The Historical Journal, 40, 1 (1997), pp. 111–142
Copyright © 1997 Cambridge University Press

JOHN FOXE'S VICTORIAN RECEPTION*

D. ANDREW PENNY
The King's University College, Alberta

ABSTRACT. *In the first year of Victoria's reign, the English reading public's expectations of 'A new and complete edition' of John Foxe's* Acts and Monuments *began to receive fulfilment, as the initial three volumes were issued by Seeley and Burnside. Not all were prepared to give the work a magnanimous reception. Chief among the detractors of that age was Samuel Roffey Maitland, destined in the near future to become librarian at Lambeth Palace under Howley's tenure as archbishop of Canterbury. This essay explores the nature of Maitland's fervent objections to Foxe and his martyrology, and also examines Maitland's relationship to the major religious movements of his day (including Tractarianism). It argues that Maitland was offended by what he perceived as Foxe's extreme partisan bias (as a member of the puritan wing of the English church) and equally, by the poor editorial job which he believed to have been performed in the Cattley/Seeley project. Furthermore, it maintains that Maitland had a sympathetic though rather complex relationship with the divines of the Oxford Movement, including John Henry Newman. Maitland's scholarly credentials as a Foxe critic are also examined.*

I

It has been well noted that the early Victorian era was characterized by a deep-seated rethinking of the nature and legacy of the English reformation. It was a time of intense discussion of issues, owing in large measure to their interconnectedness, recent historical occurrences, and the personalities of the individuals who participated in the dialogue. Locating common ground often proved elusive, as even former compatriots fell out with one another over some point of procedure or interpretation. Dickens and Tonkin have perhaps summed it up best:

> Spokesmen of the established Church of England were confronted by opponents in the Roman and dissenting traditions, powerful and articulate despite their continuing social and political disabilities. More significantly, these spokesmen could not even agree among themselves on whether the Church of England was a legitimate child of the Reformation, and whether the reformation it had undergone was a renewal or a perversion of the true faith. Consequently, the interweaving of historical judgments and contemporary preoccupations – never absent from scholarly debates – was in nineteenth-century British studies of the Reformation particularly acute.[1]

* An earlier and much abbreviated version of this essay was presented in Toronto on 29 October 1994 during The Sixteenth Century Studies Conference's annual gathering, as part of a session entitled 'Dialogue Across the Centuries'.

[1] A. G. Dickens and John Tonkin, *The reformation in historical thought* (Cambridge, Mass., 1985), p. 189.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The social and political context for this round of contention was rather dramatic in itself, and as always, inseparably linked to religious issues. The instability created by the French revolution and the Napoleonic era (not to mention the rumblings of romanticism),[2] left an admixture of conservative and progressive ambitions throughout Europe and Britain. While still living in an age of faith as far as appearances were concerned, some seekers of that day were already being drawn in different directions.[3] Longstanding measures such as the Test Act were re-examined, and in this case, repealed, while Catholic emancipation and the first Reform Bill also came before parliament.[4] Other well-known disputes would not be far behind: the Jerusalem bishopric, the Hampden controversy, the Gorham judgment and the Martyr's Memorial at Oxford.

In the midst of these ecclesiastical discussions came new whirlwinds such as the Catholic Apostolic Church, the Plymouth Brethren and, most famous of all, the Tractarian Movement. All of these manifestations arose due to discontentment with the establishment. While the Irvingites represented desire for the primitive and the charismatic, the Oxford men stressed the grandeur of procedure and the necessity of historical connection with the ancient and medieval past. To this maelstrom was added the remnants of the puritan and evangelical branches of the religious milieu, determined to carry the day for the forces which had animated the protestant reformation. According to Hempton, 'the narrower evangelicalism of the second quarter of the century was characterised by its Calvinism, anti-rationalism, anti-Catholicism and biblical literalism'. He also points to 'the growth of pre-millenialism, that is the expectation of the personal return of Christ to establish his millenial kingdom on earth' as a significant, though neglected, trend.[5]

Evangelicalism was by no means a new phenomenon, of course, and Wand has argued that 'there always has been an Evangelical or Low Church party in Anglicanism. Just as the High Church party can be said to have its origin in people like Elizabeth I, Parker and Laud, so can evangelicalism be said to have begun with Cranmer, Edward VI, and also with the puritan exponents of continental protestantism, who found their way into the Church of England and nearly succeeded in disrupting it.'[6] Though some would take exception to the equation of evangelical with low church,[7] few would dispute the association of the renowned martyrologist John Foxe with both the puritan

[2] See Shane Leslie, *The Oxford Movement, 1833–1933* (Milwaukee, 1933), pp. 39–40.

[3] See Howard R. Murphy, 'The ethical revolt against Christian orthodoxy in early Victorian England', *American Historical Review*, lx, 4 (1955), 800–17. See especially p. 816. Cf. D. N. Hempton, 'Evangelicalism and eschatology', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, xxxi, 2 (1980), 179–80.

[4] See Hempton, 'Evangelicalism', p. 191.

[5] Hempton, 'Evangelicalism', p. 180. See also S. C. Orchard, 'English evangelical eschatology, 1790–1850', Ph.D. dissertation, Cambridge, 1969.

[6] J. W. C. Wand, *Anglicanism in history and today* (London, 1961), p. 110.

[7] See the position taken by G. R. Balleine in *A history of the evangelical party in the Church of England* (London, 1951; orig. pub. 1908), pp. 165–6.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

camp of the mid-sixteenth century and the evangelical wing of the English church of the nineteenth century. This, of course, does not guarantee Foxe a good press, since, as John Kent has stated:

> ... Anglican historians are apt to regard the Puritanism of 1558 to 1640 as an alien, non-Anglican element in the Established Church, a source of disaffection which was inevitably and properly expelled in 1662 at the Restoration.

Thus, in studies which follow this approach, 'one misses a sense of the Church of England in this period as itself a struggle for self-definition; instead, there is an assumption that "Anglicanism" had already been defined once and for all, and that the Puritans were rebelling against the very nature of the Church'.[8] And, though British evangelicals may already have been involved in 'a tale of declining significance'[9] by the time a new edition of *The acts and monuments* was ready for the eager Victorian remnant, there is no doubt that considerable energy could still be expended in defending Foxe's heritage. After all, 'the Evangelicals saw themselves as spiritual heirs of the Reformers', and despite various divisions within their ranks, they 'were at one in their anti-Romanism and their vision of an "evangelical succession" of true faith through the Christian Era derived from the traditions of the *Magdeburg Centuries* ... and John Foxe'.[10]

And yet the field was not by any means abandoned for their exclusive enjoyment; indeed, Diarmaid MacCulloch has argued that, 'despite continuing respect for the industry of Foxe, Strype, and Burnet' during the last century,[11] their side was not able to prevail in the cataclysmic battles of that time. 'The nineteenth-century growth of Anglo-Catholicism amounted to nothing less than an ideological revolution in the Church of England and in the worldwide Anglican Communion with which it was associated.'[12] The attendant 'Anglo-Catholic historiographical victory has had profound consequences in the way that we have perceived the Reformation'. The result was determined, to a large degree at least, by Cranmer's generosity, as 'he bequeathed to the Church of England ambiguity for Anglo-Catholics to exploit'.[13]

Such was the broad and narrower context, then, for the Victorian fascination with Foxe's *Acts and monuments*, which appeared in no less than four major, successive editions between 1837 and 1877. Foxe's work, which had been widely disseminated in various forms since the sixteenth century (often as *The book of martyrs*), had taken on a life of its own over the years, being ranked with the Authorized Version of the Bible and perhaps Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* as one of the three most influential publications in the English language. Doubtless some version of Foxe's project had found its way into

[8] John Kent, 'The study of modern ecclesiastical history since 1930', in J. Daniélou and others, *Historical theology*, The Pelican guide to modern theology, II (Harmondsworth, 1969), 288.

[9] Ibid. p. 331. [10] Dickens and Tonkin, *Reformation in historical thought*, p. 190.

[11] Diarmaid MacCulloch, 'The myth of the English reformation', *Journal of British Studies*, xxx (1991), 4. I wish to thank Professor David Loades for bringing this article to my attention.

[12] Ibid. p. 3. [13] Ibid. pp. 4, 7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

many protestant homes and hearts over the centuries, so that when plans for 'A new and complete edition' of *The acts and monuments* were announced in the 1830s, a loyal pool of willing subscribers was not difficult to locate.[14] The publisher of the enterprise was none other than 'the House of Seeley and Burnside, which with the House of Hatchard produced most of the books, tracts and pamphlets written by Evangelical Anglicans'[15] during the critical period of the Tractarian advance. Not surprisingly, they were confident that they were making available the most praiseworthy replica of the great martyrologist's masterpiece.[16]

But history has demonstrated repeatedly that when great endeavours (and great individuals) are set up on the stage for examination, critics of some description will eventually come forth and begin casting aspersions. Such was the case for this ambitious scheme to provide the English reading public with the finest version of Foxe to that point in time. Its anticipated success in helping to anchor the position of the evangelical forces in the English ecclesiastical world was certainly challenged, and perhaps to some degree thwarted, by a circle of detractors. The key figure in this circle was the distinguished librarian of Lambeth Palace, Samuel Roffey Maitland. The substance of his criticisms, and the motives which lay behind them (which were tied to the peculiar climate of the early Victorian age), form much of the basis of this inquiry.

It is hoped that a re-examination of Maitland's role (and that of his circle of influential friends) in the Victorian phase of the dialogue concerning the origin and nature of the Church of England will serve as a helpful bridge between original reformation issues, and those of the heady days of the 1830s and 1840s. And, if John Kent was correct in his analysis, it should also bring contemporary matters into sharper relief. Not that long ago he argued: '… the Victorian Church is still very much with us, some of its controversies even now still undecided: too much is still at stake'.[17] In this light, Maitland's criticisms of Foxe would appear to be an ideal place to begin reassessing the status of Foxe in the 1990s. It is probable that at least some of his concerns are still relevant, and it will be crucial to further study on Foxe to reaquaint ourselves with their substance. There is no doubt that Maitland is the most serious Foxe critic to date.

The development and printing history of Foxe's works constitute an

[14] The list of subscribers is given with the introductory material to vol. 1 of the new edition, just after the 'Contents of preliminary dissertation' and the 'Addenda et corrigenda'. It consists of sixteen pages with double columns of names. See *The acts and monuments of John Foxe: a new and complete edition*…, ed. Stephen Reed Cattley (London, 1837–9, 1841), 1. All future references to Foxe are from this edition unless otherwise indicated, and will be cited as *A&M*.

[15] Peter Toon, *Evangelical theology, 1833–1856: a response to Tractarianism* (London, 1979), p. 44.

[16] Details regarding the new edition were originally set forth by the publishers in a 'Prospectus' of 25 June 1836. Their scheme was endorsed by three prominent clergymen in a letter 'To the editor of "The Record"' on 16 January (presumably of 1837). The clergymen were Josiah Pratt, Edward Bickersteth, and Charles Bridges. Both documents are reproduced in S. R. Maitland, *Six letters on Fox's acts and monuments*… (London, 1837), pp. xii–xv. See also information on p. v.

[17] Kent, 'Study of modern ecclesiastical history', pp. 308–9.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

interesting, and rather complex, study in themselves, and are directly relevant to the business of assessing the dialogue across the centuries which occurred at this point. Following the two preliminary Latin works of 1554 and 1559 (both issued on the continent), Foxe produced four English editions of the *Acts and monuments* during his own lifetime, the first appearing in 1563, and the final in 1583.[18] There was one more edition before the end of the century (i.e. in 1596), with another four during the seventeenth century. This makes for a total of nine 'ancient'[19] English editions from 1563 to 1684, a period of some 121 years. We could average this out to one edition approximately every 13·5 years.

