

Extended Commentary:

Samuel Rawson Gardiner, a Victorian Historian whose Father Was an Angel¹

Samuel Rawson Gardiner (1829-1902) was one of the greatest Victorian historians.² His father, a retired East India civil servant, was an angel, a kind of bishop in the Catholic Apostolic Church, an exotic denomination in which S.R. Gardiner was raised. His younger brother also became an angel. Combining priestly vestments and hierarchical leadership with charismatic premillennialism and prophecy, it fit with neither Nonconformity nor the Established Church.³ Gardiner's first book, *Christian Family Life*, published in 1856, was a translation of a book by H.W.J. Thiersch, a German convert to the new sect.⁴

Gardiner's reputation is based on a massive history of England from 1603 to 1656. A paralytic stroke, the year before his death, prevented Gardiner from extending his history to the Stuart Restoration in 1660 or even to the death of Oliver Cromwell. As an epigraph to his recent book on Gardiner, Mark Nixon quoted Guernsey Jones (1901), "life is short and Gardiner is long."⁵ Gardiner began his research at the British Museum in 1856, followed by work at the Public Record Office two years later. His detailed history's "grinding factuality" had been "constructed ... within the walls of the archive."⁶ Apparently, he was the first scholar to read all the Thomason Tracts, over 22,000 printed items, bound in two thousand volumes. He built his history on strictly contemporary sources. For that reason, he distrusted memoirs. Writing to a publisher whom he thought might have Prince Rupert's diary, Gardiner explained: "I dislike extremely taking second-hand authority unless the original is absolutely out of reach."⁷ Despite his busy schedule, he managed to serve as a director of the Camden Society, 1869-97, editing twelve volumes of documents and parts of other volumes.

Gardiner was interested in the borderline between ideas and politics. In a book review he argued “facts are only of importance as they help us to understand the changes of thought, of feeling, or of knowledge that mark the growth of that complex social unity which we call a nation.”⁸ Like most of the historians of his generation, Gardiner neglected social and economic history. In discussing the genesis of the revolution, he made only limited mention of the rise of the middle classes whose effect Hume and Guizot had emphasized. Gardiner expressed his satisfaction that “if war there was to be [in 1642], it was well that it should not ... degenerate, like the troubles of the French Revolution, into a war of classes.”⁹

It took time for Gardiner to build his reputation. In 1863 he published the first two of his eventual eighteen volumes. They were greeted “with some hostility and more indifference.”¹⁰ Only 146 copies of initial two volumes were sold. The rest of the edition “went to waste-paper.”¹¹ In contrast, 32,000 copies of John Richard Green’s *Short History of the English People* (1874) were sold within twelve months. Unfortunately for Gardiner, unlike Green, he was a pedestrian writer. F.W. Maitland lamented: “If only Gardiner had a little skill in story telling how good he would be.”¹²

Gardiner was not a literary artist such as his predecessor Macaulay, but in his later volumes his prose improved. At least he avoided the bombast of some of his contemporaries. The modern historians Brundage and Cosgrove are generous toward Gardiner the writer. “The individual who actually reads Gardiner will discover a mode of expression that moves the story forward in interesting fashion” as “the writing was clear and straightforward.”¹³ Lytton Strachey, not a friend of Victorians, exaggerated when he described Gardiner’s history as “nothing so much as a very large heap of sawdust.”¹⁴ As a respectable Victorian, Gardiner’s description of feminine beauty was confined to a compliment for sparkling eyes, but he could write a striking

sentence, as when he described the lawyer Bulstrode Whitelocke as “a fair representative of the well-meaning but somewhat stolid portion of the prosperous classes, whose inertia every statesman in his heart despises.” Gardiner wrote decent set pieces such as for the execution of Charles I and the battle of Marston Moor. He was at his best as a kind of stage manager who chose vivid quotations, for instance, in recounting the confrontation between the Levellers and the Council of State. The Marxist historian Christopher Hill praised Gardiner’s “knack of hitting on the telling quotation.”¹⁵

The historian Edward Freeman sometimes grumbled that Gardiner had whitewashed Freeman’s favorite villains. “Give me a history with some one to hate in it.” But he mostly championed Gardiner as a writer as well as a scholar. “Those who call him dull, I suppose want him to rave like Carlyle, or talk namby-pamby like Froude. That he won’t, or I either.”¹⁶

Mark Nixon included in his book a whole chapter on Gardiner as a writer. Nixon was intrigued with Gardiner’s comparison of Wentworth (Lord Strafford) with Shakespeare’s Coriolanus. Nixon began the conclusion to his book by quoting one of my most obscure publications. “Gardiner the antiquarian whose obsession for research crowds out the artistic sensibility exists principally in the imagination of those admirers too respectful of his eighteen-volume *opus* to read it.”¹⁷

It was the late 1870s and the early 1880s before Gardiner began to make money from his great history. Then the demand for his books was such that in 1884 he issued a revised standard edition of the first ten volumes.¹⁸ His *magnum opus* depicted in painstaking detail the struggle between the Stuart kings and Parliament, the Puritan revolution and civil wars, and the rise of Oliver Cromwell. He considered Parliament the greatest English achievement. He avoided the blatant partisanship of earlier Whig historians and saw honorable motives in adversaries. He

honored Laud and Strafford as well as Pym and Lilburne. In a book review published in 1874, Gardiner declared “no history is ever properly written, unless the writer does his best to understand what people, of whose conduct or theories he disapproves, have to say for themselves.”¹⁹

The historian Timothy Lang argues that Gardiner’s “famed impartiality” was the result of “a Liberal historian’s attempt to foster national unity by presenting a balanced interpretation of the Civil War.”²⁰ Gardiner said: “England sprang from a union between the Puritanism and the Churchmanship of the seventeenth century.”²¹ Gardiner made his special theme the rise of religious toleration.²² He said that “the secret of the future was with those who could guide England into the sure haven of religious liberty.”²³ In an unpretentious volume in the Epochs of Modern History series, Gardiner explained why majority rule would eventually have established toleration on a safer basis than the favor of a benevolent monarch. For a time, the majority might be tyrannical, “but the mere success of the majority of the nation would eventually bring toleration in its train. The strong can afford to allow things to be done and words to be spoken which the weak will be eager to suppress at all hazards.”²⁴

In 1882 Reginald Palgrave, clerk of the House of Commons, called Gardiner’s work revolutionary as it transcended the division between Tory and Whig. “This historical revolution is the more remarkable because Mr. Gardiner’s bias—and who is not in some way biased?—is toward the Puritan aspect of life and so-called liberalism in politics.”²⁵ Although Gardiner made use of many published sources, he is renowned for his manuscript research at the British Museum, the Public Record Office, and college and private libraries in England as well as archives at Simancas in Spain, Brussels, Paris, Venice, and Rome.²⁶ His research required him to read sources in Latin, French, German, Italian, Spanish, Dutch, Swedish, and even ciphers. He

read Danish as he cited books written in it. According to Firth, Gardiner had chosen his period “largely as a reaction against the views what were in vogue when he began to write.”²⁷

In 1882, in the preface (p. vi) to *The Fall of the Monarchy of Charles I*, Gardiner remembered:

Many years ago, as a young and unknown writer I deliberately refrained from selecting a subject more attractive in its own nature than the reign of James I. could possibly be. It seemed to me then as it seems to me now that it was the duty of a serious inquirer to search into the original causes of great events rather than, for the sake of catching an audience, to rush unprepared upon the great events themselves. My reward has been that, whether the present work is well or ill done, it is at all far better done than it could have been if I had commenced with the tale of the Puritan Revolution itself.

Gardiner is sometimes presented as a narrow specialist. Perhaps the best analysis of him as a historian appeared in the *Quarterly Review* (April 1902). The anonymous writer (who was C.H. Firth) pointed out that in his popular works Gardiner wrote about the entirety of English history and, knowing many languages, read widely in continental European history.²⁸

Despite the common assumption that Gardiner simply summarized documents, he said in a private letter something quite different.²⁹

It has always been my wish that I might so be able to write the story of that very interesting period on which I have been for so many years engaged as to convey something better than mere information. It seems to me that without any attempt at preaching, merely to explain how men acted towards one another, and the reasons for their misunderstandings, ought to teach us something for the conduct of our own lives.

