



Class BX 5098

Book . H3

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE
OXFORD MOVEMENT

A SHORT HISTORY
OF THE
OXFORD MOVEMENT

BY

SIR SAMUEL HALL, M.A., K.C.
FORMERLY VICE-CHANCELLOR OF THE COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER

3
2
3
3
3
3
3

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK AND BOMBAY

1906

BX5098
H3

103939

07



P R E F A C E.

THIS little work is merely a layman's attempt to give an unbiassed account of the very interesting episode in history commonly called **The Oxford Movement**. It makes no pretence to discuss the theological questions which were raised in its progress, but endeavours to explain, How it arose, Who were its leaders, How it proceeded, and What were its results. Its main activity only covered a very limited period (1833 to 1845), and though it was not, and could not, be an entirely isolated affair, yet it was almost dramatic in its completeness and interest. The writer has made free use of the Authorities of which he has given a list, and

v

hopes this will be accepted as sufficient acknowledgment even in those cases where he has not expressly and precisely indicated his obligation.

S. H.

1906.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTORY - - - - -	1
1. English Protestant Sects. 2. Sketch of English Church History before the Reformation. 3. The Reformation and Its Machinery. 4. Later History of the Church. 5. Reform Act, 1832. 6. State of Oxford and the Church in the Reform Days.	
NOTES: A.—J. A. Froude on Dogmatic Theology - -	29
B.—Dr. Tulloch on the Reformation - - -	31
C.—Dr. Hook on the Prayer-Book - - -	33
D.—Dr. Hook on the Thirty-Nine Articles - -	35
E.—C. A. Fyffe on State of Oxford - - -	40

CHAPTER II.

THE LEADERS - - - - -	44
1. Whately. 2. Keble. 3. Hurrell Froude. 4. Newman —Difference with Hawkins—Sermons. 5. Pusey. 6. Hugh James Rose, and others.	
NOTE: Illustrations of Newman's style - - -	108

CHAPTER III.

	PAGE
THE MOVEMENT, 1833 TO 1839 - - - - -	116
1. Immediate Occasion. 2. Hadleigh Conference—Associations—Addresses to Archbishop. 3. Earlier Tracts—Tract 1. 4. List of Tracts—Prosperity to 1839—Circulation of Tracts. 5. Question of Subscription at Matriculation—Hampden's Pamphlet—Pusey's Tracts. 6. Hampden, Regius Professor of Divinity. 7. Lectures—Wiseman and Newman—Martyrs' Monument— <i>Via Media</i> .	
1839 TO 1845 - - - - -	172

1. Turning of Tide—W. G. Ward. 2. Pusey's Letter—Newman's Article in *British Critic*. 3. Newman Studies Monophysite Controversy—Wiseman on Anglican Claims—Littlemore—Newman's Preparations. 4. Younger Men's Forward Movement. 5. Tract 90. 6. Sensation caused by Tract 90—Protest of the Four Tutors—Censure by Authorities. 7. Newman at Littlemore—The Three Blows: (a) Arianism, Question Involved; (b) Bishops' Charges; (c) Jerusalem Bishopric, and their Effect on Newman. 8. Professorship of Poetry—Monastery. 9. Newman went to Littlemore permanently, 1842—Retraction of Language against Rome—Pusey Suspended—Newman's Last Sermon as Anglican—His delay in going over. 10. Ward's Leadership—His Ideal—His Deprivation—Newman's Censure vetoed. 11. Newman's "Development"—Received into Roman Catholic Church.

CHAPTER IV.

RESULTS - - - - -	220
1. Anglican Church remained stable. 2. Oxford Reform. 3. Influence on English Church—Raising of Tone—Scholarship—History and Historical School. 4. Ritualism. 5. Indifference—Agnosticism. 6. Conclusion.	
INDEX - - - - -	253

PRINCIPAL AUTHORITIES USED.

(The dates are those of the Editions used.)

- Burgon. *Twelve Good Men*. 2 vols. 1888.
- Church. *The Oxford Movement*. 1892.
- The Christian Year*. 1873.
- Dictionary of National Biography, v.d.*
- Hampden's *Bampton Lectures*. 1832.
- Lely. *Position of the Church of England* (Statutes). 1899.
- Lives. *Arnold*. By Stanley. 2 vols. 1858.
- Keble*. (1) By Coleridge. 1880. (2) By Lock. 1893.
- Hurrell Froude*. By Louise J. Guiney. 1904. *Remains*.
2 vols. (4 parts). Keble and Newman.
- Manning*. By Purcell. 2 vols. 1895.
- Pusey*. 4 vols. By Liddon and others. 1893-97.
- Pattison*. *Memoirs*. 1885.
- Tait, Archbishop*. 2 vols. 1891.
- Whately*. 2 vols. 1866.
- Wilberforce, Bp.* 3 vols. 1880-82.
- Wiseman*. By Wilfrid Ward. 2 vols. 1897.
- Wordsworth, Bp. Charles*. *Annals*. 2 vols. 1891-93.
- Rev. Thos. Mozley. *Reminiscences*. 2 vols. 1882.
- Dr. Jas. B. Mozley. *Letters*. 1885.
- J. H. Newman. *Works*. *Apologia*. 1879. Sermons, Tracts,
Verses, Histories, etc., etc., *v.d.*
- „ *Controversy with Kingsley, with Apologia*. 1864.
- „ *Letters and Correspondence during his Life in
the English Church*. 2 vols. 1891. Edited
by Anne Mozley.

- J. H. Newman. *Early History*. By F. W. Newman. 1891.
 „ *Life*. By R. H. Hutton. 1891.
 „ *Life*. By Abbott. 2 vols. 1892.
 „ *Literary Life*. By Dr. Barry. 1904.
 Oakeley's *Historical Notes on the Tractarian Movement*.
 Overton. *Life in the English Church, 1660 to 1714*. 1885.
 Abbey and Overton. *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century*. 1878.
 Palmer. *Narrative of Events connected with the Tracts for the Times*. 1883.
 A. P. Perceval's *Collection of Papers connected with the Theological Movement of 1833*.
 Swete. *Patristic Study. Handbooks for the Clergy*. 1902.
Tracts for the Times, v.d.
 W. G. Ward. *Ideal of Christian Church*. 1844.
W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement. By Wilfrid Ward. 1889.
 Isaac Williams. *Autobiography*. 1892.
 Wilberforce, Bp. *Essays from Quarterly*. 2 vols. 1874.

ABBREVIATED TERMS OCCASIONALLY USED IN REFERENCE.

- Apologia* for Newman's *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*.
Letters for Newman's *Letters and Correspondence during his Life in the English Church*.
Reminiscences for Rev. T. Mozley's *Reminiscences*.
 Church for *The Oxford Movement*. By Dean Church.
 Palmer for Palmer's *Narrative*.
 Ward for *Mr. W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement*.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

1. THE forms of belief held by English Protestants are many and various, and the difficulty of classifying or enumerating them is practically insuperable. Most of those, however, who profess to have any religious belief, accept the existence of a Supreme Being and a future state of rewards and punishments. They have indeed (not quite seriously) been sometimes accused of worshipping a book, and the very general adoption of the doctrine stated in Chillingworth's *The Bible and the Bible alone the Religion of Protestants*, coupled with the right claimed and asserted of private judgment, has not only given some countenance to the charge, exaggerated though it be, but has led to the great multiplication of sects, and hence it is when any attempt is made to add fuller

details to the above-mentioned statements of faith that enormous difficulty arises.

