

ART. XV. – “*Homo Politicus*” or “*Homo Religiosus*”?  
Thomas J. F. Strickland of Sizergh<sup>1</sup> (?1682-1740)  
By GERNOT O. GÜRTLER

THE year 1714 was decisive in two respects for the further development of Britain. First the establishment of a continental dynasty on the English throne marked the beginning of a new era of European history, in which King George I (1660-1727)<sup>2</sup> as both King of Great Britain and Elector of Hanover had to relate the political, social, economic and dynastic interests of Europe's leading sea-power to those of a modest German territorial state. Second, the Hanoverian king also encouraged the hopes of a hitherto tolerated religious minority in England: the Catholics. Of major interest was how the new monarch would combine his ecclesiastical duties as a Lutheran in his German principality with those as Supreme Head of the Church of England in his new kingdom. Even more interesting was how he would behave towards Catholics, Puritans, Dissenters; in short to the rest of the non-conforming subjects in Anglican society. The political situation at the beginning of his reign was destined to influence his decision: with several Jacobite rebellions behind and one to come, the slogan of George's reign should have been “religious toleration”.<sup>3</sup>

Since the days of Queen Elizabeth I (1533-1603), the political and economic situation of English Catholics had been declining unrelentingly.<sup>4</sup> English Catholicism had only been able to survive through the foundation of colleges on the Continent. These had proved to be the last strongholds of militant Catholicism, especially as centres of education and necessary reservoirs for supplying young and dynamic missionaries.<sup>5</sup> Although the later Stuarts had promised some relief, the Test Acts of 1673 and 1678 convincingly demonstrated the discriminatory treatment of Catholics.

Even the religious policy of the staunch Catholic James II (1633-1701) did more harm than good to the Catholic cause.<sup>6</sup> Nevertheless, his ecclesiastical programme was of decisive importance for future developments. James II succeeded (after an interval of more than fifty years) in reactivating the position of a vicar apostolic in England.<sup>7</sup> This new vicar, Dr John Leyburn (1620-1702), possessed rights and duties equivalent to those of a “bishop in ordinary”. One of his first tasks was to reduce from six to four the original religious districts introduced in 1623 under the first vicar apostolic, Dr William Bishop (1554-1624). Thus, in 1688 the newly established vicariates were under the control of the following clerics: the London District under Dr John Leyburn (1688-1702), the Midland District under Dr Bonaventura Giffard (1688-1703), the Northern District under Dr James Smith (1688-1711) and the Western District under the Benedictine Michael Ellis (1688-1705).

The revolution of 1688/89 brought an unforeseeable set-back. But even the imprisonment of the two prominent vicars apostolic of the London and the Midland District did not stop further development of the denomination, because the Catholics were tolerated as long as they did not cause political disturbances. By the end of the 17th century, however, the situation was less favourable than ever. The penal laws were repeatedly enforced, especially after the Stuart rising in 1708, when the government finally dropped



Thomas J. F. Strickland (?1682-1740) at St Gregory's, Paris (By the French artist Alexis Simon Belle [1674-1734] – kept at Sizergh Castle, Cumbria)

its policy of religious conformity and focused on social and political humiliation of the English Catholics.<sup>8</sup> The development of the four vicariates had been decisively influenced by the death of Leyburn in June 1702, when Giffard (1643-1734) was transferred from the Midland to the London District. He was also made responsible for the administration of the Western District after Ellis (1652-1726) had resigned in 1705, in favour of the more congenial Italian see of Segni.<sup>9</sup> The vacant Midland District was now given to Dr George Witham (1655-1725). He mainly owed his promotion to Queen Mary of Modena (1658-1718), the widow of James II, who had recommended him as Leyburn's coadjutor to Pope Clement XI (1649-1721). Meanwhile the hotly debated succession in the Western District finally went to the Franciscan, Matthew Prichard (1669-1750). The Catholic religion again faced difficulty when, in 1711, Smith (1645-1711) died. Dr Silvester Jenks (1656-1714) was designated as his successor to the Northern District. Unfortunately, the "Briefs of Appointment" reached Jenks after his death in December 1714, when the problem of an appointment for the North had to be reconsidered again. Dr Robert Witham (1667-1738), brother of George Witham, Lawrence Mayes (1673-1749), the Catholic "chargé d'affaires" at the court of Rome, and Dr John Ingleton (1658-1739), subpreceptor to the "Old Pretender" and almoner to Queen Mary at the court of St Germain were among the leading possible candidates. Each of them would have been well-suited for the position, but none of them was promoted by Giffard. After an interval of two years and numerous negotiations it was finally decided to have George Witham transferred to the North. Witham's place in the Midland District was filled by a man whose career was greatly influenced by Giffard himself: Dr John Talbot Stonor (1678-1756).<sup>10</sup>

Moreover, Stonor was the closest friend of Thomas John Francis Strickland (?1682-1740),<sup>11</sup> whose main aspiration was to achieve a reconciliation between the English Catholics and King George I.<sup>12</sup> Because of George's accession and Jenk's sudden death, 1714 marked two further developments of Roman Catholicism in England: first through Stonor's promotion which finally materialized in 1716 (a promotion, incidentally, that the ambitious Strickland might easily have coveted for himself) and second through the negotiations which were to be conducted by the "two young doctors" in the years to come.

Thomas J. F. Strickland's ecclesiastical career was to be crowned with the nomination to a bishopric in the Austrian Netherlands more than a quarter of a century later.<sup>13</sup> The fifth-born<sup>14</sup> but fourth surviving son of Sir Thomas Strickland (1621-1694) of Sizergh Castle, left England at the age of seven in 1689, when his family followed the dethroned James II into exile to St. Germain-en-Laye outside Paris.<sup>15</sup> In 1699, he entered Douai college<sup>16</sup> to begin his ecclesiastical studies.

On 1 September, 1726, the archbishop and Duke of Cambrai, Charles de Saint-Albin (+1764), "*un fils naturel de Regent*",<sup>17</sup> testified that according to the archival records of the late archbishop of Cambrai, François de Salignac de la Mothe-Fénélon (1651-1715)<sup>18</sup> Thomas J. F. Strickland of the English Diocese of Carlisle received the tonsure and minor orders from Fénélon's hand on 26 March, 1700 in the chapel of the archbishop's palace in Cambrai.<sup>19</sup> After four years Strickland left Douai and entered "upon his own expences" St Gregory's in Paris on 9 January, 1703;<sup>20</sup> the seminary was then under the supervision of both Dr Thomas Witham (+1727), cousin to the vicar apostolic of the Midland District, and of Robert Witham, the future president of Douai in 1715 after

the death of Dr Edward Paston (1641-1714). After more than a year, Strickland left the seminary again on 4 April, 1704 and entered that of St Sulpice, where he continued his liturgical studies; temporarily he is said to have held an ecclesiastical office in the seminary of St Magloire in Paris.<sup>21</sup> The archbishop of Paris, Cardinal Louis Antoine de Noailles (1651-1729),<sup>22</sup> testified on 9 September, 1726 that the late bishop of Tulle, Humbert Ancelin (1648-1720),<sup>23</sup> conferred the subdiaconate on Strickland on 20 March, 1706, and then on 9 April, 1707 Strickland received the diaconate in the private chapel of the archiepiscopal palace.<sup>24</sup> Before priestly ordination candidates were investigated as to whether they were "fit for orders";<sup>25</sup> in Strickland's case this investigation was done extremely carefully, as the vicar apostolic of the Northern District, Smith, had informed the president of Douai that some unpleasant remarks had been made concerning the candidate.<sup>26</sup> Still, Strickland became a priest during High Mass celebrated by the titular bishop of Rosalia, Arthur of Lyonne,<sup>27</sup> on 25 May, 1709.<sup>28</sup> After an interval of seven years Strickland returned to St Gregory's,<sup>29</sup> where he successfully finished his theological studies. He received his "*laurea doctoralis*" on 20 April, 1712<sup>30</sup> according to Monsieur Herissant, court recorder of the theological faculty of the Sorbonne, whose statement was testified by Monsieur de Romigny,<sup>31</sup> sindicus of the same faculty, on 7 September, 1726. Eight months later, on 16 December, 1712, he left the English seminary of St Gregory's and seems to have returned to his family estate in Westmorland, where he was staying on 21 June, 1713 according to the Tildesley Diary.<sup>32</sup> Shortly afterwards he had returned to France because in March 1714 he declared his intention to return again to England.<sup>33</sup>

From this point Strickland is actively involved in the fate of English Catholicism. He gave an exact description of the present state of the Catholic religion in a "Memoire" dated 16 December, 1714<sup>34</sup> and addressed to Vincenzo Santini (1676-1728),<sup>35</sup> the internuncio in Flanders. Among other information, this note contained the news of Jenk's recent death. Strickland, who probably thought himself perfectly capable of holding a position for which Jenks had been designated, was to be disappointed for the first time, when Giffard preferred Stonor to him, not just because of Stonor's assumed extraordinary ecclesiastical qualities but also because Stonor was the nephew of Charles Talbot, twelfth Earl and only Duke of Shrewsbury (1660-1718)<sup>36</sup> on his mother's side. In any case, more likely Strickland's aspirations were directed from the very beginning towards the Northern District rather than that of the London or Midland. After Giffard promoted Stonor to his vicar general, Strickland commenced numerous intrigues against the vicar apostolic, whom he thought to be too old to fulfil his ecclesiastical functions, thereby clearly demonstrating that he was determined to secure promotion (if possible to the Northern District) through the influence of Santini despite the opposition of some of the English clergy.<sup>37</sup> Strickland's strategy to eliminate his closest friend as possible successor to the Northern District by means of making him coadjutor "*cum iure successionis*" to Giffard seemed to work perfectly well at the beginning. At least Ingleton had promising news from the future cardinal protector, Filippo Antonio Gualtieri (1660-1728),<sup>38</sup> that both of them had been considered as possible candidates for the position in question.<sup>39</sup> His capacity for intrigue and lack of discretion in important matters which were to make him very unpopular among his "co-religionists" notwithstanding, Strickland knew whom to choose as his friends. One of them was Henry Howard (1684-1720), the future bishop of Utica "*in partibus infidelium*" and coadjutor to Giffard "*cum iure successionis*". He was



the nephew of the convert Henry Howard, 7th Duke of Norfolk (1655-1701), and second son of Lord Thomas Howard of Worksop (+1689), who had revived Jacobite sympathies in the Norfolk family.<sup>40</sup> Strickland spent the summer months of 1715 with him in Spa,<sup>41</sup> from where he continued his voluminous correspondence with the internuncio. Strickland's ostentatious behaviour and his unfortunate manner in getting the "*distretto settentrionale*" for himself and the position as "*coadjutore di Mons<sup>r</sup> Giffard*" for his "*alter ego*", made him continuously more suspect not only in the eyes of the English Catholics but also in those of the cardinals and the curial officials.<sup>42</sup> Still his good relations with Rome, his influential friends in Flanders and France and his "*singolare vivacità d'ingegno*" ought to have secured him a promotion. Whereas Stonor was regarded as a much more sincere and sober character, Strickland, who prided himself on being a "*virum candidum et sincerum, et in rerum ecclesiasticarum administratione praecipuum*", was suspected to be an enemy of his own denomination. His opponents compared him with his older brother whose contribution to the growth of the Catholic religion had been much admired at the beginning, but who suffered from madness in later years: "*. . . essendo fresca la memoria del suo fratello maggiore, quale di giovine assai spiritoso, in pochi anni morì impazzito*".<sup>43</sup>

In September 1715 Strickland's disappointment peaked for the first time, when Stonor got his letters of appointment for the Midland District. Strickland's notorious manner of discrediting his own religious brethren, along with his underestimate of Santini's esteem and support, were among the reasons for this set-back.<sup>44</sup> Besides the Jesuits' assault of his "*being yet too young (35), and not very agreeable at present to the clergy*" in December 1714,<sup>45</sup> it was also his ecclesiastical insufficiency that was much discussed, as the president of Douai greatly lamented in his letter to Rome in March 1716:<sup>46</sup>

Strickland goes on in his intrigues and has lately said that we shall shortly hear of great alterations as to the affairs of our mission, . . . and [he] signified that the Northern District would fall to his lot. I hope Santini will not favour him after such a character as I took the freedom to give of him. Besides what I writt [*sic*] before, I think it may be of some weight to add that he very seldom says Mass. He was about 2 months in the North of England and never said Mass all that time not even on Sundays or the greatest feasts which was much taken notice of; 'tis necessary in our mission that the gentry and laity have a good opinion and great esteem of their Bishop, who composes difference, hinders suites etc.; now 'tis certain they will have very little of Mr Strickland.