During the eighteenth century, Foxe's writings appear to have been published mostly, if not always, in edited form as *The book of martyrs*, so that we have something of a significant leap, all the way through to 1837, when the first instalment of the first so-called 'modern' edition[20] of *The acts and monuments* appeared. This edition was not completed until 1841. As already noted, three further editions were set forth by 1877. Thus, in a relative flurry of activity, we have four complete editions of the work within a generation, or one every ten years or so. Exactly 120 years have elapsed since the publication of the final nineteenth-century edition. Thus, during two blocks of busy years, *The acts and monuments* appeared quite frequently, while the eighteenth century seems to have concentrated upon the Marian years, and the twentieth century has, thus far, been relatively quiet.[21]

[18] J. F. Mozley is most helpful in sorting out the various editions. See his *John Foxe and his book* (New York, 1970; orig. pub. 1940), pp. ix–x. Other useful standards include *A short-title catalogue of books printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland… 1475–1640*, eds. Katharine F. Pantzer et al., 2nd edn (London, 1986), I (A–H), 496–7 (hereafter referred to as *RSTC*); and the *British Museum general catalogue of printed books to 1955*, compact edition (New York, 1967), IX, 690–1 (hereafter referred to as the *BM Cat*).

[19] The expression is Mozley's. See p. ix.

[20] Once again, the term is Mozley's.

[21] My thanks again to Professor Loades for pointing out in correspondence the relatively high degree of interest in Foxe in the interval between 1684 and 1837. The fact that Foxe was often being set forth in some form or another can easily be confirmed by referring to the *BM Cat*. The exact nature of these in-between works requires further careful investigation. At this point in my own research, it appears that Foxe was published usually, if not exclusively, as *The book of martyrs* with a definite focus on the Marian material. The work of Timothy Bright in abridging *The acts and monuments* during the 1580s may prove to be the beginning of the transition. See *An abridgement of the booke of acts and mon*[*u*]*mentes of the ch*[*u*]*rch…* (London, 1589); *RSTC* 11229. Cf. *The dictionary of national biography*, eds. Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee (London, orig. pub. 1885–1901; reprinted 1949–50), II, 1246 (hereafter *DNB*). At some point, Edward Bulkley (or perhaps also Bulkeley – see the *BM Cat*, IV, 536; cf. *DNB*, III, 235) seems to have become involved in the process, witness being provided by a note to the reader which appears to have become fairly commonplace in editions of *The book of martyrs* for a time. Bulkley extended the martyrology into the early seventeenth century. See *The book of martyrs: containing an account of the sufferings and death of the protestants in the reign of Queen Mary the First* (London, 1732); in The Eighteenth Century (Research Publications), reel no. 4419. The note is on pp. 946–7. At the same time, at least some works from this interval which claim to be complete martyrologies lack considerable pre-reformational portions found in *The acts and monuments*. Perhaps the longest eighteenth-century version which I have encountered to date was edited by Paul Wright and printed in America. See *The new and complete book of martyrs* (New York, 1794); in Early American Imprints, 1639–1800 (American Antiquarian Society), Evans no. 26991. It would appear to have less than half of the material

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

No doubt some of the apparent reluctance to become engaged with Foxe in a fresh critical encounter relates to the controversial reception he received as the first Victorian edition rolled off the press. As stated, the undisputed leader of the assault at that time was the Anglican cleric, Samuel Roffey Maitland. Although not the first critic of Foxe to appear in the nineteenth century,[22] Maitland was indisputably the most erudite and learned. And it is obvious that he could not have flourished at a more auspicious moment – just when the fanfare surrounding the Seeley project was beginning to build. Maitland was on hand to critique the project from the outset, and some would maintain, Foxe has never been the same since. But what exactly was Maitland's problem with Foxe? We will need to ask whether Maitland was justified in casting the aspersions upon the martyrology and martyrologist which he did with such vigour. Was it more the martyrology than the martyrologist which drew his fire, or was he motivated (as one of Foxe's defender's maintained) by 'puerile, as well as personal hatred'[23] for Foxe himself? Thus, the question of motives looms large, together with the precise nature of the objections. We will also wish to know if and how Maitland, and indeed the entire cofuffle regarding Foxe, were related to the excited stirrings of the Oxford Movement of that same period when the Church of England revisited its identity crisis. But before proceeding with the details of the Foxean controversy, we must briefly evaluate Maitland from several crucial angles in order to appreciate his role more clearly.

---

found in Foxe's final edition of 1584. By this time it was common to add more contemporary accounts, such as information related to Quaker activity as recent as 1779 (see II, 663–4). It was also thought expedient to extend the story in the other direction, including for example, a brief account of the life of Christ (see I, 7–9). Another editor who worked on Foxe during the same century was Martin Madan (see *DNB*, XII, 732–4), who longed for a complete edition of *The acts and monuments* 'at the public expence', and seems to have anticipated (in 1761) that his own publisher would take up the task. Whether he did or not, I cannot say at present. See *The book of martyrs* ([London], 1776), I, i–ii; in The Eighteenth Century, reel no. 215. Finally, it is clear that the practice of numbering the editions of *The acts and monuments* stopped with the 1684 edition, and commenced again only with the Victorian editions. Evidently Mozley did not feel that the interim works were on a par with these numbered editions. Once again, this does not negate the clear fact that Foxe's popularity must have been quite high during this time.

[22] The loudest, but not especially credible, critic prior to Maitland in the century was unquestionably William Eusebius Andrews. See his *A critical and historical review of Fox's book of martyrs, shewing the inaccuracies, falsehoods, and misrepresentations in that work of deception* (2 vols., London, 1824, 1826). Andrews's role as a Foxe detractor is addressed by George Townsend as part of his 'Preliminary dissertation' in the first volume of the new edition. See the portion dealing with Andrews in 'The objectors, objections, and replies to the objections, to the general authority, and veracity, of Foxe's "Acts and monuments of the church", considered', in *A&M*, I, 327–86. See also mention of Andrews's work in Patrick Collinson, 'Truth and legend: the veracity of John Foxe's book of martyrs', in *Clio's mirror: historiography in Britain and the Netherlands*, eds. A. C. Duke and C. A. Tamse (Zutphen, 1985), p. 31.

[23] Townsend, 'Preliminary dissertation', in *A&M*, I, 302.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

II

It would be difficult to classify Maitland under a single occupational category, since he was engaged in a variety of pursuits during his lifetime. Thus he appears as clergyman, librarian, editor, historian, and controversialist – certainly in line with G. R. Elton's reference to the 'rather complicated careers' which seemed to run in the Maitland family.[24] Though called to the bar in 1816 (he would have turned 24 years of age that year),[25] his interests had gravitated more towards religion. This is reflected in the title of his first publication which appeared the following year, *A dissertation on the primary objects of idolatrous worship; being a further attempt to divest tradition of fable*,[26] aptly summed up by one authority as 'remarkable for its range of curious learning'.[27] Indeed, the description might well be used as a caption on all of Maitland's works, and even on Maitland himself – remarkable but curious.

A shift in his attitude towards the established church appears to have been underway during this time, taking him away from his early nonconformist associations (inherited from his father), and opening the way for his admission to deacon's orders in 1821. By 1823, he was serving as 'perpetual curate of Christ Church,' Gloucester.[28] Gladstone heard him preach on a Sunday morning in late August, 1825, though the experience seems to have made little impression.[29] Perhaps Samuel was not much at preaching; at any rate his post turned out to be anything but perpetual due to his other interests.[30] A concern with 'the conversion of the Jews' evidently prompted an extended visit to the continent in 1828, and resulted in *A letter to the Rev. Charles Simeon, A.M. ... on the propriety of adopting some means beside those which are now used for promoting Christianity among the Jews*,[31] and related philanthropic activity.[32] In addition, and even prior to his trip, Maitland had become absorbed with the first of several major issues which occupied him during his lifetime – the interpretation of biblical prophecy.[33]

Hempton has pointed to at least three stimuli for this kind of study in the early nineteenth century: '[t]he French Revolution, renewed Catholic pressure from Ireland and a fresh interest in the Jews'.[34] David Bebbington suggests a connection between '[t]he advent hope' as it was defined by early nineteenth-century evangelicals and romanticism.[35] But whatever the context,

[24] G. R. Elton, *F. W. Maitland* (London, 1985), p. 6. Samuel Roffey Maitland was Frederic William Maitland's grandfather. Sir Geoffrey is here referring both to F. W. Maitland's father and grandfather.

[25] *DNB*, xii, 815. I have relied heavily upon the *DNB* article on Maitland in this section of my work.

[26] (London, 1817). No author is given on the title page.

[27] *DNB*, xii, 815–16.

[28] Ibid.

[29] *The Gladstone diaries*, ed. M. R. D. Foot, vol. i. 1825–1832 (Oxford, 1968), p. 6. It may be significant that Gladstone recorded hearing a 'Mr Jones at St Johns in evening' on the same day he heard S. R. Maitland in the morning, considering the 'last a good sermon'.

[30] *DNB*, xii, 816.

[31] (London, 1828).

[32] *DNB*, xii, 816.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Hempton, 'Evangelicalism', p. 185.

[35] D. W. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in modern Britain: a history from the 1730s to the 1980s* (London, 1989), p. 84.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with Samuel apparently always spoiling for a fight and critical of 'the present day of licentious freedom',[36] it would not have taken much to spark his interest in any worthwhile controversy of the time. Certainly prophetic inquiry was fast becoming one of those controversial fields, with a veritable explosion of interest as Maitland approached his mid-thirties. As early as 1826, he had joined the fray.[37]

Maitland's interest in prophetic subjects such as the 'Year-day Theory'[38] continued, so that by mid-century he was referred to as 'this second Valla' for 'having effected a partial reformation in the manner of conducting prophetic investigations'.[39] Certainly Samuel was a major player in this field, and his influence is perhaps easy to overlook if we concentrate only upon the Foxean attacks which followed. At the very least, he seems to have been one of the leaders in the 'futurist' swing of his day, especially with reference to the subject of the revealing of Antichrist which Maitland, unlike Foxe, assumed still lay ahead.[40] In this respect, Maitland appears to have lent assistance to the High Church position which aided the agenda of John Henry Newman and ultimately, helped spark Tractarianism.[41]

Maitland continued his exploration of prophetic themes during the early 1830s; but, as time went on, he appears to have become increasingly preoccupied with criticizing the labours of the church historian, Joseph Milner.[42] Numerous arrows were sent in Milner's direction, all with the intention of undermining his credibility. It would appear that Milner's appreciation for the orthodox, even protestant, inclinations of the Albigensians and Waldensians was a particularly sore point with Maitland,[43] and closely related to his interpretation of history and prophecy. This concern for the status of the two medieval sects was reflected clearly in numerous of Maitland's writings. Milner happened to be the unfortunate purveyor of what was to Maitland an erroneous interpretation. Maitland's contributions to this discussion included a chapter in his *Facts and documents illustrative of the history, doctrine, and rites, of the ancient Albigenses & Waldenses*,[44] and a number of related letters.[45] At least the promoters of Foxe could take comfort in the knowledge

[36] Maitland, *Essays on subjects connected with the reformation in England* (London, 1849), p. 21.

[37] In this year he published *An enquiry into the grounds on which the prophetic period of Daniel and St. John, has been supposed to consist of 1260 years* (London, 1826).

[38] *DNB*, XII, 816.

[39] Charles Maitland, *The apostles' school of prophetic interpretation: with its history down to the present time* (London, 1849), p. 394. Cf. the reference to Charles and S. R. Maitland in V. Norskov Olsen, *John Foxe and the Elizabethan church* (Berkeley, 1973), p. 92. Olsen states that the two Maitlands were not related, though he cites no source for the claim.

[40] See S. R. Maitland's *An attempt to elucidate the prophecies concerning Antichrist* (London, 1830). Also, see Olsen, pp. 88–93, for his comments on Maitland's interpretation of the church and eschatology as compared with that of Foxe.

[41] See Sheridan Gilley, *Newman and his age* (London, 1990), p. 190. On Newman's awareness of Maitland in this field, see Olsen, p. 93.

