

English Benedictine Congregation History Symposium 1998

THE BENEDICTINE COMMUNITY OF THE QUEEN'S CHAPEL St JAMES PALACE

David Baldwin, *Serjeant of H.M. Chapel Royal*

See note on p.28 about missing footnotes

IT IS A GREAT PRIVILEGE to have been asked by Dom Geoffrey Scott to address this learned company as part of Ealing Abbey's centenary celebrations. We are all aware of Dom Geoffrey's incomparable and unique contribution to 17th and 18th century Benedictine scholarship, and so any attempt by me to cover the same ground would do his great scholarship nothing short of a massive injustice. I hope you will bear with me, therefore, in an attempt to explore unfamiliar 17th century ground.

The drift of this address is that four areas of activity hitherto associated with Benedictine activity at St. James's Palace need shafts of light from hitherto unexplored sources directed at them to make better sense of what was happening at the time. The result of this examination is, I hope, to show that some Court Benedictines were reacting to hitherto unrecognised but mightily important challenges, while others have come to be credited with activities the origins of which can perhaps be equally well explained from an entirely different and unexpected direction. Our search will range from identification of ships on charts belonging to a Cardinal to the personal actions of particular individuals.

A Commons' petition of December 1621 sets the context in stressing two of the prime English anxieties which characterised the politics surrounding the issue of Catholicism, namely that it 'draweth with it an unavoidable dependency upon foreign princes' and that its form 'hath a restless spirit and will strive by these gradations; if it once get but a connivance, it will press for a toleration; if that should be obtained, that they have an equality; from thence they will aspire to superiority, and will never rest till they get a subversion of the true religion'¹.

Firstly, there is the matter of who and why were the first Benedictines appointed to serve the Queen's Chapel before its new building was ready in April 1626? Rather than dismissing as ill-informed rumour one or two curious references to their presence as early as 1626, this address attempts to reinstate the probability that they were indeed appointed to serve - and for a very particular reason.

Secondly, there is the matter of how and when the Confraternity of the Holy Rosary came to be adopted at the Queen's Chapel? The Benedictine from St. Gregory's, Anselm Crowder, is credited with having introduced it during Cromwell's England in 1650, probably, according to the renowned historian David Lunn, at Cardigan House in Lincoln's Inn Fields². Robert Brudenell, second Earl of Cardigan, was its Prefect there until its demise in 1681. Anselm Crowder was among those Benedictines appointed to choose the

¹ J.Tanner, *Constitutional Documents of the reign of James I, 1603-1625*, London, 1960, p.277.
B.Coward, *The Stuart Age*, Longmans, London, 1996, p.3 16.

² D.Lunn, *The English Benedictines, 1540-1688*, Burns and Oates, London, 1980, p.129.

six priests who served Queen Katherine of Braganza at St James's Palace following her marriage in 1662. He died in 1666. His place as Dean was then held by Thomas Vincent Sadler until his death at Dieulouard in 1681. However, the Capuchin Cyprien de Gamache recalled that Queen Henrietta Maria had established the Confraternity at the Roman Catholic Chapel in Somerset House as early as the 1630s, following successful application to the Father General of the Order of St. Dominic; and that as Queen Dowager she restored it after the Civil War and Restoration, again at Somerset House, in the 1660s until her death. But, there is a work at Downside Abbey entitled 'The Method of saying the Rosary of our Blessed Lady as it was Ordered by Pope Pius the Fifth, of the Holy Orders of Preachers. And as it is said in Her Majesties Chappel at St. James's - Printed in the year 1669'. This would clearly indicate that the Confraternity had been established not only at Somerset House and Cardigan House but at the Queen's Chapel in St. James's Palace as well. This address will argue that its establishment here was the result of a clash on the high seas, rather than Benedictine or indeed Capuchin influence as has been assumed hitherto.

Thirdly, we shall look at the relationship between Benedictines at the Queen's Chapel and the Roman Catholic Embassy and Papal Agency Chapels. This History Symposium will see the first airing of a theory perhaps best described as the 'politico-religious geographical migration' observation. This address argues that the establishment of the Queen's Chapels at both St. James's Palace and Somerset House, operating under the protection of international treaty, immediately resulted in their becoming the hub of Catholic activity in London. It was too good an opportunity for the Embassies to miss. Geographical proximity led to cross-staffing and political entree to Court activity. In short, no geographical location to the Queen's Chapel - no comment!

Lastly, we shall be taking a new look at the ministry of the Queen's Chapel Benedictine, Fr. Philip Ellis, in the reign of James II. For this address I shall be arguing that he was facing a dilemma hitherto unrecognised, and that far from being a tacit mouth-piece of James, using the Benedictine pulpit offered by the Queen's Chapel to bolster the King's position by renouncing the old claims of the Benedictines to their pre-Reformation lands and titles, on the contrary Ellis stood up to the potential wrath of James to preach this renunciation. It was, in short, to be a stance of bravery and far-sightedness over potential short-term gains in the face of advice against renunciation tendered to James and his wife a decade beforehand by a priest of a different Order. We shall end by taking a look at the physical surroundings of the Queen's Chapel in which these and other Benedictines served.

But we shall embark upon the journey in the year 1623 at what was formerly the London Palace of the Bishops of Ely in Holborn - but which since 1620 had housed the Embassy and Chapel of the Spanish Ambassador. This is, I hope, a fitting place to begin, since the Sanctuary of the former Embassy Chapel is lined with choir-stalls originally from the Benedictine Abbey of Downside and which then came via no lesser place than here at Ealing Abbey.

What follows now must be seen as occurring under the ever-present lowering cloud of the real, or perceived, threat of physical invasion³. That the threat and concomitant fears long remained real is best appreciated from the disposition and number of galleys and galleons and the readiness of Spanish Army deployments and resources in Spain and the Spanish possessions. These are detailed in an unpublished manuscript of 95 pages that has only just come to light, written by Girolano Soranzo, Librarian of the Marciana from 1601, and Venetian Ambassador to the Court of Philip III from 1608-11, *Relazione delle cose di magg. considerat, ne di di tutta Ia Corte di Spagna fatta nell'Anno 1611*, now in the hands of Richard Hatchwell of Chippenham, Wiltshire. This manuscript also lists the monasteries throughout Spain, the chief ecclesiastics, and the form of services held in the Spanish Chapel Royal, themselves based to no little extent upon Philip II's experience of Mary Tudor's Chapel Royal.⁴

Figures such as Robert Persons and Cardinal Allen became synonymous with Spanish attempts since 1588⁵. In the middle of the century Bishop Cosin proposed alterations to the Prayer Book, recognising this continuous threat by retaining the text of the 1619 Prayer Book's 'A Thanksgiving for Peace and Victory' but replacing its title with a prayer 'For

³ The oil painting 'The English and Spanish Fleets Engaged, 1588' English School, post 1588? National Maritime Museum, (BHC 0262) shows several Benedictine monks, tonsured and in habits, abandoning sinking ships, and a Jesuit priest delivering a rousing address aboard a galleass.

⁴ For analysis of the continuing threat posed by the Spanish Armada's capacity to support invasion of England and Ireland see: Wernham, R.B., *Before the Armada: The growth of English Foreign Policy, 1485-1588*, Knopf, New York, 1966, and *After the Armada, Elizabethan England and the struggle for Western Europe, 1588-1595*, Oxford University Press, 1984. Rodriguez Salgado, Mia, (ed.), *Armada, 1588-1988*, Penguin Books, London, 1988, pp.12-183, 206-285. Rodriguez Salgado, Mia, and Adams, Simon, *England Spain and the Gran'Armada.*, J. Donald, Edinburgh, 1991, and Maltby, W.S., *The Black Legend in England, The development of anti-Spanish sentiment, 1588-1660*, Harper Torchbooks, London, 1970.

⁵ For new research about the intentions and plans of Robert Persons and Cardinal Allen for the reintroduction of the Roman Catholic hierarchy following a successful invasion, in Edward, Francis, *Robert Persons - The Biography of an Elizabethan Jesuit, 1546-1610*, Institute of Jesuit Sources, St.Louis, Missouri, 1995, esp.pp.25-47. In 1613 the Privy Council went to the expense of calling out musters and ordering beacons to be made ready in case of a Spanish invasion attempt. See Gardiner, S.R., *Prince Charles and the Spanish Marriage 1617-1623*, Hurst & Blackett, London, 1869, Vol.1, p.⁷. In December 1627, the Conde Duque Olivares showed the Genoese Ambassador in the Alcazar six maps of England to show how the joint Franco-Spanish invasion plans would work. Archivo di Stato, Genoa, Lettre Ministeri, Spagna, 18th December 1627.

See also, Baldwin, David, 'Regular and Secular Orders and Confraternities attached to the Queen's Chapel, St.James's Palace, 1623-1688', Paper delivered to the Society of Court Studies International Conference on Chapels Royal, 1997. Typescript available from the Archives of H.M.Chapel Royal.

deliverance from Foreign Invasion', preceded by an entirely new prayer for 'Victory over Rebels and restoring of public peace at home'⁶.

FOUNDATION OF THE QUEEN'S CHAPEL

A small explanation as to how the Queen's Chapel came into existence may be useful before tackling the confusion which has reigned, among both contemporaries and historians, as to exactly who comprised the ecclesiastical establishment appointed to serve the Queen's Chapel at its foundation, and where the Benedictines fitted into its activities.

The birth of the Queen's Chapel – a Chapel at St. James's Palace specifically designed for Catholic worship – lay in the courtship attempts of Prince Charles (later King Charles I). There is much to dispute with conventional historians who have perpetuated the myth of Spanish marriage as the long-term objective of James I, symbolised by the Spanish camp at the English Court comprising such figures as Cottingham, Somerset and Lake.⁷

Going straight to the point, the refusal of Parliament to pass James I's supply vote in 1614 landed him with a debt of £680,000. The Spanish marriage option would bring him £600,000, whereas the French would bring only £200,000. The Spanish option would entail all sorts of religious conditions, though, and James dragged his feet, even appearing less than enthusiastic over Prince Charles's attempts at courting the Spanish infanta in Spain.⁸ As it happened, the eventual outcome was in favour of a 'Spanish match'. Sarmiento, Spanish Ambassador, had worked hard for the inclusion of the provision for a Catholic place of worship for the intended bride-to-be as a condition of such a marriage. In this insistence lay the birth of the Queen's Chapel at St. James's Palace – a project begun with the signing of diplomatic terms in the Chapel Royal at Whitehall Palace (there is a contemporary print of this ceremony) and Sarmiento himself laying the foundation stone in 1623. His reasoning is revealed in figures he supplied to Philip III of Spain concerning the religious convictions of the population in England. By Sarmiento's reckoning there were:

300,000 Recusants

⁶ Bishop Cosin's proposed alterations in 1661 used the text of the 1619 Book of Common Prayer, with 'directions to be given to the printers - in This Booke - Where a line is drawne through ye words, that is all to be left out. Wherein a line is drawn under ye words, yt is to be printed in ye Roman letter'. The Book itself is kept in the SR. Safe of the Bishop Cosin Library, Durham University, as 'Cosin D.3.5.?'

⁷ Archivo General, Simancas, Estado 841, Francisco de Jesus, 1 Sept. 2/12th 1604.

