Northern Catholic History

No. 45 2004

North East Catholic History Society

NORTH EAST CATHOLIC HISTORY SOCIETY

The Society was founded in July 1974 to foster interest and promote research into the history of the Catholic Church in North East England.

A yearly programme of talks and visits to places of Catholic interest is arranged and *NORTHERN CATHOLIC HISTORY*, the Society's periodical, is published yearly, in May.

PATRON: The Rt Rev. Ambrose Griffiths, O.S.B., Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle.

OFFICERS 2003/2004

CHAIRMAN	Rev. D. Milburn. D.S.H., St Thomas of Canterbury, Longhorsley, Morpeth, Northumberland, NE65 8UY Tel: 01670 788344
VICE-CHAIRMAN	Mr G. Thornton, 302 Wingrove Road North, Fenham, Newcastle, NE4 9ED Tel: 0191 274 5128
GENERAL SECRETARY	Miss J. McCabe, 47 Langley Terrace, Jarrow, NE32 5DX Tel: 0191 422 0780
PROGRAMME SECRETARY	Mr R. Murphy, Fenham Hall Drive, Newcastle, NE4 9UT Tel/Fax: 0191 273 3698 E-mail: robertamurphy@compuserve.com
TREASURER	Mr and Mrs G. Wills, 18 Tanfield Rd, Denton Burn, Newcastle, NE15 7DT Tel: 0191 241 1017
OUTINGS SECRETARY	Miss Anne McCormick, 33 Powburn Gardens, Fenham, Newcastle, NE4 9UE Tel: 0191 274 5740
EDITOR	R.M. Gard, 21 Larchwood Avenue, Wideopen, Newcastle, NE13 6PY Tel: 0191 236 6043
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE	Officers (as above), Mr P. Hardie, Mrs S. Hardie, Miss J. O'Callaghan, Miss E. Swallow.
Annual Subscription	£6.00 or £10.00 (Joint), with *Northern Catholic History*

NORTHERN CATHOLIC HISTORY

Published yearly (in May) £5.00 (U.K.), £5.50 (Overseas), incl. postage.

Copies of Nos. 10-44 available from Mr Gard (above) at reduced rates. Photocopies of articles also available

© North East Catholic History Society and contributors.

Articles and enquiries welcomed by the Editor.

ISSN 0307—4455

Society internet web-site: www. catholic-history. org.uk/nechs

NORTHERN CATHOLIC HISTORY

No. 45 2004

CONTENTS

Editorial Notes		2
St Oswald of Northumbria (604-642): The Just King	J. GAVIN	3
The Medieval Hospitals of Northumberland and Newcastle	R.M. GARD	11
Blessed Thomas Percy (1528-1572)	G.B. THORNTON	21
Mrs Durham and the Suppression of the Jesuits	W.V. SMITH & G. HOLT	33
Caveat for a Cardinal: The Public Life of Ushaw's Merry del Val	D. MILBURN	46
Excursions during 2003: Selby Abbey, Felton	D. MILBURN	59

Illustrations

St Oswald	5
A Leper; a Pilgrim	14
St Mary the Virgin Hospital, Newcastle	17
Blessed Thomas Percy	29
Mgr Merry del Val, 1897	48
Selby Abbey	59

NORTH EAST CATHOLIC HISTORY SOCIETY

The 2003-2004 year began with the annual Mass for deceased members at St Andrew's on 3 September, followed by the AGM attended by 28 members. Fr Milburn, Chairman, reviewed the talks and outings of the previous year, thanked the officers for their hard work, the speakers for excellent talks, and the members for their loyal support. The officers and Committee agreed to continue and were duly re-elected.

Visits were made to Selby Abbey on 17 May, to Abbotsford on 14 June, and to Felton on 14 September. The three pre-Christmas talks, by Liam Kelly on Cardinal Hume on 8 October, by John Gavin on St Oswald on 5 November, and by Sr Eileen Foster on the Society of the Sacred Heart on 3 December, were well attended and well received. Vivienne Fetherston returns on 4 February to speak further on Irish Social Catholicism in Sunderland in the 19th century. The Summer outings will be to Ripley Castle and Ripon on 15 May and the Whitby and Egton Bridge on 19 June.

Almost all periods in the Church's history in this country are represented by articles in this edition. John Gavin describes the life of St Oswald, the 1600 years' anniversary of whose birth falls this year. The Editor contributes an article of medieval hospitals in Northumberland and Newcastle. George Thornton discusses the role of Blessed Thomas Percy, martyred at York in 1572 for his part in the Rising in the North in 1569. There follows a previously unpublished essay by the late Fr Vincent Smith on the Suppression of the Jesuits in the North East, supplemented by comments from Fr Geoffrey Holt – the Jesuits were suppressed in 1773, partially restored in 1803 and fully restored in 1814. The issue is completed by two contributions from Fr David Milburn, the first of a two-part article on Cardinal Merry del Val and a report on the excursions to Selby Abbey and to Felton.

The authors of these articles are warmly thanked. Without their research and writing, Northern Catholic History *could not try to fulfil its objective of keeping fresh the memory of our forefathers in the faith. The legacy is a rich one and it is hoped that other historians will provide articles to sustain future editions. Once again, the Society is grateful to Darlington Carmel for their expert printing, and we all thank the Good Lord for enabling the periodical to continue.*

R.M.Gard, Editor.

January 2004

ST OSWALD OF NORTHUMBRIA (604-642): THE JUST KING

John Gavin

Oswald! Not a name to conjure with any more, except perhaps in the North East. Yet, that St Oswald is still held in high regard in these parts is best evidenced by the number of schools, hospitals, and public buildings locally named after him.

So is it surprising, considering his fame, that we know so little about him? Not really, considering when he lived, over 1300 years ago, during the so-called Dark Ages. Literacy had been in retreat since the Romans left, and very little was being recorded by those that remained. A man's word was his bond, and, even if it was not, few knew how to put it in writing. Even in the monasteries, education was the exception rather than the rule. So it is fortunate that we have Bede, the scholar and historian, in itself testimony that Northumbria in the seventh and eighth centuries, before the Vikings descended on our shores, was the cultural centre of the nation.

The Angles and the Saxons had been the problem in the centuries before. But they were farmers and came to settle, whereas the Northmen were, by and large, raiders who came to plunder. By the seventh century, then, the Angles and Saxons were settled, and kingdoms were starting to emerge. Northumbria was one of the most important, and Oswald, who was fourth generation English, held these islands as his home.

Yet it was less than sixty years earlier that Ida had landed at Flamborough Head, and set out to wrest a kingdom for his own from the native British. For the first forty years, however, the Angles were confined to a small bridgehead north of the Ouse. But Oswald's father, Ethelfrid, a ferocious leader, not for nothing nicknamed the Destroyer, had begun to take the offensive, and, after uniting the kingdom, launched into attacking his neighbours. Suffice it to say, that after a string of victories he was defeated and killed by Raedwald, King of East Anglia, the same, it is thought, who was buried at Sutton Hoo.

Raedwald already had his own candidate for the Northumbrian throne, and after the death of Ethefrid, Edwin, from another branch of the royal family, was crowned king. Oswald and his mother were, of course, seen as a threat, and had to flee into exile in Scotland. After further advancing the cause of Northumbria, Edwin was himself defeated some

years later by an alliance of British Christians under the Welsh prince, Cadwallon of Gwynedd, and Penda, the pagan king of Mercia.

Cadwallon, remembering an earlier bloody massacre by Edwin, then invaded Northumbria, and for eighteen months laid waste the countryside, until defeated by Oswald in a popular revolt. The battle of Heavenfield, near Hexham, from which Oswald emerged victorious, is considered one of the most important battles in English history, marking the end of British resistance to English domination, outside the Celtic fringe at least.

The battle also marked one of Oswald's principal claims to sainthood, as defender of the Faith, and an important figure in the conversion of England. Though Cadwallon was nominally Christian, he had certainly not acted like one, and there was no doubt in Oswald's mind, as to whose side God was on. Indeed, before the battle Oswald had a huge cross erected on the spot where he had chosen to fight, and spent the night, with his men around him, praying for victory. Victory duly came the next day, and, after a bitter struggle, Oswald's men, fighting literally with their backs to the Roman Wall, crushed the Welsh, Cadwallon dying a dismal death in the subsequent pursuit, probably at Devil's Water, south of Hexham.

Oswald, pledged already to convert his kingdom, which was still largely heathen, lost no time in sending for a missionary, eloquent and learned enough to bring this about. Rather than recall Paulinus, an Italian, who had already fled the country once, Oswald looked to his old school, the monastery of Iona in Scotland. However, the first candidate for bishop proved unsuitable, being neither a great preacher, nor a diplomat. Oswald persevered, and was sent an older man, Aidan, who, though over fifty, proved to be one of the great figures of Northumbrian history. Perhaps Oswald knew him already from his school days. Certainly, they seem to have become close friends, so much so that the king offered to act as the new bishop's interpreter among the English, since Aidan spoke no English, whereas Oswald spoke both English and Gaelic from his many years in exile. This service was later cited as another sign of Oswald's virtue, his humility in making himself the servant of the Church and, when Bede came to write his history, Oswald figured prominently, alongside Aidan, as the very proper example of a just ruler. In fact, if Oswald had not established law and order to a considerable level during his eight-year reign, Bede might never have been able to write his history.

In the event, Bede gives only one example of Oswald's qualities, when

he was alive. This occurred at a feast during Easter week, when the king, sitting down to dine with his guests, heard that there were a number of poor people outside the gates asking for bread. Not only did Oswald order that they should be fed sufficient for their needs from his own table, but that the silver dish, on which the bread was being served, should be sold for their benefit. Apparently, Aidan, impressed by such generosity, took the king by the hand, which had presented the gift, and said "May this arm never perish!".

However, it was as a martyr in his final battle that Oswald's reputation as a saint was really established. Again, it was against the pagan Penda, though this time it was on Penda's soil in Mercia at Maserfelth, or Maser's Field, in Shropshire. Here, Oswald also spent the night before the battle praying for his army in the coming fight. But this time his prayers went unanswered, and he and his men were literally hacked to pieces by the fierce heathen. Penda, determined to make an example to show what happens to invaders, had the various parts of Oswald's body left on stakes to rot, and these were not recovered by Oswiu, his brother and successor, until eighteen months later.

St Oswald: painted portrait in church of St Oswald, Tschirland, South Tyrol

But a curious story is told about Oswald's right arm. This was seemingly snatched by a crow, or more probably a raven, considering the size of the titbit, and taken up into a tree. Penda's caveat about leaving it to rot having thus been broken, the arm was rescued by local monks, and placed in a small church, which they built nearby, thus helping to fulfil Aidan's prophesy that the arm would be preserved. Tradition has it that the tree into which the crow, or raven, flew became known as Oswald's tree, hence Oswestry, a nearby town.

The crow appears in various depictions of Oswald, most notably in a stained glass window in St Oswald's church in Gloucester, to which the arm was later transferred. In the window the crow is seen perched on the saint's arm, almost as a familiar, which is again odd, since the crow, or raven, is a pagan symbol, and bird of ill omen. As a harbinger of death, however, it was undoubtedly appropriate, but probably the artist also wished to convey the mysterious working of God's will. Certainly, it was another example of how Christianity adapted pagan mythology for its own use.

Further symbols seen in pictures of Oswald are a sword, sceptre and orb for his kingship, a ciborium for his charity to the poor, and a palm branch for his martyrdom and efforts to bring peace and honour to his people. In these depictions Oswald is seen as a young man: indeed, he was only thirty-eight when he died. It is also said that he was pretty imposing physically, though this might be taken to be a *sine qua non* of leaders at the time.

One medieval source says of his appearance: "He had arms of great length and power, his eyes were blue, and his hair yellow. He had a long face with thin lips, usually wearing a benign expression. He wore a thin beard and often sat with his palms open on his knees in an attitude of prayer, which he often did for long hours of the night".

Despite appearances, Oswald was not universally popular. Certainly, in lands taken from the pagans in Mercia, he was regarded as a foreigner, and when his niece tried to have his body translated from where it was buried on the battlefield to Bardney, in Lincolnshire, then part of Mercia, the monks at first refused to receive it. This was long after Penda's death, and by this time Mercia was Christian, and Osthryth, Oswald's niece was queen. Yet the monks still kept the hearse, on which the royal remains lay, waiting outside the monastery, while inside they argued hotly whether they should receive it. Not until an ethereal light appeared over the coffin did they agree to let the funeral cortege enter. Nevertheless, in the event, Penda.'s efforts at stamping out Christianity by destroying the body of his enemy only served to spread the veneration of the saint further afield. Indeed, these vestigial signs, and others, became touchstones for the miracles necessary for Oswald, the king, to achieve recognition as a saint by the Church.

Bede gives several examples of such miracles, though he recounts few

occurring during Oswald's life. However, an early sign happened while Oswald was a student at Iona. One day he slipped on the ice and broke his right arm – a nice human touch here! It was very painful and, hearing that a monk was going to "the place of the holy cross" – was it Durham or less likely, Rome? – he asked him to bring back a piece to help relieve the pain. The monk duly returned with a piece of moss found growing from the wood and, as they were at supper, Oswald put it for safe-keeping in his robe, and promptly forgot about it. Waking in the middle of the night, he found that the moss was still inside his tunic. Going to remove it, he discovered that his arm was no longer painful. When he told the other monks in the morning, they took it that he was "Beloved of God"! Note that it was his right arm again, which seemed to be especially beloved of God.

Bede then goes on to say "How great his (Oswald's) faith was towards God, and how remarkable, has been made evident by miracles since his death, for in the place where he was killed by the pagans, fighting for his country, infirm men and cattle are healed to this day. Whereupon many took up the very dust of the place, where his body fell and, putting it into water, did much good with it to their friends who were sick. This custom came so much into use that, the earth being carried away by degrees, there remained a hole as deep as the height of a man. Nor is it to be wondered that the sick should be healed in the place where he died, for whilst he lived he never ceased to provide for the poor and infirm, and to bestow alms on them and assist them".

"Many miracles are said to have been wrought at that place", that is the spot where Oswald died. A number of these, too, are cited as examples: a horse cured of a fit, a girl recovered from the palsy, a bag of earth kept as a cure for future ailments being saved from a fire along with the post on which it hung. The description of the night in the house before the fire is, if nothing else, wonderfully evocative of those far off times: "They ate long at supper, and drank hard, with a great fire in the middle of the room". In all, Bede ascribes seven miracles to Oswald, one occurring as far away as Ireland, and all being vouched for, undoubtedly fulfilling the requisite number for canonisation.

The dismemberment of Oswald's body on the battlefield gave ample opportunity for the preservation and circulation of relics, thus promoting the cult of the saint. The various parts each had their own adventures. At one time there were five heads going the rounds. Clearly, they were not all

what they claimed to be, but in skull-shaped reliquaries, they may have been small shavings from the original. But, almost certainly, the actual head relic is the one placed in the coffin of St Cuthbert for safe-keeping during the Viking raids, and still there, in St Cuthbert's tomb in Durham Cathedral to this day. On statues and in paintings of St Cuthbert, he is generally shown as holding St Oswald's head in his left arm, and, since St Cuthbert was a saint revered throughout the whole Church, the cult of St Oswald benefited from this association.

The right arm, blessed by St Aidan, likewise was greatly treasured. It is traditionally reputed to have been enshrined in silver and kept in the church of St Oswald in the Northumbrian royal seat at Bamburgh. This early church no longer exists, but appears to have stood on the present site of the castle chapel, which is within the walls, but outside the Norman donjon. The chapel, along with the parish church, was later given to Nostell Priory, in West Yorkshire, and in the thirteenth century the monks there claimed to hold a substantial part of St Oswald's remains, presumably an arm.

However, it is also said that Oswald's right arm, found incorrupt, had been taken from Bamburgh by monks from Peterborough Abbey. Some say that it was stolen, though the Peterborough monks claimed that they found the church in a neglected state, and took the arm away for safe-keeping. That being said, it became one of the abbey's prized possessions, and was recorded as still incorrupt by Symeon of Durham, who wrote in the twelfth century. Like many relics all trace of it was lost at the Reformation. But with the recent excavations at Bamburgh, experts are hoping that something may be found.

