has been done to the memory of Stephen Marleye. Rev. G.E. Phillips has written:

No less than three among them, Stephen Marleye (the last sub-prior), Thomas Sparke and George Cliffe were apostate monks who, following no principle except the securing of their worldly interests had accepted each successive change that had followed the suppression of their monastery in 1541, renouncing their faith again finally on the accession of Elizabeth.

This is perfectly correct of Sparke. It is not correct of George Cliffe, though of his subsequent conformity there can be little doubt. Of Stephen Marleye it is entirely incorrect for the reasons we have seen. Crawford, Todd and Ch'ffe were compromised by Chapter business. Stephen Marleye's name remains conspicuously absent in all the records open to us except for the vital evidence of his sequestration and of his subsequent deprivation.[1]

Ushaw has a proud and particular reason for being tender to the memory of the two brothers Nicolas and Stephen Marleye. They may be said to be the founders of the college library, for the collection of books, now valuable incunabula, bequeathed to them by the old monk Thomas Swaiwell and bearing their autographs, forms the earliest nucleus of the books in the library. They link us with the old Abbey of Durham and are justly regarded as one of our greatest treasures. The presence of Stephen's books along with those of his brother Nicolas is in favour of his constancy. Both brothers may have found a home with the Tempests and hence why their books subsequently and indirectly carne to us from the Tempests.]

Robert Dalton's is a name to be held in veneration as that of one of the bravest confessors of his time. He had been a monk at the suppression and was one of the original foundation. Besides his prebendal stall, he held the livings of Norton and Billingham. He appeared twice before Elizabeth's Commissioners. On his second appearance he told the Commissioners 'that he believeth that he who sitteth in the seat of Rome hath and ought to have the jurisdiction ecclesiastical over all Christian Realms.[14] He was a third time summoned and examined, but nothing could shake his firmness.[1] His living of Billingham and his prebend were thereupon sequestrated and his deprivation followed in 1560. He was deprived of Norton on appeal of the Edwardian intruder. Worse punishment was to follow. It seems to have been the policy of the Commissioners to drive from the county those of the recusant clergy who had strong local interest. Accordingly Dalton was committed to the custody of Lord Dacre, a peer, however, very favourable to the old religion. His enemies wrote of him that he was proud and unlettered.

John Towton or Tuttyn likewise had been a monk at the suppression and was a prebendary of the first foundation. He was deprived for recusancy. He is included in Sanders list. For reasons which cannot be discovered, Nicolas Marleye had the honour of being one of those marked out for immediate punishment At the Visitation he was deprived of the living of Pittington and of his stall in the Chapter and sentenced not to come within eight miles of Durham. He, like his brother Stephen, had been a monk of Durham and was one of the prebendaries appointed by Henry VIII. George Bullock was a secular priest and presented to stall by Queen Mary. In 1559 he was deprived for refusing the oath and went into exile. Happier than his brethren he found a refuge at Antwerp in the monastery of St Michael and died in 1580.[18]

Anthony Salvin was a son of Gerard Salvin, of Croxdale, Durham, With his strong local and family influence and his high prestige in the diocese, he would have been a great capture for .the Reformers. There was, however, never the least hope of his compromising and he was immediately deprived of his prebend at Durham and the rectory of Sedgefield, He was then ordered to leave Durham and retire to Yorkshire. He was forbidden to enter the city of York or to depart five miles northwards of Kirby Moorside. 'He was noted', so record his enemies, 'as a person highly esteemed in the county - but a man of mean erudition.'

The last of the prebendaries was George Cliffe, remarkable not for his heroism but for the vicissitudes he underwent in his determination to secure a living after his stall was sequestrated and yet, apparently, not to cut himself off from his Catholic past. Two months before Queen Mary died he had been collated to the Durham Chapter. Within twelve months Mary's successor Elizabeth, through her Commissioners, had withdrawn from him his income since he refused the Oath of Supremacy. Others before him have felt that to dig they were not able and to beg they were ashamed. Possibly he conformed and took the oath. That he must sometime or other have taken the oath is certain.[2]" When or how is not