But Strickland was far from giving up all hopes for his own promotion since he was convinced that his future career would not so much depend on the English clergy but on prominent Continental ecclesiastics such as Cardinal Agostino Fabroni (1661-1727), Cardinal Henri de Thiard de Bissy (1657-1737), bishop of Méaux, the French Jesuit Père Honoré Renaud de Gaillard (1641-1727), "a young famous spy of the Jesuits", and Père Michel le Tellier (1643-1719), who was the Jesuit Provincial of France and King Louis XIV's confessor.<sup>47</sup> Robert Witham, however, thought that Strickland's constant boasting about his good contacts might finally displease and exasperate the internuncio; a conviction that proved to be right when in March 1716 the English seminaries on the Continent came "*uni sono*" to the conclusion that "we cannot rely upon what Mr Strickland says nor that all is true that he brags of his concerning great interest".<sup>48</sup> Three weeks after this communication Strickland shocked the English clergy with the sensational news that Cardinal de Bissy had written in his favour to the Roman curia and he "pretended to have a letter [which he did not shew] from some '*auditor rotae*' at

Rome which assures him His Holiness will make [him] a *5th Bishop and Vicar Apostolic* in England '*motu proprio*' without consulting the congregation '*de propaganda [fide]*'.<sup>49</sup> By the summer of 1716, Strickland's extravagant designs, however, had completely come to an end. This was due not only to Stonor's promotion but also to Strickland's fatal misinterpretation of Stonor's friendship which ended when personal advantages were concerned:<sup>50</sup>

As for Dr Strickland, Stonor has already declared to him that he cannot employ him as grand vicar, or in any other way; and this he thought absolutely necessary to remove the prejudices he lies under. So that having employed this poor tool while he wanted him, he now drops him where he found him. This puts Strickland in a very great ferment, finding disappointments on all sides. However, he still goes on in the great correspondence he has with Cardinal Fabroni and the internuncio, and fancies his flourishing letters upon all sorts of business which no ways belongs to him, will at length produce something.

The consequence of his not being accepted as a possible candidate for an episcopal office in the Northern District brought about a total change in Strickland's personality. He reconsidered the original plans of 1714 and tried to make political contact with the Hanoverian elector and King of Great Britain, but still on behalf of the Catholic cause. The moment seemed favourable because the Jacobite rising of 1715 had turned out to be a complete disaster, not only because the Stuarts lacked French assistance after the death of Louis XIV (1638-1715),<sup>51</sup> but also because George I appeared to have a real chance of reconciling the English Catholics to the Hanoverian succession with the help of an intermediary and thereby lessening their adherence to the Pretender. At least Strickland was prepared to take his chance and was destined to play the part of intermediary.

At the beginning of the reign of King George I, English Catholic loyalty centred upon an "Oath of Allegiance" to the Hanoverian dynasty. Although strongly opposed by the Stuart exiles, it prevented them from further political, financial and social humiliation. The situation, however, became worse, when in June 1716, as a result of the supposed participation of Catholics in "the Fifteen", Parliament passed the "Register Act" which required all papists who had not done so to take the desired oath and to renounce the Pretender before January 1717 ("Oath for Abjuring the Stuart Family"). Otherwise they were ordered to register their lands with the Clerks of the Peace of Court; so that confiscation of two-thirds of them might be facilitated, or such tax levied upon them as might be substituted for confiscation. Besides an older obligation which subjected them to the payment of double the amount of the land-tax,<sup>52</sup> two other discriminatory statutes were imposed on them in the same session.<sup>53</sup>

This lamentable situation marked the beginning of a series of negotiations between Strickland and James Stanhope, first Earl Stanhope (1673-1721).<sup>54</sup> Strickland was thereby assisted by Stonor, who suggested that the Catholics "should publicly apologise for the past, or rather swear for the future all that they can prudently think may give satisfaction to the government, and conscience will allow".<sup>55</sup> Although he strongly rejected the "Test Act" and the "Oath of Supremacy", he thought it wise and advisable to take a simple "Oath of Submission and Non-Resistance", furthermore an "Oath of Allegiance" to King George I and the desired "Oath of Abjuration". There is no doubt that the leading politicians favoured such a compromise which suggested not executing the

"Register Act" before the Catholics had offered an oath which would have been compatible with their conscience. At the instigation of some Catholic gentry resident in London<sup>56</sup> Stonor and some of the reconcilable Jesuits ("two or three of whom agreed with him")<sup>57</sup> drafted such an oath a couple of days *before* the "Register Act" passed Parliament. Although representing the conservative party among the Catholic clergy, who had always been averse to any compromise with the Hanoverian government, Giffard himself took this oath into real consideration, but – obviously for fear of losing his sincerity and credibility among his "co-religionists" – he seems to have changed his mind. Thus, the first chance for a reconciliation had apparently been missed!

After the "Register Act" had finally passed Parliament in June 1716, a meeting was instantly called at the lodgings of Giffard upon the theme of the oath:<sup>58</sup>

The opinions were divided. Bishop Giffard who seemed to allow it in private, was so cautious as to give nothing in writing. Mr Stonor was for allowing it; little or nothing was agreed upon; and if they had, they would get no one to present a petition to the house.

This presumption, however, was wrong. Strickland had already started secret negotiations with influential politicians<sup>59</sup> and the text proposed at Giffard's conference had already been accepted by the Stanhope ministry; but *not all* of the formula had been shown to the Bishop. He saw only the first part, in which the desired "Oath of Submission" ought to be granted. Whereas the second part, which was very unlikely to be approved by a majority of the clergy as it dealt with papal dispensation, was kept from him, even though it seems to have been part of the formula from the very beginning.<sup>60</sup>

The first part of the Catholic submission was approved by Bishop Giffard tho [sic] he said it was very strong. 2nd he did not see. The first was given by some four Catholics, who wrongfully took upon themselves to represent all of that persuasion to some foreign ministers to be delivered to the Secretaries of State: but one answering it would sacrifice more, if something was inserted relating to the Pope's dispensing power, on this account the 2nd part was added by 2 or 3 Catholics unknown to others. Most of the Catholics know nothing of either of these oaths; or if they did would they allow of it? . . . Mr Stonor, with a layman or two were the first movers in it and drew the first scheme of the submission oath after we have refused it for 27 years.

The sparse attendance at the conference shows the dilemma in which the English Catholics found themselves. On the one hand they would have lost their credit at the exiled Stuart court in France if their plans had been revealed. On the other the negotiations only helped the particular interests of a handful of wealthy Catholic families who feared the loss of part of their property. Thus, rather personal and egoistic motives stimulated a minority of the Catholic gentry (and clergy) to approve an "Oath of Submission" as it was termed. The next step, however, was to apply to Rome for permission to take such an oath, while at the same time demonstrating the fatal consequences resulting from a non-acceptance of the "*Juramentum . . . offerendum a Catholicis cum approbatione Episcopi Madaurensis* [i.e. Bishop Giffard]".<sup>61</sup> One might expect Strickland to have been charged with sounding out the papal reaction. But at this critical juncture the internuncio in Brussels instead kindly requested Cardinal Fabrizio Paolucci (1651-1726)<sup>62</sup> to act as intermediary. The Cardinal Secretary of State was to handle the affair with the utmost discretion, while the Pope consented not to communicate

anything to Cardinal Gualtieri, the agent of the Pretender, who would positively try to thwart any negotiations of this kind. Although Stonor and Strickland, who was the meddling figure in the background, tried to keep their agitations most secret, they were soon revealed by some clergy:<sup>63</sup>

Bishop Stonor and Strickland pretend to be fallen out. Dr Thong. [i.e. Thomas Witham] believes it, I believe no such thing, because 'tis certain and can be easily proved that Strickland is still underhand working for Stonor.

At this stage Strickland's way of handling this difficult matter was highly diplomatic, if not devious. On the one hand he denied his part in drafting the "Memorial", and defended himself against massive accusations from the Pretender's court. On the other he assiduously cultivated the friendship of Thomas Howard, 8th Duke of Norfolk (1683-1732), the prominent head of the Catholic faction, "whose purse he [i.e. Strickland] has at [his] command".<sup>64</sup> The first decisive step taken by the congregation of "*propaganda fide*" at the beginning of September 1716, was, however, much disliked by the exiled Stuart court:<sup>65</sup>

I [i.e. John Ingleton] have yours [i.e. Lawrence Mayes] of the 1st and am extremely surprised of that part wherein you tell me, that your court has approved a pure 'Oath of Allegiance', tho [sic] not in writing. . . . This proceeding is not only injurious to the King [i.e. James III], but altogether useless and unprofitable for the Catholics of England. For the oaths now tendered by the laws are the 'Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance', the 'Oath of Abjuration', and the 'Test'.

So the Catholics were (at least unofficially) allowed to take a pure "Oath of Allegiance". Yet, although the Duke of Norfolk (during his stay in Brussels in October 1716) was given orders by Santini to communicate the papal decision to the vicar apostolic of the London District, according to an express command from Rome, nothing was to be put "in writing". The uncertainty about the permissibility of taking the oaths, and the indecisiveness of the English clergy were among the many reasons why Thomas J. F. Strickland was to be sent on his mission to Rome in early 1717.<sup>66</sup> Bishop Stonor, who had repeatedly written to Rome requesting a definite statement about the oaths, pressed for Strickland's mission to the papal curia. This step taken clandestinely and without the consent of the rest of the English clergy, would cause a vehement reaction.<sup>67</sup>

In the meantime Strickland had received his instructions. First, he was "to thank him [i.e. the Pope] in the name of many Catholics for the declaration lately sent from Rome"; second he was "to desire to know what they must do in the 2nd part of the oath . . . as to the Pope's dispensing power"; and third he was "to get Briefs to the Emperor and German princes . . . to get their mediation".<sup>68</sup> After having used "great endeavours" to make George I "favourable to the Catholics" during the elector's stay in his German principality in the summer of 1716, Strickland left England for Brussels in November in order to receive encouraging letters of recommendation from the internuncio.<sup>69</sup> In Paris he met with Cardinal de Bissy, who promised him ecclesiastical offices in his own diocese. These promises, however, were regretfully withdrawn by the bishop of Méaux after the intervention of Queen Mary in February 1717.<sup>70</sup> In the first half of December Strickland left St Germain-en-Laye, where the Jacobite entourage had just been threatened with a treaty between the Regent and England concerning the King's removal from

Avignon. Since time was running short, he made for Rome via Lyons, as Ingleton wrote on 26 December, 1716:<sup>71</sup>

You may possibly ere this have seen Dr Strickland; for he reckoned to be at Rome by Christmas. He went as far as Lyons with the envoy of Florence, and might have gone with him into Italy: but the envoy being resolved to pass by Avignon, he chose rather to quit him than appear at that place; that you may be a little apprized of his negotiations, I shall give you the copy of a letter from Avignon, 'tis as follows: Dr Strickland told the envoy in confidence that he was going to Rome to desire the Pope to intercede with all the Catholic Princes to interpose their credit with George in favour of the English Catholics, and at the same time to know from His Holiness whether it be lawfull for the Catholics to take the oaths to avoid the persecution. He told him also he had assurance given him that upon his arrival at Rome the Pope would assemble a congregation of cardinals to consult that matter. He said his great correspondence was with the Jesuits, that he lodged with them wherever he came, and had all his packets directed to them; in fine he told him he had been in several courts of Germany, that he had been at Hanover, where he has seen George and spoke with him; that from thence he had gone to England, and had conferences with Stanhope, who, he said, is his relation. . . . I had this from the vicelegat's secretary, and the vicelegat confirmed the same last night to the King. [December 16]

I question not but Strickland will go farther, and propose a decision concerning the 'Oath of Abjuration', for which I know he has already argued much, and consulted some foreign Divines, who are strangers to the constitution and laws of England. His other great view will be his own promotion; but the King and Queen have put Cardinal Gualterio upon his guard, and we must rely upon his zeal and great capacity.

The note "*venuto poi in Roma l'Abbate Strickland come allegato da i Cattolici d'Inghilterra*"<sup>72</sup> is our first indication of his arrival at the papal curia, where he immediately made contact with Mayes. Strickland complained to the "chargé d'affaires" about Stonor's unfortunate behaviour in this important question. Stonor, however, was well able to cope with this assault:<sup>73</sup>

I do not wonder of what you tell me of D[r.] Strickland's showing his dissatisfaction with me. . . . He has certainly a very great deal of wit, and every singular talent of easy and elegant elocution; both in speaking and writing. He has of learning mediocrement, for the only time he studied was whilst you knew him at Douai; what he has got since is what casually has fallen into his ears and has been retained by his very good memory. He is one of no manner of integrity and will sacrifice any business he is charged with to his own interest and will as easily betray his friend particularly if that friend does not entirely come up to his humour and desires as 'tis hard to do. He has no good judgement as to the concluding any affair of consequence; but yet he would in a great measure make up this defect by his ex tempore wit and address if he did not again spoil things by his vain and superabundant talk, and by a worse fault which is that he can neither keep his own counsel nor anybody's else; so that if you humour him a little there is nothing that he will not tell you. 'Tis a sort of vanity which makes him thus let fly everything that may make him look important. But otherwise he is not to be relied on for the truth of what he says. As for his piety and devotion when I left him last it was at a very low ebb. His wit and the good reception . . . make him think capable of any thing; but his indiscreet and light carriage make not any one . . . think him capable of any sort of preferment.