The first and fundamental element of religious belief, the existence of the Supreme Being, has given rise during many generations to numerous speculations and disputes. What is the nature of this Being? Is it one, or is there a Trinity in Unity? and if so, what are the nature, origin and status of the several persons of the Trinity, and what is the nature of their relationship to each other and to mankind? It is obvious that the Divinity and Incarnation of Christ and the Atonement by Him involve difficult and serious questions which must vitally affect the details of the faith held even by those professing and calling themselves Christians. The Unitarian Society, for example, must have broad differences which lie between it and the other Christian bodies. In the same way, the doctrine of the future state of rewards and punishments necessarily gives rise to difficult speculations and discussions, upon which many different conclusions have been arrived at. Thus a large body of Christians, commonly called Calvinists, hold that God has chosen a certain number in

Christ to everlasting glory before the foundation of the world, of His free grace and love, without faith, good works or other conditions of the creature, and that the rest of mankind are passed by and ordained to everlasting dishonour and wrath; that the atonement of Christ enured only for the benefit of the elect, with the subsidiary doctrines of moral inability in a fallen state, irresistible grace and final perseverance. Another large body, commonly called Arminians, on the other hand, hold that God from all eternity determined to bestow salvation on those who as He foresaw would persevere to the end in their faith in Jesus Christ, and to inflict everlasting punishment on those who should continue in their unbelief and resist to the end of life His Divine assistance, so that election was conditional and reprobation the result of foreseen infidelity and persevering wickedness; that the atonement of Christ enured for the benefit of all who believed in Him, with the subsidiary doctrines that regeneration was only by operation of the Holy Ghost which was the gift of God through Jesus Christ; that all good works were attributable to God alone, and especially (as opposed

to the Calvinistic doctrine of final perseverance) that the regenerate might fall away and die in their sins.

There naturally arose many sects holding variations more or less important of Calvinistic and Arminian doctrines, and many other sects holding special views flowing as they considered from the fundamental articles of faith as expressed in the Scriptures, but it is not necessary for the purposes of this work to pursue this branch of the subject farther than to call attention to the great cleavage of all which really separated Protestants into two well-distinguishable camps, one of them, which coincided with the Established Church, recognised Episcopacy, and the other did not. The Non-Episcopalian bodies, commonly called "Nonconformists," roughly speaking regard only as of real importance the direct communion of the creature with its Creator. There are two, and two only, absolute beings, and the eternal salvation of the creature depends entirely on his direct communion with the Creator and their mutual relationship without the intervention of any third person or corporation. The Episcopalian, on the

other hand, believes in the existence of what he calls "The Church" as a substantive body or corporation, which plays a vital, or at any rate a most important part in the relation between the creature and the Creator. He believes in what he calls "The Sacraments" as means of conveying grace from the Creator to the creature, and as generally necessary to salvation. He accepts the government of the Church by bishops, and regards them as having received a Divine commission which they communicate to others by the laying on of hands, and so keep up a body of men set apart to rightly and duly administer the Sacraments. From the death of Christ until the scattered books, making up the canon of the New Testament, had been collected, the knowledge of the teaching of Christ must have existed somewhere, and many Churchmen contend that this deposit of faith was given by Christ to His Church, who must be the ultimate teacher on matters of faith, and that the Bible was never intended to teach doctrine, but only to prove it, and that the dogmas of the Church must be sought for in the formularies of the Church—its Catechism

and Creeds.¹ But many Churchmen hold opinions which might not be a disqualification to their joining any ordinary Nonconformist body. This work, however, does not deal with the questions between the Church and Dissent. The real question involved in the Oxford Movement was between the Established Church and the Church of Rome. Is there a Church? If so, where and what is it? Is the Church of Rome a Church of Christ and the English Church another? Are they two Churches, or do they in combination either with each other, or with each other and, say, the Greek and other Churches, make up the entire Church of Christ? How far do variations from or corruptions of the original faith and practice, if and so far as they can be now ascertained, disqualify any body from being deemed to be the Church or part of the Church of Christ? Wide questions are involved in these considerations, and the difficulty in dealing with them arises partly from the nature of the subject, and partly from the nature and quality of the materials from which the details of the original faith and practice of

¹ See Note A. J. A. Froude on Dogma.

the Church must be ascertained. The principal of these materials, the writings of "the Fathers," although they contain a large body of literature, only begin at a considerable distance of time from the death of Christ, although the space is now fore-shortened by time, and are naturally, from their scattered origins and im-methodical and rather miscellaneous characters, very difficult to understand or to systematise.

2. There is, however, no doubt that after the death of Christ His teaching spread rapidly, and a body of men holding that teaching, and also believing in His supernatural character and career, rapidly grew up. Scattered disciples spread the faith here and there, and accordingly bodies of Christians calling themselves the Church of this place or that gradually were formed—probably for a long time with no definite co-relationship with each other. The Church at Rome, however, seems from obvious reasons to have gradually overshadowed and dominated the Churches in the other centres and assumed to itself the headship of Christianity, and its bishop claimed to be head of the Christian Church itself. A Church existed and flourished in England

many hundred years before the Norman Conquest, but to what extent the Anglo-Saxon Church allowed the interference of Rome is matter of great dispute, but whether the interference was great or small there was no distinction between Church and State before the Conquest. William the Conqueror and Archbishop Lanfranc made great changes. The authority of the Pope was recognised. Special Romish doctrines such as transubstantiation were disseminated, and the ecclesiastical and secular courts were separated, it being arranged that civil matters should be decided by civil courts and ecclesiastical matters by ecclesiastical courts, and of course the boundaries of their jurisdiction being ill-defined this led to frequent misunderstandings and disputes, and accordingly we find a constant struggle by the secular power to resist the interference of the Bishop of Rome in the internal affairs of this country. Concurrently with this struggle, the corruption, religious and moral of the Church, as governed by and identified with Rome, had continuously increased until at last came the Reformation, and this event, or series of events, the Englishman

looks upon as constituting a point from which the English Church made a distinct and new departure. For what did the Reformation do? It is supposed to have purified the Church of Christ in this country from the corruptions, or some of the corruptions, of Rome, to have abolished its headship and control, and to have placed under the control of the secular Government, in the last resort, the enumeration and statement of those dogmas, which whether essential or not to salvation, were to be essential to holding office and preferment in the English Church. What the Reformation did in fact effect, and how it was done, are questions much too complicated for this book to discuss at length. Large works have been written and angry discussions have taken place on the questions by persons apparently well qualified to discuss them, but who arrive at very different conclusions. There are, however, several points which seem fairly clear.

The difficulty men had to free their minds arose from the old idea at the bottom of the idea of the holy Roman Empire, that the State and Church were one, just as the body and

soul are one, but the insular position of England, the scandals of the papacy, and many other special circumstances had weakened and almost destroyed the idea in this country. The revival of learning which threw ridicule on the scholastic theology, and Luther's discussions which raised fundamental questions, opened men's minds wider to truer conceptions of State and Church, of what they were and what they ought to be, and to newer conceptions of the essentials of the Christian faith.