[42] *DNB*, XII, 816. Joseph's brother Isaac was also deeply involved with the work. See *DNB*, XIII, 465.

[43] Ibid.

[44] (London, 1832.)

[45] See *A letter to the Rev. Hugh James Rose, B.D. ... with strictures on Milner's Church History*, 2nd ed. (London, 1835); *A second letter to the Rev. Hugh James Rose, B.D. ... containing notes on Milner's History of the church in the fourth century* (London, 1835); *A letter to the Rev. John King, M.A. ... occasioned by*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that they were not the first to be ravaged by Maitland's expertise in the crisis days of the 1830s when so much appeared to be at stake in terms of the nature and definition of the Church of England.

By 1835, Maitland had made two vital connections. He had begun sending regular contributions to *The British Magazine*, and had become friendly with its editor, Hugh James Rose. In time, Maitland succeeded Rose as editor upon the latter's death in 1839 after a brief fling at the *British Critic*,[46] and continued in this capacity until the publication's demise a decade later.[47] Over the years, Maitland used the journal as his primary instrument for communicating his understanding of religious history. Many of the articles which he contributed were later published in larger volumes according to themes. One of these, *The dark ages*, came out in 1844,[48] while *Essays on subjects connected with the reformation in England* appeared in 1849.[49] Long before either of these were set forth, however, Maitland had begun reprinting his stinging critiques of the new edition of Foxe's *Acts and monuments* which was being produced under the editorial supervision of Stephen Reed Cattley and with the assistance of George Townsend. The first of Maitland's major collections, which consisted of six letters originally sent to the *Magazine*, appeared in 1837 – a reaction to the firstfruits of the Foxe project which came out in the same year.[50] As noted,

---

his pamphlet entitled, "*Maitland not authorized to censure Milner*" (London, 1835); and *Remarks on that part of the Rev. J. King's pamphlet, entitled* "*Maitland not authorized to censure Milner*", *which relates to the Waldenses, including a reply to the Rev. G. S. Faber's Supplement, entitled* "*Reinerius and Maitland*" (London, 1836). I have seen a bound volume which contains all four of these works and two additional ones, with *Maitland's Tracts on Church History* on the spine.

[46] Ian Ker, *John Henry Newman: a biography* (Oxford/New York, 1990; orig. pub. 1988), pp. 158–9. Cf. *DNB*, XII, 818.

[47] *DNB*, XII, 816–17.

[48] The work is subtitled, *A series of essays, intended to illustrate the state of religion and literature in the ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries*. I have seen only a microfilmed copy of the sixth edition, published by John Hodges in 1890. For the date of the original edition, see *DNB*, XII, 817 and the *BM Cat*, XVI, 615.

[49] (London, 1849). Cf. *DNB*, XII, 817.

[50] Volumes II, III and IV were published in 1837, with volumes V, VI and VII in 1838, volume VIII in 1839, and volume I completing the project in 1841. As for Maitland's letters, Olsen refers to 'a series of thirteen consecutive articles printed monthly in the *British Magazine* beginning in June 1837'. In his note, he says that '[t]he first six articles were reprinted in a book'. This would be the collection I refer to here and have cited in n. 16 above. Olsen then cites but twelve articles in his notes and bibliography, it would seem, with the last evidently appearing in June of 1838. He also includes in his bibliography two articles from *The British Magazine* (hereafter *TBM*) published in 1843, again by Maitland and both under the title, 'On the Personal History of Foxe the Martyrologist'. See pp. 91 and 247 of Olsen. Mozley also lists the six-letter volume as one of several of Maitland's works which drew upon material previously published as 'articles in the *British Magazine* from 1837 to 1847'. He adds: 'But other of his contributions to that magazine Maitland did not reprint, and in particular six more *Letters on Foxe's Acts and Monuments*, 1837–8, and two articles on *The personal history of John Foxe*, 1843.' See Mozley, p. x. To compound matters, however, Townsend affirmed to the editor of *TBM* in January of 1842 that Maitland 'has republished … the last Six Letters of a series of twelve … which were originally given to the world in the years 1837 and 1838, in the pages of your Magazine'. Townsend also gives a brief account of each one of these '*Six more Letters*'. The matter would appear to be settled by the inclusion of the title, *Six more letters*, in a list of Maitland's publications given in his *Notes on the contributions of the Rev. George Townsend, M.A. Prebendary of Durham, &c. to the new edition of Fox's martyrology*, 3

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the edition was not completed until 1841, and Maitland marked the occasion with another well-timed assault between 1841 and 1842 with Townsend as the chief target.[51]

Needless to say, these were also crucial years in the development of the Oxford Movement, and Maitland had to watch his step as editor of the *Magazine* and as an acquaintance of Newman and company, since in 1838, he had assumed the duties of librarian of Lambeth Palace Library.[52] The appointment is said to have been the brainchild of Rose, who was then 'domestic chaplain to Archbishop Howley' as well as Principal of King's College, London.[53] In addition, Rose may have been attempting to serve at the library in an interim capacity, so that the appointment of an ally to the post must have seemed ideal. Howley would have to have been convinced about the propriety of the move as well, since he issued the formal 'request'. According to one of his boosters, William J. Thoms, Maitland was resident 'in his own freehold house at Gloucester' when the position was offered to him. 'He gave up that, took a house in town at 200l. a year, removed his valuable books to London, paid a clerk to assist him two guineas a week, and received in return the enormous salary of FORTY POUNDS A YEAR!' Thoms was at pains to establish that, despite his appointment, Maitland 'was *not* stall-fed.' As if to close the matter, Thoms recorded: 'Not one bit of Church preferment was ever offered to him.' Moreover, Maitland proved to be just what the place needed whilst he held the office, publishing at least two bibliographic guides related to the earlier printed books in the library's collection and putting himself out to assist those engaged in research.[54] Ironically, a sincere testimonial to Maitland's helpfulness in this capacity came from John Stoughton, who

---

parts (London, 1841–2), following p. 103 of part III (hereafter *Notes*). Publication date is given as 1841. Although I have not encountered a copy of the book, I have read the additional six letters as originally published in *TBM*, as well as the two articles published in 1843. The first of the twelve articles on Foxe and the Seeley/Cattley edition appeared in *TBM* as 'Remarks on the new edition of Fox's work, and on the work itself, by the Rev. S. R. Maitland', XI (June, 1837), 620–25. Thereafter, they appeared under the heading 'Fox's acts and monuments' and were numbered from II to XII. They are found thus: XII (July, 1837), 6–13; XII (August, 1837), 137–44; XII (September, 1837), 253–9; XII (October, 1837), 376–81; XII (November, 1837), 496–502; XII (December, 1837), 620–7; XIII (January, 1838), 12–20; XIII (February, 1838), 122–9; XIII (March, 1838), 254–63; XIII (April, 1838), 385–9; XIII (June, 1838), 613–19. The two other articles noted by Olsen and Mozley appeared as follows: XXIII (May, 1843), 493–500; XXIV (November, 1843), 477–89. In between these efforts, at least one additional contribution was made to *TBM* by Maitland under the title of 'Fox's martyrology': XX (December, 1841), 601–8. Letters from Townsend and Cattley were published in the next edition: XXI (January, 1842), 23–9. These latter items were also reproduced by Maitland in the *Notes*, Part II, pp. 45–67. The controversy continued via correspondence in *TBM* from at least February to May of 1842, as further letters are reprinted by Maitland in the *Notes*, part II, 67–94. Finally, Dr Williams's Library possesses a copy of *Twelve letters on Fox's acts and monuments, originally published in the British Magazine, during the years 1837 and 1838* (London, 1841).

[51] See S. R. Maitland, *Notes*.

[52] *DNB*, XII, 817; William J. Thoms, 'Lambeth Library and its librarians', *Notes and Queries*, I, 4th ser. (18 January 1868), 50.

[53] Thoms, 'Lambeth Library' p. 50; *DNB*, XVII, 241.

[54] Thoms, 'Lambeth Library', p. 50.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

contributed 'An introduction, biographical and descriptive' to the fourth and final nineteenth-century edition of Foxe. Though obviously very much aware of Maitland's acid tongue and '[h]is prejudice against Puritanism', Stoughton had fond reminiscence 'of the help he afforded me in investigations I was carrying on' in his subsequent *Religion in England from 1800 to 1850*.[55]

Obviously research was dear to his heart, and Maitland must have found plenty of time to pursue his personal priorities, including the campaign against Foxe's esteemed place in the early Victorian religious mix. The job was clearly much to his liking despite the token financial returns, 'the duties just as light or just as onerous as the librarian was disposed to make them'.[56] Even his antagonist, George Townsend, had to speak of 'an appointment to which he was deservedly raised on account of his profound ecclesiastical learning',[57] although this did not prevent Townsend from attempting to drive a wedge between the archbishop and his unconventional librarian over the matter of Foxe and his work.[58]

Election to the Royal Society took place in 1839, and Howley honoured Maitland at some point with 'the degree of D.D.'.[59] But Howley's days were numbered, and his passing in February of 1848[60] meant that Maitland's as librarian were as well. There could be little room for a self-styled man with a shadowy relationship to Tractarianism such as Maitland in the household of an evangelical such as John Bird Sumner. Thus, Maitland experienced the fate of many a personal appointee, suffering 'ejectment' at the archbishop's hands.[61] Owen Chadwick sees the dismissal by Sumner as confirming 'the belief that he [Sumner] was partisan'.[62] No doubt the naming of Maitland's successor would add to the perception, as he proved to be none other than the very son-in-law of the new archbishop, Reverend John Thomas.[63] Retirement in Gloucester followed for Maitland, though it would appear to have been rather long, active, and at times, still very much controversial. He supported Thoms as *Notes and Queries* was launched in November of 1849.[64] He moved on to subjects such as Mesmerism and spirit-rapping in his publishing.[65] Thus, a full life was experienced by the time of his passing in early 1866, when Maitland was 'in his seventy-fifth year'.[66]

What was it about Maitland which made him go after Foxe (or any worthwhile object for that matter)? How do we assess his personality and its bearing upon his work? In the first place, we cannot assure ourselves that

[55] For Stoughton's introduction, see *The acts and monuments of John Foxe*, ed. Rev. Josiah Pratt, 4th edn (London, [1877]), I, 3–92. On p. 81, Stoughton refers to 'a critic, to say the least, with no prejudice in favour of Foxe', and the note indicates this is none other than Maitland. Stoughton's later study was published in two volumes (London, 1884), and the reference here is to II, 212–13. See especially the footnote here.

[56] *DNB*, XII, 817.

[57] Townsend, 'Preliminary dissertation', in *A&M*, I, 279.

[58] Ibid. pp. 283–4.

[59] *DNB*, XII, 817.

[60] *DNB*, X, 129.

[61] Edmund Beckett Denison, *The life of John Lonsdale bishop of Lichfield* (London, 1869), p. 186.

[62] Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian church*, part I (London, 1966), p. 453.

[63] Thoms, 'Lambeth Library', p. 50.

[64] *DNB*, XII, 817; *DNB*, XIX, 711.

[65] See S. R. Maitland, *Illustrations and enquiries relating to mesmerism*, part I (London, 1849), and *Superstition and science: an essay* (London, 1855) – hereafter *Superstition*.