⁸ See Gardiner, 'Prince Charles and the Spanish Marriage', *op.cit.*p.30. It was not King James who pursued the goal of a Spanish Match; it was a Spanish initiative contained in these instructions issued to the Count of Villa Mediana, Spanish Ambassador in England, proposing a marriage between Prince Henry and the eldest daughter of the King of Spain, the Infanta Anna. King James wrote on the back of the 1615 Articles proposing a Spanish marriage, to the effect he wished to abandon all further negotiations. Gardiner argues that 'the internal probability is very great that they were the result of shock occasioned by the first reading of the Articles'. This involved the upbringing of the royal children as Roman Catholics, the suspension of the Penal Laws, and a public Roman Catholic Chapel together with the freedom of ecclesiastics appointed to it to wear their habits in the street.

600,000 Catholics who go to Church
 900,000 Atheists
 600,000 Puritans
 1,200,000 Other Protestants
 Total= 3,600,000⁹

Sarmiento's figures serve to expose the great quandary faced by all the Stuart Kings.⁸ On these figures, granting of complete religious liberty would result in dominance by the Protestants/Puritans, whereas the option of remitting penalties specifically against Roman Catholics by Royal Authority would benefit Roman Catholics alone. This was a no-win situation for Spain and her aspirations unless the English nation could somehow be brought round to Roman Catholicism by the favourable actions of a converted King and Council. Sarmiento thought that the conversion of the nation was possible if the King's conversion and that of his Council could be brought about gradually. In this plan the Queen's Chapel was obviously of significant importance, especially if positioned within a royal Palace.

Upon this understanding lay the actions of the Capuchins appointed to the Queen's Household in a purpose-built Chapel at Somerset House, whose mission from 1630, brainchild of Fr. Joseph de Tremblay, laboured to convert the chief courtiers. Ironically it was their very success that became their downfall before they could reach the threshold of influence which they sought.^{9,10}

⁹ Archivo General, Simancas, Inglaterra, Estado.2592, April 29/May 9th, 1621. Letter to Philip III from Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, after 1617 known as the Count of Gondomar

⁹ The Queen's Chapel Capuchin mission was strongly promoted by Fr. Joseph de Tremblay, whose actions in its support should be seen in the context of his simultaneous work for other missions at the behest of Propaganda de fide, viz: 1(24 Moroccan Mission and French and English missions to Quebec in 1632 and to Nigritia (Gulf of Benin) in 1634. See in particular the Provincial Archives of the Capuchins in Dublin which contain transcripts of Nicholas Archbold's 'The History of the Irish Capuchins' (the original MS of which is to be found in the Bibliotheque de Troyes as Cabinet des MSS., No.1103), his 'Evangelicall Fruct of the Seraphicall Franciscan Order' (Harlem MS 122, d.2, No.3888), Robert Conuley's 'Historia seu Annales missiones Hibernicae' (Cabinet des MSS., No.7%, Bibliotheque de Troyes), and Fr. Bernardine O'Ferrall's 'Little Notes for the helpe of my memory', concerning the English mission (MA Archives de Louville).

¹⁰ A goodly number of biographies of Fr. Joseph de Tremblay exist, amongst which are Parmentier, J., *De Patris Josephi capucini Publica Vita qualis ex ejus cum Richelio commerciis appareat*, Paris, 1877; Dedouvres, L., *Le Pere Joseph devant l'Histoire*, Angers, 1872; *Vie du R.P. Joseph de Paris du Sr. de Hautebresse*, Paris, 1889; *Le Pere Joseph Polemiste*, Paris, 1895, and 'Le Pere Joseph de Paris' in *Etudes Franciscaines* xxxiii, Paris, 1921 from p.78. There are also the anonymous *Le Veritable Pere Joseph*, which was a reply in the opposite spirit to the panegyric *Histoire de la Vie du R.P. Joseph de du Tremblay*, of Rene Richard. Archivio Segreto Vaticano, VA Inghilterra, 1071, 3A, Panzani, Gregorio, *Diario del Negotio dell'Inghilterra 1634-1637*. Panzani's notes on re-unification appear at the following page numbers entered in manuscript. They supercede the original foliation, now partly illegible and which differs in being two numbers back. See therefore pages 8, 14, 18r, 29, 38, 39, 39r, 47r, 48r, 49, 49r, 50, 51, 53r, 54, 58, 59r, 60r, 61, 62r, 63, 64, 65r, 66, 67r, 68r, 69, 70, 734r, 74, 77r, 78.80, 81r, 82, 83, 84r, 85r, 86r, 93.

What was going on, though, down the road at the Queen's Chapel at St. James's Palace from 1623? Here, Oratorians were at work attempting a different way around the problem. Rather than a head-on approach to conversion, this paper argues that they were working to the dictates of the new Papal Congregation de Propaganda Fide, constituted in 1622 to maintain control over burgeoning missions throughout the world as missions followed economic explorations and growing empires. The Oratorians at the Queen's Chapel in the 1620s, and their fellow Oratorians subsequently holding office alongside them as Papal Agents in the 1630s, appeared to have been working towards a very different objective - namely, that of bringing about re-unification of the Church of England with that of the Church of Rome.

In this context, then, it is not surprising that both critics and promoters of this enterprise should concentrate upon the actions of the Laudians/Arminians within the Church of England. Given that there appeared to be a move by the King to govern more through the institutions of the Church of England and its pulpits and Courts than hitherto, the objective of re-unification would wrest the corridors of power from the refuge provided by re-invigorated institutions of the Church of England.

There is no denying, for example, that Laud was offered a Cardinal's Hat on at least two occasions. Interestingly, Laud's response was not outrightly dismissive. But there are good arguments to show that many Laudians and Arminians were not prepared to go as far as re-unification. Again, as attempts at reunification were beginning to bear fruit and the notion was entering the realms of possibility, the reaction to it burst forth with such vehemence toward the end of the 1630s that the possibility of success became its downfall. The Grand Remonstrance of 1641 was one expression of this reaction. Into this context, then, were to arrive the first 'official' Regulars and Seculars appointed specifically and legally to the Queen's Chapel of Henrietta Maria in 1625 - and we shall come to these in a moment - although a few Benedictines, Capuchins and Jesuits were already operating within these shores.

With the French marriage option winning the day over the Spanish came the matter of who would form the new Queen's domestic ecclesiastical retinue and 'occupy' the Queen's Chapel, which, according to the new Marriage Treaty, was to be completed for Henrietta Maria. The original Spanish marriage contract of 1623, written in Latin, had been signed in conjunction with a series of secret articles drawn up in Madrid. These required James I to ensure that the 'suspension and the abrogation of all laws made against the Roman Catholics shall within three years infallibly take effect, and sooner, if it be possible...'. They also required that 'Furthermore I, Prince of Wales, oblige myself upon my faith to the Catholic King that, as often as the most illustrious Lady Infants shall require that I should give ear to divines or other whom her Highness shall be pleased to employ in matters of the Roman Catholic religion, I will hearken to them willingly without all difficulty, and laying aside all excuse.'¹¹

It cannot be argued that ditching this Spanish option and taking the French one resulted in any easier terms. Similar terms to the Infanta's, which made provision for the

¹¹ For the 1623 Spanish Treaty see: Rushworth, *Historical Collections*, Vol.1., p.89. Also BL. Add. Mss., 1927. The original marriage contract is in Latin. The Madrid Articles which were signed in conjunction here quoted from the text provided by Gardiner, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp.382-3.

appointment of Regulars and Seculars to the Queen's Household, were incorporated into Henrietta Maria's Treaty.

It is clear in reality that King Charles could not allow the re-introduction of the Roman Catholic episcopal hierarchy which would inevitably occupy a completed Chapel at this time. What happened to result in the Benedictines becoming involved in 1625 must have been very much tied up with the physical progress of the building of the Queen's Chapel by Inigo Jones.

The first 'official' Regulars and Seculars appointed to serve at the Queen's Chapel comprised 29 priests, of whom 14 were Theatines and 15 Seculars, together with the young Bishop of Montpellier. But barely four weeks after the Queen's Chapel at St. James's Palace was 'opened' according to one authority on 17th April 1626 (exactly 372 years ago to the day¹²), King Charles had issued instructions for the immediate expulsion of all of them, on the pretext of irreverent behaviour¹³. A Skrine manuscript, though, records a visit from the King's Commissioner to the French Ambassador Extraordinary, Bassoinpiere, with the offer that the Queen is to have 'one Bishop and twelve secular priests.. .all to be in French, and that the Chapel in the Palace of St. James's which was begun for the Infanta of Spain, shall be completed for the use of the Queen and her suite.¹⁴ This poses a puzzle, not least because the date of this visit was six months later, on Saturday 3rd November 1626, and would therefore cast doubt upon the the final state of the Queen's Chapel at the time when the King decided to expel the French; and it would support an argument that the King was not prepared to countenance the French Bishop any rein to celebrate at the Queen's Chapel when the possibility fast approached. Indeed, the young Bishop had complained about the slowness of building construction in relation to it. We shall return to the exact composition of the Secular quota a little later, but for now it would seem that Roman Catholic episcopal authority was the immediate issue. The opening of the Queen's Chapel was nothing less than the occasion for opening also the question of the authority of Roman Catholic Bishops in a Protestant country with a Protestant Church Established in Parliament. Rather than conspicuously picking off only the Bishop, King Charles, evidently chose wholesale expulsion as the only quick answer, with the added attraction of throwing out to boot the physical evidence of Richelieu's influence in this country in the form of her French ecclesiastical retinue.

FIRST BENEDICTINES SERVE THE CHAPEL

Whether the wholesale expulsion of Henrietta's French ecclesiastical retinue was the moment when the Benedictines first became attached to the Queen's Chapel depends upon

¹² The paper was read on 17 April 1998.

¹³ Birch, T, Court and Times of Charles I, Vol.1., Colburn, London, 1848, p.¹ 19. Lord Conway was commanded by the King to expel all the French retinue on Monday 26th June 1626, following the King's displeasure at 'finding some Frenchmen, her servants, unreverently curvetting in her presence

¹⁴ Cited in Sheppard, Edgar, Memorials of St.James's Palace, Longmans, 1894, Vol.11, pp.229-30.

conflicting contemporary evidence.¹⁵ Information from Pory maintained of Henrietta Maria's ecclesiastical establishment, following the comprehensive expulsion of her French Bishop and clergy, that just 'Two English priests she hath now allowed her, viz. Potter and Godfrey. Some add a third, to wit Preston. All three of them have taken the Oath of Allegiance; some say of Supremacy also'.¹⁶

If correctly identified by Pory there may have been more to the choice of these three Benedictines than David Lunn's famous pragmatic explanation for them – 'When in 1625-6 Charles quarrelled with France and expelled his wife's French chaplains, the only priests whom he could scrape up at short notice were the offscourings, three Cassinese monks of dubious reputation.'¹⁷

Preston was an interesting and politically important choice for co-operation between Crown and Cowl. Over a hundred years previously, Benedictines were described and illustrated carrying the Royal Canopy over King Henry VIII as he processed to the Opening of Parliament in 1512. Now in 1625 an opportunity presented itself for King Charles to resume the old alliance – and on favourable terms compared with the episcopal and hierarchical problems posed by the French retinue.