The body, presumably including the legs since no one else mentions them, having been put to rest at Bardney, was also considered a valuable asset, and in the days of Norse piracy, all sorts of expedients were resorted to for the preservation of such a treasure. The reliquary, in which they were kept, was even saved from marauding Danes by Prior Aethelwold secreting it in the straw of his bed. However, because of such attacks, in 909 the remains were again translated, this time to St Peter's Priory in Gloucester, henceforth known as St Oswald's, where the saint's shrine was a conspicuous object of veneration until the sixteenth century. Three bones were said to have remained at Bardney, and there were others claimed by monasteries across the country, at Bath, Glastonbury, Reading, St Alban's,

Christchurch, Tynemouth, and York. The cult of St Oswald was thus spread widely and rapidly throughout the country. Indeed, by the tenth century there were over fifty churches dedicated to the saint in Northumbria and Mercia alone, and places were named after him, such as Oswaldkirk, Kirkoswald.

St Oswald's cult was also popular abroad, again associated with the spread of relics. St Winnoc's monastery in Bergues in Flanders claimed to have been given St Oswald's body – more likely a bone from it – by King Harold Harefoot. This was burnt by Protestants in 1588. St Willibrord is also recorded as taking a number of the saint's relics to Frisia, from where Oswald's people originated. Willibrord would have got these from St Wilfrid, whom he knew from his days as a student at Ripon. Willibrord's foundation at Epternach, in Luxemburg, certainly once claimed to possess the head.

Marriages helped as well to spread the cult abroad, three women in particular playing a prominent part! King Athelstan, Bretwalda and ruler of Britain in the tenth century, had a half-sister Edith. The king was a great collector of relics and on Edith's marriage to Otto the Great of Saxony in 930 he presented her with several, including some of St Oswald. Then, Lady Julia, widow of Earl Tostig of Northumbria, also took some with her when she married the Count of Flanders in the following century. Later, in the twelfth century, Matilda, daughter of Henry II and sister of Richard the Lion-Heart, married Henry the Lion of Saxony, and took other relics to Regensburg, where there was already a community of Irish monks from 1180. St Oswald was also adopted as a warrior saint by many crusaders. Once his feastday, 5th August (now 9th), the anniversary of his death, was incorporated into the Church calendar, his memory was perpetuated and he is thus still honoured today.

Myths and legends about St Oswald abound. One curious one concerns the Munich Oswald. An angel tells Oswald that he must take a bride. After a long search he falls in love with the daughter of a heathen king. She is willing, but her father puts all sorts of obstacles in their path. Oswald, however, with the help of a crow, overcomes all these, and the two are duly married. But the angel says that they are not to consummate the marriage, as they will both die within two years, and, if they sleep together, Oswald, rather than break this pledge, is to get out of bed in the night, and throw cold water over himself to cool his ardour. After a test like that, no wonder

he was made a saint! In fact, Oswald married Cyneburga, daughter of Cynegils, the first Christian king of Wessex. They had one child, a son, Ethelwald, who became king of Deira, but is said to have been little credit to his father.

So, to sum up, what can one say about Oswald in brief? Certainly he was possibly the most important English Saint before Edward the Confessor. Indeed, Bede presented him as the Northumbrian Constantine. There is even a statue of him on the thirteenth century west front of Wells Cathedral, founded in the early eighth century. Doubtless, there were many such statues of the saint in churches and monasteries, most of which would have been destroyed during the Reformation. Oswald's memory, however, survived all such attempts to destroy his cult, and he was never forgotten in his native Northumbria, where in his humility and his defence of the Faith he remains a shining example for leaders today.

MAIN SOURCES

Clare Stancliffe and Eric Cambridge (eds.), *Oswald; Northumbrian King to European Saint,* (Stamford, 1955).

John Sadler, *Battle for Northumbria,* (Bridge Studios, Morpeth, 1988).

Bede, *The Ecclesiastical History of the English People,* trans. J.Stevens, (Everyman's Library, Dent, London, 1910, re-printed 1970).

Sir Frank Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England,* in *The Oxford History of England,* (OUP, 3rd edn., 1971).

THE MEDIEVAL HOSPITALS OF NORTHUMBERLAND AND NEWCASTLE

R.M.Gard

Judging from the frequency of television programmes devoted to the study of the past, it would seem that there is an abiding interest among the general, or at least the viewing, public in the lives of our forebears from pre-historic times right up to those of recent memory. Curiously, the later Middle Ages, the five centuries following the Norman Conquest, do not appear to attract programme makers, and this lack of interest in the period and particularly in the medieval Catholic Church seems to be also shared by Catholics. Perhaps Catholics have succumbed to the Protestant view that anything 'pre-Reformation' was essentially antiquated and obscurantist, whereas, in reality, the Church in the later Middle Ages demonstrated some of the noblest achievements of the Christian faith. We owe our faith today as much to our forebears in the Middle Ages as to the apostles of the so-called Dark Ages and the martyrs of the Penal Years.

It is not that evidence for the medieval Church is lacking since physical remains abound: one might say, indeed, that "the very stones cry out". The noblest early buildings surviving are the cathedrals erected to the glory of God in what Catholics devotedly used to call 'the Ages of Faith', while the substantial remains of monasteries and religious houses are potent reminders of the dedication of countless lives to praising and serving the Lord. So much more, too, is being revealed of the lives of ordinary people in towns and villages, and how the Church was at the centre of communal life. This periodical is committed to tracing the history of the Church throughout the Christian centuries and it is thus appropriate that it should feature articles on the medieval Church as well as other periods. Much research has already been published and needs only to be brought out once again into the light, not merely as a recognition of the rich legacy left by our forefathers in the faith, but also as an encouragement to persevere and a reminder of the duty of handing on the faith to future generations.

The medieval Church was notable for, among other things, the founding and flourishing of the religious orders, particularly monks of the major monastic orders and the friars, with corresponding convents of religious women. All these merit renewed study. This article, however,

deals with Christian faith in its most basic action, the care of the sick and poor, though only, because of limited space, in Northumberland and Newcastle. It is primarily a listing of hospitals based on the pioneering work of Rotha Mary Clay in her *Medieval Hospitals of England* (1909), amplified by David Knowles and R. Neville Hadcock in their *Medieval Religious Houses of England and Wales* (1953, 1971). The list is arranged alphabetically and gives the dates of foundation and dissolution, where known, and references to the evidence. The principal local sources are coded as follows: *RMC* for Rotha Mary Clay; *JH* for John Hodgson's *History of Northumberland* (1827-1840); *HN* for *A History of Northumberland* (15 vols., 1897-1940); *AA* for *Archaeologia Aeliana;* and *Brand* for his *The History and Antiquities of . . Newcastle upon Tyne* (2 vols., 1789). Further reading and detailed research would doubtless uncover additional evidence. Berwick on Tweed was omitted by Knowles and Hadcock as being mainly in Scotland during the Middle Ages, and the brief references are those found by Miss Clay.

Of some 750 or so medieval hospitals, hospices and almshouses identified by Knowles and Hadcock, forty were in Northumberland and Newcastle and are the subject of this article. Little is known about the majority of these apart from occasional documentary references: few physical remains survive and even the sites of many are uncertain. Some were founded for one purpose but this was changed in later years: for instance, several leper hospitals ceased to serve this need when leprosy became less prevalent and became almshouses. Dedications are given when known, and these often indicate the object of the foundation, and sometimes the name survives to suggest the location, as with the name 'Spital'. Our Lady and St Mary Magdalene (often for leper hospitals) were popular dedications, as were St James (for pilgrims and wayfarers) and St Leonard (with his reputation for healing). Other dedications were possibly the favoured patrons of founders.

The hospitals were ecclesiastical, not medical, institutions. They were founded for the care of the soul rather than the cure of the body. Ideally, faith and love were the predominant features of their service, and the religious observances prepared the soul, as the body decayed, for the future life. The stricter routine of the larger, semi-monastic hospitals, in which inmates with infectious and contagious diseases could be segregated would have restricted the spread of sickness, but most would have been

badly affected by the Black Death, which killed one third of the country's population in the middle of the 14th century. As well as these hospitals, the major monasteries and religious houses also provided relief for the sick, poor and wayfarers, and offered a higher degree of medical attention than commonly available. Parishes, too, had an obligation to provide relief for their poor.

Hospitals dependent on religious houses were subject to supervision, while privately founded institutions came under the jurisdiction of the bishop. Most had endowments, mainly in land, the rents from which and from other income supported the staff and the inmates. None was immune from the inherent weaknesses of human nature, whether in mis-administration or moral laxity, delinquencies recorded in documentary evidence often providing the historian with the only knowledge of the institution's existence and continuance. There were abuses by the patrons, by the wardens and officials, and in later years, many wardens were non-resident or pluralists, and money was, as ever, the root of most ill-doing. Many hospitals had declined by the end of the 14th century. The preamble to a statute for the reform of hospitals in 1414 stated: "Many hospitals ... be now for the most part decayed and the goods and profit of the same, by diverse persons, spiritual and temporal, withdrawn and spent for the use of others, whereby many men and women have died in great misery for default of aid, livelihood and succour". Even so, the majority of the hospitals listed survived and doubtless did good work throughout their existence until their dissolution in the 16th century.

Knowles and Hadcock have distinguished medieval hospitals under the following broad categories, and their coded letters have been incorporated into the entries in the list:

A For resident brethren and sisters, and/or poor people under a master or chaplain, sometimes with a simple rule, and wearing a distinctive habit, with a chapel and common hall for meals, but otherwise like an almshouse.

B Lesser secular almshouse, usually with no resident master of chaplain.

C Primarily for aged, sick, or blind priests and clerks.

L For lepers. Several of the smaller leper-houses appear to have become extinct at the Black Death, and afterwards, when leprosy

became less common: most of the remainder seem to have become hospitals for the poor or sick, or merely almshouses for the aged. Some leper houses were subject to the English provincial house of Burton Lazars in Leicestershire.

P For the poor, aged and infirm, under a master, often with a chaplain or chaplains, brethren and/or sisters.

S Primarily for the sick poor, under a master, etc., as above.

T For poor pilgrims and wayfarers, often combined with other types.

T Lesser hospice for poor pilgrims and wayfarers.

m after A, etc. – for men (eg. Am)

w after A, etc. – for women (eg. Aw)

At many of the hospitals, the master or prior, chaplains, brethren and/or sisters followed a rule and wore a religious habit, and this often applied to leprous and other inmates also. The most usual rule was that of the Order of St Augustine (OSA). Comparatively few hospitals were fully Augustinian, though a number appear to have been under a simple rule, perhaps based on that rule. Hospitals controlled by monasteries sometimes, but not always, followed the rule of that monastery. Many hospitals seem to have been purely secular institutions throughout their life. Nearly all the monasteries provided accommodation for poor travellers and maintained their aged retainers, while several, like Newminster, had infirmaries for sick lay folk.

The Leper

The Pilgrim

ALLERBURN, or RYEHILL, or TOSSON, or HEPPLE, Near Rothbury. St Leonard. (P-T). Recorded in 1281; under a master in 1302; with a chaplain in 1331; under Newminster Abbey in 1535. (*HN*, XV, 337; *AA*, 4th ser., xvi, 181).

ALNWICK. St Leonard (L-P). Founded by Eustace de Vescy in memory of Malcolm III of Scotland, killed in battle nearby in 1193; under Alnwick Abbey from 1376, but ruinous in c.1535. (Tate, *History of Alnwick,* ii, 41-2; *RMC*, 261).

BAMBURGH. St Mary Magdalene. (Lm). For leper brethren, under a chaplain and warden. Recorded in Assize Roll, 40 Hen.III (1256), when it had been in existence for several decades, as there is a reference to an annual payment by Nostell Priory. Possibly founded by Henry III when in Bamburgh in 1221. In 1376 the warden had failed to provide a chaplain for ten years, and the chapel, hall and other buildings were ruinous. (*HN*, 1, 134-7).

BEDLINGTON. (L). Founded before 1203. (*RMC*, citing C.R.R., 1203).

BERWICK ON TWEED. St Mary Magdalene. (L?). Recorded in 1301. (*RMC*.311).

BERWICK ON TWEED. God's House. Founded by Philip de Rydale, 1286. (*RMC*.311).

BERWICK ON TWEED. St Edward. Recorded in 1246. (*RMC*.311).

BOLAM. St Mary. (T). Recorded in 1285 (*RMC*, 311). The church was appropriated to Blanchland Abbey in 1359, when the vicar lodged and entertained poor travellers in a competent house and buildings, under an honest man, and repaired and put up by the abbot and convent. (*JH*, II, i, 338-9).

BOLTON. St Thomas. (LmT, to c.1225; AmT, c.1336-c.1547). Founded, c.1225, for a prior or master, 13 leper brethren, 3 chaplains, and lay brothers, also relieving the poor and strangers, under the supervision of Kirkham and Rievaulx abbeys. Owing to Scottish raids a licence to crenellate the hospital was granted in 1336, after which there is no mention of lepers, and it was then probably more like a small monastery. (Leland, *Itinerary,* v, 65; *HN,* VII, 202-17).

CAPELFORD, near Norham. (L?). Recorded in 1311 (*RMC*, citing Patent Roll). Probably a leper hospital which had lately been destroyed by the Scots (Patent Roll, 1333), and no later records found. (*RMC*, 109).

CATCHBURNE. St Mary Magdalene. (L/T?). Built by Roger de Merlay II (d.1239). Recorded in 1282 and 1346, when a chaplain was appointed. Hodgson suggests that it was for wayfaring people, but most hospitals of St Mary Magdalene were for lepers. (*JH*, II, ii, 427, cf. 375, 480).

CATCHBURNE. St John. (*RMC*, citing Close Roll, 1363). Probably the same as previous entry.

ELISHAW. (T). Recorded c.1240. Founded, probably by an Umfreville, for a master, providing food and lodgings for wayfarers, with an income of £5 in 1292; it was wasted by the Scots in 1318; a master appointed in 1544. (*JH*, II, ii, 146-7).

EMBLETON. (L?). A hospital, probably for lepers, existed in the 13th century. A hospital at Spiteldene (Spitalford, south of Embleton), is recorded in 1314, but no later references. (*HN*, 11, 23-4).

HAREHOPE. St Lazarus(?). (L). Granted to Burton Lazars by Waldeve after 1178, and a Walter of Newcastle was master in 1189. The last reference is in 1334-5, and the hospital may have ended at the Black Death. (*HN*. XIV, 419-20; *AA*, 3rd ser., xix, 76-9).

HARTFORD BRIDGE. St James. (T). Founded by Richard de Plessis before 1201. In 1267 it was partly dependent on Brinkburn Priory, which provided a chaplain, but hospitality was no longer maintained by 2 Rich. II. (*HN*, IX, 284; *JH*, II, ii, 303-7).

HEPPLE. Recorded in Close Roll, 1362. (*RMC*, 380; *HN*, XV, 336-7. Same as Allerburn, above.

HEXHAM. St Giles. (LP-A). Said to have been founded c.1114 by an archbishop of York (probably Thurstan, after his election but before his consecration in 1119) in conjunction with the prior (OSA). It was for a master, poor labourers, infirm persons or lepers, apparently never more than 8 in all. It was for lepers in 1291, and ruined by the Scots in 1296. In decay in 1378, it was united with the Priory, which provided a chaplain, and maintained two poor people. (*HN*, III, 309-11).

MITFORD. St Leonard. (P). Founded by William Bertram (founder of Brinkburn Priory), temp. Henry I, and under a priest-warden. Some time after 1464 it was annexed to Newminster Abbey. (*JH*, II, ii, 76-7).

MORPETH. (S). William de Merlay granted land to the 'infirmary house' c.1160. The hospital was for sick persons. (*JH*, II, ii, 374, 469; *AA*. 4th ser., xvi, 177).