Despite the discouraging description of Strickland's character, he obtained the assistance of some cardinals;<sup>74</sup> but none of them was prepared to put anything "in writing" to be transmitted to the internuncio. After several interventions and discussions he was given the unsatisfactory answer "*consulant theologos*".<sup>75</sup> Nevertheless, Strickland was

full of hope and his correspondence showed his unsuccessful endeavours in Rome in a favourable and promising light.<sup>76</sup>

Le Pape m'a dit qu'il avoit toujours supposé que les Catholiques d'Angleterre avoient prestés les sermens de fidélité et d'obéissance au gouvernement, usités dans les autres nations, et que s'ils ne les prêtoient pas, ils ne souffriroient pas pour leur religion, mais pour leur obstination.

<sup>2</sup><sup>ment.</sup> Qu'il ne donneroit jamais au Chevalier aucune assistance d'hommes ni d'argent pour susciter de nouveaux troubles en Angleterre.

<sup>3</sup><sup>ment.</sup> Qu'un Religieux Carme luy aiant dit qu'à son arrivée en Angleterre il trouveroit moiien de soutenir et d'avancer les interêts du Roy Jacques, Sa Sainteté donna ordre de le retenir et de ne le pas envoyer à la mission. L'internonce de Bruxelles a reçu une decision de la congregation portant que les Catholiques d'Angleterre non seulement pouvoient, mais aussi qu'ils devoient selon les paroles de St. Pierre et de St. Paul, paier toute obéissance politique et fidelité au present gouvernement. Le contenu de cette decision a été adressé dans une lettre à l'évêque Stonor, qui lui a été rendu par le Duc de Norfolk, et l'évêque Stonor a eu ordre de le communiquer aux autres évêques. Il est vrai que peu de jours après l'internonce eut ordre de ne rien donner de ceci par écrit; mais cela ne fait pas que le decret soit moins réel, ni moins authentique.

Strickland's mission, however, was to fail in the end. This failure is due to a series of unfortunate but partly foreseeable factors: first, to the natural aversion of Catholics towards the Anglican church; second, to the number of serious accusations discrediting Stonor's and Strickland's activities, accusing them of primarily following their own interests and ends; third, to the strong resolution of some "wavering Catholics" to follow an obviously powerful group of English clerics at the decisive moment; and fourth, to the intervention of the Stuart King James III, whose presence in the papal states seems to have been the final blow to the plan.<sup>77</sup> The failure of these important negotiations, however, resulted in a continuance of the politically, socially and economically humiliating situation of Roman Catholics for more than another hundred years. And as far as Thomas J. F. Strickland is concerned, it forced the metamorphosis of his ecclesiastical career into a political one during the next several years.

With letters of recommendation to the Habsburg Emperor Charles VI (1685-1740), to Prince Eugene of Savoy (1663-1736)<sup>78</sup> and to other imperial ministers, Strickland left Rome on 24 April 1717,<sup>79</sup> disappointed but far from being completely discouraged. On 1 July, 1717 he wrote again to Cardinal Paolucci from Turin submitting six questions in Latin to him concerning the political and religious consequences such an oath would entail, which the Cardinal promised to take carefully into consideration. Nonetheless, nothing seems ever to have been put "in writing".<sup>80</sup>

Not very much is recorded about Strickland's activities in the second half of the year 1717. He seems to have stayed in Turin until the end of July; and Stonor thought him to be in Brussels in August.<sup>81</sup> Whether he resided at the court of the exiled King of Poland, Stanislaus Leszczyński (1677-1766) in Bar-le-Duc,<sup>82</sup> cannot be proved. By the end of 1717 he was in Paris, where the Stuart entourage very much disapproved his "anglophilic" tendencies and "his wiggish way of talking".<sup>83</sup> At the beginning of 1718 Strickland's influence clearly was waning among the leading English Catholics: "Strickland's chief support, the Duke of Norfolk has abandoned him".<sup>84</sup> Not so in Vienna, where he was warmly received by Emperor Charles VI, Prince Eugene and Gundakar Thomas von Starhemberg (1663-1745).<sup>85</sup> The main purpose of his visit to the

imperial capital on the Danube was to obtain Charles's promise to intercede on behalf of the English Catholics in finding a tolerable form of reconciliation with the electoral king. Strickland even might have expected to be sent to the Roman curia a second time. Especially since he remembered the emperor's promise to instruct the imperial envoy in Rome, Johann Wenzel Count Gallas, Duca di Lucera (1669-1719),<sup>86</sup> to obtain the title of a bishop "*in partibus*" for Strickland. This position would have empowered him to publish his views opposing Giffard and his circle. If that plan did not bear out, Strickland was determined to suggest the probability of the Catholics' being forced to take the oaths. This step was taken in complete accordance with Stanhope:<sup>87</sup>

I [i.e. Stanhope] am likewise to acknowledge a former dispatch of your Lordship . . . touching the Roman Catholics giving some pledge to the government of their allegiance and fidelity; I laid it before his Majesty who thinks it deserves attention: . . . Your Lordship is sensible how tenderly such a thing must be handled; . . . if we are so happy as to end our great affair well, I think it will then be a proper occasion to have it in our thoughts, in the meantime I think the person (obviously Dr Strickland) deserves all kind of encouragement.

The reaction at the exiled Stuart residence was fatal. The Court of St. Germain-en-Laye, according to the English Ambassador Extraordinary in Paris, John Dalrymple, second Earl of Stair (1673-1747), was so exasperated with Strickland that "several messages had been sent to him of late, threatening to have him [i.e. Strickland] murdered".<sup>88</sup> Stair, nonetheless, had very good grounds to recommend him to the Regent for some ecclesiastical preferment.

At the beginning of May 1718 Strickland went to Liège to await further instructions.<sup>89</sup> Both in Louvain and Brussels he met Robert Witham, who strongly condemned his "whiggish and republican [sic] principles". Strickland denied any intention of crossing the Channel and boasted of being very soon made vicar general of Soissons, with a "benefice under Cardinal de Bissy at Méaux", a position which (after Mary of Modena's death [7 May 1718]) ought not to be withheld from him any longer.<sup>90</sup> Only a couple of weeks later Strickland, however, appeared in England.<sup>91</sup> At this time his mission was successfully kept secret, while Stanhope and Stair were generally thought to be the initiators of an alternative scheme of reconciliation. Strickland seems to have had lengthy and detailed discussions with William Pulteney, Earl of Bath (1684-1764), the former Secretary of War. Through Pulteney, Sir William Goring, one of the eight suggested subscribers to the new formula, thought to get detailed information about Strickland's views. Goring, who was more reserved, heartily agreed to an improvement of the Catholic situation, but warned at the same time that the present formula "seemed more calculated for private ends than for what was wanted here".<sup>92</sup> Thus, Strickland had been found out again.

Although Stanhope showed real interest in Strickland's ideas, he does not seem to have taken any further decisive steps towards successfully concluding the matter. Strickland's disappointment was obviously great. The "Memoire" which in the summer of 1718 he presented to James Craggs (1686-1721), Secretary of State, showed his bitterness and even hostility towards his own Catholic brethren. His ambition and determination to succeed in some way or other had turned him into a complete political instrument, so much that he suggested a catalogue of harsh measures against his "co-religionists".<sup>93</sup>



In the memorandum presented to Craggs, Strickland repeated the conditions under which the negotiations could be successfully completed: first by replacing Cardinal Gualtieri (either by the nephew of Pope Clement XI, Annibale Albani [1682-1751],<sup>94</sup> or by the Cardinal Secretary of State, Fabrizio Paolucci); second by revoking the Brief granted to the Chevalier de St George [i.e. James III, the "Old Pretender"] for allowing the nomination of the bishops of Ireland; third by recalling and replacing any vicar apostolic disliked by the present government; and last by nominating a confident Catholic mediator. This might refer to Strickland himself as he writes "*à Rome . . . agréable à la Cour d'Angleterre, pour travailler conjointement avec les Cardinaux Protecteurs, et sous leur autorité, à toutes les affaires qui regarderont le gouvernement ecclésiastique des Catholiques des Trois Royaumes*".<sup>95</sup> Furthermore, Strickland suggested that the Catholics should write an urgent letter to the emperor requesting his assistance through his envoy in Rome, Count Gallas.

Stanhope and Craggs again neglected to take any decisive steps, but took advantage of Strickland's usefulness in two different political affairs: firstly in securing the cardinal's hat for Guillaume Dubois (1656-1723),<sup>96</sup> secondly in preventing the "Old Pretender's" (1688-1765) marriage to Maria Clementina Sobieska (1702-1735).<sup>97</sup> In both cases Strickland should have been rewarded with personal advancement. Empowered with letters of recommendation to Stair, the Scottish financier John Law (1671-1729) and to François Louis de Pesme, Seigneur de St. Saphorin (1688-1737), the English resident at the Viennese court, Strickland left London.<sup>98</sup> Within a couple of weeks, Stair's and Law's representations to Philippe II, Duke of Orléans (1674-1723), were successful. On 25 August, 1718 Stanhope was informed "that the Regent has today promised the Abbey de Préaux (i.e. St Pierre de Préaux in Normandy) to Mr Strickland".<sup>99</sup> Thus, Strickland had finally received some personal advancement, which materialized on 23 November, 1718, in return for his eager political activities:<sup>100</sup>

L'abbé Strickland [sic], à qui M. le duc d'Orléans avoit promis l'abbaye de Préaux, à la recommandation des ministres du roi Georges, a été présenté ce matin à S. A. R., à qui il a fait ses remerciements. L'abbaye vaut 12 ou 15,000 livres de rente, et étoit une de celles qu'avoit l'abbé d'Estrées, archevêque de Cambrai. M. le duc d'Orléans a réservé 4,000 livres de pension sur cette abbaye; mais on ne sait pas encore à qui ces pensions sont destinées.

The Abbé's further movements in the later months of 1718 are obscure. The appearance in late 1718 of a pamphlet entitled "*A letter from a Gentleman at R[ome] to a friend at L[ondon]*"<sup>101</sup> gave rise to speculation that Strickland might have been in Rome in the autumn of 1718. The Stuart court tried to identify him as the author of this report, which severely criticised the court of the Pretender and his entourage, particularly John Erskine, Earl of Mar (1675-1732), James's first minister.

