



## Durham E-Theses

---

### *A study of William Van Mildert, Bishop of Durham, and the high church movement of the early nineteenth century*

Varley, E A

#### How to cite:

---

Varley, E A (1985) *A study of William Van Mildert, Bishop of Durham, and the high church movement of the early nineteenth century*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses  
Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/6840/>

#### Use policy

---

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

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

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

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

A STUDY OF WILLIAM VAN MILDERT, BISHOP OF  
DURHAM, AND THE HIGH CHURCH MOVEMENT OF  
THE EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURY

by E.A. Varley

A thesis submitted in qualification for  
the degree of Ph. D. in Theology  
at the University of Durham  
in the Department of Theology

1985

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

Volume II

-1. MAY 1985



Chapter Eleven - Last Rites . . . . . 405  
The 'association for the defence of the Church';  
the Durham Divinity Professorship; the second  
Durham University Bill; Van Mildert's Durham  
Assize Sermon; his defence of Cathedral  
dignities; his death; tributes and memorials.  
Notes to Chapter Eleven . . . . . 453

Bibliography A

Printed works of Van Mildert . . . . . 463

Bibliography B

I. Archives . . . . . 466  
II. General . . . . . 467  
III. Primary Sources . . . . . 467  
IV. Secondary Sources . . . . . 469

## Chapter Eight

### Bishop and Dean: Llandaff and St. Paul's

Consecration; diocesan administration; works at St. Paul's;  
the Bill of Pains and Penalties; Van Mildert's Waterland;  
serious illness.

## Chapter Eight

In March 1819 John Parsons, reforming Master of Balliol, Bishop of Peterborough and personal friend of Van Mildert, died. 'Immediately on that melancholy occurrence,' Van Mildert wrote to his nephew Henry Douglas a few days later, 'Lord Liverpool wrote to me, announcing the intention of translating Bishop Marsh from Llandaff to Peterborough, & of proposing me to fill the see of Llandaff.'

Van Mildert was already in mourning for his mother, who had died the previous September, and his grief at Parsons' death was more than a pious formality: 'I feel so deeply,' he wrote to Liverpool, 'with your Lordship & every other sincere friend of the University & the Church, the loss which both have sustained in the death of the Bishop of Peterborough, that I can with difficulty express my sense of the obligation conferred upon me by your Lordship's communication, & the gratification it would otherwise have afforded me.' The griefs and stresses of the year had their effect on his health: in August, his sister Catherine 'was sorry to observe my poor Brother is sadly altered with his severe illness, and does not recover himself, he says he is not so well as he was two or three weeks ago.... he looks so much older since I saw him last.'

It took Van Mildert two days to decide whether to accept the offer of Llandaff. His anxiety, as he explained frankly to Liverpool, arose from 'fears with respect to the adequacy of the emoluments of the See, to bear the charges it would necessarily bring with it. Until, by your Lordship's unexpected

patronage & recommendation, I was brought to my present station, my preferments had been very inconsiderable in point of emolument, & my private means scarcely sufficient to my station. Consequently, I am now but just beginning to reap the fruits of my improved condition: & I feel it incumbent upon me to weigh well the possibility of involving myself in any pecuniary difficulties by accepting a higher station.'<sup>4</sup>

This entirely reasonable fear - the revenues of the See of Llandaff amounted to a net total of £924 per annum - was allayed by the agreement that Van Mildert should keep Bow, Ewelme and the Regius Professorship in commendam with his see, and on March 16th a second letter to Liverpool conveyed his grateful acceptance.<sup>5</sup>

The hesitancy with which Van Mildert greeted Liverpool's offer was as nothing to the hesitancy with which Joshua Watson received the proposal of the Vice-Chancellor and Heads of Houses of the University of Oxford, made at about the same time, to present him with an honorary degree. Van Mildert was asked to give the news of what was intended to his friend, and explained carefully that the proposal 'had originated entirely on public principle', being intended to honour Watson's work for 'the community at large, and...the Church in particular,' as well as his 'munificent support of all those institutions which give stability both to Church and State.'<sup>7</sup>

Watson was so shattered as to forget ordinary good manners. Van Mildert's first letter went unanswered, and an urgent second letter was needed before he could bring himself to write a response.

Acknowledged as the leader of the Hackney Phalanx by everyone except himself, Watson had no desire to receive 'a distinction to which services of a very different order from mine can rarely aspire', could understand the offer only as a personal gesture by Van Mildert, and dreaded the attendant publicity: 'if, with becoming respect to the Vice-Chancellor and the Heads of Houses, the matter might rest where it now is, and I remain in quiet possession of the knowledge of their good opinion,....I must say it would better accord with my personal feelings and love of privacy than any more public expression on the subject....' Watson combined a high respect for learning with a strong sense of the academic inadequacy of his own education. His reluctance to accept an Oxford degree for which he felt unqualified was not assumed; it outraged his conception of Oxford that the offer should even have been made.

Van Mildert attempted to pacify Watson with the argument that the degree should be seen not so much as a personal honour but rather as a sign of esteem for the various causes with which Watson was publicly identified. It was, Van Mildert urged, the University's only available means of 'conveying to the public....the interest it takes in the support of those bulwarks of Church and State with which the world already knows you to be so honourably connected.'

Watson was not persuaded, and it was necessary to use polite brutality before he would give in: 'it was represented to him that the refusal would be so unprecedented a thing, that it would really painfully embarrass his friends, and be liable to misconstructions which all would regret'. Watson was

presented to the degree of LL.D. in 1819, in company with Robert Southey, Sir William Grant, Sir Henry Hardinge and Lord Hill.<sup>10</sup> There is no evidence that he ever called himself 'Dr. Watson'.

Van Mildert was consecrated Bishop of Llandaff on May 31st 1819 by Archbishop Manners-Sutton, Howley, Marsh and John Luxmoore of St. Asaph. On May 24th, with 'unfeigned regret', he at last resigned the post of Preacher of Lincoln's Inn, offering, 'if the Masters of the Bench approve the arrangement, to continue the duty of the pulpit, either by himself or his assistant, until his successor be appointed'; the offer was thankfully accepted.<sup>11</sup>

The meeting on May 24th which received Van Mildert's resignation set the date of June 14th for electing his successor. Canvassing was clearly well advanced by this time: on March 29th Van Mildert was already writing to Norris to bring him up to date on the chances of the two candidates, Charles Lloyd and Reginald Heber. The retiring Preacher made it 'a point of delicacy....not to interfere by espousing the interest of either of the candidates', but could not keep from defending his 'excellent friend Mr. Lloyd' against the accusation of 'relying upon undue Government interest'. Van Mildert pointed out that, while Peel was naturally doing his best to ensure Lloyd's election, Vansittart supported Heber, and 'some other Benchers connected with the Administration' had not yet made their intentions known.<sup>12</sup> Only his sense of delicacy kept Van Mildert from actively supporting Lloyd's candidature, and he was delighted when his friend was elected

Prescher.

The new Bishop of Llandaff did not at first intend residing in his diocese. The ancient See had had two palaces, but one was in ruins and the other had long ago been alienated: 'there being no Episcopal residence on the See,' Van Mildert wrote to Henry Douglas, 'no material alteration in my customary mode of life will take place. Oxford & Ewelme will still be my usual places of abode, except when an attendance in Parliament will require me to be in London.'<sup>13</sup>

Almost at once he entered into communication with the Revd. W. Bruce Knight, who had been Marsh's examining chaplain. Marsh had appointed Bruce Knight Chancellor of the Church in 1817, with the comparatively rich prebend of Howell. Van Mildert found him 'a friend...in all respects worthy of his entire confidence and affection',<sup>14</sup> and appointed him Chancellor of the Diocese at the first vacancy. They continued to write to each other for the rest of Van Mildert's life. Cornelius Ives used this correspondence, which has regrettably not survived, in writing his memoir, and particularly in compiling his outline of Van Mildert's diocesan administration.

A 1795 'account of the members of the cathedral at Landaff' declared that: 'There are twelve prebendaries, of which the bishop is one....There are neither choristers, singing-men, nor organist. There are two vicars-choral, who are obliged to reside, but have no houses appropriate to their office....The dignitaries are not resident. There are now no prebendal houses; the ruins of the last remaining one were taken down some few years since.'<sup>15</sup>

The diocesan hierarchy was rudimentary. There was no dean; the bishop served quasi-decanus, having the decanal as well as the episcopal stall, and from 1256 the bishops also served as diocesan treasurers. The diocese had one archdeacon. Marsh, during his short tenure of the see following upon the long absentee episcopate of Richard Watson, had re-established the office of rural dean, and Van Mildert found the reports of his rural deans on 'the state of the parishes placed under their respective surveillance'<sup>16</sup> extremely useful. The only other diocesan officers were the two Chancellors and the Precentor.<sup>17</sup>

Matters stood little better in the parishes. Even after Marsh's attempts to stimulate church repair work, the proportion of churches 'in decent and respectable condition' was less than five to one; fewer than a third of the livings had any glebe houses at all, 'and of those which have any,' Van Mildert noted in his Primary Visitation Charge of 1821, 'a large portion are so mean, and so unimprovable, as to afford but too good a plea for non-residence....' While shortage of church room was a problem 'less extensively felt in this Diocese than in most others', there were exceptions: Merthyr Tydfil, even after the addition of galleries to the parish church, had room for only about 900 people from a population of more than 18,000.<sup>18</sup>

The strength of Dissent in his diocese also disturbed the new bishop. In 1812 the see of Llandaff was officially reckoned to have 21 Anglican churches and chapels, 42 Dissenting chapels.<sup>19</sup> Welsh Nonconformity, the driving force behind the founding of the Bible Society, flourished in profusion: Van

Mildert discovered 'with regret....that in this Diocese, besides numerous congregations of Calvinists, Wesleyans, Independents, and other sects of frequent occurrence, there are found, in the remoter parts of it, some few Socinian or Unitarian places of worship.' Van Mildert cautioned his clergy against naked bigotry: 'Towards our Dissenting brethren, intent as many of them undoubtedly are upon promoting in common with ourselves the great purpose for which the Gospel was imparted to mankind, it behoves us to demean ourselves with charity, with good-will, with respect.' They were not, however, to be treated as equals. Members of 'our ancient and venerable Church' would find ample opportunities for exercising their liberality in the Diocesan and District Committees of the National Society and the S.P.C.K., in the S.P.G. and 'the Society for the enlargement and rebuilding of Churches and Chapels'. It would be not merely wrong but dangerous for loyal Anglicans to adhere to 'popular and captivating associations... formed, on the acknowledged principle of obliterating every mark of religious distinction'. Van Mildert declared the vision of the Phalanx in undertaking its social programme: 'let us hope the time is at hand, when none among us need complain that Evangelical light and truth must be sought elsewhere than within the pale of the Church of England.'<sup>20</sup>

It is likely that this determination not to compromise with Dissent was a factor in Van Mildert's struggle to raise the qualifications and standards of his ordinands. Like Marsh before him, the new Bishop insisted that men seeking ordination from him should either be Oxbridge graduates or have studied at

one of the two divinity schools in the diocese, at Cowbridge and Usk. Van Mildert did what he could to regulate the proceedings of these two schools, to improve their standards and to keep informed of their activities. Through his close collaboration with Bruce Knight, who continued as examining chaplain, Van Mildert effected a gradual but steady increase in the stringency with which the 'religious, moral, and literary fitness for the sacred office' of his ordinands was assessed.<sup>21</sup>

Van Mildert also decreed that every candidate for orders should be examined on his proficiency in the Welsh language. While the ability to speak Welsh was not made an absolute requirement, the Bishop was determined to provide Welsh-speaking clergy for Welsh-speaking parishes. 'I should not think of licensing any person to a Curacy, or of instituting any person to a Benefice, where that language was necessary to the pastor, without being assured of his competency in that respect.' he wrote to Bruce Knight, '....and every candidate should understand, that without a proficiency in Welsh, his sphere of utility, and consequently of admissibility in my Diocese, must be very circumscribed.' Although Van Mildert does not seem to have gone so far as to learn Welsh himself, he arranged for several S.P.C.K. tracts to be made available in a Welsh translation.<sup>22</sup>

Less than a year after his consecration to Llandaff, Van Mildert received an offer of further promotion. In January 1820, Lord Liverpool sent a complimentary letter proposing to translate him to the Archbishopric of Dublin. Liverpool assured him that he 'need make no scruple about accepting it upon the

ground that not being an Irishman your appointment might be unpopular in Ireland',<sup>23</sup> but Van Mildert had no intention of becoming embroiled in the Irish Question. His reply was sent by return of post: 'My attachment to England, and to the many ties and connections which must in a great degree be sacrificed by a residence in the sister country, is alone sufficient to incline me to continue here, in preference to any situation abroad, however superior in rank or emolument. Being also totally a stranger to the country, the habits, and the society of Ireland, I should feel myself under peculiarly disadvantageous circumstances....'<sup>24</sup>

Van Mildert recognised that this refusal might have a damaging effect on his relationship with Lord Liverpool, but judged it unlikely. His judgement was rapidly vindicated. On July 15th 1820, Liverpool offered him the Deanery of St. Paul's, to be held in commendam with the See of Llandaff.

There were two conditions to this offer. Van Mildert was to reside in or near the Deanery for six months in every year, and was to do something about the scandalous state of the Cathedral. It had, Liverpool wrote, 'been long felt by the Public, that the Church of St. Paul's has been greatly neglected: and I understand that the Service is performed there in a much less creditable manner than in any other Cathedral in the Kingdom....I know I speak the sentiments both of the Archbp. of Canterbury & of the Bp. of London that this is an occasion on which a thorough Reform ought to take place as to all these Particulars.'<sup>25</sup> Liverpool also requested '5 minutes Conversation' on the subject of Van Mildert's other preferment,

and it was no doubt with the Prime Minister's encouragement that Van Mildert resigned both Bow and the Regius Professorship immediately upon his preferment to St. Paul's, which took effect in August 1820. The St. Paul's prebend of Portpool was officially added to his dignities a month later.

As Dean of St. Paul's, Van Mildert at once began an ambitious programme of repairs and improvements to both Cathedral and Deanery. Where the comforts of modern technology were concerned, he was willing to countenance radical reform. A 'new water closet' was installed in the Deanery and, having extracted grudging consent from his Chapter, the new Dean embarked on a bold 'experiment' of heating the choir, where the cathedral services were conducted. Here, at least, he faced problems familiar to his twentieth-century colleagues: of disastrous convection currents and unheatable roof spaces, of contractors always busy with other projects, of the need to decide whether 'entirely inclosing the Choir' would 'very much disfigure the edifice'. There was also the question of financial responsibility. Liverpool had offered government assistance, but by 1823 Van Mildert felt that the success of the project had been so modest as to lay this open to doubt. The heating machines poured warm air up into the Dome, 'the cold air...consequently descending with such force as to be almost intolerable to those who officiated in the Choir'. The best hope (short of enclosing the choir) seemed to be that continual use of the machines outside the hours of service would at least reduce the chilliness and dampness of the cathedral's atmosphere. Since Van Mildert had promised the

Chapter that his experiment would not involve them in any expense, the alternative to government subsidy was to foot the bill himself.<sup>22</sup>

In January 1820 George III died, and the Prince Regent at last became George IV. On 5th June his wife returned to England to claim her rights as Queen, attempts to secure her permanent residence abroad in exchange for a pension having failed. Unable to endure the prospect of Caroline as Queen, the new King had a Bill of Pains and Penalties drawn up degrading and divorcing her for her adultery with one Pergami, an Italian servant. Popular discontent with the monarch and his government found a focus and rallying-point in the cause of the 'wronged Queen'; Parliament was lavishly petitioned on her behalf, and the Bill's passage through the Lords proved expensive in window-glass. The debates received the widest publicity, and the Archbishop of York spoke for all his brethren in observing that 'it was lamentable to reflect how deeply the interests of religion and morality must have been injured by the introduction into every family, of such odious and disgusting details.'<sup>23</sup>

The Bill's introduction into the House of Lords presented the bishops, in their character as Lords Spiritual, with the necessity of forming a public opinion on a case in which nobody was unambiguously in the right. Divorce is an issue fecund of ecclesiastical disagreement, and the debates revealed considerable disagreement among the bench of bishops. There was virtual unanimity as to the facts. Even Archbishop Vernon Harcourt of York, the Bill's staunchest episcopal opponent, was

satisfied that the Queen had committed adultery, and the King's marital shortcomings were undisputed - he had abandoned his wife a scant year after their wedding, and was well known to have formed subsequent liaisons, some doubly adulterous. Where the bishops differed most was on the propriety of the divorce clause embodied in the Bill.

Vernon Harcourt attacked the whole proceeding as a matter of expediency, repugnant both to 'impartial justice' and to Scripture. Marriage, being 'not merely a civil contract, but a solemn ordinance of religion', deserved more respect than this sordid affair could allow. The evangelical Bishop Ryder of Gloucester opposed the clause on the ground that the Queen had been refused proper means of defence. The Archbishop of Tuam contended that the King could not expect relief because he had put his wife away, a view in support of which Lord Kenyon cited the authority of Horsley (who had to some extent championed Caroline at the time of the original separation<sup>223</sup>). Bishop Marsh of Peterborough proposed a compromise clause annulling the Queen's civil matrimonial rights while retaining the religious ones, a solution which, whatever it may have been intended to mean in practice, found favour with nobody. These four bishops and six of their colleagues voted against the divorce clause at the committee stage, and when it was nevertheless retained (by 129 votes to 62), York, Tuam and Gloucester voted against the third reading.<sup>224</sup>

Manners-Sutton, Howley and Van Mildert voted consistently for the Bill, with all its clauses. They even voted against a prior motion (carried by 121 votes to 106, with eight bishops

voting for and eight against) to allow counsel for the Queen to cross-examine witnesses immediately after the examination in chief and to call them back for later cross-examination. The Queen's conduct had not at all been such as to command their sympathy. She had made common cause with the Radicals: her principal advocates in the Commons were Hume, Brougham and Tierney, and from mid-July 1820 her speechwriter was Cobbett,<sup>30</sup> now returned from his brief exile in the United States. As a Defender of the Anglican Faith, Caroline was a disaster. Not only, the Attorney General informed the Lords, had she abandoned 'the performance of divine service, according to the established religion of this country...a most imperative duty upon a person in her situation to have kept up in her family'; she had taken to attending Roman Catholic Mass with Pergami.<sup>31</sup> Nor was her understanding of royal dignity and decorum in any way compatible with that of the High Church bishops.

All three spoke in favour of the divorce clause, representing the issue as a simple one. Van Mildert expressed the argument most concisely: 'according to the law of the country, he knew of no other cause of divorce than adultery, and no other punishment for adultery than divorce; and, as to the Christian law, it certainly provided that dissolution of marriage might take place in any case of adultery.' Manners-Sutton was more emphatic: divorces 'were expressly declared to be lawful by our Saviour himself'. Howley seems to have been influenced by the awareness that the Queen's case against the King also benefited from these arguments. He examined at some length the constitutional maxim 'that the king

could do no wrong', which 'would seem to remove all ground for recrimination, all inquiry into the conduct of his majesty in his conjugal relations', before denying that he meant to argue from this principle, and offered the scarcely diplomatic reminder that 'there were many instances of bills of divorce having passed that House, though the conduct of the husband was notoriously reprehensible.'<sup>32</sup>

Howley's luckless excursus on 'the king can do no wrong' was, as Churton remarked, 'calculated to act as a conductor to direct the electric fluid of public wrath upon the heads of the bishops.'<sup>33</sup> The nine bishops who, on November 10th, voted for the third reading of the Bill attracted greater public odium than the ninety and nine Lords Temporal who did likewise. Had not the Church agreed, on the King's orders, to omit the name of the persecuted Queen from the prayers for the Royal Family?

Van Mildert can hardly be said to have played a leading part in the debate, but he had spoken and voted against the Queen. Returning to Ewelme after the excitement, when the Government had decided to abandon the Bill, he found his house attacked by 'a tumultuous crowd of country-people', who 'hurled stones at the windows, and were with difficulty deterred from further acts of violence.'<sup>34</sup> That Van Mildert's relations with his parishioners had not been of the best before this crisis is suggested by his 'having within the last two years entirely renewed a very stout & high Wattle Fence along one Side of the Premises, & built a substantial high Brick Wall on one Side of the Garden'.<sup>35</sup> The Bishop felt it necessary to publish a handbill defending his actions; an 'abusive paper' was pasted

up in response, and Van Mildert asked his nephew Henry Douglas, now serving as curate of Ewelme, to send him a copy of this paper.

The Oxfordshire authorities do not seem to have responded energetically to this mini-riot - the county was, in Churton's opinion at least, 'not at that time under very efficient magisterial regulations' - and by November 23rd Van Mildert had almost given up 'any expectation of any disclosures respecting the perpetrators of the late outrage. It is more for public justice than for private redress that I wish the offenders to be found out. For their own sakes too it is, in one respect desirable, since impunity too often hardens the offenders, & tempts them to similar or even worse conduct.' Van Mildert and Jane, neither of them in good health at the time, decamped to Christ Church, leaving Henry Douglas in charge of the Rectory with a warning 'not unnecessarily [to] incur the enmity of such malignant spirits as haunt the parish of Ewelme'.

The exact date of the attack is not known, but by November 19th Van Mildert was installed at Christ Church and plunged into fresh troubles.

On November 17th the Hon. Keppel Craven, acting as the Queen's personal representative, approached the Lord Mayor of London to announce that Her Majesty proposed to attend public worship at St. Paul's Cathedral on Sunday November 26th, to give thanks for her deliverance from prosecution. This was never intended to be a quiet act of personal devotion; it was a demonstration of popular triumph.

By November 19th Van Mildert had learnt of this intention.

'Fully resolved that he would in no way sanction what he could only regard as "a mockery of religion & an insult to the Church," he was yet somewhat perplexed how to act without danger of exciting a riot, and acts which might desecrate the sacred building.'<sup>39</sup> He wrote to Liverpool, and at greater length to Home Secretary Sidmouth, expressing his alarm at 'the Queen's declared Intention of going to St. Paul's on Sunday next' and his conviction that, 'unless it can be prevented by some Interference on the part of His Majesty's Government, incalculable mischief may ensue.'<sup>40</sup> Between writing and sending these letters, Van Mildert received official word from the Queen, which he described in a postscript to Liverpool as 'two letters from Mr. Keppel Craven'.

Keppel Craven's epistolary style was not courtly. The letter he wrote to Liverpool on November 18th about the forthcoming prorogation of Parliament, and delivered in person to Liverpool's secretary, included the sentence; 'Defeated in their first attempt, disgraced in the Eyes of the People, consigned to the contempt of all Europe, deserted by the most rational & respected of their adherents, they [Liverpool's government] meditate a new attack on the Honor of the Queen'.<sup>40</sup> The content of the two letters to Van Mildert is not known.

Liverpool sent no reply to his own letter from Keppel Craven. Van Mildert, less wary, sent a note which, according to Churton, 'informed the Queen's officer of the ordinary times of Divine Service'.<sup>41</sup> Keppel Craven handed it straight to The Times.

The Times, nothing loth to pillory a fresh bishop, devoted

a leader on Tuesday November 21st to the topic.

'We have been informed, from a quarter which leaves no room to doubt the authenticity of a statement otherwise hardly credible, that the answer which the Bishop of Llandaff returned to the Queen's communication, made by the Hon. K. Craven, was carefully worded so as to exclude all those expressions of courtesy which the ordinary forms of civilised life prescribe in the correspondence between gentlemen. Who or what Bishop Van Mildert may originally have been, it is unnecessary to conjecture, and might possibly be fruitless at this late period to inquire. But rudeness of the nature described to us it is difficult to suppose could be the effect of habit merely, since men who are raised to high station in the Church, without any claims either from birth or merit, transgress, for the most part, on the side of indiscriminate servility, instead of failing in the observance of decent respect to their superiors, especially such as are superior to them in the former of those two qualifications.'<sup>42</sup>

This uncomfortable eminence continued for some days. 'Bishop Van Mildert's letter' received mention in the next day's leader; on the Thursday, a letter signed 'C.D.' informed readers that 'his father was formerly an eminent distiller in Blackman-street, Southwark, a man eminent likewise for piety and charity', adding: 'I would that the son were as much distinguished for the latter virtue.' Wednesday November 29th saw the publication of a satirical verse.<sup>43</sup>

Liverpool's reply to Van Mildert, dated November 21st, also acknowledged receipt of a letter from Dr. Hughes, who as Canon

in residence at St. Paul's for the Sunday in question, was in the least enviable position of all.<sup>44</sup> Liverpool reported to Van Mildert the content of his own letter to Hughes, thus conveying that Hughes, not the Dean, was to be responsible for all arrangements. It was 'quite impossible for the Govt. to prevent the Queen going to any Public Church to which she may think proper to resort during the regular time of Divine Service, nor would a remonstrance be likely to have any other effect than to confirm her in her Determination.' Liverpool instructed Hughes that 'the Service ought to be prepared in the usual manner, without alteration or addition, or without any deviation from the accustomed course.'

Liverpool also gave his blessing to Van Mildert's remaining in Oxford on November 23rd, rather than travelling to London for the prórogation of Parliament. Van Mildert had asked for this dispensation on the double grounds of ill health and pressure of business; he was preparing for his departure from Oxford in order to come into residence at St. Paul's on December 1st, and his function at the prórogation would have been purely ceremonial. R.A. Soloway, in Prelates and People, has hopelessly garbled this exchange: 'During the tense coronation of George IV in 1820 Van Mildert was so frightened that the Queen would cause a riot at St. Paul's that Liverpool told him to stay at Llandaff till it was all over. He did.'<sup>45</sup> George IV was not crowned until 19th July 1821 (and Van Mildert was present<sup>46</sup>), the originally planned date of August 1st 1820 having been abandoned on the Queen's refusal to stay overseas; and, while Van Mildert may have foreseen the disorderly scenes

which took place at the prorogation,<sup>47</sup> to assert that he stayed away from fear rather than for the two good reasons which he himself gave is speculation. As to Liverpool's telling him to stay at Llandaff, there is no evidence that Van Mildert had yet set foot in his diocese. He was, as his letter made plain, in Oxford.

There was never any proposal that Van Mildert should himself attend the controversial service; Liverpool's bluff 'hope that you will remain where you now are until the beginning of next month' could have been intended to scotch any such possibility, but it is highly improbable that Liverpool would have thought this necessary. Although Joshua Watson suggested to Van Mildert, who had solicited his advice while awaiting replies from Liverpool, Manners-Sutton and Howley, that 'since the Queen's rank was now recognised, and the prosecution abandoned, she should be received with all the outward respect due to her title',<sup>48</sup> this was a charming and eirenical nonsense. The Bill of Pains and Penalties might be abandoned, but a reconciliation between the King and Queen was not even the faintest of possibilities, and without such a reconciliation, no graceful public gesture by the Church could be anything but an embarrassment.

Moreover, charges had been laid and found proven against the Queen which could not casually be forgotten, whatever political expediency might dictate with regard to Pains and Penalties. To suppose that Van Mildert might assist a notorious adulteress to give thanks for her escape from the punishment which he had publicly declared that she merited, lending his

decanal and episcopal countenance to the triumph of a political faction which he regarded as dedicated to the overthrow of the Church he loved, is a transparent absurdity.

Queen Caroline attended Matins at St. Paul's on Wednesday November 29th, 'accompanied by the Common Council of the City of London and a guard of honour composed of 1,000 gentlemen on horseback'.<sup>49</sup> The hapless Hughes had a trying day,<sup>50</sup> but Van Mildert's fears of riot or sacrilege proved unfounded. The Times noted sourly that 'The Bishop's throne and the Dean's seat were not occupied at all, both these reverend dignitaries having written to the Lord Mayor, prohibiting them from being used.'<sup>51</sup>

Van Mildert took his parliamentary duties seriously. He had already made his maiden speech, on December 10th 1819, during the debate on the third reading of the Blasphemous Libel Bill. He drew the attention of his fellow Lords to the 'entirely new aspect' which the long standing offence of blasphemy had lately assumed. 'It was formerly limited to books of infidelity and free-thinking, which fell into the hands only of persons of education, who could resist their influence or refute their errors. In the present times, blasphemous and infidel productions were brought down to the level of the meanest capacity - learning and argument and reason were discarded, and the meanest understanding joined to the grossest ignorance assumed the privilege of abusing what the most cultivated and sublimest minds had defended and venerated. There was no reason in that called the "Age of Reason".'<sup>52</sup>

Van Mildert felt that the character of these publications

made it 'vain to suppose that they could be put down by legitimate reasoning or fair argument', and while 'the distribution of moral and religious tracts' and the 'efforts [of]...ministers of religion' had value as counter-measures, they were 'not alone sufficient'. He urged the Lords to try the effectiveness of 'the terrors of the law', adding that 'the persons who had lately published their pestiferous doctrines had evinced so much of the felon's character that they deserved to share the felon's fate.'

This was the only episcopal contribution to the debate. Van Mildert's Boyle lectures, still much esteemed - a third edition was published in 1820 - gave him clear title to be regarded as the bishop most expert on blasphemous libel.

The S.P.C.K. also gave attention in 1819 to the countering of cheap Radical literature, setting up an Anti-Infidel Committee. The Committee published and distributed 'Books and Tracts against Infidelity and Blasphemy', and, financed by a public appeal which raised £7000, put out 'nearly a million copies' in less than a year.<sup>53</sup>

In May 1820 Van Mildert again addressed the House of Lords, this time in defence of Bishop Pelham of Exeter, under attack by the Whigs for refusing to counter-sign the testimonials of a Devon curate who had publicly declared, in the course of a speech supporting 'Roman Catholic claims', that ninety per cent of Anglicans who signed the Thirty-nine Articles did not believe the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed. Lord Holland led the call for further enquiry into the Bishop's 'arbitrary' decision; Van Mildert asserted that Pelham had

acted 'only in the strict discharge of his duty', and complained at the lack of consideration shown for his brother bishop's feelings. At the end of a heated debate, the Earl of Carnarvon asserted that 'they who did believe' the damnatory clauses 'could not be Christians', and the Bishop of Exeter's attempt to reply was forestalled by a procedural motion.<sup>54</sup>

Parliamentary duty also led Van Mildert to give serious study to the doctrinal and practical issues concerned with the solemnisation of marriage. In 1822 a Bill was brought in to amend earlier legislation 'for the better preventing of Clandestine Marriage': in 1823 the Lords debated a Bill to allow Dissenting places of worship to be licensed for weddings. Van Mildert opposed both Bills, drawing up handwritten pamphlets which rehearsed his arguments in each case, and compiling lengthy abstracts from the writings of other divines which touched on relevant matters - Warburton on the nature of the marriage vow, Stebbing on the proper limits of state control over the validity of marriages, Gibson's Codex on laws respecting marriage, Ibbetson on the Marriage Act of 1754, even notes on parliamentary debates of 1753 and 1689 concerning marriage legislation.

Without ever using the term 'sacrament', Van Mildert argued for a high doctrine of matrimony: the marriage vow, 'however fraudulently, or wickedly intended, if it have been made with all the religious solemnity required of the parties, seems to impose an obligation which no human Law can entirely supersede.' While fortune-hunters might legitimately be punished by measures to deprive them of their financial gains,

troth pledged in the sight of God should not, and 'whatever the Legislature may enact' could not, be dissolved except by 'Divorce alone (and that for such a cause as entitles to Divorce)'.

It was in entire congruity with this view that Van Mildert also held that the sacred ordinance ought to be safeguarded both by certainty as to the proper authority of the presiding minister and by the use of a duly approved form of service. His objections to the Dissenters' Marriages Bill of 1823 were based on its failure to meet these requirements. While 'he admitted that it was a question well deserving consideration', Van Mildert urged a more detailed consideration both of how Dissenting ministers entitled to conduct marriages were to be identified and of how an order of service could be devised which would be acceptable to all those empowered to use it. The Bill narrowly failed to secure a second reading in a meagre House of thirty peers and eighteen proxies.

Two new bishops were consecrated in 1820, and Van Mildert participated in both consecrations, that of John Kaye to the see of Bristol in July, and that of William Carey, Pelham's successor at Exeter, in November.

On June 8th 1820, Van Mildert delivered the Charity Schools Sermon at St. Paul's, taking as his text Proverbs 19.2, 'That the soul be without knowledge, it is not good.' Van Mildert devoted his sermon to an emphatic if qualified defence of the principle of mass education, arguing that intellectual advancement was good both for the individual and for society 'when associated with that RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLE, which stamps

its real value.' Those who wished 'to leave the Poor in a state almost destitute of mental cultivation' were guilty not merely of wishful thinking - the educational machine was already in motion and could not be halted - but of 'odious selfishness'.

The objective of Christian education was, Van Mildert declared, the conquest of the twin evils of Ignorance and False Knowledge. While he offered a vivid description of the harmful potency of False Knowledge and the energy of its proponents, he also cautioned his hearers against pessimism: 'However numerous the host of our adversaries, however perilous the warfare, our friends are many and active, our resources abundant, our forces commensurate to the dangers. And while there is a righteous Providence to direct the issue, who shall harbour the thought that Impiety and Irreligion are waging war against us upon equal terms?'

The sermon concluded with the warning that 'the difference betwixt true and false Knowledge is not always marked by so....distinct a line of boundary, as to be obvious to an unpractised eye.' Christian teachers ought therefore to form their understanding not by Scripture and reason alone, but also by 'our Creeds and Articles, and Book of Common Prayer' and by the publications of the S.P.C.K.

On leaving Oxford in the winter of 1820, Van Mildert entered on a joint tenancy with Joshua Watson of a house in Great George Street, since St. Paul's Deanery was uninhabitable due to the building operations. This arrangement suited all concerned, and continued until the Van Milderts moved into the Deanery early in 1823. According to Churton, 'the place was

soon made famous by the choice society which it assembled together. some of the best and ablest and most distinguished characters in the sacred and learned professions.... The Hackney Phalanx were now much advanced in eminence. John James Watson was Archdeacon of St. Alban's. Cambridge Archdeacon of Middlesex: Park became Justice of the Common Pleas in 1816 and was knighted the same year: Richardson became Justice of the Common Pleas in 1818 and was knighted the following year. In 1820 Christopher Wordsworth became Master of Trinity College Cambridge, D'Oyly succeeded him as Rector of Lambeth, and Mant was consecrated Bishop of Killaloe. Thomas Rennell the younger became Christian Advocate at Cambridge in 1816.

There were new recruits as well: the elder Thomas Rennell. Dean of Winchester, an intimate of Norris: Charles James Blomfield, Rector of St. Botolph's Bishopsgate, who in 1822 became Archdeacon of Colchester: John Lonsdale, another chaplain to Archbishop Manners-Sutton.

In 1821 Van Mildert created something of a stir by going to live in his diocese, renting Coldbrook House near Abergavenny for the purpose. Marsh, who had been Bishop of Llandaff for only three years, had never resided. Marsh's predecessor Richard Watson was Bishop of Llandaff for thirty-four years, a Whig stranded by the long ascendancy of the Tories and by his own imprudence in voting for the Regency Bill of 1788. He lived on his family estate in Westmoreland, declaring that his aim in life was 'to be remembered as an improver of his estates, and a planter of trees'. If in this he did himself less than justice - he was an able scholar who in 1782-3 produced a scheme of

church reform (including proposals for the reduction of inequalities in episcopal incomes) in a Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury - he does not seem to have taken much interest in his diocese.<sup>42</sup>

Van Mildert made his Primary Visitation at Llandaff in August 1821, delivering the customary Charge to his clergy. It is not entirely certain that this was his first occasion of setting foot in the diocese.<sup>43</sup> but since the journey from London to Llandaff was no light undertaking it seems probable. Van Mildert apologised to his clergy for Visiting them at 'a much later period than I had at first intended', blaming the delay on 'the course of public events'. He had, however, had some prior correspondence with 'several of the Parochial Clergy' and received up-to-date official returns from the rural deans, basing much of his Charge on the information thus gained. History does not relate whether Canon Henry Handley Norris, whom Marsh had presented to a Llandaff prebend in 1816, journeyed to Wales on this occasion to meet his new diocesan.

The Visitation, if delayed, was thorough. From Ives' brief description, Van Mildert would seem to have followed the same procedure he was later to use in Durham, of travelling round his diocese conducting local visitations and confirmations. 'At every station in his progress, the Bishop was hospitably welcomed and entertained by the principal inhabitants of the place or neighbourhood; and such, in return, was his Christian urbanity and conversation, that he won the hearts of all who met him.'<sup>44</sup> Ives does not say whether these conquests included any Dissenters, but a later passage suggests, chiefly by

omission, that the Bishop's relations with 'the Presbyterians and others, within his Diocese' were not particularly amicable.<sup>55</sup> This is hardly surprising: his Charge, which was published, referred to the increase in numbers of Dissenting chapels as 'a growing evil' to be counteracted, drew the attention of his clergy to their ordination vow to 'banish all erroneous and strange doctrines' from their charge, and expressed the 'hope...to bring back them who have already strayed from the fold'.<sup>56</sup> These could scarcely be expected to appear to Dissenters as the innocent commonplaces they so clearly were to Van Mildert - 'We concede toleration freely and fully.' he assured his clergy later in the same Charge: 'we claim only to be equally unmolested in our own privileges, and thus to preserve the relations of peace and amity. What more does Christian Charity require? Or what further advances can be made towards an interchange of good offices, without a compromise on one side or the other, or perhaps on both, of sincerity and truth?'<sup>57</sup>

Van Mildert's ingenuous tone-deafness to the sensitivities of Dissenters was the result of a genuine blind spot: the very strength of his conviction that secure title to salvation rested on membership of the True Church kept him from realising how offensive this conviction was to those unchurched by it.

On August 12th Van Mildert ordained ten deacons and six priests, presumably in Llandaff Cathedral. Cochrane, who gives exact numbers of those ordained in each of Van Mildert's years at Llandaff, notes with satisfaction that 'the surnames indicate that nearly all the candidates were of Welsh origin';

he also observes that 'very few' were graduates.<sup>44</sup>

During his periods of residence at Coldbrook House, Van Mildert 'made himself personally accessible both to the Gentry and Clergy of the surrounding district, receiving them with a truly episcopal courtesy and hospitality, attending to their sentiments and wishes, and freely conferring and taking counsel with them concerning every good suggestion which they had to offer.'<sup>45</sup>

In November 1821 Van Mildert was sent a circular by the indignant inhabitants of Llanddewi-Brefi and Trezaron in the neighbouring diocese of St. David's, meeting at the Talbot Inn in Trezaron. They claimed to have raised around £10,000 to build a college at Llanddewi-Brefi, and were not at all pleased by the proposal, backed by Bishop Burgess of St. David's, to build a college at Lampeter instead.<sup>46</sup> Van Mildert may well have taken an intelligent interest in the founding of St. David's College (in Lampeter): this is particularly likely given his recorded interest in the two Llandaff theological colleges. It is not, however, at all probable that this circular inspired him to meddle in the quarrel about the college's siting.

Van Mildert was still scarcely a wealthy man. His income, by his own calculations, averaged £6,613.1s.3d,<sup>47</sup> from which he had to maintain two establishments and live in the style expected of a Dean of St. Paul's and a bishop. This could be expensive: at the time of his preferment to St. Paul's, a single dinner for thirty people 'in Upper Room' and twelve people 'in Lower Room', with eight singing boys to entertain

the select downstairs party 'and Servants at the Tavern' cost Van Mildert £112.18s.6d. There were more mundane expenses too: for instance, in 1822 the Bishop incurred a bill of £70.8s.6d. for coach repairs. Nevertheless, in Llandaff he contributed generously to diocesan charities, those, that is to say, which 'were in accordance with Church principles'. He had a particular regard for the diocesan 'Charity for the Relief of the Widows and Orphans of necessitous Clergymen', to which he contributed five guineas in 1821.<sup>73</sup> He was also a staunch supporter of the National Society in his diocese: in 1821, besides contributing five guineas, he used his Charge to exhort his clergy to set up more parochial schools: 'those humbler Village Schools, by which some portion of instruction may be imparted to every individual of your flock.'<sup>74</sup> R.A. Soloway does not seem to have taken this passage into account in forming his judgement that 'Van Mildert, as one of the prelates least able to come to grips with post-war England, in contrast to most Church leaders of the 1820's and 1830's rarely mentioned the question of lower-class education. As far as he was concerned, it had proceeded far enough, and he could not abide the receptivity of his colleagues to plans for still greater expansion....Not even the security of the National Society and its dedication to Church principles reconciled Van Mildert, and his coolness towards the schools was only exceeded by his bitter hostility to reform of any kind.'<sup>74</sup>

On 4th December 1821 the Van Milderts' younger foster daughter Mary Douglas was married, to Edward Stanley of Fonsoyby, Cumberland.<sup>75</sup> The relationship of the Van Milderts to

their Douglas kin continued warm and close. Jane's brother Philip, the Master of Bene't, died on January 2nd 1822, having suffered an apopleptic fit the previous evening. 'The Bishop of Llandaff was immediately written to,' Henry Douglas informed his Irish cousin Archy, 'and with all that kindheartedness for which he is so conspicuous, went down to Cambridge for the purpose of comforting his Afflicted Nephew and Niece, and of affording the assistance of his Advice and superintendence.'<sup>76</sup>

Henry was himself well acquainted with Van Mildert's kindheartedness. He had already acted as his uncle's curate at Ewelme, and was now his domestic chaplain. In 1821 Van Mildert offered him the living of Llanarth, which he declined; in 1822 he accepted the vicarage of Newland, a parish in the county and diocese of Gloucester but in the gift of the bishops of Llandaff.<sup>77</sup>

Although Van Mildert's patronage was not particularly extensive, he had the disposal of all the Llandaff prebends, and on 5th February 1823 he had the satisfaction of presenting Gaisford to the Prebend of Fairwater, the third most valuable of the twelve (if no great prize in absolute terms). Van Mildert also enjoyed some patronage in his capacity as Dean of St. Paul's, and in the autumn of 1823 bestowed 'a little living' on his friend and protegee T.L. Strong. Archdeacon Pott received 'a stall in St. Paul's' at about the same time, but not from Van Mildert: it was, according to Joshua Watson, 'one of the very best things in Bishop Howley's gift'. In 1824 Van Mildert offered the small living of St. Bennet's Paul's Wharf successively to Henry Ducane and to H.H. Norris, but both

declined it.↗

In June 1823 the Hackney Phalanx gathered in force at Bartlett's Buildings to give a good send-off to Reginald Heber, appointed to succeed T.F. Middleton as Bishop of Calcutta after the latter's early death in 1822. Heber was regarded by the Phalanx as a brilliant young man of letters 'rather than...a zealous parish priest or studious divine', and doubts were entertained as to his seriousness.↗ The farewell meeting, however, went off very well. Archbishop Manners-Sutton delivered the main address, and Churton, who seems to have been present, commented on 'the grave and dignified address of the aged primate, and the eloquent and expressive answer of the newly-appointed missionary bishop.'