NEWBIGGIN. (L?). Recorded in 1391. Possibly sited near the former Spital House, between North Seaton and Newbiggin. (*RMC*, 312; *JH*, II, ii, 190,217).

NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE. St Mary the Virgin (and St John the Evangelist), Westgate. (CPT). Founded, c.1165, by Aselack of Killinghowe. For two regular brethren and a chaplain under a master or prior, serving God and the poor, and providing hospitality to indigent clergy and pilgrims. The number of brothers was later increased, and the hospital may have been partly dependent on the Benedictine nunnery. In 1412, after the death of the prior, there were only two regular brothers, and an Augustinian canon of Newburgh was appointed. The income was over £26 in 1535, when the hospital was for a master, a chaplain, 6 bedefolk, and lodging poor and wayfaring people who were destitute. Reverted to the Crown by 1540, and continued thereafter. (*Brand*, i, 67-85).

Hospital of St Mary the Virgin, Newcastle upon Tyne

NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE. St Katherine, or Maison Dieu, Sandhill. (A). Founded 1403 by Roger Thornton, a burgess, who was granted

licence in that year and in 1412. For a priest-warden, 9 poor brothers and 4 poor sisters. In 1535 the income was over £12, and in 1551 there were 5 poor women. Granted by Sir Richard Lumley of Lumley Castle to the mayor and burgesses in 1624. (*Brand*, i, 25-8).

NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE. St Mary Magdalene. (L-P). Said to have been founded by Henry I for a master or prior, brethren and sisters, to receive leprous persons. There were still lepermen in 1429. The income in 1535 was over £9, and in 1546 it had a non-resident priest-master and some 14 poor and impotent people. (*Brand*, i, 425-9).

NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE. St James, Barras Bridge. (L). This chapel seems to have belonged to a nearby lazar-house, an appendage of the hospital of St Mary Magdalene. (*Brand*, i, 196-7, 427, 431).

NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE. Nykson's Almshouses, by All Saints. (Aw). Founded by Elizabeth Nykson, widow, for 4 poor women. (*Brand*, i, 343-4).

NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE. Brigham's Almshouses, Pilgrim Street. (Aw). Founded by Christopher Brigham, sheriff in 1495, mayor in 1504 and 1505, for poor religious women. (*Brand*, i, 342).

NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE. St Mary, Jesmond. (T?). The chapel was built in the first quarter of the 12th century, and became a popular resort for pilgrims, as many reputed miracles occurred there. It was dissolved in 1548. Chapel and hospital, probably a hospice beside the chapel. (*HN*, XIII, 298-307; *Brand*, i, 198).

NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE. Nether Dene Bridge, near St Nicholas's. (Aw). Almshouse for a few poor women. (*Brand*, i, 338).

NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE. Pudding Chare, near St John's. (Aw). Almshouse for 7 poor persons, later for 10 poor widows. (*Brand*, i, 136).

NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE. Spital Almshouse, Westgate, opposite St John's church. (*Brand*, i, 105).

NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE. Stockbridge. (A). Almshouse, east of All Saints. (*Brand*, i, 399).

NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE. Ward's Almshouse, near the Austin Friars. (A). Founded by John Ward, mayor in 1448 and 1450, for 12 poor men and 12 poor women, as recorded in 1475. (*Brand*, i, 358).

NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE. Trinity House. A fraternity of mariners was

in being in 1505, and lodgings were provided for members who were destitute, with a chapel and priest. (*Brand*, i, 691ff.: J.R.Boyle, *Newcastle and Gateshead* (1890), 198ff.).

NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE. St Cuthbert's Inn or Hospice, Pilgrim Street. (T). Owned by the monks of Durham, later by the dean and chapter. Possibly other similar inns or hospices for travellers in this street. (*Brand*,i,339).

SHEEPWASH. (T). In 1379 Bishop Hatfield appointed a master for the hospital, on the death of the previous-master. Founded for the benefit of travellers. (*JH*, II, ii, 150-1).

SPITAL, by Blenkinsop, in Haltwhistle parish. (T?). Founded before 1274, probably for poor wayfarers. (*JH*, II, iii, 135).

SPITTAL, by Tweedmouth. St Bartholemew. (LS). The endowments of the leper hospital were confirmed by Bishop Poore in 1234, and the master, appointed in 1369, built a tower to protect the hospital, which, owing its poverty, was annexed to Kepier Durham before 1535, and alienated in 1552. (J.Raine, *North Durham*, 246-7).

STAGSHAW, On Dere Street, near Corbridge. Founded in the 13th century by one of the Claverings. It had languished by 1373. (*HN*, X, 73-4).

THROPTON, or ROTHBURY. St James. (P?). Founded probably by Roger fitz Roger, c. 1283, and in 1296 the master was assessed at over £3½. In 1493 the master was also master of Warkworth hospital, and both held under Hulne Priory before 1537. Both hospitals were probably for the poor and infirm. (*HN*, XV, 335).

TYNEMOUTH. St Leonard. Foundations discovered in 1885 show that the hospital was large and seemed to date before c.1220. Recorded in 1293, and it seems to have been partly under Tynemouth Priory and partly under the nunnery in Newcastle. 'Nuns' of Tynemouth, possibly sisters serving the hospital, are mentioned among lesser religious houses suppressed in 1536. (*HN*, VIII, 259-60, 289).

WARENFORD. St John the Baptist (?) (L). A leper hospital, recorded in 1253, may have been attached to an early chapel of St John the Baptist, which was claimed in 1249-56 by the brothers of the Holy Cross (Crutched Friars). The hospital and chapel later passed to the Duchy of Lancaster, and the hospital was granted by John of Gaunt to a hermit before 1399. (*HN*, 1, 249-51).

WARKWORTH. St John the Baptist. (P). Recorded in 1292. The hospital was for a master and brethren. It passed at some later date to Hulne Priory, and is called 'sometyme a Spytell', c.1537, as was Thropton. (*HN,* V, 237-9).

WELTON, or SPITAL. St Michael. (ST). Recorded in 1266. The hospital was for the benefit of persons going to the medicinal well there. In 1293 the master was wrongfully accused of causing the death of one of the sisters. It was valued at nearly £3 in 1296; probably destroyed by the Scots and never refounded. (*HN*, XII, 207-8).

WOOLER. St Mary Magdalene. (L?). The master was accused of trespass in 1288. In 1302 Adam of Sherburn was appointed master. No reference found after 1490. (*HN*, XI, 292-3).

Hospitals and similar charities which had outlived their usefulness had mostly been suppressed before the general dissolution of religious houses under Henry VIII, and their funds often put to other purposes, such as schools. Some hospitals fell with the closure of the smaller religious houses in 1536, those dependent on the greater houses in 1539, and the remainder with the Acts of 1545 and 1547 dissolving chantries, free chapels, hospitals and guilds. Generally speaking, institutions in private or ecclesiastical hands were suppressed, those in the possession of corporate bodies were continued, a feature of many of the Newcastle hospitals. While a result of the dissolution of the monasteries and religious houses was to increase the number of poor and vagrants, it has to be said that this was not intended, and attempts were made to temper this effect of the confiscations by requiring beneficiaries to continue the charity which the religious houses had provided. Also, the ending of the ecclesiastical provision for the relief of the poor prompted the philanthropy of wealthy burgesses and landed families, some of the Newcastle hospitals listed being probably of 16th century foundation.

BLESSED THOMAS PERCY (1528-1572)

George Thornton

The family of Thomas Percy, 7th Earl of Northumberland has a distinguished pedigree and a turbulent history.[1] The House of Perci takes its name from Perci-en-Auge in the Calvados region of Normandy. William de Perci came to England at the Conquest and already at the Domesday Survey, as lord of Topcliffe, held 32 manors in Lincolnshire and 86 in Yorkshire. He re-founded the abbey at Whitby and died in Palestine on the first Crusade in 1096. The family connection with Northumberland dates from 1310 when Henry de Perci II bought the barony of Alnwick and was knighted by Edward I, the 'Hammer of the Scots', for his part in the victory at Dunbar. Henry de Percy III commanded the right wing of the victorious army in the defeat of the Scots at Neville's Cross. Henry de Percy IV was Governor of Berwick, a key post on the Borders, and fought at Crecy, while his son was made Marshall of England in 1376 and Earl of Northumberland by Edward III for his part in the French campaigns.

Bloody deaths, as well as honours, became a family tradition. Harry Hotspur, the fiery son of the first Earl, was killed by an arrow while fighting against the King at Shrewsbury in 1403 and his drawn and quartered body exhibited in York and Newcastle. The Wars of the Roses claimed the next two Earls, who espoused the Lancastrian cause: Hotspur's son died at the battle of St Alban's in 1455, and his successor at Towton Fields in 1461. The fourth Earl had a worse fate, for he was 'furiouslie and cruellie murthered by the rude and beastlie people' in his own home at Coxlodge, near Thirsk, as he tried to collect a special levy imposed by Parliament. The fifth Earl, Henry Algernon, was 'Esteemed both of Scots and English, more like a prince than a subject', and had a household of 166 and a barony of 33 townships. However, the newly emerging class cared naught for wealth and titles, so that when Henry Algernon fell out of favour with the powerful Wolsey, he was committed to the Fleet prison and, although released after a month, his spirit was broken and he died in penury shortly afterwards in 1527. The sixth Earl was raised in the household of Wolsey where, at the royal court, Anne Boleyn took his fancy; unfortunately for him Henry VIII had similar ideas and Wolsey warned him not to press his suit. He conformed to the religious changes and died without issue in June 1537.

On the 20th of the same month in 1537, Henry's heir apparent as Earl,

his brother Sir Thomas Percy was executed with other gentry and many commoners for rising in the Pilgrimage of Grace. The title and lands were attainted, so that Thomas's children, Thomas, Henry and Katherine, could not succeed, and grew up in obscurity. Seemingly, Henry VIII had succeeded in his aim of destroying Percy power in the unruly North, which henceforth would be governed by loyal men in the Council of the North, based in York. But although the Percy family had been eclipsed, the people's faith had not; amid simmering discontent and border feuding prophecies flourished: 'The moon shall kindle again, and take the light of the sun, meaning by the moon the blood of the Percies'; a Yorkshire tiler told some friends in 1538 that if anything happened to the King, a Percy would inherit and 'he would cause Ingland to shine as bryght as seynt George'.[2]

When the Catholic Queen Mary acceded to the throne in 1553, it seemed that almost miraculously the prophecies would be fulfilled, for the change of monarch soon brought about a dramatic change in the fortunes of the House of Percy. For his recapture of Scarborough Castle from the Protestant force of Sir Thomas Stafford, Thomas Percy was knighted and made Baron Percy of Cockermouth; then, on 1 May 1557, in Whitehall with much pomp and ceremony, he was made seventh Earl of Northumberland and full family honours were restored. In the fifth year of Mary's reign the Earl was given the high honour of carrying the sword of state before the monarch as she processed to open Parliament. Borders were still in a state of turmoil so the Earl was given the key posts of Warden of the East and Middle March and Captain of Berwick, and fought several engagements with Scottish and French troops along the Border.

Thomas Percy's appointment as seventh Earl brought much joy to the North; oxen were roasted in every village from Beverley to Berwick, the aged Bishop of Durham sang High Mass in the cathedral, the beacons were bright with bonfires. 'Men whose fathers, like the Earl's, had lost their lives in the Pilgrimage of Grace, came in their hundreds to give the feudal greeting. Almost royal was the progress made from Breamish to Alnwick and along the Border.' Men flocked to his service and he showed himself an excellent Border Warden, as his father had been, for both his character and way of life heightened his popularity. His chronicler describes him as 'affectionate and simple-minded, a warm friend, a jovial and hospitable neighbour, a kind and generous master, devoted to field sports and martial

exercises.' 'Ever they kept open house, with meat and drink for all who came, they always rode with a noble company of servants and orderly apparel, their amusements they sought not in dicing but in pastimes of hawking and hunting.' 'In truth it could be written that this bearded cheerful man, going a little bald in his early forties, rather hot tempered, deeply religious and sincere, lived in a different world from the *astutia* of the Elizabethans.[3]

It is easy to imagine such men conceiving contempt for the intrigues of court life, epitomised by Cecil. When it was possible to travel only about fifteen miles a day on the rough roads, London was a long way away. Hunsdon was right when he wrote to the Privy Council that the people in the North 'know no prince but a Percy'. The new Queen Elizabeth invested the seventh Earl with the Order of the Garter in recognition of his services. In the early years of her reign he made no opposition to her radical changes in religion and his name appears on a list of Commissioners appointed to 'remove the abuses' of the Church in the North, although dramatic events soon to unfold revealed that he remained steadfast in his loyalty to the Catholic faith.

The causes, course and consequences of the Rising of the North have been charted elsewhere.[4] The chief concerns of this essay are to examine the extent to which the Earl of Northumberland was a willing participant and to describe his eventual fate.

When Mr Secretary Walsingham wrote: 'Scotland is the postern-gate to any mischief or peril that may befall this realm', he would have had especially in mind the arrival of Mary, Queen of Scots, at Workington by boat from across the Solway Firth on 16 May 1568. Three years previously she had told a Catholic priest that she 'trusted to find many friends when Time did serve among those of the old religion', doubtless she was encouraged by earlier offers of help from Elizabeth. Northumberland at once wrote to Cecil requesting that Mary be given into his care, as she had landed in his Liberty of Cockermouth, but Lowther, the Under-Warden, allowed the Earl only a brief visit and refused to hand over the fugitive Queen. In the following months Mary exchanged letters with the Earl and encouraged his loyalty by sending him and his wife rings and tokens.

There is no doubt that Northumberland was fully aware of the plot to marry the Queen of Scots to England's premier duke, Norfolk, thereby undermining Cecil and securing Mary's strong claims to the succession,

while facilitating a lasting peace with France and Spain. Northumberland was opposed to the plot and told Mary 'how her marriage with the Duke was disliked, he being counted a Protestant, and if she looked to recover her estate, it must be by advancing the Catholic religion'. He was not willing 'to hazard myself for the marriage'. Norfolk himself retreated to East Anglia where he vacillated for a week before returning to London, and to the Tower.

The North was by now full of rumours and tensions. The Earl of Northumberland and Charles Neville, Earl of Westmorland, were summed to the Council of the North at York, but Elizabeth, not satisfied by the President's report, ordered them both to attend court. Here was a dilemma: to obey meant the Tower, to disobey was treason. In the hall of Brancepeth Castle the Earls, their ladies and the assembled gentry had an agonising debate as they were torn by conflicting feudal and national loyalties.

Northumberland harboured bitter personal grievances against the Queen for he had suffered greatly from her policy of weakening the powers of the North in her pursuit of absolute sovereignty. She had deprived him of his Wardenship of the Middle March, had allowed him no part in the custody of Mary, and had denied his claim for compensation over the Crown's seizure of the newly discovered rich copper mines in the Newlands Valley on his land. Both the two great Northern Earls were now reduced in status and wealth to relative poverty. Yet Northumberland was loath to rebel, pointing to their lack of money and of grain after a bad harvest, a scarcity of victuals and the absence of artillery. Furthermore, The Duke of Norfolk was in the Tower and Leonard Dacre of Naworth was away in London, and without him help from the Scottish Border lords of Maxwell and Herries was unlikely.

There was a strong argument, too, that a rising against a legitimate monarch was morally wrong and would not have the Church's blessing unless Elizabeth had first been excommunicated – the Pope's Bull of Excommunication was not promulgated until February 1570. The argument that Elizabeth had excommunicated herself by refusing to see the Papal Nuncio, first proposed by Nicholas Morton (a spy from Rome?), and now advanced again by Thomas Markenfield, was rejected. Northumberland's confessions after the Rising are most revealing and need not be doubted for he was then facing certain execution. The Earl of Westmorland 'ever seemed to be cold therein so I am persuaded that it be never attempted

but throughe the earnest meanes of my Lady his wief'. Weeping bitterly, 'my Lady W' cried out 'We and our countrie were shamed for ever that nowe, in the ende, we shoold seke holes to creepe into'. Ann, Countess of Northumberland, was of a similar mind and rode with the rebel forces through Yorkshire – in exile later in Europe she was an inveterate plotter with Don Juan of Austria, on behalf of Mary, Queen of Scots. On 26 November 1568 Hunsdon wrote to Cecil about Northumberland: 'He ys very tymerus, and yt ys affyrmde, hath ment, twyse or thryse, too submytt hymselfe, but that hys wyfe, beyng the stowter of the too, dothe hasten hym, and yncorage hym to persever'.