"*L'Abbé Strickland est arrivé hier au soir, et j'ai eu aujourd'hui une longue conférence avec lui*": with these words on 21 January, 1719 St Saphorin informed Stanhope of Strickland's arrival in Vienna and added that he was in some way suspicious about Strickland's success as "*le Pape a pris depuis quelque temps avec le Pretendant*".<sup>102</sup> But he added, in case the Abbé should fail to gain the Emperor's assistance, he still might be useful in preventing the Stuart-Sobieska marriage. A couple of days later, St Saphorin informed Stanhope extensively about Strickland's activities, which culminated in "*plusieurs conférences*" with the responsible Austrian ministers, Prince Eugene and Philipp Ludwig

Wenzel Count Sinzendorf (1671-1742).<sup>103</sup> He had drawn their attention to a "Memoire" illustrating the fatal consequences that would follow upon the enforcement of the penal laws: "*dans moins de 6 années, il n'y auroit peut être pas 2,000 Catholiques en Angleterre*".<sup>104</sup> Charles VI seemed to be willing to help, at least he expressed his readiness to intercede on Strickland's behalf; the imperial court was even prepared to "*demande pour lui au Pape le titre d'Archevêque in partibus, et l'on enverra en meme temps au Comte de Gallas son 'Memoire'*".<sup>105</sup> Count Gallas was instructed to intercede on the Abbé's behalf, who "*seit kurzem . . . unterm Nammen Salerne aus Engelland hier [i.e. Vienna] ankommen*", and to seek promotion for him. The hoped for promotion was intended to replace Giffard as vicar apostolic!<sup>106</sup> But no results were forthcoming. Although Gallas had already mentioned Strickland's name in a letter to Sinzendorf on 18 March, 1719, it was not until the middle of May that he gave two reasons why he had done nothing to further Strickland's promotion so far. First, he thought that Strickland ought to have contacted him personally about his intentions, which he obviously had neglected to do. Second, the imperial envoy wanted to know curial opinion about the Abbé. According to information from Cardinal Albani, Gallas informed Sinzendorf that Strickland had lost most of his credit since his departure in 1717, because in papal circles he was considered "*per un' uomo attaccato al partito del Cardinale di Noailles*". Gallas denied all these accusations in the strongest terms, but Albani warned the envoy that it is "*molto difficile, per non dire impossibile*" to come to a satisfactory conclusion concerning the oaths. As far as Strickland's promotion was concerned, however, he could assure him "*che tutti i vescovi d'Inghilterra si fanno a nomina del Re, e in conseguenza del Pretendente*", who was considered as their legal and lawful appointed king. It was very unlikely, however, that Strickland would ever gain the Pretender's approval.<sup>107</sup>

Strickland left Vienna on 1 March, 1719 for Brussels and by the beginning of May he was in Paris where he informed Stair and Dubois about his standing at the Viennese court.<sup>108</sup> On 20 May, 1719 St Saphorin informed Stanhope that "*il [i.e. the Pope] n'a aussi encore rien répondu au Comte de Gallas au sujet de la négociation de l'Abbé de Strickland*"; and a fortnight later, he still had no further news,<sup>109</sup> suggesting at the same time that only military operations against the Pope would prevent further delays in the negotiations.<sup>110</sup> Even more so, Albani's warning about papal assistance for the Pretender proved to be true, since James Francis Edward had left Rome in February 1719 in another attempt to re-establish the Stuart dynasty in England.<sup>111</sup>

Enfin j'ai ordre de réitérer à Votre Sainteté les très humbles remerciemens du Roi mon maître (i.e. James III) pour l'assurance qu'Elle lui a donné qu'Elle n'autorisera point les Catholiques d'Angleterre de prêter les sermens au gouvernement; 2°. De ce qu'Elle n'a point chargé l'Abbé Strickland ni ne le chargera pas à l'avenir d'aucun Bref aux Princes Catholiques ni autre commission qui puisse l'autoriser à aller faire dans les cours étrangers au préjudice du service de S. M. et de la paix et de l'union de la mission d'Angleterre.

After all these destructive set-backs Strickland went again to England in June 1719 (the Stuart rising had just come to an unsuccessful end at the battle of Glenshiel) to present his final memorandum to the Secretary of State, James Craggs. This memorandum was, as far as the central propositions were concerned, equivalent to the demands he had already suggested in spring 1718.<sup>112</sup> This document was now to be signed by the Duke of Norfolk and the Lords Stafford, Montague (Brown) and Waldegrave for the

nobility, and by Sir John Webb, Mr [Henry] Charles Howard, Mr [Thomas] Stonor and Mr Arundell Bealing for the gentry.<sup>113</sup> In the case of failure, Strickland suggested the full execution of the penal laws and that the Register Act be enforced.

At a conference on 27 June, 1719, with the Duke of Norfolk, in the presence of Waldegrave and Howard, Craggs was confident that the desired signature would be secured, although Howard "showed an unwillingness" to sign. Strickland was requested to prepare two letters for those signatures: one for the emperor, the other for the Pope. But three days later Craggs regretfully observed "a coolness as if they would depart what they had appeared ready to subscribe to". Strickland, who until the evening of 30 June, 1719 had expected a definite decision, was greatly alarmed and thought that this unforeseen digression was caused by the "unsurmountable resistance of Charles Howard and perhaps the encouragement of some Tories". It was not until the following day, 1 July 1719, that Waldegrave saw Craggs and informed him that because of "some other expedients", as yet no decision had been achieved. Cragg's letter to Stanhope, who spent the summer months with the king in his electoral residence at Herrenhausen,<sup>114</sup> advised him to inform Strickland about the situation, what they actually did and "where they gave their reason of fear, conscience, honour etc." for their behaviour in the affair. With powerful arguments Strickland once again tried to convince English Catholic leaders of the necessity of signing.<sup>115</sup> He even gave them a deadline for decision, "by noon" of the said day. That afternoon they came to his house but had changed their resolution again:

Charles Howard and the Duke (i.e. of Norfolk) withdrew several times into the back room to consult, where no doubt the former got the better again of the latter, for they determined at last not to sign, and so left the Doctor.

The arguments Henry Charles Howard of Greystoke and Deepdene (+1734) used in this connection are of particular interest.<sup>116</sup> He cited the toleration extended to Catholics in Protestant countries such as Holland or some German states; even in Turkey and "in many parts of the infidel world" Catholics were accepted and tolerated as long as they promised total obedience to their sovereign, only remaining connected with Rome in matters of doctrine and religious practice. English Catholics would be prepared to take an "Oath of Fidelity" to King George I *but* "without asking leave of the Pope". Under English law, however, it was high treason to assert the Pope's authority; such a formulation of their demands could be turned against them and bring about the severe enforcement of the penal laws.

The Duke of Norfolk, who left London immediately after the negotiations had failed, informed Craggs that the failure to secure the signatures was due both to the lack of time and to the participants' disregard of the need for discretion. Only four of them (the Duke himself, Lord Waldegrave (1685-1741), Charles Howard and one person not named)<sup>117</sup> came together to discuss the matter but they did not dare to decide on behalf of the other four. He promised to come to a conclusion as soon as possible.<sup>118</sup> Cragg's reaction, however, proved to be fatal.<sup>119</sup>

The matter being thus broke off, I have determined to put the thing in execution which I said in my former I intended in that case, by tendering the oaths to Howard and seizing Bishop Giffard and Grey [i.e. the Earl of Shrewsbury].

Here he acted in complete accordance with Strickland, who considered such a procedure

the only way "to make them sign even stronger letters than those already proposed to them" and "for oppressing everyone of them as much as we can, till their humour changes".<sup>120</sup> The only person who was imprisoned in this connection, however, was Francis Plowden (+1788),<sup>121</sup> an adherent of the Pretender.

The negotiations had reached a climax in July 1719; although the prospects for success were undoubtedly very small, agitation continued. The chief mediator in the following negotiations was not Strickland, but rather Stonor. He was Strickland's choice as intermediary at the Viennese court. Having been threatened by Rome with the deposition from his own vicariate,<sup>122</sup> Stonor, however, decided not to take a leading part, but to mediate in the background.

It must have shocked the English clergy when Ingleton informed them at the end of August 1719 "that Dr Strickland is named by the emperor to the bishopric of Ypres";<sup>123</sup> that information, however, soon proved to be false. Nevertheless, it is the first hint that Strickland was interested in a bishopric in the Austrian Netherlands.

In September 1719 Strickland was still convinced that orders would come from the Pope for the Catholics to submit and take the oaths.<sup>124</sup> It was not until then that Matthew Prichard of the Western District had realized that the Abbé was the chief figure in all the negotiations, a circumstance that clearly demonstrates the complexity of the affair. He assumed that the Viennese ministers had been responsible for the various communications. While the emperor's court was made responsible for the "Memoire" in England, Strickland made Santini believe that it was the Catholic English clergy who took the initiative.<sup>125</sup> At the Hanoverian court, where Strickland stayed for a couple of days in September 1719, he managed to increase his influence, as Witham regretfully stated in the same letter to Mayes. Strickland's opportunism had finally turned him into a complete political instrument, a circumstance which he himself did not hesitate to express openly.<sup>126</sup>

Stonor, who was heavily attacked by Witham for supporting Strickland's scheme, nonetheless, summarized and strongly defended on 6 December, 1719 his engagement in his letter to Mayes:<sup>127</sup>

All I will tell you of the said meeting and of the points which were those agreed on, . . . , is this. It was agreed on:

- 1° that they had no manner of difficulty of conscience to comply with the proposals; and
- 2° that if they did not comply with the proposals they and all the Catholics should be immediately ruined.

Now without going any further let any one judge whether I am so much to blame for being for the affirmative and labouring to induce others to the same, and not rather they for persisting so obstinately in the negative. . . . But you will ask me perhaps what need was there of bringing things to such a point, and why could not the Catholics be let alone and hobble on their way without troubling them with any proposals about bettering their condition. To this I answer:

- 1° that this would be an odd query in regard of Catholics of any other country; but, I grant it, in regard of ours 'tis a very proper one;
- 2° their present misery, their declining condition, the law of two-thirds hanging over their heads, their applications to Vienna, recommendations from thence to our court naturally brought on proposals of this kind.
- 3° for these reasons I cannot condemn Dr Strickland . . . and I rather look upon it as a happiness that one of our religion had such an access to and interest with it.

For my own part I had no manner of hand informing this scheme, knew nothing of it till the

proposals had been actually made to the Duke of Norfolk and others last summer. Afterwards I met the Dr [i.e. Strickland] at Brussels as he was going to Hanover, and after he had exposed to me the whole business, . . . , I concluded the same things as the gentlemen of the assembly, . . . , I therefore begged of him that he would obtain some further delay of the court so that I could induce them to a better mind. I can assure you it has not been out of a bad intention. But it must be that my mind is made of a quite different mould from that of any other people; so that what seems to me, as in the clearest evidence lawful, prudent, necessary, conformable to the practise of all ages, and of all wise and Holy men, unfortunately proves to be quite otherwise.

Stonor intensified his activities at the end of 1719, emphasizing that the English Catholics could not be made martyrs for the Stuart cause.<sup>128</sup> Although the two “*enfants terribles*” thereby “put papists into a ferment” and the most prominent representatives of English Catholicism continued to refuse the oath, some were “wavering and so filled with the repeated menaces of persecution and ruin that they seem to be for consenting to offer to the present government a promise and even an oath (if they cannot avoid it) of living peaceably and giving no disturbance”.<sup>129</sup> Even Giffard regretted “*que Monsieur Stonor me presse fort de publier une règle de serment*”.<sup>130</sup> But he again refused to put anything “in writing”. Some Catholics were even prepared to raise up to £2,000 for Stonor and Strickland, so that the former might go to Rome, the latter to Vienna, in order to get a final decision.<sup>131</sup> Thoroughly alarmed by these plans, Giffard even informed Witham “that the prelate who is to be sent to Rome with Bishop Stonor is to be made cardinal and also protector of England in the place of Cardinal Gualtieri”.<sup>132</sup> A memorandum written in French in February 1720 heavily condemned all their activities and even accused them of their strong desire to get rid of all English and Irish priests and missionaries, who would not act according “*les sentiments de la presente Sorbonne, du corps de laquelle il (i.e. Strickland) est, aussi bien que le Sieur Stonor, Vicaire Apostolique*”.<sup>133</sup>

Stonor and Strickland were already preparing their departure when they finally had to realize that they were not to obtain the signatures, since only the Duke of Norfolk, Lord Shrewsbury, Stonor’s own brother and William Herbert, second Marquis and titular Duke of Powis (before 1667-1745) were prepared to sign. Despite their hopes for support from other quarters, the great reluctance and indiscretion of some people made it soon advisable not to press the business any further.<sup>134</sup>

While Stonor and Strickland seemed indefatigable in working out a new formula<sup>135</sup> Santini received orders from Rome that all negotiations between the “two doctors” and the English ministers were to be declared null and void for they had been undertaken without the consent of Pope Clement XI and the College of Cardinals.<sup>136</sup> Although this seemed to be the final blow,<sup>137</sup> both Stonor in his letter to Paolucci, and Strickland in his conversation with Ercole Giuseppe Turinetti, Marquis de Prié (1658-1726), underlined once more the necessity of signing the oaths.<sup>138</sup> Strickland finally requested that Giffard be deprived of his title and position and the Pretender be forced to reside within the boundaries of the papal states.<sup>139</sup> Both requisitions should have been achieved with imperial help. But neither Santini nor the English ministers, who considered Giffard an “*uomo savio e quieto, non avendo il minimo motivo di lamentarsi della sua condotta*”,<sup>140</sup> approved of Strickland’s animosity.

On 29 June, 1720 the last and decisive papal instruction reached Santini, in which he was ordered to execute the papal decree as already stated on 23 March.<sup>141</sup> Although the

matter was finally decided by Rome, Strickland still worked via Vienna. On 27 July, 1720 Cardinal Michael Friedrich von Althan (1680-1734)<sup>142</sup> received a communication in which he was instructed to continue the negotiations begun under Count Gallas.<sup>143</sup> When he reported the affair to the Pope, Clement XI gave him a “*rauhe Antwort*”<sup>144</sup> (brusque reply), which the Cardinal obviously did not expect. This is however, our last reference to Strickland’s activities in this connection.