Discussing Bate’s case (1606) and the legality of royal impositions on imported currants, Gardiner did not bother much with what the law was at the time. He said:

if...the judges had looked upon the history of “preceding” times as we are able to do, they would have perceived at a glance that such technical objections were unworthy of attention. They would have seen the English constitution marching steadily onwards under the influence of a great principle, and they would have interpreted every verbal difficulty in accordance with the law by which the progress of the nation was governed.³⁰

Gardiner apparently drew a distinction between an interpretation of the past, employing perspectives contemporary to that time, and a commentary, drawing on the perspective of the entirety of history. An example of Gardiner's departure from a seventeenth-century perspective was his criticism of the supranational character of the Austrian empire. "The tree which was planted on the White Hill before the walls of Prague was to bear its bitter fruit at Leuthen and at Marengo, at Solferino and at Sadowa."³¹

Gardiner wanted historians to put the past into the context of the future. While preparing an obituary for Edward Freeman, he wrote James Bryce (26 May 1892):

In Freeman's admiration for Macaulay [there is] their agreement in the high place they ascribe to Parliamentary institutions. On the other hand, when Macaulay wants to make you understand a thing, he compares it with that which existed in his own day. The standard of the present is always with him. Freeman traces it from its origins. He testifies to its growth. The strength of this mode of proceedings in an historian is obvious. Its weakness is that it does not help him to appreciate statesmanship, looking forward, trying to find a solution of difficult problems.³²

Was Gardiner without passion? In an obituary appreciation of the great German historian, Gardiner says: "Ranke is cold and unenthusiastic; and, in judging individuals, it is well to be cold and unenthusiastic. But is there not room for warmth of feeling in recounting the efforts and struggle of the race?"³³

Gardiner was not simply a facts man. "There is an accuracy in detail which may exist quite independently of any perception of the larger truths of history. One is sickened by hearing how history is sometimes taught by men who, no doubt, are doing their best, but who have no idea that history cannot be got up like the rules of Latin grammar."³⁴

The notion that Gardiner sent the text of his book directly from the British Museum to the printers without any later review is more colorful than true.³⁵ On 10 June 1881, he told his friend Oscar Browning: "I am toiling through proof sheets, which as you know is a grind, and I am going over my last chapters revising. I have spotted today why Pym impeached the Bishops.

How new facts turn up.” In an obituary for John Richard Green, Gardiner mentioned the challenge to the historian who had to revise a manuscript even when it had gone to the printers. “Anyone who writes history knows of the frequent searches into authorities, the necessity of running off, even when proof sheets are in hand, to the [Public] Record Office or the [British] Museum to verify a reference suspected to have been wrongly made.”³⁶

In 1990, J.S.A. Adamson began his valuable *Historical Journal* article about with an “eccentrically endearing” image of Gardiner, “in the summer of 1885, on his Humber Tandem Tricycle, pedalling his way ... across the battlefield of Marston Moor” with his second wife Bertha Meriton, also a historian.³⁷

In Adamson’s article, Gardiner is not above partisanship. He makes heroes of those that he considered men of character, notably Cromwell. Adamson reminds us that writing to the medievalist J H. Round on 21 November 1893, Gardiner said: “My point about the 2[nd] Civil War is that Government by force is very bad, but that Government by lying and equivocation is worse.” For Gardiner, this damned the Stuart king and justified the Lord Protector. Five years later, when Round compared Gladstone with Charles I, Gardiner (5 April 1898) dismissed the insult to his modern hero: “I fear I cannot follow your comparison between Gladstone and Charles I.”

A few years after Gardiner’s death he was severely criticized by a young American, Roland G. Usher, in his book, *A Critical Study of the Historical Method of Samuel Rawson Gardiner*.³⁸ Usher argued that Gardiner inconsistently employed concepts such as that of the Elizabethan constitution. Usher was correct. Usher also doubted that Gardiner had any originality in interpretation despite his enormous addition of data. Most historians would disagree.

Gardiner rejected the old interpretation that the Civil Wars were about the constitution. It had been on religion that the unity of the future Royalists and Parliamentarians had foundered, "The final conversion of the Episcopal party into a Royalist party" came in early November 1641, occasioned by a constitutional issue. "To baffle the Puritans had now become that party's chief object. For the sake of that it was ready to trust the King." ³⁹

Usher's most important contention was that Gardiner had joined inadvertent and crippling present-mindedness with a naïve attempt to divorce his presentation of the early and mid-seventeenth century from his knowledge of what happened later. According to Usher (in a passage copied by many later writers) Gardiner had refused to read documents for the years after the period about which he was writing in order that he might provide an account based strictly on contemporary knowledge. In fact, although Gardiner did not want his knowing the sequel obscure what people at the time knew, he wanted readers to know the importance of what happened. ⁴⁰

For Gardiner, as for his predecessors, history remained philosophy teaching through examples and the historian had a responsibility to point out the lessons of the past. In a review of Firth's *Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans*, Gardiner said that "one should like to find Mr. Firth looking a little more backwards and forwards, and placing the movements he describes in a wider setting of past and future developments," to provide "that wide instruction which is the salt of history." ⁴¹

In his book, *Cromwell's Place in History*, that Gardiner offered his most quoted judgment about Cromwell. He was "the greatest because the most typical Englishman of all time." This characterization was less paradoxical than has been claimed by critics who neglect the lines which followed. Among men of action Cromwell "stands... not to be implicitly followed

as a model, but to hold up a mirror to ourselves, wherein we may see alike our weaknesses and our strength," the moral, humanitarian zeal and the self-interested practicality which, when found in combination, foreigners describe as English hypocrisy.⁴² Despite creating a military dictatorship, Cromwell was by instinct a traditionalist. In 1647, when he rejected the Leveller proposal for a republic: "Without any constitutional learning [and] still more without any philosophical training, [Cromwell] instinctively turned against a proposal to cast the institutions of the country into the melting pot, after the fashion practiced by the makers of modern France a century and a half later."⁴³

As Usher's book was published when Britain was at war, little attention was paid to it initially.⁴⁴ This changed when someone who used the pseudonym "Historian" began a debate in the *Times Literary Supplement* on 25 September 1919 which continued to 18 December 1919.⁴⁵ "Historian" supported Usher but went beyond him. "Historian" said about Gardiner: "The truth is that nothing that he says can be trusted. Every reference note needs to be checked." Most of the contributors to the *TLS* debate defended Gardiner as in the case of his widow Bertha Meriton Gardiner and his friend C.H. Firth.

Recent historians sometimes agree with Usher. This is the case most of all for John Kenyon in a lengthy section in the *History Men*. On the other hand, many historians are not much troubled by Usher even when they accept his critique. Brundage and Cosgrove say that "Usher's criticisms, although accurate in some respects, did not discredit the overall work."⁴⁶

In 2011, Mark Nixon opened a new approach in his controversial study of Gardiner. Unlike most historians, Nixon depicts him not as a political historian but as a historian of ideas. The evidence, Nixon argued, is strongest for this in Gardiner's work outside his eighteen-volume *History*, in his journal articles and reviews and in his books for a popular audience and

schoolchildren.⁴⁷ Nixon emphasizes the influence on Gardiner of early German idealist philosophy such as in the writings of Fichte, Hegel, Schiller, and Goethe. Although Gardiner never studied at a German university, he read German fluently and occasionally visited Germany. Nixon regretted that those who write about Gardiner rely too much on context and not enough on text. In a dense and difficult introduction, Nixon observed that those who comment on Gardiner spend more time on his personal life, religious and political (about which little is known) than on his historical writings (which are abundant). They often try, somewhat awkwardly, to situate him in the intellectual life of Britain in the second half of the nineteenth century, for instance, as a Darwinist or even as a positivist. The titles for Nixon's chapters are not helpful, as despite their ambitious names he usually focuses on a single book or person. For example, "Practice" studied Gardiner's book, *The Thirty Years' War, 1618-1648* (1874) in the context of German historiography. His chapter "Religion" looked at Richard Hooker, a historically minded Anglican clergyman who defended the Elizabethan church settlement. Like Hooker, Gardiner by the late 1860s was an Anglican who adhered to the Established Church and who rejected both Puritanism (identified with subsequent Nonconformity) and the Roman Catholic Church. In his chapter "Politics" Gardiner studied Francis Bacon, for Gardiner not only a master of high politics but also an intellectual whose writings deserved respect. The chapter on "Writing" examined Gardiner's diverse publications, his practice of biography and his use of drama. "What biography was for Gardiner ... is the presentation of character."⁴⁸ Nixon added that Gardiner was not "a dry empiricist without any concerns for the aesthetics of representation."⁴⁹