At the commencement of the reign of Henry VIII. the power and authority of the Roman Church were displayed and the dual authority of the Church and State accentuated by the style and authority of Cardinal Wolsey, and it is from his fall that the era of the Reformation really dates. Whether it was that Cromwell from a wide statesman's view, and Henry, on his advice, determined there should only be one authority in England in matters ecclesiastical as well as civil, or whether Henry, irritated by the resistance of the papacy to his divorce from Catherine, concluded that such a constitution would best bring about his desire for a union with Anne Boleyn, or whether an

avaricious desire to appropriate the revenues of the Church was the determining factor, are interesting questions. Probably all the motives had their effect. It is certain that neither Cromwell nor Henry was influenced in the course he took by any desire to arrive at or promote religious truth. Their object was secular, and was to unite the civil and ecclesiastical powers in one hand, perhaps for the greater peace and benefit of this country, perhaps for the greater glory and power of the Tudor dynasty and the removal of any obstacle to fulfilment of the immediate desire of the king, perhaps for the wealth to be so acquired or controlled. The measures taken were, however, clear, drastic and business-like in the extreme.

3. By the Act 23 Henry VIII., c. 20, affirmed by Henry by Letters Patent in pursuance of the Act, the annates or first-fruits, being the first year's profits of every archbishopric and bishopric, were no longer to be paid to Rome, and by 26 Henry VIII., c. 3, was granted to the Crown for ever not only the first-fruits or first year's produce of all bishoprics, benefices and other clerical preferments, but also a tenth

part of the annual revenues of such preferments. These Acts largely stopped the enormous drain of money from England to Rome, and the fund known as "Queen Anne's Bounty for the augmentation of the livings of the poorer clergy" was nearly 200 years after derived from the first-fruits and tenths. Acts were also passed by Henry by virtue of which many monasteries were suppressed and their lands confiscated.

There were four great Acts in the reign of Henry VIII. by which the change was mainly effected.

(1) By the Act of Appeals (24 Henry VIII., c. 12) testamentary, matrimonial and divorce causes, and rights of tithes, oblations and obventions, were from thenceforth to be heard and determined within the king's jurisdiction and not elsewhere—in such courts spiritual and temporal as the nature of the causes should require, and no papal or other foreign citations, processes, interdicts or excommunications were to be regarded.

(2) By the Act of Submission (25 Henry VIII., c. 19) no new canons were to be made in convocation without the royal licence, and

it was also provided that no manner of appeals should be made to Rome, but all manner of appeals should be made in accordance with the Act of Appeals, and as the ultimate appeal mentioned in that Act was to the archbishop, the Act of Submission provided a further appeal from any court of the archbishop to the king in the Court of Chancery, to be heard by commissioners named by the king. This ultimate jurisdiction is now vested in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

(3) The Election of Bishops Act (25 Henry VIII., c. 20) provided that no archbishop or bishop was to be presented to the Bishop of Rome, and also provided for the election, confirmation and consecration of archbishops and bishops.

(4) The Archiepiscopal Licences Act (25 Henry VIII., c. 21) provided that the Archbishop of Canterbury might grant any licence or dispensation which the Pope had been in the habit of granting for causes not being contrary to the Scriptures or the Law of God. It is by virtue of this Act that the Archbishop of Canterbury now grants special licences for marriage at any time and place.

Henry moreover passed an Act of Supremacy (26 Henry VIII., c. 1) which enacted that the kings of this realm should be taken and accepted and reputed "the only Supreme head in earth of the Church of England," but this Act was repealed by Queen Mary, and not afterwards revived.¹

These measures completely freed the English Church from the authority of Rome, and all details of internal affairs became subject to the control of the State. Although Henry and his advisers were not influenced by any desire to arrive at precise theological truth, there were many men in the Church who, awakened by the revival of learning, by the dissemination of the Scriptures, owing to the labours of Tyndale and others, by the teaching of Luther, Calvin and other reformers, and by conviction of the gross abuses of Rome, regarded these measures as steps by means of which a reformed religion might be established

¹ See Note B at the end of this chapter for Dr. Tulloch's view of the character of the English Reformation. See also the Thirty-seventh Article and the Declaration prefixed to the Articles for a statement of the position of the King as Governor of the Church and his relation to Convocation.

in this country. The separation from Rome involved two great struggles—one respecting the shape of the formularies and Articles of belief of the separated English Church, and the other respecting conformity to those formularies and Articles, and incidentally the right of religious belief in this country.

In the reign of Edward VI. two Acts of Uniformity were passed, each accompanied by a Book of Common Prayer in English, the use of which was enjoined. The first book, 1549, speaks of the Communion Service as “The Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion commonly called The Mass,” but in the second book, 1552, among other alterations in a Protestant direction, the use of the word “Mass” is discontinued, and it never reappeared in the Prayer-book. In Edward’s reign too it was enacted that the administration of the Sacrament should be in both kinds and that the marriage of priests be permitted.

Queen Mary having repealed the Reformation Acts in force at her accession, the statutes against foreign jurisdiction were revived by Queen Elizabeth by the Act 1 Elizabeth, c. 1, with the exception of Henry’s Act of Suprem-

acy (26 Henry VIII., c. 1), which so continued repealed. Elizabeth also passed an Act of Uniformity (1 Elizabeth, c. 2) which revived with some alterations the second Prayer-book of Edward VI., *e.g.*, the two sentences of the first and second books of Edward VI. were combined into the present form of administration of Holy Communion. The great Act of Elizabeth's reign was the Act (13 Elizabeth, c. 12) entitled "An Act to reform certain disorders touching Ministers of the Church," which required clerical subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles agreed upon by Convocation in 1562, for the avoiding of diversities of opinions and for the Stablishing of Consent touching true religion. The declaration prefixed by Charles I. to the Thirty-nine Articles was drawn up by Archbishop Laud in 1628, and is added to the Prayer-book prescribed by the Act of Uniformity of 1662. Omitting discussion of the canons of 1603 or of the Hampton Court Revision in 1604 of the Prayer-book, the great Act of Uniformity of 1662 (14 Charles II., c. 4) required the use of the Book of Common Prayer as we now have it (qualified by the Amendment Act of 1872),

and which is in fact the Elizabethan Book of Common Prayer with certain additions and alterations presented by the convocations of Canterbury and York. The additions and alterations were numerous, but not of radical importance.

The first struggle thus resulted in the Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-nine Articles substantially as we now have them. They are obviously a compromise between the mere lay statesmen and the religious reformers who desired to embody in the formularies and Articles those principles and doctrines which are commonly called Protestant as opposed to Romish on the one hand or Latitudinarian on the other.¹

The other consequential struggle arose from the idea that the secular and religious authorities were necessarily one. There was one State and one Church. The idea that each unit of the State should be at liberty to formulate his own belief and his own form of worship was scarcely conceivable then, but that right which really included the right to have teachers

¹ See Notes C and D at the end of this chapter for an Anglican view of the origin of the Prayer-book and Articles.

of those special views was gradually conceded, and it is only within comparatively recent times that religious disabilities which assumed that every one who did not conform was for many purposes outside the civil pale have been practically removed. It was only after a great struggle that the London University was authorised, and a still greater struggle that Oxford and Cambridge were thrown open. The struggle for uniformity is not yet settled, but it is now mainly between persons who all profess to be members of the Established Church.

The Movement which so broadened down to religious toleration and almost to religious equality was not an isolated Movement. Contemporaneously a struggle went on for civil liberty and equality, and in the life of the community it is impossible to sever the two movements. And a third influence quieter and more insidious was the increase of learning, especially in history, philosophy and the physical sciences. All these together make modern history a very complicated study, and it is absolutely impossible to divide it into compact and separate departments.