[66] *DNB*, XII, 817.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Maitland was likeable. Although his *Dictionary of national biography* entry testified to his accessibility 'to young students, whom he was always glad to help and advise',[67] and although Thoms could expect to 'be readily pardoned for boasting that this distinguished scholar and excellent man honoured him with his friendship',[68] still there can be no assuming that here was a man who exuded personal warmth or possessed an attractive personality. One can certainly imagine Maitland taking pains to share his vast knowledge with others, but deep down there is always the suspicion that we are dealing with a rather nasty man who enjoys roasting his enemies over a spit. He gave the impression of being meticulous with detail: he clearly became intimidating when engaged in controversy with his penchant for precision, even pickiness to the point of smallness. And one cannot escape the feeling that the first thing Maitland is at pains to disclose when beginning his polemical pieces is precisely what he is *not* writing about![69] In the process, he is certainly credible enough for the most part, but peculiar and somewhat eccentric too. His orderly, almost litigious, manner makes him appear cranky, except when enjoying a joke at the expense of his foe. Certainly, then, there was an arrogance associated with his tone. He would not easily admit to being wrong – perhaps the hallmark of the consummate politician. One anonymous opponent referred to 'the learned and not unfrequently polemical Doctor'.[70] Cattley obviously had Maitland in mind when he spoke of 'those critics who are more witty than wise, more sarcastic than just'.[71] In a specific focus on Maitland, Cattley continued:

> No sooner does this able but uncourteous scholar perceive a writer of sentiments uncongenial with his own, fairly afloat in the troublous whirlpool of literature, and struggling against difficulties, than he takes his station upon the banks, and away goes one of his well-directed and unfriendly missiles.[72]

Here, then, is Maitland the bully, preying upon the weak and vulnerable, always ready to attack instead of edify. Even his *DNB* sympathizer had to admit a proclivity to contention, but he also saw a silver lining:

> But by this time [c. early 1830s] it began to be felt that he was an antagonist whom it was better to leave alone; and although he was not averse to engage in polemics, and did do so when in his judgment it was necessary to vindicate any position he had taken up, the last thirty years of his life were free from such annoyances, as ''unlearned and ignorant men'' had caused him in the first half of his career.[73]

As for diversions, Maitland was thought to have been something of a musician, was skilled 'as a draughtsman', had a printing press at his home,

[67] Ibid. [68] Thoms, 'Lambeth Library', p. 50.

[69] For example, see his 'Introduction' in *Superstition and science*, p. 1, where he begins: 'I [do] not propose to write a treatise on Superstition, or even to review and compare the definitions and disputes to which the word has given rise.'

[70] Clericus, *Spirit-rapping & table-turning. Remarks on Dr. Maitland's Superstition and science* (London, 1856), p. 9.

[71] Stephen Reed Cattley, 'The defence of this edition by the editor', in *A&M*, I, 488.

[72] Ibid. p. 491. [73] *DNB*, XII, 816.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'and tried his hand at bookbinding among other things'.[74] Though he married in November of 1816, there appears to be little more to say regarding his home life, or his relationship to his wife, Selina, who was the daughter of a church of England clergyman. One wonders, for example, if Mrs Maitland accompanied her husband on his extended trip to Europe in 1828. At least we know that she died before Samuel, as did their son, John Gorham Maitland.[75]

III

Although Maitland may have possessed a variety of skills and interests, it is his work as historian, and as a critic of Foxe the historian, which arrests our attention. In the course of examining Maitland's ideals, concerns and methods in approaching the discipline of history, we shall continue to learn much about his character and motivation.

According to Samuel's more famous grandson, F. W. Maitland, there were four descriptors which summed up 'the criteria for history properly taught and studied': it ought to be done 'well, conscientiously, circumspectly, methodically'. The goal is simply stated: 'that mankind should believe what is true, and disbelieve what is false'.[76] The same ideals were evident in Samuel Roffey Maitland, particularly the concern to uncover the truth. But how successful was he in maintaining the objectivity he required in achieving his end, especially when Foxe and the distasteful aspects of the English reformation were involved?

Maitland gave his own list of 'the three principal qualifications of an historian' during the course of his critique of the initial Cattley edition. Thus, 'the three characteristics which entitle him to be considered as an authority, are knowledge, care, and veracity'.[77] Conversely stated, one can argue that Maitland's list of deadly sins would feature ignorance, carelessness, and falsehood. Here, the ultimate question turned upon the right to be considered an authority, and not surprisingly, upon 'the authority of Fox' specifically, which had been defended (though not without qualification) by Townsend.[78] When assessing his other major source of aggravation, that being 'Milner's Church History', and especially the qualifications of one who should be involved in the study of 'real church history', Maitland gave a fascinating expansion on the nature of the task:

> He must be out at nights, creeping under the hedge and beside the ditch, in darkness and dirt, to catch the glow-worm – or, to speak plainly, he must toil through much that is useless, worthless, and repulsive – much offence to taste, logic, and common sense; much ignorance, and much superstition – he must be strong in mind, in body, and in purpose – his daily task must be "the reading that was never read;" and half his books what where [sic] not thought worth printing – he must tuck up his sleeves, and bid defiance to dirt, and dog-latin, and all the tricks of monkish penmanship – he must have free access to old and large libraries, and full permission to ransack their stores

[74] Ibid. p. 817. [75] Ibid. pp. 815–17. [76] Elton, *F. W. Maitland*, p. 100.
[77] S. R. Maitland, *Notes*, part III, p. 16. [78] Ibid. pp. 15–16.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

– and he must *not* (however useful and honourable those employments may be, *he* must not) write basketfuls of sermons, and spend six hours a day in teaching greek and latin.[79]

When it was Townsend's turn to consider Maitland's qualifications to engage the revered martyrologist, he had to admit that they were considerable if not overwhelming. With reference to Maitland's own criteria, Townsend remarked: 'He has the patience, the zeal, the knowledge he thus deems requisite'. And of course, there was his opportunity to make full use of the resources at Lambeth Palace Library.[80] Townsend felt that if he could show the concerns about Foxe from the formidable Maitland to be unfounded, it would serve as the vindication he so earnestly sought.[81] In other words, no other critic need be taken seriously, since Maitland was in a class all by himself.

But, of course, Townsend could defend Foxe all he liked and Maitland would not have been satisfied. Foxe represented the epitome of the very qualities which Maitland most despised in a scholar. This litany of shortcomings included misrepresentation, carelessness, ignorance and, almost worst of all, an extreme spirit of partisanship. Not only did Foxe display a propensity to manufacture martyrs with the greatest of ease,[82] but also it appeared 'that Fox's taste for perusing ancient monuments often led him to get hold of what he did not understand, and therefore misconceived, and misrepresented'. Furthermore, Maitland referred to 'that carelessness which … greatly detracts from the authority of a writer', and 'the practical effect of this careless mode of writing history'. Following another alleged example of Foxe's culpability, Maitland comments:

> But so it is that history is defaced by ignorance and party spirit; and when it has done its miserable work, there is sure to be more ignorance, and more party spirit, ready to come out and vouch for it.[83]

Or, as F. W. Maitland put it, 'If we try to make history the handmaid of dogma she will soon cease to be history.'[84] Perhaps Frederic William Maitland lived up to his ideal. But we have yet to establish whether it can be affirmed of his grandfather; perhaps he castigated Foxe for his partisanship while merrily pursuing his own biases. But before a further consideration of

[79] S. R. Maitland, *Facts and documents illustrative of the history, doctrine, and rites, of the ancient Albigenses & Waldenses* (London, 1832), pp. 47–9. The references at the end of the quotation to such things as extensive composition of sermons and teaching school are made with Milner in mind. See Maitland's n. 5, pp. 49–50.

[80] Townsend, 'Preliminary dissertation', in *A&M*, I, 285. [81] See ibid. 280, 284.

[82] Maitland once commented: '… a main part of the controversy about the value of Fox's work has turned upon the charge that he could "make a martyr" with too great facility….' See the footnote in the eighth of Maitland's articles in *TBM*, XIII, 14.

[83] S. R. Maitland, *Notes*, III, 8, 11. In another place, Maitland referred disparagingly to 'the "never-mind" style of history' (*TBM*, XIII, 259), which Foxe and his devotees undoubtedly had adopted. A little later in the same piece, he continued: '… the only way to account for a good deal in Fox's work is to suppose … that in writing some parts, he had no idea what he had said in others.' (p. 262). [84] Quoted in Elton, *F. W. Maitland*, p. 21.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Maitland's affiliation with causes and parties (such as Tractarianism), we must look more deeply at his claims to be the defender of truth.

First of all, it goes without saying that Maitland is not unique for professing his allegiance to the pursuit of truth and objectivity. It was said, for example, that a contemporary of Maitland, Francis W. Newman, 'through all his changes of opinions sought the truth with singleness of heart'.[85] Where he wound up after his search is, like almost everything else, a matter of debate. Meanwhile, his more famous brother, John Henry, may have been something of an exception, if it is correct to say that '[h]e was always in quest, not of the truth, but of the best system'.[86] Then again, perhaps he was simply more honest than most of his day. At any rate, claiming to want the truth and nothing but was not uncommon in the nineteenth century. Even William Eusebius Andrews, possibly the most vociferous critic of Foxe since Robert Parsons,[87] began the renewed onslaught in the nineteenth century with a tirade in which he asserted his 'desire ... to elucidate TRUTH, the WHOLE TRUTH, and NOTHING BUT THE TRUTH!'.[88] So one could be forgiven for being somewhat sceptical amidst all of the cries for objectivity.

And yet there is something genuinely convincing in Maitland's appeal. Throughout many of his works, he exhibits a profound, consistent indignation towards charlatans in the field of scholarship. This aggravates him no end. Writing in 1837 at the launching of his series of examinations concerning Foxe, he looked forward to a time when 'readers may see how they are hoaxed by ignorant pretenders, and ... even some of the pretenders themselves may become ashamed of the nonsense which they have been led to write, by relying on modern authorities, which have misled them'.[89] He obviously viewed himself as an agent called upon to lay bare as many errors and falsehoods as possible, 'being convinced that one of the most likely ways to lead men to sound and really useful knowledge respecting the History of the Church of Christ, is to shew them how grossly they are imposed on by popular statements'.[90]

By the time the Cattley/Seeley edition had been completed, Maitland was cautiously optimistic that the task of exposing shoddy workmanship was beginning to bear fruit. But, he served notice that it was a situation which required ongoing attention; clearly he was still the man to take charge, and the Seeley experience with Foxe was serving as an important example of how not to proceed:

> I propose to put the public, and in particular the members of the Christian Church, on their guard against imposters, against men who know little and talk big: to check the practices of those who make a gain in money or in fame, by a pretence of learning

[85] Goldwin Smith, *Reminiscences*, ed. Arnold Haultain (New York, 1910), pp. 61–2.
[86] Ibid. p. 61.
[87] For Parsons, see *A treatise of three conversions of England from pagani[s]me to Chri[s]tian religion* ([St. Omer], 1603, 1604), 3 parts. *RSTC* 19416. The author is given only as N. D.
[88] Andrews, *Critical and historical review*, I, 13.
[89] S. R. Maitland, *A review of Fox the martyrologist's History of the Waldenses* (London, 1837), p. 11 (hereafter *Waldenses*).
[90] Ibid. p. 54.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which they do not possess, and who obscure and mystify truth, and put forth nonsense and falsehood, by boldly meddling with what they do not understand. In this I trust that something has been already effected; and I have no doubt that the helot-like example of the new edition of Fox has tended to increase and preserve the sobriety of editors, and produced greater accuracy and value in more than one book which has been recently published.[91]

Here indeed is vintage Maitland, where he provides deep insight into his perceptions and motivation: he is concerned for the unsuspecting members of the Christian household of faith who are preyed upon by unscrupulous, self-proclaimed experts. He seems particularly upset by false pretences – by those who engage in this kind of noble work without adequate qualification. The end result is, of course, error. But the redeeming feature could prove to be the self-correction stimulated by the Foxean debacle.