now to be discovered. He was not called upon either to dig or to beg. Robert Dalton's living of Billingham was vacant It was in the gift of the Chapter and Cliffe secured it in 1560, there being as yet no Bishop of Durham. It was ideal for his purpose, because for years past all the work had been done by a parochial chaplain and the vicar had .been non-resident. So much so that in 1587, while Cliffe was incumbent, the parishioners complained that the sacraments were being performed by strange curates and one John Davison. was actually ex-communicated in 1575 for calling John Martyn, the curate, 'a vacabound, a wag-wallett and a syde-taiied knave.[2]" Epithets so Shakespeareanly picturesque ought never to have incurred so severe a penalty. For five years Cliffe was left undisturbed. He had an income and yet need not touch the heresy of the new religion. Then a heavy blow fell. An intruder named Macbrayne appealed and Cliffe was deprived by the Commissioners and he was left to shift for himself. Their action makes it hard to believe that he had as yet taken the oath. Worse was to follow. In 1562 he had secured the living of Elwick, where he was under the powerful .protection of the Catholic Earl of West-moreland. Of this living too he was deprived and thus he lost all his preferments.[23] In 1569 when the Northern Rising occurred, he was present in the Cathedral on various occasions during the brief restoration of the Old Religion. If it was not from sympathy, it is difficult to see why he attended at all.

Whatever part he took he had sufficiently compromised himself to be summoned before the Council, and his depositions made to them remain to this day.[24] One knows not whether to marvel at the simplicity of the questions or the casuistry of the answers. Cliffe certainly must have smiled when he found himself bluffing his enemies so disingenuously. He said he believed it to be true that there is one order of Divine Service established by Parliament in the Church of England - that by the law of the Realm the latin service and authority of the Bishop of Rome were abolished. These statements are almost platitudinous. Of his presence at the cathedral on these fateful days his account is as follows: on St Andrew's Day he was present at morning service and on the Saturday after at evensong. On Sunday, December 4th, he was likewise at monring prayer in his habit. Robert Peirson, priest, sang Mass on St Andrew's day at the High Altar. Cliffe was present. He did not sing, nor look at the Elevation nor bowed, nor knocked (i.e., beat his breast), nor use any open fact nor reverend gesture. This was Sunday, the second of Advent, on which the people of Durham were absolved from heresy and schism. They crowded to the cathedral in their thousands - witness after witness during the trial gave evidence to this. Cliffe was again present. On the same Sunday, sitting in Th. Gibson's stall behind the Lady Bowlton altar[25] the press of people being very great, he heard his voice but understood not one sentence of what the preacher said. As for absolution, he heard none of it till afterwards. When the people kneeled down to receive it he thought they were kneeling for the 'bidding

prayer'.[26] He cannot be telling the truth here. He must have known that what was to be the great incident of the day's proceedings and when that vast congregation kneeled he must have known that it could only have one purpose. 'That he was neither willing nor earnest to follow the said service nor to receive the Poop's[27] absolution, whereof he knew not.' This, vague as it was, satisfied the Commissioners. He saved his skin and withdrew.

That his sympathies still were Catholic may be deduced from the fact that before the final break-up of the fortunes of the Nevilles, Cliffe received in 1571 from Lady Adeline Neville, the sister of the attainted Earl, the gift of the living of Brancepeth. It is most unlikely that so far the *Book of Common Prayer* had been used in Brancepeth Church, under the eye of the Earl of Westraoreland. Here again Cliffe was in luck - he had a living without the heresy. But not for long; Brancepeth without the Nevilles was one place, under the prying eyes of Pilkington it was quite another. Hence he resigned this rectory in 1584 and resumed Billingham since Macbrayne was now dead. One relic of his presence at Brancepeth is thought to remain in the two beautiful canopies existing there (one of which hangs over the chancel arch) and which are thought to have belonged to two of the altars in Durham Cathedral and to have been rescued by George Cliffe. He died in 1595; whether at his death he got the 'Poop's' absolution or died 'unhouseled, disappointed, unanealed,' is one of those mysteries which remains hidden.