The Tudor period, when the modern Movement really began, is marked by disturbances, as might be expected when changes of such far-reaching importance were begun and attempted to be developed. Persecutions and counter-persecutions were the natural phenomena of the time, there being little doubt that the Government of the time was influenced mainly by political motives, while many, perhaps most of the sufferers, were martyrs who suffered for conscience' sake.

4. In the Stuart period the political struggle with Rome was practically over, but with weak kings and the strong development of Protestantism, aided by the political mistakes of Charles I. and James II., the flight of James left the Established Church in possession of power, but with great liberty to Nonconformists and a Crown resting on a Parliamentary title. In this period Romanism had been stunned, but there were many divines who taught what they considered to be Catholic doctrines, but which to the rabid Independent were not distinguishable from those of Rome, especially those respecting the authority of the Church, the Apostolical Succession and

the efficacy of the Sacraments. The divine right of kings was naturally a burning question during this period, but little was heard of it after the reign of Anne. The divines just referred to may be regarded as the founders of the modern High Church branch of the Church of England. The other conformists who took no special part may be looked on as the general body of the Church, but not Low Church as now understood. The Broad Church may perhaps have had some historical origin in the interesting men known as the Cambridge Platonists. During the time of the Georges the Church sank into a state of sloth and lethargy, theological learning was in decay, the services were slackly performed. It was mainly a machinery by which a moderate living was provided for moderate men from whom very moderate things were expected. The laity did not expect any great learning or spiritual fervour from their clergy, but they desired to be baptised, married and buried according to the ritual of the Church, and it was good form to attend once a week to hear the Church Service read. The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge

were practically dead. There were, however, here and there in country livings and among the Fellows of colleges traditions preserved of the old High Church doctrines and of the old broad views, but it was not until Wesley's day that life began to move again in the Church. Wesley, a Church of England clergyman, and his followers impressed strenuously on the minds of the people the importance of the question, What shall I do to be saved? Its answer, Justification by Faith, was simple. He undoubtedly woke up the spiritual life of the country, though his teaching and measures led ultimately to an organisation separate from that of the Established Church. The few representatives of the High Church and Broad Church despised the Wesleyans for their enthusiasm and ignorance, forgetting that they themselves were little but dead bones. The destruction of baronial power by the wars of the Roses and the Tudors, and the political movements in the reigns of the Stuarts which completely curbed the kingly power, had resulted in making the government of this country a Constitutional Monarchy. The king was no doubt the head, but he could

only act on the advice of his responsible ministers, and they were responsible to and removable by Parliament. The theory of the divine right of kings could not survive the Act of Settlement. The whole theory of Government rested on a contract between king and people.

5. The wars which began with William of Orange and ended with Waterloo prevented much attention being given to the solution of political problems, but the exhaustion of the country consequent on that prolonged struggle, the enormous misery of the mass of the people, and the partial destruction of respect for the throne which had taken place during the reign of the Georges, had brought the country to such a perilous state that responsible statesmen had no alternative between revolution and parliamentary reform, and hence the Reform Bill of 1832 was at last passed. The great Reform Act of 1832, which on the face of it merely reformed the House of Commons, was really a great revolution. It marked the end of the oligarchical period, when the government of the country was really in the hands of the aristocratic and landed classes, mainly

belonging to the Church of England, who filled the House of Lords, and by their influence controlled the Lower House. The Reform Act, however, by abolishing pocket boroughs, by extending the suffrage, and by redistribution, placed power in the hands of the middle classes largely imbued with the Nonconformist spirit, and was the beginning of the political movements whose aim was political and religious equality. The Reform Act was a new departure, as important politically as the measures of Henry VIII. severing the English Church from Rome were important ecclesiastically. If any one did not appreciate the importance of the political movement, the measures proposed by the first reformed Parliament must have been a rather rude awakening. The Reform Act of 1832 was however no isolated movement. The stupendous political, social and religious eruption known as the French Revolution had not merely obliterated the ancient political, social and religious organisation of France, but had set free an enormous amount of speculation which spread over all Europe and largely destroyed the old acquiescence of men in things

as they were, and led them to inquire more carefully into the foundations of Society and of Religion itself, and thus caused enormous alarm among those who considered themselves to be the guardians of social order and of the means of salvation. The wildest speculations, political, social and religious, were the common-places of the day.

In the endeavour to ascertain the state of affairs in 1832, attention has been drawn to the two lines of development in English history, ecclesiastical and political, but the other quieter and more insidious influences arising from the discovery of printing and the consequent dissemination of knowledge must not be overlooked. Bacon first taught men to look at phenomena from the real scientific point of view, that is the inductive, and although his philosophy appears to have lain dormant for many years because the necessary materials had not been accumulated, the spirit was there and worked. The Deistic controversies had accustomed men to discuss abstruse theological dogmas from rather wider points of view than had in earlier ages been possible. Locke had brought a great deal of hard

common sense to bear in his theory that all knowledge was acquired through the senses. Gibbon had shown how history should be studied and written, and had incidentally insinuated that many Christian beliefs were mere illusions. Scott, by his romanticism, had helped to teach men to throw themselves into remoter periods, and try to see them as the men of those periods did. Germany, by a succession of philosophers whose teaching showed that Locke and his school had taken too hard and narrow a view, and that there were more things in the intellect and soul than had been dreamt of in that narrow school, had done useful service, and although almost entirely unknown at first hand in this country, the speculations of S. T. Coleridge had to some extent familiarised the minds of reading men in this country with some of the results of German philosophy.

6. The Act of 1832 not merely transferred power from the aristocratic and landed classes to the middle and possibly soon to the lower classes, but opened a vista of immediate consequential radical reform in Church and State, one of the first of which was the proposed

suppression of some at least of the many bishoprics in Ireland. The only seats of liberal education in this country, Oxford and Cambridge, were closed to all except members of the Established Church. As institutions for the promotion of sound learning they were practically extinct, as seminaries of religious teaching they were asleep.¹ Although toleration of religious belief was now allowed and active persecution was practically at an end, Nonconformity was heavily handicapped in the race of life. The Established Church itself, safe for many years in possession, had practically gone to sleep. As before stated, here and there a little of the old High Church learning and feeling had survived, in other places a little of the old broad or platonist feeling, in many more places such teaching as there was was Evangelical, caught from the fervour of Wesleyanism, but in the vast majority of places there was a dull performance of the services without learning, without enthusiasm, one might almost say without belief, certainly without any active vivifying influence. The only survival of real

¹ See Note E to this chapter on the state of Oxford.

religious belief, and of active religious teaching, seemed to be in the Nonconformist bodies, and mainly in the Methodist Societies which had now assumed almost the dimensions and position of a Church. To appreciate more accurately, however, the intellectual and spiritual outlook of the time, it is necessary to subtract the achievements of the Victoria Era. The great conquests of physical science, the molecular theory, the theory of the correlation of physical forces, the theory of evolution, the discoveries of biology, the comparative study of institutions, political and religious, the study of the Sacred Books of the East, the investigation of the origin of the Old and New Testament and their critical study, the new philosophy,—all these things must be taken into account and subtracted from the present mass of knowledge and theory, before we can fully appreciate and estimate the emptiness and ignorance of the learning of the earlier times. Speaking generally of the leaders of the Movement, Professor Jowett (*W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement*, p. 432) says: “None of the leaders were I think at that time acquainted with German except

Dr. Pusey, who employed his knowledge for the most part in the refutation of the old German Rationalism. To say the truth, the learning of that day was of a rather attenuated sort. The energy and ability of that generation were out of all proportion to their attainments. Hardly any one had read the works of Kant and Hegel which have since exercised a great influence upon Oxford study. Very little was known of Plato. The philosophy of that day was contained in Aristotle's *Ethics* and *Rhetoric* and in Butler's *Analogy* and *Sermons*."

