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ABSTRACT

In terms of historiography, eighteenth century can be described as a crucial period in the history of Britain. However, it should be noted that, due to ideological reasons influencing historical research, this era of British history is observed only partially until recent decades. The main concern of this thesis is to evaluate the works of an eighteenth century British historian, John Whitaker, who was a significant representative of Tory discourse, neglected to a great extent in British history writing. As secondary themes, the influence of the “Whig Interpretation of History” on eighteenth century studies, similarities and differences between Tory and Enlightenment historians are discussed. Also, on the basis of John Whitaker’s writings, a special effort is made to observe some major problems of historiography, including anachronism, ethnocentrism, “history of the victors”, epistemological limitations and “history of greatmen.”
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INTRODUCTION

Within the framework of this small introduction, the general thematic organization of the work, describing briefly the main axes of the discussion and the content of each chapter will be given. But, before doing this, it would probably be wise to acquaint the reader with the basic theme of this research in order to give the opportunity to follow the guidelines of the main argumentation.

At the preliminary stages of the research, there were two determined data: chronologically speaking, the scope of the research was the eighteenth century and, thematically, the accentuation was on the history of British Isles. After a few months, the boundaries became more clear and the topic was broadly described as "Tory Historiography in England in the Eighteenth Century"; however the reading process of secondary sources and the observation of reachable primary materials which are relevant to the above-mentioned subject proved that this description was largely surpassing the physical and intellectual limits of a master's thesis. Under these circumstances, the research was centered around the life and especially the writings of an eighteenth century English historian, John Whitaker who was one of the significant representatives of Tory discourse. Therefore, the following chapters of this work are concerned with the evaluation of John
Whitaker's writings and his place in historiography, taking into account the general atmosphere of eighteenth century England.

The importance of primary sources is a highly problematic aspect of historiography. The problem becomes much more determinantal in the existence of linguistic obstacles: the access to primary sources requires sometimes - and not rarely - a special knowledge on some languages and alphabets. (To the present time, the most obvious example of this phenomenon for me is the Ottoman archives.) Some scholars, who have an absolute love for primary sources leading them to a "fetishism of archival materials", are doing their researches leaving aside all theoretical works; on the other hand, some others which can be called "fetishists of theories", are trying to prove the validity of their claims with the help of theories or paradigms already established. It is useless to say that the members of the second group are not interested in the use of primary sources as part of historical investigation.

I personally think that the use of primary materials and the importance attributed to theoretical works, are not necessarily two concepts excluding each other. In the light of this sentence, this work is an attempt to combine these two seemingly uncompromising components: in some chapters, knowledge obtained from the reading of secondary sources is widely used
whereas in some others, writings of John Whitaker, perhaps with the ones of some other scholars, are critically observed.

Considering the contents of the chapters, the first chapter consists of two parts helping to understand the nature of eighteenth century studies. In the first part of this chapter, the critique of a historiographical school which has an enormous weight on our period of study will be made. Since the "Whig Interpretation of History" influenced drastically researches on eighteenth century England, it deserves I believe a special interest from the perspective of historiography. One can argue that the Whig Interpretation of History is basically a creation of nineteenth century, but without taking into account the contributions and long-lasting impacts of this tradition, to draw a sound, meaningful picture of England in the times of Whitaker would be a difficult task. The relationship between history writing and ideology; the concepts of ethnocentrism and anachronism; the issue of "history of the victors" are the subtitles of this part.

The second part of the first chapter is concerned to determine the characteristics of Tory ideology. We stated earlier that the focus of the research is the evolution of Tory historiography in the eighteenth century England, but here we have an obstacle requiring particular effort to overcome. Unlike Whig historiography, one cannot speak of a Tory historiography with well-defined, clear concepts. The Whig Interpretation of
History provides the researcher with satisfactory tools, but a historian having an interest in Tory historiography has to obtain the main arguments of this intellectual current from the political discourse of Tories. Tories were mainly a political entity; and in order to observe the writings of Tory historians, one has to pay particular attention to the political expressions of Toryism.

Certainly, Tory ideology experienced some changes in the course of history. Even today the members of Conservative Party are called Tories by the British press, but this is only the reflection of a cultural continuity. So, it would not be possible to talk of some characteristics which remained constant from eighteenth century on. The ones mentioned in our context were the valid categories in the times of John Whitaker.

The second chapter is mainly based on primary sources with the intention to evaluate the nature of Whitaker's writings. Beside Whitaker's works, there is the possibility to use books by John Wilkes, Robert Brady and Charles Lucas. It is true that Wilkes and Lucas were not part of Tory historiography, however their works could be useful in understanding the general intellectual milieu of the era. Some notes on the life of Whitaker and scholarship on Whitaker will be other components of this chapter.

The third chapter forms the comparative dimension of the work. George Rudé is right with a high probability when he says that "all roads did
not go inevitably to Paris at the end of the eighteenth century"¹; but in
cultural terms, it would not be completely absurd to see eighteenth century as
"French century in Europe".² When we consider the lifetime of John
Whitaker (1735-1808), who was a contemporary of the Enlightenment, I
believe that a comparison between Tory historiography and Continental
historiography will be interesting and fruitful. Also his pamphlet The Real
Origin of Government discussing some ideals of Enlightenment and
criticizing French Revolution proves his interest in this field.³

University Press, 1985. p.1
² Isser Woloch. Eighteenth Century Europe: Tradition and Progress. New York:
W.W. Norton & Company, 1982. p. xvi
Stockdale, Piccadilly, 1795
When one is interested in the observation of eighteenth century England, it is hard to neglect the importance of a certain school, the expounders of "The Whig Interpretation of History", which has a very significant impact on studies in this field. The influence of Whig Interpretation of History lasted until recent decades, therefore to understand the nature of this perception of history and make a critical analysis of it is a valuable effort.

The Whig Interpretation of History school was founded, mainly in the nineteenth century by a group of historians seeing in the course of history an evolution towards political, civil and religious liberty and depicting men of the past in a black-and-white manner. The impact of these historians, supported by the political power of this ideology, was significant and dominated eighteenth century studies. The works of Whig historians are of great value and contributed to English historiography, but their perspective

---

which will be discussed in the following pages was distorted by their
determinedly ideological perception.

One should also mention that major challenge against the hegemony of
Whig historiography comes from another group of historians that can be
entitled "Namierite school". These people, under the influence of Sir Lewis
Namier criticized the ideological approach of Whig historians; however, they
went to another extreme: they observed eighteenth century England regarding
"structures", mainly the political ones and did not give credit to
contemporary political ideas. According to Namier, material interest was the
determinant element in the eighteenth century's socio-political milieu and
there was no room for ideologies.⁵

In the critique of Whig Interpretation of History, I would like to use
the theoretical support of an old master. Giambattista Vico (1688-1744) was
one of the leading figures of European historiography. During his lifetime,
his ideas were not understood by his contemporaries; for instance Neapolitan
historian Pietro Giannone wrote that "There was no one in Naples fuller of
fantasies and visions than Vico".⁶ But later, with the efforts of Barthold G.

---

⁵ Sir Lewis Namier (1888-1960) was a very influential figure of British
historiography with his masterpieces The Structure of Politics at the Accession of
George III (1929) and England in the Age of the American Revolution (1930).
"Structural analysis", evaluating components and functioning of political machine and
"prosopography", collecting evidence on the life, career, connections and behavior
of every single high-rank politician are important parts of his method.

Niebuhr in Germany, Jules Michelet in France and, Robin G. Collingwood and Isaiah Berlin in the Anglo-Saxon world, his work became significantly important. One can remember Vico with his struggle against Cartesianism both in defending humanities and in the "Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes"; his cycles "corso-ricorso"; his idea of "Spirit of an Age" and his new technique in reading ancient sources (i.e. Homeric poems). But here two other points which I believe extremely important for the history writing will be cited.

Vico warns historians against two types of errors: "conceit of nation" and "conceit of scholars". For the first case, he said:

"Every nation... has had the same conceit that it before all other nations invented the comforts of human life and that its remembered history goes back to the very beginning of the world. This axiom disposes at once of the proud claims of the Chaldeans, Scythians, Egyptians, Chinese, to have been the first founders of the Ancient World".7

In modern terms, this concept can be named ethnocentrism. Whig historians, were very proud to see English history as a brave march towards liberty and democracy, and this imagery was to a large extent based on their evaluations of 1688 Revolution and eighteenth century England. The pioneering role of England over other nations were accepted by them as the foundation of a "New World", and in a speculative manner, one can say that

---
even the "White Man's Burden" conceptualization, the discourse of imperialism depicting the white men a "force civilisatrice" offering "civilization" to other "uncivilized" nations of the world can be seen as an integral part of this judgment.  

The weakness of this theory is open to criticism from two points of view: in the first place, as it was stated earlier, Whig historians were firmly ideological in their evaluations of history and this bias makes it difficult to rely on the validity of their arguments. Secondly, they manipulated historical realities according to their ethnocentric approach: if we borrow two concepts from a great English historian, Eric J. Hobsbawm, they choose some components of history on a very selective basis in order to create a "formalized social past" proving their claims and, using this evidence, they defined an "invented tradition", which was in fact not historically true. In our case, describing the history of England as the history of struggle for liberty and democracy, and English people as zealous lovers of these values, they were consciously leaving aside the Tory tradition on British soil or condemning it as a minor, marginal opposition movement. (The period that we are talking here is basically post-Glorious Revolution era, but sometimes

10 The Invention of Tradition, edited by Eric J. Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992
the discussion goes back even to "Magna Charta Libertatum", which was in essence a compromise made between King and feudal lords.)

If we turn back to Vico, the conceit of nations in Vichian vocabulary was "... that whatever they know is as old as the world". In today's terms, it will be meaningful to label this bias anachronism.

Anachronism is particularly important in the Whig Interpretation of History, because Whig historians were observing the eighteenth century (and the Glorious Revolution) from the nineteenth century's perspective and glorifying or condemning historical events, historical agents according to this criterion. As the reader can easily observe, there are close links between this attitude and the points that are mentioned in previous paragraphs (i.e. formalized social past and invented tradition). To a large extent, Sir Herbert Butterfield was right when he accused Whig historians of committing a "cardinal sin" by "studying the past with one eye on the present".

Another criticism is related to the concept which can be defined as "the history of the victors". No doubt the history of mankind is to a great

---

12 This statement is taken from *The Whig Interpretation of History* by Butterfield, criticizing Whig historians, believed to be Trevelyan or Acton, for their ideological approach to the eighteenth century. See John Derry's "Whig Interpretation of History", John Cannon's "Herbert Butterfield" and John Cannon's "George Macaulay Trevelyan" in *The Blackwell Dictionary of Historians*. 
extent written by the victors. At the end of a struggle, the ones who were able to control the situation and obtain the power (chiefly political power) wrote their own histories and in many cases, they destroyed the histories written by the opposition, if there were any. Especially after revolutions, which aim to create a "tabula rasa", the process becomes more serious and violent.\textsuperscript{13} This makes the situation extremely difficult for historians in the next generations, since the evidence is derived from a single and biased source.

The Whig Interpretation of History is a typical example of this approach. First of all, the Glorious Revolution of 1688 was not only the results of Whigs' efforts; many Tories played an active role in the event and indeed, their actions caused a serious split in Tory camp: the ones who compromised with Whigs were labeled "Court Tories" and the others who insisted on some of their old principles (i.e. dislike for dissenters, love for established Church, reaction against the growth of commercial classes) were called "Country Tories". But, after the consolidation of power in the Whigs' hands, the Revolution was described as the peak of Whig politics in Whig historians' writings and the role of Tories was minimized or sometimes disappeared.