"The impression of yesterday's delightful business still glows upon my mind,' Van Mildert wrote the next day. 'I know not when I have had so exquisite a treat. It was everything that the purest taste and the most unaffected piety could desire.' Joshua Watson, describing the event to Christopher Wordsworth, remarked that the Archbishop was 'looking well again, you will be glad to learn; and so are the elite of his corps, the Bishops of London and Llandaff.'↗ Heber died less than three years from first arrival in his diocese.

This was one of the last assemblies of the Phalanx at Bartlett's Buildings. In 1823 Gaskin at last ended his thirty-eight years of service as Secretary; in 1824, yielding to the argument that 'the House in Bartlett's Buildings did not afford sufficient accommodation for the General Meetings, and indeed for the daily transaction of the Society's increasing

business', the S.P.C.K. bought 67, Lincoln's Inn Fields from the Duke of Newcastle and transferred its headquarters.<sup>81</sup>

In the autumn of 1823<sup>82</sup> Van Mildert published his most durable piece of scholarship, a complete edition of the works of Daniel Waterland, prefixed by a massive 'Review of the Author's Life and Writings'. Churton described it rather lavishly as 'one of the most masterly and perfect pieces of ecclesiastical biography which the Church of England has yet produced', and for many years it held the position of a classic.<sup>83</sup>

Waterland (1683-1740), one of the principal defenders of Trinitarianism against the 'Arianism' of Dr. Samuel Clarke, was a vigorous but not a venomous controversialist whose writings were still in general esteem, forming a regular part of the arsenal of Van Mildert and his fellow defenders of orthodoxy. In the eighty years since his lingering death from an operation for an ingrowing toenail, Waterland had attracted no biographer, a circumstance which Van Mildert found 'remarkable'.

As one would expect, Van Mildert undertook his literary task with great thoroughness. Besides making a careful survey of the printed sources, such as they were, he set his friends to work searching the archives: Archdeacon Cambridge at Twickenham, Archdeacon Wrangham at York, the Provost of Eton at Windsor, Bishop Marsh at Cambridge. Bishop ffoliot of Worcester 'searched the library at Hartlebury for information which might connect Waterland's history with that of Warburton'. Bishop Law of Chester was interrogated about the acquaintance of his

father, a former Bishop of Carlisle, with Waterland. Archdeacon Pott contributed a manuscript Waterland sermon, and although the contemporary Master of Magdalene's search of the college records produced nothing, important materials were unexpectedly discovered in Oxford.<sup>54</sup>

Van Mildert found some difficulty in 'prosecuting his design under almost incessant avocations of public duty, or during indisposition equally unfavourable to constant application', and felt that he had not gone so far as he might have into 'the matters which the course of reading necessary to his purpose presented to him.' But the biography produced under these constraints was already 266 pages long, and the author wryly surmised that 'a majority of his readers will rather be of opinion that too much has been said, than too little.'<sup>55</sup>

No collected edition of Waterland's works had previously been produced, and few of his 'detached Treatises' had ever been reprinted. In one of his working papers, Van Mildert speculated on the reason for this. Whether it was 'due to the apprehension, that his writings collectively considered, were of too temporary or occasional a description to excite general attention at this distance of time since their first publication,' or whether 'the disposition, so frequent among the learned, to set a value upon the writings of great men in proportion to the rarity of their occurrence as articles of purchase, may have lessened the wish to extend the means of their circulation,' Van Mildert was sure that the neglect could not be attributed to 'any doubt of their intrinsic excellence.' His own esteem for Waterland was of long standing: he had

probably played a part in the selection of two Waterland tracts for the first volume of The Churchman's Remembrancer (1802), and drew heavily on his writings in preparing both Boyle and Bampton Lectures.<sup>66</sup>

Waterland's Works, as collected by Van Mildert, filled ten volumes: five of 'Trinitarian writings and incidental controversies', one of tracts written against Deists which also included some 'miscellaneous writings', one of 'Eucharistic writings', one of Charges and occasional sermons, one of posthumously published works, and a final volume selected from the unpublished materials assembled by Van Mildert, 'such...as ...might be acceptable to the public, and not tend to diminish the author's reputation.'<sup>67</sup>

Since most of Waterland's works were written in the course of controversy, Van Mildert devoted the greater part of his biography to charting the course of the different controversies in which Waterland engaged, explaining the positions taken by Waterland and his opponents, and relating the different arguments briefly to their historical context. This was a task at which Van Mildert excelled. Dead (or, more exactly, past) controversies fascinated him: 'he dug them up like a ghoul, reconstructing with delicate and loving skill the historic triumphs of orthodoxy.'<sup>68</sup> He was particularly drawn by the doctrinal position of Dr. Samuel Clarke, to which he took pains to be fair, pointing out that Clarke 'disclaimed the character of an Anti-Trinitarian; and appears to have been firmly persuaded, that the doctrine of the Trinity was a true Scripture-doctrine.'

On Clarke, at least, Van Mildert had collected rather more material than he could find a place for in the finished biography, and he seems to have regretted its exclusion. In January 1825 he sent to an unnamed friend, who had asked him to suggest 'any topic of observation which it might be desirable [sic] to bring forward' in 'an intended article in the Quarterly upon the new Edition of Waterland', an outline for a fuller discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of Clarke's position. Van Mildert wished to have it shown, not only that Clarke was 'a very sincere Xtian, conscientious, & pious,' who 'meant to be, & believed himself to be, a Trinitarian,' but also that 'his work is not without it's merits and it's utility. A more substantial refutation of Sabellianism, and the errors bordering upon it, can hardly be desired; and errors of that cast, it should be remembered, were rife in his days....' Van Mildert added an anecdote about Horsley, who had been persuaded by reading Clarke's works to embrace Trinitarianism rather than Arianism.☞

Although not invariably in agreement with Waterland, for example on the interpretation of John 6,☞ Van Mildert made clear his great respect for him, and gave the strongest praise he knew to Waterland's 'ardent zeal for the truth, under the discipline of a sober and well-regulated judgment, and of feelings equally remote from lukewarmness and extravagance'.☞, There were many points of similarity between the two men, and Van Mildert's defence of Waterland against the charge of bigotry prefigured the later arguments of his own biographers. 'Whatever imputations of bigotry or uncharitableness

may...have been cast upon him by those who felt themselves unable to cope with him, the general good-humour and even suavity of his disposition are attested in the strongest terms by those who most intimately knew him.'<sup>92</sup>

Van Mildert's intention in producing this labour of love was not antiquarian. By 'facilitating to less-informed students ....a readier insight into the ecclesiastical history of a brilliant period in our Church annals', the Bishop intended to 'promote the interests of pure and sound religion' in his own day. The warfare against infidel and heretical beliefs in which Waterland had engaged with such distinction was not over, and it seemed to Van Mildert 'scarcely possible, that any reader of solid understanding, not warped by prejudice, or attached to error by some more unworthy motive, should rise from a careful and attentive perusal of Dr. Waterland's writings, without feeling himself more strongly rooted in the faith, better able to vindicate its truth, and more internally satisfied in adhering to it as the guide of life.'<sup>93</sup> There was a good deal of justice in Hurrell Froude's characterisation of Van Mildert as the last of the school of Waterland; the decision to identify himself publicly with Waterland's writings in this way has been interpreted as Van Mildert's statement of his own alignment with Waterland rather than with the 'stream of high churchmanship....represented by the later Nonjurors.'<sup>94</sup>

The Memoir of Waterland was finished on September 19th. By October, Van Mildert was critically ill. 'The last letter I had from Mary gives a more favourable account of the poor Bishop,' his sister-in-law Elizabeth Douglas wrote on October 30th. 'I

trust his valuable life may still be preserved some little time longer; though I fear he has too shattered a frame to give his friends a hope of his continuing for any length of period!'<sup>95</sup>

In January 1824 Van Mildert underwent 'a severe surgical Operation', a serious matter indeed in the days before modern anaesthesia and antiseptics. After the operation he wrote a devotional poem inspired by his pain; his versification, like his other literary skills, had now matured considerably.<sup>96</sup>

Convalescence was slow. Van Mildert was absent from the Lords' debates on the Unitarian Marriages Relief Bill in April, and there is no record of his attendance at the important debates of May and June on the affairs of Ireland and the Irish Church. In May he was at Fulham and wrote to Norris: 'We are enjoying the sweets of this delicious retreat with the highest possible gratification. Yet I cannot boast of any material amendment.'<sup>97</sup> July found him in Harrogate, and though by July 18th he was well enough to preach there, he seems not to have gone to Coldbrook House that year. No ordination took place in Llandaff in 1824, and his second Visitation, planned for that summer, was deferred to 1825 due to the Bishop's 'painful and distressing malady'.<sup>98</sup>

By the end of the year Van Mildert had returned to his duties at St. Paul's, but he now found himself deaf. 'If this should continue,' he wrote to Joshua Watson, 'my taking the chair at the meeting you speak of will be quite out of the question. Yesterday morning I could neither hear the responses of the Litany, nor of the Commandments, and was obliged to blunder on by guess as to the proper time of interposing my

part of the service. Should this continue, there is an end of me as a public man, or even as a member of society.'¶¶

The deafness was to persist in varying degrees of severity for the rest of Van Mildert's life; but his ministry as a public man was far from ended.

1. Van Mildert to H. Douglas, March 20th 1819, in Adams, p.460. The letter also speaks of 'the irreparable loss that has been sustained in the death of the excellent Bishop of Peterborough.'
2. Van Mildert to Liverpool, March 14th 1819. British Library Ms. Add. 38275, f.415.
3. Catherine Van Mildert to Nancy Grant, 5th August 1819. Durham University Library Add. Ms. 274.207V2L4.
4. See note 2. See also Van Mildert's comment in his Memoir of Waterland, p.245, on Waterland's refusal of the See of Llandaff.
5. The Clerical Guide, and Ecclesiastical Directory, compiled from the report of the Ecclesiastical Revenues Commission of 1832-5, New Edition. London (Rivington, 1836), Table 1, Revenues of Episcopal Sees. The income Van Mildert actually received as Bishop of Llandaff averaged £1403.10s.7d. per annum, according to a financial memorandum in the Van Mildert Papers.
6. Van Mildert to Liverpool, March 16th 1819. British Library Ms. Add. 38276, f.5.
7. Churton, vol.1, pp.208-9
8. Watson to Van Mildert, [March/April 1819], in Churton, vol.1, p.210.
9. Churton, vol.1, p.213
10. Ibid., p.215. Van Mildert to Watson, 3rd April 1819, in Churton, vol.1, p.213, describes the degree as L.L.D.; Churton gives the date of its presentation as 1819. Webster, p.43, describes the degree as a D.C.L. and gives the date of presentation as 1820. The citation was 'for his educational work'.
11. Extract from Minutes of the Council of Lincoln's Inn, 24th May 1819. In Cochrane, pp.121-2.
12. Van Mildert to H.H. Norris, March 29th 1819, in Churton, vol.1, pp.272-3.
13. Van Mildert to H. Douglas, March 20th 1819, in Adams, p.460.
14. Ives, vol.1, p.51
15. Gentleman's Magazine, vol.LXV (1795), part 2, p.635. Letter, dated July 15th, signed 'Juba'.
16. W. Van Mildert, A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the

Diocese of Llandaff at the primary visitation in August MDCCCXXI, in Ives, vol.1, pp.489-512; pp.491-2. Van Mildert mentions returns made to Marsh in 1817 and to himself in 1819 and 1820.

17. The Clerical Guide, or, Ecclesiastical Directory, 2nd edition (corrected), London (Rivington, 1822), pp.iv-v, xv. See also S.L. Ollard and G. Crosse (eds.), A Dictionary of English Church History, London (Mowbrays, 1912), pp.333-4.

18. Ives, vol.1, pp.492-4

19. E. [Halévy], A History of the English People in the Nineteenth Century, London (1949-52), vol.1, p.416, note 1

20. Ives, vol.1, pp.506-510. See also below, pp.270-1.

21. Ives, vol.1, p.53

22. Van Mildert to Bruce Knight [undated], in Ives, vol.1, p.54.

23. Liverpool to Van Mildert, 15th July 1820. British Library Ms. Add. 38282, ff.298-9. The wording of the letter suggests that Liverpool did not expect Van Mildert to accept.

24. Van Mildert to Liverpool, quoted in Ives, vol.1, pp.58-9. Van Mildert had some contact with the Irish Douglasses, and had in 1817 written to Peel on behalf of one of them, Lady Cloncurry (British Library Ms. Add. 40272, ff.67, 69). The connection was not wholly auspicious. Archbishop Cleaver of Dublin refused Archy Douglas, Jane Van Mildert's cousin, institution to the benefice of Dunlaven, to which the Duke of Richmond wished to present him, on the grounds that 'Mr. Douglas had preached Catholic Emancipation, and abused the Bench of Bishops.' (Adams, p.376)

25. Liverpool to Van Mildert, 15th July 1820. British Library Ms. Add. 38286, f.120-2.

26. Bills for the works at the Deanery, which were very extensive, are in the Van Mildert Papers. A bill presented on July 5th 1821 was for a total of £1699.12s.-. The attempts to heat the Cathedral are described in Van Mildert to Liverpool, May 30th 1823, British Library Ms. Add. 38294, ff.230-2.

27. Hansard, New Series, vol.3, p.1710

28. Horsley to Fanny Horsley (daughter-in-law), 1st July 1801. Lambeth Palace Library Ms. 1767, ff.41-2.

29. The other six bishops who voted against the divorce clause were Law of Chester, Luxmoore of St. Asaph, Burgess of St. David's, ffoliot of Worcester, Sparke of Ely and the Bishop of Cork (Hansard, New Series, vol.3, p.1726). Law abstained at the

division for the third reading, Marsh and the other five voted for, with Manners-Sutton, Howley and Van Mildert (Hansard, New Series, vol.3, pp.1744-5).

30. J. [Stevenson], Popular Disturbances in England 1700-1870, New York (Longman, 1979), p.199

31. Hansard, New Series, vol.3, p.1306

32. Ibid., pp.1710-31

33. Churton, vol.1, p.223; see also Stevenson, p.201, and O. Chadwick, The Victorian Church, London (1966), vol.1, p.12 [page reference is to 3rd edition].

34. Churton, vol.1, p.223

35. Memorandum by Van Mildert, dated December 11th 1820, on matters concerning Ewelme, presumably for the information of his successor. Van Mildert Papers.

36. Van Mildert to H. Douglas, November 23rd 1820, in Adams, pp.462-3.

37. Robert Huish, Memoirs of Caroline, Queen of Great Britain, London (1821), vol.2, p.637

38. Churton, vol.1, pp.223-4. The context implies that Churton is paraphrasing and quoting a letter from Van Mildert to Joshua Watson.

39. Van Mildert to Liverpool, November 19th 1820. British Library Ms. Add. 38288, ff.154-5.

40. Keppel Craven to Liverpool, November 18th 1820. Ibid., ff.148-50.

41. Keppel Craven to Liverpool, November 21st 1820 (Ibid., f.165), protests at the lack of response to his earlier letter. Churton, vol.1, p.224, for Van Mildert's note. Van Mildert also sent copies of the correspondence to Sidmouth.

42. The Times, 23rd November 1820, p.2, col.2. Reproduced in Cochrane, pp.136-7.

43. 'On a certain Prelate's Letter to the Hon. Keppel Craven -  
The religion of Jesus is meekness and love;  
The politeness of Oxford proverbially known:  
Yet a Bishop from Oxford has labour'd to prove  
His great hate to his Queen with a coarseness his own.  
And "this woman", to ev'ry true Briton's heart dear,  
(While thousands with joy will range under her banners)  
Not unaptly proposes this paradox queer -  
Does your Lordship thus shew your acquaintance with Manners.'  
[Lord Manners had referred to the Queen as "this woman" in the

course of a speech to the Lords.] The Times, November 29th 1820, p.2, col.5. The letter appeared in The Times, November 23rd 1820, p.2, col.4. Cochrane, pp.138-9, gives both poem and letter in full, also a lengthy summary of The Times' account of the St. Paul's service.

44. Liverpool to Van Mildert, November 21st 1820. British Library Ms. Add. 38288, f.170. Churton, vol.1, p.224, notes that this Dr. Hughes was the grandfather of the author of 'Tom Brown's Schooldays'. Hughes was Canon in Residence, not, as Cochrane (p.138) supposes, the Sub-Dean.

45. R.A. [Soloway], Prelates and People, London (1969), p.41, footnote. The first part of the footnote, relating to Van Mildert's prosecution for non-residence in 1800, is no fairer and only nominally more accurate than the second part. Soloway explicitly gives Van Mildert's letter of November 19th and Liverpool's reply of November 21st as his authority.

46. Van Mildert received two invitations to the Coronation, one for August 1st 1820, one for 19th July 1821 (when the event actually took place). Both invitations, and copies of both letters of acceptance, are in the Van Mildert Papers. Adams, p.496, notes the fate of the 'remarkably good' embroidered waistcoat worn by one of the Douglas nephews when accompanying Van Mildert to the Coronation.

47. Hansard, New Series, vol.3, p.1750

48. Churton, vol.1, p.224

49. Stevenson, p.201

50. Cochrane, p.140

51. The Times, 30th November 1820, p.2, col.5; quoted in Cochrane, p.140

52. Hansard, vol.XLI, pp.987-8. Unlike many denigrators of The Age of Reason, Van Mildert had read it, while preparing his Boyle Lectures.

53. W.O.B. [Allen and] E. [McClure], Two Hundred Years: the History of The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1698-1898, London (1898), pp.189-90

54. Hansard, New Series, vol.1, p.328

55. Working papers on matrimonial law, in Van Mildert Papers.

56. Hansard, New Series, vol.9, pp.967-73 (June 12th 1823)

57. Cochrane, p.141, citing 'Stubbs' Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum, p.150, Reg: Sutton, 310, 335'.

58. W. Van Mildert, A Sermon Preached in the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, June 8, 1820, at the Yearly Meeting of the Children educated in the Charity Schools in and about the Cities of London and Westminster. in Ives, vol.1, pp.201-222: pp.202-3, 215

59. Ibid., p.219

60. Ibid., pp.219-20

61. Churton, vol.1, p.233. The first of Van Mildert's extant letters written from the Deanery is dated May 30th 1823 (British Library Ms. Add. 38294, ff.230-2).

62. Y. Brilioth, The Anglican Revival, London (Longmans, 1925), p.13; G.F.A. Best, [Temporal Pillars], Cambridge (1964), p.197.

63. Ives, vol.1, p.489; the wording is slightly ambiguous.

64. Ives, vol.1, p.57

65. Ibid., p.151; contrast the description of Van Mildert's relations with Roman Catholics. The diocese referred to is not specified, and is most naturally taken to be Durham; but if Van Mildert had been on friendly terms with Protestant Dissenters in Llandaff, Ives would hardly have omitted to refer to this in defending his uncle from the charge of bigotry.

66. Ives, vol.1, pp.497-8

67. Ibid., p.511

68. Cochrane, pp.152-6. He gives exhaustive details of his researches among the Acta Books and Subscription Books of the diocese.

69. Ives, vol.1, p.56

70. The circular, reaching Coldbrook House after Van Mildert had returned to London for the winter, was duly forwarded to St. Paul's. In Van Mildert Papers.

71. Financial memorandum, not earlier than 1826. Van Mildert Papers.

72. Summary of expenses on taking possession of St. Paul's; C. Hodgson's Account with The Lord Bishop of Llandaff, 1823. Van Mildert Papers. Christopher Hodgson acted for a number of bishops, and in 1822 became secretary of Queen Anne's Bounty. Temporal Pillars, pp.225-6, gives some biographical details.

73. Ives, vol.1, p.496

74. Soloway, p.383, arguing from Van Mildert's Durham Assize Sermon of 1834 (see below, p.427). Van Mildert's Charity

Schools Sermon of 1820 (see above, pp.153-4) also defended the principle of mass education.

75. Adams, p.424. Adams' later statement, p.452, that 'it was whilst living at Durham that Mary met her husband', presents problems. Stanley was 'for a time M.P. for Cumberland'; Joshua Watson and his daughter Mary visited Mary Stanley and her husband in 1835, and found them 'surrounded by a fine family of delightfully trained and sweetly tempered children' (Churton, vol.2, p.44).

76. H. Douglas to Rev. A. Douglas, January 8th 1822, in Adams, p.441. Van Mildert was an executor of Philip Douglas' will; the other was 'Dr. D'Oyley'.

77. Van Mildert to H. Douglas, March 20th 1819: 'I still reckon . . . upon your being domesticated with me as Chaplain' (in Adams, p.460). The offer of Llanarth was made and declined on 15th May 1821; Henry then went with his uncle and aunt to view the Deanery, accompanied them to the Anniversary Meeting of the Sons of the Clergy on May 17th, and dined with his uncle on May 18th (Adams, p.545).

78. Cochrane, p.156; Joshua Watson to Christopher Wordsworth, October 1823, in Churton, vol.1, p.237; Van Mildert to H.H. Norris, July 13th 1824, Norris Papers. The Clerical Guide, or, Ecclesiastical Directory, 2nd edition, London (1822), gave the first-fruits value of the Fairwater prebend as £5.6s.8d. The only valuable prebend was Howell, held by Bruce Knight as Chancellor of the Church, with a first-fruits value of £87.12s.11d. Hicman's, held by the Precentor, had first-fruits of £6. Norris' prebend of St. Dyfric (or Dubritius), first-fruits £1.3s.4d., was the second poorest.

79. Churton, vol.1, p.240

80. Van Mildert to Joshua Watson, June 1823; Watson to C. Wordsworth, June 24th 1823. In Churton, vol.1, p.242.

81. Allen and McClure, pp.131, 134

82. The Memoir is dated September 19th 1823. The [Works of] . . . Daniel [Waterland], collected and arranged, with a review of the author's life and writings by William Van Mildert, bishop of Llandaff, 10 vols., Oxford (Clarendon Press, 1823), vol.1, p.266.

83. Churton, vol.1, p.247. A second edition of Works of Waterland appeared in 1843, a third in 1856. A review of the doctrine of the Eucharist: with four charges to the clergy of Middlesex connected with the same subject, extracted from the 1856 edition of the Works, was published in 1896.

84. Works of Waterland, vol.1, pp.4-7

85. Ibid., pp.347-8

86. Van Mildert, 'Outline of a plan for Memoirs of the Life & Writings of Waterland'. Van Mildert Papers. For The Churchman's Remembrancer, Churton, vol.1, p.65. Churton attributes the 'short literary notices' with which the two Waterland tracts were prefaced to Van Mildert. Citations and quotations of Waterland's writings appear regularly in the Appendices to Van Mildert's Boyle and Bampton lectures. On the importance of Waterland in the development of High Church theology, see P.B. [Nockles], Continuity and Change in Anglican High Churchmanship in Britain, 1792-1850, 2 vols., Oxford (D. Phil. thesis, 1982), vol.1, p.112.

87. Works of Waterland, vol.1, p.265

88. G.F.A. Best, 'The Mind and Times of William Van Mildert', in Journal of Theological Studies, New Series, vol.XIV, part 2 (October 1963), pp. 355-70; p.357. The other half of Best's assertion, 'Controversies had to be dead - stone dead - before they gripped Van Mildert', is untenable. For a sample of Van Mildert's skill, see the discussion of the differences between Johnson and Waterland on the Unbloody Sacrifice (Works of Waterland, vol.1, pp.204-5).

89. Draft letter by Van Mildert, unaddressed, dated January 1825. Durham University Library Add. Ms. 274.207V21W2. Part in Ives, vol.1, pp.63-6.

90. Works of Waterland, vol.1, p.213

91. Ibid., p.261

92. Ibid., p.263

93. Van Mildert to an unnamed friend, undated, in Ives, vol.1, pp.62-3. Works of Waterland, vol.1, p.265.

94. Nockles, pp.112-3

95. Elizabeth Douglas to Henry Douglas, October 30th 1823, in Adams, pp.549-51.

96. Poem 'January 27th 1824, after undergoing a severe surgical Operation'. Durham University Library Add. Ms. 274.207V2108.

97. Hansard, New Series, vol.11, pp.446, 1104-64. Van Mildert to H.H. Norris, May 8th 1824, Norris Papers.

98. Ives, vol.1, p.56. Cochrane, p.154, for the absence of any ordination by Van Mildert in 1824 and details of the Letters Dimissory issued instead; p.168 for the Harrogate sermon.

99. Van Mildert to Joshua Watson, 'at the close of 1824', in Churton, vol.1, p.247.

## Chapter Nine

### Catholic Relief: Defeat

Catholic Emancipation to 1825; Van Mildert's 1825 speech; translation to Durham; the Wellington banquet; repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts; the Catholic Relief Bill of 1829.

## Chapter Nine

Traditionally, the Lords Temporal were expected to manage the 'political' business of the House of Lords, the Lords Spiritual to participate only where the interests of religion in general or the Church of England in particular were directly involved. There were, however, areas in which high politics and the interests of the Church of England merged. In 1825 Van Mildert and his episcopal brethren found themselves caught up in debating the fundamental nature of the British Constitution.

In theory, Parliament in 1825 was made up entirely of practising members of the Church of England, the Church of Scotland or the established Church of Ireland. Protestant Dissenters were debarred by the Test and Corporation Acts, Roman Catholics by a patchwork of anti-Catholic legislation, from any active part in government. By 1825 the Test and Corporation Acts had been allowed to fall into abeyance, with annual Acts of Indemnity to excuse the numerous infringements. Roman Catholics, however, while no longer liable to penalties simply for professing their faith, were proscribed from serving as judges or county sheriffs, members of parliament or ministers of the Crown, and enjoyed no relief.

In England, Scotland and Wales this state of affairs was not unduly contentious. In Ireland, however, it was a serious political grievance. There had been wide expectation that Pitt's Act of Union (1800) would be followed by an emancipation measure, but this never happened. Throughout the first quarter of the nineteenth century, unsuccessful Bills and petitions for

Roman Catholic relief were a regular feature of the parliamentary calendar - Beilby Porteus participated in one such debate in May 1805.<sup>1</sup>

By 1821, the principle of Catholic Emancipation commanded a majority in the House of Commons, 'despite the dominance of a Tory government committed to the union of church and state'.<sup>2</sup> The Lords still stood firm. The Roman Catholic Disability Removal Bill of 1821 fell by 120 votes to 159, the Roman Catholic Peers Bill of 1822 by 129 votes to 171, the English Catholics Elective Franchise Bill of 1823 by 73 votes to 80, the English Catholics Relief Bill of 1824 by 101 votes to 139. On each occasion Bishop Bathurst of Norwich, now approaching eighty, rose to offer a vigorous challenge to the massed opposition of his fellow bishops. 'Christianity itself was a glorious innovation,' he reminded them in 1823, warning 'the christian high churchmen of the present day, who were alarmed at the bare mention of any innovation in church or state.... that a blind, doting, obstinate adherence to old establishments, resolutely opposed to all reform, was as weak and dangerous as a wild and irrational desire of change.'<sup>3</sup>

The only other bishop to break ranks was the Evangelical Henry Ryder, who in 1824, shortly after his translation to Lichfield, gave his support to that year's Bill on the ground that it conceded only the electoral franchise denied to English (but not Irish) Roman Catholics.<sup>4</sup>

It was not a simple hatred of reform that stiffened the bishops' opposition. Rather, they were convinced that political emancipation alone would not satisfy the grievances of Irish

Roman Catholics. It was a deeply felt source of anger that all revenues pertaining to Establishment, including tithe, had been declared the property of the established and protestant Church of Ireland. If the bishops saw Roman Catholic emancipation principally as a means of introducing into the House of Commons a substantial new interest bloc dedicated to the destruction of the Established Church in Ireland, this was not due to unsupported paranoia.

In June 1824, the Irish Tithes Composition Amendment Bill gave an opportunity to both sides to declare their positions. Bishop Jebb of Limerick delivered a strenuous defence of the Church of Ireland clergy, claiming for them an important role in repairing the damage done to the Irish social fabric by absentee landlords. Lord King responded with a scorching attack on the Church of Ireland, its wealth, its irrelevance to the Irish peasantry. Lord Liverpool 'said, that the remarks of the noble Lord withdrew the veil. The friends of the establishment would know now what they had to expect. It was no longer the granting a few more political situations; nothing would satisfy but the total destruction of the church establishment in Ireland.'

Van Mildert took no part in these debates, although his vote helped to defeat the Bills of 1821 and 1822. In 1824 he was asked for advice by a member of the commission set up to look at the state of educational institutions in Ireland and to report on measures for mass education. Van Mildert's assessment of the prospects for 'bringing up Papists and Protestants together in the same schools' was pessimistic; he felt that a

joint syllabus for religious education was not merely unattainable but undesirable, 'having long been of opinion, that an honest avowal of diversity of sentiment in matters of religion, (provided it be not maintained by absolute intolerance and persecution on either side,) is preferable to ....insincere professions of unanimity, which can only serve to throw one or the other of the parties off their guard, and probably make the better and unsuspecting among them ultimately victims of the crafty and insidious.'

The practical difficulties of co-operation would, he foresaw, be considerable. Roman Catholics used a different translation of the Bible, regarding the Protestant versions as heretical; catechisms and formulae of interpretation likewise differed, while to use the Bible 'without note or comment' would be as unacceptable to the Roman Catholic authorities as to Van Mildert himself. Under these circumstances, Van Mildert felt that any arrangement would necessarily be precarious, more likely to foster confusion than community.

The Bill for 1825 was once more a full Catholic Relief Bill, offering as a sop to the Protestant conscience provisions for payment of the Roman Catholic clergy by the State (thus giving the State some degree of control and removing one main source of pressure for an assault on the revenues of the Church of Ireland) and for the abolition of the Irish forty shilling freehold franchise. This Bill passed its third reading in the Commons by the unusually large majority of 284 to 227, and the 'Protestant party' viewed it as a serious threat. Petitions against the Catholic claims were organised. On 13th April 1825,

a number were presented to the House of Lords. Van Mildert was chosen to present the petition of the archdeacon and clergy of the diocese of Oxford. Bishop Carey of Exeter had one from Totnes. Charles James Blomfield, who had the previous year been elevated to the see of Chester, brought one from the clergy resident in Manchester, also a petition of 8,000 signatures from the magistrates, clergy and inhabitants of Bolton-le-Moors which contained 'some stigmas....on the Catholics, of which he did not approve.' Further petitions were presented on April 18th by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Blomfield and, with his own expressed dissent, Bathurst of Norwich. On April 25th, presenting the petition of the dean and canons of Windsor, the Duke of York went so far as to blame George III's illness on the agitation for Catholic Emancipation.>

On May 17th the Roman Catholic Relief Bill was presented to the Lords for its second reading. Van Mildert was the first bishop to speak in the debate, and his speech achieved instant celebrity: it was published by Rivingtons and widely circulated. Ives describes it as 'generally....esteemed his principal speech' in the House of Lords.e

Van Mildert grounded his opposition to the Bill entirely on the principle of allegiance: Catholics could not expect equal treatment when their overriding obedience to the Pope rendered them incapable of offering the same undivided allegiance to the State as other Christians. Elaborating on this, Van Mildert drew on a distinction of Horsley's between the power of Order and the power of Jurisdiction as the two component parts of spiritual authority. Order, which the State neither did nor

should exercise, was 'that power which confers the capability of exercising spiritual functions': the power to preach, to baptise, to administer the Eucharist, to ordain, to confirm, to consecrate. Jurisdiction, the power to appoint 'particular persons to exercise spiritual functions throughout the State', to regulate their conduct, determine their remuneration and settle other details of ecclesiastical polity, 'belongs to the State, as allied to the Church, and although exercised by the Church, is derived from the State.' Since the Pope exercised spiritual jurisdiction over Roman Catholics, their loyalty to the State was on an intrinsically less secure basis than that of Protestants.→

Having drawn up his basic thesis at some length, Van Mildert proceeded to bury his audience under a torrent of scholarship. He claimed support for his view from Laud, Stillingfleet, Jeremy Taylor, 'Leslie the non-juror', Hickes, Atterbury, the two Sherlocks, Horsley and Marsh 'among those who are commonly reputed to have been what are called High-Churchmen'. He then painstakingly demonstrated that opposition to Papal Supremacy was not confined to High Church circles, citing Archbishop Wake and the Anglican-Gallican conversations of 1718-9; 'Tillotson, Burnet, and Gibson, all strenuous opponents to Popery, yet sincere advocates of Toleration'; Locke, Hoadly and Sykes. He added Milner's strictures against Locke and Hoadly, with the comment 'So much ....for the good-will which Papists bear towards writers whom ....their Protestant friends are continually holding up as models of liberality of sentiment.' On Roman Catholic views of

Papal Supremacy he took Bellarmine as his authority, observing that 'Bellarmine was not in the best odour with the See of Rome, his notions of the Papal prerogatives not being sufficiently high'.<sup>10</sup>

Van Mildert's own attitude to Roman Catholics was clearly explained, and tolerant according to his own understanding of the word. On the one hand he claimed to respect, even esteem Roman Catholics individually and as a body, refused to question their personal integrity, carefully eschewed 'any hostile or unchristian feelings' towards them. On the other, he opposed all attempts to blur what he saw as very real differences between Roman Catholic and Anglican doctrine: Transubstantiation, the invocation of saints, "image worship" were simply 'errors and corruptions of Christianity'. To those who argued that Roman Catholicism had changed its nature, and that the days of sweeping Papal claims were long past, he retorted that 'there can hardly....be a greater cause of offence to a Roman Catholic, than to question the immutability of his faith.'

Having devoted thirty pages to the theological reasons for opposing the Bill, Van Mildert gave one paragraph to the purely pragmatic. The Bill was intended to 'conciliate the Roman Catholics'. He judged it extremely doubtful that it would have any such effect on 'the lower orders, at least,' and saw its most probable outcome as a renewal of acrimonious controversy between Anglicans and Catholics. 'I am too conversant with polemics, (perhaps have been too much of a polemic myself,) not to know that these contests unavoidably engender strife, and enmity, and bitterness, of which no one can foresee the

termination.<sup>11</sup>

This was a political speech not an ecclesiological treatise, and Van Mildert made no attempt to elaborate the practical consequences of assigning 'the entire government of the Ecclesiastical Body' to 'the Legislative and Executive Government of the Country'.<sup>12</sup> Like Horsley before him, he would have refused with abhorrence the doctrine that priests were 'the mere hired servants of the laity', and priesthood 'a part to be gravely played in the drama of human politics'.<sup>13</sup> In his Bampton Lectures, Van Mildert had indicated the centrality he assigned to the priesthood within the Divine economy: 'if the Sacraments be not only signs or emblems of spiritual benefits, but the instituted means of conveying those benefits, - and if the ministration of the Priesthood, as a Divine ordinance, be necessary to give the Sacraments their validity and effect; then are these interwoven into the very substance of Christianity and inseparable from its general design.'<sup>14</sup> Without the power of Order, which for Van Mildert no less than for Horsley it was simply impossible for the State to exercise, there could be no Church. Bishop Bathurst, speaking next in the debate, was less than just in implying that Van Mildert was in danger of making establishment an essential part of the Christian Faith, a position which the Hackney Phalanx had always explicitly rejected.<sup>15</sup>

Van Mildert saw the necessity of establishment, not as sustaining the Faith but as sustaining the constitution of 'almost every well-constituted government', and pre-eminently of Britain. He grounded this necessity, not in some pietistic

principle that the Church should or even could hold herself aloof from secular politics, but rather in Bellarmine's conception of the temporal and the spiritual as being interconnected with the same intimacy as body and soul. Van Mildert was willing to say that the Church could not act independently of the State without directly infringing 'the temporal authority of the Sovereign' and, since he was concerned on this occasion purely to establish that Papal Supremacy was as dangerous to the British Constitution in the spiritual as in the temporal realm, to say so with emphasis. He had already made it clear, however, that this willingness depended critically on the permanent and inviolable establishment of a Protestant and Episcopal Church in England and Ireland. Establishment once breached, the whole basis of the 'alliance between Church and State' would be imperilled.<sup>16</sup>

The 1825 Catholic Relief Bill failed to secure a second reading in the House of Lords by 130 votes to 178. Of the twenty-nine bishops who voted, only King of Rochester cast his proxy vote with Bathurst in support of the Bill.

The Catholic Question was not to make a direct return to the House of Lords until 1829. In 1826, a short parliamentary session followed by a general election meant that no Catholic Relief Bill was introduced, although the election was marked in Ireland by significant electoral gains for the emancipationists and by blatant electioneering on the part of the Catholic clergy.<sup>17</sup> In 1827, Burdett's motions for Catholic relief were unexpectedly defeated in the Commons, albeit by a margin of four votes, and the parallel motions for the Lords were

dropped.

If 1826 and 1827 were, relatively speaking, quiet years for the Catholic Question, they were hectic indeed for Van Mildert. After the 1824 second grant to the Church Building Commission, of half a million pounds, new Letters Patent were drawn up to replenish the Commission, five of whose original members had died. In 1825 Van Mildert was appointed a Church Building Commissioner, together with Bishops Blomfield, Ryder and Pelham of Lincoln, the ecclesiastical lawyers Stephen Lushington and Sir Christopher Robinson, and D'Oyly and Lonsdale. In 1826, Van Mildert and Blomfield joined the standing committee appointed in May 1825 to examine and report on pew-rent schedules, 'the character to be given to the new churches and the duties to be performed therein, the division of parishes, and assignment of stipends and fees.' This committee was also asked to handle questions of appropriation. In 1827, it made the recommendation that the Commissioners should allocate all remaining moneys to those very large parishes which had as yet received no help: Eccles, Halifax, Rochdale, Whitechapel, Merthyr Tydfil and Spitalfields. Van Mildert was almost certainly responsible for the inclusion of Merthyr Tydfil.<sup>15</sup>

Earlier, Van Mildert had served with Pelham, Ryder and Bishop Law of Chester on a committee set up by Queen Anne's Bounty to list livings whose annual value was less than £50, and to 'make recommendations for at last getting rid of them.' Appointed in 1822, the committee discovered nearly four hundred such livings, and in 1824 the Bounty Board 'was enabled to bring them all summarily up to £50, and put them on the road to

£60', although the problem of livings under £50 was not finally solved for another forty years.<sup>19</sup> The Church Building Commission committee's recommendations did not enjoy even this degree of success: the plan 'broke down in application because of lack of funds, the impossibility in some places of letting enough pews to provide a stipend, the difficulty of finding sites, and the hostility of vestries.'

In the spring of 1826 the Honourable Shute Barrington, Bishop of Durham for thirty-five years, was gravely ill. By early March Liverpool was sure enough of the outcome to propose to George IV that Van Mildert should be offered the bishopric, 'should it unhappily become vacant'; the King raised no objection.<sup>20</sup> Barrington died on March 25th. Before the end of the day, Liverpool had made the offer and Van Mildert had accepted.<sup>21</sup>

The formalities surrounding Van Mildert's translation from the poorest see in the Church of England to the richest after Canterbury were performed with dispatch. The official nomination was made on 27th March, the congé d'élire and letter recommendatory issued on April 5th, the canonical election took place on April 14th, the Confirmation on April 24th.<sup>22</sup> This did not constitute exceptional haste; during the Reform crisis of 1831, Lord Grey caused scandal by filling a vacant see with such alacrity that the congé d'elire arrived before the funeral of the departed bishop.<sup>23</sup> It was, however, creditably expeditious, no doubt stimulated by the serious civil consequences of a vacancy in the See of Durham. The Bishop of Durham was also Earl of Sadberge and Earl Palatine of Durham,

with quasi-viceregal powers dating back to the Saxon 'patrimony of St. Cuthbert'. By 1826 these powers were much reduced in scope, but it remained true, for instance, that neither the trial of prisoners nor any other business requiring a jury could be transacted during a vacancy in see.<sup>24</sup>

Van Mildert's elevation was greeted with delight by the rest of the High Church group. Howley wrote to Liverpool, who had evidently solicited his opinion, 'I...entirely approve of the translation of the Bishop of Llandaff to Durham, both for the reasons which your Lordship has stated and because I know no man who possesses in a higher degree all the qualities essential to the character of a Christian Bishop.'<sup>25</sup> On April 1st, Van Mildert wrote to Henry Douglas that 'a host of friends' had been 'fortifying me by their kind expressions of satisfaction and delight'. Henry had picked up a rumour that Van Mildert owed his preferment to 'the particular wish of the King', and this notion was firmly dispelled: 'The style, on such occasions, always is, that the Minister has it in command for His Majesty to make the offer. But this implies nothing of a personal kind.' The 'credit, or discredit,' was due in Van Mildert's opinion to Lord Liverpool.<sup>26</sup>

Credit, indeed, attached to all concerned; Van Mildert's appointment as prince bishop offered irrefutable proof that under Lord Liverpool's administration, 'merit and morals were now at least as weighty qualifications for the highest preferments as birth and connexion.'<sup>27</sup>

Ironically, Van Mildert's preferment involved him in considerable financial embarrassment. The expenses of taking

possession of so rich a see were massive: Shute Barrington in 1787 paid £266.12s.8d in fees alone.<sup>28</sup> Not only were there firstfruits, the many attendant expenses of leaving Llandaff and St. Paul's, the need to acquire a suitable London residence; there was also the lavish scale on which a Prince Bishop was required to operate in his own diocese.