Notes and References

1. W. Hutchinson *The History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham* (1823) vol. II, p. 211, note under A. Salvyn.
2. See Norbert Birt, *The Elizabethan Religious Settlement,* p. 143.
3. Birt, pp. 150/5.
4. Hutchinson, vol. II, p. 142; Gee, *The Elizabethan Clergy,* p. 184.
5. Hutchinson vol. II, p. 215, note.
6. Bolton Altar, i.e., Our Lady's Altar, supported by the tithes of Bolton.
7. Gee, p. 81.
8. (Ed.) J.T. Fowler, *Rites of Durham...written 1593* (Surtees Society 1903) p. 39.
9. Not the Bolton Altar, but Houghal's altar, so called because some portion of the Houghal estate was devoted to its maintenance. Cf. *Rites of Durham* p. 219, note.
10. Hutchinson vol. II. p. 215, note.
11. *Ushaw Magazine,* Dec, 1892, p. 303.
12. *Lives of the English Martyrs,* vol. II, p. 142; *Ushaw Magazine,* December 1892, p. 294. Cf. Birt, p. 156.
13. *Ushaw Magazine* December 1905, p. 253.
14. Birt, p. 153

15. Gee.
16. Birt, p. 160.
17. Hutchinson, vol. II, p. 196.
18. Hutchinson, vol. II, p. 209. [Additional note. A statute of 1555 handed down by Queen Mary required the dean and each of the twelve canons of Durham to provide twenty-one days of 'sumptuous' hospitality for the cathedral choir and the citizens of Durham. No period was to overlap with another and failure to comply would incur the loss of a year's income. Hence, feasting took place on 273 days in the year. Criticism of ecclesiastical luxury in the early nineteenth century brought the tradition to an end and the dinners were replaced by doles. (P. Mussett, 'Cathedral Catering', lecture 19S6.)]
19. Hutchinson, vol. II, p. 211. This is the only county history to record the imprisonment of Nicolas Marleye, Robert Dalton, Anthony Salvin and the Dean, Dr. Robertson.
20. Hutchinson records that he was joined with Dr W. Todd in the patent of officially by the Dean and Chapter in 1560. In 1561 he was appointed by the same authority to collect the tenths and subsidies exacted by Queen Elizabeth. Both these offices may have been due to a desire to help two sequestrated prebendaries, for the offices would not be without emoluments.
21. *Victoria History of Durham,* vol. 3, p. 203.
22. W. Fordyce, *History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham* (1857), vol. II, p. 309.
23. Gee, p. 287.
24. (Ed.) J. Raine, *Depositions & other Ecclesiastical Proceedings from the Courts of Durham, extending from 1311 to the Reign of Elizabeth* (Surtees Society 1845) p. 136.
25. Raine, p. 136.
26. loc. cit.
27. Whether his spelling or the secretary's I cannot say. Cf. Topcliffe's Jhezewitt for Jesuit.

Bibliography

The following is a list of known recently published work relating to the Catholic history of Northumberland, Durham and North Yorkshire. The Editor would be grateful for details of articles and books, as well as parish histories (after 2000) as they are published.

Katharine M. Longley, 'Blessed George Errington and Companions', *Recusant History* vol. 19/1 (1988)

Leo Gooch, 'Priests and Patrons in the Eighteenth Century', *Recusant History* vol. 20/2 (1990)

John P. Perkins & Pauline M. Litton, *Roman Catholics in the Diocese of Durham:* [Extracted from the Returns of Papists 1767] (1991)

Claire Cross, 'The Reconstitution of Northern Monastic Communities in the Reign of Mary Tudor', *Northern History* vol. 29 (1993)

Geoffrey Holt, SJ, ' "An able mathematician": Christopher Maire', *Recusant History* vol. 21/4 (1993)

David Milburn, *St John Baste and the Continuity of Catholicism in the Deerness Valley* (1993)

Donald Woodward, ' "Here comes a chopper to chop off his head", The Execution of Three Priests at Newcastle and Gateshead, 1592-1594', [Joseph Lambton, Edward Waterson and John Ingram] *Recusant History* vol. 22/1 (1994)

Christine M. Newman, *Robert Bowes and the Pilgrimage of Grace* (NEEHI, 1997)

William J. Sheils: 'Catholics and Their Neighbours in a Rural Community: Egton Chapelry 1590-1780', *Northern History* vol. 34 (1998)

Sheridan Gilley, 'The Legacy of William Hogarth, 1786-1866', *Recusant History* vol. 25/2 (2000)

Shirley Gray-Wilson, *It Isn't Always Raining: Children in Care 1939-1948,* [Nazareth House, Newcastle] (privately published 2000)

Dominic Mamer, *St Cuthbert, His Life and Cult in Medieval Durham* (British Library, 2000)

Michael Morris & Leo Gooch, *Down Your Aisles: The Diocese of Hexham & Newcastle 1850-2000 (Northern Cross,* Hartlepool, 2000, ISBN 095382800X)