In his controversial *Superstition and science: an essay* published in 1855 (which was long after his days at Lambeth), Maitland continued with what had become yet another of his favourite subjects. Amidst discussion of clairvoyance and spirit-rapping (not to mention 'Reichenbach's Ghost Stories'), he found time to denounce certain 'ingenious and abominable theologians and psychologists'.[92] His purpose in this context was to demonstrate 'how… an alleged scientific discovery that looks as if it might be turned to some account against what they are pleased to call superstition – is received and reported by some philosophers'.[93] Once again we have the concern for accuracy, and especially the effect which poor reporting may have on gullible, impressionable people. Moreover, there is the familiar questioning about whether the experts have really proven what they claim. This approach is entirely consistent with the spirit of Maitland's criticisms of the Cattley edition of Foxe. He goes on in a similar vein:

> My aim, and object, and earnest desire, is to do something (however little may be in my power) towards freeing men who are capable of forming an opinion on such matters of fact as are to be judged of by common sense, from the tyranny of empirics and pretenders to philosophy and science…'[94]

He feels insulted by 'very childish explanations';[95] he castigates 'the Zoist' for some 'graphic specimens of scientific simpletonism';[96] he scorns those philosophers whose message 'is, not "see and believe", but "let me *see*, and I will tell you what to *believe*"';[97] and, he refers to 'those for whom especially I write – I means those who have not taken the trouble to enquire what evidence has been given respecting facts'.[98]

Finally, in his remarkable essay on 'Bonner's Cruelty', he appeals to 'every man who loves truth better than party' in his re-examination.[99] Here in this

[91] S. R. Maitland, *Notes*, III, 3. [92] S. R. Maitland, *Superstition*, p. 14.
[93] Ibid. pp. 13–14. [94] Ibid. pp. 32–3. [95] Ibid. p. 39.
[96] Ibid. p. 40. *The Zooist* was 'a journal of mesmerism and phrenology, materialistic and radical sciences which often shared an audience'. It was founded by Dr. John Elliotson in 1843. See Diana Postlethwaite, 'Mesmerism', in *Victorian Britain: an encyclopedia*, ed. Sally Mitchell (New York/London, 1988), p. 499. [97] S. R. Maitland, *Superstition*, p. 55. [98] Ibid. p. 61.
[99] See 'Essay XX', in Maitland, *Essays*, pp. 406–576. The reference here is from p. 574.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

concern for 'truth' over 'party', we see once more the heart of Maitland's approach to the study and writing of history. And it is from here that we can trace the source of much of his grievance with John Foxe, whom Maitland views very much as a man of partisan, party spirit.[100] But for now we acknowledge that Samuel, like F.W., Maitland, 'all the time wrestles with specific and often highly technical problems of the past', apparently content with the continual presenting of 'intermediate answers' rather than the final word.[101] His mission, as he himself understood and stated it, was to clarify the issues which aroused his interest, and protect the unsuspecting from the manipulations of inferior specialists.

IV

According to Charles Maitland, Samuel's status as a 'second Valla' in his day was directly related to his determination to return to the primary sources of information, instead of following the time-honoured 'custom to quote authorities at second or third hand, or even to rend half a sentence from its context, with little regard to the intention of its original author'.[102] He was not exaggerating by much if at all, since Samuel was usually extremely particular in his use of sources. He provided original documentation in many instances, even to the point of inserting large chunks in the body of his text. Thus, his writings were often not aesthetically pleasing, but they would serve his purpose well. After all, there was a vital connection between a return 'to original sources' and the apprehension of 'truth'.[103] Well might he conjecture 'that not one in a hundred, or perhaps in a thousand of the readers of Fox's Martyrology will look to his authorities'.[104] Obviously, Maitland could not be ranked among those who were too busy or disinterested to check, though he let it be known that he had only hit upon the tip of the iceberg in his examination of Foxe's deplorable use of his authorities.[105] This weakness in Foxe, combined with a poor editorial job by the new editor, Stephen Reed Cattley,[106] appears to get at still more of the root of Maitland's concern regarding the *Acts and monuments*. True to form, Maitland was also aware that sources could be utilized to support the presuppositions and biases of the investigator. Thus, he begins his note 'On the authority of Strype' with the following analysis:

> It is so seldom that history is written without prejudice, and some purpose beyond the mere record of truth, that we must always be on our guard lest it should turn out that the authorities which historians use are over or under-rated by them. If we feel sufficient interest in any part of history to attempt its investigation, it is impossible that

[100] For example, see the first footnote, *TBM*, XIII, 385, where Maitland comments on Foxe's tendency to address doctrinal matters 'not merely as a historian, but as a partisan'. Later, in the same article, he asks: 'Why should Fox have been at the pains to gloss over the opinions of others, if he could not conceal his own?' (p. 389).

[101] Elton, *F. W. Maitland*, pp. vii, 54.

[102] Charles Maitland, *The apostles' school*, pp. 394–5.

[103] S. R. Maitland, *Waldenses*, p. 11.

[104] S. R. Maitland, *Notes*, III, p. 66.

[105] Ibid. pp. 66–7.

[106] Ibid.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

we should not wish to discover one thing rather than another. We must, when we find contradictions, incline as a matter of feeling (if it be merely a bare sense of comparative probability) to one side or the other, and it will be hard to avoid giving undue importance to the authority who says just what we wish him to say.[107]

Any historian with deeply-held religious views (to name only what is to many the most troublesome category) will know at once what Maitland is addressing in this comment. Indeed, it is probable that some sensitive researchers may have deliberately shied away from a field of intense interest for reasons similar to those given by Maitland. It has been convincingly argued that Butterfield, for example, had to avoid detailed concentration on subjects such as the reformation for precisely this reason.[108] The temptation to find that certain conditions were exactly as we would hope to find them, is best avoided by staying clear of the relevant territory altogether. But Maitland himself appears to have deeply-held religious convictions which inform virtually all areas of his life. How well does he resist the temptation to party affiliation in his pursuit of truth? In order to begin answering this question, it will be necessary to examine Maitland's circle of contacts. But before doing so, it will be helpful to make two further tentative observations related to Maitland's use of sources (both of which have a direct bearing upon his work on Foxe), and also to consider briefly his attitude towards languages and scholarship.

First, it is somewhat curious that Maitland, with perhaps a few notable exceptions, does not seem to have made as much use as one would expect of the Foxean manuscripts deposited in the manuscript room of the (then) British Museum, or, to cite another example, he does not seem to have made any use at all of the 'Letters of the Martyrs' available at Emmanuel College Library, Cambridge.[109] His concern with Foxe is usually confined to aforementioned 'ancient' printed editions of the *Acts and monuments*. Perhaps his duties at Lambeth kept him away from Great Russell Street, or possibly his aversion to Strype, into whose hands the vast majority of the papers eventually came, discouraged his further inquiries. Whatever the reason, it is something of a

[107] Ibid. pp. 97–8.

[108] See Elton, 'Herbert Butterfield and the study of history', *The Historical Journal*, xxvii, 3 (1984), 729–43. See especially pp. 742–3.

[109] I cannot recall any reference to the martyrs' letters at Cambridge in the Maitland works which I have examined. For details regarding these documents see Susan Wabuda, 'Henry Bull, Miles Coverdale, and the making of Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*', in *Martyrs and martyrologies*, ed. Diana Wood, Studies in Church History, No. 30 (Oxford, 1993). See also Montague R. James, ed., *The Western manuscripts in the library of Emmanuel College: a descriptive catalogue* (Cambridge, 1904), pp. 159–66, regarding MSS 260–62. For a situation where Maitland did make extensive use of manuscript sources, see *Notes*, ii, particularly pp. 135–44 regarding MS Harl. 590. See also 'On the personal history of Fox the martyrologist', *TBM*, xxiii (May, 1843), 498–9, where he refers to MSS Harl. 416 and 417. In the second part of this 'personal history', he prints a note by Townsend which includes reference to Lansdowne MS 982. Maitland has also relied upon an intermediary who evidently checked this source (which is given as Ridley's 'Register') for him, thus helping Maitland in conducting his research into the details of Foxe's life. Maitland comments that he was '… so informed by a gentleman on whom I have the greatest reliance, and who did me the favour to inspect it'. See *TBM*, xxiv (November, 1843), 479, especially the notes.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

curiosity, as is the impression that a disproportionate amount of Maitland's criticisms of Foxe is related to pre-reformational material,[110] while vast amounts of what Foxe would have considered to be the crux of the matter (that is, of course, the mid-Tudor and especially the Marian interlude) are often not given due attention. It is fascinating to speculate that if Foxe had omitted the long and often tedious early portions of his project and simply proceeded with the most recent parts he knew best, he might have escaped the worst of the criticism aimed at him by his greatest Victorian critic.

Secondly, while Maitland does get heavily involved with the printed editions of the *Acts and monuments*, he does not appear to have had much experience in handling the earliest editions. It is possible that he, like most practitioners, sometimes chose the path of least resistance and habitually utilized only those editions to which he had the readiest access. This would suggest the holdings at Lambeth and perhaps his own personal library. Once again, however, it raises a curious note regarding this otherwise fastidious scholar. In fact, it would appear to be one of the few chinks in his impressive armour.

In the 1837 diatribe regarding Foxe and the Waldensians, he relates that he has had 'access' to two 'old' editions of Foxe, to which he hoped to compare the new one of his day. These were 'those of 1596 and 1684'.[111] That of 1596 was the fifth English edition of Foxe, and ironically, the first one published outside of Foxe's actual lifetime. The 1684 edition was the ninth, and the final of the so-called 'ancient' ones.[112]

In a letter published in *The British Magazine* in December of 1841, Maitland asserted: 'I have not at present access to the editions of 1563 and 1570, and therefore cannot say anything about them; but that of 1576 is on my desk'.[113] Cattley later implied that Maitland could procure the earlier editions when necessary; in a letter of his own in the *Magazine* of January of 1842, Cattley addressed Maitland's exclusive reference to the 1576 edition when it suited him – in this instance, to embarrass Cattley on his lack of editorial prowess. Cattley's comment is clearly made with tongue in cheek: '… how singular that this should be the only edition to which Mr. Maitland should have access now, when there were times in which most of the early editions of John Foxe were on his desk!'[114] The specific context here is not particularly important for our purposes, since it relates (not surprisingly) to the account of a pre-reformation martyr given across numerous editions of Foxe. What is significant is Maitland's subsequent information confirming a rather narrow investigative base. He asked for evidence 'that I had ever seen any one page printed in the lifetime of John Fox, except the first volume of the

[110] For example, see his unit 'Of Fox's knowledge and care in regard to the translation of authorities', in *Notes*, part III, section II, 16–90.

[111] S. R. Maitland, *Waldenses*, p. 12.

[112] See Mozley, *John Foxe*, p. ix, the *BM Cat*, IX, 690–1, and the *RSTC*, I, 496–7.

[113] 'Fox's martyrology', *TBM*, XX (December, 1841), 604; reprinted in S. R. Maitland, *Notes*, part II, p. 50.