Thomas Preston was one of the first Benedictines to return to England, following in the footsteps of Mark Barkworth and, from Spain, Augustine Bradshaw (leader), Joseph Prater (ex-soldier who had not attended any College) and John Robarts, all of whom had travelled from Santiago de Compostella, landing in England around the 10th March 1603. They were witnessed on the way by an Irish priest in Bordeaux who observed that 'three Benedictine friars have lately gone to England, with plenty of money'.¹⁸

Lunn's discovery from Holy Office records of an earlier provisional licence for their mission, dated 29th September, puts out of court the presumption by historians that they jumped the gun because post from Rome to Spain normally took forty two days. Preston was in the next wave, leaving Rome in June 1603, in company with Beech, and reaching England toward the end of 1603. But he was of the Cassinese persuasion (having become a monk at Monte Cassino in 1591) – a stance in his favour when it came twenty years later to Benedictines, who were not tagged with the Spanish label, being favoured by the Crown.

It has until now been thought that no evidence existed that any monk ever met King James I. Yet in response to the Oath of Allegiance of 1606, devised by the apostate Jesuit, Perkins, Thomas Preston assembled his thoughts in favour of swearing to the Oath as early as 1609.¹⁸ Preston's Book in defence of the Oath came out in 1611, deliberately printed

¹⁵ Birch, T., *The Court and Times of Charles I*, p.121, footnote. The French Bishop unsuccessfully pleaded diplomatic status, and the King issued the following instruction to Buckingham, 'I command you to send all the French away tomorrow out of town, if you can, by fair means, driving them away like so many wild beasts, until you have shipped them, and so the devil go with them. Let me hear of no answer of the performance of my command, for I rest your faithful, constant, loving friend C.R.' Birch, T., *The Court and Times of Charles I*, pp.122-3

¹⁶ Another contemporary account records that those chosen to replace the French were the Benedictines, Thomas Preston, Michael Godfrey and David Codner (alias Savage). Common to these two accounts were Godfrey and Preston.

¹⁷ Lunn, David, *The English Benedictines 1540-1688*, Burns & Qates, 1980, p.123.

¹⁸ Domestic State Paper, 1603, quoted by Lunn, p.26.

with the misleading title *Apologia Cardinalis Bellarmini pro Jure Principium* under the assumed name Roger Widdrington, and under a false imprint 'Cosmopoli, apud Theophilum Pratum', complete with the Jesuit emblem, thereby giving the impression that it had been produced abroad by the Jesuits. It was, in fact, printed by the Government in London.¹⁹

But more than this, King James wanted to insert some passages of his own, according to the Venetian Ambassador, but was refused by the author – i.e. Preston. If correct, for the King, a letter which has not survived expressing this desire, or an intermediary, must have been involved at this time.

Whatever the arrangement was, historians agree that Preston was operating from the Clink Prison where he was to be confined for nigh on forty years! Certainly King James commented of Preston in relation to hostile Catholic authorities that 'Of my saul, for his awne gude, For if they had him they would burn him'.²⁰ Although Preston used the name Widdrington, the latter was a real figure, related to Preston by marriage, who kept a chaplain who defended Preston's stance on the Oath, as well as carrying Preston's books abroad for dissemination. It is true, too, that when cited in 1625 for serious recusancy, Widdrington mentioned in mitigation 'the defence and opposition he made from time to time, both by writing and otherwise, against the dangerous position of the adversaries of His Majesty's government in causes temporal'.²¹ This vague allusion may indicate that he at least collaborated with Preston on the *Apologia*? Widdrington was, too, a friend of Lord William Howard – to whom we shall turn presently.

Coming forward, then, to the possibility or likelihood of Preston being appointed to serve at the Queen's Chapel in 1625 following the mass expulsion of the French and their young Bishop, we have to grapple with the matter of Preston's confinement to the Clink. In short, was he confined as we generally understand the meaning?

It is misleading to equate committal to the Clink prison with geographical confinement to that place. The Liberty of the Clink was set in the grounds of the Palace of the Bishop of Winchester, impressive remains of which (including the great Rose Window set in the West Wall) were exposed in 1990 following the demolition of adjacent warehouses. A sketch by W. Capon drawn in 1828 looking from Bankside eastward along Clink Street, with Southwark Cathedral behind, gives an idea of where the Clink was situated, adjoining the Great Hall at its west end. Today, the Clink Prison Museum is situated in the vault area of the Great Hall, almost on the original site, and contains displays which reveal not only the common 17th century practice of Catholic priests celebrating mass with books and holy vessels in spite of the presence of gaolers but also that King James I visited the brothel, known as the Hollandes Leaguer, which was also situated in the Liberty of the Clink nearby. He must have known of Preston's presence in the Clink, and so the rumour that they met in his Clink quarters to discuss Preston's Book in defence of the Oath of Allegiance cannot easily be dismissed as physically unlikely.

¹⁹ See Lunn, David, *Op.Cit.*, p.40 and note 21.

²⁰ See Clancy, T.H., 'English Catholics and the Papal Deposing Power, 1570-1640', *Recusant History* 6, p61-2, p.117. Ornsby, O., editor of 'Selections from the Household Books of Lord Howard of Naworth Castle', *Surtees Society* 68, Durham, 1877, p.10 note.

²¹ Jones, Leander, *Rationes contra factam unionem...*, 1614, and discussion in Lunn, p.40.

There exists the contemporary account of Joseph Creswell which observed of Preston that 'he dwells more at ease.. .than he could in any monastery of his order. He has a well stocked library, a personal valet, and a maid servant who does his cooking and keeps his quarters tidy. He goes out when he pleases, and I am informed that some priests who share his views and approve the oath go out to the theatre, and their prison serves them like a comfortable suite at an hotel'²³. Whatever the exaggeration involved in this description (which raises the fascinating probability that Preston watched Shakespeare on stage at the adjacent Globe Theatre), it is the case that his plight was never so pressing as to force him to apostatise, and he never had his faculties removed, and so he continued to minister as a priest. Whether this degree of 'freedom' would have allowed Preston to serve the Queen from time to time at the Queen's Chapel at St. James's from 1626 cannot therefore be so easily dismissed as a possibility, although Lunn **24** was of the view that 'In any case the Benedictine community at London may never have been formally established, for a new agreement was made as soon as the autumn of 1626 by which the Queen should have chaplains of her own choice, though it was not until 1630 that the new chaplains, who were Capuchins, arrived'.²⁴

Playing a key role in directing the Capuchin mission at Somerset House from 1630 was Fr. Joseph de Tremblay, mentioned in the Victoria and Albert Museum's Forster Ms as 'Le R.P. Joseph de Paris, Predicateur Capucin', who directed this mission from France in conjunction with the Propaganda Fide, but also others in Morocco and the American seaboard.²⁵ From the memoirs of Cyprien de Gamache we learn that two Oratorians retained the Queen's Confession and ran the day to day liturgical round at the Queen's Chapel from 1625/6 until the Civil War, literally in spite of the arrival of the Capuchins who were based instead at the new Chapel at Somerset House.²⁶

What then of the three Benedictines who earned a mention by Pory and others as serving the Queen's Chapel? David Lunn was of the opinion that 'the only Benedictine who established himself permanently at Henrietta Maria's chapel was David Codner, who operated under the disguise of a gentleman-in-waiting with the cover name of Matthew Savage'.²⁷ Codner apparently posed as an art broker for the Court, only to come under the suspicion of Van Dyck, who asked Codner for the opinion of an Italian expert in relation to attempts by the Cassinese, Gregory Law, in Perugia to sell pictures on behalf of an Italian art dealer. Codner is on record as having panicked, writing in alarm to Law that he would be utterly undone if he were to be exposed in fraud, attempting to palm off King

²³ Webb, W.K.L., 'Thomas Preston, O.S.B. alias Roger Widdrington', *Biographical Studies* 2, 1954,

²⁴ Lunn, David, *op. cit.*, p.32. For a vivid description of the Clink by an inmate see Weston, W, *Autobiography of an Elizabethan*. A chapter from this is reprinted as *Midnight In the Clink* by the Clink Prison Museum, 1 Clink Street, Southwark, 1997.

²⁵ See Note 9.

²⁶ See illustration of Superieur General de la Congregation de l'Oratoire, Fr. Charles de Condren, who visited all the Oratorian establishments. Other useful guides to records of Stuart Catholicism are: David Shorney, *Protestant Nonconformity and Roman Catholicism. A Guide to Sources in the Public Records Office*. PRO Kew, 1996, and B.Jackson, *Papal History and the Public Record Office*, PRO Chancery Lane 1993. This includes some of the Embassy correspondence.

²⁷ Ellis H, *Original Letters*, 1st Series, London, 1824, III, p.243.

Charles with a series of fake paintings. He was saved by the intervention of Arundell in 1637, who took upon himself the role of connoisseur – to which he had a genuine claim, as we know from the much noted British Library Cyprien MS in relation to his patronage of the great Dieussart at Somerset House. William Petty, Arundell's agent, was then assigned the necessary tasks.²⁸

Codner, though, had a record of incautious action in his student days in Venice, in collaboration with none other than fellow Cassinese, Michael Godfrey, whose name is mentioned as one of the four suddenly attached to the Queen's Chapel in 1626. This is perhaps more than coincidence. As a Londoner Codner had a good argument to persuade Bishop Smith to give him the faculties he sought in order to operate in London. Both he and Godfrey had become vagabonds in 1611 and were refused accommodation by the English Benedictines at Paris, Codner being cautioned by Preston as his Cassinese superior that 'You must e'en shift for yourself'.²⁹ While Godfrey was suspected of being a government spy, later going to Italy where he became a monastic senior, living in Rome until returning to England in 1626. Codner was to be arrested for his priesthood three times in 1631, his freedom being secured only by the personal intervention of the Queen. From extant details concerning the paintings hiatus, we know Codner was still serving the Queen in 1637.³⁰

Preston, meanwhile had become a temporary embarrassment to King James as the Spanish match negotiations hotted up, and Spain demanded a less rigorous exaction of the Oath. Gondomar, since taking up residence in Ely Palace at Holborn, was enjoying success in persuading English Catholics to resist the Oath of Allegiance, while Guido Bentivoglio, appointed special nuncio with specific reference to the question of the Oath, was enjoying similar success in Paris. On top of this came the demand in 1621 from the new Pope, Gregory XV, that Preston return to Rome. Preston had in fact submitted to the new Pope on the advice of Gondomar earlier in the year. But in order to enable him to avoid the expected wrath of the Catholic Inquisition, King James acted by asking Secretary Conway to seek Preston's wishes.

Preston opted to stay in the Clink.³¹ Preston lived on and was still alive in 1646³², when on 6th July two pursuivants together with a large number of soldiers burst into the Clink. They removed all his possessions, with the exception of a Latin Bible. Perhaps those 'possessions' were the 'six cart-loads of books' described in an earlier unsuccessful raid on 7th April 1626, at which time the Queen's Chapel had been open for perhaps just nine days and Charles was acting to expel the French and looking to Preston to fill the gap he was about to create at the Queen's Chapel.

²⁸ See in particular, Chaney, Edward, 'Thomas Howard, 14th Earl of Arundel by Francois Dieussart' in *Apollo*, August 1996, pp.49-50.'