Paul L. Younger, *The Lamesley Martyrs: Bl. Thomas Palaser, Bl. John Norton, Bl John Talbot* (2000)

Sarah Bastow, ' "Worth noting, but very wilful", Catholic Recusant Women of Yorkshire 1536- 1642', *Recusant History* vol. 25/4 (2001)

D.M.Jackson, 'Newcastle's Irish Riot of 1861', *North East History* vol. 34 (2001)

Geoffrey Moorhouse, *The Pilgrimage of Grace* (London, 2002)

Donald M. MacRaild, ' "Abandon Hibernicisation": Priests, Ribbonmen and an Irish Street Fight in the North-East of England in 1858', [Sunderland], *Historical Research* vol. 76/194(2003}

Daniela Busse, 'Anti-Catholic Polemical Writing on the Rising in the North (1569) and the Catholic Reaction', *Recusant History* vol. 27/1 (2004)

F. Dobson, *The Life & Times of George Silvertop of Minsteracres* (Browne Burton & Associates, Newcastle, 2004, ISBN 0952420708)

K J. Kesselring, 'Constructing and Containing the Northern Rising of 1569', *Journal of British Studies* vol. 43 (2004)

Peter Lake & Michael Questier, 'Margaret Clitherow, Catholic Nonconformity, Martyrology and the Politics of Change in Elizabethan England', *Past and Present* No. 185 {November 2004)

Philip Lees, *Little Ireland: A Family's Journey from Co. Sligo to Co. Durham* [Bishop Auckland] (Privately published 2004, ISBN 0954827309).

E.A. Macek, ' "Ghostly Fathers" and their "Virtuous Daughters": The Role of Spiritual Direction in the Lives of Three Early Modern English Women', [Margaret Clitherow, Dorothy Lawson & Mary Ward] *Catholic Historical Review* [USA] vol. 90 (2004).

Peter Phillips (Ed.), *Lingard Remembered: Essays to mark the Sesquicentenary of John Lingard's Death (*Catholic Record Society, Monograph No. 6, 2004, ISBN 0902832212)

Leo Gooch, *Nazareth in Willington* (2005) [Willington on Wear parish history]

Anne Parkinson, 'The Rising of the Northern Earls', *Recusant History* vol. 27/3 (2005)

Leo Gooch, 'Henry O'Callaghan: Manning's Reluctant Episcopal Protege', (in *Victorian Churches and Churchmen,* Sheridan Gilley, Ed., (Catholic Record Society, Monograph No. 7, 2005, ISBN 0902832220)

Winifred Stokes, 'Matthias Dunn, Campaigner for Mining Safety, c. 1789-1869', *Durham County Local History Society Bulletin,* No. 69 (January 2006)

Review

Tony Pelton

(Eds.), R. Finnigan and J. Hagerty. *The Bishops of Leeds 1878-1985: Essays in Honour of Bishop David Konstant* (Diocese of Leeds 2006. Available at £20 hb, £15 pb (plus £2-50 p&p) from Leeds Diocesan Archives, Hinsley Hall, 62 Headingley Lane, Leeds LS6 2BX)

A book about bishops is uncommon and arises, in this instance, as a tribute to David Konstant, a Bishop of Leeds and successor to a line of bishops established in Victorian times. His praises are justifiably sung in chorus with all his predecessors. All the bishops from Robert Cornthwaite, the first, are individually researched and the chapters are well illustrated.

For two hundred years England was without a hierarchy, but the Church survived and, under its new bishops, it thrived. From the early growing pains of gathering the faithful for Mass in, for example, a disused wheelwright's shop, or in a loft over a ginger beer works, and through the increase in the number of missions (parishes were yet to come), the bishops worked tirelessly for church and school building, to create welfare services equalling those of the state, and the development of a lay social apostolate. As punches are not pulled but stated charitably, the result is clear and the book is realistic about diocesan development with some breath-taking statistics, up to present day concerns over the shortage of priests and parochial reorganisations. Many details of major events are recalled: the first televised Mass from Leeds, a bishop beekeeper, the Vocations Exhibition, and the Papal Visit to York, all creating a spiritual journey and a social history of faith.

For the majority of people the first and only time a bishop is seen is at confirmation. Otherwise they are remote figures, of pastoral letters and maybe a rare parish appointment before elevation to a bishopric. One arriving from outside the diocese is like an alien from outer space. What such bishops bring, this book reveals.