[114] 'Fox's martyrology', *TBM*, XXI (January, 1842), 29; Cattley letter reprinted in S. R. Maitland, *Notes*, II, 67.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

fourth English edition of 1583. To this hour I am not aware of having seen the second volume; but I luckily met with this odd first volume just after Mr. Cattley had begun his publication, the only copy which I possessed before being of the more recent edition of 1596.'[115]

Once again the irony is thick: though Maitland divulges the information to help his cause in an immediate tight spot, he risks losing further credibility as a thorough researcher. We must not be too hard on him in the light of such human limitations in which we all share, of course, but the disclosure is surprising. So too is the declaration in a note near the end of his letter that his 'information' concerning the 1570 edition on the point in question came via 'the Rev. F. W. Collison, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, who kindly examined the copy belonging to the University library'. On this basis, Maitland felt sufficiently confident to assert his belief that an alleged reference to this edition 'contains nothing but matter wholly foreign'.[116]

Then, in the final part of the *Notes on the contributions of the Rev. George Townsend … to the new edition of Fox's martyrology*, Maitland was busy checking up upon Foxe's translating skills. At this juncture, he confessed that '[t]he edition most accessible was that which is called the best, of 1684'; sometime later he managed to consult both the 1583 and 1596 editions.[117] In the reformation *Essays* of the mid to late 1840s, he quotes early on from the 1596 edition; later he confirms it is 'the only one to which I have at present opportunity to refer'.[118] While in the midst of another salvo fired against the notion of 'Puritan veracity', Maitland again cited the 1596 edition in a case and noted that 'some few particulars which Fox omitted in his later editions are taken from Messrs. Seeley's edition, vol. v.'. He did not wish to imply thereby that he was certifying 'the correctness of the reprint', and added: 'but the matter is so trifling that it is not worth while to seek after the very scarce original edition of Fox'.[119]

It would appear, then, that there were limits to the extent to which Maitland would go in order to check out his sources: perhaps he was mortal after all, though still very much capable of intimidating opponents. He was always eager to demonstrate his facility with Latin, as the long section 'Of Fox's knowledge and care in regard to the translation of authorities' amply shows.[120] He was frank (and wise) enough to admit that no one could expect to be a perfect translator: 'I do not believe that any man can translate a great deal, without at least a high probability that he will make some mistakes, such as will surprise himself' – this after claiming to have produced 'very nearly fifty separate extracts … within about forty-six consecutive pages of the new octavo edition' of the martyrology, all pertaining to Foxe's 'blunders'.[121] He also had some knowledge of Greek, but admitted in another place that he had

[115] S. R. Maitland letter from *TBM*, March, 1842, reprinted in S. R. Maitland, *Notes*, II, 78–9. [116] S. R. Maitland, *Notes*, II, 80. See also n. 109 above for a similar case.
[117] S. R. Maitland, *Notes*, III, pp. 74–5. [118] S. R. Maitland, *Essays*, pp. 2–3, 36.
[119] Ibid. p. 13, n. 5. [120] S. R. Maitland, *Notes*, part III, section II, pp. 16–90.
[121] Ibid. pp. 56–7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a preference for 'those editions of greek books which have a latin translation, because I understand latin much better than greek; and I am glad to use any means in my power to get at the sense of a language which I read with uncertainty and labour'. Though he had read Latin steadily over a period in excess of thirty years, he was self-effacing: he did not consider himself possessing 'anything like a critical knowledge of either language', and felt that his capability had sometimes been exaggerated by others.[122] Still, his modesty did not prevent him from expressing his opinion regarding the accuracy of some translations from German in *Superstition and science*.[123]

V

We are now in a position to make a preliminary exploration of S. R. Maitland's circle of friends and colleagues. This is especially vital to our inquiry in the light of his own stated preference for truth over party. Can we link him with one faction or another, particularly with reference to the great matter of the day: to join or not to join the Oxford men in their crusade to redefine the nature of the English Church? Did Maitland succeed in occupying the coveted *media via* while others simply aspired in vain? And what should we make of Townsend's assertion that Maitland had incurred, 'in spite of many eulogies, the contempt of the papist for his treason, and of the protestant, for his unreasonable folly'?[124]

At first glance we might expect a man such as Maitland to have no real friends or close associates. The overly critical bent in his scholarly activities put many on their guard. But then, Maitland was surely not alone in being critical during the Victorian age.

All the same, we can point to perhaps but one really close colleague during the 1830s – a lift-off period for many careers, including Maitland's – and that is Hugh James Rose. His life journey serves as a kind of preparation for Maitland, and furthermore, since he is a key to understanding Maitland's own behaviour during these days (not to mention the genesis of Tractarianism), an extended look at the final years of his short life is an absolute must before proceeding further with Maitland himself.

Rose's association with Maitland went back at least to 1835 and was related to Maitland's contributions to *The British Magazine*, which was very much in Rose's hands.[125] It is alleged that they were already close friends,[126] and it would appear that they remained so until Rose's untimely passing just before

[122] S. R. Maitland, *A second letter to the Rev. Hugh James Rose*, pp. 13–14.

[123] S. R. Maitland, *Superstition*, p. 15.

[124] Townsend, 'Preliminary dissertation', in *A&M*, I, 325.

[125] William Palmer later commented: 'I had myself the gratification of promoting in some degree the first movement of reaction in 1832, by publishing in the "British Magazine," which had been just established by a lamented friend, the Rev. Hugh J. Rose, a series of articles on dissent....' See Palmer, *A narrative of events connected with the publication of the Tracts for the times...*, 3rd edn (Oxford, 1843), p. 5. Rose's *DNB* entry gives 1832 as the year of the journal's founding by Rose (XVII, 241). Cf. *DNB*, XII, 816–17.

[126] *DNB*, XII, 816–17.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Christmas, 1838[127] – untimely, that is, with reference to the undetermined result of the discussion touched off by Tractarianism. Rose has been referred to as 'Cambridge's only serious contributor to the movement', who 'stood forth at the beginning of the thirties as the high churchmen's chief intellectual hatchet man'.[128] As early as 1821 he had 'preached for the S.P.C.K. in Brighton parish church', outlining the fundamental tenets of the organization.[129] In the late Victorian era, Church referred to Rose as 'the most eminent person of his generation as a divine'.[130] Though obviously 'a Cambridge man',[131] Rose was definitely instrumental in preserving '[t]he High Church tradition'[132] there. It is, perhaps, rather odd to associate Cambridge with the beginnings of Tractarianism, since '[b]itterly it was once said that Cambridge had produced Protestant Martyrs and Oxford burnt them'.[133] Then too, it may serve to illustrate the claim 'that Oxford adopted lost causes while Cambridge preferred discovering them'.[134] That we can legitimately associate him with the early phase of the Oxford Movement, however, is abundantly clear from the fact that the so-called 'first step' in its launch occurred in his Hadleigh 'parsonage' in late July, 1833.[135] Maitland was not there, and neither was Newman, since Rose later lamented the latter's absence in a letter to him the very next month.[136] Rose also confessed to being 'a good deal shattered and perplexed by the suspense and uncertainty' then clouding his own 'future movements'.

But this was not the beginning of Rose's contacts with Newman and his following. What appears to have been the first major incident could easily have been the last, though, as Rose and Edward Pusey became embroiled in a dispute concerning the state of German theology in the mid to late twenties. Earlier, Rose had spent a year in Germany for health reasons and had become sufficiently alarmed at the extent of rationalism to begin to pronounce against it upon his return to Cambridge. A series of related lectures were soon delivered and published, and Rose found himself under attack at home and abroad.[137] Newman speculated on the appearance of 'Pusey's book' in response to Rose in a letter to Richard Hurrell Froude on 11 September 1829.[138] It is clear that the question of biblical inspiration was foremost at the time. Froude commented in reply: 'I hope Pusey may turn out High Church

[127] *DNB*, xvii, 241. Cf. the dating given in R. W. Church, *The Oxford Movement: twelve years, 1833–1845*, ed. Geoffrey Best (Chicago and London, 1970; orig. pub. 1891), p. 71.

[128] Best, ed., 'Editor's introduction', in Church, *Oxford Movement*, p. xv.

[129] W. K. Lowther Clarke, *A history of the S.P.C.K.* (London, 1959), p. 150.

[130] Church, *Oxford Movement*, p. 16.

[131] Leslie, *The Oxford Movement*, p. 58.

[132] James F. White, *The Cambridge movement: the ecclesiologists and the Gothic revival* (Cambridge, 1962), p. 26. See also the recent excellent study, Peter B. Nockles, *The Oxford movement in context: Anglican high churchmanship, 1760–1857* (Cambridge, 1994).

[133] Leslie, *The Oxford Movement*, p. 57.

[134] Ibid.

[135] Church, *Oxford Movement*, p. 69.

[136] 'Rev. H. J. Rose to Rev. J. H. Newman', 20 August 1833, in *Letters and correspondence of John Henry Newman during his life in the English church*, ed. Anne Mozley (New York, 1911), i, 390. Hereafter, all references to Mozley are to Anne Mozley, and are from either vol. i or ii of this publication.

[137] *DNB*, xvii, 240.

[138] Mozley, *Letters*, i, 186–7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

after all'.[139] In the following year, a correspondent of Newman's referred to Rose's 'scrape' – presumably with Pusey – and some 'interest' it was generating. He went on:

> ... I know hardly anything about the matter, except that I wish somebody would be so good as to convince me that he is a very first-rate man, because I find it mighty inconvenient to stir among Cambridge men and not to think him so. But let him be what he may in this respect, from all that is said it seems he will be a bishop before long, and so, I hope, he is all I am told he is.

To this Newman added a notation of his own:

> Here Rickards wrote hastily. I am a bad hand at criticising men, but the admiration and love I had for Rose were inspired, I think, by his elevation of mind, his unflagging zeal, his keen appreciation of what was noble and saintly, his insight into character, and his vigorous eloquence.[140]

Though Pusey was advised at one point 'not to attempt to vindicate' himself in his 'book against Mr. Rose's censures',[141] the contention continued until 1832. On 2 June, Newman (who for some time had been 'engaged to Mr. Rose for a succession of works')[142] evidently met Rose for the first time at the residence of Reverend William Palmer of Worcester College, whom Rose was visiting at Oxford. The purpose of Rose's mission to Oxford, it would appear, was to locate men who would contribute to *The British Magazine*, which he had established in 1832.[143] On the next day, Newman and Pusey went to see Rose. According to Newman's entry in his 'Chronological Notes', '[t]his was the termination of their quarrel about German writers'.[144] Thus, Rose was not afraid to engage in disputation, even taking on the young Pusey who, to at least one observer, appeared 'the embodiment of his favourite doctrine, the irremissibility of post-baptismal sin'.[145] According to Peter Toon, Rose 'believed that too much was made by Pusey of the effects of post-baptismal sin',[146] though this was evidently not the primary issue in the squabble just concluded.

On the 3rd of June, Rose was on display once more, this time for Newman and Froude, followed by Newman and C. A. Ogilvie on the 6th.[147] Clearly there were important evaluations being made; for his part, Rose commented to Palmer on not having 'spent so delightful a week for many years'. He continued:

[139] Ibid. 187.
[140] 'Rev. S. Rickards to Rev. J. H. Newman', 26 May 1830, in Mozley, *Letters*, I, 200.
[141] Lambeth Palace Library, MS 1562, fo. 28r. E. B. Pusey to Joshua Watson, 6 May [1830]. My thanks are owed to the deputy librarian, Melanie Barber, for sending me a copy of this interesting letter. Cf. E. G. W. Bill, *A catalogue of manuscripts in Lambeth Palace Library: mss. 1222–1860* (Oxford, 1972), p. 177.
[142] J. H. Newman 'To His Sister H. E. N. (At Stowlangloft)', 16 October 1831, Mozley, *Letters*, I, 220.
[143] *DNB*, XVII, 241. See n. 125 above.
[144] Mozley, *Letters*, I, 229.
[145] Smith, *Reminiscences*, p. 62.
[146] Peter Toon, *Evangelical theology, 1833–1856: a response to Tractarianism* (London, 1979), p. 26.
[147] Mozley, *Letters*, I, 229–30.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

…I derived the very highest gratification which such times as these admit, from seeing such a body of learned, powerful and high-minded men as I had the good fortune, through your kindness, to meet at Oxford.[148]

The opinions of the Oxford men concerning Rose were not to be quite so conclusive. In particular, Hurrell Froude, who, along with Palmer and Arthur Philip Perceval, was with Rose at Hadleigh,[149] seemed extremely cautious about including him in the inner circle. In an update to Newman from Hadleigh on 30 July, Froude had affirmed that 'Rose has many good notions, and I like him much, but he is not yet an Apostolical'.[150] To be sure, Newman himself had been reserved about Rose almost a year earlier when writing to Froude. His assessment: 'Rose is a very energetic, well-principled fellow. I have seen a good deal of him; whether he is firm remains to be seen. I will believe no one till he has committed himself.'[151]

So the skepticism was not unique to Froude, though Newman seemed to mellow with time. Not so Froude, for as Newman reported to John Keble in early August of 1833, 'Froude wishes to break with Rose, which must not be, I think'. In speaking of the recent conference, he commented: 'I fear they did not get on very well at Hadleigh'. Concerning the Oxford strategy at that moment he added: 'We shall lose all our influence when times are worse, if we are prematurely violent. I heartily wish things may keep quiet for a year or two, that we may ascertain our position, get up precedents, and know our duty.'[152] This was clearly one of the pivotal points in the formative stage of Tractarianism, and Newman was hoping to keep his options open, including the choice of comrades-at-arms which could still include Rose. In his response, Keble agreed 'that Rose's Magazine must be supported – unless he actually rats, which I never will believe till I see it'.[153]

By the end of August, 1833, Palmer had some good news for Newman in response to a letter which Palmer had sent to Rose 'about the Society' then being contemplated. Rose had replied:

'…I enter warmly into your plan and feel that, as far as your description goes, no Churchman *can* entertain any objection to a Society the object of which is to disseminate right views as to the Church and the ministry among our less informed brethren. But I want more distinct accounts of your plans, and, if I had them, should not despair of getting sanction for them.'