²⁹ Lunn, David, *op. cit.*, p.152

³⁰ PRO, State Paper SP/16/149/57 and 79.

³¹ Confirms his presence in the Queen's Household. Domestic State Paper, 1603, quoted by D.Lunn, *The English Benedictines 1540-1688*, Burns & Qates, 1980, pp.26 and 123-4. PRO, State Paper SP/16/149/57 and 79.

³² Although his death was reported prematurely in 1640.

In the 1646 raid, twenty years later, the pursuivants not only took the books he had written in defence of the Oath of Allegiance printed by authority of 'the King and the State', but also two letters from King Charles commanding him to publish on the Oath and authorising his protection. Shortly after he caught a fever and died. His example could not have been more different, then, from where we began with the portrait of Cardinal Allen who, back in 1588, had re-issued the Pope's excommunication Bull of 1570 in justification for the great enterprise known as the Spanish Armada to win Catholicism for England by force.

There remains, though, a puzzling question – namely why, since there were by 1621 a total of fifty-seven Benedictine missionaries of all congregations in England, and with the number never falling below forty-six for the remainder of the century, was it so difficult to find Benedictines to fill the gap left at the Queen's Chapel by the French expulsions in 1625/6? It was not after all as though their whereabouts were unknown to the Court. King James, after rewarding the catholic Thomas Arundell with the title of first Baron Arundell of Wardour for his patriotic help amongst other things in fitting out an expedition of discovery to America, subsequently proposed him as Colonel of the English regiment in Spanish Flanders after blocking two of Spain's candidates. Arundell in turn appointed in 1605-6 a relative of his as Chaplain Major to the Regiment who turned out to be none other than the Benedictine Augustine Bradshaw. Bradshaw, though, was of the Spanish Congregation of San Martin, Compostella.³³

In 1607 at Rheims Bradshaw had met the recent Benedictine convert, Gifford, and also Leander Jones and Thomas Preston to discuss the way forward for the Benedictines now that it had become clear that the Jesuits had called for the total suppression of the Benedictine mission, quite apart from the long-running rivalries and issues thrown up by the Appellant Dispute.

It is clear, returning to the 1626 search for Benedictines to fill the gap at the Queen's Chapel, that they were chosen for the 'politics' of their religious stance. They had to be of the Cassinese persuasion so as not to indicate approval of the Spanish colleges who had a track record of enthusiasm for participation in Armada invasion attempts. This would have ruled out such as Bradshaw. They had to be below the status of a Bishop to avoid the imminent question of the status of a foreign appointee who might have catholic episcopal status conferred upon him and, in the manner of a Trojan Horse, demand diplomatic recognition of this at Court in the face of the Anglican hierarchy of the Established Church. If the chips were down, the candidate had to be one who would back the King's stance against that of the Pope or other overseas Benedictine authorities. In short, the chosen candidates would appear to live up to these conditions of religious *real-politik*. All three had gone out on limbs, to remain Benedictines just by the skin of their teeth. That record fitted the circumstances perfectly in the mid 1620s at the Queen's Chapel.

As far as the Queen and the Queen's Chapel at St. James's were concerned, if the Oratorians according to Cyprien were 'to serve her in the functions of the Chapel' and were 'lodged in the suburb of St. James' where does this place the Benedictines? The answer to this is the Liberty of the Clink at Southwark in the case of Preston. What of Codner and

³³ Lunn, David, 'Chaplains to the English Regiment in Spanish Flanders 1605-6' in *Recusant History* 11 (1971) 133-135. Also Luan, *op.cit.* 1980, p.40 and note 21.

Godfrey? Most probably they were in nearby Embassies or St. James's Palace itself rather than in Somerset House, else Cyprien would have had much to say of them, since he was resident at Somerset House. John Gee's list in *The Foot Out of the Snare* of priests who were in or near London in 1623 enables nine monks to be identified with certainty, with a possible other fifteen. Of these Thomas Preston was serving at the Venetian Embassy until his imprisonment in the Clink, and another two were serving Gondomar at the Spanish Embassy in Ely Palace, Holborn. Later in the century James Ferreyra was known to be serving at the Portuguese Embassy.³⁶

EMBASSY PROXIMITY TO THE QUEEN'S CHAPEL

The need for major Catholic nations in Europe to attempt to co-ordinate and influence politico-religious activity through such chaplaincies as they had to hand may explain the sudden bunching of Spanish, French and Portuguese Embassies in close proximity to the Queen's Chapels at St. James's Palace (chiefly and regularly in Berkshire House, a matter of yards away at St. James's) and Somerset House (mostly at Buckingham House almost next door) following the foundation of these Chapels in 1620s and 1630s. In general this represented a move from traditional locations in Holborn and Blackfriars. Papal Agency Chapels were similarly attracted in the 1630s. One might expect cross-stalling to represent an ideal way in: and this duly happens. This observation is also consistent with the unbunching and re-location of Embassy Chapels once again further away from the Queen's Chapel once James II comes to the throne as an openly professed Roman Catholic. Rather than concentrating efforts around the Court opportunities and protection offered by proximity to the Queen's Chapel, efforts were instead turned towards radiating Catholicism out from the Court and London.³⁷

CONFRATERNITY OF THE HOLY ROSARY

It is clear from the contents of the Oratorian Papal agent Gregorio Panzani's Diary that the question of reunification was the chief thrust, if not interest, of his politico-religious activity at Court from 1634 to 1636.~ A significant degree of co-operation with Oratorians at the Queen's Chapel may be implied, not least through overlapping membership of the Order, but this must remain surmise until evidence is forthcoming. What evidence, though, does exist of the politico-religious activity of fellow Oratorians at the Queen's Chapel in St. James's Palace from their arrival in 1623 until their flight at the Civil War?

³⁶ Venetian State Paper, 29th September 1623, Alvise Valaresso to the Doge and Senate.

³⁷ For locations and stalling of Embassies see Adair, A.E., *The Extra-territoriality of Ambassadors in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, Longmans, London, 1929; Trimble, William R., 'The Embassy Chapel Question, 1625-1660' in *Journal of Modern History* 18, 1946, pp.97-107; Holmes, John, 'Catalogue of French Ambassadors to England' in *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol.XIV, 1840, pp.483-7 and 608-610; Barber, Peter, *Diplomacy - the world of the honest spy*, British Library, 1979;

While much is known of the activities, principally conversions, by the Capuchins based at Somerset House from 1630, and identity of their patrons within the Court, such as Arundel, no such research has been undertaken of activity at the Queen's Chapel at St. James's in this period.³⁹ Ironically, the memoirs of the contemporary Capuchin, Cyprien de Gamache, give an unexpected insight into activities down the road at St. James's because of intense rivalry between the Oratorian and Capuchin Orders over who had superior charge of the Queen's Chapel.⁴⁰

Much can be deduced from this, not least that the Oratorians must have been ministering elsewhere, namely, at the Queen's Chapel in St. James's. Although Cyprien de Gamache knew of its building and completion by 1627 he goes out of his way to ignore it, making only oblique reference to it with his comment:

You must know that in London there are but two catholic cemeteries belonging to the two churches of the Queen, wherein are interred none but their officers and servants, both sexes, who die in the faith of the Church of Rome.⁴¹

This is a reference to the Catholic Queen's Chapels at Somerset House and St. James's Palace. Gamache made reference to how the Oratorians came to be attached to the Queen's Chapel in the first place in 1625, commenting that

M. de Berulle, founder of the Oratory, afterwards Cardinal, had at that time great influence with the King of France, and he employed it in bringing about an agreement between the two crowns, that a certain number of Fathers of the Oratory should, with himself attend that Princess to England, and serve her in the functions of the chapel, under the authority and direction of the Bishop of Mandes, our grand almoner.⁴²

We are then offered the tantalizing information that:

The Fathers of the Oratory, on their arrival in London, were lodged in the suburb of St. James, in the sight of the royal residence, to which access was not obtained of the sentries without extreme difficulty by the Catholics, who repaired thither to attend divine service. **43**

⁴⁰ *Memoirs of the Mission in England of the Capuchin Friars of the Province of Paris, from the year 1630 to 1669* by Father Cyprien de Gamache, is to be found within Birch, T., *The Court and Times of Charles I*, p.294. This was based upon Victoria and Albert Museum, MS Forster 48 D 14 in the Reserved Special Collection. From examination the original French text of this is evidently a later and more corrupted version of another more accurate copy in the BL. Curiously, the one consistently favoured by all historians, including Colvin, but with the notable exceptions of Albion and Chancy, has been Birch's translation of the V&A MS which would appear from the appalling spelling to have been itself copied by a poor transcriber. Its title reads *Memoires de la Mission des Capucins de la Province de Paris Pr~t la Reine d'Angleterre l'An 1639 jusque a l'An 1669*. Par le Pere Cyprien de [~~'Gamage'~~] Gamache pred. capucin Mission. For the other earlier differing version of this manuscript see BL MS 470 (?)Saal 2. This translation is entitled 'Memoires de la Mission des Capucins de Paris pres in Reine d'Angleterre depuis l'An 1630 jusqu'a 1669 par le P.Cyprien de Gamache', edite P.Apollinaire de Valence, Bibliotheque Franciscaine, Paris, 1881.

⁴¹ Birch, T, *Court and Times of Charles I*, p.342. As to the two graveyards, that of the Queen's Chapel, St James's Palace now lies under Marlborough Road.

⁴² See Gainache, Cyprien, *Memoirs etc...*, *op.cit.*, and Chaney, Edward, 'Thomas Howard, 14th Earl of Arundel by Francois Dieussart', *Apollo*, August 1996, pp.49-50 for patrons associated with Somerset who use the Roman Catholic Chapel.

Geographically located in the vicinity of the Queen's Chapel at St. James's, there is also a hint in Gamache's memoirs that the number of Oratorians were at least a handful initially, for he states of the subsequent French expulsions that 'the fathers of the Oratory and the rest of the French quitted England, without any advancement of the Catholic religion', but then goes on to qualify this with the statement we have already met in a different context that to assuage the Queen's anger 'the King, her husband, therefore detained two of those of the Oratory, till matters should be arranged, and till others who were peaceable and disinterested should be given him'.⁴⁴

Whether one of the two who remained was Father Berulle until he found himself advising the Queen of France before his death in 1629 is unclear. However, we have established that two Oratorians were still serving at the Queen's Chapel at St. James's when the Capuchins arrived in London in 1630, but without the direction of a Bishop. Cyprien's memoirs, occasioned by further rivalry over the appointment and status of the Grand Almoner at the end of the 1620s, serves further to confirm the dominant position of the Oratorians at St. James's. From Gamache's point of view the problem was, as he himself admitted, that the Oratorians retained the 'Queen's Confession'.⁴⁵ This, together with Father Berulle's personal hand in matters at least initially, provides a clue to Oratorian politico-religious usage of the Queen's Chapel.