Michael Bentley, in a mostly negative review, conceded that "what Nixon's research does show without quibble is that Gardiner was more complicated than we have tended to assume."⁵⁰

Despite this half-hearted praise, Bentley complained that Nixon's "vaunted close reading can become too close for comfort when it occludes important matters such as religion or politics." Supposedly, Nixon turns "the Fichtean (rather than Hegelian) understanding of dialectic, ... into a mantra for his monograph, couching Gardiner's explanations in Fichtean terms and turning his hero into an intellectual historian." In addition, Bentley argued that Nixon should have compared Gardiner with other late nineteenth-century British historians and intellectuals, many of whom had studied in Germany.

We know Gardiner the man less well than other prominent historians of his lifetime. Unlike contemporaries such as Froude and Lord Acton (and near contemporaries such as Carlyle), Gardiner can boast no biography nor memoir nor stout volume of correspondence. For many decades he was remembered only in obituary reminiscences. Only Hallam has been more neglected.

In *The History Men*, John Kenyon characterized Gardiner as "a strange, reclusive figure" and described his personality and private life as "shadowy." "He had no known enemies, and at the same time no known friends." He knew other historians of his time only "casually." Nobody seemed to refer to him by his first name.⁵¹ The historian of the Catholic Apostolic Church, Tim Grass, said that while growing up Gardiner was known as Sam. As for Gardiner's lack of friends, I should mention to the contrary that John Bruce, one of the founders of the Camden Society, became an "intimate friend," Gardiner's successor as professor of modern history at King's College, London, the naval historian Sir John Knox Laughton, the educational reformer and popular historian Oscar Browning, the historian and politician James (Lord) Bryce, and the historian C.H. Firth.⁵² Although not a close friend of the historian Freeman, he had sufficient friendly relations to enjoy visiting him.

Although reared in the Catholic Apostolic Church, Gardiner was educated at Anglican institutions, six years at Winchester College, followed by four years at Oxford's Christ Church College. Unlike Roman Catholics and most Nonconformists, members of the Catholic Apostolic Church had no problem in subscribing to the Church of England's credal Thirty-Nine Articles, a condition for a degree at Oxford. He graduated from Christ Church in 1851, with a pass degree first class in Literae Humaniores and in the previously year had been honored with the award of a studentship, the Christ Church name for a fellowship. It carried with it a small stipend. On 27 October 1851, he became an unpaid deacon-evangelist in the Catholic Apostolic Church at Gordon Square. Four days later he resigned his studentship. Presumably he was asked to do so.⁵³ Christ Church would not provide the young heretic with financial support. It would not even award him an honorific M.A. degree until 1884. When he died, an educational journal tartly said, "Oxford has little to take pride of in regard to her recognition of his work or substantial aid to its progress."⁵⁴

During the years when Oxford colleges did not provide him with an income, Gardiner struggled. In 1855, he married Isabella Irving (1834-78), the youngest daughter of the Scottish minister who was a leader in the Catholic Apostolic Church. By the late 1860s, they had seven children. He taught in London wherever he could find work and wrote books that a middle-class market would buy. For instance, he taught at Bedford College, a school for women, from 1863 to 1881, and at other colleges in London.

In 1871 he joined the history faculty at King's College, London, as a lecturer and began teaching classes there in the following year. From 1876 to 1885 he held the title professor of modern history. He continued at King's as an examiner until his paralytic stroke in March 1901.

To get King's College to hire him, Gardiner needed a character reference from the vicar of his Anglican parish when he no longer was affiliated with the Catholic Apostolic Church.⁵⁵

Gardiner was "a close personal friend" of his successor at King's College, London, Sir John Knox Laughton, and often corresponded with him about research materials. Laughton's editor described one such communication as "a typically dense and occasionally cryptic postcard." They had been acquainted since 1882. The editor depicted Laughton's appointment "as not particularly prestigious." When determining his naval pension in 1885, the Royal Navy estimated that he received "a doubtful £160 from literary work, including a Professorship at King's College." His modest salary was supplemented by a small fee for each student. King's College, London, was a mediocre institution which did not grant degrees and was not part of the University of London.⁵⁶

Gardiner wrote his friend Oscar Browning about a booklet by the Belgian scholar Paul Frédéricq, based on observations of history lectures at British universities. Gardiner was half-amused, half-irritated, that Frédéricq praised Browning's lectures, while criticizing Gardiner's. "I fumble with my spectacles and use a coloured pocket handkerchief which seems to have offended the Belgian mind."⁵⁷ Frédéricq's report deserves extended quotation as a unique glimpse of Gardiner as a teacher at King's College, London.⁵⁸ Frédéricq said that Gardiner's course on English history was for advanced students and covered about fifty years:

Mr. Gardiner's lectures, one of which I attended, take an hour and a quarter twice a week. The professor and students are dressed in their black gowns, their square caps laid on the desk beside their note-books. Before the lecture an officer carefully calls the roll—a formality not observed at University College, where attendance is not compulsory. There were twelve students present at the lecture I attended. Mr. Gardiner's subject was the state of the English Church under Queen Elizabeth. He spoke simply and clearly, without attempt at eloquence, reminding me of a German professor, the resemblance being heightened, no doubt, by the somewhat Teutonic cast of the professor's features and his expression of learned candor and almost anxious good will. From time to time he readjusted his eyeglasses and polished his nose with his large colored handkerchief, like [J.G.] Droysen of Berlin. He related quietly and clearly and without

euphemism the history of the dissolute clergy of the sixteenth century, especially in Great Britain. The five hearers of the first row of seats took notes conscientiously and some of the others listened attentively; but those behind seemed occupied with other matters and eager for the lecture to close; they were little pleased when explanations detained Mr. Gardiner beyond his allotted time. In a word the audience was a mixed one. Mr. Gardiner gave very detailed and interesting explanations, but without referring his pupils to books or documents.

“Gardiner had a very high conception of the place of history in popular education.”⁵⁹

Consequently, he was happy to lecture for the London Society for the Extension of University Teaching from 1877 until 1894.⁶⁰ Additional lectures seem to have been presented under other auspices. For instance, early in 1878, he lectured on Edmund Burke at the Croydon Literary and Scientific Institution, part of a series of six lectures for members only.⁶¹ Gardiner also lectured at the Working Men’s College in London and at Toynbee Hall.

In his book about Gardiner, Mark Nixon argues that Gardiner taught not only because he needed money but also out of ideology. Nixon points out that “these movements, these colleges, and these lectures were inspired, founded and staffed by the leading lights of English Idealism.”⁶² Gardiner was influenced, directly and indirectly, by early German Idealists such as Fichte, Hegel, Schilling, and Goethe.

Lecturing informally as a kind of conversation, he was a favorite of working-class audiences in the East End. The bookbinder Frederick Rogers “was a great admirer” of Gardiner when he spoke at Toynbee Hall.⁶³ Rogers remembered when Gardiner “standing quietly before his audience, without note or gesture, ... began to talk to them about the nation of which they were a part.”⁶⁴

Gardiner was a deacon-evangelist in the Catholic Apostolic Church from 1851 to 1865 but soon afterwards left it for the Church of England. In the early years he was a successful preacher. For instance, in June 1856 he preached at Newport, Isle of Wight.⁶⁵ Later he questioned the failure of the Catholic Apostolic Church to respond to new intellectual challenges.