Palmer went on to brief Newman that he had replied to Rose, 'stating again our two objects of maintaining the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession, and the orthodoxy of the Prayer Book against Socinian innovations'. He had also 'informed him that our plans are to publish tracts, &c., on these subjects, and make use of the press…But that on the details of our plans we wanted advice,

[148] Ibid. p. 230.
[149] Mozley, *Letters*, I, 379; *DNB*, XVII, 241.
[150] 'Rev. R. H. Froude to Rev. J. H. Newman', 30 July 1833, in Mozley, *Letters*, I, 384–5.
[151] 'To the Rev. R. H. Froude', 13 September 1832, in *Letters of John Henry Newman: a selection edited and introduced by Derek Stanford and Muriel Spark* (London, 1957), p. 56.
[152] 'Rev. J. H. Newman to Rev. J. Keble', 5 August 1833, in Mozley, I, 386–7.
[153] 'Rev. J. Keble to Rev. J. H. Newman', 8 August 1833, in Mozley, I, 388.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and should be happy to take it.'[154] Obviously the fully and partially committed were still feeling each other out. But as indicated, Newman continued to want to think the best about Rose. Also on 31 August, he wrote to another correspondent that *The British Magazine* 'on the whole advocates good principles. Rose writes very cleverly, and there is a knot of persons here who support him, – Keble, Miller, Palmer of Worcester, and others.'[155] By 9 September, Newman could confirm to Froude that 'Rose joins' the proposed 'Association'. It was hoped that he would secure 'high patronage' in due course.[156] In reply, Froude actually suggested that Rose be one of those approached about joining the organizing 'Committee'.[157]

It seems that Rose could do no wrong for at least a brief interval, with Newman responding: 'Is not Rose bold in this last number?'[158] – presumably a reference to the *Magazine*. In a subsequent letter to J. W. Bowden, he included Rose in a list of men who were 'more or less connected with us; all have given their approbation and names at least'.[159] In mid-October, after receiving 'two splendid letters' from Rose, Newman could announce that '[h]e goes all our lengths'.[160] When certain of 'the tracts' had caused a furore by mid-November, Newman told Froude how he had compared their labours to those of Rose's in response to criticism from Palmer: 'I suggested to him [Palmer] that *we* were only doing *here* what *Rose* is doing *elsewhere*, who nevertheless is a member of the grand scheme.'[161] Further proof of Rose's ascendancy was evident in Newman's 'names of leaders' supplied to Bowden at the same time: Rose appeared first on the list which also included Keble, Rickards, 'Archdeacon Froude, the Wilberforces', and Palmer.[162] In December, Newman composed a letter to Rose (which may never have been sent) in which he discussed various points of strategy aimed at keeping the twin-tracks then deemed to be in operation from colliding with each other. He was particularly concerned with 'the chance of interfering with the "British Magazine"'; hence, the need to be in agreement with Rose concerning the nature and format of the forthcoming tracts. He also wished to assure Rose, that the work on the tracts would not result in 'withdrawing writers, even ourselves, from the Magazine, as is evident … Accordingly we fancy we might sail out in our little boat without the chance of your running us down.' Even so, they would defer to Rose's opinion on the subject, since '[t]he Church owes so much to the "British Magazine", as the first publication which set up her standard when others shrank from doing so…'.[163] Newman, for his part,

[154] 'Rev. W. Palmer of Worcester to Rev. J. H. Newman', 31 August 1833, in Mozley, I, 393.
[155] 'Rev. J. H. Newman to J. W. Bowden, Esq.', 31 August 1833, in Mozley, I, 394.
[156] 'Rev. J. H. Newman to Rev. R. H. Froude', 9 September 1833, in Mozley, I, 401–2.
[157] 'Rev. R. H. Froude to Rev. J. H. Newman', 15 September 1833, in Mozley, I, 402.
[158] 'Rev. J. H. Newman to Rev. R. H. Froude', 18 September 1833, in Mozley, I, 403.
[159] 'Rev. J. H. Newman to J. W. Bowden, Esq.', 23 September 1833, in Mozley, I, 404.
[160] 'Rev. J. H. Newman to J. W. Bowden, Esq.', 18 October 1833, in Mozley, I, 407.
[161] 'Rev. J. H. Newman to Rev. R. H. Froude', 13 November 1833, in Mozley, I, 420–1.
[162] 'Rev. J. H. Newman to J. W. Bowden, Esq.', 13 November 1833, in Mozley, I, 425.
[163] 'Rev. J. H. Newman to Rev. Hugh James Rose', 15 December 1833, in Mozley, II, 1–3. A notation from Newman states that he does not know whether the letter in question was ever sent.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

appears to have lived up to his intentions: at the end of August, 1833, he reported that he had 'been writing a series of papers for Rose, called the "Church of the Fathers"', due to begin publication in October.[164]

But the waters became muddied by the Spring of the next year, as Rose apparently took exception to what he perceived to be the '*formal Association*' which had by then come into being. Though Newman tried to put their misunderstanding in the best possible light, the grounds for taking offence on both sides were established. Newman lamented: 'Really I am deeply pained at your annoyance.'[165]

It is likely that Newman was becoming annoyed with Rose by this point as well. Evidently he was not alone. Keble referred to Newman's task of 'appeasing poor Rose', and it is clear that Rose's workload was being fingered as the principal culprit. Keble's assessment was not flattering, though his solution foreshadows (unwittingly) the future role of S. R. Maitland:

> It is quite plain that he in some measure forgets from month to month what he wrote the number before; and no wonder. But it proves he has too much to do. It never *can* be necessary for the Church that men should do grave things in a hurry – can it? And yet he does the thing so very well, 'tis a thousand pities he should give it up. Why can't he take a partner?[166]

In addition to the demands of his positions, Rose, though not by any standard advanced in years (he would have turned 39 years of age in June of 1834), was faced with seriously declining health. Obviously, this contributed to his testiness, and the gradual loss of solidarity with the Newman circle. True, Rose had almost certainly never been fully accepted by the likes of Froude, but even so, Newman's remarks of 3 April 1834 to Keble come as something of a surprise:

> I cannot recollect whether Rose has committed himself to our view as regards the Irish Sees. Indeed I never thought he had a *view*. I never have reckoned him as in his opinions one of ourselves, so to say. I have thought him a man of high and ardent mind, keen lively perceptions, and ready eloquence, but deficient in the power of taking an accurate and firm view of any subject which was clouded by political interests and the influences of friends and superiors. Our view, whether right or wrong, he has not seemed to me to grasp, or to be likely to grasp. Doubtless if he was a good deal with Froude or you, he would *ex animo* take your side; then, when he got to London he would shift. I perfectly coincide in what you say about his inconsistency or forgetfulness; only I have ever taken it for granted… I cannot help thinking he (unawares) excogitates his explanation of past facts as he writes.

He concludes: 'Most probably; at least in substance. It is transcribed here as recording the feelings, &c., of the writer at the time.'

[164] 'Rev. J. H. Newman to F. Rogers, Esq.', 31 August 1833, in Mozley, I, 396.

[165] 'Rev. J. H. Newman to Rev. H. J. Rose', 30 March 1834, in Mozley, II, 28–9. The editor advises that this 'letter to Mr. Rose is from a draft preserved by Mr. Newman, the original of his letter not having been returned to him'.

[166] 'Rev. John Keble to Rev. J. H. Newman', 1 April 1834, in Mozley, II, 29.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Newman was still being careful not to lose Rose altogether, but it seems clear that a good deal of his respect for Rose had evaporated by this point. He traced 'his frettings' regarding the movement more to 'his occupation' than to the group itself, speculating: '… I am not sure he is not sick of the Magazine, and finds the Chaplaincy in the way of it.'[167]

So Rose was evidently having trouble keeping track of his work with the journal, though within a week Newman could exult that he had made some significant progress with him. Rose would publish one of Newman's letters 'if he can find it'. If not, Newman would compose it over again.[168] By this point Froude was suggesting: '… Rose is turning a Z again.'[169] Since 'the Z.'s' was Tractarian language for 'Establishment men',[170] this could not be considered a positive trend: but then Rose seems to have lost his way by that point anyway. Still, Newman reported in mid-January of the following year that he had 'seen a good deal of Rose the last ten days'.[171] And in early June, Rose sent an appreciative letter to Newman which included his plans for publishing (presumably as editor of the *Magazine*) in the near future, and solicited any help which Newman might venture to offer.[172]

So the channels of interaction had not dried up, even though it seems most unlikely that a complete meeting of minds (and affections) could ever take place. Moreover, this is the point at which Maitland had just begun to make a name for himself, and the reception which he was to receive from the Oxford loyalists is made much more intelligible with the example of Rose already in hand; for it would appear that Maitland was also much analysed and tested in terms of his relationship to Tractarianism. In the end, he probably came off little better than Rose, his mentor.

Like Rose, Maitland had a promising start. He wrote to Newman as early as April of 1835, presumably the point at which he was beginning to contribute to *The British Magazine*. His cynical vein was already exposed, as he commented with reference to Newman's suggestion involving 'Suffragan Bishops': '… I have no hope that any measure so rational and Christian will be favourably entertained by any numerous body of men.'[173] Before long, Rose was making supplication to Newman on behalf 'of the scheme for a Church history which Maitland has suggested'.[174] It is evident that a number of the group felt such an undertaking to be expedient, given the state of affairs then in existence. Rose himself looked upon an enterprise of this type in terms of 'urgent necessity', and we know that church history was a vital component of Newman's work on Arianism which figures prominently in his correspondence

[167] 'Rev. J. H. Newman to Rev. J. Keble', 3 April 1834, in Mozley, II, 30–1.
[168] 'Rev. J. H. Newman to Rev. J. Keble', 9 April [1834], in Mozley, II, 32.
[169] 'Rev. R. H. Froude to Rev. J. H. Newman', 8 April 1834, in Mozley, II, 32.
[170] Newman had used the term in his letter to Froude on 13 November 1833, with the explanation provided, presumably later by the editor, in parentheses. See Mozley, I, 421.
[171] 'Rev. J. H. Newman to Rev. R. H. Froude', 18 January 1835, in Mozley, II, 76.
[172] 'Rev. Hugh J. Rose to Rev. J. H. Newman', 9 June 1835, in Mozley, II, 95–6.
[173] 'Rev. S. R. Maitland to Rev. J. H. Newman', 8 April 1835, in Mozley, II, 86.
[174] 'Rev. H. J. Rose to Rev. J. H. Newman', 31 July 1835, in Mozley, II, 105.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

at the time.[175] Rose went so far as to say: 'We are perishing from ignorance.' He also made disparaging comments regarding a work by Short (obviously then in currency), concluding:

> It is really too bad to be destroyed by such books, and yet we deserve it if we do not exert ourselves. I am ready to give up my time to such an undertaking, conjointly with others.[176]

Not surprisingly then, Rose and Maitland were on the same wave-length. But how would the elite of the Oxford Movement respond? Would they be enthusiastically committed, or give but polite encouragement? Newman informed J. W. Bowden of the plans in early August: '... Rose and Maitland have a grand design in contemplation, viz. that of writing an ecclesiastical history.' Though there were no firm arrangements as yet, Newman could advise that they were searching 'for about a dozen men to divide the eighteen centuries among, and have asked Keble, Palmer and myself'.[177] Since there appeared to be a real possibility that the tracts would fold at that point, Newman could be forgiven for having other priorities.[178] Still, he appears to have written back to Rose with regard 'to the history scheme', and Rose kept the correspondence going with further discussion. The main issue was time: how could 'something tolerable' be produced in fairly short order, particularly since they were '*perishing* day by day for want of it'.[179] Thus, they had to look at the relative merits of working on 'some already existing book' (which could be done quite rapidly) over against 'original work', such as that envisaged in the suggestion of a team of experts. Rose obviously was balking at the latter, confessing: 'I know ... of myself, that in *history* I am never easy till I have full security that I have ferreted *out all*.' Then again, there was the possibility of somehow combining 'the two plans'. But the important thing was to get going:

> All that I would say, however, is *let something be done*, for the want is a crying one. What do our students, what do our clergy, read? What is there to recommend to them but Mosheim and Milner, and Milner and Mosheim? Yet does not every day's debate in Parliament show the importance of the thing, and tell us, trumpet-tongued, that as we sow we shall reap – that deserved ruin is the fruit of wilful negligence and ignorance of the history of the Gospel?