In the end, a major opportunity for the early reconciliation of English Catholics with the Hanoverian government had been missed. Neither Stanhope, nor Craggs, nor any other politician or statesman earnestly took any decisive step in completing a scheme, which mainly originated with the anti-Stuart party among the English Catholics, led by the ambitious Dr Stonor and Dr Strickland. At the same time the failure of all the various negotiations shows the strong adherence of parts of the English clergy to the exiled court in St Germain-en-Laye, even despite heavy legal penalties and restrictions. The emancipation of Roman Catholics and their complete political and social integration in a mainly Anglican society, therefore, was to take more than another hundred years.

## Notes and References

- <sup>1</sup> Besides London archives the author mainly used hitherto unpublished source material from Roman and Viennese archives. The study concentrates exclusively on the early years of the ecclesiastical and political career of Dr Thomas J. F. Strickland; for his subsequent activities see Gernot O. Gürtler, “Der verkaufte Kardinals purpur” – Studien zur Genese eines englischen Polit-Klerikers des 18. Jahrhunderts: Thomas John Francis Strickland (?1682-1740). *Historische Blickpunkte – Festschrift für Johann Rainer. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft* 25 (Innsbruck, 1988), 195-215; G. O. Gürtler, *Ein Diplomat im Spannungsfeld von Politik und Kirche: Studien zu Thomas John Francis Strickland (?1682-1740)*, unpubl. thesis, (Innsbruck, 1981); for an analysis of the documents preserved in Ushaw College, Durham see Eamon Duffy, “Englishmen in Vaine”: Roman Catholic Allegiance to George I. *Studies in Church History*, 18 (London, 1981), 345-365.
- <sup>2</sup> See Ragnhild M. Hatton, “New Light on George I of Great Britain”. *England’s Rise to Greatness (1660-1763)*, ed. by S. Baxter (Berkeley, 1983), 213-255; R. M. Hatton, *George I – Elector and King* (London, 1978); R. M. Hatton, “In Search of an Elusive Ruler”. *Wiener Beiträge zur Geschichte der Neuzeit [Fürst-Bürger-Mensch]*, 2 (Wien, 1975), 11-41; Georg Schnath, *Geschichte Hannovers im Zeitalter der Neunten Kur und der englischen Sukzession 1674-1714*, 4 vols. (Hildesheim, 1938-1982).
- <sup>3</sup> For the rebellions see Rupert C. Jarvis, *Collected Papers on the Jacobite Risings* 2 vols. (Manchester, 1971/72); see also George H. Jones, *The Mainstream of Jacobitism* (Cambridge Mass., 1954); Charles Petrie, *The Jacobite Movement, the first Phase (1688-1716)* (London, 1948); Ch. Petrie, *The Jacobite Movement, the last Phase (1716-1807)* (London, 1950).
- <sup>4</sup> See Arnold Pritchard, *Catholic Loyalism in Elizabethan England* (London, 1979); Adrian Morey, *The Catholic Subjects of Elizabeth I* (London, 1978).
- <sup>5</sup> See Publications of the Catholic Record Society (CRS) 62 (*The Letter Book of Lewis Sabran, S. J. – Rector of St. Omer’s College [Oct. 1713 – Oct. 1715]*) (St. Albans, 1971); CRS 28 (*The Douay College Diaries – The Seventh Diary [1715-1778], preceded by a summary of events 1691-1715*), (London, 1928); CRS 19 (*Miscellanea 11 – Register Book of St. Gregory’s College Paris*), (London, 1917); Michael E. Williams, *St. Alban’s College Valladolid – Four Centuries of English Catholic Presence in Spain* (London, 1986); M. E. Williams, *The Venerable English College Rome: A History (1579-1979)* (London, 1979); Arthur Charles F. Beales, *Education under Penalty – English Catholic Education from the Reformation to the Fall of James II (1549-1689)* (London, 1963); Hubert Chadwick, *St. Omer’s to Stonyhurst – A history of two centuries* (London, 1962); Peter Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent 1558-1795, 1 [The English Colleges and Convents in the Catholic Low Countries]* (London, 1914); Robert Lechat, *Les Réfugiés Anglais dans les Pays-Bas Espagnols durant le Règne d’Elisabeth 1558-1603* (Louvain, 1914).
- <sup>6</sup> See Ludwig Hammermayer, “Papists” oder “Roman Catholic Citizens”? – Zur Toleranz und frühen

Katholikenemanzipation auf den Britischen Inseln im 18. Jahrhundert. *Wiener Beiträge zur Geschichte der Neuzeit* [Formen der europäischen Aufklärung], 3 (Wien, 1976), 20-80; Patrick, J. Corish, "Die Lage der Katholiken in Großbritannien und Irland im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert". *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte* 5 (Freiburg-Basel-Wien, 1970), 194-205; Robert W. Linker, "English Catholics in the Eighteenth Century" – *An Interpretation*. *Church History* 35 (Oreland, 1966), 288-310; for a general survey see also Michael R. Watts, *The Dissenters – From the Reformation to the French Revolution* (Oxford, 1978); John Cedric H. Aveling, *The Handle and the Axe – The Catholic Recusants in England from Reformation to Emancipation* (London, 1976); John Bossy, *The English Catholic Community 1570-1850* (Cambridge, 1974); for a social analysis of the Catholic community in Georgian London see George Rudé, *Paris and London in the 18th Century* (London, 1969), 268-292; Mary D. Leys, *Catholics in England (1559-1829) – A Social History* (London, 1961).

<sup>7</sup> See Basil Hemphill (vere Whelan), *The Early Vicars Apostolic of England 1685-1750* (London, 1954); for short biographies of the English clerics mentioned in this article see Godfrey Anstruther, *The Seminary Priests – A Dictionary of the Secular Clergy of England and Wales* vol. 3 (1660-1715) and 4 (1716-1800), (Great Wakering, 1976/77); *Dictionary of National Biography* (DNB).

<sup>8</sup> See Maureen Wall, *The Penal Laws 1691-1760* (Dublin, 1961, reprint 1968); for the rising of 1708 see Charles S. Terry (ed.), *The Jacobites and the Union – Being a Narrative of the Movements of 1708, 1715, 1719* (Cambridge, 1922).

<sup>9</sup> See Remigius Ritzler – Pirminus Sefrin, *Hierarchia Catholica medii et recentioris aevi* 5 (Patavii, 1952), 106 (sub Aureliopolitan.) and 357 (sub Signin.).

<sup>10</sup> See Robert, J. Stonor, *Stonor – A Catholic Sanctuary in the Chilterns from the Fifth Century till Today*, (Newport, 1951), 280-299.

<sup>11</sup> See John Burke, *Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Landed Gentry*, 2 (London, 1872), 872; Henry Hornyard-Strickland, *Genealogical Memoirs of the Family of Strickland of Sizergh*, (Kendal 1928), 151-159; David Scott of Penrith, *The Stricklands of Sizergh Castle – The records of twenty-five generations of a Westmorland family* (Kendal, 1908), 189-195; John F. Curwen, "Strickland of Sizergh", *CW1*, x, 66-74; Edward Bellasis (*Lancaster Herald*), "Strickland of Sizergh", *CW1*, x, 75-94 (with pedigree); see also Geoffrey Holt, *William Strickland and the Suppressed Jesuits* (London, 1988), 6.

<sup>12</sup> See E. Duffy, *Englishmen in Vaine*, 345-365; Summerfield Baldwin, *The Catholic Negotiation 1717-1719. Benedictine Historical Monographs*, 1 (St. Anselm's Priory, Washington, 1926), 5-40; Wolfgang Michael, *Englische Geschichte im 18. Jahrhundert*, 2, 1 [Das Zeitalter Walpoles], (Berlin-Leipzig, 1920), 121-129.

<sup>13</sup> See [Città del Vaticano], *Archivio Segreto Vaticano (ASV), Processus Episcoporum S. Congregationis Consistorialis* 113 (1727), fol. 454-471; Louis Jadin. "Procès d'information pour la nomination des évêques et abbés des Pays-Bas, de Liège et de Franche-Comté d'après les archives de la Congregation Consistoriale" 3 (1713-1974). *Bulletin de l'Institut historique Belge de Rome*, 11 (Rome, 1931), 50-55 (Procès de nomination de Thomas-Jean-François de Strickland, proposé pour le siège épiscopal de Namur – 1726); for Strickland's nomination to the diocese and his career as bishop of Namur (1727-1740) see G. O. Gürtler, "Der verkaufte Kardinals purpur", 195-215; Louis Antheunis, "Thomas Strickland, évêque de Namur, au service de la Couronne d'Angleterre", *Bulletin de la Commission Royale d'Histoire*, 3<sup>e</sup> livraison, 122 (Bruxelles, 1957), 239-259; Eugène del Marmol, "Ancien Palais des Evêques à Namur". *Annales de la Société Archéologique de Namur* 16 (Namur, 1883), 14-20; Jules Borgnet, "L'Evêque Strickland et le Magistrat de Namur – Une femme bourgmestre (1736-1738)". *Annales de la Société Archéologique de Namur* 2 (Namur, 1851), 383-396 and 5 (Namur, 1857), 403.

<sup>14</sup> Wrong in G. Anstruther, *Seminary Priests* 3, 213, Thompson Cooper, "Thomas John Francis Strickland". *DNB* 19 (London, 1909), 53, D. Scott, *Stricklands of Sizergh Castle*, 190 and Joseph Gillow, *A Literary and Biographical History, or, Biographical Dictionary of the English Catholics from the Breach with Rome, in 1534, to the Present Time* (London-New York, 1885-1902), 533, who consider him to be the fourth-born son of Sir Thomas Strickland. Another major mistake in John Kirk, *Biographies of English Catholics in the Eighteenth Century* ed. by J. H. Pollen and E. Burton (London, 1909), 223, who thought him to be the son of Sir Thomas's first wife Jane, widow of Sir Christopher Dawney, and daughter and co-heiress of John Moseley of Uskelf (Worcester), instead of Thomas's second wife, Winifred (1645-1725), elder daughter and co-heiress of Sir Christopher Trentham of Rochester, who he had married in 1674.

<sup>15</sup> Strickland's exact date of birth is uncertain. According to John Lord Hervey, *Memoirs of the Reign of George the Second, from his accession to the death of Queen Caroline*, ed. by J. W. Croker (London, 1848), 392, he was born in 1679; Dieudonné Brouwers, "Notice sur Mgr. Strickland". *Biographie Nationale* 24



(Bruxelles, 1926-1929), 180-183 and N. J. Aigret, *Histoire de l'église et du chapitre de Saint Aubin à Namur* (Namur, 1881), xii and 663 thought him to be 57 when he died in 1740; S. Baldwin, *Catholic Negotiation 1717-1719* 16 fn. 2. even took 1684/85 as his possible birth-date. I refer to H. Hornyold-Strickland, *Genealogical Memoirs*, 151, who justifies his opinion that Thomas's elder brother seems to have been born in 1680; an opinion which was rectified in a letter by the late Thomas Henry Hornyold-Strickland of February 15, 1978; for the Stuart exile in France see G. de Bosq. de Beaumont, *La Cour des Stuarts à Saint Germain-en Laye (1698-1718)* (Paris, 1912).

<sup>16</sup> CRS 19, 116.

<sup>17</sup> See M. Chartier, *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastiques* 11 (Paris, 1949), 556 and 561; R. Ritzler – P. Sefrin, *Hierarchia Catholica* 5, 139 (sub Cameracen.) and 238 (sub Laudunen.).

<sup>18</sup> See L. Cognet, Fénelon. *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastiques* 16 (Paris, 1967), 958-987; R. Ritzler – P. Sefrin, *Hierarchia Catholica* 5, 139 (sub Cameracen.); John McEwen (ed.), *Fénelon Letters* (London, 1964); Bernard von Koskull (ed.), *Fénelon – Persönlichkeit und Wirken* (München, 1951).

<sup>19</sup> See ASV, *Processus Episcoporum* fol. 460.

<sup>20</sup> See CRS 19, 116.

<sup>21</sup> See CRS 19, 117; *Gallia Christiana* 11 (Paris, 1870), 842.

<sup>22</sup> See H. Fisquet, *Noailles. Nouvelles Biographie Générale* 38 (Paris, 1862, reprint Copenhagen 1968), 132-138; R. Ritzler – P. Sefrin, *Hierarchia Catholica* 5, 22 (28), 150 (sub Cat[h]alaunen.), 151 (sub Caturcen.) and 307 (sub Parisien.); for the question of jansenism in France see Louis Cognet, *Der Jansenismus im Frankreich des 18. Jahrhunderts. Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte* 5, 409-461.

<sup>23</sup> See A. Lecler, Ancelin. *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastiques* 2 (Paris, 1914), 1507; R. Ritzler – P. Sefrin, *Hierarchia Catholica* 5, 396 (sub Tutelen).