The other prime movers in the decision to rise up in rebellion were four gentlemen from among the many staunchly Catholic families in the North: Richard Norton, the eighty-one year old sheriff of Yorkshire, father of nine sons, and who, had been out in the Pilgrimage of Grace; Christopher Neville, Westmorland's uncle, who had been involved in the riots in 1554 with the northern families of Rokeby, Bowes and Wycliffe; Thomas Markenfield and the aforementioned Dr Nicholas Morton, who had just returned from Europe fired with enthusiasm for the Counter-Reformation.

The assembly broke up in disarray. Markenfield, Francis Norton, John Swinburne and the two Tempests left immediately 'providing to make shift for themselves'. Northumberland intended leaving the next morning but was persuaded 'to enter still further into the matter by Old Norton and the other gentlemen' who argued that if the Earl left he would cast away not only himself but them also for 'they that remayned still in that opinion to rise'. At last, seeing that there was no escape, the Earl agreed to rise but in his own time. He would gather his forces and join the Earl of Westmorland 'about the Water of Tyne against such time as our adversaries should come against us, and to hazard the matter in such place as might advantage us': his hesitancy and caution were all too obvious.

The following morning Westmorland had escorted Northumberland a few miles from Brancepeth on his way to Alnwick and bade him farewell when Norton rode up with others and willed him to return 'with very earnest meanes and persuasions', ourselves were caste away and them too, if my Lord and I should sunder'. A servant of the Earl, George Pryngall, plucked him by the sleeve and urged him to return for some of the others were desperately bent. Returning, he met Westmorland on his way to Durham 'to begin the matter there', clearly intending to begin the rising on

his own. A final anxious consultation took place, vividly described by Northumberland: 'walking up and down till the sun was sett, riding neither one way nor other, notwithstanding their great persuasions, they seeing I could not be brought to it, one of my Lord's servants called Wightman came harde behind me, and said, and I should not choose but go'. Of a sudden, the Earl was won over to immediate action; 'then, if it be so, have with you'; he was later informed that if he had not turned back some of the others meant him 'an ill turne'.

Thus, eventually and most reluctantly, the seventh Earl of Northumberland agreed to raise the standard of revolt against the Queen in the only domestic rising in her long rule of forty-five years. It was a momentous decision and one with profound consequences.

In his confession, Northumberland maintained that he had been 'drawn into it perforce'. Clearly, he was a most reluctant participant and became a leader of the rebellion not because he was an instigator but by virtue of his position as a feudal lord. Though an experienced and skilful Border Warden, well used to skirmishes, he was no general of an army which, at its southernmost point of advance, on Bramham Moor on 22 November 1569, mustered only 3,800 footmen, 'mostly artificers and the meanest sort of husbandmen, and 1,600 horsemen, for the most part gentlemen and their household servants and tenants'. The rebels came mainly from the locality of the seats of the nobles, around Durham, Richmond and Kirby Moorside, out of loyalty to their lord, with the promise of wages, or by coercion under the threat of spoil or burning. Cecil wrote that two- thirds of the people of the North were still Catholic in religion, so that it is no surprise that in all three public proclamations, at Darlington on 16 November and later at Staindrop and Richmond, the Earl's determination to restore the 'ancyent customs and usages' in religion was emphasised. Everyone 'being above the age of sixteen and (below) sixty, as your dutie to God doth bynde you, for the settinge forthe of his trewe and catholicke religion, come and resort unto us with all spedewith such armour and furnyture as you have. This fail you not. God save the Queen'.

Lord Westmorland his ancyent raisde,
The Dun Bull he rays'd on hye,
And three Dogs with golden collars
Were there sett out most royalle.

Erle Percy there his ancyent spred,
The Halfe-Moone shining all soe faire,
The Norton's ancyent had the crosse,
And the five wounds our Lord did beare.

[Two verses from *Reliques of Ancient Poetry*, edited by Bishop Percy, 1878.]

Two events illustrate the strength of feeling for the old faith and represent the high points of the otherwise ill-conceived, disorganised and abortive rising. In many village churches in Durham and North Yorkshire Mass was celebrated for the first time in twelve years, and on 4 December in a packed cathedral in Durham, the heart of the rebellion, a Mass of Reconciliation was celebrated, at which the kneeling congregation, including the Earl of Northumberland, was absolved from heresy. A month later to the day the chief celebrant, Thomas Plumtree, was executed in Durham market-place. The fate of the other celebrants, William Holmes, who gave the absolution, and Robert Peirson is unknown. One week later a Mass of feudal splendour and pageantry was celebrated in the collegiate church of Ripon. A long procession filed into the church, first the Earls of Northumberland and Westmorland, and their Countesses, then a long line of gentlemen and retainers, wearing corselets and white armour, with bows and arrows, bill and spears, and in their midst a banner "God speed the Plough". All bore on their shoulders the red cross of the Crusaders. Richard Norton, doyen of the congregation and veteran of the Pilgrimage of Grace, held aloft the cross with streamers he had carried thirty-three years previously. Priests, nobles, gentlemen, retainers and peasants together offered up their beloved Mass under the 'Banner of the Five Wounds', with the legend 'In hoc signo vinces'.

The small army advanced to Bramham Moor, near Boroughbridge, and camped there, but after three days of deliberation, the decision was taken on 24 November to retreat, an admission of failure. A similar decision was made by Prince Charles at Derby in 1745 began the retreat of the Jacobite Army and effectively ended the final attempt to recover the throne for a Stuart monarch. Northumberland had earlier been warned against rising by Norfolk, by De Spes, the Spanish ambassador, whose offers of help from the Duke of Alba in the Low Countries were now seen to be hopelessly exaggerated. The rebels desperately needed some spectacular success and sent a flying column of horsemen as far south as Selby with the hope of rescuing Mary from captivity at Tutbury. But this enterprise had been

foreseen and Mary had been taken the previous day to Coventry. In any case, Mary did not want to become involved; she had advised Northumberland against rising, and her rescue would have endangered her chances of succeeding to the throne.

Unfortunately for the rebels, no support was forthcoming from Lancashire, Cornwall, Cumbria and East Anglia, where there had been disaffection and where many still held to the old faith, for, in truth, the Houses of Percy and Neville were hardly known outside the North. Two loyal armies were gathering in the south, in Warwickshire and Lincolnshire, while in the North itself both York and Newcastle stood firm for the Crown, and Sir Henry Percy, the Earl's brother, remained loyal to the Queen at Alnwick. Families were divided in their loyalties. Ominously, too, Lord Hunsdon's force along the Tyne stood behind the rebels. A successful but pointless siege of Barnard Castle and the seizure of the port of Hartlepool by Sir Christopher Neville were the only notable incidents in the short campaign, before the decision to disperse was finally made at Brancepeth Castle on 16 December.

The rebel Lords advised 'the commone people must make shift for themselves' and they themselves fled westwards into Liddesdale. The Earl of Westmorland, Countess Anne, Richard Norton, with his son Francis, Thomas Markenfield, John Swinburne of Chopwell, Robert Tempest, with his son Michael, Cuthbert and Christopher Neville managed to escape by taking ship, probably from Leith, to Flanders, where they lived on meagre pensions from the King of Spain until they died in exile. On Christmas Day Cecil reported to his Queen: 'the vermin be fledd into forrain coverts'.

Thomas Percy was not so fortunate. The Borderers believed it 'a liberty incident to all nations to succour banished men', so that their homes became a regular refuge for alien fugitives on both sides of the Border.[4] The Earl stayed safely for periods with Black Ormston, Jock o' the Side and the Lord's Jack, characters with lives doubtless as colourful as their names, but was then betrayed by Hector Armstrong of Harelaw, a friend from earlier days, into the hands of the Scottish Regent Moray for £2,000. Hector was henceforth branded a Judas and the expression 'to take Hector's cloak' came to mean betraying a friend. The capture was unpopular on the Border, where the rebel cause found much sympathy, and there was an unsuccessful attempt by Scots and the men of Bewcastle to rescue the Earl.[5] It was an irony that Moray imprisoned the Earl in Lochleven Castle,

from which Mary, Queen of Scots, had escaped to become the focus of hope for Catholics in the North. In the Earl's two and a half years in Lochleven, its laird, a zealous Calvinist, frequently disputed with him, but the Earl remained steadfast, spending much time in prayer, refusing to eat meat on fasting days, and writing in a book (which survives) prayers and passages that stirred him.

The countess in exile raised a sum for a ransom but she was outbid by Elizabeth. In May 1572, the Earl was put on board a ship ostensibly bound for Antwerp but, in fact, sailing for Coldingham. Thus, he passed from the hands of Marr, now Regent, into the custody of Elizabeth's cousin, Lord Hunsdon, Captain of Berwick, for the princely sum of £2,000. While at Berwick he answered the numerous questions concerning the Rising which were sent up from London. He was well aware that eventūally he would be executed, and it is said that, during a fever at this time, his only fear was that he would die of it and so be deprived of a martyr's crown. Hunsdon was ordered to conduct the Earl to York for execution but declined the disgrace and it fell to Sir John Forster, who held the Earl's forfeited estates, to escort the prisoner, arriving on 21 August, and straightaway the Earl was informed that his sentence would be carried out the following morning.

Blessed Thomas Percy

Portrait in stained glass window in the Bailiffgate Museum, formerly St Mary's RC church, Alnwick

It is said that the Earl received his sentence with joy, and spent the night in prayer, attended by a faithful servant, John Clerk. Hutton, the Dean of York, and Palmer, a Calvinist minister, disputed with

him unsuccessfully for a long time, Sir John Forster declared the next day 'I have known the Earl for many years, but have never marked in him so much learning, such telling speeches, such gentleness and steadfastness, as he showed and uttered lastnight'. Clerk offered to read from A Dialogue of Comfort against Tribulation which Thomas More had written when awaiting his own death, and urged him to take some rest. The Earl replied 'If Christ chid his disciples because they watched not with him even one hour, would you have me pass one hour at in sleep, when so little of life is left to me? It shall not be; this hour at least will I keep watch with my Lord'.

The Earl's execution took place at 'the Pavement'. As was the custom, he was permitted to address the crowd, when the prisoner was expected to confess his crimes and plead for the Queen's mercy and God's forgiveness. The Earl declared that 'from my childhood until this day, I have lived in the faith of that Church, which is knit and bound together throughout the whole Christian world, and that in this same faith am I now about to end this wretched life. As for this upstart Church of England, I know it not'. Here, Palmer broke in, telling him that he was dying an obstinate papist and a member, not of the Catholic, but of the Romish Church. 'What you call Romish', the Earl replied, 'is the Catholic Church, the same that was founded upon the doctrine of the Apostles, with Christ Jesus himself for its corner-stone: that was established in martyrs' bloode, adorned with the confessions of the holy fathers, and that abideth ever the same; against which, as our Saviour has said, the gates of hell shall not prevail'. He lamented of the fate of his followers: 'It grieveth me much that on my account so many of the simple people have been put to a hard death, for the zeal they had of God's religion, and for the love they bore unto me. And would that by my death I could have kept them in life, though I fear not but that their souls have by this gained the bliss of heaven'. He commended his children and servants to his brother Henry, asked forgiveness of all, and assured all of his forgiveness, crossed and kissed the block, invoked 'Lord, receive my soul', and was summarily beheaded. His head was fixed and remained on Micklegate Bar for two years, and his body buried in Holy Cross church. The church no longer stands and the place of his burial is unknown.

By a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites on 13 May 1895, Thomas Percy was declared Blessed, it being established on the best authorities that 'he preferred martyrdom to life and honours, held out to

him, if only he would revolt from the faith'. One such authority was Cardinal William Allen, a contemporary of the Earl, who wrote: 'We can tel you that the renowned countie of Northumberland died a saint and holie martyr; for, what former quarel or cause of death soever ther was, yet was he a true martir, in that he was offered his life yf he would alter his religion; as divers others were of the same action in the north, and al other priestes pretended to be condemned for other treasons. Which life and living inasmuch as they refused for Christ and his faith, when it was offered, they be in the number of saints and confessors, no lesse then if they had died onelie for the same'. (*Answer to England's Justice*, 42- 3).

Compared with what one might consider a clean death suffered by Blessed Thomas Percy, the fate of many who had taken part in the Rising was vengeful and cruel, the object of the Crown being to discourage any discontent by showing how rebels were dealt with. Thomas Plumtree, who was executed in Durham market-place has also been declared Blessed. Thomas Norton, the younger brother of old Richard Norton, and his nephew Christopher, who were both Committed to the Tower, were hung, drawn and quartered at Tyburn on 27 May 1570. Only nine rebels of wealth and inheritance were executed, the rest attainted so that their lands passed to the Crown to defray the costs of suppressing the Rising.

The fate of the rank and file was indeed grievous. Cecil ordered that 'the example be very greate'. Sussex wrote to Elizabeth 'it will not be under 600 or 700, at the very least, that shall be executed of the common sort, besides prisoners taken on the field'. Sir George Bowes, who had been allowed to leave Barnard Castle unharmed with 400 of the garrison after his surrender to the rebels, reported that 'he did see them executed in every market town 'twixt Newcastle and Wetherby'. From extant lists, it is known that 81 were hanged in Durham, 314 in the county of Durham, 57 from 215 listed in Richmondshire, and 24 from 41 listed in Darlington. Bowes wrote of the difficulties of his task as circuit commissioner, 'the places where the prisoners are taken are far distant, the weather extreme, the country impassible with snow, some are fled ...'. No lists exist for Bywell, Hexhamshire or Northumberland. Historians estimate that the number who were executed under martial law as being between 600 and 700. The example was indeed great and in marked contrast to the virtually bloodless rising.

The Rising in the North has been variously described as 'the last

episode in 500 years of protest by the Highland zone against the interference of London',[6] and as 'the final fling of medieval feudalism against encroaching Tudor absolutism'; it marks a crucial stage in the Crown's policy of substituting royal for magnate power in governing the troublesome North, and in replacing the old Faith with the new Protestantism. Yet the advent of new priests from Douai, Louvain, and other seminaries in Europe kept alive the flickering flame of the Catholic Faith, which had been symbolised by the banner of the Five Wounds carried in the rebellions of 1536 and 1549 and under which Thomas Percy and the rebels of 1569 processed with such pride into the collegiate church in Ripon.

Some of the problems of these troubled Tudor times are still with us even four centuries later: central and local government still dispute with each other as to where real power lies, and there are still marked social and economic differences between the North and the more prosperous South. For Catholics today it is salutary to reflect on the high price Blessed Thomas Percy, his fellow martyrs and commoners placed on the Faith we so often take for granted in our freedom to worship.

NOTES

1. W. Percy Hedley, *Northumberland Families,* Vol. II, pp. 10-19. Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle upon Tyne,' 1970.
2. A. Fletcher, *Tudor Rebellions,* Longmans, 1983, p.38.
3. E.B.Foublanque, *Annals of the House of Percy*, Vol. II, 1887, p.9.
4. G.B.Thornton, 'The Rising in the North 1569', *Northern Catholic History*, No.17, pp.3-9; and unpublished M.A. thesis 'The Rising in the North', Durham University, 1953.
5. D.L.W.Tough, *The Last Years of a Frontier*, Oxford, 1928, p.208.
6. A. Fletcher, *op. cit.*, p.96.

OTHER SOURCES

G.C.Burton, 'Blessed Thomas Percy', *Northern Catholic Calendar*, 1896.

M.M. Merrick, *Thomas Percy, Seventh Earl*, 1949.

R.R.Reid, 'The Rebellion of the Northern Earls', *Royal Historical Society,* Vol. XX, 1906.