[175] See Froude's comments regarding his father's reaction to Newman's "Arians", in 'Rev. R. H. Froude to Rev. J. H. Newman', 31 July [1835], in Mozley, II, 104. This letter is also noteworthy due to Froude's reference to Newman's 'monasticism articles in the "British Magazine"', which contained some potentially explosive material. Froude saw little cause for concern, remarking philosophically: 'I cannot see the harm of losing influence with people when you can only retain it by sinking the points on which you differ with them ... What is the good of influence, except to influence people?' See Mozley, II, 105.

[176] Mozley, II, 105.

[177] 'Rev. J. H. Newman to J. W. Bowden, Esq.', 3 August 1835, in Mozley, II, 107.

[178] He received advice from Bowden on the need to '[m]arch off with drums beating and colours flying in a farewell tract, recapitulating your motives for publishing the series, expressing your hopes *quod bene vortat*, and perhaps alluding to future exertions. Make it appear that the work which you had undertaken has been accomplished, not given up ....' See 'J. W. Bowden, Esq., to Rev. J. H. Newman', 4 August 1835, in Mozley, II, 107–8.

[179] 'Rev. Hugh James Rose to Rev. J. H. Newman', 8 August 1835, in Mozley, II, 108–9.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

At this point Maitland's profile with the Newman circle appears to have dropped for a time, only to rise again at the beginning of 1838. The occasion was the resignation of J. S. Boone as editor of the *British Critic*, a journal which had concerned the Oxford group (and especially Newman) for some time.[180] Upon Boone's resignation, 'Newman made it clear that Tractarian support would only be forthcoming if the right editor was appointed, who would personally ensure the Catholic character of the journal.' Henry Edward Manning was offered the post but refused to accept it. Ultimately, the lot fell to S. R. Maitland, but only as a probationary appointment. He was to have a go for a single issue.[181] On 17 January, Newman's letter to Bowden included some scant details. Maitland had assumed the responsibility 'with a promise of our assistance; when I know more you shall hear more'. Obviously he was under a certain degree of suspicion, and his association with Rose, himself normally under a cloud, probably added to the air of uncertainty. Yet Newman could assure Froude: 'Nothing could be better unless he were under Rose's eyes, for he is going to live in town; but we must be quite decided, and if he will not put in our strong articles we must retire.'[182]

And so, Maitland was briefly in the spotlight. Newman observed him 'in a state half pleasurable half nervous – alternately soothed and startled, as a little boy being ducked in the sea, or a horse brought up to a post he shies at'.[183] True enough, Maitland did shy away. Appointed librarian by Howley in the same year,[184] Maitland dumped the project (following the single issue) before his assessors had time to dump him. According to Ker, 'he had taken fright at a forthcoming review article by Pusey, which would put him in an embarrassing situation with the Archbishop'.[185] Once again, Newman was in a fix, and the only way out was to take charge himself. Dr Mozley recollected: 'Newman only took it after others refusing.'[186] As might be expected, he was not enthralled with the prospect. To Mrs Mozley he wrote:

> I am quite sick at the thoughts of having the "British Critic," but there was no one else, and I did not like so important a work to get into hands I could not trust. I do not begin with it till the July number.[187]

And so Newman had Maitland to thank for an increased workload. But Maitland's stint could only have helped prepare him for greater involvement with *The British Magazine*. As noted, Rose's health had long been a concern. So too was the tone of the journal. In fact, Newman reported Pusey's intention 'to affix to his pamphlet the list of passages against Popery which have already

[180] Ker, *Newman*, p. 158. See also Newman's comments to Froude in his letter of 17 January 1836, in Mozley, II, 138.
[181] Ker, *Newman*, p. 159.
[182] 'Rev. J. H. Newman to J. W. Bowden, Esq.', 17 January 1838, in Mozley, II, 223.
[183] 'To H. E. Manning', 12 January 1838, in *The letters and diaries of John Henry Newman*, ed. Gerard Tracey (Oxford, 1984), VI, 187; also quoted in Ker, *Newman*, p. 159.
[184] *DNB*, XII, 817.
[185] Ker, *Newman*, p. 159.
[186] Dr. [J.B.?] Mozley quoted in Mozley, II, 224, n. 1. Cf. *DNB*, XIII, 1146.
[187] 'Rev. J. H. Newman to Mrs. John Mozley', 29 January 1838, in Mozley, II, 223.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

been stitched into the "'British Magazine"'.[188] But Newman's rather inconsistent attitude towards Rose took one last turn in a positive direction.

Rose was preparing to leave for a winter's reprieve in Italy in the fall of 1838, when Newman 'caught him the very day before he set out'. He wrote to request Rose's permission 'to dedicate' his 'volume [presumably of sermons] to him'. Rose had replied in kind; genuine appreciation if not affection garnished his words of acceptance: 'I shall consider (not making fine speeches) placing my name where you propose to do as a very great honour publicly, and privately a very high gratification indeed.' Clearly, Rose was not in good shape physically, referring to his confused state; but the gesture from Newman had given him a boost, if only a temporary one. By early January of the following year, Newman was writing of 'that most afflicting event – Rose's death'. No wonder he was so delighted to have contacted him.[189]

That Newman still considered Rose a comrade of sorts is obvious from a later remark: 'Poor Rose, or happy, that he is taken off just as the battle begins!'[190] Perhaps it saved Rose from developing a more strained relationship with the Oxford Movement than that which existed at the time of his death. It would appear that he shared many perspectives with the Tractarian circle, but always shrank from going the full limit. It is difficult not to see him in a distinct category all on his own, except of course, that Maitland was to a significant degree his colleague, if not disciple. Certainly Maitland was the most likely candidate to fill the void created by the loss of Rose in the early Victorian religious spectrum, and especially to succeed him at *The British Magazine*. But how would he fare on his own against the entrenched evangelical forces on the one hand and the strident Anglo-catholics on the other? Would he capitulate to either side, or perhaps alienate himself from both equally?

Though there are still many questions to raise, one thing seems certain: Maitland was a complex figure, even with reference to the distinctive traits of the Victorian age. For example, if we agree with Norman Cantor that one of the major characteristics of Victorianism 'was the tendency to macrocosm, for the big picture, for large-scale views', does this leave Maitland, with his penchant for detail, considerably out of step?[191] And further, if we accept that another 'feature of Victorianism was simplification and popularization',[192] where does this put Maitland with his desire to enlighten the reading public on the one hand, and his endless discussions of Latin translation on the other?

In attempting to make sense out of Maitland's attacks upon Foxe, not to

[188] 'Rev. J. H. Newman to Rev. J. Keble', 28 February 1838, in Mozley, II, 224.

[189] Both Newman's commentary and Rose's reply are contained in 'Rev. J. H. Newman to Mrs. J. Mozley', 9 January 1839, in Mozley, II, 247–8; see also *DNB*, XVII, 241, regarding Rose's movements in late 1838.

[190] 'Rev. J. H. Newman to F. Rogers, Esq.', 22 January 1839, in Mozley, II, 249.

[191] Norman F. Cantor, *Twentieth-century culture: modernism to deconstruction* (New York, 1988), p. 14.

[192] Ibid. pp. 20–1.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mention his peculiar relationship to Tractarianism, it may well be that he, like Rose, 'represented the old divinity of the English Church', but in the end, 'would have been opposed to anything that really tended towards Rome'.[193] True enough, it is difficult to see Maitland going as far as Foxe's earlier critic, William Eusebius Andrews, in asserting 'that the SPIRIT OF PROTESTANTISM is NOT the SPIRIT of the GOSPEL'.[194] Nor can we imagine him joining Newman in referring to J. B. Sumner as 'a heretic'[195] – even though he might have felt considerable resentment towards the man who replaced him with his son-in-law. Yet might not Townsend have had a point when he saw Maitland as 'the spy within' who weakened the defences during 'the hour of danger to the Anglican church'?[196] In taking this stance, Townsend was associating Maitland with the very trait he professed to abhor: the adoption of a partisan stance regarding issues, which in this case was concerned with the nature of the English church in the light of its reformation heritage. Thus Townsend threw down the gauntlet:

> I am defending the cause of the Church as our Reformers left it. I am defending a more perfect mode of worshipping God and Christ, than I elsewhere find. My duty, therefore, both to God and man, to my country and to the Church demands of me that I persevere in my humble exertions, till the plague be stayed; and till the apostacy and the treason, which have begun with the Tractarian at Oxford, and which have extended to the Librarian at Lambeth, be not only resisted, but subdued.[197]

Perhaps, then, Maitland was in some way guilty of trying to capitalize on that theological and ecclesiological ambiguity left over from the Edwardian and early Elizabethan stages, thus helping prepare the way for the revisionist flurry of the present day. This is a crucial point which requires further assessment, especially since Christopher Haigh has argued that '[t]he perspective and the method of the Foxe–Dickens approach have been undermined by the impact of "revisionism"'.[198] Though this triumphalism may be questioned, there seems little room for doubting that it was Maitland who came to be singled out for creating, or at least furthering, a hostile climate of opinion regarding Foxe which has prevailed in some quarters right down to the present day. As Rosemary O'Day reflected on Townsend, '... he, like

[193] Church, *Oxford Movement*, pp. 153, 71. Church was referring only to Rose (and in one case to 'Bishop Phillpotts' as well) in making these observations.

[194] Andrews, *Critical and historical reviews*, II, 430.

[195] 'To Henry Wilberforce', [8 May 1848], in *The letters and diaries of John Henry Newman*, ed. Charles Stephen Dessain (London, 1962), XII, 204.

[196] Townsend, 'Preliminary dissertation', *A&M*, I, 324–5.

[197] George Townsend, *Remarks on the errors of Mr. Maitland, in his notes on the contributions of the Rev. Geo. Townsend to the new edition of Foxe's martyrology. Part 1. On the memoir of Foxe ascribed to his son* (Durham, 1842), p. 23.

[198] Christopher Haigh, 'Introduction', in Haigh, ed., *The English reformation revised* (Cambridge, 1987), p. 2. Foxe's soulmate here, of course, is said to be A. G. Dickens, author of numerous reformation works, and especially within this context, *The English reformation* (New York, 1964).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Foxe's other defenders, made relatively little impression: it was Maitland's dart which reached home.'[199] The nature of this strike, which relates to Foxe's role as historian, prophet and puritan, is an important chapter in the ongoing dialogue concerning the essence of the English reformation and the nature of the English church. As such, it requires further attention.

[199] Rosemary O'Day, *The debate on the English reformation* (London and New York, 1986), p. 90.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X96007029 Published online by Cambridge University Press