'Do not....figure to yourself, in the occupier of Auckland Castle, a man divested of cares and troubles,' Van Mildert wrote to Bruce Knight towards the end of the year. 'An enormous domestic establishment; an unavoidable expenditure, upon a scale which will probably make this See a much less productive source of private wealth than some of much inferior revenues; together with the incessant applications for contributions & patronage of every kind....You may form some idea of the large scale on which things are done here when I mention that at Durham Castle, in the Assize week, I entertained in the course of three days upwards of 200 guests at dinner; and in my four public days at Auckland Castle nearly 300.'<sup>29</sup>

In order to cope with the short-term financial burden, Van Mildert was 'obliged to borrow to a considerable extent, and he insured his life at a considerable premium, because he was a bad life and he paid an additional sum; but altogether it was a source of great concern and anxiety to him.'<sup>30</sup>

Pomp and ceremonial were the hallmarks of Van Mildert's new palatine rank, and he coped with them to general admiration. He was spared the ceremony of Installation and Inthronization, which was performed in Durham Cathedral on 30th May 1826 with the Prebendary of the First Prebend, Thomas Gisborne, acting as

proxy for the absent Bishop. Cochrane speculates that Van Mildert's absence may have been due to ill-health, but it is not clear how essential a bishop's presence at his own installation was deemed at this time; in 1848 J.B. Sumner became 'the first of modern Archbishops to be enthroned at Canterbury'.<sup>31</sup>

The journey from London to Durham was no light undertaking in 1826. Van Mildert left London on July 11th, accompanied by his wife, his two domestic chaplains and his personal secretary. His Chaplains were his longstanding friend and protégé T.L. Strong, and C.J. Plumer. His secretary was Robert Archibald Douglas-Gresley, Henry Douglas' brother; the name Gresley had been assumed at the wish of a wealthy benefactress. Douglas-Gresley, after studying at Rugby, had been 'admitted a Solicitor, and practised in the Temple' before accepting the post of secretary to his uncle. The ability with which he discharged his duties is witnessed by the fact that Van Mildert's successor Maltby, a Whig nominee very unpopular with High Tories, retained Douglas-Gresley's services, as did Maltby's successor.<sup>32</sup>

Van Mildert's departure from London may have been delayed - the Durham Advertiser of 3rd June expected the Bishop to arrive in his new diocese on 27th June.<sup>33</sup> The journey, once started, was rapid. On July 11th the episcopal party (Douglas-Gresley makes no mention of servants, but the travellers must have been attended) covered 86 miles, sleeping at Wandsford. On July 12th they covered 94 miles before spending the night at Ferrybridge. July 13th took Van Mildert to the border of his diocese and the

party halted at Croft at the unwontedly early hour of 4 p.m., ready for the next day's triumphal entry.

'This morning presented a scene of much bustle and Gaiety at Croft,' Douglas-Gresley recorded in his diary for Friday July 14th, 'a great number of Ladies and Gentlemen arriving in carriages and on horseback to witness His Lordship's entry into his County Palatine of Durham.' During the morning, local worthies called to pay their compliments; among them was Lord Barrington, Prebendary of the 11th Prebend and kin to the late Bishop. Another caller was Dr. Henry Phillpotts, Rector of the fabulously wealthy benefice of Stanhope and a noted High Tory polemicist.

At noon, Van Mildert set out in a coach and six to cross the bridge into County Durham. Douglas-Gresley and the chaplains accompanied him, but Jane Van Mildert was relegated to the following vehicle. A large cheering crowd waited on the bridge, and it was with some difficulty that a space was cleared for Van Mildert to descend from his coach and receive the honorary service (performed by proxy) due from the Lord of the Manor of Sockburne.

The Bishop then processed in triumph into Darlington, some four miles away, at the head of 'about forty other carriages besides a large cavalcade of horsemen, and some hundreds of people on foot. We drove up to the King's Head Inn, where the Bishop held a sort of Levee at which a great number of the Gentry and Clergy of the County and also the Corporation of the Borough of Stockton were introduced to him. His Lordship afterwards entertained them all with a handsome cold collation,

at which Champagne, Hock, Claret and a variety of other wines were produced.'

For the journey on to Auckland Castle, Van Mildert returned Jane to her place at his side in the coach and six with four outriders; Strong accompanied them, Douglas-Gresley and Plumer following in the second vehicle. An honour guard of 'about 30 or 40 horsemen' met them a mile from the Castle, 'preceded us to the Castle Gate and there drew up on each side in rank and file while we passed through them into the Castle Court....'

It was a long way from Llandaff, a sudden and substantial dislocation, and Van Mildert's letters to Bruce Knight suggest a certain wistfulness. Writing on the day of his official nomination to give Bruce Knight the news of his imminent translation, Van Mildert spoke of his 'regret...on quitting a Diocese, where I have received such invariable kindness and attention, and have derived so much real satisfaction. More especially do I feel this with regard to yourself, and continually am I wishing that I may be fortunate enough to meet with such an one in Durham, to be my constant friend and coadjutor....'

Later in the year, Van Mildert wrote that the ceremonies of his arrival in Durham had 'been gone through with much less fatigue or difficulty than the chief performer had anticipated, and apparently with mutual satisfaction to the parties concerned. I were unworthy, indeed, of the reception I have met with, both from the Clergy and Laity, if I did not retain a grateful sense of....the more than ordinary courtesies and civilities, I have everywhere experienced....the air of this

delightful spot seems likely to suit me extremely well. I often wish for you here, to taste its sweets: and though the country in general in Durham, is not comparable in picturesque scenery with Glamorgan, or Monmouthshire, yet Auckland itself may vie, perhaps, with any individual spot in either of them....<sup>35</sup>

Van Mildert performed his Primary Visitation in the summer of 1827; it took a full month. The programme started in Durham City with a visitation and a confirmation on successive days, a public dinner being held at Durham Castle on each evening. During the month, Van Mildert held visitations at Newcastle, Berwick, Alnwick, Morpeth and Auckland and confirmations were planned at Chester-le-Street, Newcastle, Ryton, Hexham, Rothbury, Wooler, Berwick, Bambrough, Alnwick, Morpeth, North Shields, Sunderland, Hartlepool, Stockton, Sedgefield, Auckland, Barnard Castle, Wolsingham and Stanhope. From brief notes which Van Mildert kept on the first week of his travels, it is known that illness forced him to cancel the confirmation at Chester-le-Street; whether any other part of this gruelling schedule had likewise to be abandoned is not known.<sup>36</sup>

Sundays during the Visitation were kept strictly free of official business. The first was spent at Ryton Rectory with the Rector, Charles Thorp, who acted as unpaid 'official' on behalf of the elderly Archdeacon Prosser of Durham. Thorp, a former Fellow and Tutor of University College Oxford, had kept up his studies after his preferment to Ryton in 1817, passing B.D. in 1822. Although they had a common friend in Charles Lloyd, Van Mildert never met Thorp until his own arrival in Durham; Thorp was then forty-three.<sup>37</sup>

Van Mildert enjoyed Thorp's company, and a warm intimacy developed between them. Part of their correspondence, from June 21st 1831, is preserved in the Thorp Papers at Durham University Library, but the first of the surviving letters was clearly not the first letter to pass between them, and the precise rate at which their friendship developed is not known. By 1831 Thorp was well established as Van Mildert's confidential agent.

Van Mildert used his Primary Visitation Charge to issue a series of linked challenges to his clergy. Shute Barrington had been an energetic bishop, famous for his generosity and his readiness to support societies, whatever their ecclesiastical hue, of whose objects he approved. A pastorally-minded man, he liked to sign letters to his clergy 'Your affectionate Brother, S. Dunelm'<sup>38</sup> and was imaginative in his personal charities - when Howley was preferred to the See of London in 1813, Barrington wrote a warm note pressing him to accept a loan to cover immediate expenses.<sup>39</sup> Van Mildert described him to Bruce Knight as 'my late venerable friend', and there was nothing forced about the eulogy of his predecessor with which the new Bishop's Charge commenced. Nevertheless, there were aspects of Barrington's diocesan administration with which Van Mildert was less than satisfied: 'many things require to be scrutinized and rectified,' he wrote in October 1826.<sup>40</sup>

Van Mildert's Charge indicated some of his dissatisfactions. He urged the importance of proper licensing of curates, pointing out the need for a bishop to 'know with certainty who are the actually officiating Clergy of his

Diocese', in order to be able to 'exercise that effectual superintendence over them, which is one of the most important functions of his office', and to protect curates suffering 'real' grievances. He also drew attention to the risk that using unlicensed curates would introduce 'exceptionable persons into the Diocese, of whose character and qualifications sufficient evidence may be wanting.'<sup>41</sup>

Two further specific anxieties were identified: one about the licensing of unconsecrated buildings for public worship, the other about the admission of academically unqualified candidates to Holy Orders. Van Mildert announced his intention of accepting as ordinands, 'with as few exceptions as possible', only graduates of Oxbridge or of the theological college founded at St. Bees in 1816 by Bishop Law. Irregular places of worship were 'in some special cases...the only practicable expedient for supplying the spiritual wants of the people', but Van Mildert greatly disliked the necessity, and was also anxious that widespread use of secular buildings for worship would undermine support for the Church Building Society. He therefore appealed for 'increased efforts to erect and endow a sufficient number of regular Chapels of Ease', promising his own 'best endeavours' in support.<sup>42</sup>

Van Mildert regarded himself as fully committed to meeting the spiritual needs of such expanding urban centres as Sunderland, Gateshead and Stockton, and to countering the spread of Primitive Methodism in the mining communities. He made it clear at the outset, however, that he was prepared to allow much less latitude than his predecessor in the means

employed. All was to be done in decent Hackney order, or as near an imitation as could be managed.

More positively, the Charge outlined the priorities which Van Mildert wished his clergy to make their own. 'If Schools, if Glebe-houses, if Churches, be still wanting or defective; if any portion of your flocks still betray ignorance or error, in doctrine, in discipline, or in practice; if any thing be still requisite to relieve the wants, spiritual or temporal, of those who are committed to your charge, no past labours, however meritorious or successful, can supersede the obligation of additional efforts to complete the work of your ministry.'<sup>43</sup>

Underpinning this appeal and giving it urgency was the examination of the current situation in Church and State with which Van Mildert concluded his Charge. Enemies were, he warned his hearers, bent on 'obtaining for every religious persuasion an entire equality of immunities and privileges, and, consequently, raising every religious sect and party to a level with the Established Church.'<sup>44</sup>

This determination Van Mildert blamed partly on a love of innovation for its own sake, partly on a double misconception of the Church of England clergy as exercising undue control over the laity and of Establishment as an infringement of religious liberty. He compared the role of the Anglican clergy with that of the Roman Catholic priest 'going forth among his people, armed with spiritual terrors and persuasives of every description', and with the degree of central or ministerial control 'ingeniously' exercised by 'some of our most popular sects'. In the Church of England, the relation of Prelate to

Pastor and of Pastor to flock was strictly regulated by law, with legal redress available 'for every undue assumption of power'. The Pastor's 'chief power, indeed, is that of persuasion, exhortation, or admonition; his main influence, that of character and reputation.'

The Church of England was, Van Mildert asserted, 'itself among the best bulwarks of religious liberty', saving the country from the 'yoke' of some more domineering religious system; any assault on Anglican privilege therefore also threatened 'that general security and freedom which members of every religious denomination now enjoy under its benignant auspices.' Removing the political ascendancy of the Church of England would 'break down the very fences and bulwarks of our Establishment', rendering the Church-State alliance 'impotent and of no avail'. The continuance of religious liberty would then rest solely on the goodwill of a State which might be governed by people of any shade of Christian belief - or (though Van Mildert did not specifically remark on this further possibility) none.

Van Mildert urged his clergy to stave off the impending catastrophe by every means at their disposal: by 'fervent supplications to the throne of grace', by reliance on Providence, by personal conduct so immaculate as to be 'invulnerable even to malignity itself', and by assiduity in the discharge of pastoral duties: 'not only such as relate to the public ritual of the Church, and your discourses from the pulpit; but also the visiting of the sick, the instruction of the ignorant, the consolation of the afflicted, the relief of

the necessitous, and the education of the poor in the principles of our Established Church.' He suggested joining the Anglican Societies as an aid to carrying out this programme effectively.

These labours, he assured them, were no less essential to the Church's warfare than those of the few to whom it was given 'to stand prominent in the field...., to engage in individual conflict, and to gather trophies of success.'

This was the Phalanx vision of the Church in its most ideal form, and for all its intrinsic paternalism it was not without attractions. Unfortunately it was unworkable, predicated upon an imaginary Golden Age when every pastor's flock was of a manageable size and a biddable disposition, and every pastor's highest ambition the privilege of serving the People of God. The vast urban parishes needed far more than the devotion of one priest, however diligent; the sheer scale of poverty both among the new industrial workforce and among agricultural labourers defeated the Hackney imagination. Yet the position which the Hackney Phalanx wished the Church of England to fill in national life depended crucially on her ability to meet the religious needs of the entire nation, to minister as widely as the Government.

To Van Mildert, the political privileges of the Church of England were an essential part of Establishment: the Established Church must be ruled by good citizens, and good citizens were by definition members of the Established Church. This was the classic Hooker theory of Parliament as lay synod of the national Church. But by 1827, the theory no longer bore

a sufficiently strong resemblance to political reality to preserve the fragile legislative superstructure by which it was maintained.

It seemed particularly hard to Van Mildert that at such a critical time, the Church should be deprived of one of her principal defenders: Lord Liverpool had retired from public life following a stroke in February 1827. Van Mildert regarded the Prime Minister with affection and respect, as patron, as friend and as valued statesman; the tragedy had, he wrote, 'thrown a gloom and sadness over me, which I cannot dispel. God only knows what may be the result. In my estimation, no loss could have been so irreparable to the country, especially at this awful crisis, when matters of the highest importance, both to Church and State, seem to be hanging by a thread.'<sup>45</sup>

After the Visitations and Confirmations were completed, Van Mildert returned to Durham Castle for the Assizes and the accompanying 'usual hospitalities', then to Auckland Castle to entertain visitors. On September 6th the Anniversary Meeting of the Sons of the Clergy, held in Newcastle, resolved to found a diocesan committee of 'the Society for promoting the Enlargement and Building of Churches and Chapels',<sup>46</sup> a decision which must have gratified the Bishop. By mid-September Van Mildert was in Harrogate, having been advised 'to pass two or three weeks here, in a sort of stupid recreation, for which, to say the truth, I have but little appetite,' he wrote to Bruce Knight. However, 'a little privacy here, with Mrs. V.M., is quite a novelty, and is relished as such by both of us.'<sup>47</sup>

At the end of September, the Duke of Wellington accepted an

invitation to stay with the Marquis and Marchioness of Londonderry at their seat Wynyard, near Stockton. The visit turned into a triumphal progress through the North-East. Wellington stayed at Bishopsthorpe as the guest of the Archbishop of York, was greeted at Stockton by a cold collation tastefully arranged - 'the names of the gallant Duke's victories appearing over many of the dishes' - and, arriving at Wynyard, was the guest of honour at a great banquet for the nobility and gentry of the county.<sup>48</sup> Van Mildert and Jane, who made a special journey from Harrogate 'solely for the purpose of meeting the Noble Duke' and returned thither almost at once, secured Wellington's promise to be the guest of honour at Durham Castle on Wednesday October 3rd.

The banquet for Wellington was the most renowned of all Van Mildert's acts of hospitality as Bishop of Durham. The civic authorities joined in the razzamatazz: Wellington, who had filled the interval with a lavish civic reception in Newcastle and a visit to Londonderry's coal works, was met at Framwellgate Moor by 'a number of men with pink ribbons round their hats, lettered "Wellington for ever!" appointed to draw the celebrated warrior into Durham'. His arrival was greeted by the playing of 'See the conquering Hero comes', 'the people loudly cheering, cannon roaring, and bells ringing'. In front of the Town Hall was a 'commodious' platform approached by an arch of laurels and flowers and a display of laudatory banners, the largest of which was six yards long. Wellington received addresses from the Mayor and Corporation and from the Citizens of Durham on the platform, then an address from the Magistrates

and Gentlemen of the County was delivered by the Hon. W.K. Barrington on the steps in front of the County Courts. Ladies viewed the proceedings from temporary seating erected inside the Town Hall, whose windows had been removed to give them a better view.

The civic part of the festivities concluded, Wellington 're-entered, with the Marquis and Marchioness of Londonderry, the open carriage, amid the cheering of an admiring multitude, and was drawn by the populace to the Bishop's Castle, where the Duke was received by his lordship and his Chaplains, and almost immediately afterwards took a hasty view of the Cathedral and College, whilst the company were assembling at the Castle.'<sup>49</sup>

The banquet was all that the occasion demanded: the Durham County Advertiser said it 'united all the sumptuousness of a noble banquet, with the comfort of a private entertainment' and the Van Mildert Papers preserve a sheaf of bills for everything from hire of twenty-one dozen wine glasses to fluting of doors with crimson moreen and 'covering door way with crimson Drugget', from twenty-seven and a half pounds of Cheshire Cheese to an intolerable deal of alcohol. The guest list included the Marquess of Douro, Earl Bathurst, Viscounts Beresford and Castlereagh, the Bishop of Gloucester, two Lords, seven Honourables (one of them Wellington's younger brother Gerald Valerian Wellesley, who earlier in the year had been presented to the Rectory of Wearmouth Episcopi by the Crown and to the Fifth Prebend by Van Mildert<sup>50</sup>), three Baronets, Colonels Freemantle and Sir Henry Brown, General Aylmer, Sir Thomas Lawrence and Sir Henry Hardinge, the Archdeacons of

Northumberland and Richmond (but not Durham), and 'nearly 100 of the principal Gentry and Clergy of the County'. The feast was held in the Great Hall; Jane Van Mildert, although the Durham County Advertiser did not deem it worth a mention, entertained 'the ladies' elsewhere in the castle.<sup>51</sup>

After the removal of the cloth and the rendition of 'Non Nobis Domine' by the Cathedral choir, the serious drinking began. Toasts were drunk to the King and the Royal Family; the choir sang the National Anthem; and Van Mildert proposed the toast to Wellington in a speech carefully worded to be generous in its praise of 'the Illustrious Guest' while 'avoiding every topic which could have excited a jarring sentiment'.<sup>52</sup> The most inflammatory phrase Van Mildert permitted himself was to offer Wellington 'that humble tribute of veneration and gratitude, which is due from every one who knows how to value the blessings of our admirable Constitution in Church and State.'<sup>53</sup>

Some among his hearers must have been disappointed by this moderation. The pink ribbons and pink banners, pink being the local Tory electoral colour, make quite clear the Tory nature of the civic celebrations, and the Duke's progress through the North-East had blatant political overtones. Wellington was a leading politician, one of the most influential members of Liverpool's last cabinet. The mixed administration of Canningites and Whigs which had taken office in April, fatally weakened by the death of Canning in August, staggered towards dissolution, and Wellington was widely regarded as the prime minister in waiting. Waterloo lay twelve years in the past; the heroising of Wellington in 1827 was inspired less by past

vainglory than by present anticipation. But Van Mildert, whatever his personal political preferences, was no party politician: 'had Van Mildert been indisposed, and....Prebendary Henry Phillpotts done the honours instead, the rafters would have rung to louder loyal cheers, and Whiggery perhaps been given some notable snub.'<sup>54</sup>

Besides proposing toasts to Londonderry and Beresford as Wellington's comrades-in-arms, Van Mildert also seized the opportunity to honour another of his guests, 'a native of our Sister Country....with whom I have this day, for the first time, become personally acquainted; but for whose incomparable writings I have long entertained....the highest possible admiration.' Van Mildert called particular attention to the fact that 'his unrivalled talents....have invariably been employed in upholding what is good and excellent, and have never....been perverted to a sinister purpose.'<sup>55</sup> The Bishop deliberately made his listeners wait until the end of the speech for the name of this 'mystery guest': Sir Walter Scott, who was also visiting in the neighbourhood.

Scott 'expressed his thanks with evident emotion,....saying, that he must ever consider it one of the proudest events of his life, that he was praised by the Bishop of Durham, in his own hall, when he was entertaining the Duke of Wellington.'<sup>56</sup>

In the evening, 'the young gentlemen of the Grammar School' played their part in the festivities, sending up 'a very splendid balloon of tissue paper from the Palace Green'.<sup>57</sup> Whose idea it was for the Grammar School boys to have this

opportunity of displaying their scientific and engineering prowess is not recorded.

'The Bishop's manner of receiving his illustrious guests has been much spoken of,' Howley wrote to Van Mildert's chaplain T.L. Strong later that month, '- and I have heard disappointment expressed that no detail of the Speeches has appeared in the London Papers:- Perfect as was the entertainment with all its accompaniments, the Bishops [sic] admirable demeanour, & eloquence, are said to have outshone every other part of the celebrity....'

In January 1828 the Goderich administration finally accepted defeat, and Wellington became Prime Minister, with Robert Peel as his Home Secretary. At the end of the month Howley gave a dinner in honour of the newest Hackney recruit to the episcopal bench, Bishop Lloyd of Oxford, and Wellington replied to a parliamentary question that the government had no intention of bringing forward a measure for Catholic relief. In February, Lord John Russell announced his intention of moving for repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, a proposal which he had made the previous May but postponed due to Government changes.

These Acts submitted members of corporations and Crown officers to the 'sacramental test' that they should, within the twelve months previous to their appointment, have received the Anglican Sacrament of Holy Communion. As has already been remarked, the Acts were no longer rigidly enforced, annual Acts of Indemnity being passed in respect of the exceptions. There was thus a clear commonsense argument in favour of removing the

Act from the statute book. Moreover, theological objections had from the first been raised by those who saw the Test as an inducement to Dissenters and Infidels to receive the Sacrament in an improper way, for the sake of gaining office.

Proposed at that juncture, and from that quarter, the Repeal Bill could not but be seen as a manoeuvre towards Catholic Emancipation. A number of speakers, in both Houses, explicitly made the connection; opinions varied as to the effect its passage would actually produce on the Catholic Question. Some argued that it would enable the Catholics to plead the injustice of a position in which they were the only religious group debarred by law from a share in government, others that it would stiffen the grateful Dissenters against Catholic claims.<sup>60</sup>

The government agreed to Peel's proposal that it should offer a moderate opposition to the repeal motion. Lloyd, Peel's former tutor and continuing adviser, while not sanguinary about the ultimate chances of defeating the repeal, urged Peel not to 'concede to the Dissenters' without first consulting some of the leading bishops - he suggested the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishops of London and Durham - adding that 'it may be of great importance for you to be able to say afterwards that you acted with their sanction.'<sup>61</sup>

Despite the opposition of the government, Lord John Russell's motion was carried by a majority of 44. Lloyd received letters from Van Mildert, asking 'whether we are to "succumb to clamour and vituperation" or whether we shall throw it out in the House of Lords', and from Blomfield, who as

Bishop of Chester was rapidly establishing himself among the most able and energetic episcopal parliamentarians, and who wished the bishops 'would consent to give them [the Acts] up with a good grace - and not have the repeal extorted from them, as it must be before long.'<sup>62</sup>

Peel conducted his own soundings among the bishops, concluding that Canterbury, Durham, London and Chester, 'though they may not be in precise conformity,....incline to a permanent settlement of the Question now' and that Kaye of Lincoln, Copleston of Llandaff and Law of Bath and Wells were 'at least as favourable'.<sup>63</sup>

On March 3rd Van Mildert wrote Lloyd a letter which in passing it to Peel Lloyd described as 'sensible and moderate'. He still wished the Lords to reject the Repeal Bill, if only to give time for a better measure to be drawn up and presented with full governmental and episcopal support; he suggested that such a measure might originate in the Lords. His main concern, however, was that an appropriate means of securing the ascendancy of the Established Church should be devised. 'All I am anxious for,' he assured Lloyd, 'is to have some demonstration of affection & respect for the Church, in the Upper House, & on the part of the Govt. as a counterpoise or a check to the increasing spirit of disaffection to it in the Commons....'<sup>64</sup>

The need for the government and the bishops to agree on a fitting substitute for the sacramental test led to a meeting at Lambeth on March 15th, between Peel, both Archbishops, and the Bishops of Llandaff, Durham, London and Chester. 'We settled a

declaration,' Peel wrote to Lloyd, '- which I think will go down in the House of Commons which we can carry against the dissenting interest there and will in my opinion or at least ought under all circumstances to be satisfactory to the Church.'<sup>65</sup>

Peel's declaration, drafted by himself on the basis of the Lambeth discussions, formed the main component of an amendment accepted by Lord John Russell for incorporation into the Repeal Bill at the first committee stage on March 18th.

The amendment failed to satisfy Van Mildert for two reasons. In the first place, Peel's declaration bound the office holder not to use any power or influence possessed by virtue of his office to 'injure or subvert' the Established Church or to 'disturb it in the possession of those rights and privileges to which it is by law entitled'.<sup>66</sup> Van Mildert had argued at Lambeth for the omission of the qualification 'by virtue of my office', on the grounds that no person sincerely well-affected to the Establishment would be unwilling to make the unqualified declaration; his view had not prevailed with Peel. In the second place, the Bill as amended gave discretion to the Crown to determine who should and who should not be required to make the declaration, a provision which would not seem to have been agreed at Lambeth.<sup>67</sup>

Van Mildert pointed out that an unsympathetic Minister could exercise this discretion so widely as to vitiate the whole purpose of having a declaration. 'Or, the effect may be, that in some instances it may be enforced, in others dispensed with - of which, the consequence would soon follow, that to

enforce it in any instance, would be deemed invidious & offensive.' The only effective remedy, Van Mildert held, would be to make the declaration mandatory in all cases.<sup>66</sup>

Enquiries having shown that 'some of the most discreet, moderate, & influential members of our Church' shared his anxieties, Van Mildert wrote urgently to Archbishop Manners-Sutton before descending on Lloyd; he arrived 'at the same moment' as a note to Lloyd from Tournay, Warden of Wadham, making the same two points.<sup>67</sup>

Lloyd's position of mediator between Peel and Van Mildert was now a painful one, and his letters reveal his discomfort. 'It is really of extreme importance to give what satisfaction you can to the high party both in the Country and the House of Lords - Van Mildert is manifestly alarmed lest the Bishops should be accused of truckling - he told me that two or three members of the H. of L. had said to him "So I hear you have deserted us" & had added "I am sorry you should have left us to fight the battle without you."'

Peel and Van Mildert, in their turn, were each in difficult positions. Peel was being asked to amend a formulary of his own drafting after it had been publicly accepted by all parties, a solecism verging on the unthinkable; he was also irritated that Van Mildert should be so critical of a document based on agreements to which Peel 'understood him distinctly to be an assenting party'.<sup>70</sup> Van Mildert was nevertheless a valuable potential supporter whom Peel needed to conciliate if possible.

Van Mildert found himself caught between the government and the ultra-Tories, each of whom claimed to be defending the best

interests of the Church, but whose chosen courses of action were mutually exclusive. His instinct was to side with the government, but to do this with a quiet mind he had to satisfy his own conscience that the proposed declaration really was a safe replacement for the sacramental test. The government were the heirs of the Liverpool administration with which the Hackney Phalanx had enjoyed so long and satisfactory a working relationship; their claim on his loyalty was strong, and Van Mildert's belief that they were true friends of the Church still held. But to refuse the call to fight to the end in defence of the Church's rights made him deeply anxious. Peel's failure to respond to the two criticisms only added to his disquiet.

The Bill's second committee stage was timetabled for March 24th. On March 23rd, having received no word, Van Mildert wrote to Peel direct. At about the same time the hapless Lloyd, who had been 'very unwell for the last week & confined to the house', visited by no-one but Van Mildert and Tournay, attempted to improve matters by sounding Peel out on the possibility that Van Mildert might put up an amendment to the Bill in the House of Lords. He went so far as to suggest a possible wording.

Peel jumped to the understandable conclusion that this idea had originated with Van Mildert and, furious, wrote back to Lloyd accusing Van Mildert of being terrified by the lay peers. He flatly refused to 'be a party to any amendment that the Bishop of Durham may move [in] the House of Lords'.>

Lloyd returned a cool reply, denying that Van Mildert had

even known of the suggestions about an amendment. He was anxious that Van Mildert should be able to give the measure full and warm support, he explained, partly because Van Mildert's sentiments were 'generally in unison with those of the Church of England', partly 'from my personal regard for him and my gratitude for his uniform kindness to me'.<sup>72</sup>

In the meantime Peel had written a patient letter to Van Mildert, reminding him that the declaration had been drawn up in good faith after very full consultation with the Bishops, explaining the impossibility of amending it and giving the reasoning behind the provisions for discretionary exemption. It would, Peel argued, 'bring the Declaration into ridicule' if it had to be subscribed by every Crown official, however menial or unrelated to Church matters his work might be. Exercise of the discretionary power would be regulated in detail, but by 'the King in Council from time to time' rather than by statute; this was the fruit of an amendment secured by Peel himself the previous evening.<sup>73</sup>

On March 28th Van Mildert 'called on Mr. Peel and had nearly half an hour's conference'. The discussion was amicable, and Van Mildert came away satisfied that he could support the measure as it now stood - 'though,' he wrote to Lloyd, 'I apprehend we must expect some hard knocks from our high-church friends in the Upper House.' The letter closed with an affectionate enquiry after Lloyd's health: 'I hope your Leeches did their duty....'<sup>74</sup>

The Bill came up for its second reading in the Lords on April 17th. Van Mildert, as he had agreed, rose to defend it,

truthfully assuring their Lordships that he had 'laboured with great earnestness and sincerity, to satisfy myself that the measure now proposed may be acceded to, with safety and with credit to the Established Church.' The bulk of his speech was employed in defending the principle and practice of Establishment. Denying that a man's religious opinions could be considered as irrelevant to his fitness for political office, Van Mildert defended the Bill on the grounds that by laying down in its preamble the permanent and inviolable establishment of the Church of England, and by substituting a serviceable political test for a religious test which was 'no longer a decisive proof of church-membership, nor, indeed, was it ever entirely so,' its actual effect would be to preserve the Church's ascendancy.<sup>75</sup> The speech reflected a less than total enthusiasm for the Bill, which Van Mildert hinted could do with further improvement in committee; he was careful to vindicate this alteration to the law governing Establishment 'on such grounds only as should fully warrant me in resisting any farther encroachments, which may hereafter be grounded upon this measure....'<sup>76</sup>

The bishops turned out in force to support the Bill. Among those who spoke in the debate were the Archbishop of York, who offered the apologies of Manners-Sutton due to serious illness, Kaye of Lincoln and Blomfield. Like Van Mildert, Blomfield defended the original framers of the Test and Corporation Acts against imputations of making unworthy use of the Sacrament, explaining the abuses as a latter-day phenomenon.<sup>77</sup>

The ultra-Tory peers were fully as angry as Van Mildert had

predicted, accusing the bishops of suspiciously rapid changes of opinion, and of naivete in supposing they could preserve the Established Church by tearing down her defences.<sup>70</sup> The attacks roused Van Mildert to a far more spirited defence of his position: he assured his critics that 'the alliance between Church and State did not originate with the Test laws,' and that the question was 'not whether the fortress shall be surrendered, but whether the outworks shall remain as they were, or be reconstructed on a somewhat different plan.' His anxiety about the Bill was concerned, he explained, not with its provisions, but with those among its supporters who might view it as 'an incipient measure only, opening a way for some ulterior objects.'<sup>71</sup>

Anxious to avoid misrepresentation, Van Mildert had his own speeches on the Bill printed for private circulation, with the usual editorial assistance and moral support from Joshua Watson; he expressed particular concern that his clergy should 'know what I actually did say, and judge of me accordingly.'<sup>72</sup> Privately he acknowledged to Watson that he still found the Bill 'anything but satisfactory', adding 'God knows, this whole proceeding has been a bitter pill to me, from the effects of which I shall not soon recover.'<sup>73</sup>

In May the question of Catholic Relief was again raised in the Commons on the motion of Burdett. On this occasion the majority was six in favour of the motion. The Lords discussed a similar motion on June 13th, rejecting it by a majority of 44; but Wellington's speech made it clear that he was now personally convinced of the necessity of relief, and waiting

only for acceptable safeguards to be devised. The election of Daniel O'Connell as Member for County Clare made it brutally clear that unless Catholics were admitted to Parliament, the whole basis of parliamentary representation in Ireland risked destruction. Wellington's speech offered a strong possibility that the next Catholic Relief Bill would be government sponsored.

'Now I tell you a secret,' Lloyd wrote to Peel on June 15th. 'After the Debate on Tuesday, the B. of Durham took me home in his carriage....I said "You will live now to see this question pass." "Perhaps so," he answered, "& if this Administration chuse to bring forward the Measure, I have no objection; it will be a very different thing coming from them." I only tell you this confidentially. My own opinion is with him.'<sup>82</sup>

What Peel, himself still bent on resignation if the government should produce such a Bill,<sup>83</sup> made of this extraordinary story can only be imagined. It is still harder to understand how Van Mildert could have made anything approximating to the remark Lloyd reports. In 1825, Van Mildert had committed himself publicly to opposing the principle of Catholic Relief, leaving himself no room for manoeuvre at a later date. He was unsatisfied with the government's handling of the far less contentious Repeal Bill and with its reception of his own objections. The cautions in his speeches on the Repeal Bill against making that Bill the basis for any further tamperings with the privileges of Establishment must surely have been intended to refer to Catholic Emancipation. Outside

this letter of Lloyd's, there is no reliable indication that Van Mildert ever deviated from uncompromising opposition to every measure for political emancipation of Roman Catholics.<sup>84</sup>

In July, Manners-Sutton died. Writing to the King about the choice of a successor, Wellington announced that Howley and Van Mildert were the two bishops 'who by talents, qualifications, and reputation, stand the highest'. Van Mildert 'would be preferable'; Howley, however, had the seniority, and Wellington recommended the King to prefer him, lest resentment might lead to a coolness between the persons filling the sees of Canterbury and of London.<sup>85</sup> Howley's see of London was given to Blomfield.

Chadwick suggests that Wellington chose Howley because, although like Van Mildert he had committed himself to opposing Catholic Emancipation, Howley 'looked so easy to frighten'.<sup>86</sup> Van Mildert was also a much more effective public speaker, and enjoyed a prestige second to none with the parochial clergy.

After a rather slow start, Howley had been drawn into close involvement with the Hackney Phalanx, and now the Phalanx greeted his elevation with pleasure; also with a determination to stiffen him for the coming battle. 'The unaffected grief & concern which I could not but feel on the loss of your late invaluable Predecessor,' Van Mildert wrote from Auckland, '.... is much alleviated by the confident persuasion that the same undeviating & firm adherence to the genuine principles of our Church-Establishment....will characterise his Successor, & enable us, under Providence, to uphold those principles & those interests against the lukewarmness of it's friends, & the

machinations of its enemies, from both of which, we have, at the present crisis, but too much reason to apprehend extensive injury.' Park was more blunt, reminding Howley that he was now to be 'spiritual head of the first Protestant Church...of the World', and calling upon him 'to advance the Glory of God, the welfare of the Church against all Popery, heresy & schism...'

In August Wellington wrote to the King that 'rebellion was pending in Ireland; that in England the government was faced with a House of Commons it dared not dissolve which contained a majority who believed the only solution was Catholic emancipation'. Wellington had himself opposed this solution in the past, but was now ready to yield to the inevitable. Peel, more deeply committed to the 'Protestant' interest and made doubly vulnerable by his position as Member for Oxford University, continued to struggle.

Wellington consulted with some of the leading bishops in November, and reported them to be adamant against 'concession'. At the end of the year Lloyd was at Addington with three bishops, probably Howley, Blomfield and Van Mildert, and reported that they would not consent to Catholic relief in any form. 'Your individual position was not mentioned,' Lloyd wrote to Peel, adding 'I must....take some time to think.'

By January 15th, Peel was ready to accept the King's challenge and remain in office in order to see through the Catholic emancipation measure which he had come to believe was the government's only possible course. The choice, he explained to Lloyd, was no longer whether the Catholic Question should be settled, but whether or not the settlement should be

'favourable to the Protestant Establishment.'

The decision cost Peel his seat as Member for Oxford University. At the end of January he consulted Gaisford and Dean Smith of Christ Church in confidence as to whether, in view of his intentions on Catholic Emancipation, he should offer his resignation. 'Thunderstruck and very sad', they felt it to be essential to the integrity of his position. In the ensuing by-election Peel was beaten by Sir Robert Inglis, and the Tory party managers had hastily to arrange a pocket borough for him.

Peel moved for Catholic Relief on March 5th. The Government's Bill offered a number of safeguards intended to preserve the position of the Church of England and the Church of Ireland: Catholics would continue to be excluded from specified high offices particularly closely concerned with ecclesiastical responsibilities, Catholic Members of Parliament would have to take a special oath, and other minor restrictions were imposed. On this occasion the oath, again drafted by Peel, contained no qualifications: Catholic Members were to 'disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present church establishment as settled by law within this realm' and 'solemnly swear' never to 'exercise any privilege to which I am, or may become entitled, to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant government in the United Kingdom'. Furthermore, each must undertake to defend to the utmost of his power 'the settlement of Property within this Realm, as established by the Laws', and additional political security was furnished by the companion measure raising the

property qualification for the Irish electoral franchise from 40s. to £10, thus removing most of the popular vote. If Van Mildert had been willing in principle to accept an oath as a guarantee of well-affectedness on the part of Roman Catholics, this formulation contained more to commend itself to him than that exacted from Protestant Dissenters. His opposition was, however, set at a level which the oath could not hope to touch. Roman Catholics, owing spiritual allegiance to a human and earthly ruler outside the jurisdiction of the British State, could not be admitted to participation in the British political process without destroying the relationship between Church and State on which the whole constitution was founded.

Peel was now convinced that Catholic Emancipation must come; his integrity as a statesman forced him to stay in power and do all he could to minimise the damage to the Protestant Establishment. Van Mildert, too, was a statesman in his way; he had the best title of any bishop then alive to represent the mind of the Church of England. His position, however, gave him no power but persuasion with which to influence the course of political events, and the negotiations with Peel over the Test and Corporation Acts had taught him a sharp lesson on the limitations of persuasion. Faced with a measure which he abhorred, and which his contact with the lower clergy convinced him was widely regarded as an act of betrayal by a previously friendly government, Van Mildert saw no political advantage to be gained from compromise. His own integrity thus forced him to a doomed but unflinching opposition to the Bill. Lloyd's position as intermediary had become untenable.

On April 2nd the Roman Catholic Relief Bill was presented to the House of Lords for its second reading, and Lloyd rose to defend it. The existing state of affairs was, he argued, impossible to maintain; although he personally 'should have seen with far greater pleasure, opinions taking a different course', 'the rising talent of the country' was now in favour of emancipation, while those who still opposed it had 'reached that time of life when most men have seceded from the busy scene of human life - when far the greater part, indeed, have been called away, altogether, from this sublunary scheme of things.'<sup>74</sup> From a man as young by episcopal standards as Lloyd, this was an argument of devastating tactlessness, which he followed a little later by declaring his belief that the welfare of the Church would not be safe in the hands of those who opposed the Bill.<sup>75</sup> Lloyd may not have intended this judgement to include the Archbishops of Canterbury, York and Armagh or the Bishops of London and Durham; he said nothing to exempt them from it.

Lloyd's central contention was that Catholic emancipation must be seen as a matter of secular politics rather than of theology, and that the argument must therefore be conducted in utilitarian terms: 'every action which is not sinful in itself may be argued...on the grounds of their [sic] conduciveness to the public happiness and the public good.' Lloyd argued that admitting Catholics to a share in government was not sinful, and that even if it was, the sin had already been committed by repealing the legislation aimed at the entire suppression of the Roman Catholic faith. If Catholicism was tolerable, it

could not be sinful; the question of admission to the legislature was therefore one of expediency.

For himself, Lloyd professed entire conviction that if the Lords should reject the Bill, a similar measure would nevertheless become law within two years or so, and the interval would see bloody war in Ireland. To refuse the Bill was therefore equivalent to starting a war from which nothing could be gained: 'an act unchristian and unlawful'.

Lloyd examined the dangers facing the Church of Ireland, and acknowledged them to be great; 'but the question now before us is, not whether the Church of Ireland is in danger, but whether the measure now proposed by his majesty's government is calculated to diminish or increase that danger?' Lloyd was, he said, inclined to see in the measure 'some faint gleam of hope', but placed more emphasis on a challenge to the Lords themselves to act as the defenders of the Church of Ireland against spoliation.

Van Mildert was not in the House to hear this speech, due to indisposition. Before he himself rose to speak on the next day, Lloyd's arguments had clearly been reported to him in detail. Van Mildert's speech contained a number of direct attacks on Lloyd, which he afterwards edited out of the printed version.⇒6 He was particularly enraged to hear that Lloyd had 'sought to obtain an added sanction to his own opinions, by pointing out....that he was Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford', and drew the attention of the House to the fact that the three other bishops who had been Regius Professors of Divinity took the opposite side of the question.⇒7 He demanded

to know what evidence supported the claim that all the rising talent of the country favoured Catholic Emancipation, and poured scorn on the notion that passing the Bill would end all dissatisfaction among Irish Roman Catholics.

Against Lloyd, Van Mildert insisted that the relationship between Church and State was inalienably a religious issue, and must be argued on principle not practicalities. At stake were the interests of 'Protestantism, and, consequently, of the pure Christian faith'; power must not be entrusted to Papists, who might then use it to tear up the safeguards provided in the Bill and force the nation back into the papal yoke thrown off by the Reformers.

A Catholic-dominated government was not, Van Mildert recognised, a likely short-term prospect; but he warned against the possibility of a Catholic faction forming an influential part of some future reformist coalition. In any case, simply to admit Roman Catholics into Parliament entailed 'a great and important change....in the very character of the Legislature itself.' Whatever might continue to be claimed on paper about the permanent and inviolable Establishment of the Protestant and Episcopal Church of England, the reality would have departed. Government and Parliament would thenceforth be not Protestant but 'mixed'; how could such a Legislature be trusted with the jurisdiction over the Established Church attributed to it by Van Mildert in his 1825 speech? More worrying to Van Mildert even than the measure itself was the espousal, by a Government generally sympathetic to the Church's interests, of 'the principle that there should be no civil distinctions on

account of religious opinions'. This principle, he believed, threatened 'the existence of any religious Establishment whatsoever'.

Lloyd rose 'in explanation' at the end of Van Mildert's speech, complaining defensively that 'he has mistaken altogether the substance of my arguments'. He offered clarification of five disputed points; the clarification suggests that Lloyd himself did not understand why Van Mildert parted company from him so decisively.

Lloyd had not, he protested, maintained that 'state policy should be argued on grounds of expediency alone', but that 'all measures, even of state policy, should be regulated, according to the immutable rules of morality'. For Van Mildert, the immutable rules of morality were not a sufficient regulator. There was a further prior question: whether the Establishment-relationship of the Church to the State would be harmed. Lloyd's speech gave no indication that he regarded the composition of Parliament as in itself part of the interests of the Church, although he took the trouble to assure the House that he had given 'most attentive and serious consideration' to the Bill's possible effects on the 'united church of England'. It was a logical extension of Lloyd's approach, though not one which he himself would necessarily have endorsed, to see the Church simply as one interest-group within the State, its role in the political life of the nation that of an expert witness on 'the immutable rules of morality'. Van Mildert's vision was of the State as the secular aspect of the Church.

The division, a victory for the government, split the

episcopate. Nine bishops voted with Lloyd for the Bill, eighteen with Van Mildert against it. The nine 'rebels' included, besides the inevitable Bathurst of Norwich, the three bishops of Evangelical sympathies: Ryder of Lichfield; C.R. Sumner, a protégé of George IV, whose translation to the noble diocese of Winchester at the early age of thirty-seven had caused some scandal;<sup>100</sup> and his brother J.B. Sumner, Blomfield's successor in the see of Chester. Of the Irish bishops, Derry and (by proxy) Kildare voted for the Bill, Meath and the Archbishop of Armagh against. Lloyd's former colleagues, the 'Hackney' bishops, voted solidly against.