C.Sharp, *Memorials of the Rebellion of 1569*, 1841, reprinted by The Scoular Press, 1975.

Two poems commemorate the Rising: 'The White Doe of Dylstone', by William Wordsworth, and 'The Rising of the North', from *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry,* collected by Bishop Percy of Dromore, Bohn, 1878.

Special thanks to Bruce Collyns of Alnwick for the photograph of the portrait of Blessed Thomas Percy.

MRS. DURHAM AND THE SUPPRESSION OF THE JESUITS

The Rev. W. Vincent Smith and the Rev. Geoffrey Holt, S.J.

Editorial Note. Many years ago the late Fr Vincent Smith wrote a paper with this title 'Mrs. Durham and the Suppression of the Jesuits'. A copy, given by Fr Vincent Smith to the late Dr A.M.C.Forster, is among Dr Forster's papers deposited in the Northumberland Record Office (ref. NRO.1954/74). The paper was never published and is here reproduced (in part), together with notes by Fr Geoffrey Holt, S.J. Fr Holt's notes are printed in italics. Fr Vincent Smith's paper was been slightly edited, one change being the substitution of 'Fr' for 'Mr.', the usual designation of a priest in the 18th century and found in the documents quoted, but which Fr Vincent Smith also adopted when referring to priests in his text. This change has been made to avoid confusion between text and quotations.

This title 'Mrs. Durham' was used by the Jesuits for over 200 years as an alias for the Durham District. Its full title was the 'Residence of St John the Evangelist', or, in shorter form, the 'Durham District'.

The Residence of St John the Evangelist was made up of the counties of Durham, Northumberland and Cumberland.

THE BACKGROUND

The Society of Jesus was suppressed and disbanded by Pope Clement XIV on July 21st, 1773. While no doubt the news was soon known in England, Bishop Challoner did not receive the official copy of the Brief for two months. Writing twice to Bishop Walton at York in the October, he gave a precis of the Decree and wrote that he found three difficulties arising from it and gave his solutions of them. The first difficulty was that a copy of the Brief was to be presented to each Jesuit who was to sign his submission to it. Bishop Challoner wrote that to make the many copies required would be too expensive and to spread them abroad would be too dangerous, for the safety of the priests. He was, therefore, asking all the Jesuits near to hand to call and see him, to give them the Brief to read and then ask them to sign their submission. When the Bishop wrote, eighteen Jesuits in London had already done so. Secondly, the Bishop had difficulties of their faculties. This he had shelved by continuing their present faculties for another year. Lastly, the greatest difficulty was that the Decree ordered that all temporalities must be handed over to the Bishops for the good of the Church. Bishop Challoner foresaw that this would cause great consternation

amongst the members of the Society and he solved it by appointing the then Provincial, Fr More, as his Vicar General of all the Jesuits in the London District, which included Maryland and other parts in America.

Because of the penal laws, if the Brief of Suppression had been made public in England and Wales, the safety not only of the priests but also that of the Vicars Apostolic would have been put at risk.

The Holy See restored the Society in Russia, where it had continued to exist, in 1801, and, two years later, the then General aggregated to the Society what may be called the English Province, consisting of the survivors from 1773 and other priests who had been ordained after that date after being educated and trained at Liège and Stonyhurst. The story of the English Jesuits from 1803 to 1829 is not *ad rem,* since by that time there were so few members left in the two counties to be discussed.

The Society had continued to exist in Russia because the Empress Catherine II had refused to allow the Suppression. In the Brief Catholicae Fidei *(1801), Pope Pius VII recognised this, and thus the Society existed, but only in Russia. Then, in 1802, Cardinal Consalvi the Papal Secretary of State, wrote to the Jesuit General in Russia to say that the Brief* Catholicae Fidei *did not prevent former Jesuits or others who wished from joining up with those in Russia. The English ex-Jesuits and some others received papal permission to do so. The General appointed a Provincial for England, Scotland and Ireland, Fr Marmaduke Stone. There were 73 former English Jesuits still alive.*

THE AUTHORITIES FOR THESE PAGES

When the late Fr Meskell lent me the whole of the MSS of the Durham Residence at Farm Street, it was on condition that I left undisturbed any skeletons I found in the cupboard. I was pleased to be able to reply there was not even a whiff of any unpleasantness. The pile of MSS was large - over 5OO pages of typescript. The most important are the series of account books from 1749 to 1795, which are nearly complete. There are earlier papers and later ones down to the middle of the 19th century. No doubt there are other MSS at Farm Street and possibly at Stonyhurst which deal with the Suppression in general and the Durham Residence in particular, but of these I have no knowledge and, in fact, have made no enquiries.

Some of the Society's MSS of this time – I suspect that they fell into the hands of the secular clergy on the closing of the Jesuit mission in Newcastle in 1807 – are now in the Archives of the Diocese of Hexham and

Newcastle. Bishop William Walton was the active Vicar Apostolic of the Northern District at the time of the Suppression and his papers, such as they are, and those of his successor, Bishop Matthew Gibson, are in the Library at Ushaw College. By the way, the references to the Ushaw Collection of MSS in Burton's *Life and Times of Bishop Challoner* are incorrect.

The loan of the papers was hardly good archival practice but it was a long time ago! The papers were not typescript. This is the place to thank Fr Vincent Smith once again for many pages of copies of papers in the North East which he gave to the British Jesuit Province archives. He was also helpful to the present writer in supplying information over several months – but there was a closed season during a Test Match! It is quite possible that Jesuit papers came into the hands of secular clergy when they took over Jesuit missions.

DRAMATIS PERSONAE

The Seculars

The Northern District was geographically divided by the Pennine range of hills. On the West were the four counties of Westmorland, Cumberland, Lancashire and Cheshire, and on the East, Northumberland, Durham and Yorkshire. Ecclesiastically in the 18th century, the hills also formed a dividing line. In 1773 the Vicar Apostolic, who lived in Lancashire, was Bishop Francis Petre, who died in 1775, aged 84. His papers appear to be non-existent. On the East side was his co-adjutor, Bishop William Walton, who had worked with Bishop Challoner in London and was deeply in his confidence. Bishop Walton, on his succession to the whole District in 1775, continued to live in Yorkshire, and on his death in 1780, he was succeeded by Bishop Matthew Gibson, who lived in Co. Durham and died in 1790. He was followed by his brother, Bishop William Gibson, a difficult character but by then the Jesuit problem was expected to be solved by time. Bishops Walton and Matthew Gibson had, as Vicar General in Lancashire, a priest named John Chadwick, and obviously left him with a considerable amount of discretion in the West.

It is not clear how the Jesuit problem was expected to be solved 'by time'. Did that mean when all of the ex-Jesuits had died? Nor is it clear what Fr Vincent Smith meant by 'the Jesuit problem'.

The Jesuits in the Durham Residence

The Rev. John Walsh, the Superior in this area, died in May, 1773. Five weeks before the Suppression of the Society, the Provincial appointed as his successor, the Rev. William Strickland, which was a most fortunate choice. Fr Strickland remained as Superior until he went to Liège at the beginning of 1784 and, returning to London after two or three years, lived in London as Procurator for England and one of the leaders of the old Society. Knowing the Durham Residence well, he was often asked for advice and sometimes offered it without being asked. As head of the Residence, he was followed by the Rev. Richard Thompson (*vere* Sanderson), who died in 1790, and then by the Rev. William Warrilow, who died in 1807. For the next fifteen years the Rev. Edward Walsh of Durham was the only active Jesuit in the Residence who was there before the Suppression.

What Fr Vincent Smith wrote about the importance of Fr Strickland is very true. He was at the centre of ex-Jesuit affairs for many years but a few of the Jesuit Districts continued to use the financial services of Fr Thomas Talbot, who was Procurator in 1773.

THE SUPPRESSION OF THE RESIDENCE

Taking Bishop Challoner's three difficulties as a guide line, they were solved in the North in the following way. On the West side Bishop Petre must have obtained the submission of the Jesuits since his list of their names is extant. (There are five or six more names than given in Foley). On the East side, Bishop Walton prepared the documents in Latin, of which the following translation is slightly abbreviated.

> To all Missionaries in this district of the Society of Jesus so named, we take notice that a Papal Brief given on 21st July 1773 was issued by Pope Clement XIV by which the Congregation of Regular Clerics of the Society of Jesus is utterly suppressed and declared to have been suppressed, and the Members of the Congregation thus suppressed are ordered to be subject in future entirely to the direction and authority of the Bishops as if secular priests. Therefore, we ask those of you here, insofar as it is our duty to show prompt obedience to the Papal Brief above-mentioned and in testimony of your obedience to endorse by your own hands the enclosed form which begins "We the undersigned clerics".
>
> At York, 25 October 1773. William of Trachonitis, Vicar Apostolic Co-adjutor.
>
> We the undersigned Clerics Regular of the Society of Jesus Missionaries in the Northern District of England, declare we fully and sincerely comply with

the Papal Brief published by Clement XIV by which the aforesaid Society is wholly suppressed and we promise that we in future will conduct our lives like secular priests, wholly under the jurisdiction and direction of the Vicars Apostolic authorized by the Holy See to guide the faithful in these areas.

In testimony of this we sign this declaration each one of us in our own hands.

There follows eleven signatures of Jesuits working in Durham and Northumberland. There is another paper, an exact replica of the above, the signatures on which are, first, that of William Strickland (Superior of the Durham Residence) and, then, those of five Jesuits working in Yorkshire. There is presumably some other paper missing with the other Yorkshire Jesuits' names.

By 'Residence', Fr Vincent Smith meant the Residence of St John the Evangelist, or the Durham Jesuit District. In the District in 1773 there were the following Jesuits: John Walsh (Newcastle), Richard Turner (Stella), Henry Brent (Durham), Joseph Plessington (Callaly), Joseph Howe (Longhorsley), William Strickland (Alnwick), Thomas Leckonby (Pontop), William Warrilow (Berrington), Charles Hanne (Haggerston), Nicholas Sanderson (Swinburn Castle), Christopher Rose (Hardwick).

The question of the faculties of these Jesuits is not so definite. (It is well known that while the faculties of the secular clergy were granted with an indefinite time limit, usually stated as *usque revocationem,* those of the regular clergy were only given on a yearly basis and, therefore, had to be renewed each year). The Vicar General for Northumberland and Durham at that time kept a register of the renewal of these faculties to the various Orders working in these counties. Unfortunately, he did not enter the names of the Jesuits and Dominicans in 1773; he did so in the following year for the Dominicans but not for the Jesuits, and the latter are never mentioned again. So it can be presumed that in this respect they were treated as secular clergy and their faculties were granted *usque revocationem.* This is borne out by the so-called Journal of Bishop William Gibson. While he gave to the Dominicans returning from Bornhem faculties for only one year, those given to the Jesuits going from Liège to Stonyhurst were granted for the usual indefinite time.

As regards the Society's property and funds, one can imagine that Bishop Petre, aged 82, was content to leave well alone. Soon after Bishop Petre's death in 1775, however, Bishop Walton was curious about them and wrote to his Vicar General in Lancashire: "As to the effects of the ex-

Jesuits, such I mean as are fallen into their hands for the use of the mission, what if we begin to make some enquiry by proposing the following queries to their Vicars", and there follows five questions as suggestions. The Bishop was also interested in their other monies, "which were not given expressly for the use of the mission, but were acquired by their own industry, or absolute gift or any other way". However, he adds "we may assure them that we have no intention to take their effects out of their hands, but only to see that proper care be taken of what belongs to the Church". There is no evidence that these suggestions were ever put into practice. We have seen that Bishop Challoner solved the difficulty by making the Provincial his Vicar General of the ex-Jesuits in the London District. In the above letter, Bishop Walton refers to "their Vicars", and this seems to mean that the Superiors of the three Residences in the Bishop's Northern District had each been appointed to the same position. This is borne out by the fact that after William Strickland, the Superior of the Durham Residence, left in 1784, Bishop Matthew Gibson consulted the Vicar Apostolic of the London District (Bishop James Talbot), and the Bishop's Roman Agent (Rev. C. Stonor) about appointing a successor to him as Vicar General. They were both against the idea; nevertheless, Bishop Gibson did not take this advice, since the Rev. Thomas Eyre wrote in 1790 that a secular priest had arrived at Haggerston, "being solicited by Mr. Thompson of Alnwick, Vicar General of the ex-Jesuits". Fr Thompson died that same year, and it is likely that no one was appointed to succeed him as Vicar General; there were, by that time, very few Jesuits left and the correspondence was between the Vicar Apostolic and the Jesuit headquarters in London.

'Coming' from Liège rather than 'going' in 1794. In 1786 the Congregation of Propaganda in Rome wrote to Bishop Matthew Gibson about the property of the ex-Jesuits. They could use it for their own support but could not dispose of it, and all was to come eventually under the control of the Vicars Apostolic. It should be noted here that as early as 1783 the English ex- Jesuits had enquired about the possibility of union with the Jesuits in Russia, and were in hope that one day the Society would be restored. William Strickland and his legal advisers, supported by a number of laymen, resisted this claim to the property. The claim was not renewed.

Another difficulty not mentioned by Bishop Challoner was the ordination of the Jesuit students at Liège to Holy Orders. The above letter of Bishop Walton to his Lancashire Vicar General began "All that is meant by

that Decree of the Congregation is that it is now in your power to grant *dismissoriae sub titulo missionis,* when you are in want of workmen provided they bind themselves in labour". The Bishop was replying to a question about the ordination of Fr Spenser (*vere* John Carnock S.J.). Five years later the Vicar General wrote to the Bishop about another Jesuit student: "Mr. Laurenson went to Mr. Talbot in Emberweek, but he did not choose to ordain him because he had no notice. Having got his address I wrote to him, and he has sent for Mr. L. in order to do the business". There were two Bishop Talbots in England in 1780; the Vicar Apostolic of the London District as more probably the one referred to.

In the archives of the secular clergy there is nothing further of importance to be found until after 1803, and so we come to the Jesuit side of the question.

There were further problems about ordination once the Liège community had settled at Stonyhurst. For Carnock read Charnock.

THE REACTION OF THE JESUITS, AND AFTERWARDS

Even though there had long been rumours that the Society was in deep trouble with the Holy See, the Suppression must have been a tremendous blow to the members. Fr Warrilow, the Jesuit in Newcastle, reacted publicly in the local newspapers, entering into controversy with his secular confrere. Fr Strickland's letter to Fr Warrilow is extant. Though the letter is undated, it seems from its contents to have been written in October 1773, before he knew how the Vicars Apostolic had decided to act. It appears that Fr Strickland had asked Fr Warrilow to make certain enquiries and this letter was the result of hearing the information Fr Warrilow had obtained.

> "Dear Sir, I return you many thanks for your favour of Sept. 29th and the trouble you have had about my Commission. J. Howard's answers and reasoning upon the case are weaker than I could have imagined from his hand". (John Howard (*vere* Holme) was the Superior of the College at Liège and Vice-Provincial). "He supposes the Society (still to exist?) and so do I, but then it is in the Fairy Land on the banks of the Meuse. The Dominium of our effects is in the Church, and the Church leaves the administration in our Hands. It is most certain that the Pope's Nuncio has demanded our effects and has begged the assistance of the secular power to take possession of them". (Bishop Challoner read the Decree of Suppression as if the Jesuit property etc and the administration of it passed into the hands of the Bishops.
>
> While abroad the Nuncios may have acted as Fr Strickland states, one

imagine the Belgian Nuncio, who looked after English affairs, asking the English Government for help in this matter). "It is almost certain that the said Nuncio in order to persuade the secular powers to give their Concurrence, in these Kingdoms, offered to convict us every one under our own handwriting of High Treason". (This is no doubt the demand in the Decree that every Jesuit must sign his obedience to the Decree. We have already seen how this difficulty was solved by Bishop Challoner and the bishops in the Northern District). "It is, therefore, that the Church, or what I take to be the same thing in this Case, the chief Governors of it, do not leave the administration in our hands, but are determined by the use of every means to get the administration out of our hands". (The Vicars Apostolic left the administration in the hands of the Jesuits). "With what justice then can we refuse to give up the administration of these effects, if the property be allowed in the Church; and what service will our natural right to the uses be to us, when we have given up the administration? I take no notice of the words foolish, nonsense, etc. etc. A civil question deserves a civil answer amongst Gentlemen, but J. Howard is not a Gentleman. The intention of our meeting is to choose proper officers and to determine any other question which any person may choose to propose. I never did draw up any account of particulars to be debated upon. The Report you heard was groundless and I find has given great offence".