\textsuperscript{13} The term "tabula rasa" is generally associated with John Locke; but it was first used in the French translation of his \textit{Essay Concerning Human Understanding} by Pierre Coste.
Secondly, Whigs formulated a "Whig supremacy" legend, trying to show the support of English people for Whig governments. In political terms, there was really a Whig domination, however the legitimation basis of the situation was not the consent of English population. The political activity in the eighteenth century was controlled by a certain élite, deriving their power from their traditional status (mainly King, Court and landowning aristocracy) or their pecuniary sources (rising commercial classes). The English public had to wait for a "Tory" government under Benjamin Disraeli for the universal suffrage of men.14 On the other hand, even in a quite late date, the popular support for '45 rebellion or at least, lack of a popular resistance against Young Pretender, Bonnie Prince Charlie proves that the Whig supremacy was not genuinely approved at the popular level.

Thirdly, the Whig Interpretation of History described Whig politicians as a more or less monolithic body, full of love of liberty and democracy; but the real situation was quite different. As one can remember from the early passages, Whig historians from a teleological perspective, evaluated the events in the light of the norms of the nineteenth century. Like Tories, Whigs did not have a well-defined, clear political ideology; as we will discuss in the next chapter, the terms "influence", "patronage" or "pursuit of place" were

---

14 In 1867, Disraeli government gave the vote to all settled tenants in the boroughs, thus integrated a substantial part of working-class within the political system.
the correct expression, defining eighteenth century English politics. On the other hand, sometimes the distinctions between Whig groups were much more rigid than the ones differing them from Tories. Seemingly, the reverse case too was true.

Above, an interesting example of history of the victors, referring to eighteenth century English history is given. But as Sir Herbert Butterfield said "Compassion ought to be extended to the defeated", and this statement is one of the major reasons encouraging me to write such a thesis.

Certainly, the duty of a historian is neither to condemn nor exalt a historical fact, but to make fair judgements. In the eyes of Whig historians, John Whitaker would be most probably a member of a retrogressive, marginal ideology; on the other hand, Namierites would even reject the existence of such an ideology. However relatively recent, more "in depth" researches proved that none of these groups provided completely satisfactory explanations, concerning the nature of Tory ideology in the eighteenth century Britain. Consequently, Toryism in the general scope and John Whitaker at the individual basis needs a re-evaluation, eliminating the defects of Namierite school and especially, Whig historiography.

---

15 In the next chapter, evaluations made by E.N. Williams, Isser Woloch and J.H. Plumb concerning this issue will take place.
16 Derry. "Whig Interpretation of History". p. 448
Ideological origins of John Whitaker's thought: the pillars of Tory discourse.

Originally the purpose of this part was to define the concept of Tory historiography and give in brief its main characteristics. But, there is a twofold difficulty in describing Tory historiography: in the first place, we do not have a "Tory Interpretation of History", comparable to Whig Interpretation of History which was defined within the framework of the first part. Also, the existence of a tradition of Whig historiography including brilliant scholars like Lord Macaulay, Thomas Erskine May, W.E.H. Lecky and the two Trevelyans shows another weakness of Tory standing: for instance, these people glorified the Revolution of 1688 as "the emergence of the two-party system, constitutional monarchy and the basic elements of modern Cabinet Government";¹⁷ but their ideas were not rejected by a similar community of Tory historians with equally convincing counter arguments. If we refer to the history of the victors theme, the modern history of England was decisively written by Whig historians and the possible rise of a Tory historiography was crushed by the intellectually hegemonic Whig discourse.

The other problem concerning studies of eighteenth century was the influence of Namierite school. Sir Lewis Namier and his followers were quite successful in challenging the Whig position; but their accentuation on "structures", political ones in this case, largely left aside the ideological dimensions of eighteenth century Britain. This approach obviously narrows down the channels of historians who are willing to write intellectual history, but with a few exceptions like H.T. Dickinson or Jonathan Clark, this is unfortunately the case. Therefore, we have little chance to obtain solid information either from the original writings of a Tory school of history or the researches of next generations.

Under these circumstances, since there was no clear distinction between politics, religion and history in those days, the appropriate path to obtaining the ideas of Tories on historiography is by examining their political views. The work of Robert Brady, a Tory of the seventeenth century, is in this respect a good example: in his History of England, he claimed that historically representation was not a "right" of the people, but a "gift" by generous monarchs. Also, Parliament was not an Anglo-Saxon institution; it was established in reality after the Plantagenets' conquest. In this context, Brady wrote history, but equally he supported the absolute sovereignty of kings and expressed his Tory identity.

At this point, another problem arises: True, Whigs and Tories were two parties dominating British politics in the eighteenth century, but one should be extremely careful in evaluating these political entities since their nature differs from that of modern "parties". Members were not subject to well-established party principles, but rather personal relationships. "Connection"\(^{19}\), "patronage"\(^{20}\) or "pursuit of place"\(^{21}\) are utilized by historians to depict the real character of political activity.

On the other hand, neither Whigs nor Tories were monolithic bodies: the existence of subtitles such as "Old Corps of Whigs"\(^{22}\), "New Whigs"\(^{23}\), "Church Tories, Court Tories, Country Tories"\(^{24}\) or "Commonwealth men"\(^{25}\) proves the fragmented structure of these parties.

Let me describe the difficulty of the task with quotations from some prominent scholars: E.N. Williams says "The names 'Whig' and 'Tory' were frequently used in the eighteenth century, but mainly with the purpose, not uncommon in political nomenclature, of confusing the hearer rather than enlightening him, and of obscuring the issue rather than clarifying it", comparing these terms to contemporary "left-wing", "right-wing"

---

19 Term used by E.N. Williams.
20 Term used by Isser Woloch.
21 J.H. Plumb talks about "the rage of party replaced by pursuit of place".
22 Owen. *The Eighteenth Century*. p. 53
23 Ibid., p. 54
descriptions. Similarly, Namier remarked that these titles "explain little, but themselves require much explaining". Plumb too accepts that "Coalitions forced on both parties by circumstances; principles at times moderated by events: desertions and conversions, loss of nerve and beady-eyed compromise... help to create a sense of confusion at the centre."  

In the light of these sentences, I shall try to define Tory identity considering its most essential features, as far as I can. In the core of Tory ideology, there was the "theory of order" consisting of five components: absolute monarchy, divine ordination, indefeasible hereditary succession, non-resistance and passive obedience. The basis of the theory was the principle of divine ordination, called sometimes Providence, since the Tories believed that kings ruled over their nations by the direct command of God. God, interfering directly in worldly affairs, established indefeasible hereditary succession as an unquestionable, inviolable institution. The idea of absolute monarchy derives its legitimation from this divine source, but doctrines of non-resistance and passive obedience were two other elements imposing the unconditional sovereignty of King on subjects. According to non-resistance doctrine, subjects should never resist the commands of their

27 Owen. *The Eighteenth Century*. p. 112
29 Dickinson. *Liberty and Property*. p. 15

17
King or revolt against him even if their lives, liberties and properties were threatened by him. On the other hand, passive obedience implies that people could not obey some royal orders conflicting with the laws of God; in such a circumstance, they must refuse to follow this order, but also should passively obey the punishment which would result of their disobedience.\(^3\) It should be noted that these principles were not Tory inventions, but the heritage of an old tradition. The origins go back even to Ancient Greece, basically to Plato and Aristotle. Sir Robert Filmer got the patriarchal analogy directly from Aristotle;\(^3\) in his book, Gordon Schochet mentions Plato on this issue and also says that Aristotle's ideas were transmitted into the Western world by St. Augustine.\(^3\) In *The Evolution of Political Thought*, Northcote Parkinson informs us of an unknown writer, who had written between 1080 and 1104. This person describes King as "The Regent of God on Earth" and called the Pope simply "the bishop of Rome". A little bit later, John of Salisbury writing *Policratus or The Statesman's Book* in 1159 exposed similar thoughts. Leaving aside the religious discourse and as a result, the doctrine of divine ordination, Thomas Hobbes with his *Leviathan* and Jean Bodin *Six Livres de la République* helped the development of this

---

\(^3\) The ideas discussed in this paragraph are mainly derived from two books by Dickinson, which I think summarize the essence of the issue in a very successful way. See Dickinson, *Liberty and Property* and also, H.T. Dickinson. *The Politics of the People in Eighteenth-century Britain*. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1995


ideology.\textsuperscript{33} Even a king, James I took part in the creation of the theory by a number of treatises i.e. "Basilican Doron", "True Law of Free Monarchies".\textsuperscript{34} But probably the most important writer of the Divine Right theory was Sir Robert Filmer with his \textit{Patriarcha}. On the opposing side, one should mention certainly John Locke with his \textit{Second Treatise on Government}. However we should also add Richard Hooker's contribution to social contract theory and John Knox's principle of "right of rebellion"\textsuperscript{35}.

The Revolution of 1688 was a real crise de conscience for Tories. During these critical days, the capital ideas of Toryism i.e. absolute monarchy, indefeasible hereditary succession, non-resistance and passive obedience were challenged even by some Tories. For instance, among those who welcomed William of Orange, there were many Tories. Under these changing circumstances, with the help of "right of conquest" theory and the idea of a "de facto" king, divine providence was formulated in a completely new manner, and Tories worked hard to legitimize the actual situation. The basic idea behind the right of conquest was that William of Orange was not a subject of James II, but an independent, sovereign prince. For him, the use of force in order to protect his own interests against another sovereign was

wholly legitimate. However, there was serious difficulty in accepting William as a "de jure" king, because he had driven James II out of his country. At this point, another ideological tool helping to improve the Tory position came into picture: divine providence. Whatever the actual situation was, at the final analysis, human actions were determined by God's will and no one was able to obtain a throne against the will of God. Consequently, William of Orange became king as a result of a particular divine interference, therefore he was de facto king.

Obviously these manipulations were not accepted by all Tories: the ones coming to terms with the existing regime had to leave two principles—absolute monarchy and indefeasible hereditary succession; the others insisted on the old values of Toryism, declined to obey and formed the opposition. This split was an important phenomenon in English political life: the first group was called "Court Tories", underlining their close relations with those in power and the second labeled "Country Tories" depicting their opposition identity.

36 According to Robert Brady, William the Conqueror was an earlier example of this application.
37 William Higden, a prominent Tory, claimed that there were only 6 "de jure" kings on the English throne since the Conquest, all the others were "de facto" kings. Dickinson. Liberty and Property. p.42
38 Dickinson. Liberty and Property. p.46
Beside the five elements described above, the defense of Established Church was another element of Tory ideology. Tories described themselves as "The Church Party" and "Church in danger" was the popular cry of those days against Dissenters and Deists. But Tories' status as champions of the Church was threatened by Whig propaganda, stating that they were crypto-Jacobites. This propaganda became particularly successful after the flight of Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke and James Butler, Duke of Ormonde, two leading Tories who were willing to support the Old Pretender and the equation Tory=Jacobite gained weight. In fact, there was significant resemblance between Toryism and Jacobitism, concerning God's providence, Divine Right Theory and the "Country" position, but the existence of a Catholic Pretender and the compromise made by many Tories with the Revolution are the weak points of the above-mentioned equation.

