
'Our Ancient Architecture': Contesting Cathedrals in Late Georgian England

Author(s): PHILIP ASPIN

Source: *Architectural History*, 2011, Vol. 54 (2011), pp. 213-232

Published by: SAHGB Publications Limited

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41418353>

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

https://www.jstor.org/stable/41418353?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Architectural History*

JSTOR

‘Our Ancient Architecture’: Contesting Cathedrals in Late Georgian England

by PHILIP ASPIN

Recent research has transformed our understanding of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries as a phase in the wider process of the Gothic Revival. While historical writing on the Gothic Revival had previously tended to see the significance of the period between 1790 and 1820 largely in terms of its academic contribution to the later development of Victorian Gothic Revival architecture,¹ emphasizing especially the role of antiquarian scholarship in providing a basis of archaeological accuracy upon which subsequent architects could draw,² more diverse angles have been opened up within the last couple of decades. Research by Simon Bradley, Chris Brooks and others has illuminated debates on the origins of the Gothic style itself and the patriotic language underpinning them, and has added greatly to our understanding of the associations between Gothic and ‘Englishness’.³ Rosemary Hill has investigated the ambiguous and problematic religious connotations of Gothic.⁴ Simon Bradley has authoritatively anatomized the increasingly enthusiastic take-up of Gothic by the Anglican Church in the first few decades of the nineteenth century, and has uncovered a rich prehistory of ecclesiological principles before the foundation of the Camden Society and all its powerfully misleading retrospective propaganda.⁵

However, there has been no dedicated study of that particular cultural-historical moment at the turn of the nineteenth century when England’s medieval cathedrals prompted and formed the focus of an intense examination of the relationships between the nation’s medieval architectural heritage and national and confessional identities.⁶ Between the 1790s and the 1810s, a controversial programme of ‘improvement’ was pursued in several cathedrals, sparking an often bitter polemical debate on how these buildings should look, whom they belonged to and what they were for, a controversy which provides a revealing window onto contemporary perceptions, not just of the meanings of the cathedral themselves, but of how they fitted into the complicated ideological intersections between the Established Church, the nation and the national past. This article seeks to assess the role played by the medieval cathedrals, or rather contemporary interpretations of the cathedrals, in shaping a series of arguments about Church and nation, and in so doing re-evaluates the importance of the cathedrals to the history of religious and national identities in this period.

The cathedrals helped to define the Established Church as institutional heir to an ancient tradition of national Christianity, linking the Church into a longer, pre-

Reformation narrative, and in that sense partly underpinned Anglican claims to catholicity; moreover, through its control of buildings which were, by this period, coming to be firmly identified as both innately Christian and innately English, the Church of England buttressed its claim to be the true national Church. However, these relationships were not unproblematic. The relationship between cathedrals, the Established Church and the nation was fraught with tension and ambiguity. Cathedrals were subject to competing claims for moral ownership. The relationship between their pasts and presents was troubled and troubling. Tracing the nature of these relationships will, it is hoped, shed light on contemporary meanings of the cathedrals themselves, and also illuminate their relationship with both national and confessional identities in a period whose importance in this regard has tended to be overshadowed by the attention paid to the period after 1820.⁷

This article is grounded in antiquarian literature, especially cathedral histories, and in periodicals and reviews. Gothic antiquities found a ready market in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, which dealt mainly with antiquarian material but was directed at a wider interested public, an interest reflected in other periodicals concerned with the state of nation and Church, such as the *Anti-Jacobin Review* and the *British Critic*. The limitations of this source material must be acknowledged: it represents a debate going on within particular circles, mainly antiquarian and clerical, especially High Church. However, it resonated with wider concerns about national and religious identities,⁸ about the condition and responsibilities of the Church, and about the national past and national heritage. In one sense this study is an anatomy of a very specific moment in the cultural history of late Georgian England, when a set of debates over Gothic architecture, Englishness and the Established Church intersected and overlapped. More broadly, however, it illuminates the significant role played by the growing enthusiasm for architectural antiquities in some of the debates and concerns which animated national life in this period, and in that sense takes inspiration from the recent work of Rosemary Sweet, which sees antiquarian culture as playing an important part in shaping a wider public sense of the national past and its contemporary significance in eighteenth-century England.⁹

Ecclesiastical historians of this period have shown little interest in the peculiar ideological significance which the nation's medieval cathedrals held for an episcopal Established Church whose diocesan structure helped to define a distinctive Anglican identity,¹⁰ and where, as Peter Nockles has shown, High Church ideals of the catholicity of the English Church still held some sway.¹¹ This historiographical neglect owes much to the fact that cathedral life in general has been seen as essentially moribund in this period. Research on the early modern period has illuminated the complicated and conflicted relationship of the cathedrals to the emergent Church of England in the century or so following the Reformation, dealing with a diverse spectrum of attitudes, from iconoclasm and Puritan hostility to the Laudians' efforts to rehabilitate cathedrals as centres of the beauty of holiness.¹² However, the situation in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries has largely been ignored. Historiographical interest only seriously resumes with the great era of cathedral reform, indeed church reform more widely, in the mid-nineteenth century, which has attracted far more interest from ecclesiastical historians than the listless decades before 1830.¹³ The cathedrals themselves were, in

terms of diocesan, let alone national, religious life, utterly marginal.¹⁴ Congregations were at a nadir.¹⁵ Nonetheless, it is crucial to recognize that, however marginal in terms of their practical liturgical functions, the cathedrals exercised a moral and aesthetic power over contemporary imaginations. In the absence of conventional worship, there was a sort of surrogate worship provided by visitors who came both to venerate the relics of the national past and to seek the sort of transcendent spiritual and aesthetic experience which cathedral buildings were expected to offer. Cathedral histories and guides proliferated in this period to cater for such a constituency. Moreover, the turn of the nineteenth century, no less than the post-Reformation or mid-Victorian periods, saw the cathedrals at the centre of passionate debates about the state of Church and nation.

Responses to Gothic cathedrals at the turn of the nineteenth century drew on a language of appreciation which was both aesthetic, fuelled especially by ideals of sublime sensibility,¹⁶ and spiritual, underpinned by a conviction that there was something peculiarly religious about medieval architecture. This pairing drew on increasingly popular notions of associationist aesthetics, the notion that particular sites, objects and images prompted particular mental associations and ideas in the viewer's imagination.¹⁷ The language of 'veneration' and 'awe' formed the common currency of responses to Gothic cathedrals throughout this period.¹⁸ This language of religious response was itself inseparable from the language of sublime aesthetics, in which religious feeling, an appreciation of the presence of the Deity and the Christian supernatural, was bound up with perceptions of cavernous space, soaring height and the interplay of light and gloom, epitomized in the interiors of Gothic cathedrals.¹⁹ The language of 'awe' and 'awfulness' derived directly from Burke.²⁰

The language of romanticism and sublimity achieved a degree of hyperbole in some responses to Gothic churches in this period, the antiquarian writer and publisher John Britton describing his experience of St Mary Redcliffe, Bristol, during a 'violent thunder storm' in terms which seem almost a parody of the romantic gothic idiom. 'Never did I witness a scene so truly sublime', he enthused, 'It reminded me of necromancy and enchanted palaces [...] in the midst of this church, enveloped in gloom, surrounded by knights in armour, monkish effigies, and other images of deceased persons, the effect was truly sublime and awful.'²¹ Combining a Gothic church with a violent storm was to unite two of the most iconic contexts for the evocation of the sublime.²² Less breathlessly, the 'solemn effect' of Salisbury was noted by its verger, William Dodsworth,²³ just as the Catholic priest and antiquary John Milner described the 'awful' nature of the choir at Winchester.²⁴ This sublime effect produced an essentially religious frisson inextricably bound up with the sacred nature of the building; Dodsworth believed that the 'solemn impression' produced by the choir was 'suited to the character of the place' and called up 'an involuntary sentiment of devotion and awe'.²⁵