It is not correct to say that the Jesuits were in deep trouble with the Holy See. In 1765 Clement XIII had by the Bull Apostolicum pascendi munus *protested against all that had been done to the Society of Jesus and with the greatest praise confirmed anew the Order, its Constitutions and privileges. The Society was threatened by the governments of France, Spain, Portugal, and Naples, and enemies elsewhere, determined to destroy the Order. Clement XIV was not strong enough to resist the threat of schism so the Jesuits were destroyed. It is not clear why Fr Strickland wrote to Fr Warrilow. If he was in doubt about the future of the Jesuit property he was to change his mind later. (See previous note). J. Howard was rector of Liège College in 1773.*

In this letter Fr Strickland refers to a forthcoming meeting of the Jesuits to settle their affairs. There is no record of any such meeting until one held in 1774, though the exact date is not mentioned. Among the resolutions passed were:

1. That whatever did belong to the District before the dissolution of the Society of Jesus is now the property of Individuals, who composed the District at the time of the Dissolution.

32. That the funds remain sacred and unalienable, unless in cases of extreme necessity.

3. That the Direction of all business be in the hands of three Agents constituted by this Meeting and be subject to the following Regulations ... (not transcribed as not important to this paper).

4. That all House-keepers whether upon Funds or not shall be made equal as near as the circumstances of the District will allow.

5. and 6. Not transcribed as not being important.

That the Agents be Mr. Strickland, Mr. Thompson and Mr Howe.

There was another Meeting soon afterwards, which is undated, at which the Agents were changed to Fr Strickland, Fr Thompson and Fr Richardson.

The third meeting was more important and was held on October 14th, 1777. While the resolutions only concerned the income of the Durham City mission, the previous resolutions "were confirmed and signed by a great majority of the said District". Then follows the signatures of eight Jesuits: W. Strickland, J. Richardson, Nic. Thompson, Jos. Howe, L. Neale, Wm. Warrilow, C. Hanne, and Jos. Plessington.

There were then three meetings of the Jesuits in the early years after the Suppression; but there is a record of only two more in the following years. In 1784 Fr Thompson entered in his Account book: "May 27. The Gentlemen's Meeting at Alnwick ... £6. 6. 0." Though the minutes are not extant, the most important business would be the appointment of a successor to Fr Strickland, and Fr Thompson himself was appointed. The next entries in the accounts were "June 19. to meet the Deputy to Congress ... £2. 12. 3.", and on the same day "The Deputy towards defraying the expenses to Congress ... £20. 0. 0." This was probably the other main business of the Meeting.

The second meeting on record was also held at Alnwick on Dec. 14, 1790, and of this meeting a full account is extant. The first business was the appointment of a new Agent, or quasi-Superior, after the death of Fr Thompson. Fr Warrilow was the one appointed from the five remaining Jesuits, but only for three years; he retained the post until he died in 1807. He made the entry in his account book: "Mr. Warrilow succeeded as Agent on Tuesday, 14th December 1790. His first journey to and from Alnwick, and at the place on District business ... £2. 6. 0." The expenses attending

the journeys to Alnwick, and back again to their respective homes, when members met ... £6. 17. 0." The remainder of the agenda was about the general administration of the funds of the District. The members who signed the minutes were "C. Hanne, Jos. Howe, Edwd Walsh, and for Christopher Rose, Edward Walsh".

These meetings were local – of the members in the Durham District. Each District had its supporting funds before 1773. The congress mentioned was of representatives of all the English ex-Jesuit districts. It met twice in London, in 1776 and 1784, for the discussion of matters of common interest. They helped to preserve a degree of unity.

One of the surprising features resulting from the Suppression is the way the members became divided almost immediately into two groups. The first consisted of those Jesuits who were in the Residence when the Jesuits were suppressed and the other group was made up of those who joined the District after 1773, whether they were ordained priests before or after that date. At their first meeting in 1774, the earliest resolution passed was "that whatever did belong to the District before the dissolution of the Society of Jesus is now the property of the individuals who composed the District at the time of the Dissolution". And at the last meeting in 1790, the members voted "that no person be admitted as a member of this District without the unanimous consent of it, and if from circumstances it be considered to admit any person to the participation of District emoluments, that participation not to be necessarily in proportion with the rest of the old standards of the District, or as it has been allowed before to Jesuits serving these places, but in ratio as it may seem expedient and proper to the immediate Incumbents of the District".

This distinction between the two groups was acknowledged by the secular clergy. The Vicar General of Lancashire, writing officially to a Jesuit in that county in 1780, asked "Have any foreigners been introduced into your College in this part since the dissolution of the body?"; and the answer was "No foreigners have been admitted into this District since the dissolution. Harris, the only one in the District was here sometime before the dissolution". For Northumberland and Durham several "foreigners" were introduced from the earliest years. They were all placed in chaplaincies and required no assistance from the general funds, except some years later at Alnwick when they received the mission endowment; the chaplain at Berrington or Haggerston received the £2. 2. 0. for supplying at Berwick

upon Tweed, and they all received a share in the Mass Stipends for a foundation Mass. None of them are mentioned as attending the meetings, except L. Neal; he was at Hardwick with the regular chaplain, Christopher Rose, and may have attended as the latter's proxy.

The distribution of the Jesuit funds of the District is clearly shown at the beginning of 1784, when Fr Strickland left a very full account on his going abroad. The capital was £5,000 on mortgages on three Catholic estates, the interest being paid direct to the District, and £3,000 in Government Stocks invested through the London Procurator; all these stocks had been purchased the previous year. Of this capital, some had been given for missionary purposes. Of the income of £422, "Messrs. Warrilow (Newcastle), Walsh (Durham), Howe (Longhorsley), and Strickland (Alnwick) received £70 each. House rent to Warrilow £18 and to Howe £5. Turner and Rose (Hardwick) £10 each. Hanne (Haggerston) and Thompson. (Berrington) £5". The surplus of £69 would be spent on £20 given extra to the Superior for his work for the District, £2. 2. 0. for Berwick, and the remainder for a foundation Mass and for travelling and other expenses. The interesting entry is £10 for Fr Turner. He had left Stella nine years earlier and, after some months out of work living in Newcastle, was stationed in Salisbury; he received this money until he died in 1794; even after forty years later the Salisbury incumbent was asking why the annuity was not then paid.

As the members decreased, the few remaining "old standards" became very much better off; there was also the problem of securing the capital for the future use of the suppressed Order. In 1797, Fr Strickland put his plan to Fr Warrilow. The monies and property should be placed in three trustees:

1. The Superior of Stonyhurst;
2. The Superior of the Durham District; and
3. The London Procurator.

He foresaw that there may be disputes between Stonyhurst, doing its best for the Order and the College, and the District, looking after its own interests, so that the scales should be held by the third party. Of the income, he suggested that the members of the District (by this time there were only two interested) should have a reasonable maintenance and the remainder should be given to educate a boy at Stonyhurst, who, after ordination,

would be able to work in the Durham District. At least the last suggestion was acted upon since some years later Fr Walsh boasted that such a boy had been ordained.

The members of each district had to live on the income of the district. They were therefore cautious about admitting any new members to a share. Some would be supported totally or in part by the chaplaincies they held. The grant to Fr Turner at Salisbury was personal and so ceased at his death.

And so to the end of the story. Foley wrote in his *Records* that neither Fr Warrilow nor Fr Walsh renewed their vows in the restored Society after 1803, but both must have retained a great interest in and affection for the Society. Fr Warrilow in his will left Fr Marmaduke Stone, the Superior of Stonyhurst, as his sole legatee, and Fr Walsh did similar, his heir being Fr Joseph Tristam. Fr Walsh also spent some time in Rome in 1817, trying on behalf of the Jesuits to obtain full recognition of the Restoration of the English Province of the Society from the Holy See. By these two old Jesuits, then, the funds of what was once the Durham Residence were secured to the Society; some were endowments for individual missions, and other monies for the general good of the members. How the former were returned to their original purposes and how the latter were used will be discussed in the accounts of the places they served. (Fr Vincent Smith's account of the various Jesuit missions, which formed the remainder of his paper, is here omitted).

Fr Walsh was attempting to obtain recognition of the existence of the Jesuits in England and Wales after the official Restoration of the Society of Jesus in 1814 against those in England and Wales who opposed it. Two important decrees before 1803 were sent from Rome to Stonyhurst which affected the position of the College and the 'Gentlemen of Stonyhurst' in relation to the Vicars Apostolic. The first was a rescript in 1796 which confirmed the Brief Catholicae Praesules, *issued in 1778 for the Academy at Liège, by which the Pope took the Academy under his protection and confirmed all privileges, including those of a pontifical seminary. Bishop Gibson found it difficult to understand that a college under secular priests in his Vicariate claimed the right to choose its own president.*

There was a second rescript, in 1802, which confirmed the wording of the oath taken before ordination as it had been traditionally pronounced at Liège and was taken at Stonyhurst. The candidates promised before ordination that after eight years of teaching at Stonyhurst (if required) and

the reception of Holy Orders, when it seemed good to the President, they would do missionary work in England and Wales under the jurisdiction of the Vicars Apostolic.

These decrees were steps on the way from Catholicae Fidei *to* Catholicae Praesules, *and Cardinal Consalvi's letter to the Jesuit General in Russia, which led in turn (though Fr Vincent Smith did not deal with it) to the General Restoration of the Society of Jesus by Pius VII on 7th August, 1814, by the Bull* Solicitudo Omnium Ecclesiarum, *which Pius VII had read in his presence at the Gesu after celebrating Mass at the altar of St Ignatius. Edward Walsh went to Rome in 1817 to try to ensure that the Restoration was accepted in England and Wales. This problem was not solved until 1829.*

CAVEAT FOR A CARDINAL: THE PUBLIC LIFE OF USHAW'S MERRY DEL VAL

The Rev. David Milburn

ENTER RAFAEL MERRY DEL VAL

The name Merry del Val suggests mixed parentage. On his father's side Rafael claimed Irish as well as Spanish ancestry, and on his mother's Basque, Scots, Dutch and English nationality: she was born in England. Rafael was their second son. He saw the light of day in London on 1 October 1865 where their father worked as Secretary to the Spanish Legation. Young Rafael received his early education in England, some of it in Bournemouth, where the del Vals spent the years of the Spanish Revolution (1866-74) at the house of Don Pedro Jos de Zulueta, second Count de Torre Diaz, Rafael's maternal grandfather. Later the del Val family moved to Belgium, and Rafael attended the Jesuit college of St Michael in Brussels where he excelled in sports and showed a talent for acting. With the exception of a few months in his early teens when he dreamed of being a cavalry officer in the Spanish army he had always wanted to be a priest. So it came as no surprise when, turned seventeen, he decided to train for the priesthood. The family had Jesuit connections, so it was with some surprise he expressed his interest in becoming a diocesan priest. Cardinal Vaughan, in whose archdiocese Rafael expected to work, had his own seminary at St Edmund's College in Hertfordshire, so it must have been against his inclination to allow Rafael to proceed to Ushaw. But the Zuluetas had happy recollections of Ushaw where Rafael's maternal uncle Don Pedro had been educated.[6] Indeed while there he had formed a close friendship with Francis Wilkinson, a later president of Ushaw, and it was at the Zulueta's house in Bournemouth that Wilkinson had died in September 1877 after succumbing to typhoid fever on holiday at Spa.[7] In the end some kind of compromise seems to have been reached: Rafael would go for a time to Ushaw, and then to Rome. In fact, he studied at Ushaw only a short while, Autumn 1883 to the Summer of 1885.

Before Rafael left Ushaw the de Val family had already moved to Vienna, where Rafael's father had become Spanish ambassador to the court of the Emperor Franz Josef of Austria. On holiday there the young man discovered that he was to study in Rome at the Scots rather than the English College because of its situation in a healthier part of the city. There

he would also have the support of his friend John Ross, whose happy disposition had already earned him the name of Don Felice. He remained a loyal friend and often helped to lift Rafael out of bouts of moodiness in the stressful years ahead.

On the train journey to Rome Rafael showed how easily, when under pressure, he could become abstracted and lose touch with reality. Neither the train conversation, nor the sights of the Italian Lakes, nor the artistic heritage of Milan, could rouse him from what one biographer calls a strange lassitude, an "apparent paralysis which came upon him in times of mental stress or profound emotion."[10] In such a state he became withdrawn and inarticulate. What brought on this particular attack? As his father intended to seek an private audience with Pope Leo XIII , Rafael may have had a premonition that all might not be plain sailing. Given his undoubted ability, might not he be caught up in the pomp and circumstance of the papal court rather than be allowed to realise his dream of returning to work in London as a priest? We do not need to speculate. The reality was worse than anything he could have imagined. During the audience, the pope fixed his attention on Rafael rather than on his father. Before him knelt an aristocratic, cultured young man, fluent in several languages. The Pope had a reputation for making snap yet accurate judgements. He made one now, which was immediately to transfer Rafael from the Scots College to the *Accademia dei Nobili Ecclesiastici,* where priests were trained for the papal diplomatic service. Objections were to no avail. Before nightfall the deed was done. Two days later Rafael moved from the Scots College to the old palazzo in the Piazza della Minerva, the home of the Academy.

THE VATICAN METEOR 1886 - 1904

Tonsured and invested with Minor Orders during his second year at Ushaw, Rafael now found himself among older men, all of them priests, in a loose-knit community where he had to learn self discipline, especially in regard to the course of theology he followed at the Gregorian University. Fed a meagre diet and lacking sports facilities, he found life at the *Accademia* far from congenial. Worse still, everything in the *Accademia* seemed to be grooming him for a permanent career in the Vatican court . In June, 1886 before he had reached the Subdiaconate, he went to London as part of the Vatican delegation to attend the golden jubilee celebrations of Queen Victoria's accession, in anticipation of which he was promoted to be a Chamberlain to the Pope, with the title of Monsignor. As a Deacon he

attended two functions, the first in March 1888 when he joined the papal contingent which went to Germany to attend the obsequies of Emperor William and the coronation of his son Frederick III; the second, some months later, to deliver a papal gift to Emperor Franz Josef of Austria-Hungary. In contrast with all this pomp and circumstance, and more to his own taste, he was ordained priest on 30 December 1889 in a private ceremony in the Vatican. The end of his apprenticeship approached. In June 1891, with degrees in Theology and Canon Law, he completed his studies for the priesthood, and wound up his course in diplomacy.

Mgr Merry del Val on appointment as Apostolic Delegate to Canada, 1897

The Pope continued to heap unpalatable work on his shoulders. Escape from a way of life which did not satisfy his deeper cravings daily became more difficult. Within six months of ordination he was appointed one of the four Chamberlains entrusted with managing the papal private audiences, wearying and wearing work which allowed him to use his linguistic skill to the full, but demanding small talk which did not come to him naturally. In 1893 he went as Apostolic Delegate to Hungary to present the red hat to that nation's new Cardinal. In 1895, he became Secretary of the Commission set up to investigate the validity of Anglican Orders, on whose recommendations the Pope issued the bull *Apostolicae Curae* declaring those Orders null and void. In April 1897 he created a stir by being sent as a simple *Monsignore* to Canada as Apostolic Delegate to try to case the tension between Church and State over the issue of Catholic schools. 1898

brought him membership of the Congregation of the Index, and 1899 the Presidency of the *Accademia dei Nobili Ecclestiastici,* a position traditionally held by a bishop. With much foreboding he was consecrated titular Archbishop of Nicaea on 6 May 1900 by the papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Rampolla, his dream of returning to England as a simple priest finally at an end.