It was in this state of things that the Oxford Movement began.

NOTE A.

MR. J. A. FROUDE ON PIETY AND DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

History of England, vol. ix., c. 16, pp. 301-2.

“The rules of life as delivered in the Gospels were too simple and too difficult : too simple, because men could not thus readily shake off the dark associations which had grown around the idea of the Almighty ; too difficult, because the perfect goodness thus assigned to Him admitted no compromise, refused the Ritualistic contrivances which had been the substitute for practical piety, and exacted imperatively the sacrifice which man ever found most difficult—the sacrifice of himself. Thus for the religion of Christ was exchanged the Christian religion. God gave the gospel ; the father of lies invented theology ; and while the duty of obedience was still

preached, and the perfect goodness of the Father in heaven, that goodness was resolved into a mystery of which human intelligence was not allowed to apprehend the meaning. The highest obedience was conceived to lie in the profession of particular dogmas on inscrutable problems of metaphysics, the highest disobedience in the refusal to admit propositions, which neither those who drew them, nor those to whom they were offered, professed to be able to understand. Forgiveness and mercy were proclaimed for moral offences ; the worst sins were made light of in comparison with heresy ; while it was insisted that the God of love, revealed by Christ, would torture in hell-fire for ever and for ever the souls of those who had held wrong opinions on the composition of His nature, however pure and holy their lives and conversation might be."

NOTE B.

DR. TULLOCH ON THE SPECIAL CHARACTER OF
THE ENGLISH REFORMATION.

Rational Theology, p. 37.

“The Reformation in England was singular amongst the great religious movements of the sixteenth century. It was the least heroic of them all—the least swayed by religious passion, or moulded and governed by spiritual and theological necessities. From a general point of view, it looks at first little more than a great political change. The exigencies of royal passion, and the dubious impulses of statecraft, seem its moving and really powerful springs. But, regarded more closely, we recognise a significant train both of religious and critical forces at work. The lust and avarice of Henry, the policy of Cromwell, and the vacillation of the leading clergy, attract

prominent notice ; but there may be traced beneath the surface a widespread Evangelical fervour amongst the people, and, above all, a genuine spiritual earnestness and excitement of thought at the Universities.”

NOTE C.

THE PRAYER-BOOK.

Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*,
vol. xi., advt. p. x.

“During the Middle Ages our own Church was not in possession of a Book of Common Prayer. Various dioceses . . . adopted different formularies under the style of ‘Uses’. In the words of the Prayer-book there had been great diversity in saying and singing in the Churches of this realm, some following Salisbury use, some Hereford use, and some the use of Bangor, some of York, some of Lincoln. It was a grand idea to determine upon the adoption of one use for the entire Church. A step was taken in advance when the two Prayer-books of Edward VI. were adopted. But we may regard it as a providential mercy that the reformers of that reign were obliged to leave their work incomplete, for it is impossible

to conjecture the extent to which the weakness of Cranmer and his coadjutors would have carried them in the way of concession (especially when they called in the aid of foreigners) if they had not been stopped in their career. A wise course was adopted on the accession of Queen Elizabeth, at the instigation of Parker, when the Prayer-books of Edward VI. were made the basis of the public formularies adopted in the reign of the great Queen,—Parker not seeking to please foreigners or sects in communion with them, but to adhere to positive truth. The Prayer-book then established remained in force until its further and final reformation, through the Amendments adopted by the two Convocations of Canterbury and York, was ratified by the Act of Uniformity under King Charles II. The Prayer-book then reformed has continued unchanged until the present time.”

NOTE D.

THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES.

Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*,
vol. ix., p. 328.

“No wonder that complaint was . . . made of a diversity of preaching on the part of the preachers; nor are we surprised that in consequence of this complaint it was considered necessary, not indeed to devise a scheme of theology, but to take measures to create an agreement upon certain of the more prominent points of controversy, amongst those whose business it was to instruct a people whose ignorance was, taking the mass of them, profound. . . .

“This was the origin of the far-famed Thirty-nine Articles. Parker clearly understood the nature of the task which devolved upon him. He was not to draw up a new scheme of doctrine. It had been already ruled that, in the Church of England, the preachers were to

accept the tradition of the Church and to carry it on, except when synods, on comparing the tradition with Holy Scripture—the fallible tradition with the infallible Word of God—had found the tradition to be at fault. Amid the entangled web of human controversy Parker had to point out what, in their teaching, the preachers were to avoid; or if there was recourse, in any instance, to dogma, it was simply because it was only by a statement of fact that the nature of a controversy could be debated. Certain things the English clergy were not to teach, because, upon those particular points, the Church of England had spoken authoritatively; beyond this there was liberty. They were not to inquire what Luther or Calvin opined, but what the Church in all ages had taught, and what the English Church in her late synods, held under the authority of the sovereign, had decreed.

“That the Thirty-nine Articles were intended to be articles of peace is an assertion which cannot be substantiated by history. There was no immediate attempt to force men to concur in opinion; this Parker knew to be an impossibility; the desire was to prevent them

from disputing in public, by showing that on certain controverted points the Church, in synod, had given judgment ; and men were called to act modestly by ' hearing the Church '. That the Thirty-nine Articles as drawn up by Parker were controversial articles we may admit—we may even contend ; but, as we have shown, the controversy was not directed against the Catholic party, as is sometimes supposed. The Catholics were in possession of most of the Churches ; the Romanists, using the word in its strict sense, had already left the Church—that is, those who insisted upon the papal supremacy had quitted their preferments and had gone abroad ; a large party, the vast majority of the clergy, remained in the English Church, reprobating popery, but retaining a love for mediæval practices if not always for mediæval doctrine, and among those there were some who were willing to abjure allegiance to the Pope, but who could not make up their minds to take the oath of royal supremacy as tendered by the Government. This large body of both clergy and laity Cecil, as a statesman, had no wish to offend ; the Queen had an abhorrence of

Calvin and the Calvinistic tenets; and the Archbishop himself was accused, and he admitted to a certain extent the justice of the charge, that he treated this body of men with leniency; he declined when they conducted themselves peaceably to press upon them the Oath of Supremacy. Add to this what has been before affirmed, that all political parties were at this time afraid, not of the Catholics, but of the ultra-Protestants, and it will be admitted that when modern controversialists would assume an exclusive Protestant character for the Thirty-nine Articles, they speak from conjecture, not from history. So far from denying that they are opposed to much which is now called Romanism, the historian must affirm it; but his affirmation must be equally strong, that they are in the same degree opposed to much which in these days would be regarded as Protestantism.