The label "Country" too was a part of Tory ideology. The social basis of Toryism lay in the landed classes and "country" was generally associated with Tories. However, one should be careful in the use of court and country as terms, because in the course of British history, both political groups were interchangeably given these titles. For instance, Tories began their political career under Charles II as a Court party formed by Danby. The Revolution of 1688 divided them into court Tories, who were able to compromise with

39 Langford, "The Eighteenth Century". p. 408
40 Frank Mclynn, in his book The Jacobites, accepts these three principles as the basis of Jacobitism.
Whigs and country Tories, who insisted on some of their old principles i.e. dislike for Dissenters, love for Established Church, opposition to the growth of "moneyed" interest. Under Queen Anne, disciplined by Harley, they became again a Court party (1702-1714); but during the Hanoverian succession, due to internal conflict between Harley and Bolingbroke, and Jacobite propaganda of Whigs, they stood once more in a country position.41 Considering these changing roles, we should take into account the judgment by Jonathan Clark remarking that Court-Country dichotomy is not a version of "centre-periphery" relationship.42

As stated in previous pages, many scholars who are working on eighteenth century British politics agree that both “Tory” and “Whig” are loose definitions, reflecting the historical reality only partially; however I believe that the principles that are mentioned above as the basis of Tory ideology, perhaps with a few missing ones, will be accepted by the specialists of the field. In the following paragraphs, the place of John Whitaker in the Tory discourse will be observed with references to these principles.

The importance of ideology in the writings of John Whitaker is the theme of the second chapter, under the subtitle “ideology and history writing”, but for the moment, it can be said that his behaviour was not a militant one. No doubt, he was a Tory who was not happy under the Whig domination, however his writings are an implicit expression of his Tory stance. (His pamphlet “The Real Origin of Government” is an exception, beyond this generalization.)

If we return to the theory of order, we can say that any of the five elements forming this category were defended by Whitaker. The role undertaken by Whitaker in the controversy concerning the execution of Scottish Queen Mary proves him to be an ardent defender of absolute monarchy and indefeasible hereditary succession. At first sight, his support for a Catholic Queen from Scotland seems strange; but what was disturbing for him is the violation of two basic ideas in the person of Queen Elizabeth. Apparently, “the right of conquest” is not an argument convincing enough from his point of view. Also he was perhaps criticizing the Glorious Revolution’s legitimation on behalf of Court Tories, by rejecting the idea of “de facto King” along with the right of conquest.

In his reaction against French Revolution, one can see three other elements of theory of order. According to him, “mob”, the furious monster for many people in the eighteenth century destroyed “non-resistance” and
“passive obedience” principles and committed a horrible sin. But the response of Providence was quick: Whitaker claims that the chaos experienced in France after the Revolution was the punishment directed by God since French people behaved against “divine ordination”, thus the will of God.

It is already remarked that the position of Whitaker was not openly expressed as a Tory, when we observe his works in a totality. Being aware of the “country” situation of Toryism, he rather preferred an indirect style, but two of his works show a different character. I have already mentioned The Real Origin of Government which is in a way the manifesto of Whitaker’s Tory identity; similarly The Origins of Arianism disclosed provides another proof regarding his political choice.

The main topic discussed in the book is the problem of Trinity, which was the major cause behind the tension between Church of England and Arians. The defense of the Established Church was openly a Tory position: within the framework of this debate, Whitaker being a member of the Church, shows his authority on the evaluation of religious sources, including Jewish and Islamic ones and proves himself a Tory.
CHAPTER II

John Whitaker: evaluation of sources and presentation of his life

As it is stated in the introduction, the theme that will be discussed in the second chapter is the life and writings of John Whitaker. The life of Whitaker, as well as the scholarship on him, will constitute a gradually smaller part of the chapter; the accentuation will certainly be on the ideas expressed by Whitaker, which form the essence of the discussion.

I have already slightly touched upon one of the major problems of modern historiography, namely the use of primary sources, in the previous chapters. Since I believe in the necessity of combining primary materials with secondary sources and also, I used secondary sources extensively until now, the main focus in this chapter will be on John Whitaker's own works.

SOURCES ON WHITAKER

John Whitaker, as a historian and rarely as a politician, was a quite significant figure of his time; but, for one reason or another, his career has not attracted the attention of researchers from the following generations.
Consequently, there are only a few sources written specifically on him and a few others mentioning Whitaker and his achievements in different contexts.

During the preliminary researches, I consulted Bodleian Library, Oxford which is probably the most favorable place for studies of eighteenth century Britain. Apparently, British Library was another option. Also, Chetham’s Library which is situated in Manchester and having a special interest on Whitaker, could be a third source of information. (For instance, a transcript of Whitaker's manuscript of The History of Manchester, continuing to the fifteenth century and his correspondence with George Chalmers between 1791 and 1804 are kept in Chetham’s Library.)

The outcome of the effort was unfortunately quite small: an article on Whitaker from The Dictionary of National Biography, a paper presented by John Eglington Bailey, entitled "John Whitaker, the Historian of Manchester" and two books by John Collier, Curious remarks on the History of Manchester and From the same pannier; or additional remarks on the History of Manchester. The last two were written as a severe

---


44 John Eglington Bailey. "John Whitaker, the Historian of Manchester." Manchester: ?, 1877


46 John Collier. From the same pannier; or additional remarks on the History of Manchester. London: ?, 1784
critique of The History of Manchester and only the others gave information on Whitaker.

From Bailey’s paper, we learn that Whatton, in his History of Manchester School, wrote an account of Whitaker. Similarly, an admirer of Whitaker, describing himself as "walking upon stilts as the correspondent of Whitaker", the Reverend Richard Polwhele wrote a memoir first published in a Truro newspaper and later in "The Gentleman's Magazine" and "Literary Anecdotes". He also published some of Whitaker's letters in his Traditions and Recollections, and also in the second volume of his Reminiscences, in Prose and Verse. Apart from these, one can cite some biographical notices of Whitaker kept in the Grammar School Register and a short memoir in Baines' History of Lancashire.
LIFE OF WHITAKER

John Whitaker, the son of a respectable innkeeper was born at Manchester on 27 April 1735. Ten years later, he entered the Foundation of Bishop Oldham and attended the Manchester Grammar School from January 1744-5 to 1752. In 1752 he obtained an exhibition to Oxford, matriculating from Brasenose College. Oxford, "the Capital of Jacobitism" would be highly important in the coming years of his life. He was elected on 2 March 1753 a Lancashire scholar of Corpus Christi College. He graduated B.A. on 24 October 1755, M.A. on 27 February 1759, became a fellow of Corpus Christi College on 21 January 1763 and received his B.D. on 1 July 1767.

He was ordained at Oxford in 1760 and acted as curate successively at Newton Heath Chapel, near Manchester, and at Bray, Berkshire. In November 1770, he was proposed as a member of the Society of Antiquaries and was elected a fellow 10th January, 1771. The same year he published his first work The History of Manchester in Four Books. The title "historian of Manchester" was given to him largely due to this book, yet probably another book The Charter of Manchester, translated: with Explanations and Remarks aiming to defend the rights of the town against the lord of manor through the translation and commentary of Grelle's charter (14th May, 1301)

50 According to Bailey, the exact date was 3 March 1753.
51 Whitaker. The History of Manchester in Four Books. London: (?). 1771
was also influential in this nomination. Whitaker was certainly happy with this title, since he called himself the "historian of Manchester" in the front page of his Additions and Corrections. 52 A second edition of The History of Manchester appeared in 1773 and also, a supplement entitled The Principal Corrections made in the History of Manchester was published. The second volume covering Saxon period was printed in 1775. The History, projected as four books, was never completed, and thus contains only two volumes. Although it shows the erudition of Whitaker and his capacity for creating original ideas, the work did not gain much success. Even the antiquary Francis Douce unjustly accused him with the notification "my commented copies of the blockhead Whitaker's History of Manchester and his Cornwall Cathedral", when he left his books to the British Library. Let us also remember that the work was heavily criticized by John Collier in two books mentioned above. 53

In 1772, Whitaker published The Genuine History of the Britons asserted as a critique of John MacPherson's work. 54 Between November 1773 and February 1774, he undertook the morning preachership at Berkeley Chapel, London, but due to a conflict, he left this position. Concerning this

---

52 Whitaker. Additions and Corrections made in the second edition of Mary Queen of Scots vindicated. London: Printed for J. Murray. 1789. In National Biography, the publication date is given as 1790.

53 See page 26.
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matter, he wrote a pamphlet entitled shortly "State of the Case".\textsuperscript{55} In London, he made the acquaintance of Dr. Johnson and Edward Gibbon. Gibbon, though The History of Manchester was not very successful, had a respect for him. He saluted him with these words: "The particular historian of Manchester embraces, under that obscure title, a subject almost as extensive as the general history of England".\textsuperscript{56} The first volume of The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire was submitted in manuscript to Whitaker, but without including the chapter on Christianity. When Whitaker read this chapter in the published form, he criticized Gibbon violently:

"... to whom I remonstrated (upon his sending me the first volume printed in 1776) so boldly and so keenly in a couple of letters, on his impious effrontery against Christianity, as broke off our friendly intercourse for ever; ... [he] therefore, from principle, wandered away into popery at first, then from sensuality turned off into Mahometanism (I believe) afterwards, but at last retired into a Roman kind of frigidly philosophical heathenism, and settled finally (I fear) in the central darkness of atheism itself; who, in this fluctuation of intellect and conduct, began to write his History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, so burst out like a comet upon the world of religion,

...and from this horrid hair
shook pestilence and war,
that worst of pestilences, infidelity, with that worst of wars, one against God himself."\textsuperscript{57}

Another quotation from The Origin of Arianism disclosed:

"But [Gibbon] has made himself the very Mahomet of history by the attempt: an impostor in fact, a satyr in

\begin{footnotes}
\item[55] Whitaker, "A State of the Case between Mr. Whitaker and Mr. Hughes relative to the Morning Preachership of Berkeley Chapel". London: ?, 1774.
\item[56] Bailey, "John Whitaker". p.19
\item[57] Bailey quotes from Ancient Cathedral of Cornwall historically surveyed. pp. 315-6
\end{footnotes}
lechery; wounding himself severely with the very point of his own contradictions; and yet staggering eagerly forward, to put himself at the head of the enemies of Christ. 58

In 1776, he participated in measures for the improvement of Manchester and took part in a paper war concerning the Improvement Bill. In 1777, he wrote an Ode supporting the formation of a Manchester regiment in order to "reduce the American rebels". The regiment never reached America, but went to Gibraltar, where it won its victories.

On 22 August 1777, he became rector of Ruan Lanyhorn, Cornwall. In 1787, he published The Charter of Manchester translated: with Explanations and Remarks to protect the rights of Manchester against the lord of the manor. For this service, he received the thanks of the townsmen in 1793, with a symbolic gift.

In his Mary Queen of Scots vindicated, 1787 he defended the executed queen and attacked her enemies. 59 The second edition is dated 1790, with a supplement, Additions and Corrections. In 1791 and 1794 he announced The Private Life of Mary Queen of Scots which would appear as a posthumous work. His Origin of Arianism disclosed, 1791 was praised by some, but also

59 Whitaker. Mary Queen of Scots vindicated. London: printed for J. Murray, 1787
criticized severely. He published the Review of Gibbon's History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, (1791) and The Course of Hannibal over the Alps ascertained, (1794). In 1804, he issued his last work, the Ancient Cathedral of Cornwall historically surveyed, which was the history of the introduction of Christianity into Cornwall. He died at Ruan rectory on 30 October 1808.