As a kind of antidote to his courtly and other public duties the young Merry del Val looked for more congenial tasks. His work as chaplain to one of the Christian Brothers' schools led him to what became his greatest joy, the nightly task of catechising and socialising with the young men of the run-down area of Trastavere, for whom he eventually provided funds for the building of a club. It is said that when in Rome he never missed an opportunity to lend a hand there. He also regularly visited the English Church of San Silvestro in Capite to hear confessions as well as acting as spiritual director to the new Spanish College. He also answered many calls to preach and give retreats. Between 1893 and 1903 he received, it is said, forty converts to the Catholic Faith.

This comprehensive voluntary work gave him the opportunity to walk through Rome, avoiding the ostentatious use of a private carriage. It also helped to keep him in good physical condition. (Later, he had at his disposal a car presented to Pius X but which the pope's status as "prisoner" in the Vatican prevented him from using.) His summer holidays were usually spent with his relatives in Spain or Austria, but he did return to England twice, in 1898 and 1899, when he stayed with the Zuluetas. There he showed that he had not lost his love of and skill at outdoor sports. Although it would be a quarter of a century before he returned to England again privately, he came publicly two years later to attend Edward VII's coronation, and its last minute cancellation allowed him another brief unexpected visit to Bournemouth.

The greatest challenge to Merry del Val's personal interests lay just ahead. In April 1903, as the aged Leo XIII lay dying, the secretary of the Consistorial Congregation, Mgr Volpini, who was already preparing for the next conclave, unexpectedly collapsed outside the papal apartment and died a few minutes later. It says much for Merry del Val's standing in the eyes of the curial Cardinals that, on the day following the Pope's death, they nominated him, still a young man of 38, and a non-Italian, to take Volpini's place. The gruelling task of organising the Conclave, for which he thought

he had little aptitude, was carried out meticulously. The Cardinals elected the pastorally-minded patriarch of Venice, Guiseppe Sarto, to succeed King Leo. He took the name Pius. Scarcely known in Rome, he turned to the young Secretary of the Conclave for help. At first Merry del Val recoiled from this further burden, but later accepted to work as Pro-Secretary of State until the new Pope found someone more suitable. Two months later, Pius made Merry del Val's position permanent. Despite constant rumours of his resignation for one reason or another, and much against his personal inclination, Merry del Val occupied this exacting position through hell and high water for the full length of Pius X's pontificate, nearly eleven years, each longer, it would seem, than the previous.

THE NEW POPE

If we are to understand the nature of Cardinal Merry del Val's work for the new pontiff, we need to bear in mind the direction that the Church had taken during the previous fifty years. Pius IX, who came to the papal throne in 1846 as a liberal died in 1878 an arch- conservative, deeply distrustful of everything the 19th century had brought in its wake, revolutions, nationalism, individualism, even progress in science and technology. Since bitter experience had taught him that the modern world was working totally against the Church's interests and authority, he answered in the time honoured way, anathematising the so-called progress in his long *Syllabus of Errors* of 1864. Henceforth, the Church, he thought, could only pull up the drawbridge and wait for better times. The loss of the Papal States in 1870 sealed his mind: he became the voluntary Prisoner of the Vatican, a sign to the world that the drawbridge was well and truly hoisted.

To Pius IX succeeded Leo XIII (1878-1903). As bishop of Perugia, Leo had made a name for himself by issuing a series of pastoral letters which seemed to temper the hostility of the Church towards the world at large. In fact, during his long reign (a word used advisedly) his skilful diplomacy defused a number of stand-offs with European states, restoring to some extent the papacy's international standing. Italy proved to be the exception, as Leo worked behind the scenes to set about recovering the recently lost papal territory.[11] The publication of his most famous encyclical *Rerum Novarum* in 1891 and his encouragement of theology and historical enquiry led many to think that this Pope was a liberal. Perhaps we can see him as another Joseph II of Austria, a Philosopher King, an Absolute

Monarch who considered it his right to liberalise, should he think fit. Leo XIII, it is said, did his best to prove that he held all the answers to the world's problems by issuing no less than 87 encyclicals during his pontificate.[12]

Leo XIII really believed in kingship. He insisted on royal genuflections and toe kissing, and cultivated remoteness to a royal degree. After twenty-five years of this, the Cardinals wanted change. In electing Guiseppe Sarto, a commoner from the north of Italy, known to have the common touch, a spokesman declared: "We wanted a pope who had never engaged in politics, whose name signified peace and concord and who had grown old in the care of souls, who would concern himself with the government of the Church in detail, who would be above all a father and shepherd."[13] There can be no doubt that Pius X wished to be every inch the true pastor. His first concern therefore, perhaps his only real concern, was to revive the spiritual life of the Church over which he had been elected to preside. Immediately he set in motion far-reaching reforms, making technical adjustments to the Curia to improve its efficiency, codifying Church Law, campaigning for more frequent reception of Holy Communion, overhauling the liturgy, reinstating plain chant, promoting catechetics, attending to the better education of priests – it is a long list. These reforms breathed new life into a moribund Church, preparing the way for the deeper changes which followed the Second Vatican Council. They made Pius a people's Pope, and led to his eventual canonisation in 1954. They were his great achievement.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

It is generally agreed that Guiseppe Sarto genuinely did not want to be pope. He was no diplomat, and saw little of value in diplomacy, especially now that the papacy had been shorn of its political power-base. Indeed, it has been claimed that on his election he wished to do away with the whole papal diplomatic corps,[14] an act which would have been not a reform but a revolution, overthrowing the earthly alliance between Church and State forged in the early fourth century by the emperor Constantine. But *realpolitik* prevailed. Much as the Pope wished the world outside the Church to go away, it did not, and he knew from his experience as Patriarch of Venice that it could not. In that case he would confront the evil. "The soft spots of Leo XIII were buried with his corpse."[15] "Society is sick: the one hope, the one remedy is the Pope", proclaimed Pius. Restoring all things in Christ meant proving that the Church alone could save the world from

collapse: which was Leo XIII's "the Pope has all the answers" over again, except that Pius preferred confrontation to diplomacy. Though warmhearted and genial by nature, characteristics which even his enemies recognised, whenever and wherever the Church came under attack he steeled himself to say the unpalatable – and he could sometimes say it very sharply and on occasion with genuine anger. This policy of confrontation lasted the whole of his pontificate. It began with the overthrow of Leo XIII's cautious pro-French policy which had prevented a rupture with a violently anti-clerical Government and ended with the Vatican's encouragement of Austria to take action against Serbia following the assassination of Grand Duke Ferdinand. In the long years between these two disasters a whole series of setbacks lay in store for the Vatican. "In international affairs" writes one commentator "the pontificate of Pius X was a failure.[16] Oddly enough, Italy was the exception that proves the rule. Though Pius X knew little about the world outside Italy, he had first hand experience of Italian politics. As Patriarch of Venice he had initiated a thaw between the Vatican and the Quirinal by encouraging his flock (apparently contrary to Leo XIII's *Non Expedit*) to vote in local elections. Further conciliatory measures during his time as Pope eventually led to the Lateran Treaty of 1929 which recognised the Vatican rump of the Papal territories as an independent State. Merry del Val took part in the negotiations, and is credited with their success, though some writers think that he actually preferred to fight on for a fuller recognition of papal political power.[17]

INTERNAL AFFAIRS

Encouraged by the freer intellectual climate under Leo XIII, Catholic intellectuals – theologians, philosophers, biblical scholars and historians had begun to engage creatively with the thought of the age. Tricky waters indeed. Pius X, hostile to most kinds of intellectualism, as Patriarch of Venice had already urged true Catholics to unmask such liberal thinkers, and this policy he pursued with utter conviction during his pontificate. In 1907 he issued the decree *Lamentabili* against what he perceived to be a coordinated attempt to destroy the Church's authority as a teacher: he called it the heresy of Modernism. Two months later a ninety-three page encyclical *Pascendi* sounded a strong warning that such thinking would lead to the collapse of the entire Church. In his efforts to wipe out these aberrations, a veritable reign of terror put paid to even perfectly legitimate enquiry and study. No-one was safe: not even cardinals and bishops.

Among those delated were apparently his immediate successor and the future John XXIII. A veritable witch-hunt was launched, the pursuivants laying hands on the innocent as well as the guilty. This sorry tale came to an end only with the election of Benedict XV in 1914. A more compassionate and sensitive man, he also condemned Modernism, but urged restraint and a resolution of the problems by free and open discussion.

MERRY DEL VAL'S ROLE

Although the Popes continued to be crowned with the triple tiara (signifying temporal as well as spiritual power) into the middle of the 20th century, the loss of the Papal States in 1870 mercifully freed them from being active players on the field of Italian politics. Merry del Val himself neatly summed up the changed situation when he declared that the Church no longer needed to look for territorial guarantees to safeguard its interests, but rather international good-standing.[18] That did not come automatically, of course, and the Cardinal Secretary of State's hopes of achieving it were never realised, except in Italy, where, following the news of the Pope's death in 1914, the generally frosty Italian Government applauded the success not of Merry del Val but of Pius X himself in bringing about a slight thaw in their relationship.

In matters of Church policy the Pope is all powerful. He can handpick his own advisers, he can overule their advice. In fact, he can do without them. Pius XII (1939-58) governed for a time without the aid of a Secretary of State: he said he did not want collaborators but men who would obey him. During the 18th century some remarkable Secretaries of State had exercised power on behalf of the Papal territories. Now that they were no more, the new Pope, Pius X, for one did not think politics really important. When he could have chosen others of known calibre, he preferred an untested young man for the office largely on two grounds, one, his ability to speak several languages, and the other his spiritual worth, which made him an ideal confidant. The two quickly became soul friends, despite their age difference. Sharing the same spiritual values and the same reluctance to play the tiresome game of politics. If the world would not go away, together they would confront it.

On the whole English Catholics adored Merry del Val. Many still do. At the popular level he seemed to be the local boy who made good, and his ultra-montanism appealed to those, the vast majority, who had been swept along by the fervour of Rome's centralising policy. Some others were not so

sure. In public, of course, he cut a striking figure: a real Prince of the Church, who measured up to the theatrical requirements of the spectacular Latin liturgy. Thrust into the limelight at such an early age, Merry del Val himself regarded his appointment as another "Station of the Cross".[18] His way was hard. Though he was far from being a consummate politician, he was an experienced diplomat,[19] but at every move he found the cards heavily stacked against him. His Spanish temperament did not help. In the Curia the old guard considered him to be an outsider: aware they were watching every move, he learned to keep himself to himself.[20] In the wider Roman circle his frugal life-style also made him a loner, foregoing as he did all but the most essential social functions, at which his chilling seriousness and face burdened by impending tasks made him depressing company.[21] The world with which he had to do business he regarded as universally against him. Finally, though he was diligently dutiful, it seems that he had no real heart for the work he had to do, which led presumably to the stress and exhaustion that he complained about.[22]

It is now generally agreed that the political policies of the new Pope were everywhere disastrous, except for his Italian policy, which was out of the hands of his Cardinal Secretary. Was Merry del Val responsible for this failure to establish a good relationship with Europe and the wider world? Liberals outside the Church and within it have always regarded the Cardinal as blameworthy: he was the "evil genius" of the pontificate in matters temporal as well as spiritual. But given the lack of definitive biographies of both Pope and Secretary of State, such a view is to say the least rather biased. It makes of the Cardinal an unsubstantiated control freak, a power behind the throne, "a mafioso in ecclesiastical purple". It has often been said that Pope and Secretary of State collaborated so closely that we may never have sufficient evidence to be able to apportion blame for the many disasters which overtook the Church during these years. But if, as many now accept, Pius X was his own master in matters spiritual, it is likely that he also was master of affairs of state, the few in his confidence being little more than dutiful servants. In his *History of the Popes* 1830-1914 (1998) Owen Chadwick bluntly calls Merry del Val "His Master's Voice". It is for that reason, perhaps, that Merry del Val does not merit much of his attention.[23]

M. Larkin's *Church and State after the Dreyfus Affair: the Separation Issue in France,* London, 1974, is more helpful than most in searching for

areas of accountability. In so far as the author did not have access to the *Archivio Segreto Vaticano* and based his book largely on research among French archives, it is necessarily incomplete. Nevertheless, there is evidence enough to argue that in the first great challenge to the new Pope's authority, that is to say the growing anti-clericalism in France – with schools closed, clergy salaries withheld, bishops nominated without consultation with the Vatican, Merry del Val did have a great measure of freedom to act as he thought fit. Not that he acted very tactfully. The French government was on the look-out for an excuse to proceed with a policy of separation, and Merry del Val's unguarded protest over a breach of protocol by Emile Coombes during a visit to Rome provided it. Though Coombes fell from power in January 1905, the bill for dis-establishment of the French Church continued its way to the statute book. Bishops were expelled from their palaces and priests from their presbyteries without any means of support: all Church property that existed before the Concordat of 1801 was returned to the State. As the crisis deepened, the Pope seems to have taken personal control. In a state of high excitement and ignoring all usual procedures, and approved beforehand by Merry del Val alone, Pius issued his letter *Gravissimo officii* in August 1906, in which, exaggerating French episcopal support for an end to the Concordat, he applauded French Catholics for throwing off the shackles which had bound them all too long to the State .[24] Merry del Val, it seems, was left to pick up the pieces. He would have preferred to see the continuation of the Concordat, but not at any price. With reluctance the French bishops accepted the consequences. When someone asked the Pope how an archbishop of Paris could do his job without a house to live in, money to spend, or a church to say his prayers in, the Pope replied that one could appoint a Franciscan.[25] If, says Owen Chadwick, by the single will of Pius, a predicament of such magnitude could occur, it was the result of the increased centralisation of the Church during the previous fifty years.[26] He adds that the Church in France never really recovered from this ordeal. On the other hand, there are others who say the calamity purified it and made it a lot more spiritual, which , after all, was one of the reasons for Pius X's election.

So far we have considered Cardinal Merry del Val's role in regard to policies formulated by the Vatican during the pontificate of Pius X in order to protect the Church and ensure its well-being wherever it was established. But as Secretary of State he was also involved in the strictly religious policy-making and its execution undertaken by Pius X to restore

and build up the spiritual health of the Church. The reason for this is that the Secretary of State had always been a sort of Chief of Staff, with as wide-ranging a brief as the Pope himself decided. In a previous age nepotism provided the Pope with a measure of independence vis a vis his advisers. When that system collapsed, the Popes continued it in the new office of Secretary of State providing them with unattached confidants able to advise on every aspect of Church life. So it is not at all surprising to find the "diplomat and politican" Merry del Val embroiled in the tumultuous Modernist crisis. Indeed, in his reform of the Curia at this very time the Pope gave extra powers to his Secretary of State. The Merry del Val's fans applauded his hard line, his enemies blamed him for the virulence of the anti-Modernist campaign. In its aftermath he became a scapegoat. Someone had to take the blame, and if was impolitic to blame Pius, whose canonisation process had begun, the blame all too easily fell on his Secretary. Those days are over. Since 1954 when Pius was declared a saint, research has been piecing together a different picture. In this the Pope takes centre stage. He it was who found someone who could bring this fatal haemorrhaging to an end, even if it meant radical treatment. "Pius needed a confidant who could tell him how to eradicate the treachery which he believed that he faced. He found Monsignor Umberto Benigni ... Impressive by appearance, he was organised and hard-working and rose in the opinion of the Curia until he became an Under-Secretary of State. There he came to know the Pope personally ... Benigni won the confidence not only of the Pope, but of the three Cardinals who ran the Curia, his superior Merry del Val, Cardinal de Lai ... and the Spanish Capuchin Cardinal Vives y Tuto. To them he made himself indispensable."[27] "Benigni does everything" said the Vatican proverb. "Benigni fa tutto." Indeed he did, directing operations against all suspects reported to him by informers belonging to his own secret society. During this critical time Benigni, though technically subject to the Secretariat of State, had the ear of the Pope, and seems to have pushed Merry del Val to one side. On one occasion that we know of he actually accused the Cardinal of excessive timidity in carrying out some of the Pope's instructions, and took him to task for watering down decisions, because of the opposition their harshness had aroused.[28] Having weighed the evidence, the level-headed Canon Roger Aubert of Louvain University suggests that: "though we cannot exonerate Merry del Val from some extremely repressive measures either in the making or in their execution (including connivance in manoeuvres which brought no credit on the

Department of State) we can now see him in a better light."[29] Fortunately, Benigni fell from office in 1911, the cause probably having been his blatant tampering with the text of a papal encyclical issued on the occasion of the third centenary of the canonisation of St Charles Borromeo. Borromeo was for the Italian Church its model of pastoral zeal. Benigni helped to draft the letter, craftily inserting some very unfavourable opinions about Luther and other Reformers circulated in Borromeo's day but long forgotten. The letter was meant for Italian consumption, so at first no-one took notice, but when copies found their way to Germany, it immediately eroded the Lutheran – Vatican dialogue. Merry del Val admitted that the first he had heard of the encyclical was when he read it in the *Osservatore Romano.*[30]

CONCLUSION

Such is the assessment of Cardinal Raphael Merry del Val's career as Secretary of State to Pope Pius X (1903-1914) as far as I have been able to piece it together from work which post-dates the hagiography of the 1930s - 1950s. For many Catholics, especially English, and those who are disenchanted with the reforms of the Second Vatican Council, he is still a role model,[31] his extreme ultramontanism and intransigence making him "an exemplar of a pure, integral Catholicism."[32] For those who have found the reforms of that Council a refreshing breeze which may yet blow harder, Merry del Val belongs to an epoch which is thankfully (or hopefully) behind them, never to return. For the rest, including the progeny of liberals who thought him evil incarnate, he is probably no more than the one liner "Spanish diplomat" of the encyclopedias.