It was easier for him to leave after his father died in 1863. Gardiner's wife was unhappy about his leaving the Irvingite church, but she was relieved that her husband continued to lead family prayers.⁶⁶

After Gardiner left the Catholic Apostolic Church in the mid 1860s, Oxford became more friendly. Christ Church provided him with an honorary studentship in 1878. This did not provide him an income, but in 1884 All Souls' College awarded him £200 per annum as a non-resident research fellow. After it expired in 1892, Merton College made him a fellow at an increased stipend. The final symbol of the Gardiner's acceptance came in 1895 when Oxford University awarded him a D.C.L. degree. Edinburgh and a German university already had given him honorary doctorates. In the late 1880s, he served Oxford as an examiner for papers written by seventeen-year-olds at elite schools. In 1896 he delivered the first Ford lectures at Oxford University. He spoke extemporaneously in six lectures on the topic Cromwell's place in history.⁶⁷ Through his father, he was a direct descendant of the Lord Protector by the marriage of his oldest daughter to the regicide Henry Ireton.

Gardiner's influential friends in the Liberal Party added to Oxford fellowships and the sale of his books in making him comfortably middle class. In 1881, the historian John Richard Green began to lobby on Gardiner's behalf. For a response, a letter by Lord Acton to Mary Gladstone (9 March 1882) is worth quoting at length.⁶⁸

Green, who does not much agree with Gardiner [about history],⁶⁹ tells me that he [Gardiner] has made great sacrifices by adhering to Irvingism [the Catholic Apostolic Church], and that he still has to struggle with extreme poverty. Being one of the two or three most solid historians in England, he has to teach at an inferior girls' school [Bedford College]. He has had the misfortune to lose several children and his first wife.⁷⁰ Do you know his Outline of English History [1881]? I make my children read it.

In 1882, at the request of Lord Acton, prime minister Gladstone awarded Gardiner a lifetime civil list pension of £150.⁷¹ Four years earlier Acton had failed to obtain for Gardiner

the appointment as Deputy Keeper of the Rolls.⁷² Gardiner was a staunch Liberal. He became a vice-president of Oxford's Gladstonian home rule league in 1887.⁷³ For him, Gladstone as well as Cromwell was a hero. On 21 October 1889, he told Edward Freeman, "I hold now as I held in 1885 that Irish Home Rule necessitates English, Scottish, and perhaps Welsh Home Rule."⁷⁴

Earlier, on 5 May 1886, he had told James Bryce:

Much of the best part of the opposition to the present [Irish Home Rule] Bill comes because men like Lord Hartington, [George] Goschen, and [Leonard] Courtney & Co. haven't read [Johann Gottlieb] Fichte's addresses to the modern world; for those who have, and who know what [Joseph] Chamberlain does not know, that the modern tendency to amalgamation has only been rendered possible by the previous assertion of the rights of nationality.⁷⁵

The historian Timothy Lange contrasts Gardiner with other university-educated Liberals who lapsed gloomily into Liberal Unionism at the time of the Irish Home Rule crisis. They had come to despair at democracy in the way that it had developed after the Reform Act of 1867.⁷⁶

Gardiner became the model of the professional historian committed to his research. In 1891 he turned down an appointment at Cambridge. "I want to write the history of the Commonwealth and Protectorate and the main sources of information are in London and Oxford, and not at Cambridge. Residing at Cambridge would knock my life's work into a cocked hat."⁷⁷ In 1894 after Froude died, he turned down the prestigious position of Regius Professor of History out of concern that lecturing at Oxford would take too much time from his research.⁷⁸ A few years earlier he told a friend that "I cannot do my regular work if I am up late at night, and I have only just declined taking lectures which would have [tired] me."⁷⁹ Preparing serious lectures at Oxford would divert too much of his time from research.

It is quite true that I give lectures in various places, but I have always taken care that they shall involve no mental effort. I can get up and talk to the sort of people I address without any trouble of preparation beforehand, and yet be conscious that I am doing some good

by interesting a great many people in subjects on which they may employ themselves with advantage.⁸⁰

Despite this, for the sake of his fellow historians he took on a burden as the unpaid editor or co-editor of the *English Historical Review* from 1891 until his crippling stroke a decade later. Sometimes Gardiner has been dismissed as having been only a figurehead editor. In fact, his correspondence as editor with J.H. Round show his skill in managing a valuable but quarrelsome contributor. He told Round that articles could air controversial questions but not in an “unparliamentary” fashion.⁸¹

As editor Gardiner was involved in a dispute when Francis P. Badham submitted an article attacking what the American naval officer Alfred Thayer Mahan and the British professor John Knox Laughton had said about Admiral Nelson at Naples. Writing (10 Sept. 1897) to Laughton, Gardiner asked “is it more likely that Badham told a deliberate lie ... or is simply a muddle-headed personage?”⁸² Gardiner was inclined to regard Badham as simply incompetent at interpreting documents. He published Badham’s article.

Today Gardiner’s prodigious publications beyond the eighteen-volume history are often forgotten. He published documents in addition to those for the Camden Society, for instance, *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1628-1660* (1889, later revised and expanded), two volumes for the Navy Record Society, and another for the Scottish Historical Society. Gardiner published books for readers other than scholars. According to an obituary: “The first book from which Gardiner received any money was a little volume for the Epochs of Modern History Series on the Thirty Years’ War, published in 1874.”⁸³ In the same year, he published *The First Two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution*, the first of his many textbooks. His scholarly books included a couple about Cromwell and a controversy (1897) with a Jesuit priest about the Gunpowder Plot.⁸⁴ Gardiner wrote fifteen surveys of English history for school

children and even compiled an historical atlas for them. “His pot-boilers were good and honest books.”⁸⁵ Gardiner contributed seventeen articles to the ninth edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* and twenty-five to the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

Working on so many projects at the same time forced Gardiner to allocate his time carefully. For instance, he told the editor of the *Dictionary of National Biography* how he was writing his article about Archbishop Laud. “I give a morning to him about once a week or ten days and do about two years at a time. This morning I got to 1635, so he will be ready in about a month or six weeks. If you want him sooner I can put on the screw.”⁸⁶

Gardiner’s innumerable articles in serious periodicals should not be ignored. In the list below, the date of his first contribution is listed below.⁸⁷ He published many articles in the *Notes and Queries* (from 1860), the *Athenaeum* (1871), the *Academy* (practically editing its history department, 1873-78), and the *English Historical Review* (1886), and fewer articles in *Fortnightly Review* (1865), *Archaeologia* (1867), *North British Review* (1869), *Fraser’s Magazine* (1871), the *Quarterly Review* (1874), *Revue historique* (1876), bulletins describing historical publications in Britain, the *Contemporary Review* (1876), including one about a dramatist, “The Political Element in Massinger.” In the 1890s he published in the *Speaker* (1890), *Edinburgh Review* (1894), *Illustrated London News* (1894), *Daily News* (1898), and the *Times* (1899).