Indeed, by the end of the 1790s it was coming to be expected that a Gothic cathedral ought to be able to provide the experience in which such a sentiment would be felt. 'In entering these grand Gothic structures', opined the traveller and collector Sir Richard Colt Hoare on visiting Durham in 1800, 'the mind should be impressed with religious awe suited to the place',²⁶ echoing the travel writer Mary Morgan who had, a few years previously, confided that 'when I enter a grand cathedral, I am struck with such

reverential awe, that even the building itself seems almost too stupendous a work to be made with hands'.²⁷ Similarly, John Henry Manners, later fifth Duke of Rutland, was struck at York Minster on his visit in 1796 by 'a solemnity and awe to the building, which can scarcely be described in adequate terms'.²⁸ Antiquarian writings and guidebooks were both shaped by, and themselves helped to shape, this perception among antiquaries, travellers and tourists that visiting a medieval cathedral was essentially an encounter with transcendental mystery, an approach to the Deity, and that these buildings were at heart sacred spaces, offering a religious experience which was pre-eminently located in the encounter with the building itself, not in any formal or liturgical observance conducted within it.²⁹ John Britton believed that a Gothic cathedral, 'as a temple of religious worship, dedicated to the true and only God [...] commands awful veneration'.³⁰ Representing them in these terms reinforced the identification of cathedral buildings as spaces where transcendent spiritual reactions ought to be experienced. They were, in the words of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, 'these religious structures'.³¹

This kind of expectation drew further strength from a deep-rooted sense that Gothic architecture was itself 'the old ecclesiastical style'.³² Classical architecture was appropriate enough for 'civil and social life', but in a Gothic cathedral the visitor 'instinctively experiences a frame of mind that fits him for prayer and contemplation'.³³ Unlike the Gothic, the Classical evoked no religious response, argued the *British Critic*.³⁴ The Gothic was peculiarly 'sacred',³⁵ suited to the need 'to elevate the mind and raise ideas and affections suitable to the Christian worship'.³⁶ The fact that the real beauty of Gothic architecture lay in its interior spaces, argued John Milner, stood as a kind of metaphor for the human soul: the essence of its beauty and its devotional power was not external but lay within. This was perhaps an unusual idea but resonated with the commonplace sentiment that 'cathedral architecture' was 'highly favourable to devotional sentiment'.³⁷ The essence of a cathedral was its capacity to evoke 'religious awe' and convey an overwhelming air of solemnity.³⁸ By the end of this period, the view that 'the Pointed style of building is best calculated for religious structures' was a commonplace.³⁹ That the 'sentiment of devout awe'⁴⁰ which these buildings were expected to stir was seen as a potential asset for the Established Church is suggested by the *Gentleman's Magazine's* view that the 'rich English cathedrals' should form the models for new Anglican churches.⁴¹ Authentically 'Gothic' cathedrals resonated with Anglican claims to a monopoly on national sanctity, and on the legitimacy conferred by continuity with a national religious past; they spoke to a sense of the authenticity of the Established Church itself.⁴²

These buildings were also Christian because they had been erected by past generations of Christians for the purposes of Christian worship. In that sense they were 'monuments of ancient piety'.⁴³ They embodied and symbolized a great devotional impulse; they were monuments to 'the religion of our ancestors'.⁴⁴ Thus they formed a link of religious veneration between the Middle Ages and the present. However, the moral legacy of the medieval past was an ambiguous one. Should Anglicans embrace this atavistic link with 'our ancestors', or should they preserve a healthy horror of the popish superstition and 'monkish' credulity which was seen to mark the history of medieval religion? Cathedrals' popish associations could be problematic for their Protestant admirers, and negotiating this formed a major element in the ultimately positive representation of cathedrals.

Perceptions of the Middle Ages as an era of superstition, of 'blind and ignorant credulity',⁴⁵ were commonplace. Miracle narratives⁴⁶ and the cult of saints came in for particular censure.⁴⁷ The credulity of 'monkish writers'⁴⁸ was contrasted with the scientific and intellectual rigour of the 'philosophical antiquary'⁴⁹ whose aim was the pursuit of truth and 'the emancipation of the human mind from many prejudices and superstitions'.⁵⁰ This enlightened and philanthropic enterprise was pointedly contrasted with medieval 'priestcraft'⁵¹ and its 'weak and superstitious devotees'.⁵² The attitude of the 'philosophic antiquary' was distanced as well as disapproving. From medieval buildings, John Britton aimed to extrapolate 'a philosophical and critical history of man',⁵³ seeing cathedrals in all their 'relations and connexions with the history of religion, the progress of art [and] the varied states of civilisation'.⁵⁴ Architecture was thus a lens through which to view the wider sweep of history, and especially the history of the progress of the human mind, of the development of arts, sciences and man's ingenuity.⁵⁵ On one level, the 'philosophic antiquary' could detach himself from the buildings he studied and survey from this eminence the great improvement in religion and civility from medieval barbarism to modern sophistication. The historian of St Albans congratulated himself on living 'in an enlightened age, free from superstitious worship'.⁵⁶ Histories of cathedrals therefore claimed in part to trace 'the progress of civilisation'.⁵⁷ In this they are readily comparable to some of the urban and local histories written in England in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, which likewise adopted at least the style, if not the substance, of the fashionable conjectural history pioneered by the Scottish Enlightenment (partly to efface or reject the stigma of antiquarian pedantry), and aimed to trace the development of 'manners and customs' through the medium of a particular town or city.⁵⁸

This assimilation of cathedral histories to the genre of conjectural or stadial history allowed the buildings an important place in narratives of intellectual and artistic progress. The four-volume survey of English and Welsh cathedrals edited by James Storer seldom neglected any opportunity to issue moral judgments on the depraved state of medieval religion.⁵⁹ However, at the same time as heaping opprobrium on medieval Catholicism, Storer's contributors still valued the narrative of 'human ingenuity'⁶⁰ which they found in the cathedrals. Storer's preface outlined the value of studying these buildings:

with their history is involved that of religion [...] In the origin and progress of religious edifices we discover the influence of devotional feelings; the condition and extent of these buildings evince the expansion of human intellect, the state of the arts, the march of civilisation [...] The construction of churches develops the skills, taste and mechanical genius of the age and nation.⁶¹

These buildings thus took their place in an essentially Enlightenment narrative of the progress of society and civilization, of the development of English architectural and aesthetic skill, accomplishment and ambition,⁶² even of the strength of the pious impulse, 'the piety of the age', whose worth was recognized, 'however perverted' in form.⁶³

Thus even if the precise forms of devotion found in medieval Catholicism were abhorrent, it was generally recognized that the artistic and pious spirit embodied in the architecture which medieval religion had produced was a vital aspect of the nation's development and progress. This narrative had the signal virtue of integrating cathedrals,

the products of a Catholic religious hierarchy and practices, into the identity of a Church which repudiated medieval Popery yet which also keenly desired to co-opt the beauty, awe and magnificence of Anglicanism's architectural inheritance.

Beyond this sense of civilizational progress, it was acknowledged that Gothic cathedrals derived much of their moral value from their associations with, and place within, an exemplary and inspirational narrative of the national past. Gothic architecture was a central aspect of national history;⁶⁴ the history of Winchester Cathedral, for instance, was 'intimately blended with that of the nation', with 'eminent men and memorable events of former ages'.⁶⁵ Cathedrals were 'the sure proofs of our history' and the country's 'historical landmarks'.⁶⁶ As the antiquary John Carter put it,

I venerate the history of my country; I venerate the names of the great, warlike and the good, of former times; I venerate those astonishing, those magnificent fabricks, those enchanting monumental memorials, which they have left behind them as proofs of their enlightened genius and skill.⁶⁷

Veneration for the cathedrals was inseparable from the wider patriotic enterprise of veneration for the nation's past;⁶⁸ moreover, it was in the architectural legacy of that past that its moral legacy was most intensely focused. Buildings were the repositories, as well as the symbols, of a proud national past. It was through experiencing medieval architectural remains, Carter melodramatically recounted, that he first came to 'imbibe' a sense of this glorious national past.⁶⁹ Their associations with the heroes of the past had a powerful exemplary effect, so that to experience a cathedral was to feel 'an emulation in our souls to follow their bright careers, and to venerate their sacred remains'.⁷⁰ More generally, cathedrals were treated as largely inseparable from the wider history of their diocese, region and the nation itself. John Britton's series of cathedral histories, for instance, integrated the cathedrals into the wider narrative of religious and civil history of the nation.⁷¹ In a similar way to that noted by Rosemary Sweet for urban histories in this period, in cathedral histories the very strength and meaning of local identities lay in the fact that they were defined by reference to a national framework.⁷²