It had been the Oratorian, Father Berulle, who was instrumental in persuading the French Queen and her mother publicly to adopt the Confraternity of the Holy Rosary in his presence to ensure the defeat of the English at the Ile de Re and La Rochelle in 1627. Its adoption at the Queen's Chapel by Henrietta Maria points to Oratorian origin, despite claims of other origins.⁴⁶

There is much contradiction surrounding exactly how this Confraternity came to be founded in London, but no doubt as to its persistence and patronage by the Queen Consorts at the Queen's Chapel. Nobody as yet has argued for an Oratorian origin under Henrietta Maria and the politico-religious associations with the defeat of Protestantism which such an origin would entail. Oratorians were irrefutably responsible for the Confraternity's introduction into the Court of the French Queen.

⁴⁴ *ibid.* p.295. After the rejection of Bishop Bazot as a candidate, Chateauneuf hit upon the successful idea of persuading King Charles 1 to accept Du Peron as Grand Almoner to the Queen, and, once appointed, promptly invested him with episcopal status by elevating him to the vacant see of Angoulême in the manner of a Trojan Horse.

⁴⁶ Batterel, L., *Memoires domestiques pour servir à l'histoire de la Congregation de l'Oratoire*, edited by Ingold, A.M.P. and Bounardet, E., 5 vols, Geneva, 1902-11; *Essai de Bibliographie Oratorienne* par Le Pere A.M.P. Ingold, Paris, 1880-1882. An illustration of the defeat of English forces at Re, oil on canvas, Palace of Versailles, is reproduced in Worden, Blair, *Stuart England*, Phaidon, Oxford 1986, p.74. Another is in Paris, B.N, Cartes et Plans, Service Hydrographique, Archives no.12. *Hydrographic Description of France*. Jean Geruard's manuscript French Chart of 1627 details areas of contemporary hostility, including the Island of Re and the vicinity of La Rochelle, symbolised by English and French ships in conflict and cryptic sentences. See too the sixteen signed and engraved views completed in 1631: Callot, Jacques, Hennriet, Israel, and Bosse, Abraham, *The Siege of La Rochelle, 1627, La Rochelle and the Dike, 1627, and Isle de Re, 1627*.

David Lunn argues that the Confraternity of the Holy Rosary was not founded until 1650, and then by the Benedictine monk, Anselm Crowder, but whom he does not note was later, along with President Fr Austin Hungate and Charles II's friend from exile days, Fr. Paul Robinson, appointed to choose the initial six Benedictines to serve the Queen's Chapel at St. James's 47.

According to Lunn, this Confraternity was probably based at Cardigan House in Lincoln's Inn Fields, and which was the residence of Robert Brudenell, second Earl of Cardigan, and prefect of the Congregation from its birth until its demise in 1681. Lunn stated that Crowder died in 1666 and was succeeded as Dean by Thomas Vincent Sadler until his death at Dieulouard in 1681. 48 Weldon noted that the Chapel associated with the Holy Rosary possessed two relics: Christ's Crown of Thorns from Glastonbury, and a piece of the True Cross from John Feckenham, who had saved it from Queen Mary Tudor's Chapel at Westminster Abbey.

The recollections of the contemporary Cyprien de Gamache, though, argue for Royal origin of the Confraternity and its practice at Court. Claiming that it was Queen Henrietta Maria who in the 1630s, before Exile and Civil War, had instituted the Confraternity, Cyprien wrote that:

She had actually applied for and obtained this most ancient and truly noble Confraternity from the most Reverend Father General of the Order of St. Dominic, who had made us lie, the French Capuchins of the Queen's Chapel at Somerset House Superiors of it... the Queen was the first who proposed to be received and, after her, the Gentlemen, the ladies, the people of the Court, and numberless other Catholics. 50

The Rule involved attending the Altar of the Blessed Virgin Mary every Saturday when litanies were chanted. Confession and communication took place every first Sunday of the month. In processions 'a beautiful image [of the Virgin Mary] exquisitely carved out of that kind of wood which is called Montaigu, which Queen Mary de Medicis had brought from Flanders... was carried by a Priest in his Pontifical habit.⁵¹ The practice continued 'for the space of several years' until the Civil War. At the Restoration the first thing the Queen did was 'commanded me to write to the most Reverend Father General of the Order of St. Dominic' and thus 'the extinct devotion was rekindled' with Dominican permission being granted once more, and with the same practices revived with great success in membership numbers. 52

It is not entirely clear, though, that the Capuchins were de facto Superiors of the Confraternity of the Holy Rosary as it operated at the Queen's Chapel in St. James's Palace. The Library at Downside Abbey contains a booklet of thirty-one pages entitled *The Method of saying the Rosary of our Blessed Lady as it was ordered by Pope Pius The Fifth, of the Holy Order of Preachers. And as it was said in Her Majesties Chappel at S. James. - Printed in the Year 1669.* It was almost certainly the work of a Dominican, with the chief contender being Father Christopher del Rosaria, O.P., perhaps with the help of Lord Philip Howard, the Roman Catholic Lord High Almoner. Certainly Howard fled to Bornhem in Flanders in 1674 so as to avoid accusations of treason in connection with a

⁵¹ Gamache in Birch, T., *The Court and Times of Charles I*, p.433. See illustration of Mary de Medici's arrival at St James's Palace in 1638. Packed amongst the baggage depicted must have been the carved image of the Virgin Mary, made for the Confraternity, of montaigu wood, the use of which was invested with especial spiritual importance by Jesuits.

publication of a book of devotion promulgating Papal Indulgencies granted to the Confraternity of the Holy Rosary. Cosimo Duke of Tuscany noted in particular upon entering the Queen's Chapel at St. James's Palace that there was a small Chapel dedicated to saying the Rosary on the right as he walked inside.

It would appear, though, that the conduct of offices and devotions entailed in membership of the Confraternity at the Queen's Chapel at St. James's may have been conducted by the Oratorians throughout its existence.

Apart from the deduction one could make from the lack of reference at all by the contemporary Capuchin, Cyprien de Gamache, to the Confraternity of the Holy Rosary at St. James's Palace, let alone no reference to Capuchins being there from time to time to administer its obligations, there are other indications that Capuchins may have had no dealings with it at the St. James's end.

The retaining of the 'Queen's Confession' was evidently important to the Oratorians. Following the Restoration in 1660, Fr. Cyprien recalled details which confirm the long-standing nature of the Oratorian mission with the Queen's Chapel and its promoters in high places - viz:

The power of the Earl of St. Albans and M. de Montagu, Grand Almoner of Her Majesty, who was a sworn partisan of the Fathers of the Oratory, by means of one Father Gough, an intimate friend of these two gentlemen .. afterwards Almoner to the Queen.

Fr. Cyprien lamented that through the influence of such as these, the Oratorians 'pretended to an authority over us in the performance of Her Majesty's Chapel, that it was only by their permission that we [Capuchins at Somerset House] were to administer the Sacraments there, and under their authority'. Whatever the origin of its introduction to the Queen's Chapel, the importance of politico-religious associations of the Confraternity of the Holy Rosary with the defeat of the Protestants off La Rochelle in 1627 ought to be appreciated in a wider political context.

Henrietta Maria had come to England with firm instructions to convert her Protestant husband King Charles to the catholic faith and to improve the lot of her co-religionists. Her Confessor, the Oratorian Father Berulle, together with the Bishop of Mends and the Duchesse de Chevreuse, advanced the notion that the influence of the Duke of Buckingham was a major source of discord in those early years of her marriage, since the Queen's position challenged his ascendancy. In fact they feared Buckingham might convert the Queen to the Protestant cause. There is little doubt that Buckingham did see a new and potentially very important sphere of influence in the creation of the Queen's household. He needed to influence it to maintain his own influence, and it was for this reason that he managed to have appointed his wife and mother as Ladies of the Queen's Bedchamber, much to the chagrin of the 'monsieurs' as Charles called her French retinue. But the French expulsion from the Court and Chapel in 1626 posed a problem of political alignment for Buckingham.

The marriage alliance that had brought Henrietta Maria to England had unwittingly brought the original Spanish terms for the creation of a Queen's Chapel with it. For Buckingham the French marriage was a keystone of the anti-Habsburg and anti-Spanish foreign policy he had striven for since his return from Madrid in 1623. The culmination of this was a disastrous expeditionary raid against Cadiz in 1625. Buckingham, in attempting to encourage internal resistance in Catholic France as a means of securing the downfall of Richelieu and the restoration of the Palatinate, led himself into the corner of the equally disastrous

expedition in 1627 to the Island of Re to relieve and encourage the Protestants in La Rochelle who so angered Richelieu. By the time of his assassination in 1628 Buckingham, far from creating the anti-Habsburg and anti-Spanish alliances against France, had in fact brought about the threat of encirclement by a Franco-Spanish alliance.

The seriousness and importance of such conflicts with France should not be underestimated when analysing the progress of international alignments between Catholic and Protestant nations in Europe. Recently Kevin Sharpe, relying upon the analysis of Dietz, has pointed to the seriousness of the domestic and international political consequences of the *lie de Re* conflict, noting that King Charles's 'Forced Loan' brought in over £240,000 by the end of 1627, the cost of the defeated Re expedition amounted to £200,000, with an estimated £600,000 being required to finance another fleet. The consequences were felt all over the realm as localities found themselves unable to sustain the financial and human consequences of the continued brinkmanship.

Perhaps the clearest exposition of the contemporary importance attached to the politico-religious conflict exemplified by the Re expedition is visual. The French pilot and hydrographer, Jean Geruard, produced a chart in 1627 indicating areas of conflict between England, France and the States General, by means of ships flying appropriate national flags nations depicted engaging one another. Three areas of conflict in particular are represented: the Hollanders of the States General engaging the French off Normandy, but roaming unchallenged off the mouth of the Somme; English engaging French between Cornwall and Brest; English engaging French off the *Ile de Re*, but French roaming unchallenged off Gascoigne and elsewhere in Biscay. The chart conveys both the humiliation felt by France over English actions in supporting Protestants in La Rochelle, and indicates this with the written streamer: 'Ergo maria invia Gallis' [ie. the sea is closed to the French]. Relief at Razilly's French victory over the English at Re is indicted by the only other streamer: 'Tempora navali fulgent rostrata corona 1627' [ie. 'His forehead gleams, wreathed with a naval crown']⁵⁶ Other charts reveal Richelieu's real intentions to bottle up and isolate England in his capacity since October 1626 as 'Grand Master, Chief and Superintendent of Navigation and Trade'. Gudrard produced another chart in 1628 which asserted French dominance as far North as Spitzbergen, while in 1633 a chart drawn by Augustin Roussin sported Cardinal Richelieu's Arms off the West coast of Ireland.

The Queen's Chapel was tied up in the consequences. In 1628 Dudley Carleton declared that the French must give up 'the idea of making themselves masters of the sea', Richelieu on the other hand vowed never to forget the *Ile de Re*.⁵⁸ Charles's reaction was to declare that 'if any one of these priests of my wife happen to die, I want the new ones to depend on the Pope and not on Richlieu...' ⁵⁹

In this context must be placed the adoption of a Confraternity known to Henrietta Maria and others as having played a key role in the defeat of the English Protestant forces of her husband in what a contemporary, Lucy Hutchinson, termed 'the unfortunate voyage to the Isle of Re'.⁶⁰ Its adoption by the Queen's Chapel was at the very least an act in itself of deliberate politico-religious defiance, since it was one which Oratorians themselves promoted in the French Court with the avowed intention of enlisting the Almighty in support of the defeat of Protestantism. at the specific request of the Oratorian, Fr. Berulle, who had accompanied Henrietta Maria to England. For the Confraternity to have continued at the Queen's Chapel after Berulle's death in 1629 must have entailed the sanction of his

⁵⁸ Coke MS 46: Goring to Coke, 9th June 1633.

successor as Superieur General de la Congregation de l'Oratoire, Fr. Charles de Condren, until the latter's death in 1641. Batterel wrote of Condren, 'Il fit la visite de toutes les maisons' of the Order, and on this basis would have visited those of the Order serving at the Queen's Chapel'.⁶¹ Quite what orders the Oratorians were following at the Queen's Chapel until the Civil War are tantalizingly absent from a contemporary work by Bourgoing entitled *Direction pour les missions qui se font par le congreg. de l'Oratoire de Jesus-Christ N.S.*, published in Paris, Vitre, in 1646.