In 1896, a few years before his death, Gardiner and his young family moved from Bedford to Sevenoaks in Kent.⁸⁸ Gardiner and his wife Bertha took advantage of their temporary homelessness to spend three weeks in Italy. They were there mostly as tourists, although Gardiner did research at the Vatican archives and in Venice.⁸⁹ In 1899, when the pace of his life had become less hectic, though no less disciplined, Gardiner described a typical day. He arrived

at the British Museum, about an hour's journey by train from his home in Sevenoaks, Kent, at eleven in the morning, and worked until half past four, with a thirty-minute interruption for lunch. In the evening he put aside serious work to write letters and read novels.⁹⁰

We know so little about Gardiner's private life that it may be worth mentioning that he preferred beer to wine unlike most members of his social class. In the early 1880s, he answered a questionnaire by saying: "I take beer at luncheon and dinner, and occasionally a glass or two of wine, but very often I am four or five days without doing that."⁹¹

For another detail about his life, in several years—1883, 1884 and 1885—Gardiner wrote his friend Oscar Browning about his new tricycle. For instance, on 17 October 1885 he reported that, with his wife, he "had a fortnight tricycling on a Humber Tandem which I like much." When he died in February 1902, Gardiner left an estate of slightly more than £10,000. His will mentions his widow, Bertha Meriton Gardiner, six sons, two daughters, and three female servants. Here is a sketch of his children: By his first wife (Isabella Irving, whom he had married in January 1856), Gardiner had seven children, four daughters and three sons: Margaret Isabella Gardiner (1858-1944), Edward Rawson Gardiner (1859-1929), Martin Baring Gardiner (1861-1946), Emily Maria Gardiner (1862-77), Mary Elizabeth Gardiner (1864-92), Sophie Amelia Gardiner (1865-1945), and Charles Irving Gardiner (1868-1940). After Isabella died in 1878, Gardiner married Bertha Meriton Cordery in September 1882. They had four more children, all of them boys, who were teenagers or younger when their father died: Oliver Cordery Gardiner (1884-1955), Thomas John Gardiner (b. 1885), Arthur James Gardiner (1888-1949), and Francis Allen Gardiner (1890-1972). Oliver and Francis attended their mother's funeral in 1925. Newspaper reports of the funeral mention, without giving names, that two of her sons had

served in the war (Oliver and Arthur) and that a third had not been accepted for military service because of his poor eyesight. Was he Francis?

Most of Gardiner's children by his first wife had distinguished careers, those by his second wife, other than the oldest, leave few records that I could find. None of his children became historians. The eldest child Margaret Isabella Gardiner became responsible for her younger siblings after the death of their mother and had to leave her studies at Bedford College. When her father remarried, she was able to pursue a career as scientist and teacher. She was educated at Newnham College, Cambridge, with a specialization in geology. She was awarded the Bathurst Scholarship for original research. After leaving Newnham, she first was a science teacher at St. Leonard's school at St. Andrews and then headmistress at Withington Girls' School at Manchester. In 1897, she founded Saint Felix School in Suffolk and was its headmistress until 1908 when ill health forced her retirement. An Old Felican later described her: "extreme seriousness and curious lack of humour made her rather an awe-inspiring figure." At the age of fourteen she had said, "when I am grown up I am going to make a school where girls are treated like sensible beings."⁹²

The eldest son, Edward Rawson Gardiner was an engineer, trained at the Royal India Engineering College. He arrived in India in 1881. He later served as a member of a provincial legislative council and designed and supervised the construction of the Secretariat High Court at Patna, the capital of Bihar province. He received the honor of C.I.E. (Companion of the Most Eminent Order of the Indian Empire) shortly after his retirement in 1915. For details, see *Who Was Who*.

For Isabella's younger sons and Bertha's, I rely on Google Books and Ancestry.

Martin Baring Gardiner attended Marlborough College. I have no information about his university education, but he studied law. The *Marlborough College Register, 1843-1904* (p. 258) reports that he was an orange grower in Florida. During the First World War, he served in the Royal Army Medical Corps. He died in Scotland and left an estate of only £158. Charles Irving Gardiner was a geologist and schoolmaster. In 1912 he received the Wollaston Prize given to an early career geoscientist. After attending the Sherborne School at Dulwich College, he studied at Christ's College, Cambridge. He held the M.A. degree and was a fellow of the Geological Society. He taught first at the Epson School, 1892-95, and then was a senior science master between 1895 and 1928 at Cheltenham College, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire. He wrote two books, *An Introduction to Geology* (1914) and *Geology* (1923).

Oliver Cordery Gardiner studied at Malvern College and then received a third-class engineering degree at Christ's College, Cambridge. He was employed at the public works department in Egypt, 1906-08, the royal arsenal at Woolwich, 1908-12, and the Coventry ordinance works, from 1912. In 1910 he invented an improved speedometer. He served in the First World War. In 1939 he appears to have been a director of a motor car company, but the entry in the published records is not clear. I do not know about his later years, but his son Brian O.C. Gardiner (1923-2014) was a distinguished scientist with a specialty in butterflies. Arthur James Gardiner served in the British army during the First World War. Later he was employed in some fashion in telecommunications. There is a mention of Francis Allen Gardiner at age 71 as being the oldest to be confirmed in a Church of England ceremony at the end of 1960.⁹³ For Thomas John Gardiner, I could find nothing. He probably died before his father's death as his will mentioned only six sons.

Gardiner was personally well regarded by contemporaries. In an obituary C. Grant Robertson, writing in the *Saturday Review* (1 March 1902), described “his innate humility, his touching modesty, his willingness to listen to the youngest neophyte.” He added about Gardiner, “no one welcomed more eagerly corrections of his own deliberate conclusions.” He was noted for his “kindness and encouragement public and private of younger workers.”

Gardiner was a model of professionalism as in his gracious acceptance of criticism by the editor of the *Academy*, Charles Edward Appleton, of a review Gardiner had written for one of the volumes of David Masson’s *Life of Milton*. Gardiner thanked Appleton for his criticism which he considered “quite true” and asked him to cancel the paper.⁹⁴ After John Richard Green died, his widow tried to collect the letters to his friends. William Boyd Dawkins and Edward Augustus Freeman were unwilling to return letters unaltered, apparently because Green had revealed youthful sexual misbehavior. Gardiner was commissioned to negotiate but failed.

Freeman spoke of the great love which both he and Dawkins had for your husband, and how that love was based on his not being perfect. If he had been perfect, he said, we would not have loved him so. Then I fancy that they are afraid lest a correspondence in which all the temptations and trials of early life were revealed, and perhaps falls before temptations, would come as a shock to you, and also that this fear was one if not the principal motive which made them hold back letters from you.⁹⁵

Gardiner later regretted that he had revealed as much as he did.

“It was almost dragged out of me by my having to account for Freeman’s refusal to allow her to see the letters, when I was negotiating about them.”⁹⁶

Gardiner liked Freeman personally. “It was always such a delight to go to his house when one at Oxford and to hear him talk, and to know how good and kind he was, whatever strangers may have thought of him.”⁹⁷ Opinions of Gardiner as a historian varied enormously.⁹⁸ In 1884 at his farewell lecture, Bishop Stubbs lamented that Gardiner had been neglected by his own university.⁹⁹ In contrast, an American historian George Louis Beer said Gardiner was not a

great historian although “unquestionably the greatest living English historical scholar.” He complained that Gardiner wrote only “political history, pure and simple” and that what he wrote was only descriptive, not analytical.¹⁰⁰ To the contrary, in his *English Historical Review* obituary, F. York Powell praised Gardiner as “our Master Interpreter.” A few years later G.P. Gooch claimed that “no Englishman of his time or of any time did more to raise the standard ... in historical work.”¹⁰¹ Although paying tribute to his “massive learning,” G.M. Trevelyan concluded that “Gardiner was neither a deep thinker nor a powerful writer,” but he “has done much to form what might fairly be called the ‘verdict of history’ on the Roundhead and Cavalier controversy.”¹⁰²

The entry in the recent *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* concludes that “no serious student, however critical, could yet ignore Gardiner.” In the mid-twentieth century Marxist historians transformed the Puritan Revolution into a bourgeois revolution, and Gardiner became less relevant. More recently a school of post-Marxist revisionists, attracted to Gardiner’s detailed narrative but not to his allegedly Whig teleology, has made him fashionable again.¹⁰³

The incurious and impatient may dismiss Gardiner as Professor Dryasdust. This is caricature. He was representative of late Victorian middle-class life, hardworking, high minded, kindhearted, and modest. At times he showed flashes of emotional and intellectual commitment such as to Irvingite religion and Gladstonian politics. Critic and friend agree that his main commitment was to his scholarship. Gardiner belonged to a new type of historian who wrote for other historians. He lacked the glamor of historians who doubled as men of letters or as men of affairs. Fittingly, he became an enthusiast for travel by tricycle, very up to date near the end of the reign of Queen Victoria.