Cathedrals were seen as intimately bound up with the history of the English Church, at both national and diocesan level. Ely was 'associated with some of the most remarkable events and characters of the English church'.⁷³ The history of York Minster was also the history of the development of Christianity in the north.⁷⁴ A sense of continuity between past and present could also be focused on the descent of formal authority within the diocese or cathedral, by including within a cathedral history or guide lists of bishops, deans and chapter officials from the earliest records to the present day, or even by the inclusion of a section of 'biographical anecdotes'⁷⁵ of the various bishops right up to the present incumbent, which located modern prelates within a narrative of continuity transcending the Reformation schism. Sometimes the history of cathedrals and similar great churches acted as a means for the vindication of local pride, and the prosecution of local ecclesiastical rivalries. Thus Dean Waddilove of Ripon argued for the status of Ripon Minster as one of the earliest Gothic buildings in England, and even suggested its aesthetic superiority to the provincial cathedral at York.⁷⁶ Cathedral buildings were firmly associated with the leading figures of the English Church's past: writing on Salisbury allowed disquisitions on the virtues of the pre-Reformation bishops Osmund and Richard Poore; 'it would indeed be difficult to

produce in any country a more extensive series of great and illustrious, of learned, pious and good men, than what we find in the see of Salisbury',⁷⁷ it was observed. Worcester could celebrate the 'high character of its prelates'.⁷⁸ The thirteenth-century century Bishop Joceline of Wells was venerated for his 'zeal for Christianity'.⁷⁹ This canon of ecclesiastical exemplars was inextricably bound up with cathedral buildings, such that a cathedral became the material and moral repository of the accumulated value of its diocesan history.

Such associations and memories were a matter of pride both for Anglican antiquaries and for the Church more widely; they reflected on issues of continuity and legitimacy, of a proud legacy of virtuous and exemplary ecclesiastics. 'While our church can boast of such characters', it was proudly said of Salisbury's past prelates, 'our religion must always remain permanent and pure, our country great, illustrious, free and happy'.⁸⁰ The personal virtues of these illustrious figures compensated for the superstitious times they lived in; they stood out and apart from 'the dark ages of ignorance, barbarity and unlimited superstition'.⁸¹ Being able to claim such exemplars, to detach them from their popish associations and rehabilitate them as prestigious ancestors of contemporary Anglicanism gave a sense of continuity with a long and proud tradition of prelatical piety and associated the Church with the virtues but not the vices of the past. Above all, it underlined the legitimacy and catholicity of Anglicanism, its status as the national Church validated by appeal to a powerful sense of institutional continuity across the history of English Christianity.

The nation's medieval cathedrals functioned as the pre-eminent sites where this sense of ancestry and continuity was preserved and transmitted. It was a sense of ancestry valued by Anglicans, despite the background taint of popery. When the Catholic John Milner identified men like William of Wykeham alongside Bede and Alfred as among the founders of the English Church and Nation,⁸² he was consciously appealing to an Anglican sentiment of veneration for these ancestral luminaries. When he prefaced his polemic against the practice of cathedral 'improvements' with an engraving of the mutilated tomb monument of Bishop Poore of Salisbury, uprooted by the alterations at that cathedral, Milner was appealing to an Anglican sense of shame at having dishonoured the memory of its own forefathers.⁸³ The firmly Protestant William Dodsworth, while pouring contempt on medieval superstition, also paid due deference to the 'venerable name' of the Anglo-Saxon Bishop Osmund, whom he revered as the father of the diocese of Salisbury.⁸⁴

Enthusiasm for the nation's cathedrals fed into a wider patriotic enthusiasm for Gothic architecture. That Gothic was peculiarly English was a belief dear to antiquarian hearts.⁸⁵ Thus, for John Milner the Gothic was the invention of 'our own ancestors, the Anglo-Normans, and the English'.⁸⁶ It was 'our national Architecture',⁸⁷ and even 'if it had not its origin in this country', argued the antiquarian publisher Joseph Taylor, 'it certainly arrived at maturity here'.⁸⁸ However, whether or not Gothic could be proved to be of English origin was of far less significance than the way in which, during this period, talking of medieval buildings as 'our national architecture' became a commonplace and generalized language. The *British Critic* was 'not disposed to controvert this assertion [of the English origin of Gothic]; nor ought we perhaps, as *British Critics*, to oppose an opinion so honourable to our country'.⁸⁹ Many writers, like Thomas Rickman,⁹⁰ saw

English medieval architecture in resolutely English terms, paying scant attention to the continental dimension. English Gothic was English precisely because it was the style of some of the nation's most ancient public and religious buildings. In the minds of many writers, it was English first and Gothic or Pointed second: the 'English, or pointed style'.⁹¹ Rickman was following George Millers when he called Gothic 'English'. Millers himself had adopted this usage from John Britton's *Architectural Antiquities of Great Britain*.⁹² Britton had taken it from Carter's *Account of Durham Cathedral*. This was not so much a debate as the propagation of a cultural *idée fixe*. Whether the Gothic style had been invented in England, or whether the best examples of it were merely to be found there,⁹³ were easily conflated, and in any case the distinction mattered less than the overwhelming fixation on the glories of England's own Gothic buildings. The continental dimension could be ignored or marginalized.

Thus a pervasive language of ownership asserted an identification of medieval architecture with Englishness. Expressions like 'our antient architecture',⁹⁴ 'our national architecture',⁹⁵ 'ancient English architecture',⁹⁶ and 'our ancient Gothic edifices',⁹⁷ helped to construct the notion of a national canon of architectural glory.⁹⁸ Thus 'our National ecclesiastical erections'⁹⁹ were tied closely to a sense of pride in the nation. Gothic cathedrals and indeed Gothic architecture more widely were seen to confer especial distinction on England. The cathedrals in particular were 'universally acknowledged to be the most important and most interesting of our national antiquities',¹⁰⁰ and 'objects of national [...] veneration'.¹⁰¹ This idea gained particular strength from the sense of symbolic continuity which the cathedrals specifically represented. Cathedrals preserved an unbroken continuity of liturgical use as well as a symbolic centrality to diocese and Church. In a sense, therefore, cathedrals operated as paradigmatic exemplars of the Gothic; they performed the symbolic and ideological functions of the Gothic *par excellence*.

However, with this sense of a national canon of buildings came a sense of national ownership. These were, it was asserted, 'public edifices'.¹⁰² This set up a tension with the identity of cathedrals as church property. It was pointed out that church ownership was merely a trust.¹⁰³ 'The members of the chapter [of Winchester] will act wisely to bear in mind', warned John Britton, 'that an English Cathedral may be regarded as national property — as a public edifice confided to their guardianship, in trust for the whole kingdom.'¹⁰⁴ Cathedrals were, said John Carter, part of a canon of 'Public Antient [*sic*] Structures which no man, or body of men, can truly call their own; structures that are in a manner committed by the Nation at large to the immediate care and protection of particular individuals as a trust the most sacred'.¹⁰⁵ This attitude did not merely have ramifications for the clergy's freedom of action with regard to their own cathedral churches. By invoking the idea of the nation's moral ownership of cathedral buildings,¹⁰⁶ it allowed the Church's treatment of those buildings to be subjected to a patriotic critique; the Church's treatment of its own cathedrals could be interpreted as abuse of the nation's cultural and religious property, even betrayal of the nation itself.

This kind of criticism struck a chord with contemporary critiques of the Church that identified cathedrals and their chapters as sites of self-serving corporate corruption.¹⁰⁷ A sense that the self-interest of the cathedral clergy was being prioritized over the protection of the national heritage was hinted at by a correspondent to the *Gentleman's*

Magazine, who complained that the chapter house at Durham had been torn down to make way for 'an elegant drawing room [...] for the use of the chapter'.¹⁰⁸ Dereliction of duty by the clergy was something of a theme with some antiquaries. Another letter in the *Gentleman's Magazine* pointedly wished that contemporary clergy 'had the taste [...] of their celebrated ancestors'.¹⁰⁹ For William Burdon, writing about Durham for John Britton's *Architectural Antiquities of Great Britain*, the destruction of the chapter house was particularly shocking for having been 'torn down, not by barbarians, republicans or atheists, but by Christian priests who are intrusted with immense revenues for the preservation of the Church and its appendant edifices'.¹¹⁰ The idea that the custodianship of the cathedrals was a trust executed by the Church on behalf of the nation resonated with a wider sense that the Church itself held its institutional status and worldly wealth as a form of trust for the nation. In stewarding the nation's cathedrals, the Church was above all responsible for acting for the 'public good'.¹¹¹ Richard Gough appealed to an 'enlightened public' to judge whether the improvements at Salisbury had been beneficial;¹¹² John Carter described his preservationist campaigns as a 'duty to the publick'.¹¹³ The nation, not the Church, was the legitimate arbiter of the appropriate treatment of buildings which were national as much as religious monuments.