That Oratorians continued to be closely involved with international diplomatic initiatives both in England and abroad following the Restoration is evident from Batterel's observation concerning the Oratorian, Le P. Duharnel. The observation noted,

En 1668, il accompagna en Allemagne Colbert de Croissy, plenipotentiaire francais a Aix-la-Chapelle, comme un autre Oratorien, le P. Lecomte, avait autrefois accompagné Servien au traite de Munster.

Il suivit le meme ambassadeur en Angleterre, pris en Hollande. ⁶²

The Benedictine community at the Queen's Chapel in St. James's Palace moved to Somerset House to join Serenus Cressy in 1671, but all were nevertheless the innocent victims of higher politics as towards the close of 1674 as Charles was forced to issue an Order in Council requiring amongst other things that 'all Catholic priests born within His Majesty's dominions, with the exception of Father Hudleston, to leave the kingdom before the 25th day of March next following', a stipulation applying also to those who served the Queen.

So, in 1675 the Benedictine chaplaincy came to an end, the Queen thereafter being served only by her Portuguese retinue at St. James's and, in particular, the Arabados of the Order of St. Peter of Alcantara, and the Jesuit Chaplain to James Duke of York, Beddingfield, and from 1676-1678 Claude de la Colombière, Jesuit Chaplain to the Duchess of York. With the brief interlude of the Jesuit father St. Germain, Colombière succeeded the Benedictine Fr Lionel Sheldon who had served as her Chaplain until 1674. Beddingfield and Colombière resided at St. James's Palace, apparently opposite the Queen's Chapel in the Tudor ranges. Fr Francis Edwards mentions, too, a Venetian Father who served the Duke of York, presumably the Jesuit Thomas Downes.⁶³

Fr Edwards, former Librarian of the English Province of the Society of Jesus at Farm Street, was of the opinion that the controversial Jesuit Consult (ie. Provincial Congregation), which was the subject of so much rumour and conjecture on the part of Titus Oates, was in all probability held in Colombière's apartments in 1678. However the sheer number mentioned in the contemporary record of Marsh, who is deliberately vague concerning the exact whereabouts of the 'Consult', merely recording 'convoked in London', is clear from the fact that the requisite number of attendees had to be made up from other Jesuits before the proceedings could start. This put the number at forty and these simply could not have been accommodated in Colombière's quarters, described so atmospherically by the Franciscan Father Wall, who visited his quarters at St. James's on All Saints 1678 for 'Mass at the little Altar of the Sacred Heart, which Father Colombière had erected in

⁶³ Edwards, Francis, S.J., *The Jesuits in England from 1580 to the present day*, Burns & Oates, 1985, for Downes serving the Duke of York.

his Oratory'.⁶⁴ For such an important event, it is curious that there remains some mystery concerning the exact whereabouts of this Chapel. The proximity of the Portuguese Embassy to the Queen's Chapel at the Restoration in the Order for 'The Portugal Ambassadors Chapel at St. James's to be shut up' on 2nd July 1676, is recorded in a Domestic State Paper. However, Peter Barber placed it in Lincoln's Inn Fields by 1688 when he identifies it on a coin struck to commemorate its destruction by Protestants in support of William of Orange.⁶⁵

Contemporary descriptions of embassy burnings certainly describe one such at Lincoln's Inn Fields but there is nothing to equate the ruin depicted with the Portuguese Embassy. Indeed, there are strong indications that the view may well be of the new buildings of St. Albans's project for St. James's Square. At any rate, it is interesting to note that the proximity of the Portuguese Embassy Chapel to St. James's Palace was not thought by Charles to obviate the need to repair the old Queen's Chapel for his bride in 1662. Note also the proximity of the Portuguese Embassy to the Queen's Chapel at the Restoration in the Order for 'The Portugal Ambassadors Chapel at St. James's to be shut up' on 2nd July 1676, in a Domestic State. Given the space limitations of an oratory the most reasonable explanation was that the Jesuit Consult took place in the Queen's Chapel itself.

BISHOP ELLIS' SERMON

Mention of the Sacred Heart leads us to our final discussion – namely the use of the Benedictine pulpit by Bishop Philip Michael Ellis. On the face of it, there would seem to be no possible connection, but I hope to show that there was, and that Ellis and King James had to face it. There was more to Ellis's pronouncements and sermons than obedient and convenient support for the King.

Pronouncements from the Benedictine pulpit at the Queen's Chapel in the reign of James ii, and their relationship or otherwise to James's plans for the the restoration of Roman Catholicism. have been so excellently researched in such scholarly depth by Dom Geoffrey Scott that any attempt to retrace it briefly here could not possibly do justice to his work.⁶⁶ And so, instead, what I have now to say is designed to open up a new perspective to

⁶⁴ Gervase Sacheverill, *An Episode in the Seventeenth Century*. Determining the exact location of Colombiere's Oratory has never been attempted, but if it occupied the room later given over to the Gennan Lutheran members of the Royal Household as detailed on the 1729 Flitcroft plan of the quarters with an altar, then it survives today as the living room of the Superintendent of the State Apartments. It may be the same as that mentioned in Hume's History of the House of Stuart which records that 'Mr. William Chaffinch, Page of the Chambers, consented, immediately after the death of King Charles to show to certain friends a tiny secret chapel adjoining the private apartments of the King. It was there, he declared, that the King in his last years used to repair secretly in order to hear Mass'. The King's Apartments are delineated n the 1729 Flitcroft plan.

⁶⁵ Barber, Peter, *Diplomacy*, British Library, London, 1979, p.31.

⁶⁶ See amongst his many other works, Scott, G. 'Sacredness of Majesty: The English Benedictines and the Cult of King James II', *Royal Stuart Papers XXIII*, Huntingdon, 1984; 'A Benedictine Conspirator: Henry Joseph Johnston (c. 1656-1723)', in *Recusant History*, 1992; *Benedictines and Jacobites*, Douai Abbey 1980; *Gothic Rage Undone: English Monks in the Age of Enlightenment*, Downside Abbey, Bath, 1992.

complement this research. It is at the moment a raw and entirely home-grown perspective on the Queen's Chapel Benedictine pulpit of Fr. Philip Michael Ellis and the motivations of King James and his wife, specifically developed for this 1998 English Benedictine History Symposium. It came to me, curiously, whilst researching the life of one of her Jesuit chaplains together with Mary of Modena's memoirs and I have arranged my thoughts as follows.

If James's wife, Mary of Modena, was indeed the true mother of the baby born in 1688 at the end of his reign, then we must presume that James and Mary, although faced with the tragedies of earlier infant deaths, were nevertheless attempting to have children during his reign, just as earlier we know they were prior to 1685 as Duke and Duchess of York. Even if the 1688 baby turns out to have been a substitute, they may nevertheless have been trying.

Exactly nine months before, in September 1687, James and Mary had spent a week together at Bath. James then went via Chester to the Shrine of St. Winifred at Holywell in North Wales. Long closed, it was unsealed for him, and there he went on bended knee to pray for the birth of a son. This, by most historians, has been viewed with suspicion that he was preparing the Nation for a contrived birth, which would then be attributed to the answer of prayer in the face of improbability. If on the other hand the birth was genuine (the answer to prayer if you like) then it has great and hitherto unrecognized significance for the actions of the Benedictines at the Queen's Chapel.

The reason why lies not with them but rather with the preaching and explanation for events proffered by the Jesuit Chaplain to Mary of Modena ten years earlier between 1675 and 1678, Claude de la Colombière.⁶⁷ What was this explanation? It was an explanation for the tragic deaths in infancy of four of his children by Mary of Modena as Duchess of York.

The eldest daughter by the Duchess, Catherine Laura, was born on 19th January 1675, baptized according to Roman Catholic rites in the Queen's Chapel by the Jesuit, Galli, but died the following 3rd October. The second, Isabella, born on 28th August 1676, died on 2nd March 1682. It was the death of the third child, the Duke of Cambridge, born on November 18th 1677, and his death a month later on 22nd December, with which Colombière had to deal following his appointment as the Duchess's chaplain. A third daughter, Charlotte Mary, was born on 15th August 1682 but died the following 6th October. Throughout this period of tragedy, the Duchess of York recalled significantly: 'I never tasted happiness in England, except between my fifteenth and twentieth year. But in those five years I had always been pregnant, and I lost all my children', but added, to my mind all importantly, 'My husband, the king, and myself would have been desolate had we to bring up our children Protestants. We found some consolation in seeing them die young'. King James said: 'Look, until we are able to bring up our children in the true religion, not one will live'.⁶⁸ This echoes the central theme of Colombière's sermons at the Queen's Chapel given as chaplain to the Duchess whilst dealing with this tragic record of infant death in James's family.

We must remember that Mary's Benedictine Confessors, Lionel Sheldon and Nicholas (or Poss), had served her when she was Duchess of York until expulsion in 1675, and that King Charles II himself had 'maintained them under pretence of their being part of the clergy composing the Chapel of his Queen. Now they had gone, the traditionally moderate influence of the Benedictines had gone too, leaving a gap until the Jesuit Colombière was appointed in 1676.

Although evidence supplied by the Visitation Order, itself founded by Francis de Sales, at Paray le Monial shows that some of Margaret Mary's contemporaries also experienced

intimate visions of the Sacred Heart, amongst others Sister Anne-Marguerite Clement in 1661, Sister Claus Gamier in 1667, Mother Anne Marie Rosset in 1677, Mother Marie Constance de Bresson in 1668, these did not have the international implications of those experienced by Sister Margaret Mary in her three revelations in 1673, 1674 and 1675. During her third, Christ is credited with exposing his heart and saying 'There it is, that Heart so deeply in love with men, it spared no means of proof – wearing it out until it was utterly spent. This meets with scant appreciation from most of them; all I get back is ingratitude - witness their irreverence, their sacrileges.'⁶⁹

Colombière clearly saw the Protestant Church in England as constituting this irreverence and sacrilege. The third revelation had demanded a 'solemn act of reparation' in the form of a special liturgical feast for his Sacred Heart. This, together with a subsequent vision which placed a duty upon the Jesuit order to spread this devotion, placed an obligation, as Colombière saw it, upon him to bring about that 'solemn act of reparation' at the Queen's Chapel in the midst of a protestant country, since he was none other than Margaret Mary's confessor.