The Bill passed its third reading on Friday April 13th, and received the Royal Assent on Monday 16th. The bitterness it stirred up in Established Church circles damaged many relationships. Bishop C.R. Sumner, finding himself under pressure, used his Charge of August 11th to assure his clergy that on a question of so much importance he could 'follow the leading of no human authority', and that his decision had been 'formed in the closet, on my knees before God!'; his Council, Dean Rennell of Winchester told H.H. Norris, advised him to leave 'the whole clause concerning his prayer on his knees in his closet before he voted for the Popish relief bill' out of the published version.<sup>101</sup> Two years later, Bishop Jebb of Limerick regarded the Bishop of Derry as an unfit person to represent the Irish bishops on the ground that he had 'voted in Parliament for the destruction of our Church, as I think the affirmative of the Popery question has been. The mischief was done, when the Test act was abolished; but many, or at least

some honest men, were there beguiled. I don't deny, that one or two were weak enough, not to see the inevitable consequences of the popish measure; but I fear, the mass of the renegades have not even that miserable excuse to offer. I never was on terms of intimacy with the Bishop of Derry; and I confess myself to wish, for the future, as far as possible, to avoid all communication with him.<sup>102</sup>

Saddest of all was the fate of Charles Lloyd. His role in the debates exposed him to particular unpopularity, the more so since he had dared to say that he did not believe Roman Catholics to be truly guilty of idolatry.<sup>103</sup> 'What I said of Popery and Idolatry,' he wrote to Peel on Sunday April 15th, 'together with the Circumstance of Van Mildert having attacked me very roughly has got among the Clergy & thrown some doubt on my Theological opinions....' He sent Peel a draft pamphlet defending himself, insisting that Peel show it to nobody, but asking for advice on whether to publish or at least print it.<sup>104</sup>

On May 2nd Lloyd attended the Royal Academy dinner at Somerset House and caught a chill. He died at his lodgings on May 31st; he was forty-five. 'The whole question,' wrote Churton, who had known and loved him, 'was not equal in value to the life of the man who was thus made the victim of honest compliance with a mistaken principle.'<sup>105</sup> Churton testifies to the grief of Joshua Watson on hearing of Lloyd's death. The response of Van Mildert is not recorded.

1. Beilby Porteus, notebook for 1805, p.42. Lambeth Palace Library Ms. 2105.
2. O. [Chadwick], The Victorian Church, 2 vols., London (1966) [page references are to 3rd edition], vol.1, p.9; pp.7-17 give the background to the 1828 Bill.
3. Hansard, New Series, vol.5, pp.241-359 for the 1821 debate; vol.7, pp.1263-4 for the 1822 vote; vol.9, p.1481, for Bathurst's speech on the 1823 Bill. Bathurst had first voted for Catholic Emancipation in 1808; so solitary was his crusade that he sometimes had trouble finding another bishop willing to hold his proxy. W.L. [Mathieson], English Church Reform 1815-1840, London (1923), p.47
4. Hansard, New Series, vol.11, pp.817-42 for the 1824 debate.
5. Ibid., pp.1104-65
6. Ives, vol.1, pp.67-71
7. Hansard, New Series, vol.12, pp.1326-35, 1361-3; vol.13, p.139.
8. Ives, vol.1, p.67
9. W. Van Mildert, [Substance of A Speech], delivered in the House of Lords, on Tuesday, May 17, 1825, by William, Lord Bishop of Llandaff, on a Bill for THE REMOVAL OF CERTAIN DISQUALIFICATIONS OF the Roman Catholics, London (Rivington, 1825), pp.8-17
10. Ibid., pp.14-21
11. Ibid., p.32
12. Ibid., p.9
13. The Charges of Samuel Horsley, late Lord Bishop of St. Asaph; delivered at his several Visitations of the Dioceses of St. David's, Rochester, and St. Asaph, Dundee (1813), pp.42-3. The quotation is from Horsley's 1790 Primary Visitation Charge to the clergy of St. David's.
14. W. Van Mildert, An Inquiry into the general principles of Scripture-Interpretation, Oxford (1815), pp.151-2; quoted in P.B. [Nockles], Continuity and Change in Anglican High Churchmanship in Britain, 1792-1850, 2 vols., Oxford (D. Phil. thesis, 1982), vol.1, p.293.
15. See above, p.45; also Nockles, vol.1, pp.32, 41-2.
16. Substance of A Speech, pp.3-7. On the place of sacral royalism in High Church conceptions of the Church-State relationship, see Nockles, vol.1, pp.7-16, 23.

17. N. [Gash], Peel, London (Longman, 1976), pp.80-81
18. M.H. [Port], 600 New Churches, a Study of the Church Building Commission, 1818-1856, and its Church Building Activities, London (1961), pp.98-9
19. G.F.A. Best, [Temporal Pillars], Cambridge (1964), p.214
20. King George IV to Liverpool, 11th March 1826. A. Aspinall (ed.), The Correspondence of George Prince of Wales 1770-1812, 8 vols., London (Cassell, 1971), vol.VIII, p.455. [This is one of a miscellany of later correspondence at the end of the volume.]
21. Van Mildert to Liverpool, March 25th 1826. British Library Ms. Add. 38301, ff.152-3.
22. Documents in Dean and Chapter Archives, Durham; quoted in full by Cochrane, pp.179-82.
23. Chadwick, vol.1, p.25, footnote 2.
24. Durham Advertizer, Friday 31st March 1826, quoted in Cochrane, p.176.
25. Howley to Liverpool, March 27th 1826. British Library Ms. Add. 38301, ff.154-5.
26. Van Mildert to Henry Douglas, April 1st 1826, in Adams, pp.463-4.
27. G.F.A. [Best], 'The Mind and Times of William Van Mildert', in Journal of Theological Studies, New Series, vol.XIV, part 2 (October 1963), pp.355-70; p.360.
28. Letterbook of Shute Barrington, 1802-18, ff.139-53. Durham University Library.
29. Van Mildert to Bruce Knight, 17th October 1826. In Ives, vol.1, pp.74-7; also in Adams, pp.465-6. Adams, p.466, gives a different perspective on Van Mildert's Durham pomp by noting that he kept two packs of foxhounds.
30. Temporal Pillars, p.20
31. Chadwick, vol.1, p.453. Howley was enthroned by proxy on becoming Archbishop of Canterbury in 1828.
32. Probably as diocesan rather than personal secretary - see below, p.445. Adams, p.486.
33. Durham Advertizer, June 3rd 1826. Quoted in Cochrane, p.185.
34. Diary of Robert Archibald Douglas-Gresley, July 11th-14th

1826. In Adams, pp.464-5; also in Cochrane, pp.186-90.
35. Van Mildert to Bruce Knight, March 27th and October 17th 1826, in Ives, vol.1, pp.72-3, 75-6.
36. Schedule of visitation and diary fragment, in Durham University Library Add. Ms. 274.207V21P8.
37. Charles Lloyd was an 'early friend' of Thorp, and introduced him to Peel when Thorp was 'as a Justice of the Peace placed in circumstances of some difficulty' - Thorp to Peel, January 13th 1842; British Library Ms. Add. 40500, f.41. Van Mildert told the House of Lords in 1832 that he had not known Thorp prior to his own arrival in Durham: Hansard, Third Series, vol.11, p.1173. Thorp was already acting as 'Official to the Archdeacon of Durham' before Van Mildert's arrival in the diocese: The Acts of the Rt. Revd. William Van Mildert, D.D., Lord Bishop of Durham [Durham Acta Book], entry for 4th July 1826, reproduced by Cochrane, p.199.
38. Letterbook of Shute Barrington, 1802-18. Durham University Library.
39. Barrington to Howley, August 15th 1813. Lambeth Palace Library Ms. 2184, f.121.
40. Van Mildert to Bruce Knight, October 17th 1826; in Ives, vol.1, p.77.
41. W. Van Mildert, A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Durham (1827), reprinted in Ives, vol.1; pp.517-8.
42. Ibid., pp.518-21
43. Ibid., p.517
44. Ibid., p.524
45. Ives, vol.1, p.80
46. Durham County Advertiser, Saturday October 6th 1827
47. Van Mildert to Bruce Knight, September 1827; in Ives, vol.1, pp.80-1.
48. Durham County Advertiser, September 29th 1827. The banquet at Wynyard was on September 24th.
49. Durham County Advertiser, Saturday October 6th 1827
50. Durham Acta Book, entries for 1st June 1827 and 18th July 1827. Reproduced by Cochrane, pp.232-3.
51. Invitations preserved in the Van Mildert Papers refer to 'Mrs. Van Mildert At Home to the Ladies'.

52. From Van Mildert's notes for his speeches, on which he evidently elaborated extempore. Two drafts are preserved, between which the Wellington speech was considerably revised. Van Mildert Papers.

53. Second draft of speech notes.

54. Best, p.356. 'Archdeacon Charles Thorp' is suggested as a second alternate; Thorp was a more cautious character than Phillpotts, and knew the value of 'a politic letter to a local liberal leader' (Temporal Pillars, p.276).

55. Second draft of speech notes. The Durham County Advertiser, October 6th 1827, reported the speech at length.

56. Durham County Advertiser, October 6th 1827. Van Mildert, who also noted down Scott's reply, has 'in the Hall of his own Castle, & in the presence of the Duke of Wellington.'

57. The balloon was 'fifteen feet high, the circumference in the middle was 33 feet 4 inches, and at the bottom 6 feet. It contained in the whole 120 sheets of paper. A large sponge was suspended at the bottom, soaked with spirits of wine, which was set fire to previous to its ascension, and it was by this means seen to a great distance.' Durham County Advertiser, October 6th 1827. The journalist does not seem to realise the causal connection between ignition and ascension.

58. Howley to Strong, October 17th 1827. Bodleian Library Ms. Eng. Misc. c. 361, ff.15-6 (Strong Papers)

59. Lloyd to Peel, January 24th 1828. British Library Ms. Add. 40343, ff.124-5. Hansard, New Series, vol.18, p.69.

60. Hansard, New Series, vol.18, passim. For a summary position see Lord Holland's speech proposing the Bill's second reading in the Lords, p.1479.

61. Gash, pp.96-7; Lloyd to Peel, February 10th 1828. British Library Ms. Add. 40343, ff.140-1.

62. Lloyd to Peel, 2nd March 1828. Ibid., ff.189-90.

63. Peel to Lloyd, March 4th 1828. Ibid., ff.205-6.

64. Van Mildert to Lloyd, March 3rd 1828; Lloyd to Peel, March 4th 1828. Ibid., ff.203-4, 201.

65. Peel to Lloyd, Most Private, March 15th 1828. Ibid., ff.212-3.

66. Hansard, New Series, vol.18, p.1194

67. This was Lloyd's conclusion; he was not at the meeting, but had ample opportunity to discuss it with those who were. Lloyd

- to Peel, 23rd March 1828. British Library Ms. Add. 40343, ff.246-7.
68. Van Mildert to Peel, 23rd March 1828. British Library Ms. Add. 40396, ff.69-70.
69. Lloyd to Peel, 21st March 1828; Tournay to Lloyd, same date. British Library Ms. Add. 40343, ff.239-40, 241. Van Mildert's letter to Manners-Sutton was probably written on March 19th or 20th; Lloyd, writing on March 21st, expected the Archbishop already to have shown it to Peel.
70. Peel to Lloyd, Saturday [March 22nd 1828]. Ibid., ff.243-5.
71. Peel to Lloyd, 25th March 1828. Ibid., ff.248-53.
72. Lloyd to Peel, 26th March 1828. Ibid., ff.254-5.
73. Peel to Van Mildert, 25th March 1828. British Library Ms. Add. 40396, ff.65-7.
74. Van Mildert to Lloyd, March 30th 1828. British Library Ms. Add. 40343, f.264.
75. Hansard, New Series, vol.18, pp.1491-7
76. Van Mildert to an unnamed friend: letter accompanying a printed copy of Van Mildert's speeches on the Bill; in Ives, vol.1, pp.86-7.
77. Hansard, New Series, vol.18, p.1508
78. See for instance the speech of Lord Eldon, following immediately on that of Van Mildert. Ibid., pp.1497-1502.
79. Quoted in Ives, vol.1, pp.90-1.
80. See note 76.
81. Van Mildert to Joshua Watson, April 30th 1828; in Churton, vol.1, pp.298-9.
82. Lloyd to Peel, 15th June 1828. British Library Ms. 40343, f.284.
83. Gash, pp.110-116, charts the process by which Peel was forced to change his position.
84. Van Mildert's obituary in The Gentleman's Magazine, New Series, vol.V, pp.425-7, stated that he had 'changed his sentiments on the Roman Catholic Question, in compliance with the Minister of the day....the Editor, on being apprised of such a flagrant error, thought fit to insert his acknowledgment of it only amongst his "Minor Correspondence"....' (Ives, vol.1, p.107, footnote). The Georgian Era: Memoirs of the most

eminent Persons who have flourished in Great Britain, from the accession of George the First to the demise of George the Fourth, 4 vols., London (Vizetelly, Branston & Co., 1832), vol.1, p.524, 'utters the same inexcusable mistake.'

85. Wellington to George IV, 21st July 1828. Duke of Wellington (ed.), Despatches, Correspondence & Memoranda of the Duke of Wellington, 1819-32, 8 vols, London (1867-80), vol.IV, pp.549-50.

86. Chadwick, vol.1, p.13; pp.11-12 for a character portrait of Howley.

87. Van Mildert to Howley, July 26th 1828; Park to Howley, same date. Lambeth Palace Library Ms. 2185, ff.17-8, 15.

88. Gash, p.111

89. Lloyd to Peel, Private, 1st January 1829. British Library Ms. Add. 40343, f.327.

90. Peel to Lloyd, 15th January 1829. Ibid., ff.329-31.

91. Lloyd to Peel, 3rd February 1829. Ibid., ff.338-9.

92. Gash, p.118

93. Chadwick, vol.1, pp.17-21, gives a summary of the Bill's provisions, including the full text of the oath.

94. Hansard, New Series, vol.19, pp.75-92.

95. 'I look around, my Lords, and among those who are opposed to these measures I see none, in whose hands I think, the undivided management of those interests would, under present circumstances, be safe.' Ibid., p.79.

96. Substance of [SPEECHES] delivered in the HOUSE OF LORDS, on the subject of THE ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIEF BILL, on April 3d., 7th, & 8th, 1829. By WILLIAM, Lord Bishop of Durham. Not Published. London (1829). The copy preserved in the Van Mildert Papers has a manuscript note at the top: 'Send a Revise of the whole to the Bishop of Durham', to which another hand has added 'tomorrow....May 20. 1829'. The text bears a number of editorial markings which appear to be the work of Van Mildert. Their principal function is to eliminate the direct attacks on Lloyd, found on pp.11, 20-1, 30, 41. It seems clear from these notations that Van Mildert's decision to edit out the attacks was taken before Lloyd's death on May 31st.

97. The three were Van Mildert himself, Howley, who had been his predecessor in the Oxford Professorship, and Kaye of Lincoln who had been Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. Van Mildert might have added Marsh of Peterborough, a former Cambridge Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity.

98. SPEECHES, pp.15-6

99. Hansard, New Series, vol.19, p.156

100. Lloyd to Peel, 28th December 1827. British Library Ms. Add. 40343, ff.96-8.

101. Rennell to Norris, [November 17th 1829]. Norris Papers. Rennell disapproved of the omission, feeling that it suppressed a piece of significant evidence as to the character of the Bishop.

102. Jebb [to Norris], Good Friday 1831. Norris Papers.

103. Hansard, New Series, vol.19, pp.82-3

104. Lloyd to Peel, 15th April 1829. British Library Ms. Add. 40343, f.400.

105. Churton, vol.1, p.293. Churton's account implies that not even Joshua Watson visited Lloyd during his last illness, although the lodging was 'not far from Park-street'.

## Chapter Ten

### Reform: Endings and Beginnings

Proposals for church reform; the Durham magistracy affair; Durham University conceived; Parliamentary Reform; the Durham University Bill, 1832; the Ecclesiastical Revenues Commission; the Church Temporalities (Ireland) Bill, 1833.

## Chapter Ten

1830 was another difficult year. For Van Mildert, it began with 'the first attack of a painful inward complaint, which afflicted him, more or less, almost continually during the remainder of his life.'. He had, soon after the opening of the parliamentary session, been appointed to the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission; but his illness and slow convalescence kept him from public activity of all kinds for the greater part of the year, and he had little or no hand in the Commission's 'striking and reformatory recommendations'.<sup>2</sup> At the end of June Van Mildert and Jane left London for Harrogate; the summer and autumn he spent quietly at Auckland, preparing his Lincoln's Inn sermons for publication early in 1831.

In June, George IV died. The ensuing general election left the Wellington administration in power, but with no certainty as to the size of majority it could command; the loyalty of the ultra-Tories, still nourishing a sense of betrayal over Catholic Emancipation, was no longer beyond doubt. Pressure was building for the 'third chapter of the revolutionary trilogy',<sup>3</sup> the reform of parliamentary representation, boosted in July by a new French Revolution. In September Edward Churton wrote an optimistic letter to Norris, twitting the Patriarch with despairing too much of the country: 'I am sorry to see you augur so unfavourably of our new Parliament....I thought I perceived an accession of strength on the side of right principles. I wish to see a government either Whig or Tory.... What I dread most is that which we have seen too much of

lately, the spirit of accommodation and expediency.<sup>4</sup> Churton also thought that the 'generally good' harvest offered the promise of a less disturbed winter. History dealt harshly with both his judgements: the autumn brought widespread agricultural rioting and machine-breaking, and the Wellington government collapsed in November, to be replaced by a Whig administration under Lord Grey.

One of Wellington's last acts as Prime Minister was the appointment of Henry Phillpotts as Bishop of Exeter, translating Bishop Bethell on to the vacant see of Bangor after an episcopal reign of six months. This meant work for Van Mildert, involving his first experience of co-operation with a Whig government.

Phillpotts, a lifelong believer in pluralism,<sup>5</sup> was unwilling to make a simple exchange of his remunerative Durham benefice of Stanhope plus his deanery of Chester for a see whose annual revenues averaged £1,571. In December 1830, Grey wrote to Van Mildert suggesting that Phillpotts should exchange Stanhope for a Canonry Residentiary at St. Paul's. Van Mildert objected that Dr. Blomberg, holder of the Canonry, was unsuitable for Stanhope by reason of his 'advanced years and habits of life' and his lack of pastoral experience; he urged Grey to heed the 'universal' demand for a resident incumbent for the benefice. Instead, the prebendary of the Durham sixth prebend, Darnell, was persuaded to make the exchange. Darnell was instituted to Stanhope on the royal presentation in January 1831; Van Mildert collated Phillpotts to the prebend the following month. Van Mildert's correspondence with Grey was

cordial, and the outcome seems to have satisfied all parties.Ⓐ

By the end of December 1830, Van Mildert was back in London. The continuing low state of his health led him to take a house at Roehampton 'with a view to escape, in some degree, from the constant calls upon him of public business'. He kept his residence at Hanover Square, however, and often needed to spend time there.Ⓡ Among other sources of anxiety was the serious crisis which arose at Queen Anne's Bounty towards the end of 1830 when the treasurer, John Paterson, business associate and trusted friend of William Stevens, resigned owing the Bounty £30,749.14s.7d.; Paterson died soon afterwards, and his estate proved wholly inadequate to meet his liabilities. The eventual loss to the Bounty was some £15,000. The Paterson affair occupied much of the Board's attention from December 1830 until early 1835. In March 1832 the Bishops accepted responsibility for paying off the deficit from their own pockets, at the rate of £1,100 a year. Van Mildert's share of this payment was £100 per annum.Ⓒ

Early in 1831, Van Mildert and Joshua Watson gave serious attention to the question of Church reform. It was widely accepted that the 'disestablished' Parliament would inevitably turn a reformist eye on the abuses of the Church of England, of which pluralism and non-residence were the most loudly deprecated. Watson characteristically hoped that by producing its own plan of amendment the Church might avoid the terrible ordeal, which he envisaged as a parliamentary commission of enquiry set up on the motion of Joseph Hume. Aware that the mood of High Churchmen was defensive and suspicious, Watson and

Van Mildert devised a plan calculated to appear as non-threatening as a reform proposal could. They suggested the creation of a Royal Commission of Enquiry with carefully defined objectives, to be composed of clergy of all levels, with episcopal representation set at about one-third. The laity were to be excluded. Lay representatives appointed by Lord Liverpool could be trusted to have the interests of the Church at heart; lay representatives appointed by Lord Grey could not. As a sop to ministerial vanity, Watson proposed that the Premier should be asked to select the Commission from a list about twice the necessary length, prepared by the Primate.

The Commission was to have full powers of enquiry to obtain 'accurate information on the state of Church revenues, with a view to the suggestion of the best practical remedies for the evils of translations, of unseemly commendams, and offensive pluralities.'<sup>9</sup> The plan was approved by Howley and Wellington, and in January 1831 Van Mildert had some hopes of securing Grey's support; he had, he said, found Grey 'frank, disinterested and gracious' in their previous communication.<sup>10</sup> It seems that Grey was taking some pains to conciliate the High Church bishops at this time; on February 14th he championed Howley in a Lords debate on a motion by Lord King for returns on the residence of Anglican incumbents. Grey pointed out to the House that the question of residence was 'under the consideration of the heads of the Church and he had had some communication concerning it with the very reverend Prelate [Howley] who was most anxious to remedy abuses, and whose views were very moderate and liberal.'<sup>11</sup> By March, however, it was

clear that the proposals for a Commission were not to be implemented, and that instead there were to be Bills at least on residence and pluralism.

In April Van Mildert clashed sharply and publicly with the government, this time on a matter concerned with his secular jurisdiction. The affair began quietly enough; on February 2nd Van Mildert's old foe Brougham, now Lord Chancellor, wrote to query one of the names proposed for inclusion in the roll of County Magistrates, and casually required the insertion of a further 'three (or four)' - in fact six - names recommended by his own (unnamed) contacts in the County.<sup>12</sup>

Van Mildert's reply was perfectly courteous, but made clear his distaste for the proposal: the original list had, he explained, been drawn up in careful consultation with the Chairman of the Quarter Sessions, the High Sheriff and 'other Magistrates of high respectability', and had 'the concurrence & sanction of General Aylmer,....on whose experience & sound judgement, as well as upright & honourable feelings, I have invariably found I might with confidence rely', and the number of names put forward was more than sufficient. Van Mildert suggested that the names should be kept for 'some future Commission'. He would, if Brougham insisted, make the insertion, but would then feel bound to make it public that this had been done under pressure from government.<sup>13</sup>

No further official mention was made to Van Mildert of the proposed insertions, although at the end of February the Bishop of Bristol, who was also a prebendary of Durham, discussed the matter with Lord Durham on Van Mildert's behalf.<sup>14</sup> On April

9th, without informing Van Mildert, Brougham's Secretary of Commissions wrote directly to the County Durham Clerk of the Peace, saying that the six names should have been inserted in the Commission and demanding to know whether they had been.

John Dunn, Deputy Clerk of the Peace, replied simply that the names had not been inserted, then sent a copy of the letter and a report of his own actions to T.H. Faber, the Bishop's Secretary, who sent it immediately to Van Mildert in London. Dunn also discussed the matter with J.R. Fenwick, a senior Durham magistrate, who raised it with Charles Thorp.

Controversy centred on four of the proposed names: those of Lord Durham's colliery agent, Lord Londonderry's colliery agent and coal viewer, a colliery viewer from Pelaw and a coal fitter recently employed by Lord Durham. According to Thorp, some of these names, 'with others similarly circumstanced', had been considered during the preparing of the original list, but had been 'put aside on account of their connection with the local trade'. Fenwick, Thorp and a number of their fellow magistrates objected strongly to the introduction of representatives of the 'Coal-Owners' on to the magistrates' bench, on the grounds that 'it is well calculated to induce an apprehension among the Pitmen that they are not likely to obtain an impartial hearing & unbiassed Decision, from the Magistracy in any differences which may arise between them, & their employers.'<sup>15</sup>

This touching concern for the confidence of the pitmen, which it may be doubted whether the Durham magistrates enjoyed to quite the degree they claimed, was a prime example of the trend of apologetic whereby high Tories - including, on

occasion, Van Mildert himself - saw themselves as the true defenders of the interests of the poor.<sup>16</sup> Indignation ran high at Brougham's underhand methods: Thorp protested that 'it conveys....a most undeserved censure upon the Custos [Rotulorum - i.e. Van Mildert]', and thought it an 'unusual, & I believe unprecedented proceeding'.<sup>17</sup>

The real passion of the affair arose, however, from its timing. The spring of 1831 was a time of high tension in the coalfields of the North-East: the great miners' strikes of 1831-2 at their peak saw some 17,000 men idle. 'The State of the Colliers begins to be awkward,' another senior magistrate, Rowland Burdon, wrote to Van Mildert on April 18th, 'and it is made more so by the circumstance of their original complaints being in several instances too well founded. The total neglect of Education, & a want of feeling, in some Collieries, for the necessities of the Pitmen, have laid the foundation of much mischief. I hope still to be able to avoid making use of the Military.'<sup>18</sup>

After tactical discussions between Fenwick and Thorp, a magistrates' meeting was held at Gateshead on April 16th; it passed resolutions opposing the appointment of colliery agents to the Bench of Justices, expressing entire confidence in Van Mildert as Custos Rotulorum, and urging the Lord Chancellor to act only in co-operation with Van Mildert. Burdon also wrote to Lord Londonderry informing him that, if the colliery agents were appointed to serve as magistrates 'in the Coal district, where they are interested,' he would not be willing to serve as their assessor.<sup>19</sup>

In responding to the developing crisis, Van Mildert was hampered both by his own continuing ill-health - his surgeon had not yet passed him as fit for public duty - and by the time delay in communications between London and Durham. He learned about the April 9th letter on April 15th, and at once wrote asking for a meeting with Brougham and Lord Durham to discuss the matter; he received no reply until April 18th. Meanwhile, Brougham's Secretary of Commissions had written a second letter to Dunn demanding that the Commission of the Peace be sent to London by return of post for insertion of the names on Brougham's authority. This letter reached Dunn on April 17th and caused considerable excitement in Durham. Dunn went at once to consult Thorp, Fenwick and two other Durham magistrates; on their advice, he dispatched the Commission of the Peace to his London agents as requested, but simultaneously wrote a full report to Van Mildert enclosing a copy of the second letter, as well as making a personal visit to T.H. Faber at Auckland. Brougham's action was extraordinarily high-handed; Dunn had, he wrote to Van Mildert, 'never before received Directions from the Chancellor, or any of His Lordship's Officers, regarding the Commission of the Peace'.<sup>20</sup>

Thorp now went to Gaisford, whom Van Mildert had preferred to the Fourth Prebend two years previously, and who was in Durham at the time. The two agreed that Brougham's actions ought to be challenged in Parliament; Gaisford thereupon wrote a 'succinct narrative of the facts' and dispatched it to Peel. 'This business alone is enough to shew what we are to expect from the Whigs,' he wrote to Van Mildert, 'but here I think

they have overstrained themselves - for their own party has now taken alarm, and is enraged I am told beyond measure at the step.'<sup>21</sup>

On April 18th, having received details of the magistrates' meeting at Gateshead and letters from several individual magistrates, Van Mildert sent Brougham a careful summary of the objections and an unambiguous refusal to insert the names. This at last brought a reply from Brougham, regretting that he had received Van Mildert's earlier 'kind note too late to avail myself of it', and confessing that he had received 'new letters from Durham & Newcastle throwing much doubt on the expediency of coal agents being in the Comn.' April 19th brought Van Mildert news of the second letter to Dunn. He immediately sent Brougham a letter of dignified reproach, coupled with a warning that if the insertions were made, 'many respectable Magistrates now in the Commission will cease to act'. He also took an unprecedented step on his own account, notifying Dunn's London agents, who were charged with making the insertions, that 'those names were sent up to them without the Bishop's knowledge or concurrence'.<sup>22</sup>

Brougham's response was a rapid capitulation. He wrote at once to Van Mildert that there must have been some misunderstanding, that he had never directed any name to be inserted in any Commission of the Peace without the recommendation of the Custos Rotulorum, that if the fiat for the insertions had been issued without Van Mildert's recommendation 'it was through a manifest mistake', and that he had directed the fiat to be withdrawn. Van Mildert's reply was

politely unyielding: he learned with satisfaction that the whole affair had been a mistake, he had made his own position clear in the letter of February 5th that Brougham never answered, he would at once inform the Chairman of the Quarter Sessions and Dr. Fenwick that the fiat was withdrawn. The correspondence closed with official notification from the Secretary of Commissions, this time addressed to Van Mildert, that the fiat had been withdrawn.<sup>23</sup>

This fiasco must have afforded Brougham considerable annoyance, coming as it did just as the first Reform Bill reached its tumultuous climax in the House of Commons: the Bill was withdrawn on April 21st following a government defeat on an amendment, and on April 22nd Parliament was prorogued, with extraordinary scenes in both Houses. Lord Durham, 'Radical Jack' Lambton, was a longstanding enemy of the Durham Tory establishment; among many other points of friction, he had presided over the meetings of the 'nobility, gentry, clergy, and freeholders of Durham' held to protest at Peterloo and at the treatment of Queen Caroline, and had played a leading part in the controversies which followed when many of the Durham clergy objected to this use of their name, drawing upon his head the thunders of Henry Phillpotts.<sup>24</sup> Brougham, and for that matter Grey, had distinguished themselves in the savage attacks on the Durham clergy following their dissociation of themselves from the cause of Queen Caroline and the failure to toll the Durham Cathedral bells for her death in 1821.<sup>25</sup> The Durham clergy, and above all the Durham chapter, were favourite targets for Whig and Radical denunciations of clerical wealth

and pluralism. It must have irked Brougham and his colleagues to lose a passage of arms with so established a foe.

The powers of the last Prince Bishop of Durham may have been rudimentary by comparison with those of his forebears; but this episode proved that they were still sufficient to create annoyance for a government which did not command the Prince Bishop's sympathy, and after Van Mildert's death the Whig government of the day thought it worth the trouble to bring in an Act abolishing them.

The wealth and corruptions of the Church of England continued a favoured subject with Radical reformers. The journalist John Wade produced a new edition of his Black Book in the spring of 1831. The original Black Book had appeared as a partwork between 1820 and 1823; the new Extraordinary Black Book was published in one volume, with substantial new prefatory material and a certain amount of updating. It promised a comprehensive attempt 'to show the manifold abuses of an unjust and oppressive system', dealing with the monarchy, the civil list, the aristocracy, the Bank of England, the East India Company and the iniquities of government both national and local; but its first and longest chapter was devoted to a savage assault on the Church of England, followed by a second chapter on the Church of Ireland. Wade compared the opulence of the Church of England unfavourably with the continental reformed churches and even the Roman Catholic Church, claiming that the revenues of the priesthood exceeded 'the revenues of either Austria or Prussia', and denouncing 'lofty prelates with £20,000 or £40,000 a year, elevated on thrones, living

sumptuously in splendid palaces....' as 'inconsistent with the very principles and purposes of Christianity'. He undertook to demonstrate that Church property was public property, and to enquire rigorously into patronage, pluralities, revenues, 'some extraordinary examples of Clerical Rapacity', even 'inconsistencies and improprieties in the Liturgy of the Church'.<sup>26</sup>

'That Black Book should be answered,' one of Norris' correspondents, W. Rennell, wrote in May. 'It is doing a great deal of mischief.' Like many others, Rennell expected 'the crisis of the Attack upon the Church' to 'succeed Reform, as one stronger dram does its predecessor....' He wanted incumbents and dignitaries to make accurate returns of income to the Archbishop, as a sure means to 'silence malignity and scandal'.<sup>27</sup> Rennell's unwillingness to admit any genuine need for reform was representative of the general High Church mood; the Hackney Phalanx were as usual in advance of their constituency.

On June 24th, Howley introduced the promised reforming Bills to the House of Lords. There were, in the event, three: a Tithe Composition Bill, a Bill to restrict pluralities, a Bill to extend an Act enabling the augmentation of small benefices. All three passed the Lords, albeit with a rough ride, but only the third survived the Commons.<sup>28</sup> Howley, as progenitor of the Bills, had a trying time; on July 21st, exasperated beyond bearing by the number of legal problems Lord Eldon raised at the committee stage of the Tithe Composition Bill, he declared that had he had advance warning of the objections he 'should

have thrown the Bill into the fire'. The Bills, as Joshua Watson had predicted, suffered 'the common fate of all present measures, pleasing neither party.'<sup>29</sup>

Howley's Augmentations Act passed on 15th October. It proved a useful piece of legislation, making it 'much easier for bishops, colleges and chapters to transfer properties to livings in their gift'. A number of bishops were prompt to take advantage of it, among them Van Mildert. Freed at last from financial constraints, he could afford to be generous, and his contributions to poorer livings in his diocese as a consequence of the Act amounted to about £1,000 per annum.<sup>30</sup>

It is clear from Van Mildert's correspondence with Thorp that his lasting reputation for munificence was well founded. Never stingy even when his fortunes were at their lowest, in this last part of his life Van Mildert made the most of his opportunities, giving generous subscriptions to public charities and many small gifts to needy people whom he considered deserving; even to some whom he considered undeserving.<sup>31</sup> The total of his giving is not known; in 1833 a Press report estimated it at £9,000 per annum, but Van Mildert repudiated this figure, informing Charles Thorp that 'It is an [changed to 'a great'] exaggeration in the first place - & in the next place, lays me open to much annoyance. Since it appeared my table has been daily covered with pecuniary applications of all sorts....'<sup>32</sup>

Van Mildert, still recuperating, played no part in the 1831 debates. In June he was in correspondence with Joshua Watson about the need to prevent the S.P.C.K. from placing a

'well-known manual of the pious Dissenter, Dr. Isaac Watts' on its list of approved literature. Van Mildert and Watson protested that 'admitting a separatist to a place among the Church's teachers' was objectionable in principle, whatever the personal merits of the separatist concerned. On this occasion the Hackney view prevailed, although H.T. Powell complained privately to Norris that the alleged principle conflicted with the already established inclusion of Watts' hymns 'upon the Society Catalogue', and with the presence of 'many extracts from the works of dissenters' in the annotations of the Family Bible.<sup>33</sup>

This skirmish, successful as it was from the Phalanx perspective, ominously prefigured the coming battles between High Churchmen and Evangelicals for control of the Society. A further 1831 straw in the wind was the founding of the S.P.C.K. Committee of General Literature, charged with the publication of 'all kinds of useful and interesting works' to counteract cheap periodicals from other sources, notably the provocatively-named Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge founded by Radical educationalists in 1825. The new Committee arose from the virtual failure of the second Anti-Infidel Committee, set up in 1830; its recommendations were to prove contentious.<sup>34</sup>

At the end of June Van Mildert left London for Harrogate, entrusting his proxy to Bishop Bethell of Bangor in case the second Reform Bill should reach the House of Lords before his return.<sup>35</sup> By the end of July he was safely returned to Auckland, and engaged in the groundwork for the greatest

achievement of his career.

It is not possible to be certain who revived the suggestion, first proposed by Oliver Cromwell, of founding a Durham University. The idea may well have been Van Mildert's own; a letter he wrote to Charles Thorp on July 25th is most naturally interpreted to suggest that Van Mildert first broached the 'great topic' with Thorp (or vice versa), and that Thorp at Van Mildert's request then sounded out Gaisford and David Durell, a Durham prebendary and confidant of the Dean of Durham, Bishop John Banks Jenkinson of St. David's.

Jenkinson maintained in 1836 that he 'certainly was given to understand that the first suggestion of establishing a University at Durham came from the Archbishop of Canterbury'.<sup>36</sup> This memory was probably at fault, since on August 9th Van Mildert wrote to suggest that Jenkinson should 'open the matter, in strict confidence, to the Abp. of Canterbury'. Van Mildert's comment to Thorp on August 10th, that he was 'anxious that the Archbishop shd. now, or soon, be apprized of what is going forward', adding 'It wd. give him great satisfaction, & his suggestions might be of great use', gives no indication of the idea's having originated with Howley.<sup>37</sup>

Whether or not the initial impulse came from Van Mildert, it is certain that he was among the first involved in the plan, and espoused it with enthusiasm. It was agreed that Durell and Thorp should make the approaches to those who were to be brought into the secret. Durell was not a young man, and the bulk of the work fell to the more energetic Thorp, somewhat hampered by Thorp's execrable handwriting.<sup>38</sup>

It was agreed that the conspirators should open their hearts first to Gaisford and the Dean. Unfortunately Gaisford was in Wiltshire and the Dean at Abergwilli Palace, which meant a postal lag of four days in each direction. Neither was prepared to give an opinion without full details of the proposal, although Gaisford from the outset expressed a preference for a 'superior school, and a place where the poorer candidates for orders might acquire instruction' rather than a full University on the Oxbridge model.<sup>39</sup> It was a blow to Van Mildert that Gaisford should have reservations; it was, he told Thorp, a matter of 'main importance' to him to have Gaisford's co-operation and concurrence, particularly 'considering his high position as an Academic'.

Van Mildert had in April 1831 preferred Gaisford to the eleventh and richest Durham prebend, giving his previous prebend to Thorp; but Gaisford was unsettled in Durham and homesick for Oxford. By the end of the summer he had persuaded Samuel Smith to give up the Deanery of Christ Church in exchange for the Golden Prebend and, which may have been harder, gained Van Mildert's consent to the substitution.<sup>40</sup> Gaisford took office as Dean of Christ Church in time for the new academic year, and Van Mildert collated Smith to the prebend on 14th October. Tuckwell's comment that this was done 'in some occult fashion' is hyperbole; the prebend was in Van Mildert's gift, and Dean Smith, unlike his predecessor Dean Hall,<sup>41</sup> was an irreproachable candidate for it. Gaisford, likewise, was an uncontroversial choice for Dean of Christ Church, although his decanal reign had its excitements.<sup>42</sup>

It must have been bitter indeed for Van Mildert to lose Gaisford from Durham. Not only would a scholar of international reputation have been a priceless asset to the new University; Gaisford was a friend of long standing, on whose judgement Van Mildert relied heavily. 'I am in frequent correspondence with Gaisford, whose letters always give me delight and satisfaction,' he wrote to Henry Douglas in February 1831. 'Seldom do so many excellences combine to form so complete and admirable a character as his.'<sup>43</sup> Helen Margaret had died in 1830; Gaisford's remarriage in 1832, to the sister of a Christ Church don, Henry Jenkyns, caused some indignation among the Douglases, but Van Mildert defended him warmly.<sup>44</sup>

The proposals for the new University were justified chiefly on political and prudential grounds. 'It appears to be morally certain,' Durell wrote to the Dean on July 28th, 'that as soon as the Reform Bill is disposed of, an attack will be made on Dean [sic] and Chapters, and as certain that Durham will be the first object. It has occur'd to us that it will be prudent, if possible, to ward off the blow; and that no plan is so likely to take, as making the public partakers of our income, by annexing an establishment of enlarged education to our College.'<sup>45</sup> Durell, Van Mildert commented wistfully to Thorp, seemed attached to the plan 'rather as a peace-offering to the public, than for it's own sake. I incline to view it in both lights.'<sup>46</sup>

There were other considerations. The drive for extending University provision beyond the confines of Oxford and Cambridge had already led to the setting up of a self-styled

London University at 'godless Gower Street', and to the founding of King's College as an orthodox alternative, with strong backing from the Hackney Phalanx.<sup>47</sup> Thorp warned Gaisford that the establishment of 'a Northern Collegiate or Academic Establishment' could not be delayed for long, 'seeing the great want there is of such an institution, and the ardent desire which manifests itself in several places, York, N'Castle, and as we hear Liverpool, to obtain it. We may have such an institution....in our own hands, or those of our adversaries.' It was also no unworthy objective to provide 'the rising families of our towns mines & manufacturers' with an alternative to the dubious benefits of Edinburgh and Geneva - and, Thorp added darkly, London University.<sup>48</sup>

By the end of August, a plan drafted by Thorp in consultation with Van Mildert, Gaisford and Jenkinson was sufficiently well developed for Jenkinson to notify the rest of the Chapter, in general terms, what was afoot.<sup>49</sup> The plan had already been revealed to the semi-retired Archdeacon of Durham but not to the Bishops of Chester, Exeter and Bristol, all of whom were Durham prebendaries. Bishop J.B. Sumner of Chester was an Evangelical, and seems never to have been particularly close to Van Mildert. Bishop Phillpotts of Exeter was a high Tory and a ferocious polemicist on behalf of Establishment interests, but between him and Van Mildert there was no love lost; Phillpotts was inclined to blame this on Catholic Emancipation.<sup>50</sup> Certainly Phillpotts' support for the Wellington Catholic Relief Bill would have damaged him in Van Mildert's estimation. Temperamentally, the two men had little

in common; Phillipotts' no-holds-barred style of public controversy was not to Van Mildert's taste, and it is doubtful that they could ever have felt much warmth for each other. Bishop Gray of Bristol had acted on Van Mildert's behalf during the Durham magistracy affair, but Gaisford and Van Mildert seem to have had doubts of his discretion,<sup>51</sup> and the early plans for the University were treated very confidentially.