G.L. Beer may have been right when he said that Gardiner was a great researcher but not a great historian, but by the standard of Thucydides was anyone in Victorian times a great historian? The medievalist Bishop Stubbs? The legal historian Maitland, also a medievalist?¹⁰⁴

Firth concluded his *Dictionary of National Biography* entry for Gardiner, by calling him “the most trustworthy of nineteenth-century historians.” His *Oxford Magazine* obituary provided even warmer praise: “That which he has contributed to English history is not merely a larger knowledge of the facts, but a better understanding of their meaning.” As a friend, Firth added a final sentence: “Those who knew him will remember him not so much for what he achieved as for what he was.”

ENDNOTES

¹ The photograph reproduced here is by Elliott and Fry, published in *Chambers's Encyclopedia* and available through Wikipedia Commons.

² See the entry for Samuel Rawson Gardiner by Ivan Roots, in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, which replaced the one by C.H. Firth in the original *Dictionary of National Biography*. Firth, who knew Gardiner well, has told us most of what we know about Gardiner's private life in four obituary sketches, in *Oxford Magazine*, 5 March 1902, *Quarterly Review*, April 1902, *Proceedings of the British Academy* (1903-1904), and his entry in the old *Dictionary of National Biography*. Firth did not publish his Ford lectures about Gardiner. F. York Powell wrote the obituary for the *English Historical Review*, April 1902. The essay about Gardiner written by E.M. Hunt for Herman Ausubel and others, eds., *Some Modern Historians of Britain* (Dryden Press, 1951) summarizes obituaries and provides a few details otherwise unavailable.

³ Tim Grass, *The Lord's Work: A History of the Catholic Apostolic Church* (Pickwick, 2017). Fearful of revolution, the supporters of the Catholic Apostolic Church often became arch-conservatives. Markku Ruotsila, “The Catholic Apostolic Church in British Politics,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 56 (January 2005). The early leader in the Catholic Apostolic Church, Edward Irving, was not a Nonconformist. He had been a Presbyterian minister in Scotland where Presbyterianism was the Established Church. The distinguished American historian, Charles McLean Andrews was the son of William Watson Andrews, one of the most prominent Catholic Apostolic Church clergymen in the United States.

⁴ N. R. N. Tyacke, “An Unnoticed Work of Samuel Rawson Gardiner,” *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* (1974). Tyacke assumes that Gardiner was paid for the translation. In 1867, Gardiner and his family visited Thiersch in Germany.

⁵ Mark Nixon, *Samuel Rawson Gardiner and the Idea of History* (Royal Historical Society and the Boydell Press, 2011). Nixon's book should be compared with his Stirling doctoral dissertation (2004) which is organized differently. Its first two chapters are “German Theory” and “German Practice.” Other than Usher's critique of Gardiner's historical method (1915),

Nixon's is the only book about Gardiner. After publishing his book, Nixon did museum work for a time but in recent years has disappeared from the Internet.

⁶ Michael Bentley, "The Age of Prothero: British Historiography in the Long Fin de Siècle, 1870-1920," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 20 (2010): 180. In 1894, when people speculated who would be Oxford's new Regius Professor of History, a journalist hinted that a champion of positivism, Frederic Harrison, had criticized Gardiner whom he saw as his rival to fill the vacancy. Harrison denied the rumor but admitted that they wrote history differently. Frederic Harrison to the editor, 12 Sept. 1894. *Westminster Gazette*, 13 Nov. 1894, p. 3. He likely criticized Gardiner when he published "The Historical Method of Professor Freeman," *Nineteenth Century* (1898). In it, Harrison argued that a sophisticated familiarity with political life made for a better historian than laborious archival research. "There is a great danger in our time that we will fall into error by exaggerating the importance of what is known as 'new material,' and 'unpublished manuscripts'." (p. 13)

⁷ Gardiner to Richard Bentley, 4 May 1882. Bodleian, MS. Eng. Lett. d 100, f. 246.

⁸ *Academy*, 13 June 1885, p. 411, quoted in Timothy Lang, *The Victorians and the Stuart Heritage: Interpretations of a Discordant Past* (Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 166. Gardiner said the nation and not the state, a distinction which Nixon says he owed to Fichte.

⁹ *Civil War* 1:11. I cite Gardiner's major work without his name.

¹⁰ Hunt, "Samuel Rawson Gardiner," p. 99. Gardiner's first historical publication (*Notes and Queries*) in 1860 dealt with the parliamentary session of 1610.

¹¹ Firth, *Proceedings of the British Academy*.

¹² Maitland to Henry Jackson, 14 Feb. 1900, quoted in *The Letters of Frederic William Maitland*, ed. C.H.S. Fifoot (Harvard University Press with the Selden Society, 1965), p. 212.

¹³ Anthony Brundage and Richard A. Cosgrove, *British Historians and National Identity: From Hume to Churchill* (Pickering & Chatto, 2014), p. 147.

¹⁴ G. Lytton Strachey, *Portraits in Miniature* (Harcourt, Brace, 1931), pp. 169-70. He was kinder when he said that despite Gardiner seeking complete objectivity "humanity would come creeping in."

¹⁵ David M. Fahey, "Gardiner as Dramatist: A Commentary," *Journal of Historical Studies*, Autumn 1968, pp. 351-52.

¹⁶ Quoted in Firth, obituary, *Oxford Magazine*, 5 March 1902, pp. 159, 160.

¹⁷ Fahey, "Gardiner as Dramatist," p. 351.

¹⁸ As Gardiner's history went through more than one edition, the number of volumes, usually counted as eighteen, is sometimes counted as seventeen.

¹⁹ *Academy*, 31 January 1874, p. 4, quoted in Lang, *The Victorians and the Stuart Heritage*, p. 164. Lang wrote an outstanding chapter about Gardiner including rare quotations from Gardiner's less publications. Nixon said (as a negative criticism) that Lang characterized Gardiner as a liberal nationalist.

²⁰ Lang, *The Victorians and the Stuart Heritage*, p. 167.

²¹ *Academy*, 28 August 1875, p. 214, quoted in *ibid.*, p. 167.

²² The book on British historians by Brundage and Cosgrove reminds us of Gardiner's focus on the Puritans with a chapter subtitle, "Incorporating Dissent into the National Story." Another recent book on British historiography offers a slightly different interpretation of Gardiner with a chapter entitled "Samuel Rawson Gardiner and the Search for National Consensus." Lang, *The Victorians and the Stuart Heritage*.

²³ *History* 5: 403.

²⁴ *The First Two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution* (1874), p. 110. See also *ibid.*, pp.198-99.

²⁵ *Quarterly Review* 154 (1882): 2. Quoted in P.E.M. Blaas, *Continuity and Anachronism: Parliamentary and Constitutional Development in Whig Historiography and in the Anti-Whig Reaction between 1890 and 1930* (Martinus Nijhoff, 1973), p. 41. Blaas (pp. 40-43) himself was critical of Gardiner.

²⁶ Gardiner occasionally had transcripts made for him in foreign archives, for instance, Swedish diplomatic dispatches. Gardiner was frustrated when Lord Fitzwilliam denied him access to the Strafford correspondence at Wentworth Woodhouse. *History* 9: viii.

²⁷ *Oxford Magazine*, 5 March 1902, p. 159.

²⁸ "Two Oxford Historians," *Quarterly Review*, April 1902. The first part of the long essay deals with John Richard Green, while pages 547-96 concern Gardiner. On page 550, the article rejects the canard that Gardiner was a narrow specialist. Gardiner drew on his knowledge of the past to explain his view of contemporary affairs. For instance, writing in the *Northern Whig* (14 Feb. 1899), he disagreed with the Russian tsar about promoting peace by a ban on the sale of armaments. Gardiner argued that common objectives among the great powers could bring about peace as was the recent case for Crete. Gardiner gave the historical example of the people of Yorkshire and Northumberland in the seventh century. After years of fighting one another, they realized that they had common objectives and common enemies.

²⁹ Gardiner to Andrew Ashcroft, 7 May 1882. British Library, Add. Ms. 45880, ff. 12-13.