<sup>24</sup> See ASV, *Processus Consistorialis*, fol. 460-461.

<sup>25</sup> See J. Kirk, *Biographies of English Catholics*, 223.

<sup>26</sup> Various charges were brought against him at different times, among them the charge of Jansenism; see Ruth Clark, *Strangers and Sojourners at Port Royal. Being an account of the connections between the British Isles and the Jansenists of France and Holland* (Cambridge, 1932), 254; for accusations of jansenistic ideology against Douai see Michael Sharratt, "Excellent Professors and an Exact Discipline: Aspects of Challoner's Douai". *Challoner and his Church – A Catholic Bishop in Georgian England* ed. by E. Duffy, (London, 1981), 112-125; E. Duffy, "A Rubb Up for Old Soares: Jesuits, Jansenists and the English Secular Clergy 1705-1715". *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 28 (Cambridge, 1977), 291-317; see also *Archiv. Westmon.* MSS. 38/1 (1700-1734/Bishop Giffard), fol. 43-65; for Strickland's defense against such accusations in later years see ASV, *Lettere di Vescovi*, t. 151, fol. 253 (Pierre de Guérin de Tencin to Niccolò-Maria Lercari/Grôté, 24 November 1728), fol. 254 (Guérin de Tencin to Thomas Strickland/Grôté, 20 November 1728), fol. 256-258 (Thomas Strickland to Guérin de Tencin/Namur, 24 October 1728) and fol. 260-263 (Mandement de Monseigneur l'Archevêque Prince d'Embrun/Embrun, 16 November 1728); Louis Jadin, *Relations des Pays-Bas, de Liège et de la Franche Comté avec le Saint-Siège d'après les "Lettere di Vescovi" conservées aux archives vaticanes (1566-1779). Bibliothèque de l'Institut historique Belge de Rome*, Fascicule 4 (Bruxelles-Rome, 1952), 449-452.

<sup>27</sup> See R. Ritzler – P. Sefrin, *Hierarchia Catholica* 5, 335 (sub Rosalien).

<sup>28</sup> See ASV, *Processus Consistorialis*, fol. 461.

<sup>29</sup> See CRS 19, 120.

<sup>30</sup> See ASV, *Processus Consistorialis*, fol. 461; the date of his promotion is sometimes giving erroneously as 2 April 1712; see G. Anstruther, *Seminary Priests* 3, 213; CRS 19, 121.

<sup>31</sup> See Ludwig Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste im Zeitalter des fürstlichen Absolutismus von der Wahl Klemens XI. bis zum Tode Klemens XII. (1700-1740)* 15 (Freiburg-Rom,<sup>8</sup> 1961), 427.

<sup>32</sup> See CRS 19, 121; H. Hornyold-Strickland, *Genealogical Memoirs*, 150; Thomas Tildesley, *The Tildesley Diary. Personal records of Thomas Tildesley of Fox Hall, Lancashire, during the years 1712-1713-1714* with introduction, notes and index by J. Gillow and A. Hewitson (Preston, 1873) [June 21, 1713: "After dinner went to Siggerzer [sic] to see Dr Tho[mas] Strickland, found Rob[ert] there, stayed all night"]; for his older brother Robert (+1712) see E. Bellasis, *Strickland of Sizergh, pedigree*.

<sup>33</sup> See CRS 62, 78-79.

<sup>34</sup> See William M. Brady, *The Episcopal Succession in England, Scotland and Ireland 1400-1875* (Rome, 1876), 249.

<sup>35</sup> See Jacques Thielens, *La correspondance de Vincenzo Santini – Internonce aux Pays-Bas (1713-1721)*.

- Analecta-Vaticano-Belgica* – Documents publiés par l'Institut historique Belge de Rome Nonciature de Flandre, 12 (Bruxelles-Rome, 1969); Léon E. Halkin, *Les Archives de Nonciatures. Bibliothèque de l'Institut historique Belge de Rome*, 14 (Bruxelles-Rome, 1968), 66 (Vincenzo Santini [1721-1722]).
- <sup>36</sup> See Dorothy H. Somerville, *The King of Hearts. Charles Talbot, Duke of Shrewsbury* (London, 1962).
- <sup>37</sup> See B. Hemphill, *Vicars Apostolic*, 51f.
- <sup>38</sup> See R. Ritzler – P. Sefrin, *Hierarchia Catholica* 5, 25 (10). 103 (sub Athenarum seu Athenien.), 228 (sub Imolen.) and 394 (sub Tudertin.); for the beginnings of the cardinal protectorship see William E. Wilkie, *The Cardinal Protectors of England – Rome and the Tudors before the Reformation* (Cambridge, 1974); W. E. Wilkie, *The beginnings of the cardinal protectorship of England: Francesco Todeschini Piccolomini (1492-1503)*, (Fribourg, 1966).
- <sup>39</sup> See B. Hemphill, *Vicars Apostolic*, 52; Edwin H. Burton, *The Life and Times of Bishop Challoner (1691-1781)*, 1 (London-New York-Bombay-Calcutta, 1909), 77; for Challoner see the more recent study E. Duffy (ed.), *Challoner and his Church – A Catholic Bishop in Georgian England* (London, 1981).
- <sup>40</sup> See W. M. Brady, *Episcopal Succession* 3, 155-158; R. Ritzler – P. Sefrin, *Hierarchia Catholica* 5, 401 (sub Uticen.); for Henry Howard, 7th Duke of Norfolk, see John M. Robinson, *The Dukes of Norfolk – A Quincentennial History* (Oxford-New York, 1982), 142-165.
- <sup>41</sup> See CRS 62, 273-275 (20 June 1715: From Fr. Hunter/Spa., 14 June 1715 and 24 June 1715: From Fr. Powell[]], Rector of Liège, 16 June 1716).
- <sup>42</sup> See [London], British Library (BL), Additional Manuscripts (Add. MSS.) 20.311 (Papers of Card<sup>l</sup>. F. A. Gualterio – Miscellaneous Papers relating to England, 1 [1701-1716], fol. 291-296 (Informazione intorno alla Persona del Sigr. Abbate Strickland Sacerdote Inglese, Dottore di Sorbona: cavata da diverse lettere di Persone degne di fede: per sgravio di coscienza).
- <sup>43</sup> See BL, Add. MSS 20.311, fol. 292.
- <sup>44</sup> See B. Hemphill, *Vicars Apostolic*, 55-57; CRS 62, 313 (8 October 1715: From the Internunce: "Glad of what I writt in favor of Stoner and Strickland. Against the first hath had no complaint; the Pope soone will show his esteeme of him. Of the second, none against probity, learning, witt. Doubts not that when better acquainted with the mission, &c, will bee a most able support").
- <sup>45</sup> See [London], Archives of the English Province of the Society of Jesus (AEPSJ), Archiv. Prov. Angl. (Notes and Fragments Father Thorpe, 1 [1585-1790], Section 2 [Extracts by Father Thorpe from the Letters of English Provincials to the Rectors of the English College], fol. 1-39 [1707-1730]), fol. 8-9 (Dav[e]s to Plowden/London, 13 December 1714).
- <sup>46</sup> See [London], Archives of the Archbishop of Westminster (AAW), Epistolae Variorum (Ep. Var.) 6, 4 (R. Witham to Mayes/Douai, 4 March 1716).
- <sup>47</sup> See AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 5 (Brockholes to Mayes/Douai, 29 March 1716); for Fabroni see R. Ritzler – P. Sefrin, *Hierarchia Catholica* 5, 26 (19); for de Bissy see J. Carreyre, Bissy. *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastiques* 9 (1937), 14-16; R. Ritzler – P. Sefrin, *Hierarchia Catholica* 5, 29 (48), 263 (sub Melden.) and 394 (sub Tullen.); for le Tellier see Arthur McCandless Wilson, *French Foreign Policy during the Administration of Cardinal Fleury 1726-1743 – A Study in Diplomacy and Commercial Development* (Cambridge, 1936), 23.
- <sup>48</sup> See AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 7 (R. Witham to Mayes/Douai, 29 March 1716).
- <sup>49</sup> See AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 10 (R. Witham to Mayes/Douai, 22 April 1716); 12 (Th[omas] Witham to Mayes/Paris [?], 27 April 1716); 13 (Ingleton to Mayes/St. Germain, 3 May 1716).
- <sup>50</sup> See AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 14 (Ingleton to Mayes/St. Germain[?], 7 May 1716: "What pleases me most is to find that his [Strickland's] expectations of a mitre are now totally vanished".); 18 (Ingleton to Mayes/Paris, 6 July 1716).
- <sup>51</sup> See Claude Nordmann, "Louis XIV and the Jacobites". *Louis XIV and Europe*, ed. by R. Hatton (London, 1976), 82-111; John Baynes, *The Jacobite Rising of 1715* (London, 1970); Patrick Purcell, "The Jacobite Rising of 1715 and the English Catholics". *English Historical Review* 44 (London, 1929), 418-432.
- <sup>52</sup> See J. V. Beckett, "Land Tax or Excise: the levying of taxation in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England". *English Historical Review* 100 (London, 1985), 285-308; J. V. Beckett, *Local Taxation: National Legislation and the Problems of Enforcement*, London 1980; William R. Ward, *The English Land Tax in the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford, 1953).
- <sup>53</sup> See Martin Haile, *James Francis Edward, the Old Chevalier*, (London-New York, 1907), 232; for James see also Peggy Miller, *James* (London, 1971); Bryan Bevan, *King James the Third of England – A Study of Kingship in Exile* (London, 1967).

- <sup>54</sup> See Basil Williams, *Stanhope – A Study in Eighteenth-Century War and Diplomacy* (Oxford, 1932, reprint 1968), 384-418; Norman Sykes, *Church and State in England in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1962); Charles Vane, Marquess of Londonderry (ed.), *Memoirs and Correspondence of Viscount Castlereagh, Second Marquess of Londonderry (Castlereagh Correspondence)* 4 (London, 1849), 435-479 (Appendix).
- <sup>55</sup> See B. Hemphill, *Vicars Apostolic*, 106.
- <sup>56</sup> See AEPSJ, Arch. Prov. Angl. 1 (Section 2), fol. 15 (?/21 May 1716: “. . ., some gentry have been consulting to frame an ‘Oath’ that may satisfy the ministry and not prejudice their conscience: different schemes have been made, some flatter themselves that this will be accepted of, that they will live peaceably [sic] and give no disturbance to the settled government or the usual ‘Oath of Allegiance’; . . . and swear fidelity, and true allegiance to King George”).
- <sup>57</sup> See AEPSJ, Arch. Prov. Angl. 1 (Section 2), fol. 16 (Parker to Ebersson/23 May 1716).
- <sup>58</sup> See AEPSJ, Arch. Prov. Angl. 1 (Section 2), fol. 15 (?/14 June 1716).
- <sup>59</sup> See S. Baldwin, *Catholic Negotiation 1717-1719*, 12 fn. 2.
- <sup>60</sup> See AEPSJ, Arch. Prov. Angl. 1 (Section 2), fol. 16 (? to Ebersson/17 June 1716); fol. 15 (Plowden to Ebersson/15 August 1716); CRS 28, 40 (August 1716).
- <sup>61</sup> See CRS 28, 41.
- <sup>62</sup> See R. Ritzler – P. Sefrin, *Hierarchia Catholica* 5, 21 (20), 201 (sub Ferrarien.) and 251 (sub Maceraten. et Tolentin.).
- <sup>63</sup> See AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 24 (R. Witham to Mayes/3 September 1716).
- <sup>64</sup> See AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 28 (R. Witham to Mayes/Douai, 23 September 1716); for Thomas Howard see J. M. Robinson, *Dukes of Norfolk*, 148-154.
- <sup>65</sup> See AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 27 (Ingleton to Mayes/Paris, 22 September 1716).
- <sup>66</sup> See AEPSJ, Arch. Prov. Angl. 1 (Section 2), fol. 15 (Parker/Liège, 31 October 1716: “I saw B[ishop] Strickland lately in these parts [i.e. in the vicinity of Liège], he will go to Rome about the oath, but first to England, to have his instruction”). Consider in this connection the abbreviation “B”. [obviously for “Bishop”, which justifies the opinion that the later Bishop of Namur (1727-1740) had himself painted in the bishop’s robes as early as 1716 (see B. Hemphill, *Vicars Apostolic*, 63, and CRS 28, 42 [August, 1716].)
- <sup>67</sup> See ASV, Fondo Albani 5 (167), fol. 68-69 (Ioannes Episcopus Thespiensis/London, 15 September 1716); AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 36 (R. Witham to Mayes/Douai, 6 January 1717); CRS 28, 46-48.
- <sup>68</sup> See AEPSJ, Arch. Prov. Angl. 1 (Section 2), fol. 16-17 (Plowden to Ebersson/14 November 1716).
- <sup>69</sup> See AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 29 (Ingleton to Mayes/St. Germain, 23 October 1716); for Santini’s recommendation of Strickland see ASV, Fondo Albani 5 (167), fol. 92-93 (Santini to Paolucci/Brussels, 20 November 1716).
- <sup>70</sup> See Ch. Vane (ed.), *Castlereagh Correspondence*, 447 (de Bissy to Strickland/Paris, 9 February 1717); for Mary of Modena see Bryan Bevan, *I was James II’s Queen* (London, 1963); Carola Oman, *Mary of Modena* (London, 1962).
- <sup>71</sup> See AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 29 (Ingleton to Mayes/St Germain, 23 October 1716); 34 (Ingleton to Mayes/St Germain, 6 December 1716); 35 (Ingleton to Mayes/St Germain 26 December 1716).
- <sup>72</sup> See ASV, Fondo Albani 5 (167), fol. 126 (Rome, 17 February 1717).
- <sup>73</sup> See AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 38 (Stonor to Mayes/4 February 1717).
- <sup>74</sup> See Ch. Vane (ed.), *Castlereagh Correspondence*, 444-447.
- <sup>75</sup> See J. Kirk, *Biographies of English Catholics*, 223; CRS, 28, 50 (May 1717).
- <sup>76</sup> See ASV, Fondo Albani 5 (167), fol. 156 (Copie d’un papier écrit et signé de la propre main de Mr. l’abbé Strickland, docteur de Sorbonne; dont l’original est entre les mains du Roi d’Angleterre/1717).
- <sup>77</sup> By the Duke of Orléan’s order King James III had to leave Avignon for Pesaro (see AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 29 [Ingleton to Mayes/St Germain, 23 October 1716]) from where he moved to Rome (see AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 51 [Ingleton to Mayes/Paris, 19 June 1717]); for the negotiations at the court of Rome after his arrival see Ch. Vane (ed.), *Castlereagh Correspondence*, 454-470; for their residence in Rome see Henrietta Taylor, “The Jacobite Court at Rome in 1719”. *Publications of the Scottish History Society*, 3rd series, 31 (Edinburgh, 1938).
- <sup>78</sup> For Prince Eugene of Savoy see Johannes Kunisch (ed.), *Prinz Eugen von Savoyen und seine Zeit* (Würzburg, 1986); Karl Gutkas (ed.), *Prinz Eugen und das barocke Österreich* (Salzburg, 1985); Gottfried Mraz, *Prinz Eugen – Ein Leben in Bildern und Dokumenten* (München, 1985); Gerda Mraz, *Prinz Eugen – Sein Leben – Sein Wirken – Seine Zeit* (Wien, 1985); Derek McKay, *Prince Eugene of Savoy* (London, 1977); Max Braubach, *Prinz Eugen von Savoyen – Eine Biographie*, 5 vols., (München-Wien, 1963-1965).