NOTES

In the editing of this article, notes 1 to 5 have been omitted.

6. The College Diary records Manuel (1853-60): Peter (1858-64): Joseph (1860-1864), all three of them at Ushaw in the time of Mgr Newsham.

7. Milburn, p. 285.

8. R. Corboy, "Ushaw's Affiliation to London University," *Ushaw Magazine* 51 (1941), p. 249. Since writing this I have discovered that the card file version of the Diary has del Val arriving on 24 September, 1883 and placed in Second Year Philosophy. Unless an exception was made, this implies that Rafael had already done a year's Philosophy, presumably at St Michael's College in Belgium.

9. F. A. Forbes, *Rafael Merry del Val, a character sketch,* London 1932, p. 50.

10. M. C. Buerle, *Rafael Cardinal Merry del Val,* London, 1957, p. 18.

11. E, Duffy, *Saints and Sinners: A History of the Popes,* Yale, 1997, p. 237.

12. Duffy, p. 272.

13. Duffy, p. 245, quoting I. Gordiani, *Pius X,* A *Country Priest,* Milwaukee, 1954.
14. C. Falconi, *The Popes in the Twentieth Century,* London, 1967, p. 73.
15. J. M. Larkin, *Church and State after the Dreyfus Affair: the Separation Issue in France,* London, 1974, p. 126.
16. M. P. Riccards, *Vicars of Christ: Popes, Power and Politics in the Modern World,* Crossroads Pub., 1998, p. 66.
17. A. Rhodes, *The Power of Rome in the Twentieth Century,* London, 1983, pp. 184-89 and 221.
18. Larkin, p. 121.
19. D.A. Bellenger and Stella Fletcher, *Princes of the Church: a History of the English Cardinals,* Sutton Pub. 2001, p.143. Chadwick, p.340.
20. Larkin, p.119.
21. Larkin, p.119. Also pp.187 and 197.
22. I hope to develop this in my next article.
23. Chadwick, p. 340
24. Chadwick, pp. 395-6
25. Chadwick, p. 397.
26. Chadwick, p. 401.
27. Chadwick, pp. 356-7.
28) R. Aubert et al. *The Christian Centuries* vol 5: *The Church in a Secularised Society,* DTL/ Paulist Press 1978, p.21. D. Jodock, (ed.), *Catholicism Contending with Modernity,* Cambridge University Press, 2000 is a recent attempt to situate the Catholic Modernists in their proper historical context, its aim being to counteract the tendency to view Modernism as a coherent, timeless movement.
29. Aubert, p. 21.
30. Chadwick, pp. 357-8.
31. Extraordinary claims have been made for our Cardinal : "Cardinal Merry del Val must be ranked among the giants who helped to shape the course of world events." So D. R. Fantz "Rafael Cardinal Merry del Val", in *Angelus* I, 1987.
32. Bellenger, p. 145.

A future article will consider the later career of the Cardinal and his relations with England, especially with Ushaw.

EXCURSIONS IN 2003: SELBY ABBEY AND FELTON

The Rev. David Milburn

SELBY ABBEY

Our first excursion this year took place on Saturday 17 May. The date is significant – it was a full four months before the participants in an important Durham conference visited Selby Abbey as part of their "hands on" experience of the wide architectural influence of the city's remarkable romanesque cathedral. Proof possible of the forward thinking that characterises our Society's proceedings, do you think?

Selby Abbey

The abbey church stands at the end of the 14th century market place and dominates the town centre. Together with the Abbot's Staithe – a line of medieval warehouses along the River Ouse which was Selby's principal line of communication with the outside world – the church is all that remains of the large Benedictine monastery begun shortly after the Norman Conquest. Reputedly its origins go further back still, to the ancient town of Auxerre in Burgundy where a monk named Benedict set out in 1069 in consequence of a vision to make a religious foundation in Selby, three flying swans showing him its precise location, just as at Durham a milkmaid with her cow came to the aid of the Cuthbert Community in their search for a place to settle. As it happened, in that

same year William the Conqueror celebrated Christmas in York. He personally granted Benedict the land he required. In 1100 Benedict's successor, Hugh de Lacy, began the long work of replacing the original primitive wooden structure by stone, a task which continued until the year 1230, when the church of cathedral-like proportions was completed, 300 feet in length and 55 feet high with the roof supported by eight arches on massive pillars and columns. It is said that the abbot worked alongside his work-force, giving his wages to the poor of the neighbourhood. The 13th choir in decorated gothic style possesses in its east window one of the finest of its kind in Britain. Despite these and the much later 20th century additions, the abbey church at Selby has a distinct romanesque quality about it, especially in its interior where the architectural and decorative influence of Durham is immediately obvious.

From the time of the Reformation this former Benedictine abbey has served as the parish church of Selby. Described locally as "the hidden jewel in the United Kingdom's heritage crown" is artistically a gem which deserved to be better known. But of course, one needs to say more than that. All religious buildings need a measure of respect in so far they are places of worship. In particular, as we wander ecstatically around the great churches of our Christian heritage we ought to be joining our prayers to that countless multitude who for centuries prayed in them and will continue to pray there. That said, Selby also reminds us forcibly of the very human face of the Church. According to David Knowles this particular black-monk monastery had a constantly troubled tradition of misbehaviour. The regular recurrence of such incidents of immorality and monastic laxity leaves us with the impression that Selby Abbey really deserved its dissolution by Henry VIII.

These are particularly hard times for Selby Abbey. Its custodians spend what they can on urgent repairs, but an immense amount of work still needs to be done. Officially listed by the World Monument Fund among the 100 significant historical sites throughout the world at serious risk, the abbey, if it is to be saved, needs a staggering £10 million. The people of Selby are most welcoming. They need to be if they are to attract tourists in sufficient number to save their church. We wish them well in their efforts.

FELTON

For Felton read Longhorsley and Felton. A happy combination, for their history is intertwined. Generally speaking, people are still surprised to hear about the many Northumberland families who resisted the religious changes of the 16th century. A number of these belonged to the neighbourhood of Longhorsley, such as the Thorntons at Netherwitton and Witton Shields. Bishop John Leyburn confirmed 243 people at Netherwitton in 1687, and in the 1730s the Bishop of Durham reported that of Netherwitton's 54 families 35 were Catholic. From the end of the 14th century the Greystocks owned much of the land in the area which has come to be known as Longhorsley, but another family, the Horsleys, were responsible for the building there of the pele tower which is the distinguishing feature of the village at the present time. Recent investigations seem to place it at the end of the 15th century rather than at the beginning of the 16th. Either way, it is a rather late example of the tower-houses which were such a feature of the medieval Northumberland landscape. Here too at Longhorsley a Catholic presence continued despite difficult times. The first recorded priest belongs to the end of the 17th century, but we may safely assume that any priests passing that way would have been invited to say Mass in the tower. There is evidence of not one but two hiding places in the building.

In 1661 the sole Horsley heiress married Captain Edward Widdrington of Felton. When he died in 1691 at the battle of the Boyne, his son, also Edward inherited both estates. Preferring to continue to live at Felton, he founded at Horsley tower a new mission, its first priest likely to have been Fr Robert Widdrington S.J., a member of the Widdrington family. The priest's living quarters occupied the ground and first floors, and the chapel the whole of the second floor, approached only by the steep stone spiral staircase. It is recorded that in the middle of the 18th century the Longhorsley Catholics numbered about 125. Would all of them been able to squeeze into that upper room? The question, I fancy is an idle one, for many of them would not have been able to manage the narrow winding stairs.

The present ownership of Felton dates back to 1760 when Thomas Riddell of Swinburne married into the Widdrington family. The Riddells had a strong connection with the Douai Benedictines, and naturally chose them as chaplains rather than the previously favoured Jesuits. Secular priests replaced the Benedictines some 36 years later, no doubt the impetus being provided by the incorporation of the mission at Witton Shields and the

opening of the Longhorsley new chapel in 1841, dedicated to St Thomas of Canterbury. Interestingly enough the Riddells also opened their chapel of St Mary at Swinburne that same year. It is possible that the two structures were once very similar, the east and west sacristies at Longhorsley very likely being additions of the 1850's. The priests at Longhorsley continued to use the pele tower as their residence until the 1920's when its almost derelict state forced the church authorities into providing the present house. The priest at that time, Father James Wright, a director of the firm of Wright's Biscuits, is likely to have helped to meet its cost, at least in part.

What actually brought us to Felton via Longhorsley was a standing invitation to visit the tower which I had secured from its present owners, Mr and Mrs Elliott, for our North East Catholic History Society. Until the Elliotts arrived about four years ago, either the lack of interest or the lack of money (or both) had prevented much being done to improve the property. The present owners have spent a considerable sum, reputedly the best part of £500,000, thoroughly restoring the property, carefully following the Government guidelines for listed buildings. They consider themselves to be the guardians of a very important historic property, and we learned from the lips of Mrs Elliott herself how devoted they are to the work not only of preservation, but also providing fittings and furnishings which reflect the character of the building. The tour took us from the bottom to the top of the house via that steep, winding staircase which must have proved as troublesome to the elderly Catholics of previous generations as it did to us. It is fitting that we acknowledge our thanks here to Mrs Elliott for a very stimulating and informative visit.

The news which broke this springtime that the diocese might have to take steps to foreclose its lease on the Catholic church at Felton persuaded the Society to make that the venue of its autumn outing. As it turned out, though the church officially closed on the 13th July after a Mass celebrated by Bishop Ambrose, because of the exorbitant cost of insuring the empty church agreement has been reached to hold occassional services in it until its lease expires in 2005 or a buyer is found before that time. As a result we visited this remarkable church and celebrated Mass there with everything still in place, including benches, heating, lighting, amplifying system and organ which accompanied our singing. Our thanks go to Mrs Anne Burton, a cousin of the Swinburne Riddells, who resides at Felton Park, for allowing us access. She, unfortunately, had another engagement that day otherwise she would have

welcomed us in person.

The lands at Felton were owned originally by the de Lisle family, but by the 17th century they had passed by marriage to the Widdringtons. In 1732 that family moved from the old tower-house (site unknown) to a spectacular Georgian mansion, which received a massive face-lift at the end of the century. Most of this rather grandiose building was demolished in 1951, leaving only the east (kitchen) wing in use, but photographs show the house to have been quite palatial. As was the case in regard to Longhorsley up to 1700, we do not know of any resident priests at Felton until the end of the 18th century, but we can assume that priests working in the district would call from time to time to say Mass for the family and their tenants in a room of the house designated for that purpose. From 1700 they would also benefit from the presence of the priests at Longhorsley. When the Riddells of Swinburne inherited the estate in 1792, they established a line of Benedictine chaplains, which ended in 1883 when the first secular priest took charge of the mission. At first, the priests seem to have lived in the hall as part of the household retinue, but later they moved into one of the houses which the family built alongside the river about 1800.

The Catholic church at Felton was designed as a private chapel by Gilbert Blount, a pupil of Pugin (also possibly a distant relative of the Riddells) which opened in 1857. The Riddells, like a lot of Catholic landowners of the day, were keen racing people. Thomas Riddell who died in 1870 owned a number of internationally famous race horses, *Dr Syntax* and *Mr XYZ* among them. The prize money that accrued as a result of their success provided him, it is said, with the means to fulfil his ambition to provide a worthy church where both his own family and the also growing body of Catholics in Felton could more conveniently gather. In free decorative Gothic style, it boasts a considerable amount of carved detail as well as a number of stained glass windows designed by Wailes. On this visit we were able to see for ourselves that Thomas Riddell had spared no expense in providing a worthy church of his dreams, and many of us, I am sure, came to share the heart-break of family and parishioners at the thought of soon having to say goodbye to it.

More happily, the outing to Felton also provided us with a chance to visit, courtesy of its vicar, the Anglican church of St Michael and All Angels which stands at the top of the bank leading to the Riddell property in Felton Park. A really bizarre structure it is, going back in parts to the 13th century.

From the outside one would swear that its nave is roofless, so flat its roof and so high the parapet around it. The inside, too, is, to quote Pevsner's *Northumberland* "a happy puzzle", a jigsaw puzzle at that, one might add, for over the centuries improvements and modifications have largely been made by a process of dismantling and reassembling various parts of the same building. Nowhere is this more striking than at its entrance. Generally speaking, as Pevsner also remarks, the interior strikes one as low and cut up – just like a jigsaw – yet with a fascination all of its own. Quite a find. This out of the way parish church must be one of the most interesting illustrations in the county of how medieval churches developed over the course of time.

SOURCES

For Selby: Tourist Information and Pevsner's *Buildings of England* Yorkshire.

For Felton: Fr W.V. Smith's MS accounts of 18th century Northumberland and Durham Missions, Pevsner's *Buildings of England,* Northumberland, information from Mrs Anne Burton of Felton, and materials in the archive of the Longhorsley Local History Society.

PROGRAMME 2003 - 2004

The meeting on the 3rd September will be held at St Andrew's, Worswick Street, Newcastle upon Tyne (Mass at 7.00 p.m., A.G.M. at 7.30 p.m.). The meeting on 3rd December will also be at St Andrews, commencing at 7.15p.m. All other meetings will be held on Wednesdays at the Tyneside Irish Centre, 43 Gallowgate, Newcastle upon Tyne, and will commence at 7.15 p.m. The Society welcomes non-members at its lectures (fee, 50p.)

3th Sept. 2003	Mass 7.00 p.m., followed by A.G.M 7.30 p.m.
2nd Oct. 2003	Mr Liam Kelly: *The appointment of Abbot Basil Hume to Archbishopric of Westminster and his approach to his mission.*
5th Nov. 2003	Mr John Gavin: *St Oswald, the Perfect Ruler.*
3rd Dec. 2003	Sister Eileen Foster:*The contribution of the Society of the Sacred Heart to the North-East Catholic education.*
4th Feb. 2004	Mrs Vivienne Fetherston: *Irish Social Catholicism and religious tensionsions in Sunderland 1829-1870.*
3rd Mar. 2004	Lecture cancelled.

COACH EXCURSIONS

6th Sept. 2003	Felton, including Mass (1 p.m. departure)
15th May, 2004	Ripley Castle, Ripon
19th June 2004	Whitby, Egton Bridge

(2004 dates are subject to change)

Printed at Darlington Carmel