In mid-September Van Mildert conducted his second Visitation as Bishop of Durham, restricting his visits to Durham itself, Newcastle and Auckland. Despite the still precarious state of his health, by which he had been driven to the desperate expedient of warm baths,<sup>52</sup> he was able to complete the Visitation without mishap, although to his great disappointment the University scheme was not far enough advanced to be announced in his Charge.<sup>53</sup>

The Charge was an open and explicit summons to his clergy to stand firm in the hour of trial. In language strongly reminiscent of his own Boyle Lectures, Van Mildert warned of 'the dangers and difficulties which beset our path, the conflict we have to sustain with enmity of no ordinary kind'. Infidelity, Atheism, Fanaticism, Popery, Socinianism, Dissent, Lukewarmness and Apathy were in monstrous alliance, bent on the overthrow of the Church of England; crisis approached; 'the vigilant Pastor' must combat the 'fiends of blasphemy and disorganisation', must "walk about Sion, and go round about her, and mark well her bulwarks;" a time had come for earning the promise of Revelation 2.10.<sup>54</sup>

Against this lurid backdrop, Van Mildert presented a sober

and careful account of the main accusations against the Church and the measures in hand to deal with them. On the issue of ecclesiastical revenues, he hinted at the continuing hope of a Commission to provide 'authentic and unimpeachable evidence' with which to counter the wilder fables of clerical opulence, and explained the purpose of Howley's Augmentations Bill as a response to 'calls for a more equal distribution of the Church Revenues'. Reference to the Bill to restrict pluralities was combined with a balanced account of the case against pluralism, and a comment on the work of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission was set in the context of a delicate survey of various allegations of clerical misbehaviour.<sup>55</sup>

Van Mildert offered a vigorous defence of the Church's recent record of improvement. In his own diocese, since his own accession, 27 new schools had been built and 85 'united to the National Society', glebe houses, churches and chapels had been built, parishes had been divided and the diocesan committees of the S.P.C.K. and S.P.G. were acting 'throughout the Diocese, with more or less efficiency'. The usefulness of the Church Building Society had been limited only by shortage of funds. Considering the Church of England at large, Van Mildert claimed 'a perceptible improvement in almost every department...; - more activity, more distinguished ability, more solicitude to adorn the Clerical character, more earnest devotedness of heart and mind to the duties of the sacred calling....' Even Oxford and Cambridge had shown 'a manifest advancement...in the studies and pursuits which lay the best foundation of utility in the Clerical character', with effects 'every where

apparent.'<sup>56</sup>

Van Mildert cautioned his clergy against raking up dead controversies, specifically over the Test Laws and Catholic Emancipation, and against combativeness in general, warning them that 'rash encounters' led only to embarrassment; instead, as in his 1827 Charge, he urged them to strenuous diligence in the discharge of their pastoral duties.<sup>57</sup>

A correspondent of Christopher Wordsworth's heard part of the Charge delivered, and reported himself 'much delighted with its high principles - and with the courage and dignity in which those principles were avowed.'<sup>58</sup>

Van Mildert was excused on health grounds from attending the coronation of William IV on September 8th, and his part in the ceremonial was taken by the Archbishop of York. The second Reform Bill came to the House of Lords on October 3rd but Van Mildert, despite a report in the Morning Post that he had taken his seat in the House, did not go to London until December.<sup>59</sup> At the end of September Wellington, busy assembling votes against the Bill, discovered with consternation that Bishop Percy of Carlisle, to whom Van Mildert's proxy had now passed, was unable to attend the debate.<sup>60</sup> Other arrangements were hastily made, and at the crucial division on October 7th Van Mildert's proxy vote was duly recorded against the Bill.

The majority against the Bill was 199-158, and it escaped nobody that had the twenty-one bishops who opposed it voted the other way, the Bill would have received its second reading. Only the venerable Whig Bishop Bathurst of Norwich and the newly appointed Whig Bishop Maltby of Chichester voted in

support of Reform.

The result was a personal rebuff for Grey, who had pursued his policy of conciliating the bishops into his opening speech in the debate. Praising again the 'prudent forethought' which had led them to adopt 'measures of amelioration', Grey begged the bishops to act with equal prudence on this occasion, warning them to consider 'their situation with the country' should the rejection of the Bill 'be decided by the votes of the heads of the Church'. Howley, the only bishop to speak in the debate, gave this plea as direct an answer as he was capable of: 'if it were their Lordships' pleasure to pass this Bill, he would sincerely rejoice, and no man more than himself, if the apprehensions which he entertained of its effects should turn out to be groundless. If, on the other hand, their Lordships threw out the measure, and popular violence, which he did not expect, should unfortunately follow, he would be content to bear his share in the general calamity.'

Brougham had made some effort to coax Van Mildert into supporting the Bill, perhaps misled by the deliberate omission of any direct reference to parliamentary reform from Van Mildert's Charge into underestimating the strength of the Bishop's determination to oppose it. Brougham adopted indirect tactics, instructing his correspondent James Losh to approach Thorp about showing Van Mildert a letter from Brougham protesting his attachment to 'the Church as by law established' and urging the dire outcome if the Bill should fall in the Lords: 'if it is so, rely on it, the Bishops will be made to bear the blame....The roar of popular fury will be directed

against the Bench, & I foresee the very worst consequences.' The Bill could not, Brougham warned, be defeated, but only delayed and then carried by popular agitation 'in a hostile and domineering manner and to a far greater extent'; if 'a few fathers of the Church were to take a sound and wholesome [sic] course,' seeking to amend the Bill rather than to overthrow or delay it, 'more would be done for both Aristocracy and Hierarchy than all else man could devise.'<sup>62</sup>

Brougham might claim attachment to the Established Church, but the gulf which separated his circle's conception of Establishment from Van Mildert's was revealed by the comment in Losh's covering letter to Thorp: 'I perfectly agree with him in thinking the Church of England the best of existing Church Establishments. And were it liberated from Tithes and its Liturgy from some useless things which give offence, it should have my best wishes.'<sup>63</sup>

In a confidential letter to Thorp, Van Mildert made his own views clear. Brougham would be 'grievously disappointed...if he supposes that my vote for the Parliamentary Reform Bill can be purchased by fears and menaces of the impending fate of the Church. I never can believe that the Church will be more safe or last one year longer by supporting that measure which can answer no purpose but to whet the appetites of the radicals and atheists & to give them an increase of power which no Govt. (certainly not the present) would long be able to resist...And pray be careful how you hand me over to these high Whig Gentry from whom I am very desirous to keep at a respectful distance.'<sup>64</sup>

Public wrath at the bishops after the vote on October 7th fulfilled the predictions. On October 11th Lord Suffield delivered a savage attack in the House of Lords, declaring that the bishops had happily supported 'arbitrary and oppressive' government in the past, turning against the administration only when 'a liberal Government produces a measure for the benefit of the people at large, and for the extension and security of the liberties of the country...' Blomfield and Bishop Copleston of Llandaff rose to remonstrate before Phillpotts sailed magnificently to the offensive: 'Was this charge an instance of liberality; and did the members of his Majesty's Government by these remarks intend to incite and encourage violence?'<sup>65</sup>

There was violence. Although no episcopal blood was shed, the Bishop of Bristol's palace was burnt during the Bristol riots at the end of October, Phillpotts and Bishop Percy of Carlisle were burnt in effigy by hostile crowds, Bishop Law of Bath and Wells had his carriage stoned, and a number of public appearances were prudently cancelled. On Guy Fawkes Day, 1831, 'the effigy of the local bishop replaced Guy Fawkes or the Pope, and at Clerkenwell all twenty-one bishops were consumed in a holocaust.'<sup>66</sup>

Van Mildert had not even been in London during the debates, but he was one of the notorious twenty-one, and was not spared. 'We have had our share of turmoil,' he wrote to Henry Douglas, '& the compliment has been paid me of burning me in effigy in sight of my Castle gates, with threats of demolishing windows, & so forth.' He found himself 'marked out...even by the Gentry and Magistrates of the County, in their inflammatory harangues

to the populace as an object of public execration, in consequence of which, I have not only received gross insults here [at Auckland], but have reason to believe that it was intended and still is to watch an opportunity of doing me personal violence.' When he left for Harrogate at the beginning of November he observed wryly to Thorp that he might find himself 'waylaid or knocked on the head', and later told Henry Douglas that 'had I passed through Darlington, I was to have been way-laid and personally maltreated'.<sup>57</sup>

As a counterpoint to the Reform excitement, plans for the Durham University continued to mature. By the beginning of October, they were sufficiently firm to be declared to the Prime Minister. Howley communicated with Grey on October 4th, outlining the proposals; on October 5th Grey received a letter from Van Mildert explaining the matter in more detail. Van Mildert had hoped that the Dean of Durham would undertake the responsibility of broaching the plans to Grey, but Jenkinson had little enthusiasm for the University project, declaring to Blomfield in 1836 that he 'was against it from the very first'. On 22nd September Jenkinson wrote to the Chapter to tell them in confidence that he was 'unable to give...his unqualified support' to the latest version of the scheme, since it appeared to 'affect too largely the present income of the Chapter', calling for an annual vote of £2850 per annum instead of the £1500 originally proposed.<sup>58</sup>

The scheme as presented to Grey was for an 'Academical Institution at Durham' modelled on 'the Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge,...Christ Church in particular, which is, in like

manner, connected with that Cathedral'. It was to provide a full university education 'more particularly to the Northern Counties, ...having a Principal, Professors, Tutors &c. with Endowments for a certain number of Students'.<sup>69</sup>

Grey's response was prompt and suave: he assured Van Mildert that 'it has seldom been my good fortune to receive a communication which gave me such unqualified pleasure', applauded both the objective and the manner of its prosecution, and promised every assistance in his power.<sup>70</sup>

The Durham Chapter met again to discuss the plans on November 21st. Van Mildert was thoroughly annoyed by the Dean's continuing insistence on the figure of two thousand pounds as a ceiling for the Chapter's contribution to the annual budget, particularly since he had now promised an 'additional Thousand' from the episcopal revenues; he seems to have threatened to moot 'awkward questions' with Earl Grey.<sup>71</sup> It can hardly have eased the increasingly tense relationship between Bishop and Dean that Jenkinson was one of the bishops who had voted for Catholic Emancipation.

In the event, the Chapter meeting went well. The Chapter decided to finance the University, not by voting an annual sum in money but by making over property. The final agreement was to 'enfranchise' property at South Shields 'to the extent of One Hundred Thousand Pounds' and to 'apply the proceeds as an Endowment'.<sup>72</sup>

This proposal could only be implemented by Act of Parliament, a necessity which Van Mildert viewed with considerable misgiving. Indeed, a further development at the

beginning of December meant that Van Mildert travelled down to London charged with piloting not one but two pieces of legislation through Parliament.

On December 2nd, Van Mildert accepted Prosser's resignation as Archdeacon of Durham, and four days later Thorp was the official holder of the position he had been filling in a voluntary capacity throughout Van Mildert's episcopate.<sup>73</sup> 'My dear Archdeacon...' Van Mildert gleefully wrote on December 7th, adding in his next day's letter the hope that Mrs. Thorp 'bears "meekly" the honour of being an Archdeacon's Lady.'<sup>74</sup> There was a problem, however. The Rectory of Easington was formally annexed to the Archdeaconry; Thorp did not wish to give up his own Rectory of Ryton; neither principle nor prudence could allow him to keep both. An Act to separate Easington from the Archdeaconry was already being drafted before Thorp's collation to his new dignity.<sup>75</sup>

Returning to London, Van Mildert found more than enough to occupy his mind. A letter from Lord Grey followed him down from Auckland, hinting delicately at the Prime Minister's desire to see Dissenters admitted to equal membership of the University. 'I cannot help regretting,' Grey wrote, 'that your Lordship should appear to feel so decided an objection to any prospective measures which might...have rendered the plan now in contemplation more extensively useful.' Grey acknowledged that using Chapter revenues to endow a University open to Dissenters could involve 'some change in the existing constitution of the Capitular Body', but felt that, rightly approached, it would 'diminish in no degree the influence and

authority of the Church; but on the contrary greatly...promote them.'<sup>76</sup>

Van Mildert assured Thorp that Grey would 'find me immoveable on this point', and immoveable he duly proved; but the pressure to admit Dissenters persisted. There were other points of disagreement. Brougham argued that the remuneration proposed for the Professors was over-generous and would tend to 'prevent exertion', an anxiety shared by Howley and Gaisford. Gaisford and Tournay continued to argue against making the new institution a full University, pleading that it set a precedent for 'a similar grant to the self-styled London University'; they did not wish Durham to have the power to confer degrees and faculties. >> Dr. Gilly, Sub-Dean of Durham, put up a proposal to endow 'an office like the Xtian Advocate at Cambridge' which Van Mildert regarded with deep suspicion: 'I know not what sort of friends Mr. Gilly has, who are disposed to be such magnificent benefactors. Sed timeo Danaos,' he wrote to Thorp. 'The party he is connected with (including other members of the Chapter with himself) would, I doubt not, be very ready to contribute largely for the sake of that influence among us which may subserve their purposes. In the project, as stated to me, I instantly saw the danger of our being in the outset tangled with a party whose zeal perpetually outruns their discretion, and a probability of turning our Institution (which ought to be most strongly characterised by sobriety and wisdom) into an arena for those unseemly displays of energy which are daily breaking forth in disputatious meetings and answering, as I conceive, no good practical purpose...'<sup>78</sup>

Dean Jenkinson continued to grumble about the terrible financial burden on the Chapter, an irritant made more poignant by Van Mildert's own growing financial anxieties: 'I...shall have extreme difficulty, if not impossibility, in meeting all the demands of this year without selling out from the small reserve in the Funds, which I had, with much anxiety, laid by as a provision in time of need,' he wrote to Thorp at the end of January. 'But I am willing even to do this, & trust to Providence for the result.' Ironically enough, The Times later that year published a poem on how St. Jerome returned to earth and found many things amiss with the Church of England, among them 'that pious soul Van Mildert/Much with his money-bags bewildered.' ↗

As soon as the University plans became public, consideration began to be given to the question of who should be the Professors: by Thorp and the Dean of Durham, by Van Mildert himself, and by a number of people anxious to offer their services. Fending off hopeful enquirers added itself to Van Mildert's other preoccupations; even the Duke of Cumberland had a protégé to recommend.<sup>50</sup> The bulk of his time at the end of 1831 and beginning of 1832 was, however, devoted to lobbying, pressing the virtues of the University Bill on a range of potential supporters. It was decided to introduce the Bill into the House of Lords: 'supposing it to have passed unhurt through that ordeal,' Van Mildert explained to Thorp, 'the fiery furnace of the H. of Commons would be so much less formidable.' From the beginning Van Mildert dreaded the need to take legislation through the Commons, fearing that 'Messrs.

Hume & Co. will be for cutting up root & branch, instead of lopping off a sufficiency for the supplies.' The only security lay in careful preparatory work, and the workload was, Van Mildert pleaded, too heavy for his 'physical powers (to say nothing of the intellectual)' to bear unaided. He persuaded Thorp, whose position as unpaid 'provisional Warden' of the new University was now firmly settled, to come down to London and help him.<sup>e1</sup>

In March Howley revived his Plurality of Benefices Bill, to the disgust of Lord King. King, 'that Enemy of the Established Church' as Cumberland described him, commented sarcastically that the Bill 'might have been considered highly beneficial thirty years ago.' He later 'villainously opposed' the Durham University Bill.<sup>e2</sup>

Van Mildert spoke in the debate at the committee stage of Howley's Bill on March 23rd, opposing an amendment which would have made the value of benefices a criterion in determining whether they could be held in plurality. The measure in hand was, he argued, aimed against pluralism as a cause of non-residence: 'if it was expedient to limit the incomes of spiritual persons, this was not the way it ought to be done.' The proper criterion was that employed in Howley's Bill, namely that union should only be allowed when the benefices were within a reasonable distance of each other. The offending amendment was negatived in committee on March 27th.<sup>e3</sup>

The Bill was given its third reading on April 2nd, after a parting attack from Lord Suffield. Van Mildert took the opportunity of the third reading debate to defend the Durham

Chapter against charges of pluralism made by a letter to The Times. He tackled the thankless task with dignity, prefacing his speech with the observation that the question of annexing commendams to episcopal sees was one of Crown prerogative not episcopal patronage, and that proposals for reform in this area would come more appropriately from Ministers than from the Bishops.

Granted Van Mildert's assumption that holding one benefice or see plus one prebend did not constitute pluralism, he was able to show that only two of the Chapter were pluralists, and that in the case of Archdeacon Thorp, one of the two, measures were being taken to remedy the situation. The same assumption demonstrably lay behind Van Mildert's declaration that he 'had never yet given a living in plurality in the diocese, nor intended to do so.'<sup>64</sup> Van Mildert could with some justice argue that he had a proven commitment to the eradication of non-residence. But the attacks on the Durham prebendaries were concerned less with non-residence than with income. Their opulence was matter of legend, the more so since, as Lord King acidly observed, it was not easy to 'learn the real value of the "golden stalls"'.<sup>65</sup>

As in the previous year, Howley's Bill passed the Lords but was lost in the Commons. Van Mildert was more fortunate: both his Bills went on to become law. Easington was detached from the Archdeaconry, and Thorp's existing prebend annexed instead.

The Durham University Bill was considered by the Lords in committee at the beginning of June. Van Mildert sat next to Lord Durham who, he reported, 'sifted the preamble and clauses

very astutely but on the whole not ill-naturedly'. The main excitement focussed on the exclusion of Dissenters. A meeting of Dissenters in Newcastle, chaired by Brougham's correspondent James Losh, had petitioned for admission to the honours and privileges of the new University; Lord Durham and, later, Hume took up their cause. After 'a little smart sparring' it was agreed that Durham University should adopt the Cambridge system of requiring students to subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles before proceeding to a degree but not before matriculation; this meant that Dissenters could with integrity study at Durham but not receive degrees. The committee broke up 'in pretty good humour', but the advocates of equal treatment continued to press their case until silenced by Van Mildert's threat that if Durham degrees were opened to Dissenters he would withdraw his support, thus ending the University's financial viability.<sup>66</sup>

The Bill received the Royal Assent on 4th July 1832. By the end of November, Thorp was able to write to Grey with details of the arrangements made to open the University to students from October 1833.<sup>67</sup>

The main focus of excitement in Parliament that Spring was the return of the Reform Bill. It became rapidly obvious that the intense pressure which had been brought to bear on the Bishops over the winter, both by the public outcry and by political lobbying, had not been without effect. When the Bill received its first reading in the Lords on March 26th Blomfield, who had been absent from the previous October's vote on the plea of mourning for his recently deceased father, separated himself decisively from his High Church colleagues by

declaring his intention to vote for the Bill and not to support any mutilating amendment. Van Mildert set out his own position in a speech on April 9th. He believed the Bill to be due to 'a restless disposition - a love of innovation - a wish to destroy institutions because they were ancient - a desire to set the subject over the ruler, and to trample the ruler under the subject'. It would not serve the 'religious and moral interests of the country'; it would not better the conditions of the poor. He rejected with sincere indignation the imputation that the bishops 'thought only of their own interests, and that they cared not for the welfare of the lower classes'.<sup>222</sup> To Van Mildert's political world-view, government was simply no part of the responsibility divinely assigned to the 'lower classes', and nothing but demagoguery on the part of unscrupulous and self-seeking Radical agitators could make it appear so. To give the masses a taste for political power could be productive of nothing but evil.

On April 13th Blomfield, the Archbishop of York and eight other bishops voted with Bathurst and Maltby in the majority that secured the Bill its second reading; among them was the Dean of Durham. On 7th May the Lords passed a 'mutilating amendment', postponing the clause to disfranchise pocket boroughs, with the support of thirteen bishops and three archbishops: the Archbishop of York's vote was later explained as due to a misunderstanding. On 8th May Grey asked King William for a promise to create enough new peers to force the Bill through the Lords. The King refused. Grey resigned.

On May 9th the King accepted Grey's resignation and began

negotiations with Peel and Wellington about forming a Tory administration pledged to bring in a reform measure. On the same day that which Joshua Watson had dreaded at last came to pass. In the Commons Hume launched a furious attack on the 'established and enormously overpaid Church'; he successfully moved for a Return giving full details of clerical pluralism in the Church of England.<sup>69</sup> It was apparent to all concerned that Hume's interest was not in pure research but in laying a basis for corrective measures. The Radical assault on the Established Church was under way.

After a week of public turmoil and sterile attempts to form a Cabinet, Wellington admitted defeat; the King reluctantly agreed to create new peers if necessary, and the Grey administration returned to power. The threat of a Whig majority in the House of Lords caved in the opposition: the Reform Bill passed its third reading on June 4th with only 22 dissentient votes, none of them episcopal. 'I never saw the House so overwhelm'd with a sense of its utter helplessness, humiliation, & degradation,' Lord Bristol wrote to Christopher Wordsworth.<sup>70</sup>

Reform was passed; but the bishops were not forgiven. At the beginning of August Howley held his primary visitation at Canterbury and was mobbed. The crowd was, he wrote soothingly to his wife, 'partly abusive but seemingly good natured', and the pelting his carriage received 'broke no windows, except one of a house with a stone intended for us'; the bodywork suffered 'no contusions that will not disappear with sufficient scrubbing';<sup>71</sup> but the incident was symptomatic of a continuing

public hostility to the Established Church that bewildered many and convinced more that the fiery trial was at hand.

On June 23rd, membership of the Commission of Enquiry into ecclesiastical revenues was announced. It was obvious that pains had been taken to include only friends of the Church. Six bishops were Commissioners: Howley, the Archbishop of York, Blomfield, Van Mildert, Kaye of Lincoln and Bethell of Bangor; all, except the Archbishop of York, associates of the Hackney Phalanx, although the support of Blomfield and Kaye for the Reform Bill may have caused some strain. The lay membership was unexceptionable; its most radical member was Stephen Lushington, an ecclesiastical lawyer and a Whig, whom Liverpool had appointed to the Church Building Commission and Wellington to the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission.→

Van Mildert sent Thorp accounts of two meetings of the Commission, both in January 1833. The Government was anxious to have a summary of the Commission's findings as rapidly as possible; on January 15th, although the Commissioners were only at the stage of 'giving directions for preparing a tabular statement of the Returns that have been made, preparatory to making a Report', it was agreed to provide the Government with 'a return of the gross & net amounts of Eccles:l property as far as they have yet been received.' Van Mildert was 'not quite well satisfied on this proceeding - but it cd. not well be put aside.' The Commissioners continued to hurry slowly. At the next meeting their 'chief business' was to 'determine on the most convenient sort of digest, or tabular statements, to be made of the Returns to the Inquiries', and Van Mildert's

apprehensions grew sharper. 'The Govt. have obtained possession of the gross & net averages of the Returns, but without the explanations requisite to a correct judgt. upon them. This must be carefully watched, lest some sinister use be made of it. Ld. Lansdowne seemed anxious to satisfy me that no such things were in contemplation. "Sed timeo." All this is confidential.'<sup>93</sup>

Church Reform schemes of all complexions abounded. The Hackney Phalanx were most horrified by the radical scheme put forward by their 'well intentioned, but highly misguided friend, Lord Henley'.<sup>94</sup> Henley, Peel's brother-in-law and a devout churchman, proposed a far-reaching package of reforms including retirement pensions for clergymen at 70, abolition of all sinecures, commendams and canonries, conversion of all cathedrals into parish churches, a levelling of episcopal incomes accompanied by a prohibition on translations except to archbishoprics, and the exclusion of bishops from the House of Lords. Park commented darkly to Howley that some 'professed friends of the Church of England' were doing her more harm than all her enemies.<sup>95</sup>

The mood of the Hackney Phalanx at the end of 1832 bordered on the apocalyptic. In October Henry Handley Norris was inspired by Howley's Charge to write him an emotional letter about 'the ordeal thro' which there is every indication that we must shortly pass', which, he added, he had 'long foreboded'. 'But tho' the Church of England and those who cleave to her and suffer persecution with her may pass thro' fire and water in the purification she has to undergo my confidence is that she will come forth into a wealthy place and whilst I supplicate

for myself that my faith may not fail me in the hour of tryal I am no less earnest in imploring for your Grace those larger measures of divine wisdom and ghostly strength which may present you as a beacon upon a hill during the darkest moments of the storm....'76

The cholera epidemic which reached England from the Continent in October 1831 had been widely interpreted as a sign of Divine judgement; a national day of fasting and humiliation had been called on 21st March 1832.77 It contributed to the sense of impending doom which oppressed many sober churchmen; the Conservative electoral disaster at the 'Reformed' general election in December seemed a further omen of coming Radical triumph. As they waited for the 'Reformed Parliament' to open its proceedings, churchmen of all shades from Keble to Dr. Arnold were convinced that the dismantling of the Established Church was at hand. Blomfield, the least fanciful or fanatical of prelates, wrote to Archdeacon Glenie in Ceylon: 'What trials are in store for us God only knows, but that we shall have a hard struggle for our very existence as an Established Church, is abundantly clear...'.78 In mid-January Arnold published The Principles of Church Reform, arguing that the only way to save the Established Church was to open it to the majority of Dissenters, making the necessary concessions in its doctrinal basis; Van Mildert thought 'Dr. Arnold's lucubrations... exquisitely absurd and mischievous'.79

Van Mildert himself composed a 'Prayer for this Church and Nation in the Year 1833', lamenting the wicked and irreligious state of the times, and thanking God that 'the sins &

iniquities prevailing among us have not yet drawn down upon our heads the full measure of Thine indignation, & that time is yet presented to us for repentance & amendment...' Not the Church only, but the entire 'social body' seemed to Van Mildert to face dismemberment; he prayed that the holders of ecclesiastical and secular authority might be preserved from 'rash enterprises which may endanger our ancient & well-tried Institutions in Church & State, & thereby open a way to the evil-minded to effect the overthrow of our dearest & most sacred rights...' Divine Assistance was needed, not only to protect the righteous and 'turn the hearts of the scoffer & the scorner...to contrition', but also to give the rulers 'true Christian courage...to put down the turbulent & unruly'.<sup>100</sup>

Van Mildert's health continued poor, and his mood was dark: 'in truth,' he wrote to Bruce Knight at the end of 1832, 'the aspect of the times, like that which an impenetrable fog just now presents at my window, baffles all attempt at getting an insight into what we are to hope for, or to fear. Were I not compelled, nolens volens, to take a prominent part in public life, most gladly would I retreat to some obscure nook or corner, and bid farewell to the great world, with all its doings and misdoings.'<sup>101</sup> But the wolves were gathering, and the proper concern for shepherds was defence.

Some attempt had been made in mid-December to arrive at a concerted episcopal position on Church Reform. Archbishop Howley and sixteen bishops met in conference at Lambeth; Van Mildert, he reported to Thorp, 'bore my full share (if not more than my share) in the conversation - for, after all, it was

little more than conversation, adapted to elicit our respective opinions on the most important topics without much discussion of specific measures and chiefly to enable the Abp. to communicate to the Govt. our general feelings and persuasions.' The meeting did not seek to adopt any 'particular schemes or devices of any kind'; the sixteen were a diverse group, including Bathurst of Norwich, Maltby of Chichester and five other Reform Bill 'rebels'.<sup>102</sup>

Although Van Mildert at the beginning of 1833 reported to Henry Douglas his 'good hope' that 'our Bench as a Body will come out of the conflict without discredit, notwithstanding some few exceptions',<sup>103</sup> and reckoned 'at least 3 fourths' of those present at Lambeth 'to be actuated by the best spirit of firmness & discretion and a real desire to do with a good grace every thing safe & needful & nothing more', it proved difficult to organise anything more definite in the way of an episcopal pressure-group. In the first place, Howley had other preoccupations: his son was gravely ill, dying at Oxford early in 1833, and his own health broke down under the additional strain.<sup>104</sup> In the second place, the Government was keeping its plans very quiet. As late as February 2nd Van Mildert wrote to Thorp that it seemed 'pretty certain that the Govt. are in no state of preparation for any measures relative to the Church, excepting Tithes', and thought that they should 'probably escape the annoyance of having Church Reform mentioned in the King's Speech'. He attended the Lords on February 5th to hear the King's Speech still, he told Thorp, 'wholly ignorant' of what it was to contain, but hoping to gain some 'insight...into

the views & feelings of different parties, from the discussions...' The Speech itself, pledging the Government to take up the issue of church reform and specifically 'a more equitable and judicious distribution of the revenues of the Church', struck him as 'all but a death blow...The great evil is that the Ministers seem purposely to keep us in the dark as to their intentions so that it is impossible for us to be prepared for them. God send us a good deliverance.'<sup>105</sup>

'Scarcely venturing to hope that I can render any essential service in the troubles we must expect to encounter,' Van Mildert wrote to Bruce Knight on February 6th, 'I yet trust, by God's help, to be found at my post, and not to swerve, so long as there is any vis vitae remaining in me.'<sup>106</sup>

It surprised nobody to discover that the first target for substantial reform was the Church of Ireland. The Church Temporalities (Ireland) Bill was introduced into the House of Commons on February 12th. Among its provisions were the amalgamation of two archbishoprics and eight bishoprics with neighbouring dioceses at the next vacancy, removing their revenues; reductions in the revenues of the two richest sees; suspension of presentation to, and removal of revenues of, any parish where no worship had been held for three years; and the abolition of church cess, a tax levied on the inhabitants of a parish to keep the parish church in good repair. The proceeds of the various economies imposed by the Bill were to be placed at the disposal of a new corporation, to be called the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and used for 'such purposes as Parliament shall hereafter appoint and decide.'<sup>107</sup>

To High Churchmen this was abomination. 'Why do we not petition against the principle of the Irish Church robbery Bill?' Archdeacon Bayley wrote to Norris in March. '...I would petition against the principle only, and take no notice of the folly of the detail.'<sup>108</sup> The Conservative leadership, and in particular Peel, found itself more in agreement with Bishop Bathurst, who observed to Howley that 'the State has a right to re-model the Church as to its internal arrangements',<sup>109</sup> a view with a striking resemblance to the conception of Establishment proposed by Van Mildert in his 1825 speech against Catholic Emancipation. Peel's negotiations with the Government concerned the disposal of the redistributed revenues: once the appropriation clause had been dropped in committee, ensuring that the surplus of Church of Ireland money must be applied to Church of Ireland purposes, official Conservative opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. Moderate politicians of both sides were anxious to avoid another collision between Lords and Commons such as had occurred over the Reform Bill; Stanley, the Irish Secretary, held that a Lords rejection of the Bill 'would vastly increase the chance of disestablishment'.<sup>110</sup> The Whigs were no more eager than the Tories to see the Church of England formally disestablished. In mid-February Grey defended the clergy and leaders of the Church against an attack by Lord King, deploring King's proposal to take tithes from Deans and Chapters and distribute them more equally among those 'who did all the work', while confirming that the Government did have measures of church reform in prospect.<sup>111</sup>

Van Mildert was prepared to make no concessions to

expediency politics. Truth (as he saw it) was Truth, to be defended. Catholic Relief marked his Rubicon: he had triumphed then over all snares of prudence, and now he had no desire to do other than resist the obnoxious Bill to the end. During the spring and early summer he served as the 'beacon upon a hill' of Norris' vision, by which all bishops inclined to oppose the Bill might orient themselves. The bishops met to 'talk over matters every Thursday after business at the Bounty Board', using the Dean's Yard offices of Queen Anne's Bounty as a base; but there was no general agreement on a proper response to the Bill, and in a natural development a smaller group of 'three or four' took to visiting Van Mildert weekly for 'more confidential discussion', a fact which Van Mildert cautioned Thorp not to 'blab'.<sup>1112</sup>

Rumours of all kinds abounded, including one that Van Mildert had 'said, that the Irish Church Bill had better not be opposed, for that in a short time we should only have a worse'. There was not, he assured Bruce Knight, 'a shadow of foundation for it. I quite agree with you, that a worse can hardly be; and, I believe, there are few of the Clergy who are not of the same opinion.' Van Mildert took a keen interest in the expressions of clerical opposition to the Bill; he complimented Bruce Knight on the 'noble feeling and spirit' which his Welsh clergy had shown 'towards their Irish brethren', and advised Thorp on tactics for handling clerical feeling in Durham diocese, with supporting advice from Joshua Watson.<sup>1113</sup>

The Bishops managed one united action when at the end of May they had a 'congratulatory private audience with his

Majesty'. Van Mildert reported to Thorp that 'mutual professions of attachment were interchanged with many assurances of Royal favour and protection,' adding darkly 'How these will be verified time must show.'<sup>114</sup>

On June 3rd, seven bishops caused outcry by voting against the government on a matter not directly concerned with Church interests. On June 6th, Phillpotts exacerbated the situation with 'a tremendous warrior utterance about the king's duties under the coronation oath'. The King wrote to Howley 'urging the bishops, for the sake of their order and the church, not to meddle in politics'.<sup>115</sup> The letter added to the pressure on the bishops not to stand out against the Bill, a pressure further increased on June 21st by the dropping of the appropriation clause, a decision regarded by the Radicals and Irish Catholics as a dastardly betrayal, and the consequent withdrawal of official Conservative opposition.

Van Mildert was unmoved by the concession. 'The omission of the most shameful clause of the Irish Church Bill will probably smooth its progress in the H. of Lords,' he wrote to Thorp. 'Yet to my apprehension the rest of it is so incorrigibly bad that I shall never be able to give it countenance. It assumes throughout, though tacitly, such maxims and principles of legislation respecting the Church as are utterly subversive of every rational view of an Established Church, either with reference to its spiritualities or its temporalities...I detest the measure more than I can describe and am quite sure the Church cannot long survive it.'<sup>116</sup>

He was, however, deeply worried about the effect of the

June developments on his brother bishops, and in particular feared that Howley would now support the Bill. The prospect of a public collision with the Archbishop, 'the person of all others from whom I should most reluctantly differ', disturbed him so much that he considered simply staying away from the debates. 'But I cannot help it,' he wrote to Joshua Watson: 'again and again have I considered the matter, and can see only one course open to me consistently with integrity or a safe conscience, or with my notions of sound policy and discretion...'<sup>117</sup>

On July 17th, at the debate on the second reading of the Bill, Van Mildert rose to deliver the last of his major speeches to the House of Lords. The Mirror of Parliament published it. It was a pivotal speech for Van Mildert personally; he was saved from realising its full cost only because he failed to sway a majority of his hearers.

He began by magnificently sweeping aside the argument, advanced by Grey in the Lords and several in the Commons, that by reallocating part of their revenues to provide for the Durham University the Dean and Chapter of Durham had set a precedent for the present measure. Their action was, he urged, 'strictly in accordance both with the spirit and the letter of the Chapter Statutes, which expressly point out the advancement of learning as one special object of their endowment as a collegiate body'; they could not, therefore, be described as 'alienating the property of the Church to other purposes than those for which it was originally bestowed'.<sup>118</sup>

Van Mildert then anatomised for their Lordships the ways in

which the Bill overturned the understanding of Establishment on which his own ministry had been based. Firstly, by shifting the burden of taxation to finance the upkeep of the Church from the laity to the clergy, the Bill implicitly denied the principle that the ministrations of the Church were of benefit to, and thus the proper financial responsibility of, the whole community. If it were accepted that providing facilities for the worship and ministry of the Established Church were 'not matters of common interest', this overthrew 'the very idea of national religion'; it was a step towards seeing the Church of Ireland merely as one denomination among many.

Secondly, the Bill represented in several of its provisions an encroachment by the State on the proper responsibilities of the episcopate. Van Mildert objected strenuously to the Bill's creation of 'what are called Ecclesiastical Commissioners', to be invested, 'to a great extent, with the executive administration of the Church'. Commissioners charged simply with gathering information, with making recommendations for change, or even with a narrowly specialised function such as church building, were an acceptable expression of State authority; Commissioners given power of initiative were an usurpation which 'seems to militate against the fundamental rights of the Church as a spiritual body'. Van Mildert glimpsed from afar the confusion of authority that would arise when a permanent executive bureaucracy was added to the Threefold Ministry, and was appalled.

The suppression of bishoprics (and so many bishoprics) for the unadorned purpose of laying hands on their revenues was an

act of piracy. Grey's plea that half the proposed unions of sees had 'previously been in force' carried no weight with Van Mildert. Unions of sees might perfectly properly be made when the internal circumstances demanded it, when the Church authorities were in agreement and when 'some spiritual advantage' was to be gained. Unions 'compulsorily forced upon the Church' at the dictates of temporal politics were an abomination.

The worst of the Bill's abrogations of episcopal authority was to Van Mildert the provision for suspending the appointment of incumbents to parishes where no worship had been held for three years. Ensuring that the spiritual needs of the community were properly served was the responsibility of the episcopate; the decision whether, and if so which, parochial charges were to be abandoned belonged to the Bishops, and Parliament had no right to interfere.

As a third main point, by those of its provisions which gave 'encouragement...to the proselyting spirit of Popery', particularly the reductions in the number of Protestant bishops and clergy, the Bill breached the State's responsibility to consider the interests of the Established Church as paramount over those of other denominations. The effect of the proposed suspension of benefices was specifically to preclude 'any prospect of reviving Protestantism, where it happens to be most depressed.'

Fourthly, by refusing to respect the property rights of the Church, the Bill violated the State's role as defender of the Church's secular interests. Van Mildert argued, in a striking

example of the congregationalist vein underlying one strand of High Church thinking on authority, that the revenues of the Church did not 'constitute one large common fund'. The Church was not 'one entire corporation, possessing revenues which may undergo continual changes in the mode of their distribution; but is rather an aggregate of corporations, each possessing its own distinct property, with which no other can, of right, interfere. There are corporations sole, such as Bishops and beneficed clergy; and there are mixed corporations, such as deans and chapters, and other collegiate bodies, all having their respective possessions and rights, independent of the rest; and unless these inherent rights can be set aside, it does not appear how they can be justly dealt with as one common fund.'<sup>120</sup>

In his 1825 speech against Catholic Emancipation, Van Mildert argued that spiritual jurisdiction over the Church belonged properly 'to the State, as allied to the Church, and although exercised by the Church, is derived from the State.' By spiritual jurisdiction he understood 'the appointment of particular persons to exercise spiritual functions throughout the State,...the rules and regulations by which they shall be directed,...their respective remunerations..., in short,... every thing which, in Ecclesiastical, no less than in Civil Polity, it is the duty of the Legislative and Executive Government of the Country to provide, for the general benefit of the community.'<sup>121</sup> The Grey government might fairly have retorted, that in redeploying the human and financial resources of the Church of Ireland it was not exceeding the jurisdiction

which Van Mildert had assigned as its proper responsibility.

To this, Van Mildert's logic could only allow one answer: that the provisions of the Bill were in themselves proof, for the reasons given in his speech, that the government had repudiated the terms of alliance on which the State's claim to jurisdiction over the Church depended. The paradox in Van Mildert's conception of Establishment was this, that although jurisdiction over an established Church belonged properly to the State, any State which attempted to exercise that jurisdiction without the consent of the Church thereby apostatised from the Establishment relationship. In 1829 he had asked how 'the principle that there should be no civil distinctions on account of religious opinions', embodied in Catholic Emancipation, could 'possibly be maintained with safety to our existing Establishments,' or indeed could be 'reconciled with the existence of any religious Establishment whatsoever'.<sup>122</sup> Now he had answered his own question. In a speech whose modest length and temperate language gave few clues to its radical content, he had demonstrated that the spiritual reality of Establishment, as he himself understood it, was at an end. What Establishment might be made to mean in the future was an open question.

The Bill was given a second reading by 157 votes to 98. Fifteen bishops voted against it; eleven, including Archbishop Whately of Dublin, voted for. It was somewhat revised in committee, but in August the Commons accepted the revised text and the Bill passed onto the statute book. On July 14th, three days before Van Mildert's verdict and not restricted by Van

Mildert's deliberately moderate choice of phrase, John Keble preached his Assize Sermon on National Apostasy, and denounced the Irish Church Bill as sacrilege.

A recent thesis has argued, drawing on a distinction of V.F. Storr, that Van Mildert should be assigned to the 'High Church' party of orthodox churchmen, committed to the Establishment relationship of Church and State, rather than the 'Church supreme and pure' party whose commitment was primarily to the Church as spiritual body and whose ethos was in the last analysis disestablishmentarian.<sup>123</sup>

For Van Mildert this distinction did not pose itself with clarity until the last years of his life. In 1829, when Catholic Emancipation was carried, he was sixty-four; not of an age, or a temperament, to relish a radical re-evaluation of his lifetime's commitment to 'the Church of England as by law established'. However, it is clear that his decision to oppose the Irish Church Bill was not taken lightly; the vehemence of his insistence to Joshua Watson that in conscience he could take no other course suggests that he had a clear inkling of how costly this path might prove.

By July 17th, he must also have known that he would not be followed. Phillpotts was fighting the same battle, with ferocious relish and a total disregard for who might or might not be lined up behind him; but the support of the King, the Government and the official Opposition for the Bill was too much weight to shift. Some of the English and Irish bishops regarded the Bill with equanimity, as a perfectly proper exercise of State authority.<sup>124</sup> The Church was not of one mind.

In deciding his tactics, Van Mildert suffered the crippling handicap of not being Archbishop of Canterbury. He was not even free to bid for the place which strategically belonged to the Archbishop, kept by his personal respect for Howley from any challenge to his authority. 'I wish the Archbishop had somewhat of the boldness of the old Catholic Prelates,' Newman wrote; 'no one can doubt that he is a man of the highest principle, and would willingly die a Martyr; but, if he had but the little finger of Athanasius, he would do us all the good in the world.'<sup>125</sup> Van Mildert commanded some of the oratorical skills which Howley so transparently lacked; he had a boldness of imagination which could conjure Durham University from the barest of conceptions to a practical reality in little more than two years; his 'prestige was higher with the clergy than any other bishop's'.<sup>126</sup> His speech contained a clear challenge to the bishops of the Church of England and Ireland to reclaim their authority from state usurpation; but the challenge was not heeded, and foreknowing that it would not be heeded he avoided giving it any direct expression.

Howley, for his part, distinguished himself in the eyes of the Oxford Movement by opposing the Bill; but clarion-calls summoning Israel to battle were not in his line, and his indecision beforehand destroyed any possibility of effective co-operation with Van Mildert.

'You may be assured,' Van Mildert wrote to Joshua Watson before the debate, '...that my utmost endeavours shall be used to give no just occasion for offence to opponents or to friends.'<sup>127</sup> Howley had given no firm lead for him to follow;

he would not himself offer a firm lead for fear of disloyalty. Van Mildert made the explanation his integrity required of him then, leaving his vote to be cast by proxy, retired to the North.

G.F.A. Best<sup>128</sup> makes the suggestion that Howley's conversion from the moderate and modest reformer of the early 1830's to the later stout defender of the Ecclesiastical Commission's radical measures 'may well have had something to do with' Van Mildert's death in 1836. The decisive date may rather have been 1833. After the passing of the Irish Church Bill, Van Mildert's remaining energies were devoted almost entirely to the nurturing of his University and the shepherding of his diocese. He does not seem to have felt any calling to be among the engineers of a new understanding of Establishment.