- <sup>79</sup> See Ch. Vane (ed.), *Castlereagh Correspondence*, 445 (Adda to Santini/Rome, 23 April 1717).
- <sup>80</sup> See ASV, Lettere di Particolari, t. 119, fol. 3-10 (Strickland to Paolucci/Turin, 1 July 1717); Louis Jadin, *Relations de Pays-Bas, de Liège, et de Franche Comté avec le Saint Siège d'après les "Lettere di Particolari" conservées aux archives vaticanes (1525-1796)*. *Bibliothèque de l'Institut historique Belge de Rome* 11 (Rome, 1962), xli (and 560), thinks that these six questions "ne sont pas conservées", where he obviously errs (see ASV, Lettere di Particolari, t. 119, fol. 9); ASV, Fondo Albani 5 (167), fol. 63-64 (sine dato); for Paolucci's response see ASV, Lettere di Particolari, t. 166, fol. 250 (Paolucci to Strickland/Rome, 24 July 1717); Louis Jadin, "Lettere di Particolari", 562.
- <sup>81</sup> See AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 56 (Stonor to Mayes/Staffordshire, 9 August 1717).
- <sup>82</sup> See G. O. Gürtler, "Der verkaufte Kardinals purpur", 199-200; for Stanislaus Leszczyński see Josef Feldman, *Stanislaus Leszczyński* (Warsaw, 1959); Pierre Boyé, *La cour polonaise de Lunéville* (Paris, 1926).
- <sup>83</sup> See AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 70 (Heydon [?] to Mayes/6 December 1717); for Paolucci's reaction to Strickland's proposals see ASV, Nunziatura Fiandra, Reg. 151, fol. 189 (Paolucci to Santini/Rome, 6 November 1717); Jacques Thielens, *Vincenzo Santini*, 238-239 (484).
- <sup>84</sup> See AEPSJ, Arch. Prov. Angl. 1 (Section 2), fol. 20 (Ken[ne]t to Ebersson/22 February 1718); Ch. Vane (ed.), *Castlereagh Correspondence*, 451-454 (Stair to Stanhope/Paris, 25 April 1718).
- <sup>85</sup> See Constant von Wurzbach, "Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserthums Österreich" 37 (Wien, 1878), 179-180.
- <sup>86</sup> See H. Benedikt, *Gallas, Neue Deutsche Biographie* 6 (Berlin, 1964), 45-46; for his diplomatic career in England see Elisabeth Mach, *Johann wenzel graf gallas, kaiserlicher und königlich-spanischer botschafter am Hof der Königin Anna von England (1705-1711)*, unpubl. thesis (Wien, 1967); for his activities in Rome see Norbert Huber, "Österreich und der Heilige Stuhl vom Ende des Spanischen Erbfolgekrieges bis zum Tode Papst Klemens XI (1714-1721)". *Archiv für österreichische Geschichte*, 126 (Wien, 1967), 88-107, 140-142, et passim.
- <sup>87</sup> See [London], Public Record Office (PRO), *State Papers* 104/219B (Foreign Entry Books Holland and the Baltic, 161 [Stanhope to Stair/Whitehall, 29 April 1718]).
- <sup>88</sup> See Ch. Vane (ed.), *Castlereagh Correspondence*, 454; for the Earl of Stair see John M. Graham, *Annals and Correspondence of the Viscount and the First and Second Earls of Stair*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh-London, 1875).
- <sup>89</sup> See AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 87 (Hind to Mayes/Paris, 9 May 1718).
- <sup>90</sup> See AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 93 (R. Witham to Mayes/28 July 1718); 85 (Ingleton to Mayes/St Germain, 8 May 1718).
- <sup>91</sup> See Ch. Vane (ed.), *Castlereagh Correspondence*, 447-451 (Goring to Waldegrave, concerning what passed between him and Mr Pulteney about the Roman Catholics/8 January 1719).
- <sup>92</sup> See Ch. Vane (ed.), *Castlereagh Correspondence*, 450; for such accusations see also ASV, Fondo Albani 5, (167), fol. 104-105 (Memoire à être communiqué à Sa Sainteté au sujet de M. l'abbé Strickland, Docteur de Sorbonne/1716? [from the content rather 1719]); fol. 40-48 (Gualtieri to Clement XI/14 February 1720; in particular fol. 45-48 [Memoire]).
- <sup>93</sup> For the proposition of enacting more stringent laws against the Catholics see Ch. Vane (ed.), *Castlereagh Correspondence*, 439-441 (Some proposals of Mr Floyd [Dr Strickland] in relation to Roman Catholics) and 441-444 (Dr Strickland's Memorial); for an exact description of the real state of religion (including persecutions) see Archiv. Westmon. MSS. 38/I, ff. 90 ("Ragguaglio circa lo stato dei Cattolici Inglesi/ Luglio 1718").
- <sup>94</sup> See G. Sofri, *Albani. Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 1 (Rom 1960), 598-600.
- <sup>95</sup> See Ch. Vane (ed.), *Castlereagh Correspondence*, 458.
- <sup>96</sup> See T. de Morembert, *Dubois. Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastiques* 14 (Paris, 1960), 939-942; R. Ritzler - P. Sefrin, *Hierarchia Catholica* 5, 34 (2) and 139 (sub Cameracen.); Jean L. Aujol, *Le cardinal Dubois, ministre de la paix* (Paris, 1948); Pierre Bliard, *Dubois, cardinal et premier ministre (1656-1723)*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1901/02); Louis Wiesener, *Le Régent, l'abbé Dubois et les Anglais d'après les sources britanniques*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1891-1899).
- <sup>97</sup> See Edward Gregg, "Power, Friends or Alliances - The Search for the Pretender's Bride". *Studies in History and Politics* 4 (Lennoxville, 1985), 35-54; G. O. Gürtler, "Der Innsbrucker Brautraub" - Die Entführung der Maria Clementina Sobieska nach englischen, österreichischen und römischen Quellen.

- Innsbrucker Historische Studien* 5 (Innsbruck, 1982), 27-46 (an English translation is being prepared); for Maria Clementina Sobieska see Peggy Miller, *A Wife for the Pretender* (London, 1965).
- <sup>98</sup> See Ch. Vane (ed.), *Castlereagh Correspondence*, 478-479; for Law's activities in France see Michel A. Sallon, "L'échec de Law". *Revue d'histoire économique et sociale* 48 (Paris, 1970), 145-195; Paul Harsin, *La finance et l'Etat jusqu'au système de Law* (1660-1726). *Histoire économique et sociale de la France* 2 (Paris, 1970), 267-321; Harford M. Hyde, *John Law* (London, 1948); for St Saphorin see Theo Gehling, "Ein europäischer Diplomat am Kaiserhof zu Wien – François Louis de Pesme, Seigneur de Saint Saphorin, als englischer Resident am Wiener Hof (1718-1727)". *Bonner Historische Forschungen* 25 (Bonn, 1964), 113-115; Hugo Hantsch, *Die drei großen Relationen St Saphorins über die inneren Verhältnisse am Wiener Hof zur Zeit Karls VI. Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 58 (Wien, 1950), 625-636; Sven Stelling-Michaud, *Saint Saphorin et la politique de la Suisse pendant la guerre de Succession d'Espagne (1700-1710)* (Lyon, 1935).
- <sup>99</sup> See J. M. Graham, *Annals and Correspondence of Stair* 2, 63 (Stair to Stanhope/Paris, 25 August 1718); for the Regent see John H. Shennan, *Philippe, Duke of Orléans – Regent of France 1715-1723* (London, 1979); Claire E. Engel, *Le régent* (Paris, 1969); Philippe Erlanger, *Le régent* (Paris, 1938).
- <sup>100</sup> See Philippe de Courcillon (Marquis de Dangeau), *Journal du Marquis de Dangeau, publié en entier pour la première fois par MM. Soulié, Dussieux, de Chennevières, Mantz, de Montaigton, avec les additions inédites du Duc de Saint Simon publiées par M. Feuillet de Conches*, 17 (Paris, 1854-1860), 420; Michel Francisque, *Les Ecosais en France – Les Français en Ecosse*, 2 (Londres, 1862), 397-398 fn. 1; AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 101 (Ingleton to Mayes/Paris, 14 November 1718); for Jean d'Estrées (1666-1718), the designated archbishop of Cambrai, who had died before the papal "Bulls" reached him, see T. de Morembert, *Estrées. Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastiques* 15 (Paris, 1963), 1088-1089.
- <sup>101</sup> See BL, Stowe MS 231 (Hanover Papers 10, fol. 161-171 [Newsletters from Rome, 15 September 1718]); *Publications of the Scottish History Society* 19 [The Jacobite Attempt of 1719], Edinburgh 1895, 21 (to Mar/Valladolid, 23 December 1718); 202-203 (Mar to Ormonde/Rome, 22 December 1718); see also Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Calendar of the Stuart Papers* 7, 254-255 (Rigby to Mar/Paris, 7 September 1718); 493 (James III to Dicconson/Bologna, 4 November 1718); 544-545 (Dillon to Mar/15 November 1718).
- <sup>102</sup> See PRO, *State Papers* 80/38 (January – June 1719/Seigneur de St Saphorin [St Saphorin to Stanhope/Vienna 21 January 1719]).
- <sup>103</sup> See PRO, *State Papers* 80/38 (St Saphorin to Stanhope/Vienna, 25 January 1719); for Sinzendorf see Charles W. Ingrao, "Josef I – Der vergessene Kaiser" (Graz-Wien-Köln 1982), passim; H. Hantsch, *Reichsweizekanzler Graf Friedrich Karl von Schönborn und Hofkanzler Graf Philipp Ludwig Sinzendorf. Etudes européennes* (Paris, 1973), 454-463; A. Györy von Nadudvar, *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* 34 (Leipzig, 1892), 408-412.
- <sup>104</sup> See PRO, *State Papers* 80/38 (St Saphorin to Stanhope/Vienna, 25 January 1719; St Saphorin to Stanhope/Vienna, 28 January 1719 including the "Memoire sur l'Etat présent de la Religion Catholique en Angleterre, et sur les moyens d'en prévenir l'extirpation").
- <sup>105</sup> See PRO, *State Papers* 80/38 (St Saphorin to Stanhope/Vienna, 8 February 1719).
- <sup>106</sup> See [Wien], Haus-, Hof-, und Staatsarchiv (HHStA), Staatskanzlei, Protokolle 1719/I, fol. 65-67 (to Gallas/Vienna, 18 February 1719: "Übrigens geht die weitere intention dahin, daß mehr erhollter Abbé als eine dem Englischen Gubernio angenehme Persohn als Bischoff in Partibus ernannt, und in Engelland künftighin zum Vicario Generali gemacht werden möchte, nachdem der dortige jezmallige Vicarius Generalis ein Mann von hohem alter sein solle").
- <sup>107</sup> See HHStA, Staatenabteilung Rom, Korrespondenz, Kart. 104 (Gallas to Sinzendorf/Rome, 18 March 1719; Gallas to Sinzendorf/Rome, 13 May 1719).
- <sup>108</sup> See AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 112 (Ingleton to Mayes/Paris, 1 May 1719); 114 (Hind to Mayes/Paris, 8 May 1719: "The travelling Dr Strickland is just now arrived here from his private negotiations at Vienna, he is so full of the Emperor, Empress etc. that you would imagine him a bosom friend of theirs; next week he goes to take possession of his Abbaye of Préaux (if the Regent be able to carry on the war against Spain without him) for which he has his bulls, though not so cheap as he imagined").
- <sup>109</sup> See PRO, *State Papers* 80/38 (St Saphorin to Stanhope/Vienna, 20 May 1719); (St Saphorin to Stanhope/Vienna, 3 June 1719).
- <sup>110</sup> See W. Michael, *Englische Geschichte*, 125.