“The Articles will never be clearly understood unless their strictly controversial character, as well as their position in combating the two extremes, be fully admitted. They are sometimes censured as containing an imperfect statement of doctrine; this criticism,

however, vanishes when, on an appeal to history, it is found that no general statement of doctrine was intended, and that a statement on certain controverted points of theology or religious practice then in vogue was all that was intended, as, indeed, it is all that we find. To the careless reader it may appear that this statement is contradicted by the first five Articles; but upon examination it will be found that they had a controversial aspect, and stand opposed, not to Romanism, much less to Catholicism, but to ultra-Protestantism. The Nicene doctrine, so clearly stated in the Articles, was accepted by Catholics of every shade of opinion, whether *Anglo* Catholics or *Roman* Catholics; they were when not opposed only partially accepted by ultra-Protestants, of whom the Queen and statesmen who now imposed the Articles had a just abhorrence—the Anabaptists, the Arians, the Libertines, and ‘Unitarians’ of every form; and to these perhaps the learned reader will add the Calvinists, for although Calvin accepted the doctrine of the Trinity, he did not receive the Nicene definition of that Divine truth—the definition adopted in the Articles.”

NOTE E.

STATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD BEFORE THE ACCESSION OF QUEEN VICTORIA.

Article by Mr. C. A. Fyffe in *The Reign of Queen Victoria* (Smith, Elder & Co., 1887), vol. ii., pp. 288, 291.

“It may be doubted whether any so-called learned society, professing at the same time to be an educational body, ever sank lower than the University of Oxford in the last century. There were, no doubt, throughout the worst times some few men who privately pursued study; but when this has been said, all has been said. The University and the Colleges neither taught, nor maintained discipline, nor examined. The professors had, with rare exceptions, ceased to lecture; there was no examination for degrees; there were no distinctions for merit—within the Colleges the Fellowships were with some few exceptions

appropriated to persons born in particular localities, or educated at particular schools, or connected by descent with the founder; moreover, the great majority of Fellows were bound to be clergymen. The scholarships were in part attached to schools, the remainder were usually bestowed by favour, as pieces of private patronage. In some cases, as at New College, the nomination to a school scholarship carried with it the certainty of a College scholarship and fellowship; such nominations were therefore sought as soon as a child was born, and the Fellow of New College was in fact appointed in his cradle. Every undergraduate on matriculation was compelled to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles, and to declare himself a member of the Church of England. The University was thus closed to Nonconformists. Most of those who came up, came with the view of taking orders, and the University was regarded both within and without as in the main a training place for the clergy. But the instruction given amounted to little or nothing; life was loose and coarse, and at the end of three or four years' residence a man might take his degree and go away with

no more knowledge than he brought up with him. Among the resident Fellows there was scarcely a pretence of learning or of the love of it. They were dull, often hard-drinking men, who had gained their posts without exertion, and held them without profit to themselves or others, waiting for the time when a college living should enable them to marry and to devote their days to domestic ease.

“It was at the beginning of the present century that light began to break in upon these dark places. It was felt to be a scandalous thing that the University should give its degrees without any examination; and the first step in reform was the establishment of an examination for the B.A. degree, accompanied by the publication of the names of the twelve men who had most distinguished themselves. This rudimentary separation of the sheep from the goats soon afterwards developed into the Honour Lists in Classics and Mathematics; and from this time the spirit of emulation, though working in a comparatively narrow circle and under many discouraging conditions, brought back to Oxford elements of vitality which had been absent for generations. Peel, Keble, Arnold, Whately, Milman,

adorned the early class-lists. Ere long the better Colleges began to think of opening their Fellowships to general competition. Whether there existed any authority but the legislature which could legally alter the existing statutes with antiquated preferences and restrictions, was more than doubtful. Two Colleges, however, took the law into their own hands. Oriel, throwing open its Fellowships, made itself the home of a body of men of whom many were destined to leave their mark on English life. Balliol, opening its scholarships as well as its Fellowships, gained an educational pre-eminence which it retains to this day. Beyond this reform did not far extend. The Tractarian Movement, which began soon after 1832, gave indeed a certain stimulus to learning, but it was primarily to learning of a theological kind. . . . At the accession therefore of Queen Victoria, Oxford had indeed risen some degrees above the low-water mark to which it had sunk under the Georges. Men of eminence were not wanting to it. Its studies, however, were still narrow, its constitution radically bad, its usefulness restricted to members of the Church of England, its spirit exclusive and ecclesiastical."

CHAPTER II.

THE LEADERS.

WHATELY—KEBLE—FROUDE—NEWMAN—
PUSEY—AND OTHERS.

WITHOUT attempting anything in the nature of biography, it may nevertheless be useful to give an introductory sketch down to the commencement of the Movement of the more distinguished men whose names are associated with it.

1. Archbishop Whately would have been very much surprised if it had been suggested to him that his name would be mentioned in this connection, since he left Oxford for Dublin in 1831, and regarded both Evangelicalism and Ecclesiasticism as mere forms of bigotry, but he undoubtedly helped to create an atmosphere in Oxford which rendered the Movement possible.

Whately was born in 1787, the son of a

Prebendary of Bristol; he was educated privately, entered Oriel in 1805, took a double second in 1808, became Fellow in 1811, and married in 1821. In 1822 he left Oxford for the living of Halesworth in Suffolk, but returned in 1825, when he was appointed Principal of St. Alban Hall. He was appointed Archbishop of Dublin in 1831, and then finally left Oxford. He was an oddity with ability and force and complete freedom from conventionality. In his early Oxford days he was known as the "White Bear," from his white hat, rough white coat, and huge white dog. Later on he gave amusement to the public and scandal to the Dons by exhibiting in Christchurch Meadow the exploits of his dog "Sailor," a large spaniel whom he had taught to climb the high trees hanging over the Cherwell, from which it would often drop into the river below. He was a great eater and smoker, and a loud talker. At St. Alban's he used to lecture his undergraduates lying on a sofa with one leg over the back or end. He was not a student nor an accomplished scholar. His range of reading was narrow, but his favourite authors were suggestive and fur-

nished ready texts which gave employment to his powers of thought, and of tracing out ideas in all their ramifications. Stuart Mill in speaking of Whately's philosophical investigations, and in language apparently adopted by Whately's biographer, says: "Of all persons in modern times entitled to the name of philosophers, the two, probably, whose reading was the scantiest in proportion to their intellectual capacity were Archbishop Whately and Dr. Brown. But though indolent readers they were both of them active and fertile thinkers." His final test being common sense, the regions of imagination and taste scarcely existed for him. The daily occupation of his brain was to seize on some notion of what he considered a practical order, to follow it out and to bring it home turned from a mere germ into a complete production. Where Whately was, there was everlasting discussion on Politics, Philosophy, Church Constitution, Church Doctrine, and other subjects which might for the time interest academic circles. He was perpetually "chopping logic" either with himself or the companions whom he used as anvils upon which to hammer his thoughts into shape.)

His position as a Churchman was somewhere between the High Churchman and the Low Churchman. His common sense rejected the dogmas of the one as not justified by sufficiently clear authority, and despised the intangible and emotional creed of the other. Oriel College in Whately's time contained, according to the Rev. Thomas Mozley,¹ some of the most distinguished personages, the most vigorous minds, and the most attractive characters in Oxford. Its most prominent talkers, preachers, and writers, says Mr. Mozley, "seemed to be always undermining if not actually demolishing received traditions and institutions," and in this new Oriel sect—the Noetic as it was called—Whately was one of the pre-eminent. Mr. Mark Pattison says:² "The Noetics knew nothing of the philosophical movement which was taking place on the Continent; they were imbued neither with Kant nor Rousseau, yet this knot of Oriel men was distinctly the product of the French Revolution. They called everything in question; they appealed to first principles and disallowed

¹ *Reminiscences*, vol. i., pp. 18, 19.