³⁰ *History* 2: 9.

³¹ *History* 3: 385.

³² David M. "Fahey, "Samuel Rawson Gardiner Looks at History, Home Rule, and Empire: Some Bodleian Letters, 1886-1899." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 115 no. 2 (April 1971): 128.

³³ *Academy*, 29 May 1886, p. 381, quoted in Nixon, *Samuel Rawson Gardiner and the Idea of History*, p. 30.

³⁴ *Academy*, 11 Dec.1875, p. 604, quoted in Nixon, *Samuel Rawson Gardiner and the Idea of History*, p. 39.

³⁵ The anecdote came from an anonymous writer, "Some Later Reminiscences of Dr. S.R. Gardiner," *Athenaeum* (8 March 1902), p. 307, who had not meant it as a criticism. "A large proportion of his later writings went straight to the press from the [British] Museum without any correction of language." "Anonymous" added that "he generally wrote rapidly."

³⁶ *Academy* (17 March 1883), p. 186, quoted in Anthony Brundage, *The People's Historian: John Richard Green and the Writing of History in Victorian England* (Greenwood Press, 1994), pp. 158-59.

³⁷ J.S.A. Adamson, "Eminent Victorians: S.R. Gardiner and the Liberal as Hero," *Historical Journal* 33 (1990). Before her marriage in 1882, Bertha Meriton Gardiner (1845-1925) co-authored with her brother-in-law J. Surtees Phillpotts, *King and Commonwealth: A History of Charles I and the Great Rebellion* (1875) and then by herself published *The Struggle against Absolute Monarchy, 1603 to 1688* [Epochs of English History] (1876). For the Camden Society, she edited *A Secret Negotiation [sic] with Charles the First, 1643-1644* (1883). Her best-known historical work is *The French Revolution, 1789-1795* (1883) which went through several editions. She also wrote articles for the *Edinburgh Review*.

³⁸ Before publishing the book in 1915, Usher had summarized his arguments in "Some Critical Notes on the Works of S.R. Gardiner," *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1910* (Washington, 1912). Usher (1880-1957) had established himself as a scholar

while a young man with two books, *The Reconstruction of the English Church* (1910) and *The Rise and Fall of the High Commission* (1913). He was critical of the Puritans. Although he was only in his mid-thirties when he published his book about Gardiner's methodology, he never wrote another scholarly book. He spent time outside his classrooms in St. Louis as a radio news commentator.

³⁹ *History* 10: 59

⁴⁰ In his obituary in the *Proceedings of the British Academy* (pp. 298-300), Firth explains Gardiner's method and his reasons for it.

⁴¹ *English Historical Review* (1900), pp. 803-04.

⁴² Gardiner, *Cromwell's Place in History*, p. 116. According to Gardiner, Cromwell was a sincere Puritan, little interested in the theological differences among his brethren and even less interested in constitutional law.

⁴³ Quoted in Lang, *The Victorians and the Stuart Heritage*, p. 208. It is not clear from Lang's footnote, whether he is quoting *Cromwell's Place in History* or Gardiner's biography of the Lord Protector.

⁴⁴ Reviewers were not friendly. In the *English Historical Review* (1917), J.N. Figgis objected that "in parts the criticism is petty and almost quibbling." An anonymous reviewer in the *American Historical Review* (1916-17) described Usher's work as "a monument of misdirected scholarship."

⁴⁵ "Historian" resumed his attack on Gardiner in *Notes and Queries*, beginning on 14 July 1923 in nine short parts. The person behind the pseudonym "Historian" was J. G. Muddiman, who wrote several books sympathetic to the Royalist cause such as *The King's Journalist, 1659-1689* (1923) which focused on his ancestor Henry Muddiman, the founder of the *London Gazette*. Until 1920 J.G. Muddiman often published as J.B. Williams. In 1929 he was granted a civil list pension of £50. Until the mid-1930s Joseph George Muddiman (1861-1939) was a frequent contributor to *Notes and Queries*. He had earned his undergraduate degree at Exeter College, Oxford, in 1885. It later awarded him the M.A. degree.

⁴⁶ Kenyon, *History Men: The Historical Profession in England since the Renaissance* (Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1983), pp. 214-22; Brundage and Cosgrove, *British Historians and National Identity*, p. 147. See also David M. Fahey "Gardiner and Usher in Perspective," *Journal of Historical Studies* (Winter 1967-68). Kenyon (p. 307) calls it "a very slight article."

⁴⁷ For the Gardiner chapter in my doctoral dissertation (University of Notre Dame, 1964) "Historical Interpretations of the English Civil War, Particularly since the Middle of the Eighteenth Century," I read all eighteen volumes of Gardiner's *History* at least once, but I confess that I only sampled the small mountain of his journal articles and reviews and his books for general readers and schoolchildren.

⁴⁸ Nixon, *Samuel Rawson Gardiner and the Idea of History*, p. 130.

⁴⁹ Nixon, *Samuel Rawson Gardiner and the Idea of History*, p. 160.

⁵⁰ Michael Bentley, review of *Samuel Rawson Gardiner and the Idea of History*, by Mark Nixon, in *Victorian Studies* 55 no. 1 (Autumn 2012): 166-68.

⁵¹ Kenyon, *The History Men*, p. 214.

⁵² In his *Oxford Magazine* Firth described Bruce as having become Gardiner's "intimate friend" as well as a mentor.

⁵³ Tim Grass, "'Telling Lies on Behalf of the Bible': S. R. Gardiner's Doubts about Catholic Apostolic Teaching," *Studies in Church History* 52 (2016): 400. Grass bases his article on family correspondence, mostly the letters of S.R. Gardiner and his wife Isabella to her brother,

Martin Irving (1831-1912). Grass also had access to Gardiner letters at the Society of Genealogists in London.

⁵⁴ *Journal of Education and School Work* (April 1902), p. 257.

⁵⁵ For details, see Lang, *The Victorians and the Stuart Heritage*, p. 147.

⁵⁶ Andrew Lambert, ed., *Letters and Papers of Professor Sir John Knox Laughton, 1880-1915* (Ashgate for Naval Records Society, 2002), p. 31 (reputation of King's and payment for each pupil), p. 41 (a doubtful £160), p. 119 no. 5 (postcard), p. 122 n. 4 (a close personal friend).

⁵⁷ Gardiner to Oscar Browning, 17 Oct. 1885. King's College, Cambridge, archives. I thank Tom Davies, assistant archivist, for help with Gardiner's letters in the Oscar Browning collection. I read some of the Gardiner letters at the Eastbourne Central Library before they were transferred to King's.

⁵⁸ Paul Frédéricq, *The Study of History in England and Scotland*, trans. Henrietta Leonard (Publication agency of Johns Hopkins University, 1887), pp. 49-50

⁵⁹ Firth, obituary, *Proceedings of the British Academy*, p. 300.

⁶⁰ Some of the lectures took place in nearby towns such as Bromley when Gardiner lived there. See the advertisement for his lecture at *Bromley and West Kent Telegraph*, 1 March 1890, p. 2.

⁶¹ *Croydon Chronicle and East Surrey Advertiser*, 16 Feb. 1878, p. 4.

⁶² Nixon, *Samuel Rawson Gardiner and the Idea of History*, p. 45.

⁶³ Sheila Rowbotham, "Travellers in a Strange Country: Responses of Working Class Students to the University Extension Movement, 1873-1910," *History Workshop*, Autumn 1981, p. 74.

⁶⁴ Quoted in Geoffrey A.C. Glen, *Culture, Philanthropy, and the Poor in Late-Victorian London* (Taylor and Francis, 2017). I read the book online where there was no pagination.

⁶⁵ Isabella Gardiner to her brother Martin Irving, 3 June 1856, cited in Grass, *Lord's Work*, p. 81. In these early years, the Gardiner family lived on Gordon Street near Gordon Square.

⁶⁶ Grass, "Telling Lies on Behalf of the Bible," p. 406

⁶⁷ For a detailed account of Gardiner's views on Cromwell, see Lang, *The Victorians and the Stuart Heritage*, pp. 198-212.