Among his other works, one can cite: 1) A Course of Sermons upon Death, Judgment, Heaven and Hell, 1783, the only compilation of Whitaker's sermons; 2) The Real Origin of Government, 1795 attacking the French Revolution (This pamphlet was denounced by Sheridan and others in the House of Commons, and placed under ban by the Whig Club); 3) The Life of Saint Neot, (1809) the book that he was working on when he died.

He contributed to Richard Polwhele's Poems chiefly by Gentlemen of Devonshire and Cornwall, 1792; wrote an introduction and notes for Flindell's Bible, 1800; and wrote articles for the "English Review", the "British Critic" and the "Anti-Jacobin Review". Among his uncompleted works are two examples of topographical history, the histories of London and Oxford, a military history of Romans in Britain, notes on Shakespeare and illustrations to the Bible.
As noted above, his correspondence with George Chalmers is preserved in manuscript in Chetham's Library. His letters to George Browne of Bodmin are in the British Library.

WORKS OF WHITAKER

In the first part of Chapter II, an effort was made to give a full list of John Whitaker's works while the reader was provided with the important events of his life. This was a conscious choice since I believe that to present the works in this manner, within a certain context will be much more useful than to add a special section into the general bibliography.

As one observing the career of Whitaker can easily realize, John Whitaker was a very productive writer with more than 10 major books, several articles appearing in various magazines and some contributions made in other scholars' works. We learn from his own pen that, even when he was close to death, he was trying to finish The Life of Saint Neot and two topographical histories:

"MY DEAR SIR,

"I reply to your letter, with speed, happy to have you for my publisher. My present work will be followed by another, next year, - The History of Oxford... Both will be followed, by a third, much larger in size, and
significancy, - A History of London, quite new, and original, and fit to make a quarto". 60

Also, The Life of Saint Neot and Private Life of Mary Queen of Scots are posthumous works.

We should also mention that Whitaker, contrary to the general trend of eighteenth century, was not interested in writing pamphlets. Although the eighteenth century was the golden age of pamphleteering, he preferred to write voluminous books like The History of Manchester and Mary Queen of Scots Vindicated. 61 The only exceptions are The Real Origin of Government, an important expression of Whitaker's political ideas not regarding its size, and the pamphlet known as the "State of the Case".

Various reasons prevented access to a complete collection of Whitaker's writings. But happily, most of the writings and the crucial ones, which I believe reflect different phases of Whitaker's erudition, are available. Therefore, the evaluations here on Whitaker are based on The History of Manchester, The Principal Corrections made in The History of Manchester, The Genuine History of the Britons asserted, Mary Queen of Scots vindicated, Additions and Corrections to Vindication, Origin of Arianism

60 Whitaker. The Life of Saint Neot. The Oldest of all brothers to King Alfred. London: printed for John Joseph Stockdale, 1809. p.v
61 The first one, though planned as four volumes, consists of two volumes and the second consists of three.
disclosed, *The Life of Saint Neot* and *The Real Origin of Government*. (The bibliographical references will be given in the selected bibliography section, under the title primary sources.)

In classifying the works of a scholar or an artist, one can use a few different methods. In the following paragraphs, the discussion will be on two of them in order to categorize Whitaker's writings.

One of the options which can be used in the evaluation process is chronology. Some researchers try to understand and define the deeds of historical figures, taking into account the changes that occur in the course of their lifetime. In the case of Whitaker, it is not safe to make a judgment in terms of chronology since the nature of his works cannot thus be explained in a convincing manner. Farther, there is seemingly no evidence of a drastic change in his life which was influential on his career. Chronologically speaking, the one point deserving to be mentioned is perhaps his appointment to the rectory of Ruan Lanyhorn in 1777, provoking his interest in the history of Cornwall.

Since the observation in chronological terms does not provide a classification, it would be meaningful to prefer a thematic one, which I believe sufficiently fruitful. One can make the basic distinction as the
writings related to Whitaker's area of specialization and the ones out of these intellectual boundaries, reflecting his ideas on some important subjects.

As seen earlier, Whitaker was an antiquary and his expertise was on the ancient history of Britain. (He was a fellow of the Society of Antiquaries from January 1771.) Consequently, his most significant contributions were made in this field of study. His linguistic capacity enabling him to evaluate Greek and Latin sources, and etymologies of Celtic worlds,62 his knowledge giving him the opportunity to form a more or less complete list of sources,63 his ability to use toponymics and archaeological evidence64 all helped him in improving the quality of his researches. But, despite his interest in the history of Cornwall, we have to state that Whitaker did not know Cornish. Profiting from this solid background, he sometimes made weighty claims: he believed, for example that Saint Neot, who was one of the sons of King Aethelwulf and brother of King Alfred the Great, was actually Aethelstan, the crown prince who left the throne and choose a monk's life.65

62 The brilliant example is The Genuine History of the Britons asserted, including many Greek and Latin sources. See p. 28 Tacitus and Caesar; p. 64 Richard of Cirencester; p. 72 Pausanias and Galgacus. In terms of etymology, see p. 90 etymology of Scotland and p. 94 etymology of Britain.
63 Whitaker. The Life of Saint Neot. pp. 3-16 Section 1 of Chapter 1 is dedicated to the analysis of the sources.
64 Whitaker. The Genuine History. for toponymics, see pp. 83, 146, 147. For archaeological evidence, see Whitaker. The History of Manchester. pp. 13-15
65 Whitaker. The Life of Saint Neot. p. 72. But Whitaker although he cited Matthew of Westminster as a source, forgot that Matthew was mentioning "a fifth son" increasing the chance for Neot and Aethelstan to be two different individuals.
In this first category, showing the scholar character of Whitaker, one can cite *The History of Manchester*, with its corrections; *The Genuine History of the Britons* asserted; *The Charter of Manchester* translated: with *Explanations and Remarks*, since this document goes back to 1301; *Origin of Arianism disclosed* and *The Life of Saint Neot*. Most probably *The Course of Hannibal over the Alps ascertained* and *Ancient Cathedral of Cornwall historically surveyed* are components of this category. 66

However, Whitaker sometimes wrote on topics which are not related to ancient history. The best examples of this activity are his books on Mary, Queen of Scots and the pamphlet *The Real Origin of Government*. In his *Vindication of Mary Queen of Scots*, one can remark that Whitaker was not in a favorable intellectual milieu. 67 Due to his Tory identity, he took part ardently in the quarrel, but he was mainly merely following the authors who were the specialists of the subject. In essence, the political struggle between Mary and her adversaries was a topic of sixteenth century and, was beyond the interest and knowledge of Whitaker. 68 On the other hand, his partisan character which will be discussed soon affected negatively the reliability of his judgments.

66 There is a little bit reservation since these books are not available during the research.
67 This book is cited either as *Mary Queen of Scots vindicated* or *Vindication of Mary Queen of Scots* in sources.
68 For instance, between pages 40-50, he gave 17 references, 12 of them from a single source, Goodall.
Another interesting point concerning the works of Whitaker is the discourse that he used. As stated in the introduction, John Whitaker was a significant representative of Tory ideology and it was a real surprise, leaving aside two exceptions, not to hear the features of Toryism from him. Another expectation of mine is a discourse formed within a religious framework since Tory ideology owed some elements to religious motives. But, this expectation is to some extent vain. Yet Whitaker was aware that the actual situation was very different from the heydays of Toryism, stating

"The arguments urged in this pamphlet, were more familiar to the nation eighty or ninety years ago than they are at present. They were then pressed upon the public with great success."

However, he rarely used religious discourse, sometimes with Tory elements in it.

It would be wise to end up this section by a small evaluation of Whitaker's works: The History of Manchester is a topographical study aiming to observe the history of the city from its foundation until the eighteenth century. Unfortunately this project which was planned by Whitaker as four volumes, did not come to an end, and only the Roman-British and Saxon periods are covered in the first two volumes. We should also add that this is

---

70 See mainly Government and Arianism.
not simply the history of a single city, rather the history of early Britain at the micro level. The social life in the island before the Roman invasion, the expansion of Roman influence through military power, the foundation of garrison-cities (Manchester was one of them.), the retreat of Roman forces, the struggles between indigenous tribes and the coming of Northern people were all observed taking Manchester as the focal point of these developments. It should be noted that the book includes archaeological, anthropological and ethnographic evidence.

The Genuine History of the Britons asserted is an effort to investigate the population process of the island and also, the ethnic origins of British nation. Whitaker, refuting Irish and Scottish legends concerning this issue, tries to prove his arguments with the help of ancient sources from a scientific perspective.

Mary Queen of Scots vindicated is a work reflecting the political stance of Whitaker, namely his Tory identity. Attacking violently the adversaries of Queen Mary, Whitaker describes the political struggle which took place in Elizabethan England and exposed to view, from his angle, the plot organized by Elizabeth I and her allies against Mary. The enthusiastic effort made by Whitaker in the defense of Mary seem strange since the vindication of a Catholic ruler from Scotland, as in the case of King James, was associated with Jacobitism. But evidence does not prove that Whitaker
was a Jacobite; probably he reacted against the idea of execution of a ruler and saw this application as the violation of an old and determinant Tory principle, namely indefeasible hereditary succession. If this is the case, it can also be said that he criticized some Tories who made a compromise with Whigs after the Glorious Revolution and rejected the ideas of right of conquest and de facto king.

Additions and Corrections to Vindication is an account of footnotes and corrections supporting the ideas which are expressed in the above-mentioned book. Even orthographic mistakes were corrected there.

Origin of Arianism disclosed is a rare example from Whitaker discussing a subject concerning religion. Whitaker shows another aspect of his Tory identity by defending Church of England against "heretics". The main theme of the book is the problem of Trinity; Whitaker referring to sacred sources of Judaism such as Book of Daniel, Book of Ezhra and Book of Baruch, and also Koran, claims that Arianism is in fact derived from Judaism and Islam. According to him, the origins of Arians' arguments against Trinity go back to these religions and on the basis of infidelity, there is no significant difference between these deviations. His intolerance against Mahomet is another interesting feature of the work.
The Life of Saint Neot is the story of an early Christian saint of ninth century, whom he held to be the brother of King Alfred the Great. The striking point there is the effort made by Whitaker to question the miracles of Saint Neot and write a realistic history, eliminating legendary elements related to the life of the man.

Finally, The Real Origin of Government is the open expression of Whitaker's Tory attitude. There, the basic values of Toryism are exalted and a severe critique was made of republicanism in the context of French Revolution.
The final part of this chapter is dedicated to the evaluation of John Whitaker as a historian. In the previous sections, it is stated that Whitaker's specialization was on the early stages of British history; consequently the testing process of the validity of his arguments, requiring an expertise on these topics is not aimed. The main effort is made to perform an observation from historiographical perspective, discussing some major points determining the scientific value of a historian's achievement.

i) The Problem of epistemological limitations

When one considers the realm of academic research, it can be seen that each discipline working towards scientific knowledge has its own difficulties. That is the reason behind the differentiation between academic interests: all disciplines have inevitably their own problematic, methods and terminologies.

The historian too, similar to other researchers, has to deal with some important problems of the field while he is pursuing his project. In the first place, each historian - and in fact, each human being - is limited by his epistemological boundaries: the theories he is trying to prove, the methods that he uses, the materials chosen according to his selectivity are all his own
creation. Similarly, the results obtained at the final stage of the research are integral parts of his intellectual framework. At this point, we should probably take into account the judgment made by Carl Becker stating that "Every man is his own historian". Thus, a historian should be extremely critical considering his epistemological capacities.