² *Memoirs*, p. 79.

authority as a judge in intellectual matters. There was a wholesome intellectual ferment constantly maintained in the Oriel Common-room." Whately's real contribution to the Movement was the creation of an atmosphere of discussion in which traditions, institutions and doctrines were freely discussed and their origin and authority looked into. Whately was a voluminous writer, and as a man was honest, straight and free from any trace of meanness.

2. In the same year, 1811, that Whately was elected Fellow of Oriel, there was also elected Fellow of the same College a youth not quite nineteen named John Keble, a striking contrast in many respects to Whately. Keble was born in 1792, being thus eight years older than Dr. Pusey (1800), nine than Newman (1801), and eleven than Hurrell Froude (1803). He was the elder son of a Gloucestershire country clergyman of some family with Cavalier and Nonjuring traditions, and a man of character and scholarship, who prepared both his sons for Oxford. John Keble entered Corpus Christi College early in 1807, having gained a scholarship the previous December,

and in 1810, when little over eighteen, he obtained a double first in Classics and Mathematics, and in April, 1811, just before his nineteenth birthday, he was elected to an open Fellowship at Oriel. In the following year he gained both the Chancellor's essays, the English and the Latin. For some years he was employed with private pupils and after his ordination in parochial work, but in 1818 he was appointed tutor at Oriel, and so remained till 1823, when he left Oxford for a curacy near his father, and after some time took the small living of Hursley, where he remained till his death.

When Keble left Oxford in 1823 he was followed by several pupils—Robert Wilberforce, Isaac Williams (afterwards curate to Newman) and Hurrell Froude, afterwards Fellow and Tutor of Oriel, and the link between Keble and Newman.

Keble, shy, modest and country-bred, had come up to Oxford, as Dr. Pusey said, "a fresh, glad, bright, joyous boy". As a tutor in the society of the pupils who joined him in the country, his nature expanded and their intercourse was free, affectionate, joyous and play-

ful. The gardener's comment was : " There is master, the greatest boy of them all ".

At Oxford, although he was as Newman said the first man in Oxford, he was absolutely free from common pride. He was from the first, what he always remained, shy, modest, unambitious. He pushed no claims. The only piece of ecclesiastical promotion which came in his way was the Archdeaconry of Barbados, offered him in 1824 by Bishop Coleridge. He would probably have accepted gladly the Provostship of Oriel, vacant in 1827 through Copleston's appointment as Bishop of Llandaff and Dean of St. Paul's. The headship lay between Hawkins and Keble, but Hawkins was a resident tutor in full work, also a double first class man and a man of a shrewd practical wisdom and keenness. The balance was turned against Keble by Newman and Pusey, neither of whom then knew Keble intimately, and in the end Keble withdrew from the candidateship. Keble was not, however, the completely perfect man his admirers and biographers would represent him to have been. His training, says the Rev. Thomas Mozley,¹

¹ *Reminiscences*, vol. i., p. 219.

“had not that admixture of roughness which is necessary to fit a man for the work of the world. He could only live in a calm and sweet atmosphere of his own. He had not the qualities for controversy and debate which are necessary for any kind of public life. He very soon lost his temper in discussion. It is true there were one or two in our College who might have tried the temper of an angel, but there was really no getting on with Keble without entire agreement, that is submission.” In later life this frame of mind developed into something like a modified feeling of papal infallibility.

In 1831 he undertook to edit Hooker's works, and towards the end of the year he was elected Professor of Poetry. His theory was (letter to Sir J. T. Coleridge, 13th Feb., 1832) to consider poetry as a vent for overcharged feelings, or a full imagination, and so account for the various classes into which poets naturally fall, by reference to the various objects which are apt to fill and overpower the mind so as to require a sort of relief. Then there would come in a grand distinction between what he called primary and second-

ary poets, the first poetising for their own relief, the second for any other reason. The principal poets are examined by this test and classed accordingly. The lectures were delivered in Latin and have never been translated. It cannot be said that they ever attracted much notice, partly because the audience must have been very limited, but mainly because there was nothing very striking or original in the subject or its treatment by him beyond what any man of Keble's knowledge, reading and general culture might be expected to produce when set down to perform a task. However, the professorship did fulfil what Keble's friends had in view. During its continuance it naturally brought him up from his country cure, renewed his acquaintance with Oxford and Oxford men, and extended and consolidated his influence as an unworldly scholar and a loyal and devoted priest of the Anglican Church. It was moreover a recognition of Keble's poetical claims as the author of *The Christian Year*, the work by which he will most probably be longest remembered and most recognised. In that age writing verses was looked upon as a

natural accomplishment for a cultured person. We are told that Warren Hastings, after his retirement, frequently presented his guests at breakfast with a copy of verses he had composed over-night. Keble had been practising the art for a long time, but the work began about 1819, and was only first published in 1827. He was first and last a Churchman. Mr. Herbert Paul, in the third volume of his *History of Modern England*, says: "There are some men for whom the Church of England is too large, and others for whom it is too small. It was exactly the right size for Mr. Keble." With some allowance for rhetorical effort this fairly describes Keble's attitude towards the Church during his whole life, and it was only natural that his verse should be coloured with those views. He would be repelled if not disgusted by the hysterical outbursts of Methodism, and would have no sympathy with the deadness of feeling shown by other extremes in the Church. Verses were written as he felt called upon to give expression to his ideas, with the result that when collected into a volume they were properly entitled *The Christian Year; Thoughts*

in Verse for the Sundays and Holydays throughout the Year. And the note which is fairly carried out is expressed in the advertisement: "That next to a sound rule of faith there is nothing of so much consequence as a sober standard of feeling in matters of practical religion; and it is the peculiar happiness of the Church of England to possess in her authorised formularies an ample and secure provision for both," and it refers to that *soothing* tendency in the Prayer-book which it was the chief purpose of those pages to exhibit. There are many beauties in *The Christian Year*, but Keble can hardly be called a great poet. He might be called a Nature poet, for he has painted with great tenderness many views of the gentle English landscape and learnt much from Wordsworth and his school. The country atmosphere permeates his verse, and a main object seems to have been to expound the lessons written in the book of earth and sky, but the outside world with its doubts, perplexities and despair is outside his range. After leaving Oxford, Keble gave his spare time to the study of general and theological writings and patristic literature, and began

the study of Hebrew. He was obviously much impressed by Butler's argument in the *Analogy* based on continuity, and his poems are filled with the same idea of continuity. It is this idea as opposed to the hysterical and arid parties in the Church which led him to lay so much stress on the soothing tendency of the Prayer-book. The great idea he strove to impress was that domestic feeling the Christian should entertain to his Maker and Redeemer. God was not a devouring being whom it was necessary to appease. He was the Father. We are His children. His house is the domestic abode of all who duly and reverently accept and obey His gentle rule. The verses, for example, in the Morning hymn :—

The trivial round, the common task,
Would furnish all we ought to ask ;
Room to deny ourselves ; a road
To bring us, daily, nearer God ;

and in the Evening hymn :—

When the soft dews of kindly sleep
My wearied eyelids gently steep,
Be my last thought, how sweet to rest
For ever on my Saviour's breast,

express the soothing continuous domesticity of home and duty Keble considered that the Church through its authorised forms expressed. The book was, and remains, an enormous success, and joined with his great academical reputation, and his known soundness in the faith, and his self-denying character, gave him immense weight in Oxford and in the Church, and so he was selected to preach the Assize Sermon on the 14th July, 1833,—no doubt selected in the ordinary course as a distinguished man to discharge a somewhat ordinary duty,—but which he afterwards published under the title of “National Apostacy Considered,” and which Newman and others regarded as the commencement of the Movement. Down to this time, however, the only publication of Keble deserving any notice was *The Christian Year*, and he can hardly be described as a very High Churchman. He had not accepted the high Sacramental view adopted as the struggle proceeded, and the stanza—

O come to our Communion Feast :
 There present in the heart,
 Not in the hands, the Eternal Priest
 Will His true Self impart,

though altered after his death with his consent, given a few weeks before his death, into "As in the hands," rather shows that his natural spontaneous expression was not inclined to the objective presence.