⁶⁸ *Letters of Lord Acton to Mary, Daughter of the Right Hon. W.E. Gladstone*, ed. Herbert Paul (George Allen, 1904), p. 129. Green died in 1883.

⁶⁹ Green complained to Freeman, 30 Sept. 1878, that Gardiner was "evidently afraid of not looking at things as Ranke looks at them." *Letters of John Richard Green*, ed. Sir Leslie Stephen (Macmillan, 1901), p. 476. Ranke's famous axiom for historians was that they should present the past *wie es eigentlich gewesen ist* (as "how it essentially happened"). See also the complaint of Freeman, shortly before his death, that Gardiner omitted many of the traditional stories, "that one had well in one's head," and published much unfamiliar detail. Freeman to Edith Thompson, 10 Jan. 1892. *The Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman*, ed. W.R. W. Stephens (Macmillan, 1895) 2: 450.

⁷⁰ In the 1860s Bedford College had a reputation for admitting unprepared girls. Gardiner's daughter Emily died in 1877 and her mother Isabella Irving in the following year. Gardiner remarried in 1882.

⁷¹ After Gardiner's death, his widow received a £75 annual civil list pension.

⁷² Hunt, "Samuel Rawson Gardiner," p. 101.

⁷³ Gardiner to Sir E.K. Chambers, 19 Dec. 1887. Bodleian MS. Autogr. E 10, ff. 120-21. Probably Gardiner was critical of the Tories of an earlier time. In an article published in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* in 1878, he made a criticism of the elder Pitt that resembled

Gladstone's complaint about Disraeli during the Bulgarian agitation in 1876. Lang, *The Victorians and the Stuart Heritage*, pp. 150-51.

"Fahey, "Bodleian Letters," p. 127. Gardiner supported Irish Home Rule before Gladstone did. Gardiner disagreed with Gladstone about the Public Worship Regulation Act. Gladstone thought that the legislation directed at ending ritualism in the Church of England infringed on religious freedom. Gardiner argued that popular sentiment supported the legislation. Lang, *The Victorians and the Stuart Heritage*, pp. 158-59.

⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 126. Presumably Gardiner had in mind *Reden an die deutsche Nation* (1807-08), translated as the *Addresses to the German Nation*, or, less likely, *Die Grundzüge des gegenwärtigen Zeitalters* (1806), translated into English by William Smith as *The Characteristics of the Present Age* (1847). Gardiner read German fluently. His first book was a translation from German.

⁷⁶ Lang, *The Victorians and the Stuart Heritage*, p. 163.

⁷⁷ Gardiner to Browning, 25 Feb. 1891.

⁷⁸ The nominal income for the Regius Professorship was £900, but in practice it averaged £660. Its endowment was partially based on agricultural lands whose rents had declined. Oliver Elton, *Frederick York Powell: A Life* (2 vols., Clarendon Press, 1906) 1: 174. In 1892 when Froude's predecessor Edward Freeman, died, there had been strong feeling in favor of the appointment of Gardiner to the vacancy. James Bryce to H. B. Adams, 7 April 1892, quoted in *Historical Scholarship in the United States. 1876-1901: As Revealed in the Correspondence of Herbert B. Adams*, ed. W. Stull Holt [Johns Hopkins, 1938], p. 186. Gardiner might have taken the Regius Professorship if it had been offered in the 1880s, but by the 1890s his financial situation was less precarious. In 1884 Freeman succeeded William Stubbs as Regius Professor.

⁷⁹ Gardiner to Browning, 5 May 1890.

⁸⁰ Gardiner to Bryce, 13 Nov. 1894, quoted in Fahey, "Bodleian Letters," p. 129.

⁸¹ Gardiner to Round, 24, 25 May, 20, 21 July, 14, 23 Nov. 1893; 3, 4 April 1894; 5 Feb. 1894, 5 April 1898; 20, 25, 27 April 1900, Institute of Historical Research, Round Papers, MS. 638. Cited in Doris S. Goldstein, "The Origins and Early Years of the *English Historical Review*," *English Historical Review* 101 (January 1986): 15.

⁸² Lambert, ed., *Letters and Papers of Professor Sir John Knox Laughton*, p. 151.

⁸³ Obituary by James Ford Rhodes, in *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*.

⁸⁴ "In What Gunpowder Plot Was [Gardiner] wrote history backward, first recreating how it was composed, then returning to the event and thus supplying a deliberate paradigm of historiographical method." Joseph M. Levine, "Intellectual History as History," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 66 no. 2 (April 2005): 193.

⁸⁵ James Ford Rhodes, in *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*.

⁸⁶ Gardiner to Sidney Lee, 1 January 1891, quoted in Fahey, "Bodleian Letters," p. 127.

⁸⁷ For this list, I have drawn on the huge bibliography compiled by Mark Nixon.

⁸⁸ Bedford is located to the northwest of London, while Sevenoaks is to the southeast and closer to London. Before living in Bedford, the Gardiner family resided in Bromley, only a few miles from Charing Cross.

⁸⁹ Gardiner to Bryce, 30 May 1896, quoted in Fahey, "Bodleian Letters," p. 129.

⁹⁰ James Ford Rhodes, in *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*.

⁹¹ A. Arthur Reade, *Study and Stimulants: Or The Use of Intoxicants and Narcotics in Relation to Intellectual Life, as Illustrated by Personal Communications on the Subject, from Men of Letters and of Science* (A. Heywood, 1883), p. 53.

⁹² See the website for Saint Felix school.

⁹³ *Sevenoaks Chronicle and Kentish Advertiser*, 2 Dec.1960.

⁹⁴ Gardiner to Appleton, 15 Oct. 1873, quoted in Diderik Roll-Hansen, *The Academy, 1869-1879: Victorian Intellectuals in Revolt* (Copenhagen, 1957), pp. 148-49.

⁹⁵ Gardiner to Alice Stopford Green, 30 Nov. 1884, quoted in Brundage, *The People's Historian*, p. 51. The letter is at Jesus College, Oxford, as part of the Green collection.

⁹⁶ Gardiner to unidentified recipient, 2 Nov. 1892, quoted in Brundage, *The People's Historian*, p. 155.

⁹⁷ Gardiner to Bryce, n.d., quoted in Fahey, "Bodleian Letters," p. 127.

⁹⁸ The entry for Gardiner (pp. 648-49) in Samuel Austin Alliborne, *Critical Dictionary of English Literature and British and American Writers* (1899 and earlier editions), quotes many reviewers. About literary style: Gardiner "jogs along quietly." About impartiality: not "ungenerous when [he] condemns."

⁹⁹ Quoted in Firth, *Proceedings*, p. 297.

¹⁰⁰ Beer, "Samuel Rawson Gardiner: An Appreciation," *Critic*, January 1901, pp. 546-47. Beer added about Gardiner that "In his own field he stands head and shoulders above all competitors, with the possible exception of Firth."

¹⁰¹ G.P. Gooch, *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century* (Longmans, Green, 1913), p. 65. My paragraph summarizes Hunt, "Samuel Rawson Gardiner," pp. 102-03.

¹⁰² *Nation* (27 Nov. 1909), p. 372.

¹⁰³ For instance, J.C.D. Clark, *Revolution and Rebellion* (Cambridge University Press, 1986), p. 21. The leading revisionist historian was the late Conrad Russell (Lord Russell). See *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart England: Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell*, ed. Thomas Cogswell, Richard Cust, and Peter Lake (Cambridge University Press, 2002).

¹⁰⁴ Describing somebody as a great or near great historian depends on the criteria. *Some Modern Historians of Britain* (1951) included Gardiner. It also listed for the nineteenth century Lingard, Hallam, Carlyle, Froude, Maine, Goldwin Smith, Sir Leslie Stephen, Lecky, Lord Morley, and Sir George O. Trevelyan. The preface explained the omission of Macaulay, John Richard Green, and Maitland. R.L. Schuyler, to whom the book was dedicated, had written about them. The editors did not explain the omission of Buckle, Stubbs, Freeman, and Acton.