On the other hand, the non-empirical character of historical observation prevents the historian from making absolute, categorical decisions. The historian, unlike the scholars who are working on natural sciences, does not have the chance to prove or falsify an argument under the conditions of a laboratory. Also, there is no possibility for him of repeating a historical event in order to verify his theses whereas a researcher in natural sciences can many times repeat an experience. This is another factor reducing the chance for a historian to express himself in a decisive manner; since the complete proof of a historical reality is a rare case in history writing, a historian should always be in doubt about the reliability of his contribution.

71 Following Bloch, we can use the concept of "historian's choice". Marc Bloch. The Historian's Craft. New York: Vintage Books, 1953
72 Carl Lotus Becker (1873-1945) was a student of Frederick Jackson Turner, the historian of the "frontier". Following Turner's argument stating that every age rewrites history according to its own purposes, he made the statement mentioned above before the American Historical Association in 1931.
73 We should here remember the dictum by Benedetto Croce, "All history is contemporary history".
It can be said that epistemological boundaries and non-empirical character of historical observation are modern terms. Of course, these are the terms of twentieth century used to determine a feature of Whitaker's writings, and I believe the contribution of one of his contemporaries, namely John Collier would prove that these are the correct, legitimate ones.

The lack of a consciousness of these epistemological limitations is one of the major points in Whitaker's works, deserving serious criticism. When one considers Whitaker's writings, it can be decided that he is extremely self-confident about the strength of his thesis and tries to claim a monopoly on truth. Interestingly, the adjectives "self-confident" and "self-sufficient" were also used by Collier in describing the attitude of Whitaker. Here are two examples:

"I intended these Remarks to be more serious than those of Chremes (another critic); but before I had perus'd a dozen Pages, I found it impossible for one of my temper to do it; having a natural Antipathy to Tyranny in Writing, as well as Politics: for I found his Reverence so positive and self-sufficient, that it threw all Gravity out of my Thoughts, and serious reasoning out of the Question; so in spite of my first Intentions, I fell into the same Strain, with the prior Remarker." 74

"I shall readily own he has advanc'd many new and ingenious Probabilities, as well as wild Extravagancies; for which last he justly blames his Brother Antiquarians: yet, Self-love is so blind, he cannot see that he has those very Faults he so sharply corrects in others." 75

---

74 Collier. Curious remarks. p. iv
75 Ibid, p. v
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His strict attitude against Gibbon, concerning the chapter on Christianity in later's The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire was one example: he condemned Gibbon in terms of religious beliefs.\textsuperscript{76} On the other hand, he did not take part in pamphlet wars against scholars criticizing him. For instance, there is no evidence showing Whitaker fighting against John Collier, who had written two successful books attacking his History of Manchester.\textsuperscript{77}

The titles of his works too reflect the same attitude. As a refutation of John MacPherson's Introduction to the History of Great Britain and Ireland, he wrote the history of the Britons, strengthened by the epithet "genuine".\textsuperscript{78} Collier criticized him noting that Whitaker said for his work "is so genuine that it needs no Proof".\textsuperscript{79} Similarly, he tried to discuss the "real" origin of government while he was refusing contract theories, in support of Filmerian position.\textsuperscript{80}

The tone of his works was also influenced by this self-confidence. In Mary Queen of Scots Vindicated, Whitaker describes the events as if he was an eyewitness\textsuperscript{81} and depicts Queen Mary from the point of view of a

\textsuperscript{76} See pp. 30-31
\textsuperscript{77} See p. 26
\textsuperscript{78} The title is The Genuine History of the Britons asserted.
\textsuperscript{79} Collier. Curious remarks. p. vi
\textsuperscript{80} See the title The Real Origin of Government.
\textsuperscript{81} Whitaker. Mary Queen of Scots. pp. 24-28 are examples of the first judgment.
courtier, who actively took part in the incident.\textsuperscript{82} In a parallel manner, Collier says that Whitaker had drawn "...his new-invented Map of the original Town of Manchester...as if he had himself measured the Streets, built the Town, and planned the Summer Station".\textsuperscript{83} Let us observe his tone from a few lines from The History of Manchester and The Genuine History of the Britons asserted:

"But if the Romans had been the original constructors of the fort, they would \textit{certainly}, they must \textit{necessarily}, have given it a Roman name. If the site of the fort had lain totally undistinguished from the waste around it by any particular denomination till the Romans first fixed their station upon it, it would \textit{necessarily} have received a particular a Roman denomination from them. And when the Romans had given it a Roman name at first, they would \textit{certainly} not have adopted any other name afterwards which the subjected Britons might have pleased to bestow upon it. They would \textit{certainly} not have inserted that name in their formal itineraries. And they would \textit{certainly} not have superseded the original Roman name for ever by the new British one."\textsuperscript{84}

"And the Gauls would \textit{certainly} not have chosen to enter Italy and invade Germany, where they were \textit{sure} to encounter opposition, and where their settlements \textit{must} be precarious from the uncertainty of their success and exposed to danger from the remoteness of their countrymen...

This \textit{must} have been the actual state of population in Britain, for some time before the expeditions of Bellovesus and Sigovesus from Gaul. And fresh colonies, for some time before, \textit{must} have ceased to find their way to Britain.

... A longtime therefore \textit{must} have elapsed, before the superfluous numbers of Gaul could have filled up the

\textsuperscript{82} Whitaker. Additions and Corrections. Depiction of Mary in pages 14-16 is proof of the second.
\textsuperscript{83} Collier. Curious remarks. p. ix
\textsuperscript{84} Whitaker. The History of Manchester. p.2
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greater part of the Island, and could have any occasion to prohibit the entrance of any more into it. And some time must have intervened, before the effect of this prohibition could have appeared upon the continent, and more, before it could have intervened, before the effect of this prohibition could have appeared upon the continent, and more, before it could have burst out in the great and necessary migrations into Germany and Italy. Four or five centuries must have passed betwixt the commencement of population in the island, and the era of those migrations on the continent."85

Concerning these sentences and many others which are comparable, we can say that an argument does not provide the basis of its validity, reliability from the excessive use of some words like "certainly", "necessarily" or "must". The first footnote of Collier's Remarks is interesting from this angle: "I hope the Reader will excuse it, if he meets with some of his dogmatical Terms in the following short Remarks, which he will find in the Italian Type; such as must, absolutely, must certainly, must of Necessity, etc. etc. etc."86 This point seems as a major weakness of John Whitaker's historical activity.87

We should also add that Whitaker sometimes makes important claims without referring to sources. For instance, he defines the geographical situation of British "Mancenion", describes the evaluation of cattle feeding in

85 Whitaker. The Genuine History... pp. 30-31
86 Collier. Curious remarks. p.1
87 This critique was also adequately expressed by Collier. See pp. vii, 34,53 in Curious remarks.
early British history or discusses the etymology of the word “Albion”, the name given by ancient Scots to Scotland; but he does not give satisfactory references. In Collier's words, "... by these his Arguments are absolutely decisive; they must ascertain the Doubtful; they must carry every Degree of Conviction with them, for one all-sufficient Reason, because he says so!"

He also adds that: “If a Thing be in Unison with his Fancy, that must be right: if any Thing clashes, that is absolutely wrong, the author was too juvenile, he was ignorant of the Matter, he did not understand the language, etc.”

Another problem is Whitaker's extreme trust of his sources. But, this more or less unconditional trust prevents Whitaker from testing the reliability of these documents. On the other hand, we should remember that the authenticity of a document is always problematic.

Whitaker thought that oldest materials were the most reliable ones:

"antiquaries, like echoes, loving to return the sounds that are pronounced to them with boldness, catching only the last words generally, and repeating them even with the lisping voice of idiocy. St. Neot has thus been echoed since by every mouth to be the nephew and not the brother of Alfred. Yet, all the while, the authority of the biographer is infinitely superior to his
corrector's. A biographer so early carries a decisive authority, in the region of realities."\textsuperscript{92}

With this sentence, Whitaker leaves no room to question the testimony of a biographer or a chronicle. But he forgets that there is always the possibility for these people to distort the historical reality.

Concerning the question of authenticity, he claimed that sources contain their authentic features in themselves: "The Poems of Ossian carry in themselves sufficient proofs of their own authenticity".\textsuperscript{93} But, unfortunately for Whitaker, this is not always the case: as the controversy was developed by such figures as Charles O'Conor, it became clear that Poems of Ossian, accepted generally as a major source on early British history, were in fact a forgery. James MacPherson, claiming to have translated these poems, had actually created them, though with the help of oral tradition.

When Whitaker refers to a religious source, his trust became more and more accentuated:

"That this doctrine [doctrine of Trinity] is true, I am fully convinced. I read it recorded in the pages of Scripture. I see it attested by the writings of the fathers. And I find it displayed, in the generally uniform and unvarying faith of the church of Christ, from the days of apostles to the present period. All these rays of light, in my opinion, unite to form such an orb of luster in favour of the doctrine; as shines out with a sun-like blaze of evidence, upon the world".\textsuperscript{94}

\textsuperscript{92} Whitaker. \textit{The Life of St. Neot}, p. 70
\textsuperscript{93} Whitaker. \textit{History of Manchester}, p. 16
\textsuperscript{94} Whitaker. \textit{Arianism}, p. 3
One can explain this situation stating that Whitaker was also a religious person; but we should also remember the many scholars from a religious background who were critical about sacred sources. On the other hand, if Whitaker were a theologian, Scriptures or writings of the fathers would be completely legitimate sources for him. However, as it will be argued in the following pages, a religious source can be accepted to a great extent as a valid source in the intellectual milieu of eighteenth century Britain. This makes Whitaker's situation gradually safe.

ii) The Problem of objectivity

The concept of objectivity has been discussed in academic circles for ages and is still one of the most attractive topics. On such a controversial issue, it is hard to express a decisive conclusion, but I will be satisfied with my own.

The epistemological limitations of a historian and the non-empirical character of history are already discussed in this chapter; in the light of these arguments, it can be said that there is seemingly no way for objectivity in history writing: the Rankean dictum "Wie es eigentlich gewesen ist" is
ultimately impossible. However, my personal belief is that the most crucial thing is to write a "honest" history. By the term "honesty", what is referred to is the positive standing of a scientist evaluating the data from a sound perspective, being willing to hear the convincing arguments of adversaries and not denying them just for the sake of an ideology or a personal bias.

I would argue that Whitaker was not honest in his writings, following the definition that was given above.

In The Real Origin of Government, which was written in 1795 as a reaction against French Revolution, France was lauded in an exaggerated manner; according to Whitaker, France was "the most polished and the most courteous" nation "in all Europe"; it "had hitherto been glorifying, in obedience to her 'Grand Monarque' [ Louis XIV ], had summoned all the virtues, all the vices, of a lively, gallant, ambitious people, to stand around his throne, and to glitter there like so many planets, attending upon the sun in the center. But France now altered its tone of thinking; directed its vices and its virtues, to move in another course: thus made the planets to desert the

95 Leopold Von Ranke (1795-1886), called sometimes the founder of scientific history, was a writer of narrative history on grand scale and an admirer of objectivity in history writing. But, some scholars claim that the sentence given above was misunderstood and the objectivity meant by Ranke was exaggerated. 96 Whitaker. Government. p.52
Sun, and to combine around that mere meteor of society, a republick". He even argues that France was the transmitter of many improvements to England:

"France while it continued a Kingdom, was always the first of the nations of Europe in arts and in arms. The long contests, that have been maintained between the French and us, may make us unwilling to allow this. But let us be peculiarly just to a fallen foe. For fallen he now is completely, France once was the grand medium, through which all the refinements of the continent were transmitted to us. To her we owe our learning, our civility, even our Christianity. She stood therefore as the conveyer of all good to us. Even now she stands unintentionally, unwillingly, as a kind friend, as a warner to our fears as a caller upon our wisdom".