Ideals of Church reform more widely could be invoked as part of the critique of the Church's treatment of its cathedral fabrics. Thus a correspondent to the *Gentleman's Magazine* deplored the practice of selfish prelates and chapters laying out great sums on 'improvements' which would be better spent improving the stipends of the poorer parish clergy.¹¹⁴ While the notion that the cathedrals constituted a precious national heritage had the potential to confer moral lustre on the Established Church as the custodian and protector of that heritage, it could equally act as a sweeping indictment not only of the Church's treatment of cathedrals, but also of its abject failure to live up to its pastoral responsibilities. Cathedrals could be of value to the Church by virtue of being linked into an ideal of public heritage at the turn of the nineteenth century, much as in the mid-nineteenth century.¹¹⁵ But, at the turn of the nineteenth century, the practice of cathedral 'improvements' proved particularly susceptible to critiques that resonated with condemnations of the Established Church as a corrupt corporation failing to sustain its duties to the nation. Not only were cathedral chapters 'not at the forefront of the reform movement within the Church of England in the early nineteenth century',¹¹⁶ they were actively helping to shape a critique of the Church which made reform imperative, and their alleged mistreatment of the buildings in their custody played a central role in this critique.

As the previous remarks suggest, arguments over the significance and ownership of the cathedrals came to a head in response to the sweeping programme of 'improvement' which was undertaken between the late 1780s and mid-1790s at several cathedrals, under the direction of the architect James Wyatt. At Durham, the chapter house was demolished, while the Galilee chapel and the altar screen, also marked for demolition,¹¹⁷ were saved at the last minute by vociferous antiquarian protest. At Salisbury, the Beauchamp and Hungerford chantry chapels and the altar screen were demolished, and the choir screen replaced by a new lower version made up of stone taken from the demolished chapels. Medieval frescoes on the roof vaults of the choir and east transept were scraped away and replaced with a homogenous stone-coloured wash; a new East

window to a design by Joshua Reynolds was inserted at the end of the Lady Chapel; existing windows in the choir were stopped up;¹¹⁸ and the altar screen between choir and Lady Chapel was removed. At Lichfield, the altar screen was demolished and a new east window was inserted, again accompanied by the blocking up of existing windows in the choir.¹¹⁹

The rationale behind these alterations has generally been seen as a reflection of the aesthetics favoured by Wyatt and late eighteenth-century 'polite' opinion more widely.¹²⁰ The removal of choir and altar screens was the product of an impulse to open up the interior spaces of cathedrals, to exploit their length and height to obtain sweeping vistas and perspectives through the building.¹²¹ This taste drew on both picturesque and sublime aesthetic ideals.¹²² The notion of 'improvement' itself derived directly from the aesthetic of the picturesque, 'improving' a view or landscape by removing visual obstructions or distractions.¹²³ But there was more to it than this. Gothic cathedrals were spaces where a transcendent sentiment of awe and veneration was conventionally expected, and 'improvement' was in large part a contribution to this. Inserting new east windows, and heightening their effect by blocking up existing windows in the choir, created an atmosphere in which the new east window could act as a kind of transcendental beacon, heightened by the evocation of a sense of supernatural drama that was achieved by opening up vistas and perspectives through the space by removing or lowering choir and altar screens. Playing with light and shadow in this way served to heighten the aestheticized religiosity of the building, to appeal to the spiritual sensations of the visitor through the visual conventions of sublime aesthetics. The resulting effect at Salisbury was praised by the *Critical Review* as 'real improvements', an intensification of the 'sublime effect' of the cathedral. As a result of Wyatt's work, the 'dim religious light' had been improved; consequently the cathedral was now even more effective in evoking 'awe and veneration'.¹²⁴ The 'improved' choir and Lady Chapel, cleared of screens and with new glass at the east end, argued the cathedral's verger and guidebook-author William Dodsworth, 'cannot fail of producing the most solemn effect'.¹²⁵

It has not been recognized, however, that this was also an attempt to create a sense of 'Gothicness'. Cathedrals had to be made to look and feel as authentic as possible, that is, as close as possible to the conventional expectation of how such buildings ought to look and feel. A building was not authentically 'Gothic' unless it presented an atmosphere of appropriately transcendental sublimity. This sense of striving for an ideal of authenticity, of the true essence of Gothic character, was underlain by the conviction of its partisans that improvement was at heart about restoring 'the original effect' of the building. This is an ideal which has usually been seen as a characteristic of mid-Victorian church restoration, which has been described as an attempt to recreate an idealized and abstracted essence of 'Gothicness'.¹²⁶ Yet this ideal also drove the improving culture of the 1790s. For apologists of improvement, 'the original effect' or the 'original design'¹²⁷ provided an ideal to be recreated. The intention at Salisbury had been to 'restore it as nearly as possible to the plan of the original architect'.¹²⁸ Supporters of the alterations at Salisbury argued that the Beauchamp and Hungerford chapels had been discordant additions to the original building,¹²⁹ detracting from its 'primitive simplicity and elegance',¹³⁰ and from the 'general effect'¹³¹ of the cathedral. With their demolition, the Lady Chapel had been restored to 'the form and proportions as originally erected'.¹³²

The cathedral as a whole had been returned to 'its primitive simplicity and beauty'.¹³³ Likewise, of Lichfield it was said that 'the style of the cathedral is now purely Gothic'.¹³⁴

In a sense, this notion of authenticity and originality was dehistoricized. It sought historical legitimization in a vague vision of what the cathedral had 'originally' looked like or been intended to look like, but really inhabited an ahistorical ideal of what a cathedral *ought* to look like. The notion of the 'original effect' was a construct of the improvers; the language of originality rationalized the projection of contemporary aesthetic values: 'harmony, propriety and effect',¹³⁵ 'primitive simplicity and elegance',¹³⁶ and 'simplicity, symmetry and beauty'.¹³⁷ As critics were quick to point out, this ideal of originality was misguided and confused.¹³⁸ At Lichfield, a commentator in the *Gentleman's Magazine* observed, Wyatt had stylistically 'borrowed a bit of one aera [sic] and a bit of another, till he had blended them all in inconvenient, unpleasing arrangement'.¹³⁹ John Carter pointed out the absurdity of demolishing the fifteenth-century Beauchamp and Hungerford chantry chapels at Salisbury because they were not part of the original thirteenth-century fabric, then using the fragments of those chapels to build a new choir screen in what was supposed to be a thirteenth-century style.¹⁴⁰ In other words, what the improvers had created was not 'original' or 'pure' Gothic at all; it was an ignorant and chaotic confusion of different periods and styles. It made a nonsense of the very idea of a 'pure' and 'uniform' Gothic style.

The ideal of originality and authenticity provided one of the main legitimizing discourses for apologists and defenders of improvement, but it essentially relied on and fed off the ideal of the religious sublimity of the cathedral space, which itself spoke to an ahistorical religious aesthetic. It is also important to note that this aesthetic was unconnected, and to some extent antagonistic, to any liturgical function of the building, a reflection perhaps of the fact that it was the provision of an appropriately 'Gothic' visual and spiritual experience, rather than any distinct liturgical purpose, which was regarded as the pre-eminent public function of these buildings. This, however, would emerge as a major bone of contention between critics and defenders of improvement.