This obligation was clearly a departure from safe practice in that it would result of necessity in an obligation to attack Protestantism, with all the dangers that would mean for a Jesuit attempting it within the English Court itself. For this purpose, the existing Catholic haven of the Queen's Chapel was a natural starting point. This explains a fearless attack in a sermon there upon the Test Act which he preached on All Saints Day, saying: 'How many subterfuges daily bring men to yield God's interests to those of the State, openly to disregard all the most sacred laws, and persuade themselves that religion itself is only a department of politics which ought to adapt itself to the times and the demands of temporal affairs'.⁷⁰

That Colombière chose to inaugurate the devotion to the Sacred Heart with its particular theme of God's mercy versus man's ingratitude, at the point in 1677 when he preached his great sermon concerning the religious state of England, was evidently no co-incidence. Rather it can be understood as the climax to the *raison d'être* for the Devotion.

Colombière looked back wistfully to pre-Reformation England during his sermon preached at the queen's chapel on the Third Sunday in Advent 1677, saying 'the number of your religious has almost equalled the number of your other inhabitants; you were hardly less than a great monastery.. .there are whole kingdoms which recognize you as their Mother in Jesus Christ, whom your children have won for the catholic Church'⁷¹ But he went on to attack the Protestant Church he now saw replacing it with 'this multitude of sects, which causes each one to doubt of his own, to distrust it, to be at a loss as to what he should believe, which is the cause of the great number having little religion, and many to have none at all'. He then proceeded to ask two questions: 'Dear God, when will you cause so great a scourge to cease? How can we at length appease You, and oblige You to unite us all in one and the same fold, as we had been throughout the space of thirteen or fourteen centuries?'⁷²

The equation of Protestantism with ingratitude to God identified by Sister Margaret Mary's revelations at Paray, which Colombière had decided were genuine, not only led to the institution of the Devotion to the Sacred Heart in the Queen's Chapel; equating the

⁷¹ Sermon pour le troisième dimanche de l'Advent, 1667, in *Oeuvres etc., op.cit.* vol III, p.111.

⁷² *ibid.*

continuing wrath of the Almighty with the persistence of Protestantism was a concept which evidently hit home with the Duke and Duchess of York as a personal explanation for their continuing family tragedies.

A decade later, then, Benedictine Fr Ellis had to cope with a King and Queen who had been convinced that failure to restore Catholicism to its former glory amounted to succouring Protestantism – the explanation given by Colombière for the deaths of their children (perhaps even on the basis of Our Lord's saying, 'He who is not for me is against me?'). Given Colombière's explanation, with its implicit threat of continued personal family tragedy if ignored, perhaps James's apparently headstrong actions in restoring the 'old Faith' in the face of political reality can now be understood in a new light.

Now on the throne at last, but unable to persuade Parliament to repeal the Test Acts between 12-19 of November, James responded by proroguing Parliament on 20th. A collusive law case, *Godden v Hales*, in April 1686, ruled that the King could dispense with the Test Acts in some circumstances without the consent of Parliament and so he immediately set about introducing Catholics and some dissenters into the Army, Universities and even the Church of England hierarchy. He established an Ecclesiastical Commission on 15th July 1686 and delegated to them his powers as Governor of the Church of England. In Scotland he introduced a largely Roman Catholic administration. On April 5th James published a Declaration of Indulgence and re-issued it on 27th April – this time requiring Anglican clergy to read it from their pulpits, and in July received Count Ferdinando d'Adda as official Papal Nuncio to the Court of St James, eventually hosting his Consecration as Archbishop of Amasia on 11th May 1687 with Vicar Apostolic Leyburn and two Irish prelates officiating in the Queen's Chapel as confirmed by Weldon, followed by Ellis on 6th May 1688 as Bishop of Auriopolis (Titular), also at the Queen's Chapel.⁷⁴

James built a new Roman Catholic Chapel Royal in 1685 only yards away in Whitehall from the existing Tudor Anglican Chapel Royal. He ignored the existence of the Anglican Clerk of the Closet to the extent that he created a complete Roman Catholic hierarchy at Court headed by a Roman Catholic Clerk of the Closet, the Jesuit Fr. Edward Petre, who was also appointed a Privy Councillor. And of course he backed the cause of the Benedictine Alban Placid Francis at Cambridge.

These full-blooded actions, in favour of the Roman Catholic cause were not the actions of a coward in political terms, so why, then, use the Benedictine pulpit through Fr. Ellis to renounce the Benedictine claims once and for all to their pre-Reformation lands? The conventional wisdom is that there must have been co-ordination over the content and timing of this sermon between Ellis and King James. But, remember Colombière's great sermon and terminology about England being 'one great monastery' in days of old and the duty to restore those days. Surely Ellis's renunciation of the claim to the old lands and foundations, together with appointments to them, would bring about the wrath of God once again within James's family?

⁷⁴ Weldon is a credible source for recollections about this, for, just eleven months later than Ellis's sermon renouncing claims to pre-reformation monastic lands, he himself later recalled 'For as much as I can remember dipping into the clear fountain of the church was on 12th October (S.N.), on a Saturday in 1687, when I made my abjuration at the Royal Convent of St. James, in the hands of R.F. Joseph Johnston, and was admitted to the most holy sacrament of the altar on the Monday following, October 14th, in the said Chapel, which I therefore particularly ever since loved, and much grieve to see in the power of erroneous darkness'.

The thought must, at any rate, have crossed James's mind when listening in person to Ellis's sermon on the Feast of all Benedictine saints delivered on 13th November 1686. Put starkly, what was to be gained from the irrevocable renunciation of the old monastic lands and claims except to confirm Protestants in their possession of them? This does not accord with James's earlier understanding from Colombière that the appeasement of Protestantism was what constituted evil in the eyes of God.

While it is true that Ellis retained the favour and friendship of James, serving him in exile after 1688, it is the contention of this lecture that Ellis was in fact looking after the future interests of the Benedictine Order by tempering James's headstrong actions. Ellis may have seen what James did not. If James's attempt at restoring the Old Faith in a big way were to include monastic pre-Reformation claims, and if James were to founder, where would the Benedictine cause have lain in the eyes of its critics?

By renouncing the old monastic lands in the face of unyielding actions in other matters, Ellis must have sailed close to James's limit of toleration – especially in its implications for potential Divine retribution in the form of further personal tragedy as James and Mary were still trying for other children. In the context of Colombière's explanation, Ellis cannot be seen as furthering James's cause. Perhaps we should revisit Ellis and regard him more as a Benedictine loyalist than a stooge for the cause of Crown and Cowl?

Whatever the case, of Ellis's six sermons printed at the king's command, the first was delivered at Windsor, and the other five at the Queen's Chapel, indicating the latter's importance as the prime pulpit until exile in 1688.

Finally let us survey the quarters and liturgical architecture enjoyed by the Benedictine community at the Queen's Chapel, and attempt to recapture something of the surroundings in which these great events occurred.

Where exactly did the Benedictines live at St. James's? Certainly they were initially accommodated at Somerset House, but moved to St. James's once the Queen's Chapel was reopened in 1662, as described so famously by Pepys. The Friary buildings beyond the east end of the Chapel were occupied from 1667 by the friars of the Order of St. Peter of Alcantara, who must have shared them with the Benedictines since records exist of works undertaken for cells in the Friary allocated 'for Father John's man' and another 'for Father Hudleston's man'. The latter was the Benedictine Father Hudleston, who himself lived in the Chaplain's quarters adjoining the Chapel on its South side.

The liturgical architecture of the Queen's Chapel as experienced by the Benedictine community there was quite magnificent. Recent major restoration works at the Chapel have revealed a number of surprises – not least of which is that the Chapel had been constructed in the 1620s as a double-shell, with a cavity all around of about a foot and a half.

Before the Arabados moved into the Friary alongside the Benedictines in 1667, the Benedictine community at the Queen's Chapel would have conducted worship in a Chapel lit not only by the lateral windows (two of which are now filled in on the North side), but by the huge triple Venetian window at the east end. The Blacksmith who has recently made the ironwork for the replica Inigo Jones theatre next to the Globe in Southwark examined the great thick curved and straight iron bars which support the glass of that window, and concluded that they must have been made using an array of eight synchronised water driven hammers to beat out the wrought iron. This would have made it one of the wonders of the great feats of the nation at the time. The glass itself was emblazoned by Thomas Bagley, Master Glazier, with 'a Crucifix of paynted glass iii foot broad and four foot deep' together with '2 coates of Armes each thre foote five inches deepe and two foote seven inches

broad' ⁷⁵. When Christopher Wren built the Apse onto the east end of the Chapel sometime around 1669 the great Venetian window was obscured and had to be hung with tapestries - as seen in the famous 1667 drawing of the interior.

Works accounts for 1663/4 reveal intimate details of other internal features integral to worship. They included a deal pulpit 'with a foote pace for it to stand on and a broad stepp ladder to it with seven steps', while Thomas Kinward for £64 18s 9d made a 'confessing howse. . . devided into three parts with arches seven foot wide, 7 foote eight inches high, two foote three inches deepe, with an Architrave freeze and cornish', and a new 'closet' for the Queen. This latter was a box like structure covered in crimson damasc as described by the French visitor M.de Monconys in May 1663, and stood near the front of the present Royal gallery. It was allegedly behind this structure in 1688 that the Jesuit Father Petre crept, carrying a baby born in the Friary in a warming pan to introduce him the Queen's bedchamber in the South range of the Palace to which this Closet was connected by a passage known as the gallery. Monconys also noted that the Queen Catherine kept 24 grand coffers up there, presumably for relics. Some of these would appear to be represented in a drawing of Mary of Modena's escape by boat from Whitehall steps with the 'old pretender' in 1688. ⁷⁶

A succession of tabernacles was constructed. The first was described by Monconys as 'un Tabernacle d'argent'. Pepys himself commented in September 1662 upon the 'fine Altar ornaments, and the fryars in their habits'. ⁷⁸ In 1679 Kinward made another Tabernacle, the outside of which was gilded and the inside was painted blue with gilded stars. Benedictines having been expelled abroad in 1675 were not to see this or the new pulpit which Kinward made, the angles of which were decorated with cherubims' heads and festoons carved by William Emmett, together with a 'Great Ogee' and a rose, until their return under James II in 1685. This pulpit with its cherubim is still to be seen but split into two and now forming the end of the Choir stalls. The Inigo Jones coffered ceiling was also repainted by Robert Streater.

Benedictines were, however, familiar with the internal Chapels under the Royal Closet, described by Cosimo Duke of Tuscany on his visit. 'At the entrance of the church are two lateral chapels, of which that on the right is dedicated to the most blessed Virgin, and in [which] Her Majesty recited the rosary on holy days, when she is present at divine service'. There is the slight possibility, though, that they were located outside on either side in the area described in the Works accounts of 1679/80 as 'the Friars' Great Cloister'. ⁷⁹ This was the cloister around the 'Burying Place' marked on Burgis's plan on 1689, the site of which now lies under Marlborough Road. It was here that the body of Lord Clancarty (Viscount Muskerry) was secretly interred in following his death fighting along with the Duke of York at the Battle of Lowestoft in 1665, while the 'real' funeral was taking place at Westminster Abbey.