As one can read between these lines, what Whitaker praises here is not France, but the "Ancien Régime" from his Tory stance. If the revolution did not occur in France, threatening the political system of many European countries, Whitaker would probably not have treated France in so friendly a manner. He was pretty happy with the actual situation in France, but worried about the spreading of revolutionary ideas through Europe.

John Collier too criticized severely the selectivity of Whitaker:

"By the foregoing mighty Hopes, and positive Assertions, we find this Antiquarian's telescopical Sight can see many small Atoms before the Conquest; but he cannot see the Importance of the Revolution in Eighty-eight. He can settle upon decisive Principles the Origin and History of the Picts, Scots, Danes: etc. but he cannot see the ten Times more plain and a hundred more momentous Annals (both to the present and future

97 Ibid., p. 44
98 Ibid., p. 43
Generations) of the late, and present blundering, corrupt, and ruinous Administrations of the present Reign."

Also, another example showing how Whitaker distorts historical realities for his purposes can be given. Being an intellectual of the period, he was well aware of political developments; however leaving aside the tradition of Enlightenment and the works of Voltaire, Montesquieu, Rousseau and many others, he wrote that after the American Revolution, "The republican genius of America came into France, with her returning soldiery; all sick with the contagion of sickness through the latter." Probably, there will be a consensus among historians on the influence of Enlightenment ideas on American Revolution, but the idea of exporting republicanism from America to France remains a relatively weak connection.

It may also be stated that Whitaker criticizes severely MacPherson of making his arguments without convincing references. Yet, the reader will remember that Whitaker too expressed some claims without adequate proofs.

99 Collier. Curious remarks. p. viii
100 Whitaker. Government. p.44
101 On American Revolution, see two books by Gordon Wood: The Creation of the American Republic and The Radicalism of the American Revolution. See also two articles from The American Revolution: "Creating a Usable Future: The Revolutionary Historians and the National Past" by Lester Cohen and "Creating a Republican Citizenry" by Melvin Yazawa.
102 Whitaker. The Genuine History p. 143
103 See p. 48
iii) Ideology and history writing:

There is the possibility to take the narrow, political sense of the term or the broader sense, but at the end each individual has a certain ideology. In some cases, ideology becomes extremely important and reaches even a transcendental level. Joseph A. Schumpeter, in his trilogy *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* is probably right in describing Karl Marx as a "prophet" as well as a philosopher, an economist, a sociologist and a political figure.\(^{104}\) When one considers the lives of individuals, the reflections of ideological choices in differing degrees are quite significant. But in the case of a historian, the role of ideology gains a specific importance, because due to epistemological reasons that are touched on in the previous paragraphs, the historian is limited by his own mental capacity and thus, subject to bias.

Before discussing the ideological dimension of Whitaker's works, it will perhaps be useful to cite a few examples from three different fields of historical research: in European history, the life of Thomas Müntzer and Peasants' War deserve special attention from this perspective. The revolt was described by some scholars as a proto-communist social movement and Müntzer was seen as the forefather of class consciousness.\(^{105}\) However,

---


\(^{105}\) The earliest example of this view was Friedrich Engels' work: Friedrich Engels. *The peasant war in Germany*. New York: International Publishers. 1976. However,
some other scholars leaving largely aside socio-economic factors (i.e. population growth, development of trade and industry, revival of cities, geographical situation) have evaluated Müntzer and his followers only as part of a long millenarianism tradition. Perhaps with some reservation, we can also mention the case of Sheik Bedreddin in Turco-Ottoman history. In American history, Eugene Genovese depicting slavery in America as a version of "slave mode of production" is another example displaying the extremities of ideology in history writing.

In the introduction, it is stated that John Whitaker was an important representative of Tory discourse in the eighteenth century. But when one observes the writings of Whitaker, it is hard to determine an open, challenging Tory position. This can be explained by the political domination of the Whig party, which Whitaker was well aware of or by the frustrations of the '15 and '45; but whatever are the reasons, Tory ideology in

many other researches centered around Müntzer and the Peasants' War were done by Russian and German Marxists.


107 On this social movement, the less distorted original source is the anonymous chronicle Tawārikh-i Āli Othmān. As a modern source, see Abdülkadir Gölpinarli and İsmet Sungurbey. Simayna Kadısioglu Seyh Bedreddin. Istanbul: Eti, 1966. Also, see two articles by Halil Inalcik: "The Yürüks: Their Origins, Expansion and Economic Role" and "Dervish and Sultan: An Analysis of the Ottom Baba Vilâyetnâmesi" in The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire. Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies, 1993.


109 See p. 39
Whitaker's works is expressed in an implicit manner. Of course, the basic themes of Toryism - absolute monarchy, divine ordination, indefeasible hereditary succession, non-resistance and passive obedience - were never questioned; however considering the works of Whitaker in totality, I can judge that I did not find them as ideological as I expected.

The exceptions to this attitude are the Vindication of Mary Queen of Scots and especially The Real Origin of Government. The pamphlet, though small in size, is a brilliant proof of Whitaker's political identity and discusses major values of Tory ideology.

One can realize the ideological affinity even from the use of vocabulary. The word "vindication", describing the self-appointed mission of Whitaker makes clear the intention of the author; on the other hand, he condemned Buchanan's Detection of Mary's Doings as a "daring effort of fabricated calumny",110 accused Dr. Robertson having "an old animation of zeal for the defamers of Mary"111 and defined the opposite views as "slandering".112

110 Whitaker. Mary Queen of Scots p.ii
111 Whitaker. Additions and Corrections, p.i
112 Whitaker. Mary Queen of Scots p. iii
In *The Real Origin of Government*, the discourse was very direct. Whitaker, referring to Old Testament, Saint Paul or Saint Peter, describes the divinely legitimate position of the King; shows how Providence organized government;\(^{113}\) defines monarchy as "the primary, the natural, the divine form of government for Man";\(^{114}\) and makes his preference between Charles and Oliver Cromwell:

"Ours [English Revolution] soon ended in that natural termination of all republicks, a Royalty; which was usurped by one of the gloomiest patrons of liberty, one of the most ferocious champions against Royalty; which exchanged a CHARLES for a CROMWELL, the best of men and best of kings for a hypocrite, and a regicide, and placed a Maltster (?) of Huntingdon on the throne, instead of the descendant of a hundred sovereigns."\(^{115}\)

Finally, equalizes the revolt against King to the revolt against God.\(^{116}\)

The reflection of Whitaker's ideology in religious terms can be seen in the *Origins of Arianism* disclosed. Attacking violently Judaism and Islam, Whitaker tries to classify Arianism as a by-product of these "heathen" religions and condemned them all together. The use of some insults including "impostor"\(^{117}\), "libidinous"\(^{118}\), "Pan of Arabia"\(^{119}\) and "Priapus of

---

\(^{113}\) Whitaker, *Government*, pp. 24-27
\(^{114}\) Ibid., p. 27
\(^{115}\) Ibid., p. 35
\(^{116}\) Ibid., p. 48
\(^{117}\) Whitaker, *Arianism*, p. 335
for the prophet of Islam, Mahomet suffices I think to prove the degree of his fanaticism.

Until now, in the evaluation process of John Whitaker's character as a historian, three points which can be seen as the major weaknesses of his works have been discussed. Now, three others constituting the contribution of Whitaker and deserving a special attention in terms of historiography will be mentioned.

iv) Use of sources

The good command of sources, either they are primary or secondary, is one of the most important features of Whitaker's works. On the one hand, he knows the significant examples of secondary literature; on the other, his philological skills which are so important for a historian helped his access to primary sources.

Concerning secondary sources, two cases can be cited as samples: in the first section of the first chapter of *The Life of Saint Neot*, Whitaker provides the reader with a bibliography including books written on Saint Neot and the early periods of British history, with some useful

---

118 Ibid, p. 351
119 Ibid, p. 362
120 Ibid
121 Whitaker, *The Life of Saint Neot*, pp. 4-68
comments. The *Vindication of Mary Queen of Scots* is another work containing a similar division: in the preface, the books of important participants of the debate such as Goodall, Robertson, Tytler or Hume are mentioned. But, here we should state that this reflects the Tory bias of Whitaker.122

Another example can be taken from his refutation of MacPherson: Whitaker argues quite convincingly that MacPherson had actually plagiarized:

"But it is proper to observe, that almost every argument in this disquisition is borrowed, sometimes literally, and generally without acknowledgments from Innes's Critical Essay. The reference to Strabo in p.60 and 61 of Mr. MacPherson; to Mela, Tacitus and Solinus, in p. 62; the answers to objections in p. 63; the appeal to Camden, Ware, and Usher, in p.64, 65; what is said of Ware and the Psalter-Cashel in p.67, and of the form of the Irish Alphabet in p. 67,68; are all taken from Innes p.428, 429, 431 and 432, 430, 433-434, 435437, 434-435, 439 and 448-449, without one acknowledgment of the real Owner, and more than once with the adoption of his own words. - And Dr. MacPherson had borrowed some of the arguments before from Innes, See. p.88-90. - Compare also p.70, 71 of Mr. MacPherson with p.90 of Dr. MacPherson".123

The competence of Whitaker with primary sources too is significant. Since he knew Latin, Greek and something old of the languages of British Isles, he had the opportunity to observe primary materials in a direct manner.

122 Whitaker. *Mary Queen of Scots*. pp.i-ix

In *The Life of Saint Neot*, he informed the reader of the existence of an original document discovered by him and, in another context,\textsuperscript{124} he proved that MacPherson had used a single source for different purposes\textsuperscript{125} opposing each other.

Also, he showed that MacPherson was using false quotations in order to support his theses. The text of MacPherson, quoted from Tacitus is: "Sexcentesimum & quadragesimum annum urbs nostra agebat cum Cimbrorum audita sunt arma", but the original is slightly different: "Sexcentesimum et quadragesimum annum urbs nostra agebat, cum *primum* Cimbrorum audita sunt arma". Seemingly, the difference is a single word; but according to Whitaker, this is crucial in refuting one of MacPherson's arguments.\textsuperscript{126}

As a last word, we need to underline one thing: Whitaker had no problems in using his sources and he used them quite effectively. But, as stated earlier, since he could not evaluate them in a critical manner, his use of these sources are subject to objection.

\textsuperscript{124} Whitaker. *The Life of Saint Neot*, p.13
\textsuperscript{125} Whitaker. *The Genuine History*: p.43-44
\textsuperscript{126} Ibid, p.56
v) Use of interdisciplinary knowledge

Even today, many members of the academic community prefer to determine the limits of their fields with strict, well-established boundaries. The interaction between disciplines, though a common place in academic language is a difficult task which a tiny minority is able to realize in the realm of scientific research. Under these circumstances, the works of an eighteenth century British historian including some discussion of linguistics, etymology, toponymics, anthropology, art history and archaeology become really striking.