From the start, critics seized on the idea that improvement was actually 'innovation', a destruction of the material and moral embodiment of the nation's religious and civil past. Demolishing chapels, chapter houses and altar screens, blocking up windows, disturbing tombs; all this marked a concerted effort to sweep away the legacy of the past. 'Innovation', moreover, carried broader moral and political undertones, serving as a powerful shorthand in contemporary political discourse for all manner of revolutionary subversion.¹⁴¹ John Carter compared cathedral alterations with the violation and desecration of medieval buildings and tombs in Revolutionary France at the instigation of 'the infernal dispensers of Liberty and Equality'.¹⁴² France acted not just as a damning point of comparison,¹⁴³ but as a dark suggestion of as yet unfathomable horrors — architectural, moral, social and political — to come: 'the name of France should never be introduced, but to raise ideas of terror and destruction'.¹⁴⁴ The very notion of 'innovation' in anything, especially something so important as 'our national Architecture',¹⁴⁵ was dangerous 'at this mad hour of democracy'.¹⁴⁶ The practice of 'improvement' therefore was subversive of 'moral, religious and political order'.¹⁴⁷

That critics like John Carter linked their opposition to 'improvement' to 'a respect for the monarchy, church and constitution' has been remarked upon.¹⁴⁸ Opposition to

'innovation' was part of the discourse of Church-and-king loyalism. Yet invoking the spectre of 'innovation' carried out by the Church threatened to undermine the coherence and unity of that loyalist discourse. In the context of 1790s counter-revolution, the Established Church went out of its way to present itself as a primary bulwark of order and authority, moral and political.¹⁴⁹ Nevertheless, Carter was arguing that the Church was pursuing a thoroughly unpatriotic programme of 'innovation' whose effect was the effacement of the memorials of the national past. Carter's ferocious assault on 'innovation' drew upon a wider culture, gaining strength in the 1790s as the British state and ruling elite defined itself against the Revolutionary tendencies and developments in France, of the revaluation of tradition and continuity (Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France* being one of the earliest and most powerful invocations of this ideal). This revaluation found architectural expression in a new emphasis on medievalism in royal projects, such as the rebuilding of Windsor Castle for George III as an appropriate base for the exercise of patriotic and chivalric kingship, and the Gothic palace which Wyatt began for George at Kew, left unfinished upon the king's second loss of sanity in 1811. Similarly, the splendid Garter Feast of 1805, held at the newly renovated Windsor, figured George as focus of a chivalric order, and beyond that leader of a martial nation united in patriotic resolve, channelling the spirit of Edward III and the Hundred Years' War.¹⁵⁰ However, Carter turned this powerful rhetoric of medievalizing tradition against the Established Church, against the king's own architect, Wyatt, calling into question the sincerity and legitimacy of the Church's claims to embody and protect tradition and order in state and nation, insinuating that patriotic unity was threatened not only by jacobinical subversion, but also by the 'innovatory' actions of the Church itself. By associating English 'improvements' with revolutionary desecrations across the Channel, Carter implied that French-style anarchy and destructiveness had already arrived on these shores, at the hands of English bishops and the king's own architect. Those who presented themselves as the forces of tradition were in fact undermining it from within.

Critiques of 'innovation' drew heavily on the language of patriotism. 'Improvement', Carter argued, was an act of treachery, an assault by modern Englishmen on 'the Architecture of their ancestors' as well as 'the glory of their country'.¹⁵¹ The Durham altar screen had been marked for demolition by Wyatt; John Carter argued that this altar screen had been built to commemorate the English victory over the Scots at Neville's Cross in 1346, and was therefore 'a national monument of a most important and honourable national event'.¹⁵² To propose its demolition was a deeply unpatriotic act, especially at a time when the inspiration of the national past, and of the monuments of national glory, were needed in the great struggle with revolutionary France.¹⁵³ Indifference to 'the extraordinary effort of genius and skill, exhibited by [our] own ancestors'¹⁵⁴ was a betrayal of all the values which the national past offered up as exemplars for posterity. That the Church itself should make such an assault on the legacy of national piety from 'pious founders and worthy benefactors'¹⁵⁵ that the cathedrals represented was especially heinous. 'Our pious ancestors'¹⁵⁶ were invoked as a stick to beat the Church which had set its face against the legacy of its own past and that of the nation it claimed to be the institutional religious expression of. Carter styled himself and his supporters as 'we [...] lovers of our country's former architectural glory [...] those who revere the history of their country'.¹⁵⁷ The implication is that those who sought or

justified 'improvement' were cultural and moral traitors who reviled their own nation, preferring the 'allurements' of 'foreign arts',¹⁵⁸ which could be taken to mean the innovating excesses of revolutionary France as well as foreign (i.e. Classical) architecture. Hysterical and hyperbolic as this rhetoric undoubtedly was, it deserves more serious consideration in the context of contemporary discourses of patriotism and loyalism than it has sometimes received.¹⁵⁹ For loyalty to the Established Church was not only a major element in conventional patriotic language;¹⁶⁰ the Church itself sought to dominate patriotic discourses.¹⁶¹ Rhetoric which glossed 'improvements' carried out by the Church as unpatriotic therefore represented a subversive challenge.

The second major language of opposition to 'improvement' was the rhetoric of sacrilege,¹⁶² the idea that 'improvement' amounted to a disordering, even violation, of sacred space. By removing the altar screen at Salisbury, protested John Milner, the liturgical integrity of the space had been violated,¹⁶³ because 'the effect of destroying the altar screen of a cathedral [...] is like removing the head from the human figure'.¹⁶⁴ John Carter agreed: by removing the division between choir and Lady Chapel, the sacred and liturgical meaning of Salisbury and Lichfield had been lost. Choir and altar screens had been 'raised for various religious purposes [...] to answer those ends, and to give those effects, for which they were at first constructed'.¹⁶⁵ Each part of the cathedral interior had a different function, intended to produce a different effect. There was an intensification of sanctity as one proceeded from the nave into the choir and on into the Lady Chapel. Wyatt's 'improvements', by opening up these separate spaces, had destroyed this effect, making nonsense of the sacred meaning of the whole building. 'Improved' cathedrals now had more of the appearance of a 'ware-room'¹⁶⁶ or 'an empty house'.¹⁶⁷ 'Impiety' was also reflected in the fact that one of the aims of improvement appeared to be the increase of comfort for the clergy. At Lichfield, the chapter house had been reglazed and wainscoted.¹⁶⁸ At Durham, the chapter house had been replaced, fulminated Carter, by 'a modern chamber, with every elegant and fashionable assortment of luxurious furniture'.¹⁶⁹ Richard Colt Hoare sardonically commented that this new room 'bears more the appearance of a coffee house than a chapter house'.¹⁷⁰ This base pursuit of worldly comfort was pointedly contrasted by Carter with the 'natural holiness of the sanctuary'¹⁷¹ at Durham before 'improvement'.

Carter's liturgical geography was centred on the altar, that 'sacred object', whose sanctity ought to be heightened, signified and guarded by screens and the subdivision of space at the east end of the cathedral.¹⁷² He loved altars and candles.¹⁷³ To an extent, this enthusiasm for the beauty of holiness resonated with some of the liturgical preferences of High Church Anglicanism,¹⁷⁴ for all that Carter reached it through a somewhat unorthodox love for the material trappings of the Middle Ages. Thus the critique derived from ideals of the sanctity of the cathedral space was to some extent a discourse internal to the Church. This only added to its effect, especially when Milner claimed that the alterations at Salisbury had even violated Anglican rubrics on the appropriate layout and appearance of a cathedral.¹⁷⁵ This sort of critique drew strength from a surviving tradition of ritualism which was being maintained in some cathedrals and collegiate churches in the late eighteenth century. York Minster retained elements of this tradition, while relatively lavish ceremonial was a distinctive aspect of Westminster Abbey's liturgical life.¹⁷⁶ The ideal was echoed in the High Church *British*

Critic which associated cathedrals with ordered practices of piety and devotion deriving ultimately from monastic tradition.¹⁷⁷ A writer in the *Gentleman's Magazine* voiced his suspicion that 'our affection for the externals of cathedral worship is to be drawn off by making playthings of the sacred structures, which our forefathers were at so great an expense to render magnificently solemn'.¹⁷⁸ There was a sense of disquiet here at a perceived over-aestheticization of cathedrals, in which their essential sacred meaning would be obscured by a shallow pursuit of outward aesthetic ideals.

Catholics like Milner and Richard Gough were still more uncompromising in their denunciations of what they saw as an attack on the whole purpose and meaning of cathedral buildings. Gough argued that treating a cathedral with the religious reverence it required meant as far as possible not altering the fabric at all.¹⁷⁹ Milner went further. The architect of 'improvement', James Wyatt, he proclaimed, 'has not an idea of the nature and uses of a cathedral church'.¹⁸⁰ This accusation was more than an irritating Catholic assertion of superior knowledge and understanding of Anglicans' architectural inheritance.¹⁸¹ It was nothing less than a polemical dispossession of the Anglican Church of its cathedrals, undermining that sense of continuity and ancestry which the cathedrals provided for Anglicanism. Milner's reassertion of the *Catholicism* of the cathedrals, the fruit of 'the piety of our Catholic ancestors',¹⁸² challenged the Anglican attempt to use these buildings as symbols of institutional continuity, and in so doing contested Anglicanism's identity as the true national Church. In its sacrilegious treatment of the cathedrals, Milner implied, contemporary Anglicanism revealed its true colours, schismatic and heretical; it stood unmasked as a *false* claimant to the identity of the true English Church.