1. Ives, vol.1, pp.110-111
2. G.F.A. Best, [Temporal Pillars], Cambridge (1964), p.192
3. N. [Gash], Peel, London (Longman, 1976), p.157
4. Churton to Norris, September 30th 1830. Norris Papers.
5. Temporal Pillars, p.404
6. Ibid., p.545, table of episcopal revenues.  
 Van Mildert to Grey, December 11th 1830; Van Mildert to Grey, December 21st 1830; Grey to Van Mildert, December 22nd 1830; Van Mildert to Grey, December 23rd 1830; Van Mildert to Grey, December 30th 1830. Papers of 2nd Earl Grey.  
 The two institutions are recorded in the Durham Acta Books, entries for 27th January and 22nd February 1831, and reprinted in Cochrane p.241.  
 Darnell, who had been Keble's tutor at Oxford, 'was inexcusably non-resident in 1833, paying two curates £270 between them to look after the parish'. A.D. [Gilbert], Religion and Society in Industrial England, New York (Longman, 1976), p.127. The annual income of Stanhope at this time was £4843. The non-residence may have been merely technical; Darnell was actively involved in diocesan affairs in 1833.
7. Ives, vol.1, p.112
8. Temporal Pillars, pp.224-5
9. Churton, vol.2, pp.3-6
10. This probably refers to the correspondence over Phillpotts' preferment. The interpretation in Temporal Pillars, p.275, that Van Mildert was referring to early negotiations over the Commission, is less easily compatible with Churton's choice of phrase.
11. Hansard, Third Series, vol.2, pp.482-3
12. Brougham to Van Mildert, 2nd February 1831. Van Mildert Papers.
13. Van Mildert to Brougham, 5th February 1831. Van Mildert Papers.
14. Bishop [Gray] of Bristol to Van Mildert, 1st March 1831. Van Mildert Papers.
15. Leonard Edmunds to John Dunn, 9th April 1831; Dunn to T.H. Faber, 11th April 1831; J.R. Fenwick to C. Thorp, 12th April 1831; Thorp to Fenwick, 13th April 1831. See also C.J. Clavering to Van Mildert, 14th April 1831. Van Mildert Papers.
16. See E.R. [Norman], Church and Society in England 1770-1970,

Oxford (Oxford University Press, 1976), p.87, commenting on Van Mildert's speech to the Lords, 9th April 1832.

17. Thorp to Fenwick, 13th April 1831. Van Mildert Papers.

18. J. [Stevenson], Popular Disturbances in England 1700-1870, London (Longman, 1979), p.235.

R. Burdon to Van Mildert, April 18th 1831; Gaisford to Van Mildert, April 17th 1831. Van Mildert Papers.

Gaisford, who was in Durham residing on the prebend to which Van Mildert had presented him in 1829, blamed the troubles on 'some methodist preachers'.

19. I.W. Williamson, Chairman of the Quarter Sessions, to Van Mildert, 16th April 1831; R. Burdon to Van Mildert, 18th April 1831; Resolutions passed at a Meeting of Justices of the Peace, Gateshead, 16th April 1831. Van Mildert Papers.

20. Van Mildert to Brougham, 15th April 1831; Leonard Edmunds to Dunn, 15th April 1831; Dunn to Van Mildert, 17th April 1831. Van Mildert Papers.

21. Gaisford to Van Mildert, 17th April 1831. Van Mildert Papers.

22. Van Mildert to Brougham, 18th April 1831; Brougham to Van Mildert, 18th April 1831; Van Mildert to Brougham, 19th April 1831; Van Mildert to Messrs. North & Smart, Solicitors, 19th April 1831. Van Mildert Papers.

23. Brougham to Van Mildert, 19th April 1831; Van Mildert to Brougham, 19th April 1831 [second letter of that date]; Leonard Edmunds to Van Mildert, 20th April 1831. Van Mildert Papers.

It may have been partly due to this affair that the High Sheriff of Durham, Clavering, resigned at the beginning of 1833 (Van Mildert to Henry Douglas, 1st January 1833, in Adams, pp. 556-7) and that Van Mildert had great difficulty finding a suitable and willing successor: Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, ff.93-114.

24. W.L. [Mathieson], English Church Reform 1815-1840, London (1923), pp.28-9. In 1828 Wellington warned the King that Van Mildert might object to Lambton's being granted the title of Baron Durham: Wellington to George IV, 12th January 1828. Duke of Wellington (ed.), Despatches, [Correspondence] & Memoranda of the Duke [of Wellington], 1819-32, 8 vols., (1867-80), vol.4, p.188.

25. Temporal Pillars, pp.245-50, gives a full account of the battle.

26. J. Wade, The Extraordinary Black Book, (2nd edition, 1831), pp.iii ff.

27. W. Rennell to Norris, 4th May 1831. Norris Papers.

28. Howley had brought in an unsuccessful Tithe Composition Bill in 1830: Hansard, New Series, vol.24, pp.499-501. The three bills were introduced on June 24th 1831: Hansard, Third Series, vol.4, pp.292-5. On July 15th Lord King brought in a rival Bill to prevent pluralities: ibid., pp.1305-8. Temporal Pillars, p.276, gives an account of the Bills' fate.
29. Hansard, Third Series. vol.5, pp.132-7; Churton. vol.2. p.11.
30. Temporal Pillars, pp.206, 329; O. [Chadwick], The Victorian Church, 2 vols., London (third edition, 1966), vol.1, p.39.
31. See, for instance, Van Mildert's letter of October 11th 1831 about a disgraced schoolmaster - 'William Van Mildert, Bishop of Durham 1826 to 1836', scrapbook in Durham University Palaeography Department, f.7b.
32. Van Mildert to Thorp, February 27th 1833. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.109.
33. Churton, vol.2, p.11. H.T. Powell to H.H. Norris, June 13th 1831; Norris Papers.
34. W.O.B. Allen and E. McClure, Two Hundred Years: the History of The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1698-1898, London (1898), pp.154, 190. The second Anti-Infidel Committee raised only £2382.2s.6d. by its public appeal, and £1,000 of this came from S.P.C.K. funds.
35. Van Mildert to Henry Douglas, July 8th 1831, in Adams, p.468. Van Mildert to Thorp, June 21st 1831; Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.1.
36. Van Mildert to Thorp, Private, July 25th 1831; Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.3. Jenkinson to Blomfield, 17th October 1836; Durham University Library Add. Ms. 378.4281J4. On Cromwell's University see C.E. [Whiting], The University of Durham 1832-1932, London (The Sheldon Press, 1932), pp.18-29 and Van Mildert to Thorp, July 27th 1831; Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.5.
37. Van Mildert to Thorp, 10th August 1831 (two letters). Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, ff.14, 15. Whiting, p.32, cites 'a tradition that Bishop Van Mildert took the initiative in founding the University, and had great difficulty in persuading the Chapter to move in the matter'.
38. Durell was older than Van Mildert: Van Mildert to Thorp, 18th February 1834; Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.166b. Copied extracts in Jenkyns Papers, IVB. On Thorp's handwriting, see Jenkinson's strictures, and Van Mildert's comment: Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, ff.13, 15.
39. Gaisford to Thorp, August 4th 1831. Thorp Correspondence,

vol.1, f.10.

40. The 'matters of a private nature' referred to in Van Mildert to Thorp, August 18th, 27th 1831, Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, ff.24, 32, probably concerned the exchange.

41. Hall was removed from the Deanery of Christ Church to the Deanery of Durham in 1824 as the result of a financial scandal. 'It is the only preferment which can properly be proposed for him,' Liverpool wrote to the King: 'and it is a great publick object to place some other person in the station which he holds at Oxford.' A. Aspinall (ed.), The Letters of King George IV, 1812-1830, Cambridge (Cambridge University Press, 1938), vol.III, pp.56-7; see footnote 2, p.58.

42. W. Tuckwell, Reminiscences of Oxford, London (Cassell, 1900), pp.69, 129, 131, gives some examples.

43. Van Mildert to Henry Douglas, February 12th 1831, in Adams, p.552.

44. 'We know very little of the Lady; but hear, in all quarters, favourable reports of her fitness for the station. We shall all anxiously hope that the little ones may find in her something to supply the want of such a parent as they have lost.' Van Mildert to Henry Douglas, May 1st 1832, in Adams, pp.554-5.

45. Durell to Thorp, July 28th 1831. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.2. The letter includes a copy of the postscript which Durell had added to his own letter to John Banks Jenkinson, Bishop of St. David's and Dean of Durham. For some reason this postscript has caused confusion among the historians. Best, Temporal Pillars, p.275, supposes it to have been addressed to Gaisford. Whiting, p.33, believes it addressed to Van Mildert.

46. Van Mildert to Thorp, July 27th 1831. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.5.

47. A.B. Webster, Joshua Watson, London (1954), pp.44-5; S.C. Carpenter, Church and People, 1789-1889, London (1933), p.73. Charles Lloyd was no keener on the King's College proposals than Gaisford was on the Durham University plan: Lloyd to Norris, 16th April, 2nd June 1828. Norris Papers.

48. Thorp to Gaisford, August 11th and 16th, 1831. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, ff.29, 34.

49. Thorp to Jenkinson, 25th August 1831; Jenkinson to Durell, Prosser and Thorp, 31st August 1831. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, ff.29, 34.

50. Phillpotts to Wellington, 24th September 1831. Correspondence of Wellington, vol.7, p.537.

51. 'I wish some contrivance could be devised towards gagging my Lord of Bristol. I am afraid his propensity for talking will ere long produce some very serious mischief.' Gaisford to Van Mildert, April 17th 1831; Van Mildert Papers. The reference could be to the ultra-Tory peer Lord Bristol rather than to Bishop Gray; but it occurs in the correspondence on the Durham magistracy affair, in which Gray is known to have been involved.

52. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, ff.15, 18, 23; Van Mildert's letters frequently refer to his continuing ill-health.

53. Van Mildert to Thorp, August 30th and 31st 1831. Thorp Correspondence vol.1, ff.33, 35. A footnote referring to the University plans was inserted in the published version of the Charge.

54. W. Van Mildert, A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Durham, 1831. Reprinted in Ives, vol.1, pp.535-72.

55. Ibid., pp.544-61

56. Ibid., pp.537-9, 557

57. Ibid., pp.541-2, 565-6, 567, 569

58. C. Wordsworth to Joshua Watson, 3rd October 1831. Lambeth Palace Library Ms. 1822, f.269.

59. Wordsworth's letter refers to the Morning Post report. Van Mildert's letters of October 3rd and December 1st to Grey are both headed 'Auckland Castle'; Papers of 2nd Earl Grey. The Van Milderts made a brief trip to Harrogate at the beginning of November, then returned to Auckland, leaving for London early in December. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, ff.61, 68, 71.

60. Wellington to Phillpotts, 23rd September 1831. Correspondence of Wellington, vol.7, p.533.

61. Hansard, Third Series, vol.7, pp.967-8; vol.8, pp.302-3.

62. Brougham to J. Losh, August 1831 [copy dated 10th September]. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.47. Van Mildert to Thorp, September 10th 1831, ibid., f.48, makes it clear that the absence from the Charge of any reference to the Reform Bill was intentional.

63. Losh to Thorp, 9th September 1831. Ibid., f.47. Losh was later to attack Van Mildert for speaking with 'contempt and harshness of all persons who do not believe in the Trinity': Van Mildert to Thorp, June 23rd 1832; ibid., f.86.

64. Van Mildert to Thorp, September 10th 1831. Ibid., f.61.

65. Hansard, Third Series, vol.8, pp.470-4

66. Chadwick, vol.1, pp.26-9; Mathieson, pp.50-1. On the Bristol riots see Stevenson pp.221-2.

67. Van Mildert to Henry Douglas, November 26th 1831, in Adams, pp.552-3. Van Mildert to Thorp, November 2nd 1831. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.61.

68. Jenkinson to Blomfield, 17th October 1836. Durham University Library Add. Ms. 378.4281J4.

Jenkinson to the Durham Chapter, 22nd September 1831. Three copies in Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, ff.51-3.

69. Van Mildert to Grey, 3rd October 1831. Papers of 2nd Earl Grey.

70. Grey to Van Mildert, 6th October 1831. Papers of 2nd Earl Grey.

71. Van Mildert to Thorp, November 21st 1831. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.63.

72. Van Mildert to Peel. June 11th 1832. British Library Ms. Add. 40403, f.38.

73. See above, p.339, note 37. At the end of 1829 Thorp was also appointed 'to the Office of Official or Commissary of the Archdeaconry of Northumberland' by Archdeacon Singleton. Durham Acta Books, entries for 31st December 1829 and [undated] January 1830, reprinted in Cochrane, pp.241-2.

Frosser resigned on December 2nd 1831, and Van Mildert collated Thorp to 'the Archdeaconry or Archidiaconal Dignity' on December 6th. Ibid., entries for December 2nd and 6th 1831, reprinted in Cochrane, p.247.

74. Van Mildert to Thorp, December 7th and 8th 1831. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, ff.67, 68.

75. Van Mildert to Thorp, December 8th 1831. Ibid., vol.1, f.68

76. Grey to Van Mildert, 10th December 1831. Papers of 2nd Earl Grey. Grey was later to raise difficulties with the Easington Bill also, summoning Van Mildert to Downing Street to discuss a technicality concerning 'the liability of Archdeaconries to be presented to by virtue of the Prerogative of the Crown'; but he does not seem to have insisted on modifying the Bill. Van Mildert to Grey, March 15th 1832. Papers of 2nd Earl Grey.

77. Brougham to Jenkinson, January 11th 1832. Copy in Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.74. See also E. [Hughes], 'The Bishops and Reform 1831-3', in English Historical Review, vol.LVI (July 1941), pp.459-90; p.471, footnote.

Van Mildert to Thorp, January 14th 1832. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.77.

78. Van Mildert to Thorp, January 24th 1832. Ibid., f.78.

79. Jenkinson to Thorp, January 13th 1832; Van Mildert to Thorp, January 24th 1832. Ibid., ff.75, 78. The Times, 8th November 1832. Quoted in Chadwick, vol.1, p.34.
80. Cumberland to Van Mildert, July 7th 1832. Copy in Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, ff.88.
81. Van Mildert to Thorp, July 27th 1831, February 14th 1832. Ibid., ff.5, 82.
82. Hansard, Third Series, vol.10, p.1107.
83. Ibid., vol.11, pp.798-9
84. Ibid., vol.11, pp.1172-5
85. Ibid., vol.11, p.1175
86. Van Mildert to Thorp, June 6th 1832; Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.84. Hansard, Third Series, vol.12, p.1215. See also Whiting, pp.39-43.
87. Grey to Thorp, December 3rd 1832. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.91.
88. Hansard, Third Series, vol.12, p.48
89. Ibid., pp.754-8. The motion called for 'the name of every person holding more than one dignity, benefice, church, or chapel, of the Established Church in England and Wales; stating how many, and the name of each..., and the gross and net annual value..., the number of years the incumbent has held each preferment or benefice, what duties are performed by him, what curates are employed under him, and the amount of stipends actually paid to each curate....'
90. Marquess of Bristol to C. Wordsworth, 5th June 1832. Lambeth Palace Library Ms. 1822, f.71. See Chadwick, vol.1, pp.29-32; on the respective positions of Peel and Wellington, Gash, pp.150-3; for a summary of episcopal contributions to the debates, Norman, pp.86-9. 'The Bishop of Bristol was so assaulted on Tuesday night coming from the House that not [sic] the Police been in great force he would have been in all probability assassinated.' H.H. Norris to C. Wordsworth, May 17th 1832; Lambeth Palace Library Ms. 1822, ff.173-4.
91. Howley to his wife, August 7th and 8th 1832. Lambeth Palace Library Ms. 2166, ff.4-5, 6-7. See also Howley to Jane Van Mildert, August 12th 1832, in Adams, p.468.
92. Van Mildert included Lushington on a short list of influential people to whom the Durham University Bill should be privately communicated when the text was available. Hughes, p.473, note 5, remarks that in 1822 Lushington had been

suggested as patronage secretary at the Treasury. He was one of the most active Ecclesiastical Courts Commissioners (Temporal Pillars, p.192, note 3); he also introduced Howley's 1831 Pluralities Bill into the House of Commons.

93. Van Mildert to Thorp, January 15th and 21st 1833. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, ff.94, 96.

94. Park to Howley, 26th October 1832. Lambeth Palace Library Ms. 2185, ff.96-7.

95. See the Dean of Durham's fulminations against 'that numerous tribe of Church Reformers...who are perpetually obtruding their nostrums on the public', Jenkinson to C. Wordsworth, 4th December 1833. Lambeth Palace Library Ms. 1822, ff.83-4.

Pusey attacked Henley's proposals to abolish cathedrals, wanting instead to 'reconvert' them into theological schools by the exercise of patronage. Mathieson, p.70; Chadwick, vol.1, p.42.

96. H.H. Norris to Howley, 25th October 1832. Lambeth Palace Library Ms. 2185, ff.94-5.

97. Chadwick, vol.1, pp.36-8. On the temporary upsurge in religious feeling caused by the epidemic see Gilbert, p.197. The Sunderland cholera outbreak gave Van Mildert 'much extra trouble in official correspondence as Custos Rotulorum, with the Government, & with the Magistracy, & with the Board of Health.' Van Mildert to Henry Douglas, November 26th 1831, in Adams, pp.552-3. There are references to the progress of the cholera in Durham diocese in Van Mildert to Thorp, December 19th 1831 and January 25th 1832: Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, ff.71, 80.

98. Blomfield to Glenie, 21st November 1832. Diocesan Letter-books of C.J. Blomfield, Bishop of London, vol.5, pp.1-3

99. Van Mildert to Thorp, 31st January 1833. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.101.

On Arnold's proposals see Chadwick, vol.1, pp.42-6. Temporal Pillars, pp.281-92, surveys the church reform writings of the period; R.W. Church, The Oxford Movement, London (1892), pp.100-4, examines their effect on the first leaders of the Oxford Movement. Norman, pp.100-5, has a comparative discussion of the conceptions of the Church-State relationship propounded by Coleridge, Gladstone and Arnold.

100. W. Van Mildert, 'Prayer for this Church and Nation, in the year 1833', Durham University Library Add. Ms. 274.207V21S4.

101. Van Mildert to Bruce Knight, December 28th 1832, in Ives, vol.1, pp.131-2.

102. Van Mildert to Thorp, December 15th 1832. Thorp

Correspondence, vol.1, f.92. The bishops present were 'London, Durham, Winchester, Hereford, Salisbury, NORWICH, Bath & Wells, Lichfield, Lincoln, St. Asaph, Worcester, Carlisle, Llandaff, Exeter, Oxford & Chichester.'

103. Van Mildert to Henry Douglas, January 1st 1833, in Adams, pp.556-7.

104. Van Mildert to Thorp, January 8th and 31st 1833. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, ff.93, 101.

105. Van Mildert to Thorp, February 2nd, 5th and 9th 1833. Ibid., ff.104, 105, 106.

106. Van Mildert to Bruce Knight, February 6th 1833. In Ives, vol.1, pp.132-3.

107. Chadwick, vol.1, pp.56-7.

108. H.V. Bayley to H.H. Norris, March 10th 1833. Norris Papers

109. H. Bathurst, Memoirs of the late Dr. Henry Bathurst, London (1837); quoted in Norman, p.106.

110. Chadwick, vol.1, p.58; Gash, p.158.

111. Hughes, p.479, note 1. Van Mildert commented to Thorp, 'Earl Grey's rebuke to Lord King might a little revive us had not Ld. Althorp's projects for upsetting the Irish Church given fresh cause for dismay...' Van Mildert to Thorp, February 5th 1833. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.107.

112. Van Mildert to Thorp, 14th March 1833. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.112; quoted in Temporal Pillars, p.126, note 2.

113. Van Mildert to Bruce Knight, May 6th 1833, in Ives, vol.1, p.134. Van Mildert to Thorp, February 27th, March 26th, March 30th, April 25th, May 24th 1833; Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, ff.109, 117, 118, 125, 133.

114. Van Mildert to Thorp, 28th May 1833. Ibid., f.134.

115. Chadwick, vol.1, pp.57-8, footnote. On Phillipotts' speech see P.B. Nockles, Continuity and Change in Anglican High Churchmanship in Britain, 1792-1850, 2 vols., Oxford (D. Phil. thesis, 1982), vol.1, p.16.

116. Van Mildert to Thorp, June 25th 1833. Ibid., f.135. See also Van Mildert to Bruce Knight, 24th June 1833, in Ives, vol.1, pp.184-5.

117. Van Mildert to Joshua Watson, undated, in Churton, vol.2, pp.24-5.

118. W. Van Mildert, [Speech] of the Right Reverend William, Lord Bishop of Durham, in the House of Lords, on Wednesday, July 17, 1833, on the Second Reading of the Church Temporalities (Ireland) Bill, extracted from the Mirror of Parliament, Part CCXXXVI. London (1833). pp.3-4.

119. Mathieson, p.78

120. Speech, p.9

121. W. Van Mildert, Substance of A Speech, delivered in the House of Lords, on Tuesday, May 17, 1825, by William, Lord Bishop of Llandaff, on a Bill for the removal of certain disqualifications of the Roman Catholics, London (1825), pp.9-10.

122. W. Van Mildert, Substance of SPEECHES delivered in the HOUSE OF LORDS, on the subject of THE ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIEF BILL, on April 3d, 7th, & 8th, 1829. By WILLIAM, Lord Bishop of Durham, London (1829), pp.16-7

123. A.S. Havens, Henry Jenkyns on the Thirty-nine Articles: A Study in Nineteenth-Century Anglican Confessionalism, Durham (M.A. thesis, 1982), pp.50-1

124. Archbishop Whately voted for the Bill. The Bishop of Ferns and Leighlin also published a pamphlet 'in favour of the church quietly submitting to parliamentary authority' (Nockles, vol.1, p.17); for Newman's attack on the pamphlet see I. Ker and T. Gornall (eds.), The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman, Oxford (Clarendon Press, 1980), vol.4, pp. 163-6.

125. J.H. Newman to J.W. Bowden, August 31st 1833. Ibid., p.33.

126. Temporal Pillars, p.346. 'To have founded a university after the manner of a great mediaeval churchman would have been no mean achievement in any age: to have done so in 1831-3 when the radical wolves "Hume and Co." were howling at the door of the ecclesiastical sheepfold was something of a miracle.' Hughes, p.460.

127. Van Mildert to Joshua Watson, undated, in Churton, vol.2, p.25.

128. Temporal Pillars, p.346

## Chapter Eleven

### Last Rites

The 'association for the defence of the Church'; the Durham Divinity Professorship; the second Durham University Bill; Van Mildert's Durham Assize Sermon; his defence of Cathedral dignities; his death; tributes and memorials.

## Chapter Eleven

After 1833, the Hackney Phalanx went their several ways. Blomfield had foreseen, as early as 1832, 'the necessity of a mixed Commission of Clergymen & Laymen to consider what measures should be adopted in the way of Church Reform whether as to the establishment of a consistent scheme of discipline, or the arrangement of ecclesiastical property', and even the possibility that 'this Commission should be permanent, and invested with the power of initiating all legislative measures affecting the Church in it's spiritual character, or in it's secular provisions, or both'. After Van Mildert's virtual withdrawal from the arena of episcopal power-politics, Blomfield was able to secure the increasingly wholehearted co-operation of Howley, and during Peel's short ministry of 1834-5, both men were closely involved in the discussions which led to the appointment of the Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues Commission in February 1835. Besides the Archbishop of York, whose inclusion was obligatory, the other two bishops appointed to the original membership of the Ecclesiastical Commission were Kaye of Lincoln and Monk of Gloucester, both associates of the Phalanx. Other Phalanx allies, Archdeacons Goddard of Lincoln and Bayley of Stowe, were also urging the necessity of reform, and offering their support and assistance.<sup>2</sup>

Van Mildert was not invited to be a member of this new Commission. 'As to my appearance among them,' he wrote to Archdeacon Singleton of Northumberland, 'it cd. have answered

no good purpose, & I had rather be excused from the responsibility, than have been a dissentient, opposed probably to those from whom it wd. be most painful to me to differ. My time is nearly gone by, & I am becoming an old almanack.<sup>3</sup> He contented himself with supporting the advice offered to the Commission by Joshua Watson, that they should begin by preparing a set of questions for the clergy to answer, in order to bring 'the grounds of the changes in agitation...before the public before legislation was attempted'.<sup>4</sup> The advice was not taken: the Commissioners, knowing the shakiness of the Government's position, were in a hurry. Watson had been unhappy with Howley's handling of the Ecclesiastical Revenues Commission, and the new body was still less to his taste: he and Van Mildert coined the nickname 'the Ecclesiastical Divan', and observed the Commission's proceedings with detached cynicism. 'Although I have had an Ecclesiastical Commissioner here, daily going in & coming out for a fortnight,' Watson wrote to Van Mildert at the end of 1835, 'yet I have done little more than laugh at the expected secrecy of printed papers & copied resolutions, when our friend has come home every afternoon with his packet stamped with the talismanic words, Strictly Private.'<sup>5</sup> Van Mildert's only serious dealings with the Commission were in pursuit of the interests of the University.

The 1832 Ecclesiastical Revenues Commission pursued its leisurely way to the final publication of its report in June 1835, having produced an interim report in mid-1834. There is no evidence that Van Mildert played any active part in its

later proceedings, and his name was not among the signatories to the report. The Commission's life had been extended twice; among the later additions to its membership were Gaisford, Christopher Wordsworth and Archdeacon Thorp. The report contained a mass of statistics on the revenues of sees, chapters and benefices, and a not inconsiderable amount of special pleading.

Joshua Watson passed through something of a personal crisis in 1833. Among the year's upheavals was his resignation from the Treasurership of the S.P.C.K., bringing to an end nearly twenty years of service. The official reason given was ill-health, but it is clear that Watson's decision was assisted, if not inspired, by internal conflict in the Society. In October Newman cited 'the present state of [the] Christian Knowledge Society' as part cause for 'a growing feeling that Societies are bad things'. The following April he gave a more detailed account of the Society's 'melancholy plight': 'The Evangelicals, taking advantage of the distracted state of the Church, are making a push to get their way in it - and the Bishop of London...temporizing, conceding 1/2 way, and so making matters clear for their ultimate triumph.'

Blomfield, whose personal intervention had some years earlier secured the reversal of a decision to refuse Charles Simeon's application for S.P.C.K. membership, continued to attempt the thankless task of mediator. Some months before Watson's resignation, Blomfield wrote to beg 'that you will not forsake us...I am quite sure, that even those individuals who have been most opposed to your views on some important

questions would be among the first to deprecate your retirement ...'

The conflict centred on the Society's publishing activities. Watson and Norris had earlier succeeded in defeating a proposal to produce 'cheap Commentaries on the Bible in penny numbers' and 'a poetical version of the Epistles and Gospels'. In March 1834, A.P. Perceval wrote to Newman that the S.P.C.K., 'which is virtually getting to be the Council and mouthpiece of the Church,' was 'exercising the functions of a Synod by putting Bishops and clergy on their trial for heterodoxy and heresy...They are now actually sitting in judgment upon Bishop Gray of Bristol and the late Bishop Heber...'

A tense meeting was held at Lincoln's Inn Fields on April 8th. Newman, protesting that the 'organs of the innovators profess they account the doctrine of baptismal regeneration heretical', was heavily involved in rounding up High Church attendance, but afterwards reported the meeting as 'very sad...To the old stagers like Joshua Watson, it must be very painful indeed.' The triumph of the Evangelicals was marked by the setting-up of an S.P.C.K. Tract Committee.<sup>10</sup>

Watson absented himself from his own official farewell, at which Van Mildert paid tribute to his services, 'appealing to the experience of forty years of his own uninterrupted friendship with him'; other tributes came from Howley and Blomfield. All three were on the small committee appointed to determine the official mark of respect, which decided to ask Watson to sit for a portrait.<sup>11</sup>

In August, H.J. Rose wrote to Christopher Wordsworth: 'Lyall and I are very anxious that when the Society has paid its public mark of respect to Mr. Watson, his friends [twice underlined] in the Society shd. (quietly) pay him an exclusive mark of their respect to wch. no one shd. be asked to contribute but those who agree about him, & about the usage he has met with. We thought that if £1000 cd. be raised to found a Divinity Scholarship in his name, it wd. be acceptable to him.' Rose asked Wordsworth to discuss the suggestion with Norris, but otherwise to keep it a 'profound secret'.<sup>12</sup> What came of this proposal is not known.

Watson, who had suffered the death of his much-loved wife in 1831, retreated for a time from the attempts of his friends to find him new interests. 'The truth is,' he wrote to Norris in October 1833, 'as I was obliged to confess the other day to the Bishop of Durham, I feel the infirmities of premature age are come upon me, and find myself so slow in apprehension and conception, in expression and action, as to be greatly indisposed to exertion either of body or mind, and to be out of humour with every person or thing that would move me to either.'<sup>13</sup>

A number of the Phalanx, Norris among them, became drawn into the plans for an 'association for the defence of the Church' mooted after the conference between H.J. Rose, William Palmer of Worcester College, A.P. Perceval and Hurrell Froude at Rose's vicarage in Hadleigh at the end of July 1833. Rose, a close friend of Joshua Watson for many years, was himself a fringe member of the Phalanx; so too was Archdeacon Lyall of

Colchester, involved in the discussions almost from the beginning, who won from Froude the tribute 'he is a most agreeable [sic] man and clever and I should not think a mere conservative in heart, tho no Apostolical.'<sup>14</sup>

At the end of October, William Palmer went to London to confer with Archdeacon Bayley about the Association, and reported the firm support of Bayley, Archdeacon Watson, Norris and W.F. Hook for the proposals. Norris held a dinner party at Hackney for Palmer, to which he invited 'men of the right sort collected from various parts'.<sup>15</sup> 'It is no common occasion,' Norris wrote to Joshua Watson; 'indeed, I know not one that has occurred during our whole course of service where all the experience and judgment that can be had is so much needed.'<sup>16</sup> Norris summarised the proposed Association as 'a solid union of such a character, that those of their superiors who were true to their calling should find a body formed to which they could appeal, and which they could call to their support in the day of trial'. Watson objected that the Bishops had given no actual 'sanction, express or implied,' which gave the proposal an embarrassingly 'unauthorized character'. At the end of November Watson wrote to Lyall that he had 'prayed Norris earnestly to lay before his correspondents the danger alike of success or failure. for I knew not which at this time would be worst for the Church. They were, however, too far committed to be open to such counsel as would have suspended all action...'<sup>17</sup> Churton notes that Van Mildert's advice was to the same effect as Watson's, but does not say who had asked for this advice.

At the end of October, probably at the original suggestion

of H.J. Rose,<sup>19</sup> it was decided that the efforts of the group should be directed towards an Address to the Archbishop of Canterbury, to be signed by as many clergy as could be persuaded to support it. Bayley canvassed this suggestion with Joshua Watson, who much preferred it to the Association, despite his lingering annoyance with Howley for 'losing the advantage I was most anxious he should make of the Ecclesiastical Commission'. Watson allowed himself to be bullied out of his retirement, and returned to Park Street to work on a 'rough draft of the Address...sent up from Oxford'.<sup>17</sup>

Disagreement at once broke out between Park Street and Oxford, both as to the content of the address and as to its literary style.<sup>20</sup> Newman felt that his own original draft was too moderate, and that Palmer's London associates had weakened it to the point of offensiveness. Norris and his colleagues felt that Newman was too extreme, and would lose valuable support which might otherwise be gained for the address. The dissension highlighted the stresses within the early Oxford Movement; Palmer found himself in a difficult position as intermediary. Edward Churton went down to Oxford to make peace between Palmer and Norris: Newman and Keble made merry over his 'diplomatic look and bearing'.<sup>21</sup>

The Address finally assumed its canonical form, although Newman thought it 'milk and water' and clergy in various places made unauthorised alterations of their own. Christopher Wordsworth was persuaded to give it his support, and is credited by Churton with insisting that there should also be a Lay Declaration.<sup>22</sup>

In Durham, the third paragraph of the Declaration<sup>23</sup> caused difficulty. Norris sent up a copy to T.L. Strong for circulation in the diocese; Thorp, who had been 'well inclined' towards the declaration until he saw the text, vehemently opposed the third paragraph's pledge of clerical support to the Archbishop and his brother bishops in undertaking measures of necessary reform. A clergy assembly held at Auckland Castle at the end of November took the same view; they were 'thoroughly annoyed & wish to join in the purpose of the address, but could come to no resolution & parted only resolving to consider the matter farther'. The Dean of Durham suggested adding the words 'after due consideration' as a qualification to the pledge; H.J. Rose suggested that if this compromise was not acceptable to the Declaration's sponsors, the only possible solution was for Joshua Watson to write 'as strongly as he can' to Van Mildert, urging the Bishop to put pressure on '3 or 4 of the leading Clergy'.<sup>24</sup> Whether Van Mildert was asked to intervene is not known, but it is unlikely that he would have agreed to do so. His own attitude was summed up in a letter to Bruce Knight, written in December 1833: 'whatever the Clergy incline to do in this way, should be done spontaneously, and without even the appearance of being urged to it by their ecclesiastical rulers. For this reason, I leave my own Clergy to follow entirely their own inclination and judgment.' He was pleased that plans for an association of a more general kind had been shelved, and hoped that when the Address had been presented to the Archbishop, 'nothing more will be thought of; unless, upon the introduction of any hostile measures into Parliament

relative to the Church, it should be deemed necessary to come forward with petitions to both Houses.'<sup>25</sup>

In February Van Mildert demurred from playing a part in the presentation of the Address, to the disappointment of Newman, who wrote to Bowden: 'I am sorry to hear what you say about Durham; and cannot quite understand it. At first the Bishop of D. had scruples but I was told had overcome them.'<sup>26</sup>

The Address was finally presented to Howley on 6th February 1834 by the Archdeacon of Canterbury at the head of a delegation of twenty-one other archdeacons, deans and clergy; among them was Keble, deputising for a sick Pusey. With late additions, it attracted some seven thousand signatures.<sup>27</sup>

The Lay Declaration which followed was largely the work of Park Street. Joshua Watson, according to Churton, was responsible for the drafting; it was then 'pushed forward by a Committee of Lawyers and barristers', headed by 'Joshua Watson and Colonel Clitheroe'. It attracted some 230,000 signatures of heads of families.<sup>28</sup>

Both Declarations stressed the attachment of the signatories to the Church of England, her doctrine, liturgy and polity; the Lay Declaration added a 'firm determination to do all that in us lies...to uphold' the Establishment of the Church. Watson, Norris and Wordsworth were still fully committed defenders of Establishment.

The Tracts for the Times, circulating from August 1833, were a further source of serious friction between Hackney and Oxford. 'I have no great veneration for Tracts,' Christopher Wordsworth wrote to Joshua Watson in November 1833, adding that

if the Association were to 'circulate Tracts...I can have nothing to do with it.' Norris was similarly unenthusiastic about the Tracts, and made himself thoroughly unpopular with Newman, Froude and Keble by insisting that for the sake of the Address and the infant Association, the Tracts ought to be given up. 'Old Norris wrote to my Father to announce that the "tract system was (he was happy to say) abandoned." We must throw the Zs overboard: they are a small and, as my Father says, daily diminishing party,' Froude wrote to Newman.<sup>29</sup>

Joshua Watson took a more tolerant view of the Tracts, associating them with the passionate Hutchinsonianism of his own and his friends' youth; he was inclined to be 'very lenient...to the excesses of young men'. He remained on good terms with Keble and Pusey; in 1835 he gave Newman a 'most munificent subscription' to the chapel at Littlemore; in 1840 Newman dedicated a volume of sermons to him, with a graceful compliment to his 'long and dutiful ministry, and patient service to his...mother' the Church.<sup>30</sup>

Van Mildert's views on the Tracts are recorded neither by Ives nor by Churton. In the autumn of 1833 his mind was mostly occupied by the affairs of Durham University, and by personal tragedy. Jane Van Mildert's health had been poor for some time; in the autumn of 1833 she suffered a stroke. Although she was to outlive her husband, it does not appear that she was ever again fit enough to leave Harrogate, and her personality was affected. Van Mildert in agony of mind wrote a prayer of 'humble suplications for my beloved Wife, labouring under grievous infirmities both of body & mind...enable her patiently

& cheerfully to submit to Thy blessed Will...whereinsoever she may fail in her duty, Lord, shew mercy to her...grant her a peaceful & tranquil end, full of faith, hope...' and could write no more.<sup>31</sup>

'Domestic anxieties' from this source were to plague Van Mildert for the rest of his life, and his visits to London became shorter. In February 1834 Jane's life was thought to be in danger; she rallied but, Van Mildert wrote to Thorp, 'these recurrences keep me in perpetual anxiety, & the shock I received from that of yesterday still dwells painfully in my recollection.'<sup>32</sup>

University business brought Van Mildert his one unclouded triumph of 1833, when Hugh James Rose accepted the Divinity Chair. Rose was a theologian of genuine distinction, and Editor of the influential High Church British Magazine. He was also an intimate of Joshua Watson, with whom he had been brought into contact by Archbishop Manners-Sutton. Watson esteemed Rose for his 'rare qualities of heart and mind', and found great 'congeniality of feeling' with him. His opinion was shared by Christopher Wordsworth.<sup>33</sup>

As early as May 1833, Van Mildert wrote to Thorp that 'The only impediment to Mr. Rose for the Divinity Chair is the state of his health, which makes me almost afraid of the experiment, & I believe overpowers, on his part, the strong inclination which he wd. otherwise have to undertake the charge.'<sup>34</sup> Rose took his time about making a firm decision; in addition to his asthma, he may have been concerned about removing himself to the relative isolation of Durham when matters of such great

moment were astir in Oxford, Cambridge and London, and perhaps also felt some unease as to the new University's future prospects. Van Mildert sounded out other possibilities; among them were J.J. Blunt, a former Hulsean Lecturer at Cambridge, who seems to have had the respect of Christopher Wordsworth, and C.A. Ogilvie, suggested by Gaisford.<sup>35</sup> Rose was so ideal a choice from Van Mildert's point of view, however, that it seems likely the position was his for the asking from his first indication of interest.

By the end of July, Rose was sufficiently serious about the proposal to reveal to Froude that he was 'deliberating whether to accept the Divinity Professorship at Durham'; but as late as August 20th, he still had doubts. He was, he wrote to Christopher Wordsworth, in poor health; he had laid the final decision as to whether he should go to Durham upon Van Mildert, and had 'promised to do so, if he wishes it - But I now earnestly hope that he will not, as I am little fit for the exertion.' He wrote on the same day and in the same vein to Newman, adding that 'under circumstances of health' he would have 'coveted' the Chair, since 'the duties of the Professor will so much lie in the formation of the Clergy.'<sup>36</sup>

By early September, it was settled that Rose would take the Professorship. Perceval thought it 'a matter of such moment to have Rose at Durham, that one ought not be [sic] regret it', adding a tribute to his 'indefatigable zeal' and 'sound judgment'.<sup>37</sup> By November Rose was in Durham and embroiled in the agitation over the Clergy Address.

Van Mildert was also able to secure Rose's help in planning

out the statutes for the University. 'Now, however fine it is to legislate, it is also very nervous,' Rose wrote to Joshua Watson. 'O that I could take you down with me! Might not Durham be made a grand Theological School, where, even after the Universities, they who could afford it might go for a year or two? Think of this, and tell me anything which strikes you.'<sup>38</sup>

The first Professor of Mathematics was the Revd. John Carr, who had been Headmaster of Durham School since 1811. Carr unfortunately died on October 30th 1833, 'two days after term began'. His successor was a Cambridge man, Temple Chevallier, who had been involved in the plans for Association and Address. Van Mildert thought highly of Chevallier, preferring him to the Perpetual Curacy of Esh in May 1835.<sup>39</sup>

Appointing to the Greek Professorship gave more trouble. The Dean of Durham early on suggested Edward Gresswell of Oriel; Froude and Newman wanted Rose to press the claims of another Oriel fellow, Eden.<sup>40</sup> Van Mildert relied most on the advice of Gaisford, whose credentials as an expert on Greek scholarship were indeed unassailable, and the final choice fell upon a third Oriel man, Henry Jenkyns.

Besides being Gaisford's brother-in-law, Jenkyns was brother to the Master of Balliol. He was also engaged to the daughter of Henry Hobhouse, and his move to Durham enabled him to marry her in 1834 - it was at this time impossible for Oxford dons to retain their Fellowships after marriage. Hobhouse, a lawyer and a Conservative M.P. who had previously served as Peel's assistant at the Home Office, was to be one of the most active members of the Ecclesiastical Commission,

continuing to serve after the fall of Peel's first short-lived administration.<sup>41</sup>

Academically Jenkyns had a distinguished record, having taken a double First at Christ Church in 1816 and become a Fellow of Oriel in 1818. An Etonian, he examined for Greek prizes at his former school and assisted Dr. Thomas Arnold in preparing an edition of Thucydides for Oxford University. He had published a 'well-received and highly praised' edition of the complete works of Cranmer. He had also tutored the sons of Charles Manners-Sutton, Speaker of the House of Commons, who tried unsuccessfully to solicit Howley's interest on Jenkyns' behalf.<sup>42</sup>

Like Gaisford, although in a far less exposed position, Jenkyns was not a supporter of the Oxford Movement even in its earliest days. He had been casually friendly with Newman, and their relations continued amicable; but in the clash between Newman and Provost Hawkins over Newman's duties as a Tutor Jenkyns' sympathies were with Hawkins, and in 1832 he joined the retiring Dean of Oriel in requesting Newman to forego voluntarily his right to become the next Dean.<sup>43</sup>

Neither brushing with Newman nor editing Cranmer was likely to endear Jenkyns to Hurrell Froude, who greeted the news of his appointment to the Durham Chair of Greek with the comment: 'What a floor the Bishop of Durham has made in thinking Jenkyns a high church man? Rose ought to have known better. However if he gives up his Fellowship in consequence I had rather spare him than Eden.'<sup>44</sup>

The University, as announced, matriculated its first intake

of students in October 1833. Rose delivered and published two public lectures; Jenkyns published his first lecture under the title 'On the Advantages of Classical Studies', but Van Mildert pressed him in vain to publish his second.<sup>45</sup>

In February 1834 Van Mildert, with the approval and support of Howley, wrote to all his fellow bishops inviting them to accept Durham graduates as candidates for ordination on the same footing as graduates of Oxford and Cambridge. Bishop Grey of Hereford replied that he could not give any undertaking until the University had been working for long enough to enable him to judge the value of its degrees. Lord George Murray, Bishop of Rochester, refused on the ground of 'the evils to be apprehended from admitting a greater number of the inferior orders of the people into the learned Professions'. Phillpotts replied simply that he would 'accept a B.A. Degree from Oxford or Cambridge together with a Durham Divinity Certificate'. The other bishops agreed to regard Durham degrees as an equivalent qualification to those of Oxbridge.<sup>46</sup> The hope of securing this acceptance may have been a factor in Van Mildert's determination to exclude Dissenters from Durham degrees.

A Chapter meeting on 15th February 1834 requested Thorp to draw up statutes for the University. Canon Smith, the former Dean of Christ Church, helped him with the task; the Chapter accepted their draft on November 21st. The Chapter also determined to make a fundamental statute constituting a Senate and a Convocation, and on this basis to apply to Parliament for a Royal Charter for the University. The fundamental statute was finally agreed on 20th July 1835.<sup>47</sup>

In April, Van Mildert left Harrogate for London. Jane was, he reported to Thorp, 'tolerably well - but it does not improve her health to see me fretful and uneasy.'<sup>48</sup> The Government was bringing forward measures on church rates and Irish tithe; petitions were afoot to open Oxford and Cambridge to Dissenters. Van Mildert himself was charged with piloting a Bill to annex three Durham prebends to the Wardenship and the Greek and Divinity Chairs of the infant University, and was deeply anxious that he might thereby be offering an opening for political manipulation of University appointments.