- <sup>111</sup> See ASV, Fondo Albani 5 (167), fol. 25-29 (Rome, 16/17 March 1719); AAW, Ep. var. 6, 110 (Ingleton to Mayes/Paris, March 1719).
- <sup>112</sup> See BL, Stowe MS 121, fol. 1-10 ("Papers relating to a scheme for inducing the English Catholics in general to become by degrees truly and heartily well affected to His Majesty's Government [June-July 1719]); these requisitions are also tractable in BL, Add. MSS. 28.252, fol. 94-97 ("True Copy of the Paper put into the hands of Roman Catholics"); PRO, *State Papers* 43, Dom. Reg. 57, fol. 83-109 (with different negotiations); AEPSJ, Arch. Prov. Angl. Varia (1706-1715), fol. 9 ("Proposals offered to the Roman Catholics debated in Council at St. James's/1719" with a "Serment de Fidelité le 9 Juillet 1719"); see also AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 130 (R. Witham to Mayes/Douai, 1 December 1719); 132 (R. Witham to Mayes/Douai[?], 29 December 1719); ASV, Fondo Albani 5 (167), fol. 127 (sine dato); fol. 157 (sine dato/in Latin); fol. 159 (Plowden to Gualtieri/sine dato); fol. 161-162 (Giffard to Santini/21 December 1719); fol. 163 (Santini to Paolucci/8 February 1720).
- <sup>113</sup> Sir Robert Throckmorton, Sir William Goring, Mr Talbot of Longford and Mr Edward Blount, who had been mentioned in Strickland's first draft (see Ch. Vane (ed.), *Castlereagh Correspondence*, 443) had now been replaced by Lord Stafford, Mr Charles Howard, Mr Stonor and Mr Arundell Bealing; see AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 131 (R. Witham to Mayes/Douai, 8 December 1719) where Sir William Goring is still mentioned instead of Mr Arundell Bealing.
- <sup>114</sup> For the electoral court see Karl H. Meyer, *Königliche Gärten – 300 Jahre Herrenhausen* (Hannover, 1966); Udo von Alvensleben, *Herrenhausen – Sommerresidenz der Welfen* (Hannover, 1929, reprint Hannover, 1966).
- <sup>115</sup> See Ch. Vane (ed.), *Castlereagh Correspondence*, 472-473 (F. Floyd [Dr Strickland] to James Craggs).
- <sup>116</sup> See BL, Add. MSS. 28.252, fol. 96-97 ("An Answer to the aforesaid Proposals").
- <sup>117</sup> For James Waldegrave, first Earl Waldegrave, see DNB 20 (1909), 473-475; for Henry Charles Howard see J. M. Robinson, *Dukes of Norfolk*, 150.
- <sup>118</sup> See BL, Stowe MS 121, fol. 6-7 (Norfolk to Craggs/1 July 1719); PRO, *State Papers* 43, Dom. reg. 57, fol. 109ff.; Ch. Vane (ed.), *Castlereagh Correspondence*, 474-475 (Norfolk to Craggs/1 July 1719).
- <sup>119</sup> See BL, Stowe MS 121, fol. 8-10 (Craggs to Stanhope/Whitehall, 7 July 1719); Ch. Vane (ed.), *Castlereagh Correspondence*, 475-476 (Craggs to Norfolk/3 July 1719).
- <sup>120</sup> See BL, Stowe MS 121, fol. 10; PRO, *State Papers* 43, Dom. Reg. 57, fol. 156ff (Craggs to Norfolk/24 July 1719).
- <sup>121</sup> See S. Baldwin, *Catholic Negotiation 1717-1719*, 32-33.
- <sup>122</sup> See B. Hemphill, *Vicars Apostolic*, 112.
- <sup>123</sup> See AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 120 (Ingleton to Mayes/21 August 1719); the diocese had been vacant since the death of Charles François de Laval Montmorency (+1713) and was transferred to Johannes de Smet (+1741) not before February 3, 1721 (see R. Ritzler – P. Sefrin, *Hierarchia Catholica* 5, 420 [sub Ypren.]).
- <sup>124</sup> See AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 124 (Ingleton to Mayes/Paris [?]/18 September 1719).
- <sup>125</sup> See ASV, Nunziatura Fiandra, Reg. 111, fol. 485-487 (Santini to Paolucci/Brussels, 26 October 1719 [including Prichard's letter to Paolucci: "Copie de la lettre de l'évêque Mirinense à Santini"]); Jacques Thielens, *Vincenzo Santini*, 346 (681); AAW Var. 6, 130 (R. Witham to Mayes/Douai, 1 December 1719).
- <sup>126</sup> See Ch. Vane (ed.), *Castlereagh Correspondence*, 470-472 (Strickland to Craggs/Vienna, 8 February 1719).
- <sup>127</sup> See AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 133 (Stonor to Mayes/London, 6 December 1719); Ep. Var. 7, 4 (Stonor to Mayes/London, 29 January 1719/20); S. Baldwin, *Catholic Negotiation 1717-1719*, 37-39 (Appendix III).
- <sup>128</sup> See ASV, Fondo Albani 5 (167), fol. 169-170 (Stonor to Santini/26 December 1719); AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 132 (R. Witham to Mayes/Douai [?] 29 December 1719).
- <sup>129</sup> See AEPSJ, Arch. Prov. Angl. 1 (Section 2), fol. 21 (?/December 1719); AAW, Ep. Var. 6, 131 (R. Witham to Mayes/Douai, 8 December 1719).
- <sup>130</sup> See ASV, Fondo Albani 5 (167), fol. 164 (Giffard to Paolucci/18 January 1719/20).
- <sup>131</sup> See AEPSJ, Arch. Prov. Angl. 1 (Section 2), fol. 22 (Parker to Ebersson/17 January 1720); AAW, Ep. Var. 7, 2 (R. Witham to Mayes/Douai [?] 19 January 1720).
- <sup>132</sup> See AAW, Ep. Var. 7, 3 (R. Witham to Mayes/Douai [?], 25 January 1720 [including suggestions to make Henry Howard coadjutor to Giffard instead of Stonor (CRS 28, 82)]; for Strickland's aspirations for a cardinal's hat see G. O. Gürtler, "Der verkaufte Kardinalspurpur", 198-206.
- <sup>133</sup> See BL, Add. MSS. 20.313 (Papers of Card<sup>1</sup> F. A. Gualterio – Miscellaneous Papers relating to England [1719-1727]), fol. 113-114 (2 February 1720); shortened version in S. Baldwin, *Catholic Negotiation 1717-1719*, 39-40 (Appendix IV); AAW, Ep. Var. 7, 5 (R. Witham to Mayes/Douai [?], 1 February 1720).

- <sup>134</sup> See AAW, Ep. Var. 7, 6 (unsigned, endorsed Bishop Stonor/London, 14 February 1719/1720); B. Hemphill, *Vicars Apostolic*, 113-115.
- <sup>135</sup> See ASV, Nunziatura Fiandra, Reg. 112, fol. 93-94 (Santini to Paolucci/Brussels, 1 March 1720); Jacques Thielens, *Vincenzo Santini*, 365-366 (717) (wrong date!); AAW, Ep. Var. 7, 9 (R. Witham to Mayes/22 February 1722).
- <sup>136</sup> See ASV, Nunziatura Fiandra, Reg. 151, fol. 295-296 (Paolucci to Santini/Rome, 23 March 1720); Jacques Thielens, *Vincenzo Santini*, 368 (723).
- <sup>137</sup> Even Santini thought that both of them had finally dropped their ideas (see ASV, Nunziatura Fiandra, Reg. 112, fol. 166 [Santini to Paolucci/Brussels, 12 April 1720]); Jacques Thielens, *Vincenzo Santini*, 370 (726) (wrong date!).
- <sup>138</sup> See ASV, Nunziatura Fiandra, Reg. 112, fol. 225-226 (Stonor to Paolucci/London, 4 May 1720); fol. 227-230 ("De rebus a se et Abbate Stricklandio in Causa Catholicorum in Anglia degentium, de praesentiorundemque statu, deque iis ad conservandam ibidem religionem necessaria viderentur"); AEPSJ, Arch. Prov. Angl. 1 (Section 2), fol. 23 (Brussels, 27 May 1720); CRS 28, 79; for de Prié see Hildegard Sandner, *Prinz Eugen als Statthalter der Niederlande und sein Verhältnis zu Prié*, unpubl. thesis (Wien, 1944); Alfred Reumont, *Il marchese di Prié nel Belgio*. *Archivio storico italiano* 17 (Florenz 1886).
- <sup>139</sup> See ASV, Nunziatura Fiandra, Reg. 112, fol. 202-203 (Santini to Paolucci/Brussels, 24 May 1720); Jacques Thielens, *Vincenzo Santini*, 372 (732) (wrong date!).
- <sup>140</sup> See ASV, Nunziatura Fiandra, Reg. 112, fol. 247 (Santini to Paolucci/Brussels, 22 June 1720) fol. 248 ("Copia di una lettera di Londra in data de 10 juin 1720"); fol. 262 ("Articoli de lettera scritta di Londra al 8 Luglio 1720": "... detto prelato (i.e. Giffard) è un buon vecchio pietoso e pacifico"); ASV, Nunziatura Fiandra, Reg. 151, fol. 312-313 (Paolucci to Santini/Rome, 27 July 1720); Jacques Thielens, *Vincenzo Santini*, 372-373 (733) (wrong date and folio number!), 375 (737/738).
- <sup>141</sup> See ASV, Nunziatura Fiandra, Reg. 151, fol. 309 (Paolucci to Santini/Rome, 29 June 1720); Jacques Thielens, *Vincenzo Santini*, 374 (736) (wrong date!).
- <sup>142</sup> H. Benedikt, *Althan. Neue Deutsche Biographie* 1 (Berlin 1953), 220; R. Ritzler – P. Sefrin, *Hierarchia Catholica* 5, 32 (66) and 402 (sub Vacien); N. Huber, "Österreich und der Heilige Stuhl", 121-123, 163-164 and passim; Alphons Lhotsky, "Kaiser Karl VI. und sein Hof im Jahre 1712/13". *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 66 (Wien, 1958), 52-80 (passim); for his position as "auditor rotae" see Richard Blaas, "Das kaiserliche Auditorat bei der Sacra Rota Romana". *Mitteilungen des österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 11 (Wien, 1958), 37-152 (in particular 90-91).
- <sup>143</sup> See HHStA, Staatskanzlei, Protokolle 1720, fol. 147 (to Althan/Vienna, 27 July 1720), fol. 219-222 (to Althan/Vienna, 12 October 1720).
- <sup>144</sup> See HHStA, Staatskanzlei, Protokolle 1720, fol. 305-306 (to Althan/Vienna, 28 December 1720).