Although the critique of 'improvement' mounted by Milner, Carter and Gough was powerful, it was also vulnerable to the rhetoric of anti-popery. The Catholicism of some antiquaries was used to challenge their resort to patriotic language. Orthodox patriotic ideology in late eighteenth-century England was underpinned by a strong current of anti-Catholicism, allied to a fervent attachment to the Established Church.¹⁸³ This patriotic anti-popery drew strength from the identification of Catholicism as subversive chiefly in an Irish context,¹⁸⁴ but the generalized power of a pervasive and insidious 'popish plot', of 'the rapid growth of popery' as the *Anti-Jacobin Review* put it,¹⁸⁵ could be deployed against those English Catholic antiquaries who contested the moral ownership of English cathedrals. Milner in particular was singled out as subversive, and aspersions were cast against his loyalty to 'the British Constitution'.¹⁸⁶ Where Milner and Carter had claimed to identify a link between architectural 'improvement' and political subversion, their Anglican opponents turned this allegation around and denounced popery as the subversive force, an attack on the constitution in Church and state masquerading as patriotic sentiment. Milner had offered nothing but insults 'to the religion and constitution of his country'.¹⁸⁷ Carter's attachment to the beauty of holiness may have borne a close affinity to some orthodox High Church practice, but he nonetheless veered suspiciously close to idolatry. A correspondent to the *Gentleman's Magazine* suggested that Carter's enthusiasm for the altar was inappropriate for a Protestant.¹⁸⁸ Carter himself complained bitterly that the accusation of popery was constantly being thrown at him.¹⁸⁹ 'The received opinion is', he protested, 'that by expressing a desire to imitate scrupulously, or religiously make good decayed parts of

sacred buildings, is to be superstitiously inclined.¹⁹⁰ Yet the taint of popery which attached itself to him was not surprising when he spoke of images and reliquaries with enthusiasm and reverence.¹⁹¹

This was a religious response to the cathedral which went beyond the safely Protestant language of solemnity, awe and veneration employed by most visitors and antiquaries, beyond even the sense of tradition and liturgical order valued by some High Church men. Carter and Milner, it seemed, were too attentive to an ideal of specifically medieval worship; they located sanctity not in an encounter with the building as an awe-inspiring and mysterious space, but rather in those details which to most Protestant commentators connoted popery, idolatry and superstition. Their focus on sacramental details and the trappings of medieval liturgical observance evoked precisely those troubling associations of the cathedrals' pasts that, as we saw earlier, many Protestant antiquaries and Anglican clergymen were most keen to establish distance from, to subsume safely into a narrative of religious and intellectual progress.

Inevitably, this exposed figures like Milner and Carter to attack. Dark suspicions were voiced about 'those who admire to a degree of superstition the glories of our antient architecture'.¹⁹² Rather than a patriotic desire to conserve national monuments, the *British Critic* insinuated, the real aims of Milner and Carter were subversive and religious.¹⁹³ Milner was denounced for 'the images and emblems of idolatry which he proposes placing in the high altar' at Winchester (i.e., the restoration of images to the niches in the reredos which had lain empty since post-Reformation iconoclasm).¹⁹⁴ As this conflict suggests, Catholic antiquaries like Milner, and fellow travellers like Carter, had their own conception of a cathedral's 'original effect' which ought to be restored, one which was decidedly at odds with the modish Protestant sublime that underpinned 'improvement'. Apologists and defenders of 'improvement' attempted to present the controversy as a conflict between popish subversion and Anglican loyalism. Milner's agenda in opposing cathedral 'improvements', it was alleged, was 'to prop up the [...] Popish cause',¹⁹⁵ to undermine the Established Church and enthrone idolatry and superstition. When Milner claimed in a spirit of patriotism to be defending the nation's architectural monuments from Wyatt's 'improvements', the *Hampshire Repository* fulminated, he had really been defending 'popish idols' and 'relics'; he would rather see the 'whole collective Church of England' trampled underfoot than let a single 'paltry shrine of the most apocryphal saint' be damaged.¹⁹⁶

A sense of Anglican defensiveness about its architectural heritage, and a jealous need to safeguard its monopoly on Gothic, has been identified as a product of the years after 1828–29, following Catholic Emancipation and Test and Corporation Act repeal.¹⁹⁷ But this defensiveness was generated earlier, at the turn of the nineteenth century, and in the specific context of the cathedrals. Before the legal and constitutional status of Anglicanism as the national Church came to be eroded, its moral ownership of the architectural trappings of establishment had been contested and challenged in a way which forced a heightened reassertion and defence of the Anglican identity of its cathedrals. Anglican resort to anti-popish rhetoric testifies to the importance of cathedrals to Anglican identity, an identity understood in terms of an historical mythology of institutional ancestry and of the essential continuity of national Christianity. It also testifies to the ambiguous and contested identity of cathedrals

themselves, so central to the self-definition of the Church yet so precariously balanced between Protestantism and Popery. Beyond confessional conflict, the controversy which 'improvement' provoked also exposed the tensions underlying cathedrals' status as 'national monuments', a status which opened up fissures between Church and nation as the cathedrals were claimed as national heritage and public property, to be protected against ecclesiastical abuse.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This article is based on the essay that won the Society of Architectural Historians of Great Britain Hawksmoor Medal in 2009. In revising it for publication, I am deeply grateful for all their advice and assistance to William Whyte, John Schofield, Alistair Fair, Judi Loach and the journal's two anonymous readers.

NOTES

- 1 For example J. Mordaunt Crook, 'John Britton and the Genesis of the Gothic Revival', in *Concerning Architecture*, ed. John Summerson (London, 1968), pp. 98–119; Kenneth Clark, *The Gothic Revival* (London, 1964).
- 2 Crook, 'John Britton', p. 98; J. Mordaunt Crook, *John Carter and the Mind of the Gothic Revival* (London, 1995), p. 26; Alexandrina Buchanan, 'Architectural Antiquarianism in the Early Nineteenth Century', in *Producing the Past*, ed. Martin Myrone and Lucy Peltz (Aldershot, 1999), pp. 169–80 (p. 170); J. M. Frew, 'The Transformation of Medievalist Research', *Journal of the Courtauld and Warburg Institutes*, 43 (1980), pp. 174–85 (p. 174); Marion Roberts, 'Thomas Gray's Contribution to the Study of Medieval Architecture', *Architectural History*, 36 (1993), pp. 49–68.
- 3 Simon Bradley, 'The Englishness of Gothic', *Architectural History*, 45 (2002), pp. 325–41; Crook, *John Carter*, pp. 1, 43; J. M. Frew, 'John Carter and the Revival of the Gothic as England's National Style', *Art Bulletin*, 64/2 (1982), pp. 315–19 (pp. 315–17); Chris Brooks, *The Gothic Revival* (London, 1999), pp. 99, 134.
- 4 Rosemary Hill, 'Catholics, Romantics and Late Georgian Gothic', in *Gothic Architecture and its Meanings*, ed. Michael Hall (Reading, 2002), pp. 164–65.
- 5 Simon Bradley, 'The Roots of Ecclesiology', in 'A Church as it should be': *The Cambridge Camden Society and its Influence*, ed. John Elliott and Christopher Webster (Stamford, 2000), pp. 22–43.
- 6 For example, the most recent and comprehensive treatment of the subject, Simon Bradley, 'The Gothic Revival and the Church of England, 1790–1840' (doctoral thesis, University of London, 1996) has relatively little to say about cathedrals in the pre-1820 period.
- 7 For example, Bradley, 'Roots of Ecclesiology', pp. 24, 28, 43; Bradley, 'Englishness of Gothic', p. 326.
- 8 The classic work on ideas of national identity in this period is Linda Colley, *Britons: Shaping the Nation* (New Haven, 1992).
- 9 Rosemary Sweet, *Antiquaries* (London, 2004), pp. xiv–xv.
- 10 R. Arthur Burns, *The Diocesan Revival in the Church of England* (Oxford, 1999), p. 2.
- 11 Peter Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 153, 165–66.
- 12 See, for example, Stanford E. Lehmberg, *The Reformation of Cathedrals* (New Jersey, 1988) and *Cathedrals Under Siege* (Exeter, 1996); Julie Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm During the English Civil War* (Woodbridge, 2003), ch. 6. Also, for one of the richest and most important medieval great churches in England which, though not technically a cathedral, exercised many of the symbolic and liturgical functions of one in the century following the Reformation, Julia F. Meritt, 'The Cradle of Laudianism? Westminster Abbey, 1558–1630', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 52/4 (2001), pp. 623–46.
- 13 Burns, *Diocesan Revival*, pp. 143–61; *Faith and Fabric*, ed. Nigel Yates and Paul Welsby (Woodbridge, 1996), p. 144; Philip Barrett, *Barchester* (London, 1993), pp. 12–14.
- 14 Burns, *Diocesan Revival*, p. 143.
- 15 Barrett, *Barchester*, pp. 1, 3, 137; *Chichester Cathedral*, ed. Mary Hobbs (Chichester, 1994), p. 120; *A History of Lincoln Minster*, ed. Dorothy Owen (Cambridge, 1994), p. 218.
- 16 See M. Andrews, *The Search for the Picturesque* (Stanford, 1989).
- 17 Bradley, 'Roots of Ecclesiology', pp. 25–26.