The church rate Bill, introduced by Lord Althorp on 21st April, was a nasty disappointment for the Radicals. It proposed the abolition of church rate; instead, the repair of parish churches was to become a charge on the Treasury, payable from the land tax through the Church Building Commission. Van Mildert thought the Bill 'rather an agreeable surprise to our Church friends'; his only reservation was that 'the Minister' might 'cook it, and spoil it, after all, to make it more palatable to his Radical friends.'<sup>49</sup> The Bill passed its first stage in the House of Commons with a comfortable majority, which offered the novelty of 140 Whigs and Radicals voting against the Government whilst the Tories voted in support. There can be little doubt that the Lords would have liked it even better; but the Bill was lost in the disintegration of the Grey administration. The Irish Tithe Bill passed the Commons, but the Lords triumphantly hurled it out in August.<sup>50</sup>

The push for the admission of Dissenters to the Universities began in March with a petition from sixty-three

residents of Cambridge University, which Lord Grey presented to the House of Lords himself. 'The attack upon our Universities wears a formidable aspect,' Van Mildert wrote to Bruce Knight. 'I can see in it nothing but a wish to undermine the Established Church, by weakening its best bulwarks. It is idle, worse than idle, to pretend that the claim to Degrees is not with the ulterior view of getting the government and the resources of the Universities into other hands...I opened my mouth in Parliament, for a few minutes, on the Petition for admitting Dissenters to our Universities'.<sup>51</sup>

Excitement ran high, particularly in Oxford, where Newman was involved in circulating petitions among 'Members of the University...immediately connected with the instruction and discipline of the place', 'members of Convocation and Bachelors of Civil Law', even 'Parents, Guardians of Students in our University, and others feeling the warmest interest in the question of Religious Education'.<sup>52</sup> In Cambridge Connop Thirlwall, one of the signatories to the March petition, wrote a pamphlet which argued that admitting Dissenters to degrees could only strengthen the University, urged that undergraduates ought not to be compelled to attend Chapel, and attacked 'the argument that the university was a sufficient nursery of clergymen'. Christopher Wordsworth promptly earned the odium of the Radical press by sacking Thirlwall from his Trinity tutorship. Lord Melbourne, who in July succeeded Grey as Prime Minister, found Thirlwall a lucrative Yorkshire benefice, and later made him Bishop of St. David's.<sup>53</sup>

On April 17th the House of Commons passed a motion for

leave to bring in a Bill for the admission of Dissenters to the Universities. The vote, Peel wrote apologetically to Christopher Wordsworth, showed 'the decided preponderance which the Dissenting Body has acquired in that Branch of the Legislature. We foresaw that we should be in a very small Minority - but thought it better to incur the disadvantage of exposing our weakness in point of numbers - than to acquiesce ...The chief characteristic of the present house of Commons is indifference or Enmity to the Church and the Establishments connected with it - and it is perfectly hopeless to oppose with success any measure hostile to the Church or the Establishments, which has the concurrence of the King's Government.'<sup>54</sup>

The Bill, sponsored by the Unitarian M.P. G.W. Wood, received its second reading in June. Revised in committee, it abolished subscription on entering or taking a degree at either University, leaving the question of Chapel attendance to the discretion of the College authorities. It passed the Commons comfortably and was rejected equally comfortably by the Lords.<sup>55</sup>

1834 was a busy year for measures touching the Established Church. Lord John Russell brought in a Dissenters' Marriages Bill which was later abandoned; Brougham, 'at a late hour, when hardly anyone was present,...brought in two Bills, one of which simply abolished non-residence, and the other prohibited plurality in the case of a living over £200, and below that level restricted it to a distance of five miles.' In May Lord John Russell revived proposals for appropriating the surplus

revenues of the Church of Ireland, causing the resignation of Stanley and two close colleagues from the Cabinet, and precipitating the collapse of the Grey administration.<sup>56</sup>

The second Durham University Bill gave Van Mildert most anguish. In July 1833, while working on the drafting of statutes, Rose had identified a threat to the University in the possibility of Chapter preferment passing into the hands of the Government. If a prebendary were to be presented to some dignity in the Royal gift, for example a bishopric, the patronage of his stall would revert to the Crown for that turn. Rose's anxieties in 1833 centred on the possibility that 'a person like Dr. Arnold' might be 'thrust into the Chapter' with an express brief to 'liberalize' the University; his suggested remedy was to draw up the statutes governing the 'divinity department' with a care and tightness sufficient to give any such future interloper 'a hard task'.<sup>57</sup>

Van Mildert's anxieties in 1834 had a still sharper focus. He envisaged the use of the same technique to force a Government nominee into one of the three stalls to be annexed to University offices. 'What, if Dr. Arnold were to replace yourself, or Sidney Smith [sic], our Professor Rose?' he wrote to Thorp.<sup>58</sup>

Soon after his arrival in London, Van Mildert waited on Grey and 'communicated our Bill to him'. Grey had no quarrel with the Bill, but demurred from the suggestion that the Crown should waive its prerogative in the case of the annexed stalls. The Bill proceeded to its second reading, which was moved by Lord Shaftesbury; but Van Mildert was already considering the

possibility of withdrawing it at a later stage, if he could not carry his point on Crown prerogative.<sup>57</sup>

He now found himself in conflict with Thorp. The Archdeacon, possibly feeling that a hypothetical Government willing to promote himself to a bishopric could not be entirely bad, wrote to urge that the Bill be proceeded with as it stood. Insisting on the waiver would, he argued, be a mistake, since attempts to cut off the Government from 'that interest in the University which in the natural order of things it will possess' could only harm the University's interests: 'the influence of the Crown will on the whole be useful to the University, & a great deal be lost to it by taking it away.'<sup>58</sup>

Van Mildert was distressed but wholly unmoved. He continued to press Grey; a meeting on May 5th left Van Mildert with the impression that Grey 'perceives some objections, or difficulties, in applying to the Crown to relinquish it's Prerogative' and Grey with the impression that Van Mildert had already determined to withdraw the Bill.<sup>59</sup>

On May 8th, at the urging of Shaftesbury, Van Mildert agreed to make one last approach to Grey before withdrawing the Bill. His letter of May 9th brought an instant response: Grey had not the time to see Van Mildert again, but would reopen the matter with the King at the first opportunity. He hinted that the King might not be wholly unwilling to concede.<sup>60</sup>

By the end of the next day, a final refusal had been given. Van Mildert, with a graceful letter to Grey, withdrew the Bill and left London. He reached Harrogate on May 12th; to his relief he found Jane 'apparently better than when I left her'.

He himself was 'exceedingly jaded, & have suffered much pain in my journey.'<sup>133</sup>

He had, he wrote to Bruce Knight, 'no intention of revisiting the Metropolis this season. Its turmoils ill suit a valetudinarian like myself; and to be in the midst of them, "spectator, vel auditor tantum," is next to impossible.' A further source of grief to him was the upheaval at Lincoln's Inn Fields: he had spoken out 'to deprecate an unhappy spirit, which is getting the ascendancy there in our venerable Society.' During his month in London, Van Mildert's health had 'retrograded sadly', and part of his urgency to return to the North had been due to the advice of his 'medical attendant'. The 'quiet and the discipline' of Harrogate restored him somewhat.<sup>134</sup>

From Harrogate he sent Thorp a retrospective on the Durham University Bill fiasco, explaining his decision to withdraw the Bill in terms of the difficulty of submitting fresh clauses for the approval of the Chapter before the end of the parliamentary session. 'My only wish & desire now is, that I may not (shd. I live to resume the matter again another year) go up to town with an imperfect & undigested Document, but with a Bill drawn out carefully in all it's details, thoroughly canvassed & approved by a full Chapter, leaving nothing afterwards to my discretion or indiscretion...' He added, with a mordant reference to 'the collision of opinions' that had already occurred, 'Whether I can ever consent to the Bill, without the restriction of the Prerogative, I extremely doubt.'<sup>135</sup>

Part of Van Mildert's bitterness must be attributed to the

clash with Thorp, which seemed to him to reflect an abrupt change of opinion on Thorp's part. For the first time there appeared the possibility that Thorp's vision of the University might not exactly coincide with Van Mildert's. Thorp saw the new University squarely within a continuing Established relationship of Church and State. The spring of 1834 revealed again that for Van Mildert the nature of Establishment had changed. Although he continued to express concern for the safety of 'the bulwarks of our Establishment', the logic of his actions was increasingly disestablishmentarian. A straw in the wind had been the exclusion of the laity from the 1831 plans for an Ecclesiastical Commission. The attempt to secure Durham University from the implications of Establishment moved Van Mildert further along a road he wished fervently never to have to tread. Not for him the bold speculations of Rose about a lay Synod to take over the responsibilities of an apostate Parliament; like his other self Joshua Watson, Van Mildert was disposed to 'hate democracy in any shape; but of all shapes the worst is an ecclesiastical democracy'.<sup>56</sup> Democracy to him meant simply mob rule. Neither could he share the innocent anti-materialism of Keble's 'Take every pound, shilling, and penny, and the curse of sacrilege along with it - only let us make our own Bishops and be governed by our own laws.'<sup>57</sup> His own ministry had taught him only too clearly how much scope for doing good the Church stood to lose if 'Reform' stripped away her revenues. He was an old man, sick, bone-weary; his perspective was backwards, not forwards, over his own lifetime and those of his spiritual ancestors, and the citadel he and

they had so long defended seemed to him to have been sold from within.

Returning to his diocese, he preached his passion in his cathedral to the Assize Judges. Power and knowledge were not good in themselves: misdirected and perverted', they were 'evil, positive, tremendous evil'. To attempt 'designs for the improvement of mankind' on the sole basis of power and knowledge, treating 'the DIVINE WILL' as irrelevant, was to invite a catastrophe on the scale of the French Revolution, 'to turn the world into an Aceldama, a very field of blood'. Van Mildert was, he pleaded, far from wishing to 'discourage mental cultivation, or to circumscribe its limits within any exclusive privileges of rank or station'; but the test of true knowledge, true wisdom, was its fruits, its conformability to the Will of God.

Establishment must be maintained, not in order that the Church might be kept powerful, but in order that the State might be kept faithful. Peace, prosperity, security, justice could only come from adherence to 'Christian principles and Christian conduct'. 'An irreligious Government, an irreligious Legislature, a nation whose rulers and subjects discard from their polity and their jurisprudence a sense of duty to the Most High, as the prime source of every blessing, public and private, social and individual, would be a degrading anomaly in the history of mankind;' and were there, Van Mildert demanded, 'no symptoms of a deadly venom infused into the Body Politic, which forbid us to be lulled into security?'

The Prophet Isaiah, appealed to for counsel, foretold 'the

deliverance of the Monarch and his people from the immediately impending danger'; but only by looking to God as hope and refuge could the nation 'escape that condemnation, of all others the most fearful and the most irrecoverable, "O ISRAEL, THOU HAST DESTROYED THYSELF."'

The next crisis concerned the Durham Divinity chair. Rose's divinity course proved a burden beyond his strength. 'They overwork me here,' he wrote to Joshua Watson, 'for while my brother professor has two lectures a week, I have seven days' lectures, and the Sunday evening lecture is a very distressing and weary one.' During the summer of 1834 his brother, Henry John Rose, a Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, took over the ordinary teaching of the divinity students.

Van Mildert evidently queried the propriety of this step, drawing a justificatory letter from the Professor. Rose had, he explained, 'found clearly that in order to have an efficient plan of study,...a residence of eight months at least on the part of the students would be necessary.' Rose's own state of health would not allow him to undertake 'daily lecturing of two hours during eight months, and the residence during one part of the year, against which the medical men warned me'. He had decided that he could continue at Durham only with the help of a second Divinity Professor who would take over the teaching for one term each year; Rose would then only need to reside and teach for six months. In order to provide a salary for the second Professor, he offered to 'give up a third of the proposed salary as well as a large part or, if necessary, the whole of the fees'. Rose protested that not only had he

repeatedly submitted this plan to Thorp's judgement, but Thorp had given him to understand that Van Mildert himself approved it. On that understanding, Rose had in February 1834 accepted the post of Chaplain to Archbishop Howley.<sup>70</sup>

Thorp confirmed Rose's account, but added that he felt that the attempt to retain Rose's services had already gone too far: 'I certainly should not incline to any further concessions. The modification of residence I have suggested is quite enough...'<sup>71</sup> In August Rose, pleading ill-health, formally resigned the Professorship.

There had clearly been friction between Rose and Thorp, and the Archdeacon wrote a defensive letter to Van Mildert, anxious that the Bishop might blame him for Rose's departure. Thorp had, he protested, 'done every thing for Mr. Rose & always consulted his wishes & his comfort', but he feared a public attack: 'I suppose I am to be subjected to his hard sayings as the B'p London was last year, unless I go into Controversy, wch. I am loth to do.'

The tension seems to have centred on Thorp's understanding of his own authority as Warden. Thorp was, he explained, willing to allow Rose a dispensation from his duties 'from time to time ill health calling for it', assistants 'if found necessary' and extended residence for the Divinity Students 'supposing their studies to require it', but insisted that the decision as to when they were warranted must be his as Warden: he could not tolerate 'that Mr. Rose shd. claim that indulgence as the rule of his own practice, when experience had proved that Durham suited his health'. Thorp also complained that Rose

wanted the 'Divinity branch' to have independent status 'apart from the other authorities', which Thorp regarded as a breach of principle, and implied that Rose had accused him of making 'the University arrangements of the term & the year' without proper consultation, which Thorp indignantly denied.<sup>72</sup>

Rose's notoriously poor health (he had less than five years to live) no doubt influenced his decision to resign, although there is some other evidence that he found Durham healthier than London.<sup>73</sup> A full explanation of his determination to leave Durham after so short a trial would doubtless include frustration at finding himself so far from the centres of action. In January 1834 Newman was sufficiently irked by Rose's absence to consider 'running up to Durham to hold a conference' with him; by March, Rose had contrived to be back in London and was busily picking up threads.<sup>74</sup>

The loss of Rose was a blow to Van Mildert; besides his 'eloquence in the pulpit, his ability as a writer, his wisdom in counsel, his learning in controversy, and the many graces of his personal character',<sup>75</sup> Rose's public stature added to the prestige of the University. For a year no new Professor was appointed to replace him; Van Mildert may have hoped to persuade Rose to reconsider, while his duties were covered by the Professors of Greek and Mathematics. Not until September 28th 1835 did Van Mildert offer the Divinity Chair to the man Rose had apparently regarded as his natural successor, the Greek Professor, Henry Jenkyns.<sup>76</sup> Jenkyns was not a public figure, but he was able, committed to the work in Durham, content with the Wardenship as exercised by Thorp, and little

inclined to distract himself from his duties with meddling in the affairs of the great world. His close relationship with his father-in-law Henry Hobhouse had moreover assumed a priceless strategic value in the continuing struggle over the University stalls. The one mildly surprising aspect of the choice was Jenkyns' close friendship with Dr. Arnold; but it is clear that Jenkyns shared none of Arnold's heretical views on ecclesiology, and Van Mildert had always approved of remaining on amicable personal terms with men of exceptionable theology but sound moral character.<sup>77</sup>

In November 1834, public affairs took an unexpected turn when the King sacked the Melbourne government and called on Peel to form a new administration. Van Mildert was by instinct and experience a Tory; he had once written a rhyming 'fable' entitled 'The Mastiff, the Fox, & the Wolf', which described how the Whig fox leagued with the Radical wolf had taken advantage of the master's gullibility to drive the faithful Tory mastiff from his rightful post as guardian of the State castle, and declared that matters would never go well again until the restoration of 'old Trusty to the Castle Gate'.<sup>78</sup> But although the hoped-for restoration had now taken place, there remained questions in Van Mildert's mind as to how trusty Old Trusty would prove in practice. The year's end found him ill and depressed: 'My state of health does not admit of much exertion, either of mind or body,' he wrote to Bruce Knight. 'A severe and painful indisposition, a few weeks ago, accompanied with a very general derangement of the whole system, has left me exceedingly disabled in all respects; and should the winter

prove a severe one, I may find it a hard matter to struggle through. Mrs. Van Mildert continues much the same as for the last twelvemonth, though not likely to rally again, as in former times.'79

Shortly after the appointment of the Ecclesiastical Commission at the beginning of February 1835, Van Mildert learnt, apparently from Howley, that reform of Chapter finances was in prospect. Appalled, he wrote Peel a long, careful and intermittently sharp letter, pleading the case for Chapters in general and the Durham Chapter in particular. The possibility that most concerned him, and against which his arguments were principally directed, was that an unknown number of prebends might go the way of the Irish Bishoprics, suppressed, their revenues diverted to some central fund for ecclesiastical purposes.

Van Mildert urged again that the revenues of the Church should not be treated as a redeployable common fund, but that the rights of each individual dignity deserved respect. He was concerned not for the interests of the particular incumbent or patron, but for the structure and self-understanding of the Church: 'to the condition so ostentatiously put forward, that present vested interests are to be spared...I attach no value whatever. To me it seems too much like a bribe to present possessors, to tempt them to despoil their successors of rights & emoluments no less inalienable than their own. As such, I feel something revolting in the proposition, however defensible it may be upon abstract grounds of Law & Equity.'

Cathedral dignities were not, he argued, 'mere retreats for

indolent, useless, & worldly-minded Clergy', but valuable 'intermediate links between the Bishops & the Parochial Clergy, advantageous to both'. Not only did they provide appropriate support for clergy ministering to 'the Gentry & Aristocracy of the country', thereby conducing to a general respect for religion 'among the more cultivated orders of society'; not only did they provide 'objects of fair & laudable ambition, to persons of rank & station, of learning & talents', enabling a tradition of distinguished 'writers in defence of Religion' to be both maintained and rewarded. 'They are publicly useful also, by their connection with with [sic] populous cities & districts, & by the encouragement they give, not only to charitable institutions of every kind, but also to works of national utility.' The Durham Chapter in particular were already of their own unforced accord giving away 'not less than [altered to 'more than'] £4000 per annum' for augmenting small livings in their patronage, besides 'building & endowing Churches & Chapels, Schools & Glebe Houses,...contributions to charitable Institutions of every kind' and expenditure on 'other Ecclesiastical purposes'. All this laudable outlay was in addition to the three thousand pounds per annum of which the Chapter had voluntarily deprived themselves in endowing the University, and to the further sums incurred in meeting the additional 'occasional' needs of the growing institution. Would it not be a humiliation if the Durham Chapter were to find 'the rightful inheritance of their predecessors, themselves, and their successors, forced from them, & diverted into other channels, comparatively of less value, perhaps, to the public,

than that to which their own munificence would apply them'?

If the revenues of Deans and Chapters must be redeployed, Van Mildert pleaded, at least let their constitution and structure be left unmutilated, and their revenues be applied to 'those parishes or districts already connected with them', with the rightful owners being allowed some discretion in the deployment of the diverted resources.<sup>80</sup>

There was work to be done in London, and Van Mildert's sense of duty impelled him back there. Reaching Hanover Square on February 27th, he found Peel's long and patient reply to his letter. Peel pointed out the weakness of his own government, the hostility to the Church's interests of 'a decided majority of the Representatives of both Ireland and Scotland...& I fear no inconsiderable number of the Representatives of England,' the certainty that questions of church reform would not be let lie no matter what his government might or might not do. He agreed that Cathedral dignities were a good thing in the abstract, but maintained that they were not a good enough thing to weigh against the spiritual destitution of the great urban centres. How could the Church justify paying £9000 per year to the Dean of Durham 'with no other Ministerial functions than those which belong properly to the Dean', when any advantage derived from such a 'great aristocratic appointment' must be set against 'the alienation of thousands from the Church, who witness this appointment and witness at the same time, populous districts in the neighbourhood of Durham, overrun with dissent from the Church because there is no adequate provision for the performance of the Rites of the Church?' <sup>81</sup>

This was an argument finely judged to carry weight with Van Mildert as an individual: his experiences as a Church Building Commissioner and on the Bounty Board's committee for dealing with livings under £50 had taught him the scale of the needs to be met. One in particular of Peel's observations, 'Additional Churches subscribed for - but not built because there is no Endowment', targeted the precise weakness Van Mildert himself had originally noted in the Church Building schemes. However, he felt bound to insist to Peel that there must be some way of attaining their shared objective 'without any disruption of our Ecclesiastical System'.

As a first step to reforming Chapter finances, Peel had proposed annexing a conveniently vacant Westminster prebend to the 'very populous and spiritually ill-provided parish of St. Margaret's', and this was duly done, despite some qualms on the part of Howley and the Chapter.<sup>92</sup> Van Mildert commended this action, pointing out that this was precisely the kind of use he was advocating for Cathedral revenues; it left the 'integrity of the Chapter...untouched.' Indeed a proposal made in Peel's letter, for the annexation of a Durham prebend to the Vicarage of Newcastle upon Tyne, had been a cherished project of his own before ever he received the letter.<sup>93</sup>

Before he left London on March 10th, Van Mildert secured a meeting with Peel to discuss the Government's attitude to his proposed reintroduction of the Bill annexing three Durham prebends to the University offices, and also to the question of 'obtaining a Royal Charter for the University'.<sup>94</sup> Van Mildert found the exchange of views 'pleasant & satisfactory': it was

agreed that the proposed Bill should be abandoned, but that the plan of annexing Stalls should be taken up by the 'Church Commissioners', on the understanding that full Government backing would be given to whatever measure the Commissioners brought forward, and that Thorp would attend a meeting to give whatever information the Commissioners required when they came to consider the matter further. Van Mildert was relieved to be free of the legislative burden; he was, he told Thorp, 'very anxious to return to Mrs. V.M., whose distress at my absence is exceedingly painful to me.'<sup>es</sup>

On the subject of the Charter, Peel was cordial but vague: 'he seems quite disposed to favour our views,' Van Mildert reported; '& on that point the interference of Parliament will not be required.'

During this very brief stay in London, Van Mildert found time to take his seat in the Lords, leave his proxy, have interviews with Howley and with Sir Charles Wetherell, who was to be asked 'for his professional opinion on the intended Charter', and submit the state of his health to the judgement of three eminent medical men. The doctors' verdict was that his case was 'irremediable', and that 'palliatives only' should henceforward be given; the palliatives they decided on were only of very temporary benefit.<sup>es</sup>

On the whole, Van Mildert found the intelligence he gathered in London encouraging. 'From what I can collect,' he wrote to Bruce Knight, 'I incline to augur somewhat better of our prospects, than before I came here. The Government intends, I am persuaded, to act towards us in the most friendly and

considerate manner.'<sup>134</sup> To Joshua Watson he added that the prospects for capitular bodies now seemed less bleak than he had feared: 'The case of Durham especially seems to be regarded with a more favourable eye than I had expected; and at all events, I am assured it will be considered on its own merits as entitled to separate attention.'<sup>135</sup>

Reaching Harrogate on March 12th, he found a letter from Howley which reported Peel as being 'much pleased with the result of his conference with you', but also reported Peel's recommendation that the application for a Charter 'should be delayed, till the threatened motions respecting Subscription to the Articles on admission to Oxford & Cambridge had been disposed of.'<sup>136</sup> Van Mildert took this as evidence 'that Sir Robt. Peel is in good earnest on the matter, & desirous of putting the concerns of the Chapter on the most practicable & least hazardous footing.' He even hoped, he confided to Thorp, that he might have convinced Peel of the need to preserve the structure of Chapters. His chief remaining anxiety was that the Stanleyites would 'urge more sweeping alterations', driving Peel either to resignation or to measures rasher than he wished. 'After all, we must see it is impossible to be confident that any measures well guarded, & favourable to the Church, will pass through the H. of Commons; of whom a very large proportion will be dissatisfied with any thing short of confiscation or spoliation.'<sup>137</sup>

The first report of the Ecclesiastical Commission, published on 19th March, reopened Van Mildert's earlier fears. He wrote another careful letter, this time to Howley, arguing

against the proposals for equalising episcopal revenues. The surplus from the richer sees would not, he calculated, be sufficient to make up all the poorer sees to the target figure of £4,500 per annum, unless the archbishoprics were to be 'diminished' (which he thought undesirable) or the sees of London, Durham and Winchester reduced below £10,000 (which he thought inconceivable). This took no account of providing for the proposed new sees of Manchester and Ripon, although the proposed unions of existing sees would be of some help. He urged that rather than tampering with property rights and creating a disastrous precedent, the Commissioners should be thinking in terms of annexing cathedral dignities to the poorer sees. He offered detailed suggestions: Durham prebends for Carlisle and Chester, a Christ Church canonry or the Deanery of Windsor for Oxford, the Deaneries and/or prebends of Westminster and St. Paul's for the rest. If episcopal revenues must be diverted, could they not be reallocated by the rightful owner? Let 'the Bishop...direct the appropriation...to such special purposes as he deemed most beneficial to his own Diocese, whether in augmentation of Livings, or building & endowing Churches & Chapels, or the increase of Glebe Houses & Schools, or the relief of distressed Clergy, beneficed or unbeneficed, or in any other way most needed in the districts committed to his charge...'

Van Mildert, himself fully committed to promoting all these objects with the scope his vast revenues allowed, could make his plea with integrity. It was doomed to pass unheeded partly because sacrificial generosity was not the commonest component

of the episcopal character at this era, partly because his vision of the Church as an aggregate of individual cures to be tended and cherished within the limitations imposed by their varying resources was not shared by those with political authority over the Church. To Peel and Blomfield and to the many who shared their view, the Church was a single corporation in sorry need of overhaul; to 'bring it into the condition of a mere stipendiary Establishment' was not, to them, the grotesque perversion it seemed to Van Mildert, but a desirable means of achieving equity and efficiency in the deployment of Church revenues. The two visions of the Church of England, the cellular and the collective, contend against each other to this day; and neither can be said wholly to prevail in the life of the contemporary Church.

May found Van Mildert in constant physical pain but back at his post in Hanover Square; he hoped that it might 'please God to let me experience some ease, and not be wholly disqualified for the duties of my station', but in the meantime, unable to take an active part in public affairs, he served 'when consulted, as a sort of Chamber Counsel, in which I have had lately full employment.'<sup>2</sup> Peel's government had fallen at the beginning of April, after defeat on a motion of Lord John Russell to appropriate the surplus revenues of the Church of Ireland to general educational purposes in Ireland; Melbourne was back in power. In June the dismantling of Establishment as Van Mildert dreamed it began in earnest with the Bill to reform municipal corporations.<sup>3</sup>

Durham University was not granted a Royal Charter in Van

Mildert's lifetime.<sup>74</sup> In November the question of annexing Durham prebends to the University offices was brought before the Ecclesiastical Commissioners by Howley, spurred by a letter from Van Mildert; 'as some of them were altogether unacquainted with the measures which had been argued on for the Establishment of the University of Durham, it was thought advisable to defer the consideration of your Lordship's request, till the concerns of the Chapter were brought in due course of proceeding before the Board,' Howley reported.<sup>75</sup>

Van Mildert pursued the question of the University stalls to the end of his life, but with diminishing hopes of success. 'I have written somewhat largely to the Archbishop on our Durham University concerns, and the arrangement of our prebendal stalls,' he wrote in his last letter to Joshua Watson, 'which, I much fear, will not go on so smoothly as when Sir Robert Peel was an Ecclesiastical Commissioner. I have stirred up the Archbishop to do what he can for us; and, knowing his good-will in the matter, I hope for the best.'<sup>76</sup>

The question of what was to be done to Chapters also continued to concern him. He had picked up a rumour that the Commissioners intended to cut down all Chapters to a total of four canons residentiary, but could glean no solid information: 'But the mist must soon be cleared away, and our destiny disclosed.' Before the second Report of the Ecclesiastical Commission was published to confirm his worst fears, Van Mildert was dead.

The tension between the Bishop and the Commissioners bore unexpected fruit two years after his death, with the

publication by William Selwyn, a canon of Ely, of a pamphlet entitled Substance of an Argument...against those clauses of the Benefices Plurality Bill which confer additional powers on the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. The pamphlet, published in 1838, included what purports to be a complete correspondence between 'W. Dunelm' (Van Mildert's invariable signature as Bishop of Durham) and 'the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England', beginning on August 3rd 1838. G.F.A. Best finds the spurious correspondence 'so exceedingly lifelike and circumstantially presented that only the most careful reader will mark that it is, in fact, completely imaginary.'<sup>97</sup> It is difficult to suppose that Selwyn intended to dupe his contemporaries; those with whom the name of W. Dunelm still carried weight will hardly have been unaware that its bearer had been dead for more than two years. But since Selwyn followed many of Van Mildert's teachings on the nature of the Church and her endowments,<sup>98</sup> he may have felt that this justified him in invoking the spirit of his departed master to help fight his case.

In the summer of 1835, Joshua Watson at last came to visit Van Mildert in his castle, on the way with his daughter Mary to a touring holiday in Scotland. Van Mildert was delighted: 'It will be a gratification to me beyond all price that you have seen Auckland and me together before one, or the other, or both, may be levelled with the dust.'<sup>99</sup> The emotion of the meeting was bittersweet, overshadowed by the absence of Mary Watson senior and of Jane Van Mildert; but Joshua Watson wrote afterwards of his 'joy to have seen your Lordship at Auckland,

and to have shewn Mary her own early friend, and one of the oldest of her father's remaining friends, in the full possession of the homage which it is in the power of the State to render to the Church, and in the receipt of the honour due to the public and private virtues of the Christian divine.'<sup>100</sup>

Van Mildert was able to improve the occasion by presenting Watson's nephew by marriage, Edward Churton, to the desirable living of Crayke (or Craik), thereby 'enjoying the purest of all gratifications in testifying my affection for the very best of personal friends, and the best of benefactors to everything deserving of support in Church and State.' Churton was collated to the benefice on September 8th by Archdeacon Lyall of Colchester, commissioned to act on Van Mildert's behalf.<sup>101</sup>

Van Mildert's use of his patronage deserves some comment. It shows instances both of classical nepotism and of what may be termed 'extended nepotism', Churton being a case in point: the tendency to prefer friends and their families.

By the standards of his own day, Van Mildert was certainly not a nepotist. Some of those he preferred to remunerative positions in the Church were members of his own family, by blood or marriage; but for Van Mildert that was never a sufficient condition. Of his six nephews in Holy Orders, he gave substantial preferment to only one.

His two male Ives cousin/nephews were both ordained; William. Van Mildert had priested himself. In 1829, four years after his ordination to the priesthood, William was collated to the Vicarage of Haltwhistle in Northumberland. He proved unsatisfactory to his uncle, who 'regretted having brought

[him] into the Diocese', and received no further promotion.<sup>102</sup> There is no evidence that his brother Cornelius was ever considered for any Durham benefice. Van Mildert took an interest in the volume of sermons which Cornelius published in 1832, wrote him affectionate letters, sent Christmas gifts of money for distribution among 'your flock, (some of them formerly of my flock also)'; but Cornelius remained quietly as Rector of the family living of Bradden.<sup>103</sup>

Four of Van Mildert's Douglas nephews entered Holy Orders. Archibald (Archy), son of Jane Van Mildert's eldest brother, lived in Ireland, the land of his birth, where he became Rector of Cootehill and achieved some celebrity as a preacher. 'In his relations with the Roman Catholic population among whom he dwelt, he was far in advance of his time',<sup>104</sup> and it never seems to have been suggested by anyone that Archy should migrate to England. Philip Henry, older son of Jane's second brother, served a short curacy but never accepted a living due to his poor health. Philip William, son of the Master of Bene't, studied at Christ Church during Van Mildert's time as Regius Professor, and owed his Studentship to his uncle; he went on to become Vicar of a Lincolnshire living, but there is no record of Van Mildert's ever having offered him preferment.

The fourth, Henry, brother to Helen Margaret, was among Van Mildert's principal proteges. During his time at Llandaff, Van Mildert first preferred him to the good living of Newland in the county and diocese of Gloucester, then in 1825 also made him Rural Dean, Prebendary and Precentor of Llandaff.<sup>105</sup> In 1832, the separation of Easington from the Archdeaconry and its

subsequent bestowal on H.G. Liddell placed Liddell's former Rectory of Whickham at Van Mildert's disposal. In May, three months before the reshuffle was completed and Whickham actually fell vacant, it had already been offered to and accepted by Henry Douglas. Van Mildert wrote urging him to come North for his collation, clearly impatient for the family reunion.<sup>106</sup> In 1834 the death of Bishop Gray of Bristol left the Durham Seventh Prebend vacant, and Van Mildert's choice again fell upon his nephew.

The reason for these preferments was clear: a combination of Henry's private virtues and the fact of his being the Bishop's nephew. Henry performed his duties to the satisfaction of all concerned. In 1833 Bishop Ryder of Lichfield, who knew him from his own days as Bishop of Gloucester, asked to be remembered to Henry 'as one for whom he entertains sincere regard'. In 1834 the Dean of Durham, whom Van Mildert had consulted as to the advisability of giving the Seventh Prebend to Henry rather than to someone of more direct usefulness to the University, replied: 'From the respectability of Mr. Douglas' character I have no doubt that his appointment will be acceptable and give general satisfaction.'<sup>107</sup>

The relationship between the Van Milderts and Henry was a particularly close one. The Bishop was godfather to Henry's eldest son Willy; the correspondence reveals a number of gifts made to both father and children, a close interest by both Van Milderts in the welfare of the children, and a great deal of affection. In February 1834, when Jane's life was in danger, Henry went at once to Harrogate: 'Our nephew Harry Douglas is

just come here,' Van Mildert wrote to Thorp, '& is a great comfort to me.'<sup>108</sup>

Equally close was their relationship with Henry's brother Robert Archibald Douglas-Gresley, who served as Van Mildert's personal secretary from his uncle's appointment to Durham. By the time the Bishop's Secretary, T.H. Faber, died in 1833, Douglas-Gresley had established himself as a 'sound professional man' and a useful administrator, and no eyebrows were raised when he accepted 'the situation of the late Mr. Faber'.<sup>109</sup>

Gaisford, his nephew by marriage to Helen Margaret, Van Mildert preferred to the full extent his patronage allowed; but the kin-tie was the least of his reasons for doing so. Gaisford was a scholar of real public eminence, for whose personal qualities the Bishop had the greatest of respect. For Van Mildert, to promote Gaisford to the best cathedral dignity in his gift was to act entirely in accordance with his own view of the purpose of such dignities.

Helen Margaret's younger sister Mary married 'a very respectable young Clergyman', Richard Lowndes, in 1819.<sup>110</sup> There is no evidence that Van Mildert took any hand in the subsequent career of Mr. Lowndes.

T.L. Strong, Van Mildert's 'young friend' of 1814, received the reward of his services as Bishop's Chaplain in 1829, in the form of the Rectory of Sedgfield, worth an estimated £2,200 per annum.<sup>111</sup> Several letters reveal Van Mildert's use of his influence on the behalf of members of the Phalanx and their families, and during his time as Dean of St. Paul's he was able

to offer preferment (not always accepted) to several of them. This is scarcely surprising, and there is nothing to suggest that considerations of friendship ever led Van Mildert to use his patronage or influence in a way which could fairly be called improper.

At the end of 1835, Van Mildert sent his last Christmas letter to Bruce Knight, with his customary gift of £100 for distribution in the Diocese of Llandaff. 'My good friend, fare you well: with the best old-fashioned salutations of the approaching hallowed season. (including a Bishop's blessing to you and yours,) believe me always sincerely and affectionately yours. W.D.'<sup>112</sup>

In January 1836 his health improved, and on Sunday January 24th he was able to preach in the chapel at Auckland. In early February he caught a 'low fever' with 'fits of shivering and pain'. 'The next day he was better; but shivering returned at night, and from that time his vital powers gradually declined. His constitution, worn out by labor, anxiety, and local maladies of long standing, sunk under an attack which did not at first seem to threaten fatal consequences.' On Sunday February 14th Van Mildert joined 'with much fervency and devotion' in the prayer Strong offered at his bedside; then his mind wandered, leaving him 'in such a state of stupor, as to be totally unable to keep up his attention, for more than a minute together.' On February 21st he died the quiet death of exhaustion, 'apparently without the slightest pain or distress'. Later that Sunday morning 'prayers were offered up in the Cathedral and the several parishes in this city [Durham]

...under the belief that his Lordship was then living.'<sup>113</sup>

Van Mildert had, in the course of substantial renovations to the chapel at Auckland Castle, had a vault constructed at the northern end of the cross aisle 'for his own body and that of Mrs. Van Mildert'; but he was not allowed his wish to lie there. At the particular request of the Dean and Chapter he was buried in Durham Cathedral, within the altar-rails. The funeral was held on March 1st, in 'most inclement' weather; in addition to those invited, about sixty of the clergy came without invitation as a mark of respect, and the congregation filled the cathedral.<sup>114</sup>

The Times, which had not loved him in life, pronounced him in death 'a brilliant ornament of the Church of England' whose 'loss will be deeply felt both among the clergy and the laity, the rich and the poor.'<sup>115</sup> At the Spring Assizes Lord Denman, who politically had little in common with Van Mildert, paid him a memorial tribute: 'His piety and learning placed him among the highest names of England; while his numerous acts of charity and munificence, and his love of truth and justice, made him entitled to their warmest gratitude and praise.'<sup>116</sup> If Van Mildert's opponents were generous in their commendations once he was safely dead, his friends were lavish.<sup>117</sup>

After the tributes came more solid memorials. A committee was formed, chaired by Thorp, to supervise the raising of a memorial fund. The resulting statue, by 'Lough, a sculptor in whose prosperity Joshua Watson took a lively interest', stands in Durham Cathedral. A scholarship was also endowed at Durham University in his name.<sup>118</sup>

Van Mildert College, founded in 1965, keeps his name a part of the life of the modern Durham University, and there are a number of less well-known commemorations: as recently as November 1979, a stained glass window depicting Van Mildert (as builder of the church) was consecrated in the parish church of Etherley near Bishop Auckland.<sup>1119</sup>

'His work is ended, and he has gone to his rest,' The Times observed, not without satisfaction. The work of the Hackney Phalanx was not finished: in 1837 Joshua Watson and Henry Handley Norris founded the Society for the Employment of Additional Curates in Populous Places, a classical Hackney society, owing its impetus to the founding in 1836 of the Church Pastoral Aid Society.<sup>1120</sup> Norris lived until 1850 and Watson until 1855, each keeping alive in his own way the vision Van Mildert had shared. Their Societies are part of the life of the Church of England to this day.

Among those who had known him, however briefly, he was long remembered. In January 1890 a Canon whom Van Mildert had ordained priest in 1834 was stimulated by a memorial paragraph on Bishop Lightfoot to write an account of 'that to me memorable day' when 'the newly-ordained clergy were invited to dinner at Auckland Castle; and on presenting ourselves we were ushered into a large apartment, where we awaited the coming of the bishop. Presently the door opened, and he entered - a slight and graceful figure - followed by his chaplains...He went round the circle which we made to receive him, bowing to each in turn, and addressing a few words to those with whom he was personally acquainted. We were entertained with becoming

splendour, and while partaking of his lordship's venison, &c., I saw that his own repast consisted of a basin of broth or gruel, which he sipped occasionally. At the same time, his conversation with those near him was as animated as if the beverage had been of a much more exhilarating description.'<sup>121</sup>

All his life Van Mildert made and kept friends, interesting himself in their families as well as themselves. One of the most striking characteristics of the Hackney Phalanx was the interlinking of friendships that knit them and their wide circle of fellow-workers together, the length and warmth of their mutual association. The personality of William Stevens had set their pattern; and from that pattern Van Mildert conceived his vision of the Church. He dreamed the Church of England as the soul of the State, as the servant of every citizen, as the custodian of true learning and wisdom, as an act of loving homage offered to God in the consciousness of unworthiness but with a confidence founded on Divine Grace. To the defence of that dream he pledged his life, and he honoured his pledge to the full limit of his strength. Never blind to the disparities between the Church as he dreamed and as he knew her, he spent his time, energy and (when he had it) money trying to bring her into closer conformity with his vision of her true nature and mission; but he never lost the passionate love for the Church of England, her liturgy, her history, her faithful members both lay and clerical, which first drew him into the ministry.

G.F.A. Best has argued that the defensive cast of Van Mildert's theology, combined with his propensity for explaining

political and doctrinal views which he found distasteful as diabolically inspired, served to blind him to the freer movements of the Holy Spirit in his own generation. Thus blinded, he stood against 'the germs of almost every idea that Protestant and liberal Catholic theologians have called into service, over the past century or so, to make Christianity believable in the modern world'.<sup>122</sup> The question of what makes Christianity 'believable in the modern world' is a complex and controversial one. For Van Mildert, its believability rested on the reliability of the Scriptures and of the living tradition through which the Church interprets them, guaranteed by the unchanging faithfulness of God. These are not dead issues for the modern Church. In the providence of God, the Body of Christ has work not only for those whose particular gift is openness to the future, but also for those whose deepest love is for the inheritance bequeathed us by our forerunners in the Faith. It is necessary for the Church in every generation to be able to bring forth from her treasure things both new and old.

The understanding of the nature and purpose of the Church which inspired Van Mildert is of more than merely antiquarian interest. While the doctrine that only members of the Established Church should take part in government conflicts with contemporary notions of justice, given the diversity of religious belief and practice which characterises modern Britain, Van Mildert's insistence that temporal and spiritual concerns are not separable remains a valuable corrective against the standing temptation for the Church to accept exclusion from 'politics'. To Van Mildert, the purpose of

Establishment was to keep the State faithful; the struggle to bring the nation's communal life into closer conformity with the Kingdom of God was thus an intimate concern of the national Church. Van Mildert's view of the Church of England as the servant of the whole nation and not simply of her own active members similarly addresses current issues.

There is a fine historical irony in the celebrity which afterwards attached to Van Mildert as 'LAST COUNT PALATINE OF DURHAM'.<sup>111</sup> Deeply attached as Van Mildert was to the living tradition of the Church, he had no particular desire to perpetuate anachronisms, and seems to have regarded the last decayed remnant of the Patrimony of St. Cuthbert as an unrelieved nuisance. He was without enthusiasm for a proposal in 1834 to bring 'the good people of Berwick' under his palatine authority, and in 1835 gave Howley a stiff hint that if the revenues of Durham were to be cut, the pomp of the Palatinate ought to be the first casualty.<sup>124</sup> Although it is unlikely that he would have rejoiced to learn that his successor was to be the Whig Bishop Maltby of Chichester, Van Mildert might well have envied Maltby the opportunity to be simple Bishop of Durham.