It was here, too, although about twenty years later, that Isabella Swinburne, who on 20th July 1684 at the age of nineteen had entered Cambrai with her sister, Mary, taking the name Gertrude and being clothed in c. 1685,

⁷⁸ Diary of Samuel Pepys, II edited by H.B.Wheatley, 1893, p.342.

⁷⁹ There is now no sign of the scrolls or cherub's head on the keystone.

about the middle of her Noviceship went into England, to be cured of, as it was thought, the King's Evill and dyed there & was the first Catholic buried in St James Chappell when our monks were chaplains to K. James the 2nd of Blessed memory. She was buried in our habit.⁸⁰

The cloister surrounding the 'Buryal Ground' itself was supported by 27 columns with capitals and bases, behind which were set four niches, which were 'washed, stopped and whitened' by a plasterer.

A fire raged outside the Palace in 1682, necessitating the use of gunpowder to blow up the houses nearby. Whether this signalled the eventual demise of the building that had housed the Portuguese Embassy until 1676 is unclear. What is clear is that the proximity of the gunpowder blasts resulted in a 'window that was blowne out' and which was repaired afterwards and the opportunity this afforded was taken to create 'a great new architrave window on the north sided of the Chapel', complete with festoon scrolls and a cherub's head on the keystone' and it this window which is seen in the internal 1687 engraving, although none of the external embellishments now survive. This may be due to the demolition of the Vestries early in the 18th century. These were ranged along the North wall, and were provided with presses for altar cloths, a 'great chest of drawers' and a long shelf 'to sett candle sticks on', and there was a 'Privy Sacristy' equipped with 'a napkin rowle' by Kinward.

There is, though, much confusion about the Friars choir. This appears to have been located in the apse, but must have somehow housed twenty stalls, where 81 feet of Portland stone was employed in 1683 'in the two round Architrave windows of the Chaire' which are visible in the Gasselin sketch. Here, too, the occupants of the stalls, presumably the Arabados, were provided with segmental 'compasse kneeling boards and resting boards', while in the centre was 'a large reading deske of wainscot turning upon a pillar' ~, and at one side there was an altar standing on deal steps. Two stalls were also 'made to open into the Chaire'. There also exists a bill 'To Grinling Gibbons Carver for carving the Altar in her Majesty's Chappell accordinge to a designe approved of by her Majestie' who made her a 'modell for the altar piece' to help the decision, for which he charged £1 17s. The Altar piece and reredos is substantially what we see today, painted and gilded at the time by Robert Streater, including the 'two Great Festoones over the Arch with the 'two flying boycs', and he was also paid the 'gilding the Queenes Antics' which are impaled with the Stuart and survive today.

Much else, though, has been lost from the scheme, which included painting of the dome over the choir and the tabernacle, as well as the famous oil painting of the Holy family which replaced that of Benedetto Gennari the Younger as the Altar Piece. Also in the 1682/3 alterations was included the hewing out of the niches by Maurice Emmett for the Saints statues which we see in the 1687 engraving.⁸²

Silver-gilt Sacramental Plate made for James Duke of York in the early 1660s has survived and is still used, albeit by the Chapel Royal. These items would have been very familiar to the Benedictine community at St. James's Palace and comprise an elaborate Chalice and Paten, two Flagons decorated on the handles with large 'M's, two Altar Candlesticks and an Offertory Plate displaying a sacred heart beneath the LHS - over a

⁸⁰ Cambrai Entry Book, written 1709-10. Copy generously supplied by Sr Margaret Truran of Stanbrook Abbey at the 1998 Benedictine History Symposium. The Convent of English Benedictine nuns had been founded at Cambrai in 1625 with English monks as chaplains.

⁸² See illustration. (Not available online)

decade therefore before its introduction as a Devotion by Colombière in the 1670s. All these items display the 'Dux Jacobus' monogram surmounted by the royal ducal coronet.

Schellinks noted interestingly upon Katherine of Braganza's arrival at Hampton Court in 1662: 'On the 14th in the morning we went once more to look at the Palace, also the Queen's Chapel, where, on the altar, was a heavy silver ciborium and candlesticks'.⁸⁴

These, then, were the features which the Benedictines were to inherit on their return in 1685 on the accession of James II to the throne. They were to see a few more alterations before their final departure in 1688. These included the making of a curved altar rail, two tabernacles for the side altar, two pedestals for the great altar, two confessing seats and a new staircase up the Royal Closet at the West end. Finally, and most importantly, in 1686 a 'great niche' was 'cutt out of the maine wall' to 'sett the font in'. This was the font in which the Old Pretender was Baptised in 1688, and it measured 8ft high by 6ft wide.

The lowering cloud threatening invasion finally fulfilled its promise at the end of this study with such drama that it was set to verse at the time and still lives among our rhymes, albeit unrecognised, today. The words will sound familiar:

Rock-a-bye baby, on the tree top,
When the wind blows, the cradle will rock,
When the bough breaks, the cradle will fall
Down will come baby, cradle and all.

The 'baby' was King James's newly born son, baptised in the Queen's Chapel on 15th October 1688. The 'cradle' was the Roman Catholic Church totally reliant like a branch upon King James and his Court, and, so far as the rhyme was concerned, with no roots. The 'wind' was the Easterly wind which would bring the Prince of Orange's fleet to England. The invasion was real, an Army Chaplain observing that: 'the whole Channel was bespangled with beautiful ships and colours flying', and involved successful invasion by 15,0⁸⁵00 mostly Dutch troops, landing in Torbay on the anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot on 5th November.⁸⁶

⁸⁴ Apparently made by John Turner, joiner.

⁸⁵ PRO Works 5/4 Extraordinary Works. In 1938 a plastered niche was revealed behind the panelling on the North side of the Chapel under the Royal Closet immediately to the West of the supporting pier at its front. This particular niche though was smaller than the dimensions detailed in 1686.

⁸⁶ See Howarth, Mary, *A Plain Man's Guide to The Glorious Revolution*, Regency Press, London 1988, p.59 for a discussion of this chaplain's account. For particulars of the circumstances of William's landing at Torbay see Howarth, *op.cit.*; Howarth, Mary, (Public Information Office) *The Glorious Revolution*, House of Commons Factsheet No. 8 - 'House of Commons Library, March 1988. Also Anderson, J.L., 'Combined Operations and the Protestant Wind, Some maritime aspects of the Glorious Revolution of 1688' in the *Great Circle* 9 (1987) pp.96-107; Lindgren, S., and Neumann, J., 'Protestant Wind - Popish Wind: the Revolution of 1688 in England', *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 66 (1985) pp.632-644; Pearsall, Alan, 'The Invasion Voyage - Some Nautical Thoughts', in Wilson, Charles and Proctor, David, (eds.), *Stateborne Alliance and Diplomatic Revolution*, National Maritime Museum, 1989, pp.165-174; Guy, Alan, and Spencer-Smith, Jenny, (eds), *1688 - Glorious Revolution? The Fall and Rise of the English Army 1660-1704*, National Army Museum, 1988.

A NOTE ON THE NOTES

The following footnotes should have been included, but their original position has been lost in the process of scanning the text. They will be corrected when an original paper copy reaches the Editor (archive@ampleforth.org.uk).

The Journal of William Schellinks? Travels in England, 1661-1663, edited by Exwood, M, and ~hmann, H.L., Camden Fifth Series,

Royal Historical Society, Vol. 1, esp.pp.55 and 59.

Archivio Segreto Vaticano, VA Inghilterra, 1071, 3A, Panzani, Gregorio, Diana del Negotlo quell'Inghilterra 1634-1637. See note 10

above.

Bassompierre, French Ambassador, actually termed the Queen?s Chapel 'The Chapel of the Fathers of the Oratory at St.Gemmes'.

His observations are discussed in Harting, Johanna, Catholic London Missions from the Reformation to the year 1850, Sands and

Co., London, 1903, p.4. The rest of this book should be treated with caution.

Birch, T., Op.Cit, Vol.11,. p.294 and Vol.1.p.33.

Lunn, David, 'The English Benedictines 1540-1688', Burns & Oates, London, 1980, p.129.

See in particular 'The Benedictine Chapel of the Rosary in London (circa 1650-1681)' in Downside Review, 1934, pp.320-328; and

'Relics and Plate from the Benedictine Chapel of the Rosary (1650) in Downside Review, 1934, pp.586-606.

Lunn, David, 'The English Benedictines 1540-1688', Burns & Oates, London, 1980, p.129.

Weldon, op.cit., I, 418.

Pepys recorded a piece of the True Cross as being kept in the Fiiary behind the Queen's Chapel. Was he suggesting a connection

with the True Cross fragment found later at Lincoln's Inn?

Gamache in Birch, T., The Court and Times of Charles I, p.432

Gamache, p.435

Travels of Cosimo, Duke of Tuscany, through England, edited by Magalotti, 1821, p.169.

Gamache in Birch, T, The Court and Times of Charles I, p.431.

Dietz, F.C.. 'English Public Finance', Vol.11, New York, 1932, pp.243-7. Sharpe, Kevin, 'The Personal Rule of Charles I', Yale

University Press, London, 1992, pp.22-23.

Paris, B.N.: Cartes et Plans, Service Hydrographique no.12. Hydrographic Description of France', Jean Gudrard, 1627. Two vellum

leaves, coloured MS assembled into a chart, 1250 x 810mm. The chart bears the arms of President de Lozon, counsellor to the Paris

Parlement and later of the Grand Council. Reproduced in Jourdin, M., Ronciere, M., Azard, M., Raynaud N. and Vannerean, M., Sea

Charts of the Early Explorers, 13th to 17th Century, Thames & Hudson, New York, 1984, pp.78, and 254-5.

Historical Manuscripts Commission, Cowper Papers, I, pp.442-3

Codex Barbenni Latini, Archivio Segretto Vaticano, 8640, ff.309-311. Account of Conto Barberini, 1637.

Hutchinson, Lucy, 'Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson', ed. N.H. Keeble, Dent, London, 1995, p.11.

Batterel, P.Louis (1680-1752), Essai de Bibliographic Oratorienne par Le Pere A.M.P. Ingold, Paris. 1880-1882, p.36

Ibid. p.41.

Served the Duchess of York from 13th October 1676 until his arrest at his quarters in St. James' Palace on 24th November 1678 and subsequent expulsion.

Meinoires Historiques relatif a SM. la reine d'Angleterre, femmes de Jacques, Vol. II, 1713.

Ladame, Jean, Saint Margaret Mary and the Visitation in Paray, translated by Mrs Elfrieda T. Dubois, University of Newcastle, 1977, in particular chapter entitled 'Revelations of the Sacred Heart'.

Premier sermon pour la fete de tous les saints, in Oeuvres Completes du Ven. P. de la Colombiere, Grenoble, 1900-1901, Vol.I p.21.

Petre's appointments appeared in The London Gazette as follows: 'Whitehall, 11 November, 1687. This day the Honourable and Reverend Edward Petre, Clerk of the Closet to his Majesty, was sworn of his Majesty's most Honorable Privy Council, and accordingly took his place at the Board'.

Le Voyage de M. de Monconys, LII. Paris, 1695, pp.36-7.

Exwood, Maurice and Lehmann, L.H., (eds) *The Journal of William Schellinks? Travels in England ~61-1663*, Translated from the Dutch Camden Fifth Series, Vol.1, Royal Historical Society, 1993, p.92.