- 18 *Hampshire Repository*, II (1801), p. 119; John Britton, *The History and Antiquities of Salisbury* (orig. London, 1814, republ. Glossop, 1999), p. 51; James Bentham, *The History and Antiquities of the Conventual and Cathedral Church of Ely* (Cambridge, 1771), p. 41; John Britton, *The History and Antiquities of the Metropolitan Church of York* (London, 1819), pp. 36–37, 56.
- 19 Andrew Wilton, *Turner and the Sublime* (London, 1980), pp. 12, 66, 113–14.
- 20 Edmund Burke, *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*, ed. Adam Phillips (Oxford, 1990), p. 64.
- 21 John Britton, *An Historical and Architectural Essay relating to Redcliffe Church, Bristol* (London, 1813), p. 29.
- 22 *The Sublime: A Reader in 18th Century British Aesthetic Theory*, ed. Andrew Ashfield and Peter de Bolla (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 276–77.
- 23 William Dodsworth, *A Guide to the Cathedral Church of Salisbury* (London, 1798), p. 34.
- 24 John Milner, *The History Civil and Ecclesiastical, and Survey of the Antiquities of Winchester*, 2 vols (London, 1798), I, pp. 48–50.
- 25 William Dodsworth, *An Historical Account of the Episcopal See and Cathedral of Sarum* (London, 1814), p. 223.
- 26 *The Journeys of Sir Richard Colt Hoare*, ed. M. W. Thompson (Gloucester, 1983), p. 143.
- 27 Mary Morgan, *A Tour to Milford Haven in the Year 1791* (London, 1795), p. 17.
- 28 John Henry Manners, *Journal of a Tour to the Northern Parts of Great Britain* (London, 1813), p. 113.
- 29 Bradley, 'Roots of Ecclesiology', pp. 22, 25–26.
- 30 Britton, *Salisbury*, p. 1.
- 31 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 85 (1815), p. 153.
- 32 *British Critic*, 39 (1812), p. 161.
- 33 *Essays on Gothic Architecture*, ed. T. Warton (London, 1800), pp. xvi–xvii; *Critical Review*, 5th ser., 5 (1817), p. 236; Bradley, 'Roots of Ecclesiology', p. 24.
- 34 *British Critic*, new ser., 3 (1815), p. 489.
- 35 George Millers, *A Description of the Cathedral Church of Ely* (London, 1807), p. 10; J. Storer, *History and Antiquities of the Cathedral Churches of Great Britain*, 4 vols (London, 1817), IV, p. 22; *Gentleman's Magazine*, 73 (1803), p. 24; John Milner, *A Dissertation on the Modern Art of Altering Ancient Cathedrals* (London, 1811), p. vii.
- 36 P. Newcombe, *The History of the Royal and Ancient Foundation Called the Abbey of St Alban* (London, 1795), p. 97.
- 37 John Milner, *A Treatise on the Ecclesiastical Architecture of England During the Middle Ages* (London, 1811), pp. xvii–xviii; *Gentleman's Magazine*, 81 (1811), p. 111.
- 38 Milner, *Dissertation*, pp. 48–49; J. Ackermann, *The History of the Abbey Church of St Peter's Westminster*, 2 vols (London, 1812), II, pp. 9–10.
- 39 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 90 (1820), p. 128; *Gentleman's Magazine*, 87 (1817), p. 367.
- 40 Millers, *Ely*, p. 2.
- 41 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 72 (1802), p. 623.
- 42 Bradley, 'Roots of Ecclesiology', pp. 23, 43; Rosemary Sweet, *The Writing of Urban Histories in Eighteenth Century England* (Oxford, 1997), p. 40.
- 43 Millers, *Ely*, p. 3.
- 44 John Milner, *Letters to a Prebendary* (Cork, 1802), p. ix.
- 45 John Britton, *The History and Antiquities of the See and Cathedral Church of Lichfield* (London, 1820), p. 9.
- 46 John Britton, *The History and Antiquities of the See and Cathedral Church of Winchester* (London, 1817), p. 107.
- 47 *British Critic*, 19 (1802), p. 332.
- 48 *Anti-Jacobin Review*, 2 (1799), pp. 248–49.
- 49 John Britton, *The Architectural Antiquities of Great Britain*, 5 vols (London, 1807–26), II, p. 54.
- 50 Britton, *Architectural Antiquities*, IV, p. 189.
- 51 *Anti-Jacobin Review*, 26 (1807), pp. 382–84.
- 52 Britton, *Salisbury*, p. 6.
- 53 *Ibid.*, p. 2.
- 54 Britton, *Lichfield*, pp. 8–9.
- 55 William Gunn, *An Inquiry into the Origin and Influence of Gothic Architecture* (London, 1819), pp. 71–72; Thomas Rickman, *An Attempt to Discriminate the Styles of English Architecture* (London, 1817), pp. 4–5.
- 56 Newcombe, *St Albans*, pp. x–xi.
- 57 John Britton, *The History and Antiquities of the See and Cathedral Church of Norwich* (London, 1816), p. 5.
- 58 Sweet, *Urban Histories*, pp. 125–26, 152, 155–56.
- 59 Storer, *Cathedral Churches*, I (St Asaph, d); (Bath, b–e, i); (Canterbury, t). [Note that Storer's volumes do not

contain numbered pages; instead the text is divided into a series of discrete sections, each corresponding to an individual cathedral. Pages within each section are identified alphabetically by letter rather than number.]

- 60 Storer, *Cathedral Churches*, I (Canterbury, cc).
- 61 *Ibid.*, I, pp. vii–viii.
- 62 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 86 (1816), p. 423.
- 63 *Anti-Jacobin Review*, 27 (1807), p. 82.
- 64 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 85 (1815), pp. 521, 524.
- 65 Britton, *Winchester*, p. 9.
- 66 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 68 (1798), pp. 1108, 764–65.
- 67 *Ibid.*, p. 926.
- 68 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 69 (1799), pp. 94, 190.
- 69 *Ibid.*, pp. 392–93.
- 70 *Ibid.*, pp. 392–93.
- 71 For example, Britton, *Norwich*, p. 5.
- 72 Sweet, *Urban Histories*, p. 279.
- 73 Storer, *Cathedral Churches*, II (Ely, a).
- 74 Britton, *York*, p. 7.
- 75 For example, Britton, *Salisbury*, pp. 20–48.
- 76 *Archaeologia*, 17 (1814), pp. 136–37.
- 77 Storer, *Cathedral Churches*, III (Salisbury, q).
- 78 Storer, *Cathedral Churches*, IV (Worcester, p).
- 79 *Ibid.* (Wells, d).
- 80 Storer, *Cathedral Churches*, III (Salisbury, q).
- 81 *Ibid.* (Salisbury, q).
- 82 Milner, *Letters to a Prebendary*, p. 6.
- 83 Milner, *Dissertation*, plate facing title page.
- 84 Dodsworth, *Sarum*, pp. 164–65.
- 85 See Simon Bradley's authoritative survey in 'Englishness of Gothic'.
- 86 Milner, *Treatise*, p. ii; Bradley, 'Englishness of Gothic', pp. 327–28.
- 87 John Carter, *Some Account of the Cathedral Church of Durham* (London, 1801), p. 3.
- 88 Warton, *Essays*, p. iii.
- 89 *British Critic*, 19 (1802), p. 330.
- 90 Bradley, 'Englishness of Gothic', p. 331.
- 91 Storer, *Cathedral Churches*, IV, pp. 22, 34.
- 92 Millers, *Ely*, p. 16.
- 93 On which, see Bradley, 'Englishness of Gothic', pp. 33–36.
- 94 Dodsworth, *Sarum*, p. 227.
- 95 *Ibid.*, p. 122.
- 96 Storer, *Cathedral Churches*, II (Exeter, i–k).
- 97 *Critical Review*, 28 (1800), p. 331.
- 98 Storer, *Cathedral Churches*, I, pp. vii–viii; *Gentlemen's Magazine*, 59 (1789), p. 214.
- 99 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 85 (1815), p. 36.
- 100 Britton, *Salisbury*, p. ii.
- 101 *British Critic*, new ser., 9 (1818), p. 331.
- 102 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 71 (1801), p. 701.
- 103 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 77 (1807), pp. 1126–27.
- 104 Britton, *Winchester*, p. 78.
- 105 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 78 (1808), pp. 22–23.
- 106 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 71 (1801), p. 311.
- 107 Yates and Welsby, *Faith and Fabric*, pp. 115–16; Barrett, *Barchester*, pp. 1, 6, 11–12; Burns, *Diocesan Revival*, pp. 4, 144.
- 108 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 72 (1802), p. 327.
- 109 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 77 (1807), p. 1205.
- 110 Britton, *Architectural Antiquities*, IV, p. 82.
- 111 Britton, *Exeter*, p. iv.
- 112 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 59 (1789), pp. 1194–95.