Van Mildert was remembered as a leading divine, a ruler of the Church, a political bugbear. Like his fellow-workers in the High Church movement of the early nineteenth century, he saw his life's work in a different light. His aims are set out in a prayer he wrote while grappling with the task of producing the right Charge to his clergy in the troubled year 1831. 'Crown my labours, O Lord, I beseech Thee, with such success as will most

promote Thy glory, the good of Thy Church, and the salvation of  
myself and others; for the sake of Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our  
Lord. <sup>125</sup>

1. Blomfield to Howley, 11th December 1832. Diocesan Letter-books of C.J. Blomfield, Bishop of London, vol.5, pp.25-7.
2. G.F.A. Best, [Temporal Pillars], Cambridge (1964), pp.292-3, 297
3. Van Mildert to Singleton, February 6th 1835. British Library Ms. Add. 40314, f.62. For the significance of the old almanac see Van Mildert's speeches on the 1829 Roman Catholic Relief Bill, p.30.
4. Churton, vol.2, p.19. Churton appears to have confused the two Commissions, of 1832 and 1835; but his comments on the haste of the proceedings make it clear that he is referring to the 1835 Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues Commission.
5. Ibid., vol. 2, pp.28, 47-8. Churton's wording does not make it clear whether the author was Watson or Van Mildert, but the Commission met in London, and Van Mildert was at Auckland.
6. The Clerical Guide, and Ecclesiastical Directory:...compiled from the report of the Commissioners appointed 'to inquire into the revenues and patronage of the Established Church in England and Wales:' and presented to both Houses of Parliament, in June 1835...New Edition. London (Rivington, 1836).  
Van Mildert's place on the Commission passed to the (new) Bishop of Bristol, Joseph Allen. For an example of special pleading, see p.xii, comments on the unavoidable expenditure of Bishops and the griefs of Archdeacons.  
On the 1834 interim report see W.L. [Mathieson], English Church Reform 1815-1840, London (1923), p.111.
7. Newman to W. Palmer, October 1833; Newman to J.W. Bowden, April 1st 1834. I. Ker and T. Gornall (eds.), The [Letters] and Diaries [of John Henry Newman], Oxford, vol.4 (1980), pp.68, 228.
8. Churton, vol.2, p.21
9. Ibid., p.20. A.P. Perceval to Newman, 10th March 1834; Letters of John Henry Newman, vol.4, p.200, footnote.
10. Newman to J.W. Bowden, April 1st 1834; Newman to Keble, undated. Letters of John Henry Newman, vol.4, pp.228, 234. Newman later brilliantly described the Watson/Norris faction as 'the old Bartlett Building school': Newman to Pusey, 24th January 1835. Ibid., vol.5 (1981), p.214.  
W.K. Lowther Clarke, A Short History of S.P.C.K., London (S.P.C.K., 1919), p.47.
11. Churton, vol.2, p.22. Howley to Joshua Watson, July 23rd 1833; Lambeth Palace Library Ms. 1562, ff.15-6.
12. Rose to C. Wordsworth, August 20th 1833. Lambeth Palace

Library Ms. 1822, f.214.

13. Joshua Watson to H.H. Norris, October 24th 1833, in Churton, vol.2, pp.26-7.

14. Froude to Newman, Hadleigh, July 30th 1833. Letters of John Henry Newman, vol.4, p.17.

Newman told C.P. Golightly that Lyall was at the Hadleigh conference, and Froude's letter is compatible with this supposition. Newman first directly quoted Lyall as a supporter of the Association early in November. Ibid., pp.13, 79.

15. Palmer to Newman, [27th October 1833]. Ibid., p.71.

16. Norris to Joshua Watson, undated, in Churton, vol.2, p.29.

17. Joshua Watson to Lyall, November 1833; ibid., p.31.

18. Thus Newman: Newman to Palmer, October 24th 1833. Letters of John Henry Newman, vol.4, pp.67-8. See Rose to Newman, October 14th 1833, but also Rose to Newman, March 10th 1834; ibid., pp.160, 207.

19. Churton, vol.2, pp.28-9

20. Newman's partisan account of the process undergone by the original draft suggests that on style at least, Oxford had the last word. Letters of John Henry Newman, vol.4, p.11.

21. Ibid., p.14, note 2. See P.B. [Nockles], Continuity and Change in Anglican High Churchmanship in Britain, 1792-1850, 2 vols., Oxford (D. Phil. thesis, 1982), vol.2, p.436.

22. Churton, vol.2, p.34

23. 'And while we most earnestly deprecate that restless desire of change which would rashly innovate in spiritual matters, we are not less solicitous to declare our firm conviction that, should any thing from the lapse of years or altered circumstances require renewal or correction, your Grace ['and our other Spiritual Rulers' added at the end of November 1833] may rely upon the cheerful cooperation and dutiful support of the Clergy in carrying into effect any measures, that may tend to revive the discipline of ancient times, to strengthen the connexion between the Bishops, Clergy, and People, and to promote the purity, the efficiency, and the unity of the Church.' Letters of John Henry Newman, vol.4, p.91, and note 3.

24. Rose to C. Wordsworth, November 30th 1833. Lambeth Palace Library Ms. 1822, ff.215-6. Thomas Sikes was involved in persuading Strong to 'take up the Address', and had 'hard work' - T. Mozley to Newman, Letters of...Newman, vol.4, p.154, n.1.

25. Van Mildert to Bruce Knight, December 18th 1833, in Ives, vol.1, pp.136-7.

26. Newman to Bowden, February 9th 1834. Letters of...Newman, vol.4, p.188. Van Mildert had probably been asked to receive and transmit the Durham clergy's collected signatures, as Phillpotts did in Exeter.

27. O. [Chadwick], The Victorian Church, 2 vols., London (3rd edition, 1971), vol.1, p.77; Letters of...Newman, vol.4, pp.186, 188.

28. Churton, vol.2, p.34; Letters of...Newman, vol.4, pp.183, 189. Nockles, vol.1, pp.xlii-xliii, notes the large number of lawyers in the High Church group associated with Nobody's Club. There is some confusion regarding when and to whom the Lay Declaration was presented. A.B. [Webster], Joshua Watson, London (1954), following Churton, says it was presented to the Archbishop, but that 'a group of laymen from Nottingham' also presented a copy of it to Grey (p.104). R.W. Church, The Oxford Movement, London (1892), p. 107, says it was presented to the Archbishop in May 1834. Chadwick, vol.1, p.78, says it was presented to the King on May 27th 1834, then ceremonially deposited in the Lambeth Palace archives; he does not give the source of this information.

29. Chadwick, vol.1, p.73, gives the date at which the Tracts first appeared.

C. Wordsworth to Joshua Watson, November 12th 1833; British Library Ms. Add. 46137, f.169. Froude to Newman, 17th November 1833; Letters of...Newman, vol.4, p.112; see also pp.11-2, 140, 151.

30. Churton, vol.2, p.243. Webster, p.104. Newman to Watson, July 12th 1835; Lambeth Palace Library Ms. 1562, f.24. Letters of...Newman, vol.4, p.265, gives an anecdote of Watson introducing Bowden to Rose 'upon the principle that "all Newman's friends should know each other"'. See also the affectionate references to Watson by Keble (pp.181, 183, 226).

31. Augusta Lady Castletown to her father Archy Douglas, 25th October 1833: 'Poor Mrs. Van Mildert, she has had a stroke...' In Adams, p.393. Three copies of the prayer are in Durham University Library Add. Ms. 274.207V21P8; f.67 seems to be the original.

32. Van Mildert to Thorp, February 18th 1834. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.166b.

33. Churton, vol.1, pp.259-60

34. Van Mildert to Thorp, May 17th 1833. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, ff.131-2.

35. Van Mildert to C. Wordsworth, Private and Confidential, May 29th 1833. Lambeth Palace Library Ms. 1822, ff.244-5. Gaisford to Van Mildert, 5th January 1832. Jenkyns Papers IV.B.

36. Froude to Newman, July 30th 1833; Rose to Newman, August 20th 1833. Letters of...Newman, vol.4, pp.16, 30. Rose to C. Wordsworth, August 20th 1833; Lambeth Palace Library Ms. 1822, f.213.
37. A.P. Perceval to Newman, September 12th 1833. Letters of...Newman, vol.4, p.43.
38. J.W. Burgon, Lives of Twelve Good Men, 2 vols., London (1889), vol.1, p.184. Quoted in Webster, p.94.
39. C.E. [Whiting], The University of Durham 1832-1932, London (The Sheldon Press, 1932), p.46. Van Mildert to Thorp, March 9th 1835; Thorp Correspondence, vol.2, f.188. Durham Acta Books, entry for 25th May 1835, reprinted in Cochrane, p.254.
40. Van Mildert to Thorp, December 8th 1831; Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.68. Newman to Rose, August 16th 1833; Letters of...Newman, vol.4, p.30. On other candidates considered for the Professorship see Whiting, p.47, and A.S. [Havens], Henry Jenkyns on the Thirty-nine Articles: A Study in Nineteenth-Century Anglican Confessionalism, Durham (M.A. thesis, 1982), p.36. For Gaisford's views on several candidates see Gaisford to Van Mildert, 5th November, 27th November, 26th December 1831, 5th January 1832; Jenkyns Papers IV.B.
41. Temporal Pillars, pp.298, 300, 308. Van Mildert expressed pleasure on learning of Hobhouse's appointment to the Commission: 'He used to be very staunch both in Church and State, & I hope still continues so: & his opinion will have weight.' Van Mildert to Archdeacon Singleton, February 6th 1835; British Library Ms. Add. 40314, f.62. To Henry Jenkyns he expressed himself more pointedly: 'He will not be disposed, I think, to put even Deans and Chapters in jeopardy, nor to break down any of the bulwarks of our Establishment.' Van Mildert to Jenkyns, 6th February 1835; Jenkyns Papers IV.B.
42. Havens, pp.11, 14-21.
43. Ibid., pp.22-34, considers the part played by Jenkyns in the conflict between Newman and Hawkins.
44. Froude to Newman, November 17th 1833. Letters of...Newman, vol.4, p.112.
45. Rose's lectures were entitled 'An Apology for the Study of Divinity' and 'The Study of Church History Recommended'. The second caused controversy by attacking eminent church historians: Whiting, p.44. Newman thought it 'one of the most enthusiastic compositions I ever met with...I trust it will carry away, as well as inform and convince a great many readers.' Newman to Rose, June 2nd 1834; Letters of...Newman, vol.4, p.263. On Jenkyns' refusal to publish, see Jenkyns to Van Mildert, February 1835; Van Mildert to Jenkyns, 6th February 1835. Jenkyns Papers IV.B. See also Havens, pp.44-5.

46. Van Mildert to the Bishops, February 8th 1834; Bishop Grey to Van Mildert, February 11th 1834; Van Mildert to Bishop Murray (copy). February 22nd 1834; Phillipotts to Van Mildert, February 17th 1834. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, ff.147, 153, 169, 166a.
47. Whiting, pp.57-8.
48. Van Mildert to Thorp, April 7th 1834. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.172.
49. Van Mildert to Bruce Knight, 24th April 1834, in Ives, vol.1, p.137. Chadwick, vol.1, p.88, gives details of the Bill, and also Howley's comments on its provisions.
50. Chadwick, vol.1, p.89; for the Irish Tithe Bill and the fate of the Grey administration, see N. [Gash], Peel, London (1976), pp.159-61.
51. Van Mildert to Bruce Knight, 24th April 1834, and a second undated letter, in Ives, vol.1, pp.137-8.
52. Letters of...Newman, vol.4, pp.239-40. Baden Powell was among the 'very few dissentient voices'.
53. Chadwick, vol.1, pp.91-3, 113. Newman thought Thirlwall's pamphlet, a reply to an earlier paper by Dr. Thomas Turton, 'most infamous'. Letters of...Newman, vol.4, p.262.
54. Peel to C. Wordsworth, April 18th 1834. Lambeth Palace Library Ms. 1822, ff.181-2.
55. Chadwick, vol.1, p.92.
56. Mathieson, pp.102, 109-10; Gash, pp.159-60. Neither of Brougham's Bills became law.
57. Rose to Van Mildert, 16th July 1833. Jenkyns Papers IV.B.
58. Van Mildert to Thorp, April 21st 1834. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.175.
59. Van Mildert to Thorp, April 16th 1834. Ibid., f.173. The Lord Shaftesbury referred to was the father of the great Evangelical philanthropist.
60. Quoted in Van Mildert's reply to Thorp, April 21st 1834. Ibid., f.175.
61. Van Mildert to Grey, May 6th 1834; Grey to Van Mildert, May 9th 1834. Papers of 2nd Earl Grey.
62. Van Mildert to Thorp, May 8th 1834; Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.178. Van Mildert to Grey, May 9th 1834; Grey to Van Mildert, same date. Papers of 2nd Earl Grey.

63. Van Mildert to Grey, May 10th 1834; Papers of 2nd Earl Grey. Van Mildert to Thorp, May 10th 1834, [May 12th 1834]; Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, ff.179, 180.
64. Van Mildert to Bruce Knight, [May?] 1834, in Ives, vol.1, pp.137-8. Van Mildert's reference to 'opening his mouth' at Lincoln's Inn Fields may concern the meeting on April 8th (see above, p.408).
65. Van Mildert to Thorp, May 15th 1834. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.181.
66. Joshua Watson to a young clergyman 'who was inveighing against the choice of bishops by the State'; Churton, vol.2, pp.154-5. Froude to Newman, July 30th 1833; Letters of... Newman, vol.4, pp.16-7.
67. Keble to Newman, August 8th 1833. Ibid., pp.22-3. Nockles, pp.24-30, examines the conception of Establishment put forward by Keble and Froude.
68. A Sermon, preached in the Cathedral Church of Durham, before the Right Honourable Lord Lyndhurst, Lord Chief Baron of the Court of Exchequer, and the Honourable Mr. Baron Gurney, at the Assizes, July 27th, 1834, by William, Lord Bishop of Durham, Durham (1834), reprinted in Ives, vol.1, pp.300-315. Cf. Webster's description, p.152, of Joshua Watson's view of Establishment.
69. Rose to Joshua Watson, quoted in Whiting, p.44.
70. Rose to Van Mildert, 2nd July 1834, quoted in Whiting, pp.44-5.
71. Thorp to Van Mildert, 5th July 1834, quoted in Whiting, p.45.
72. Thorp to Van Mildert, August 18th 1834. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.185.
73. Cf. Rose to C. Wordsworth, November 30th 1833, Lambeth Palace Library Ms. 1822, f.216v, with Newman to Rose, August 20th 1834, Letters of...Newman, vol.4, p.323.
74. Newman to T. Mozley, January 3rd 1834; ibid., p.162. Newman to C.P. Golightly, January 6th 1834; Lambeth Palace Library Ms. 1946, f.15. Rose to Newman, March 24th 1834; Letters of... Newman, vol.4, pp.224-5.
75. Churton, vol.2, p.63.
76. Jenkyns to Hobhouse, 26th October 1834. Jenkyns Papers V.B.10. Havens, pp.46-55, discusses Van Mildert's reasons for choosing Jenkyns.

77. For Jenkyns' relations with Arnold, see Havens, p.55.
78. W. Van Mildert, 'The Mastiff, the Fox, & the Wolf, a Fable'. Durham University Library Add. Ms. 274.207V2108 f.95.
79. Van Mildert to Bruce Knight, November 24th 1834, in Ives, vol.1, p.139. 'Mrs V:M: continues...as well as for some time', Van Mildert to John Burder (mutilated fragment), 15th December 1834, in 'William Van Mildert, Bishop of Durham 1826 to 1836', scrapbook in Durham University Palaeography Department, f.5c.
80. Van Mildert to Peel, February 18th 1835. British Library Ms. Add. 40415, ff.4-9. At about the same time, the Dean of Durham wrote to Howley proposing that the finances of Durham University should be entirely reorganised on the basis of the pooled income of three annexed stalls: Whiting, p.63.
81. Peel to Van Mildert, Most Private, February 23rd 1835. Ibid., ff.136-42. Peel clearly found this letter difficult to write; it is so much edited that he had to have it fair-copied, and parts of the draft are illegible.
82. Temporal Pillars, p.303
83. Van Mildert to Peel, February 28th 1835. British Library Ms. Add. 40415, ff.275-6.
84. Van Mildert to Peel, March 5th 1835; Peel to Van Mildert, March 6th 1835. British Library Ms. Add. 40416, ff.133, 135.
85. Van Mildert to Thorp, March 7th 1835. Thorp Correspondence, vol.2, f.187.
86. Ives, vol.1, p.140.
87. Van Mildert to Bruce Knight, March 1835, in Ives, vol.1, p.139.
88. Van Mildert to Joshua Watson, March 9th 1835, in Churton, vol.2, pp.41-2.
89. Quoted in Van Mildert to Thorp, March 13th 1835. Thorp Correspondence, vol.2, f.189.
90. Van Mildert to Thorp, March 13th 1835. Ibid., ff.189-90.
91. Van Mildert to Howley, April 2nd 1835. British Library Ms. Add. 40419, ff.143-6. Chadwick, vol.1, pp.104-5, summarises the first report of the Commission and gives Rose's reaction.
92. Van Mildert to Cornelius Ives, May 1835, in Ives, vol.1, pp.141-2.
93. For the reasons why this Bill affected the 'national' aspect of the Church of England, see Chadwick, vol.1, pp.108-11

94. The Charter was granted on 1st June 1837: Whiting, p.71. The delay was due to continuing battles over the status of Dissenters.

95. Howley to Van Mildert, November 16th 1835. Thorp Correspondence, vol.2, f.197.

96. Van Mildert to Joshua Watson, January 28th 1836, in Churton, vol.2, p.48. The question of the stalls was not finally settled until June 1841: Whiting, p.77.

97. Temporal Pillars, p.315

98. Ibid., pp.431-3, 441-2; see also Chadwick, vol.1, p.138. Selwyn, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity and brother to the Bishop, was a spiritual heir of whom Van Mildert would have been proud.

Another taking of Van Mildert's name in vain may be reflected in the gift of £20 by 'W.V.M.' to help build a 'Scotch Church' at South Shields, reported by The Times, 16th March 1836, p.6, column 2 (Cochrane, p.426). Van Mildert had always refused to 'contribute towards the expense of Dissenting places of worship' (Ives, vol.1, p.151).

99. Churton, vol.2, p.43

100. Joshua Watson to Van Mildert, August 25th 1835, in Churton, vol.2, pp.43-4.

101. Van Mildert to Joshua Watson, autumn 1835; ibid., pp.44-5. Durham Acta Books, entry for 28th August 1835, reprinted in Cochrane, pp.254-5. In preferring Churton to Crayke, Van Mildert was 'following up' an earlier 'kindness' solicited by Watson: 'the only request' Watson 'ever preferred on private grounds'. Churton had been among those considered for the Greek Professorship: Havens, p.36.

102. Durham Acta Books, entry for 30th April 1829, in Cochrane, p.239. Van Mildert to Thorp, July 12th 1832; Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.90. Van Mildert ordained William Ives priest on Sunday 24th April 1825 in a private ceremony at St. Paul's; also ordained on the same occasion was W. John Peel, B.A., of Christ Church. Cochrane, p.154.

103. Van Mildert to Thorp, January 25th 1832, postscript; Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.80. The underlining of 'Cornelius' may emphasise that the reference was not to William. Cornelius published A Compendious History of the Church of God in 1820 and Sermons Originally composed for a Country Congregation in 1832: Crockford's Clerical Directory for 1868, London (Horace Cox, 1868), p.355.

Van Mildert to Cornelius Ives, December 17th 1835, in Ives, vol.1, p.142.

104. Adams, p.384

105. J.A. Venn, Alumni Cantabrigienses Part II (1752-1900), Cambridge (Cambridge University Press, 1944), vol.2, p.325

106. Van Mildert to Henry Douglas, May 1st, August 1st 1832, in Adams, pp.554-6.

107. Van Mildert to Henry Douglas, March 14th 1833, in Adams, p.557. Jenkinson to Van Mildert, quoted in Van Mildert to Henry Douglas, 20th October 1834; Adams, pp.558-9. Cochrane, p.253, is probably mistaken in supposing that Van Mildert's anxiety concerned a possible charge of nepotism. The wording of the letter suggests that the Bishop was thinking of the need to annex stalls to University offices. In May 1836 six of the Durham Chapter, Douglas among them, wrote to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners that Van Mildert 'considered the appropriation of the first, third and eleventh stalls so settled that when one of the other stalls fell vacant that summer [1834] he gave it to an outsider': Whiting, p.66.

108. Van Mildert to Thorp, February 19th 1834. Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.167.

109. Van Mildert to Thorp, April 25th 1833. Ibid., f.125.

110. Van Mildert to Cornelius Ives, January 29th 1819. Durham University Library Add. Ms. 274.207V2L4.

111. Van Mildert to Strong, March 24th 1829; Bodleian Library Ms. Eng. Misc. c. 631 ff.46-7. Another protégé was Thomas Hart Dyke, son of a Kent friend. Van Mildert probably helped Dyke to a Christ Church Studentship in 1821, and presented him to the Durham benefice of Long Newton in 1832.

112. Van Mildert to Bruce Knight, December 8th 1835, in Ives, vol.1, p.140.

113. Ives, vol.1, pp.143-4; Durham Advertiser, Friday February 26th 1836, p.2 columns 4-5, p.3 column 3. Ives, vol.1, p.145, attributes the Durham Advertiser obituary to T.L. Strong; the account in Ives is probably also by Strong, cf. Churton, vol.2, p.49.

114. Ives, vol.1, pp.144-5. The alterations to the Chapel cost Van Mildert an estimated £1500; they included another abortive hot air central heating project. J. Raine, A brief historical account of the Episcopal Castle, or Palace, of Auckland (1852), pp.95-6, quoted by Cochrane, pp.190-3.

115. The Times, February 24th 1836.

116. Lord Denman's Charge to the Grand Jury at Durham, quoted by Ives, vol.1, p.146.

117. Ives, vol.1, pp.146-7, gives the tribute from Thorp's Archidiaconal Charge.

118. Churton, vol.2, p.49. Monument to the Late Bishop of Durham, printed circular, Durham, 1836. A meeting held in Bishop Cosin's Library on March 14th 1836 voted to open 'a Subscription...for the purpose of erecting a Monument...in the Cathedral Church' and, on the motion of the Revd. John Tyson, to open a second fund to endow a scholarship. Joshua Watson was anxious that the second proposal should not eclipse the statue: Watson to C. Wordsworth, 21st March 1836; Lambeth Palace Library Ms. 1822, ff.275-6. The March 14th meeting appointed a Committee, chaired by Thorp, which included Park, Watson, Norris, Christopher Wordsworth and Lord Kenyon; Henry Douglas, Douglas-Gresley, Edward Stanley, Gaisford, William Grant, T.L. Strong and T.H. Dyke, but not Cornelius or William Ives; Temple Chevallier, but not Henry Jenkyns; Liddell, Darnell and Prebendary Wellesley, but not the Dean of Durham.

119. Information provided by the Rector, the Revd. D.G.F. Hinge, to the Master of Van Mildert College, Dr. P.W. Kent.

120. Webster, pp.74-5; S.C. Carpenter, Church and People, 1789-1889, London (S.P.C.K., 1933), p.36.

121. Canon Ilderton, Rector of Ingram, to an unidentified newspaper, January 1890. 'William Van Mildert, Bishop of Durham 1826 to 1836', scrapbook in Durham University Palaeography Department.

122. G.F.A. [Best], 'The Mind and Times of William Van Mildert', in Journal of Theological Studies, New Series, vol.XIV, part 2 (October 1963), pp.355-70; pp.360-70.

123. Closing phrase of Ives' Memoir: vol.1, p.158. See Best, p.355.

124. Van Mildert to Thorp, 7th April 1834; Thorp Correspondence, vol.1, f.172. Van Mildert to Howley, April 2nd 1835; British Library Ms. Add. 40419, ff.143-4. For Van Mildert's views on 'pomp and ceremony' in general, and in matters of religion, see his 1828 sermon on the consecration of St. Paul's Chapel, Ryton: Ives, vol.1, p.289.

125. Ives, vol.1, pp.155-6.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY A

### Printed Works of Van Mildert

1. C. Ives (ed.), Sermons on several Occasions, and Charges, by William Van Mildert, D.D. Late Bishop of Durham. To which is prefixed a memoir of the Author. 6 vols., Oxford (J.H. Parker, 1838).
2. [W. Percy, W. Van Mildert et al.], Poems by A Literary Society, comprehending Original Pieces in the Several Walks of Poetry, London (1784).
3. W. Van Mildert, The Excellency of the Liturgy, and the Advantages of being Educated in the Doctrine and Principles, of the Church of England. A Sermon, preached in the Parish Church of St. Mary Le Bow..., London (1797).
4. W. Van Mildert, Cautions against Innovation in Matters of Religion, A Sermon, preached in the Parish Church of St. Mary Le Bow..., London (1798).
5. W. Van Mildert, An historical view of the rise and progress of Infidelity, with a refutation of it's principles and reasonings: in a series of Sermons preached for the lecture founded by the Hon. Robert Boyle, London (1st edition 1806, 2nd edition 1808, 3rd edition 1820, 4th edition 1831).
6. A Letter to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Occasioned by two recent publications respecting the British and Foreign Bible Society, by a Member of the Society [attributed to Van Mildert by the Bodleian Library]. London (Rivington, 1805).
7. W. Van Mildert, To THE INHABITANTS of THE PARISH OF FARNINGHAM in the County of Kent (1810)
8. W. Van Mildert, A Sermon on Psalm lvii.1, preached before the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn, on the occasion of the assassination of the Right Hon. Spencer Perceval, London (1812)
9. W. Van Mildert, An Inquiry into the general principles of Scripture-Interpretation, in eight sermons preached before the University of Oxford in 1814, Oxford (1st edition 1815, 2nd edition 1815, 3rd edition 1831)
10. W. Van Mildert, A Sermon Preached before The Corporation of Trinity House, in the Church of St. Nicholas, Deptford, June 10, 1816. London (1816)
11. W. Van Mildert, A Sermon Preached in the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, June 8, 1820, at the Yearly Meeting of the Children educated in the Charity Schools in and about the Cities of London and Westminster, London (1820)

12. W. Van Mildert, A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Llandaff at the primary visitation in August MDCCCXXI, Oxford (1821)
13. W. Van Mildert, A Sermon Preached before The Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, at their Anniversary Meeting, in the parish Church of St. Mary le Bow, on Friday, Feb. 15, 1822, London (1822)
14. The Works of the Rev. Daniel Waterland, D.D., formerly Master of Magdalene College, Cambridge, Canon of Windsor, and Archdeacon of Middlesex. To which is prefixed a review of the Author's Life and Writings, by William Van Mildert, D.D., Lord Bishop of Llandaff, 10 vols., Oxford (Clarendon Press, 1st edition 1823, 2nd edition 1843, 3rd edition 1856; extracts, A review of the doctrine of the Eucharist: with four charges to the clergy of Middlesex connected with the same subject, reprinted 1896)
15. Substance of A Speech, delivered in the House of Lords, on Tuesday, May 17, 1825, by William, Lord Bishop of Llandaff, on a Bill for THE REMOVAL OF CERTAIN DISQUALIFICATIONS OF the Roman Catholics, London (Rivington, 1825)
16. W. Van Mildert, [Speeches on the Bill for the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts], London (reprinted from the Mirror of Parliament, 1828) [mentioned by Ives, vol.1, p.86]
17. W. Van Mildert, A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Durham, 1827, Oxford (1828)
18. W. Van Mildert, A Sermon Preached at The Consecration of St. Paul's Chapel, in the parish of Ryton, Durham, on Tuesday, Sept. 9, 1828 (1828)
19. Substance of SPEECHES delivered in the HOUSE OF LORDS, on the subject of THE ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIEF BILL, on April 3d., 7th, & 8th, 1829. By WILLIAM, Lord Bishop of Durham. Not Published, London (1829)
20. W. Van Mildert, A Sermon for the Sons of the Clergy in the Diocese of Durham, preached at St. Nicholas' Church, Newcastle, Sept. 3, 1829, Oxford (1830)
21. W. Van Mildert, A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Durham, Oxford (1831)
22. W. Van Mildert, Sermons preached before the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn, from the year 1812 to the year 1819, 2 vols., Oxford (1st edition 1831, 2nd edition 1832)
23. Speech of the Right Reverend William, Lord Bishop of Durham, in the House of Lords, on Wednesday, July 17, 1833, on the Second Reading of the Church Temporalities (Ireland) Bill, extracted from the Mirror of Parliament, Part CCXXXVI. London (1833)

24. W. Van Mildert, A Sermon, preached in the Cathedral Church of Durham, before the Right Honourable Lord Lyndhurst, Lord Chief Baron of the Court of Exchequer, and the Honourable Mr. Baron Gurney, at the Assizes, July 27th, 1834, Durham (1834)

25. W. Van Mildert, True and false Knowledge compared: a sermon, London (1850) [reprint of the 1820 Charity Schools sermon]

## BIBLIOGRAPHY B

### I. Archives

1. Van Mildert Manuscripts: Durham University Library.
2. Van Mildert Papers: Van Mildert College, Durham University.
3. 'William Van Mildert, Bishop of Durham 1826 to 1836', scrapbook: Durham University Palaeography Department.
4. Letterbook of Shute Barrington, 1802-18: Durham University Library.
5. Diocesan Letter-books of C.J. Blomfield, Bishop of London, vols. 4-5: Lambeth Palace Library.
6. Chapter Book, Batells Book, Van Mildert's private account book: Christ Church archives, Oxford.
7. Durham Acta Book: Diocesan Registry.
8. Archives of Dean and Chapter of Durham: Dean and Chapter Registry.
9. Farningham Parish Records: Kent County Archives, Maidstone.
10. Papers of 2nd Earl Grey: Grey of Howick Mss., Durham University Library.
11. Common place book of George Horne: Cambridge University Library.
12. Horsley Papers: Lambeth Palace Library.
13. Howley Papers: Lambeth Palace Library.
14. Jenkyns Papers, IV-V: Balliol College Library, Oxford.
15. Liverpool Papers: British Library.
16. Llandaff Acta Book: National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth.
17. Norris Papers: Bodleian Library.
18. Peel Papers: British Library.
19. Notebooks of Beilby Porteus: Lambeth Palace Library.
20. Batells Book 1779-91: The Queen's College archives, Oxford.
21. Strong Papers: Bodleian Library.
22. Thorp Correspondence, vols. 1-2: Durham University Library.
23. Papers of Christopher Wordsworth: British Library, Lambeth Palace Library.

## II. General

1. London Chronicle, vol. LIV (1783).
2. The Times, 1789-92, 1801, 1820, 1832, 1836.
3. Durham County Advertiser, 1826-7, 1836.
4. Journals of the House of Commons, vol. 56 (1801).
5. Hansard, first series, vols. VII (1806), XLI (1819); New Series, vols. 1-13 (1820-5), 18-19 (1828-9), 24-5 (1830); Third Series, vols. 2-12 (1831-2).

## III. Primary Sources

- A. Aspinall [ed.], The Correspondence of George Prince of Wales 1770-1812, 8 vols., London (Cassell, 1971)
- A. Aspinall [ed.], The Letters of King George IV, 1812-1830. Cambridge (Cambridge University Press, 1938)
- J.W. Burgon, Lives of Twelve Good Men, 2nd ed., 2 vols., London (John Murray, 1888)
- R.W. Church, The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years 1833-1845, London (Macmillan, 1892)
- E. Churton, Memoir of Joshua Watson, 2 vols., Oxford (J.H. Parker, 1838)
- C. Daubeny, A Guide to the Church, in Several Discourses, London (T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1798)
- M. Evans [ed.], Letters of Radcliffe and James, Oxford (Oxford Historical Society, 1888)
- D. Forbes, A Letter to a Bishop, concerning some Important Discoveries in Philosophy and Theology, in The Whole Works of the Right Honourable Duncan Forbes, Late Lord President of the Court of Session, London & Edinburgh [undated]
- C. & J. Greenwood, Atlas of the Counties of England, from Actual Surveys made from the Years 1817 to 1833, London (Greenwood, 1834)
- G. Horne, A Charge intended to have been delivered to the Clergy of Norwich, at the Primary Visitation of George, Lord Bishop of that Diocese, Norwich (Yarlington & Bacon, 1791)
- S. Horsley, The Charges of Samuel Horsley, late Lord Bishop of St. Asaph; delivered at his several Visitations of the Dioceses of St. David's, Rochester, and St. Asaph, Dundee (1813)

R. Huish, Memoirs of Caroline, Queen of Great Britain, 2 vols., London (1821)

C. Ives, Memoir of the Author, in Sermons on several Occasions, and Charges, by William Van Mildert, D.D. Late Bishop of Durham, to which is prefixed a memoir of the Author, 6 vols., Oxford (J.H. Parker, 1838), vol.1

[D. Jones], Tracts published under the signature of the Welch Freeholder, London (ca. 1794)

W. Jones, A Letter to Three Converted Jews, lately Baptized and Confirmed in the Church of England, London (F. & C. Rivington, 1799)

W. Jones [ed.], The Works of the Right Reverend George Horne, D.D., Late Lord Bishop of Norwich; to which are prefixed Memoirs of his Life, Studies, and Writings, 2nd ed., London (F.C. & J. Rivington, 1818)

[B. Kennicott], A Word to the Hutchinsonians: or Remarks on Three extraordinary Sermons Lately preached before the University of Oxford, by The Reverend Dr. Patten, The Reverend Mr. Wetherall, and The Reverend Mr. Horne, By A Member of the University, London (1756)

I. Ker and T. Gornall [eds.], The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman, 5 vols., Oxford (Clarendon Press, 1978-81)

Londina Illustrata. Graphic And Historic Memorials of Monasteries, Churches, Chapels, Schools, Charitable Foundations, Palaces, Halls, Courts, Processions, Places of Early Amusement And Modern & Present Theatres, In the Cities and Suburbs of London & Westminster, London (Robert Wilkinson, 1819)

Monument to the Late Bishop of Durham, Durham (1836)

J.H. Newman, Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church, viewed relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism, London (J.G. & F. Rivington, 1837)

[J.A. Park], Memoirs of William Stevens, Esq., London (1812)

B. Porteus, A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of London, at the Visitation of that Diocese in the year MDCCXCIV, London (F. & C. Rivington, 1794)

B. Porteus, A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of London, in the years 1798 and 1799, London (1799)

'Substance of the Speech of the Earl of Harrowby, on moving for the Recommitment of a Bill for the better Support and Maintenance of Stipendiary Curates', in Quarterly Review, vol.X, no.XIX (October 1813), pp.41-57

The Clerical Guide, or, Ecclesiastical Directory, 2nd ed. (corrected), London (F.C. & J. Rivington, 1822)

The Clerical Guide, and Ecclesiastical Directory, New Edition, London (J.G. & F. Rivington, 1836)

The Georgian Era: Memoirs of the most eminent persons who have flourished in Great Britain, from the accession of George the First to the demise of George the Fourth, 4 vols., London (Vizetelly, Branston & co., 1832)

W. Tuckwell, Reminiscences of Oxford, London (Cassell, 1900)

J. Wade, The Extraordinary Black Book, London (Effingham Wilson, 1831)

D. Waterland, Advice to a Young Student, in The Works of... Waterland..., ed. Van Mildert, Oxford (Clarendon Press, 1823), vol.VI

The Duke of Wellington [ed.], Despatches, correspondence, and memoranda of Field Marshal Arthur, Duke of Wellington, K.G., 1819-32 (in continuation of former series), 8 vols., London (John Murray, 1867-80)

R.I. and S. Wilberforce, The Life of William Wilberforce, 5 vols., London (John Murray, 1838)

J. Woodforde, The Diary of a Country Parson, ed. J. Beresford, 5 vols., London (Oxford University Press, 1924)

#### IV. Secondary Sources

P.W.L. Adams, A History of the Douglas family of Morton in Nithsdale (Dumfriesshire) and Fingland (Kirkcudbrightshire) and their descendants, Bedford (The Sidney Press, 1921)

W.O.B. Allen and E. McClure, Two Hundred Years: the History of The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1698-1898, London (S.P.C.K., 1898)

G.F.A. Best, 'The Mind and Times of William Van Mildert', in Journal of Theological Studies, New Series, vol.XIV, part 2 (October 1963), pp.355-70

G.F.A. Best, Temporal Pillars: Queen Anne's Bounty, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and the Church of England, Cambridge (Cambridge University Press, 1964)

S.B. Black, The Children of Farningham and their Schools 1800-1900, Kent (Darenth Valley Publications, 1982)

A. Bradshaw, 'William Van Mildert's visit to the Netherlands in 1792', in Durham University Journal, vol.LXXI, no.1 (December 1978), pp.45-53

Y. Brillioth, The Anglican Revival, London (Longmans, 1925)

- P.A. Brown, The French Revolution in English History, London (Crosby Lockwood & Son, 1918)
- S.C. Carpenter, Church and People, 1789-1889, London (S.P.C.K., 1933)
- O. Chadwick, The Victorian Church, 2 vols., London (Black, 1966)
- C.P.S. Clarke, The Oxford Movement and After, London (Mowbray, 1932)
- W.K. Lowther Clarke, A History of the S.P.C.K., London (S.P.C.K., 1959)
- L. Clarkson, Death, Disease and Famine in Pre-industrial England, Dublin (Gill & Macmillan, 1975)
- R.A. Cochrane, William Van Mildert, bishop of Durham 1826-1836, Durham (M. Litt. thesis, 1950)
- B.H. Coleman, Anglican Church Extension and Related Movements c. 1800-1860 with special reference to London, Cambridge (Ph.D. thesis, 1968)
- F. Warre Cornish, A History of the English Church in the Nineteenth Century, 2 vols., London (Macmillan, 1910)
- A.D. Culler, The Imperial Intellect - a study of Newman's educational ideal, New Haven (Yale University Press, 1955)
- J.J. Dahm, 'Science and Apologetics in the Early Boyle Lectures', in Church History, vol.39 (1970), no.2, pp.172-86
- J.A. De Jong, As the Waters Cover the Sea: Millennial Expectations in the Rise of Anglo-American Missions 1640-1810, Amsterdam (1970)
- G. Faber, Oxford Apostles: A Character Study of the Oxford Movement, London (Faber, 1933)
- [W.C. Farr, ed.], Merchant Taylors' School: Its Origin, History, and Present Surroundings, Oxford (Blackwell, 1929)
- N. Gash, Mr. Secretary Peel - the life of Sir Robert Peel to 1830, London (Longman, 1961)
- N. Gash, Peel, London (Longman, 1976)
- A.D. Gilbert, Religion and Society in Industrial England, London (Longman, 1976)
- S. Gilley, 'Christianity and Enlightenment: An Historical Survey', in History of European Ideas, vol.1 (1981), no.2, pp.103-121

- S. Gilley, 'Nationality and liberty, protestant and catholic: Robert Southey's Book of the Church', in S. Mews [ed.], Religion and National Identity, Studies in Church History, vol.18, Oxford (1982)
- C.C. Gillispie, Genesis and Geology, New York (Harper & Row, 1959)
- V.H.H. Green, Religion at Oxford and Cambridge, London (S.C.M. Press, 1964)
- V.H.H. Green, A History of Oxford University, London (Batsford, 1974)
- E. Halevy, A History of the English People in the Nineteenth Century, 6 vols., London (Ernest Benn, 1949-52)
- A.S. Havens, Henry Jenkyns on the Thirty-nine Articles: A Study in Nineteenth-Century Anglican Confessionalism, Durham (M.A. thesis, 1982)
- E.J. Hobsbawm, The Age of Revolution 1789-1848, London (Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1962)
- R.H. Hodgkin, Six Centuries of an Oxford College, Oxford (Blackwell, 1969)
- E. Hughes, 'The Bishops and Reform 1831-3', in English Historical Review, vol.LVI (July 1941), pp.459-90
- J. Hunt, Religious Thought in England in the Nineteenth Century, London (Gibbings, 1896)
- M.C. Jacob, The Newtonians and the English Revolution 1689-1720, Sussex (The Harvester Press, 1976)
- H.H. Jebb, A Great Bishop of One Hundred Years Ago, being a sketch of the life of Samuel Horsley, LL.D., formerly Bishop of St. David's, Rochester, and St. Asaph and Dean of Westminster, London (Edward Arnold, 1909)
- J. McManners, The French Revolution and the Church, London (S.P.C.K., 1969)
- J.R. Magrath, The Queen's College, Oxford (Clarendon Press, 1921)
- C.E. Mallet, A History of the University of Oxford, London (Methuen, 1927)
- W.L. Mathieson, English Church Reform 1815-1840, London (Longman, 1923)
- P.B. Nockles, Continuity and Change in Anglican High Churchmanship in Britain, 1792-1850, 2 vols., Oxford (D. Phil. thesis, 1982)

- E.R. Norman. Church and Society in England 1770-1970, Oxford (Oxford University Press, 1976)
- J.H. Overton and F. Relton. The English Church from the Accession of George I to the end of the Eighteenth Century, London (Macmillan, 1906)
- C.F. Pascoe. Two Hundred Years of the S.P.G.: An Historical Account of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 1701-1900, London (S.P.G., 1901)
- M.H. Port. 600 New Churches, a Study of the Church Building Commission, 1815-1856, and its Church Building Activities, London (S.P.C.K. for the Church Historical Society, 1961)
- B.M.G. Reardon. Religious Thought in the Victorian Age: A Survey from Coleridge to Gore, New York (Longman, 1980)
- A.W. Rowden. The Primates of the Four Georges, London (Murray, 1916)
- M.J.S. Rudwick. The Meaning of Fossils, London (Macdonald, 1972)
- G. Smith. The Life of William Carey: Shoemaker and Missionary, London (John Murray, 1885)
- R.A. Soloway. Prelates and People: Ecclesiastical Social Thought in England 1783-1852, London (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969)
- J. Stevenson. Popular Disturbances in England 1700-1870, New York (Longman, 1979)
- E. Stock. The History of the Church Missionary Society, 3 vols., London (C.M.S., 1899)
- L. Stone [ed.], The University in Society, 2 vols., Princeton (Princeton University Press, 1974)
- E.P. Thompson. The Making of the English Working Class, London (Penguin Books, 1968)
- W.R. Ward. Victorian Oxford, London (Cass, 1965)
- W.R. Ward. Religion and Society in England 1790-1850, New York (Schocken Books, 1973)
- A.B. Webster. Joshua Watson: The Story of a Layman, 1771-1855, London (S.P.C.K. for the Church Historical Society, 1954)
- C.E. Whiting. The University of Durham 1832-1932, London (The Sheldon Press, 1932)
- C.B. Wilde. 'Hutchinsonianism. Natural Philosophy and Religious Controversy in Eighteenth Century Britain', in History of Science, vol.xviii (1980), pp.1-24

C. Wordsworth, Scholae Academicæ; some account of the Studies at the English Universities in the Eighteenth Century, Cambridge (Deighton Bell, 1877)