But, before the evaluation of contributions of all these disciplines in Whitaker's works, we should note that if one speaks of an interdisciplinary knowledge in this context, the first rank goes inevitably to religious studies. From the perspective of twentieth century, it can be said that the nature of religious studies differs drastically from the other disciplines: the unquestionable character of theological knowledge makes this distinction. However, Whitaker was a man of eighteenth century England, and in terms of chronological realism, he had the right to use this source quite legitimately. If we refer to another example, at the turn of eighteenth century, even John Locke arguing against Sir Robert Filmer did not object
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Bible as a historical source; what he was refusing was the logic of Filmer's argumentation.127

Interestingly, Whitaker observes the oral tradition in Cornwall.128 In fact, he did not accept folkloric tales or legends as sound sources for history, but whatever is the reason, his interest in oral tradition proves that he was not limited only to written sources.

The philological skills of John Whitaker have already been mentioned in previous paragraphs. The use of this skill enabled Whitaker to support his arguments with the help of linguistic proofs. With specific examples, the discussions on the origins of the words "Celtae" and "Cimmerii", written also as Cimбри, Cumri, Gumri and Gomerite;129 the etymology of "Alba" or "Albion", the name given to Scotland by the ancient Scots130 and the Roman or British character of the name "Manchester",131 reflect this part of Whitaker's erudition.

Another interesting point is the importance given to toponymics by Whitaker. For instance, in order to prove the similarities between three early

---

127 Schochet. The Authoritarian Family. p. 122
128 Whitaker. The Life of Saint Neot. p. 17
129 Whitaker. The Genuine History. for the first discussion, see p. 19; for the second one, see p. 53
130 Ibid., p. 90
131 Whitaker. The History of Manchester. p. 2
inhabitants of Britain, namely Gael, Cimbri and Belgae, he used the names
given to towns, rivers or other geographical locations:

"The language of all the three was exactly the
same; as is plain to a demonstration from the appearance
of the same names of towns, of rivers, and of tribes
among all. We have Camulodunum, for the name of a
fortress among Mr. MacPherson's Cimbri of Yorkshire,
and his Belgae of Essex; Lindum amongst his Belgae and
his Gael; and Venta for the Capital of his Cimbri in
Wales, and of his Belgae in Hampshire and in Norfolk;
Urus or Ure, the name of a river in Yorkshire and in
Suffolk, and an appellative for a river in the Erse at
present; and Alauna, Deva, and Devana, all three rivers in
the country equally of his Gaul, his Belgae and his
Cimbri".132

Anthropological and ethnographic aspects play also a distinct role in
Whitaker's works. For instance, in refuting MacPherson stating that Britons
and Belgae were completely different tribes, he uses the following evidence:

"Nor was the difference great in itself betwixt the
real Britons and the real Belgae. They both constructed
their houses in the same manner, used the same stated
pieces of brass or iron bullion for money, had the same
fondness for keeping poultry and hares about their
houses, and the same aversion to seeing them upon their			
tables. They both painted their bodies, both threw off
their clothes in the hour of battle, both suffered the hair
of their head to grow to a great length, both shaved all
but the upper lip, both had wives in common, and both
prosecuted their wars on the same principles".133

Archaeological findings too are used by Whitaker in order to describe
the civilizations who had lived in early centuries. In The History of

132 Whitaker. The Genuine History, p. 83, see also pp. 146 and 238
133 ibid, p. 84
Manchester, Whitaker comments on arms found and even gives pictures of some of them.\textsuperscript{134}

Lastly, we should mention Whitaker's interest in the history of art. In \textit{The Life of Saint Neot}, he depicts accurately the architecture of the chapel that Saint Neot lived in and also tries to imagine some sections of the building which were demolished. On the other hand, observing an inscription graven on the frame of a window, he obtains an evidence proving that Saint Neot was actually from the royal family.\textsuperscript{135}

\textbf{vi) nature of Whitaker's history}

An important problem of history writing can be defined as the determinant role given to some historical agents; the outcome of this preference was the "history of great men" which was based on the achievements realized by a very small elite. For centuries, historians' main interest was the deeds of kings, princes, military leaders and officials which took part in the state apparatus. This attitude was to a great extent challenged by Marxist historiography and some other schools following a similar

\textsuperscript{134} Whitaker. \textit{The History of Manchester}, p. 16
\textsuperscript{135} Whitaker. \textit{The Life of Saint Neot}, p. 79
path. But, even at the turn of the twenty-first century, the history of great men still has a certain weight.

When one considers the course of the eighteenth century, it can be seen that this general consent was refused by some scholars. The examples of this challenge will be offered in the framework of the chapter comparing Tory historiography and Enlightenment historiography, but let me cite two minds who were the forerunners of this new perspective.

Giambattista Vico, who was called by some scholars "the founder of the philosophy of history" and even "the founder of social science", was one of these minds. He stressed the importance of the masses, leaving aside members of the ruling class. In this respect, and also with his idea of social conflict, Vico significantly influenced Karl Marx. (But, we should also mention that the concept of conflict in Vichian terms differs slightly from the Marxist paradigm: his example is the confrontation between patricians and plebeians in the Early Rome.)

136 Among these schools, Annales School including Lucien Febvre, Marc Bloch, Fernand Braudel and Jacques LeGoff; "British Marxist historians" including Christopher Hill, Eric J. Hobsbawm, Rodney Hilton and Edward Thompson; Social historians of the French Revolution including Georges Lefebvre, George Rudé, Albert Soboul and Richard Cobb can be cited.
137 Jules Michelet, who translated Vico's works into French gave him the first status.
138 Second judgment belongs to R.G. Collingwood, seen in the academic circles as a "disciple" of Vico.
Charles Secondat de Montesquieu was the other thinker reacting against this commonly used discourse. For instance, in his political writings he did not follow the "speculum principis-mirror for princes" tradition. This was the tradition of Niccolo Macchiavelli, Thomas More, Desiderius Erasmus and Baldassare Castiglione. For the first time, Montesquieu created a new genre of political criticism written for the public, not for a prince.

Two more examples can be taken from Considerations sur les causes de la grandeur des Romains et de leur decadence. According to Montesquieu, Julius Caesar was not an important historical figure. If he had not put an end to the republic, another general would have done the same thing. Similarly, if Rome was not destroyed by Goths of Odoacer, some other barbarians would have attacked and invaded it.

Compared to Montesquieu or Vico, the tone of John Whitaker's writings was much more sympathetic to grandees. However, in some of his works, he was not interested at all in this theme. The Life of Saint Neot and Mary Queen of Scots Vindicated are obviously contributions to the history of great men: Saint Neot was an important religious figure of ninth-century

---

139 Macchiavelli’s Prince, More’s Utopia, Erasmus’ Education of a Christian Prince and Castiglione’s Book of the Courtier are examples of this trend.
Cornwall, Queen Mary the ruler. Also, in *The Real Origin of Government* the image of king legitimized by divine right and associated with the father figure, is an open expression of this perception.

However, there are some other patterns showing a drastic shift in Whitaker's works. In his *The Genuine History of the Britons* asserted, discussing the nature of migrations into Britain and origins of nations of the island, Whitaker mentioned the names of important people - i.e. chieftains - only two or three times. In the same manner, in *The History of Manchester* no particular credit was given to grandees. Rather the history of Britain was narrated on the scale of a city.
CHAPTER III

Enlightenment Historiography:
A Comparative Perspective

The third chapter of this work is an effort to make a comparative study between the historiographical traditions in Britain and the Continent. Since the characteristics of two representatives of British historiography are described in the first chapter and the writings of an eighteenth-century Tory historian are observed as a case study within the framework of the general debate in the second, the accent in this chapter will be on the main features of Continental historiography, which was basically defined by Enlightenment ideas, with references to history writing in Britain. However, it should be pointed out that the basis of this comparison is largely the works of Whitaker.

When a historian deals with a concrete subject, his work is quite easy: as in the example of Waterloo, given by Norman Hampson, everybody knows the exact date, the exact place and the historical elements which contributed this event. But a subject like the Enlightenment differs drastically: the dating, the place and the participants are enormously controversial. For instance, Leonard Krieger proposes us a conventional date as the starting

---

point, 1748, associating this year with the Peace of Aix-La-Chapelle and the publication of *Esprit des Lois* by Montesquieu. But, a few pages later, he shifted the beginning date to 1687—the publication of *Principia Mathematica* by Isaac Newton—and 1690—the publication of John Locke's *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* and *Two Treatises on Civil Government*. In *The Crisis of European Consciousness*, Paul Hazard suggested the beginning of the Enlightenment in the second half of the XVIIth century. Christopher Hill, in *The Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution*, moved Enlightenment, at least in the case of England, to the late XVIth century. Similarly, Peter Gay described the XVIIIth century as the "Age of Enlightenment"; but the limits of this description were not clearly defined. Ulrich Im Hof too informs us about the existence of the concept in different countries: "Enlightenment" in England, "Lumières" in France, "Aufklärung" in Germany, "Illuminismo" in Italy and Spain; however, there was still an ambiguity.

Whatever its chronological limits were, as stated in the introduction, the Enlightenment was the determinant intellectual phenomenon of the eighteenth-century Europe. Due to this, the comparison between Britain and

---

Continental Europe in terms of history writing will, I think be an interesting one for observing the theme of peculiarities of British experience.

In the first place, Enlightenment historians managed to eliminate the idea of "God's intervention" in history. As one recalls, this concept was one of the basic principles of Tory historians, describing it as "divine ordination" or "Providence". Also, because of the religious, dogmatic character of the concept, it remained unquestionable from the perspective of Tory historians. Providence was a key concept for John Whitaker too: he explains the origins of sovereignty with the direct action of God;\textsuperscript{147} claims that French people were punished by God because of French provocation in American Independance;\textsuperscript{148} depicts implicitly the conversion process of Saxons into Christianity with the divine grace.\textsuperscript{149} Before the Enlightenment historians, "Christian" historians believed that God himself was shaping the course of history through human beings, in an indirect manner. For instance, Jacques Bénigne Bossuet, in his Discours sur l'histoire universelle, accepted the Bible as the unique historical source, Moses as the first historian and claimed the existence of a divine plan in the historical process.\textsuperscript{150} As a reaction to this mentality, Enlightenment historians rejected the God's intervention and tried to explain historical changes by human elements and the actions of human

\textsuperscript{147} Whitaker. Government. pp. 4-5 and 24-29
\textsuperscript{148} Ibid, p. 44
\textsuperscript{149} Whitaker. History of Manchester. p. 496
beings. However, this does not necessarily mean that they rejected religion; Charles Secondat de Montesquieu in *Dissertation sur la politique des Romains*, David Hume in *Natural History of Religion* and Edward Gibbon in *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* discussed the psychological causes and historical influence of religion. ¹⁵¹ What they were opposing to was the idea of a God penetrating all spheres of human life. Also, despite these developments, we should always take into account the enormous weight of God and religion: René Descartes, in the *Principes de la philosophie*, said "Above all, we will observe as an infallible rule that what God has revealed is incomparably more certain than the rest". ¹⁵² Isaac Newton wrote that "if any question at any time arise concerning his (Christ's) interpretations we are to beware of Philosophy... and to have recourse to the Old Testament". ¹⁵³ In his *Interpretation de la nature*, Denis Diderot, probably the most radical of the Enlightenment generation, wrote:

"O God, I do not know if you exist... I ask nothing in this world, for the course of events is determined by its own necessity if you do not exist, or by your decree if you do... Here I stand, as I am, a necessarily organized part of eternal and necessary matter-- or perhaps your own creation". ¹⁵⁴