- 113 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 71 (1801), p. 311.
- 114 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 65 (1795), pp. 924–25; Barrett, *Barchester*, p. 1; Burns, *Diocesan Revival*, p. 144.
- 115 Burns, *Diocesan Revival*, p. 149.
- 116 Yates and Welsby, *Faith and Fabric*, p. 144.
- 117 Carter, *Durham*, p. 5.
- 118 William Dodsworth, *A Guide to the Cathedral Church of Salisbury, with a Particular Account of the Great Improvements made therein, under the Direction of James Wyatt Esq.* (London, 1798), pp. 28, 34, 37, 39; *Gentleman's Magazine*, 73 (1803), p. 1122.
- 119 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 77 (1807), p. 322.
- 120 Crook, *John Carter*, p. 35.
- 121 J. M. Frew, 'James Wyatt's Choir Screen at Salisbury Cathedral Reconsidered', *Architectural History*, 27 (1984), pp. 481–87 (p. 483).
- 122 Crook, *John Carter*, p. 48; J. Macaulay, *The Gothic Revival* (Edinburgh, 1975), pp. 135–36.
- 123 Macaulay, *Gothic Revival*, p. 177; Andrews, *Search for the Picturesque*, p. 98.
- 124 *Critical Review*, 30 (1800), p. 210.
- 125 Dodsworth, *Guide* [1798], p. 34.
- 126 Chris Miele, 'Professionalism and the Restoration of Medieval Churches', in *The Victorian Church*, ed. Chris Brooks and Andrew Saint (Manchester, 1995), pp. 151–72 (pp. 152–54).
- 127 *Critical Review*, 28 (1800), pp. 332–33.
- 128 Dodsworth, *Sarum*, p. 178.
- 129 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 59 (1789), pp. 1064–66; Dodsworth, *Guide*, p. 28; *Critical Review*, 28 (1800), pp. 331–33.
- 130 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 61 (1791), pp. 137–38.
- 131 Dodsworth, *Sarum*, p. 167.
- 132 Britton, *Salisbury*, p. 60.
- 133 Storer, *Cathedral Churches*, III (Salisbury, m–n).
- 134 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 65 (1795), pp. 998–99.
- 135 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 59 (1789), pp. 1064–66.
- 136 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 61 (1791), pp. 137–38.
- 137 Britton, *Salisbury*, p. 60.
- 138 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 59 (1789), pp. 1194–95.
- 139 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 65 (1795), p. 1074.
- 140 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 73 (1803), p. 1021.
- 141 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 71 (1801), p. 310.
- 142 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 68 (1798), p. 1108.
- 143 Milner, *Dissertation*, pp. 32, 51.
- 144 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 69 (1799), p. 190.
- 145 Carter, *Durham*, pp. 3, 8.
- 146 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 70 (1800), p. 839.
- 147 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 71 (1801), p. 1005.
- 148 Frew, 'Carter and the Revival of the Gothic', p. 317.
- 149 R. Hole, 'English Sermons and Tracts as Media of Debate on the French Revolution', in *The French Revolution and British Popular Politics*, ed. Mark Philp (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 18–37 (p. 34).
- 150 David Watkin, 'George III and the Shift to Gothic', in *New Offerings, Ancient Treasures: Studies in Medieval Art for George Henderson*, ed. Paul Binski (Stroud, 2001), pp. 519–30; Mark Girouard, *Return to Camelot* (New Haven, 1981), pp. 24–27.
- 151 Carter, *Ancient Architecture of England*, preface.
- 152 Carter, *Durham*, p. 12.
- 153 Brooks, *Gothic Revival*, p. 134.
- 154 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 86 (1816), p. 423.
- 155 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 60 (1790), p. 908.
- 156 Milner, *Letters to a Prebendary*, p. 58.
- 157 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 69 (1799), pp. 92–94.
- 158 *Ibid.*, pp. 392–93.
- 159 Clark, *Gothic Revival*, pp. 74–75.
- 160 Emma Vincent, 'John Bowles and the French Revolutionary Wars', *History*, 78 (1993), pp. 393–420 (p. 419);

- Thomas Schofield, 'Conservative Political Thought in Britain in Response to the French Revolution', *Historical Journal*, 29/3 (1986), pp. 601–22; Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context*, pp. 48–49, 63.
- 161 David Eastwood, 'Patriotism and the English State in the 1790s', in *French Revolution*, ed. Philp, pp. 146–68 (pp. 152–53).
- 162 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 69 (1799), p. 27.
- 163 Milner, *Dissertation*, pp. 37–38.
- 164 Warton, *Essays*, p. xx.
- 165 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 73 (1803), p. 1021; 77 (1807), p. 322.
- 166 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 69 (1799), p. 946.
- 167 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 77 (1807), p. 629.
- 168 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 71 (1801), p. 312.
- 169 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 71 (1801), p. 1093.
- 170 Thompson, *Journeys of Sir Richard Colt Hoare*, p. 144.
- 171 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 72 (1802), p. 495.
- 172 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 75 (1805), pp. 24–25; 70 (1800), p. 1052.
- 173 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 69 (1799), p. 27; 72 (1802), pp. 134–35.
- 174 Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context*, pp. 210–11; Bradley, 'Gothic Revival and the Church of England', pp. 61–63, 67.
- 175 Milner, *Dissertation*, p. 37–38.
- 176 F. C. Mather, 'Georgian Churchmanship Reconsidered', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 36/2 (1985), pp. 255–83 (pp. 263, 258).
- 177 Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context*, pp. 210–11; *British Critic*, new ser., 3 (1815), pp. 488–89.
- 178 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 65 (1795), pp. 924–25.
- 179 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 59 (1789), pp. 1194–95.
- 180 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 67 (1797), p. 638.
- 181 Hill, 'Late Georgian Gothic', pp. 164–65.
- 182 Milner, *Letters to a Prebendary*, p. 55.
- 183 Vincent, 'John Bowles', p. 419; Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context*, pp. 62, 169.
- 184 *Anti-Jacobin Review*, 21 (1805), pp. 71–73; 27 (1807), pp. 214–15.
- 185 *Anti-Jacobin Review*, 25 (1806), p. 140.
- 186 *British Critic*, 15 (1800), p. 157.
- 187 *Critical Review*, 2nd ser., 28 (1800), p. 371.
- 188 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 78 (1808), p. 110.
- 189 *Ibid.*, p. 300; *Gentleman's Magazine*, 74 (1804), p. 28; 75 (1805), p. 1014.
- 190 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 76 (1806), p. 925.
- 191 Carter, *Durham*, p. 12; *Gentleman's Magazine*, 72 (1802), pp. 134–35.
- 192 *Gentleman's Magazine*, 72 (1802), p. 622.
- 193 *British Critic*, 13 (1799), p. 203.
- 194 Storer, III (Winchester, m–n).
- 195 *Hampshire Repository*, II (1801), p. 149.
- 196 *Ibid.*, p. 149.
- 197 Bradley, 'Englishness of Gothic', p. 326; Bradley, 'Gothic Revival and the Church of England', p. 120.