A second change was the introduction of the idea of progress in history. In the early modern era, the European mind was largely retrogressive: the concept of "Golden Ages" and admiration of the past were

valid categories. The Renaissance imitating the components of Greco-Roman heritage and the Reformation adoring early Christian life and the Bible strengthened this belief. Tory historians of the eighteenth-century, too, had a similar conceptualization of Golden Ages; especially the Puritan Revolution under the leadership of Oliver Cromwell and the deposition of English King during the Glorious Revolution provoked their love for a magnificent, but imaginary past. The interest of Whitaker in ancient history which was criticized by John Collier was a reflection of this conceptualization: he probably sees his own time as a degenerate version of a happier era. In Francis Bacon's words, "Men have been kept back, as by a kind of enchantment, from progress in the sciences by reverence for antiquity, by the authority of men accounted great in philosophy, and then by general consent".155 With the Enlightenment, this perception was challenged severely: people, virtually in all aspects of sciences as well as historiography, preferred to look forward instead of backward. Enlightenment historians began to write a new history, leaving aside the authority of religion and ancient masters. We may cite the Marquis de Condorcet, writer of the Ésquisse d'un tableau historique des progrès de l'esprit humain: "No doubt this progress may be more or less rapid, but there will never be any retrogression".156

155 Ibid, p.36.
Rationalism was another characteristic of the Enlightenment. Going back to XVIIth century, and especially to Descartes, "the vivifying planet of the intellectual firmament" they were rational, scientific in research, critical of traditional authorities. (Remember the XVIIth century's "Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes"). This lowest common denominator was also remarked on by contemporaries, such as Étienne Bonnot de Condillac and Jean Le Rond d'Alembert, two significant figures of the Enlightenment. However, due partly to the religious character of Tory historiography, Tory historians were often using elements which did not fit into the rational discourse of the Enlightenment, i.e. Providence. Also, as it was seen in the case of Whitaker, their respect for traditional authorities was so great that it sometimes prevented them of testing the reliability of their sources. On the other hand, one should not exagerate the achievements of the Enlightenment; because according to some scholars, Providence of early centuries was replaced by an overemphasis of reason, which would end up in the "culte de Raison" of post-revolutionary France. Carl Becker in his Heavenly City of the Enlightenment Philosophers compares Enlightenment thinkers with thirteenth and nineteenth century philosophers, and claims that in fact they were closer to thirteenth century.

The recognition of cultures, other than the Christian and Western European one, was another contribution of Enlightenment. Earlier, Western Europeans accepted themselves as the norm of the civilization and their interest in the rest of the world and its history was limited. Tories also shared this belief. And for them, Christianity was the determinant characteristic of the Western culture. The judgements of Whitaker on Judaism, Islam and prophet Mahomet provides outstanding examples of this value.159 But with the influence of geographical discoveries and especially with the effect of travel accounts, Europeans became aware of the existence of other civilizations, which could challenge or even exceed their own culture. In Sir James Macintosh's words, travel accounts were "a museum, in which specimens of every variety of human nature may be studied".160 For example, Voltaire's Essai sur les moeurs was a trial for writing a universal history, beginning with China in the first chapters, later moving to India and then going to Persia.161 We should also put a common belief of the period: Enlightenment historians claimed that fundamental principles of human life were the same throughout the world. However as Hume and Voltaire argued, "moeurs" and culture produce "different fruits", in customs, religions, institutions, life styles, etc.162

159 These observations are mainly expressed in the Origins of Arianism disclosed, Gay. The Enlightenment: an interpretation, p.320.
The rejection of the history of "great men" was another determinant feature of the Enlightenment historiography, distinguishing it drastically from the Tory tradition. As we have seen, the king had a very important role, supported by a legitimacy deriving from a sacred source. Also, the fresh memory of English Revolution and fear of masses, or "mob" in current terminology, was another component of Tory discourse. (Although Whitaker shares the main characteristics of the discourse with the other Tory writers, it should be noted that, as was previously remarked, he has a tendency to write a history differing from the recordings of great men's deeds.) But Enlightenment historians were not interested in the history of individual actors; they preferred to observe societies and cultures. Voltaire's *Essays on the Manners and Spirit of Nations* was an important manifestation of this view, leaving aside political leaders and western Christian culture, seeing all men as the subject of history and defining the struggle for rationality as the unifying factor of history.163 "Si l'histoire que j'écris n'est ni militaire, ni politique, ni économique,...on me demandera quelle est donc celle que je me propose d'écrire. C'est l'histoire des hommes et des moeurs" wrote Duclos.164 According to Diderot, the book of history that he liked was "the one that kings and courtiers detest, it is the kind of book that give birth to

164 "If the history that I write is neither military, nor political, nor economic... people will ask me what I am supposed to write. It is the history of men and customs." quoted from *La pensée européenne au XVIIIe siècle*, by Paul Hazard. p.242.
Brutuses give it whatever name you please."\textsuperscript{165} The title of a book by Voltaire, \textit{Le siècle de Louis XIV} can seem paradoxical to the view expressed above; but Voltaire was very clear in his preference: "It is not merely the life of Louis XIV that we claim to write... We want to attempt to paint for posterity, not the actions of a single man, but the spirit of the men in the most enlightened century that ever was".\textsuperscript{166}

To separate history and legend was another part of Enlightenment historians' efforts: "Divorcia de la historia y de la fabula".\textsuperscript{167} In this respect, there were similarities between Enlightenment and Tory historians. For instance, Whitaker tried to write the life of St. Neot by eliminating the legendary elements. On the other hand, the growing interest of Enlightenment historians in primary and secondary sources was valid for Tory historians, too. The importance attributed by Whitaker to primary sources and his good command of secondary materials have already been mentioned. The structure of his works, his references to sources, either primary or secondary, his footnotes prove that Whitaker worked systematically in order to write history. Enlightenment historians thought that the historiography of the earlier centuries was relied too heavily on legends, consequently, they were extremely biased. In order to prevent these biases, they turned their attention to primary and secondary sources. In fact,

\textsuperscript{165} Gay. \textit{The Enlightenment: an interpretation}. p. 385.
\textsuperscript{166} Ibid, p. 394.
\textsuperscript{167} Hazard. \textit{La pensée européenne}. p. 239.
the reading of primary sources was not an innovation: long before Voltaire, Catholic and Protestant monks were trying hard to prove the antiquity of their churches through the editions of the documents and scholarly works in ancient languages.\textsuperscript{168} However, the efforts of Enlightenment historians were highly respectable: Hume, writing his \textit{History of England}, read all the XVIIth century English medievalists, consulted the library of British Museum and worked in archives but, not in a systematic manner. Voltaire read the chronicles of medieval annalists, the accounts of recent historians, eye-witness reports and unpublished memoirs. Interestingly, he did not cite the authorities he read in his works. William Robertson, writer of \textit{History of America}, used XVIth century Spanish and other manuscripts, consulted the Imperial libraries of Vienna and St. Petersburg, and sent queries about Indians to Portuguese officials and colonial governors.\textsuperscript{169} Also Gibbon's footnotes to his \textit{Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire} show his access to Beausobre's history of the Manicheans, Mabillon's study of diplomatcs and Tillemont's histories of the early church.\textsuperscript{170}

As two last points, we can cite two features, objectivity and didactic historiography, which were linked to each other. Objectivity was a very important criterion for Enlightenment historians: according to Voltaire,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{168} Gay. \textit{The Enlightenment: an interpretation}, pp. 385-386.
  \item \textsuperscript{169} Ibid, pp.373-375.
  \item \textsuperscript{170} Ibid, p. 375.
\end{itemize}
"History must be neither a satir nor a encomium". He also praised Hume's *History of England* with these words: "Mr. Hume, in his History, is neither parliamentarian, nor royalist, nor Anglican, nor Presbyterian- he is simply judicial". Hume too considered himself as a "historian, that had at once neglected present power, interest and authority and the cry of popular prejudices", but also he added that he was "assailed by one cry of reproach, disapprobation, and even detestation; English, Scotch, and Irish, Whig and Tory, churchman and sectary, free-thinker and religionist, patriot and courtier, united in their rage against the man, who had presumed to shed a generous tear for the fate of Charles I and the Earl of Strafford".

However, the historians of the Enlightenment were biased too: concerned mainly with the struggle between vice and virtue and seeing in themselves a moral responsibility, they were trying to impose their own values and using historiography as a means of propaganda. A second common feature between Tory and Enlightenment historiographies becomes apparent there: for instance, Whitaker claimed a monopoly on truth for his writings and was extremely confident about the validity of his arguments. He also wanted to spread his ideas since he shared the general belief of the period that individuals could learn a lot from the experiences of past centuries. Similarly, according to Henry Saint John Bolingbroke, a Tory

---

politician, history was "la philosophie nous enseignant par des examples comment nous devons nous conduire dans toutes les circonstances de la vie publique et privée; en conséquence, nous devons nous adresser à elle dans un esprit philosophique." 174

To come to a conclusion, we can say that Enlightenment was significantly important in the evolution of historiography. Although Enlightenment historians were not real professionals, Montesquieu was a historian, political scientist, social critic, political theorist and sociologist; Voltaire a playwright, popularizer of science, publicist and historian; Adam Smith a student of rhetoric, a moral philosopher and economist-- their contributions to the history writing, that I have tried to summarize in this chapter, were determinant.

174 "History is the philosophy which teaches us with the examples how to behave in all circumstances of public and private life; consequently, we should address to history in a philosophical spirit." quoted from Hazard, p.239.
CONCLUSION

In the next few lines, the intellectual outcome of this study deriving from the evaluation of primary and secondary sources will be summarized. Also, it should be noted that commentaries of persons from different backgrounds, academic or non-academic, interested in the subject helped to shape the structure of this part.

As stated in the introduction, the basis of this research was the life and works of an eighteenth century British historian. The political stance of John Whitaker, namely his Tory identity was another component of the theme, requiring special attention. However, I personally think that the observation of Whitaker as a historian, with references to his political choice, would be a narrow channel in terms of history writing. Consequently, the scope of the research was expanded with the introduction of additional topics.

In the first chapter, the panorama of eighteenth century from the ideologically biased perspective of the Whig Interpretation of History school is mentioned. Within this context, some major themes such as the influence of ideological standpoints on history writing, the concepts of anachronism and ethnocentrism and, the idea of "history of the victors" are discussed.
The second part of the chapter is an attempt to acquire a more realistic picture of the eighteenth century taking into account the existence of Tory ideology, which was neglected by both Whig or Namierite historians. In other words, the first part is the expression of "how the eighteenth century ought to be" from the objective of Whig tradition, whereas the second one is the definition of "how actually the eighteenth century was". Also, since it is difficult to label Tory historians as historiographical school, the basic values which would help to understand Whitaker as a Tory historian are obtained as a result of an analysis of Tory political discourse.

The second chapter is dedicated to investigate the scholar identity of John Whitaker by the observation of his writings. But, beside this, some important issues which are determinant for a historian even today are mentioned in this chapter. The epistemological dimension of historical research, the basis of objectivity, critical analysis of the sources, either primary or secondary, and the importance of interdisciplinary work are some of these points, among others.

A comparison is made, in the third chapter, between Britain and the Continent in terms of historiography in order to understand the contributions made by the Enlightenment thought. However, it should be remarked that it is a modest trial since the basis of this comparative study is to a great extent John Whitaker's works from the British side.
In sum, it can be said that this study provided me with the opportunity to evaluate two representatives of British historiography, namely the Whig Interpretation of History and Tory historians, though to describe the second group as a school is seriously controversial. In these terms, John Whitaker was an interesting case study showing the features of a certain period in the evolution of Tory thought. Also, the comparison with Continental Europe, especially the accentuated, sharp contrasts are significant indicators, depicting the origins of some ideas in the course of European intellectual history.
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