3. Richard Hurrell Froude was the elder brother of the better known James Anthony Froude. Their father, Robert Hurrell Froude, was Rector of Dartington, and from 1820 on for many years Archdeacon of Totness in the Diocese of Exeter. Richard Hurrell Froude (commonly called Hurrell Froude), the eldest of eight children, was born in 1803, being about fifteen years older than Anthony. He is described from the first as a stormy kind of child, handsome and odd, and some say adored by his relatives. He seems really to have been an ill-conditioned and unmannerly kind of lad. His mother, in a letter written in 1820 to an imaginary correspondent, but really intended for Hurrell himself, describes him as "very much disposed to find his own amusement in teasing and vexing others, and almost entirely incorrigible when it was necessary to reprove him. . . . In all points of substantial principle his feelings were just

and high.”¹ And Mr. Paul, in his life of J. A. Froude, describes Hurrell Froude as harsh and cruel, and gives a number of instances of his almost incredible cruelty to his young brother Anthony. He was sent early to the Free School, Ottery St. Mary, under the Rev. George Coleridge, and then to Eton, where he remained until he matriculated at Oriel in April, 1821. His tutor was John Keble, and when Keble left Oriel for the Curacy of Southrop, he was followed by Hurrell Froude and later by Robert Wilberforce and Isaac Williams, as pupils—to read for their degrees. Hurrell Froude took his degree in December, 1823, a second class in Classics and Mathematics. Early in 1826 Hurrell Froude and Robert Wilberforce were elected Fellows of Oriel. The editor of Newman’s correspondence says the election was momentous to Mr. Newman, as bringing him into intimacy with the friend whose intimacy he ever felt powerful beyond all others to which he had been subject, and Newman, writing to his mother on 31st March, 1826, said, with some exaggeration, “Froude

¹ Guiney, *Life*, pp. 6, 7.

is one of the acutest and clearest and deepest men in the memory of man". Fellowships at Oriel depended not so much on what a man had read, or what honours he had taken, but on a man's whole momentum and equilibrium, not what he had read, but what he was like—originality and distinction were the test, and the Fellowships were thrown open to the whole University. Froude soon formed a deep friendship with Newman. Their view, like Keble's, that a tutorship involved a cure of souls, and not merely a routine of lectures, was not accepted by the new Provost Hawkins, with the result that the old tutors were by degrees left without pupils, Froude giving up the tutorship in 1830. Froude's health, however, giving signs of weakness, he went abroad in December, 1832, with his father and Newman. They visited Rome in April and saw Dr. Wiseman, when the Froudes returned to England, leaving Newman. On 25th July, 1833, the Hadleigh Conference began, at which Hurrell Froude was present, but not Keble or Newman. The impression Froude made on his friends and acquaintances was that he was not learned, but relied too much on his

own insight and reasoning, and was too hasty in coming to conclusions, and often intemperate in the expressing of them. Although it was evident that his health was still giving way, when Newman returned he plunged into the controversy by his side. The first tract was written by Newman in September, 1833, and Froude contributed four, though one is attributed to Newman. In October, 1833, Froude left England for Barbados, and after acting for some time as domestic chaplain to the bishop, he became mathematical master at Codrington College, but returned in March, 1835, and, after a few days at Oxford, returned to his country home, to die on 28th February, 1836. Besides the four *Tracts for the Times*, and a few casual contributions to magazines, he has practically left nothing except the *Remains*, collected by Newman and Keble in 1838 and 1839. Though not published by him and only collected by Keble and Newman, they were in the nature of a party manifesto. They consisted mainly of journals, diaries, memoranda, poems, sermons, ecclesiastical papers, and especially a history of the contest of Thomas à Becket with Henry II., and gave

great material for the opponents of the party to show the ascetical and ecclesiastical tendencies of the writer and his friends. Dr. Arnold's view is expressed in his letter to Dr. Hawkins dated 5th August, 1838: "I have read Froude's volume (*i.e.* vol. i. of *Remains*), and I think that its prominent character is extraordinary impudence. I never saw a more remarkable instance of that quality than the way in which he, a young man and a clergyman of the Church of England, reviles all those persons whom the accordant voice of that Church, without distinction of party, has agreed to honour, even perhaps with an excess of admiration." They are only referred to here for the purpose of showing something of the ideas of one who was so much regarded by Keble and Newman as Froude. It is otherwise a little difficult to see the immense prominence given to Hurrell Froude by all those who took part in or wrote in a friendly spirit about the Movement. Hurrell Froude himself said: "Do you know the story of the murderer who had done one good thing in his life? Well, if I was ever asked what good deed I had done, I should say I had

brought Keble and Newman to understand each other.”¹ Newman says (Apology): “Hurrell Froude was a pupil of Keble, formed by him, and in turn reacting upon him. He had an intellect critical and logical as it was speculative and bold. His opinions arrested and influenced me even when they did not gain my assent.” They became acquainted in 1826, and were in the closest and most affectionate friendship from about 1829 to his death in 1836. There can be no doubt that they acted and reacted on one another, and that Froude taught Newman or led him to accept much Catholic doctrine. Froude’s ideal was the Mediæval Church, with Thomas à Becket as the type. He looked on Liberalism and not the Pope as Antichrist and on the Church as supreme ruler of the world, and on the Reformation as a rebellion against authority. He delighted to describe himself as pushing his friends forward to do things, or a poker stirring up the fire burning in them, and which he was incapable physically of doing himself. He was no doubt a brilliant talker, consummate dialectician and ardent prose-

¹ *Remains*, vol. i., p. 438.

lytiser. Dean Church¹ says of him: "Like Henry Martyn he was made by strong and even merciless self-discipline over a strong and for a time refractory nature. He was a man of great gifts with much that was attractive and noble, but joined to this there was originally in his character a vein of perversity and mischief always in danger of breaking out, and with which he kept up a long and painful struggle. His inmost thoughts and knowledge of himself have been laid bare in the papers published after his death." Many of his friends considered him either directly, or indirectly, the real leader of the Movement. Dean Church, after referring to the Hadleigh Conference and the beginning of the Tracts, says: "Keble had given the inspiration, Froude had given the impulse; then Newman took up the work, and the impulse henceforward and the direction were his".²

4. John Henry Newman.—It is a natural question whether any one can be properly called the leader of the Movement. It was

¹ *The Oxford Movement*, by Dean Church, p. 36.

² *Ibid.*, p. 32.

probable, almost certain, that in the existing state of opinion and politics some considerable movement must occur and the men engaged in it are merely parts of the phenomena, but in this particular Movement the leadership seems to be seriously disputed only between the friends of Keble, Pusey and Newman respectively, and on the whole the consensus of opinion seems to be that Newman was most entitled to be called the leader.

John Henry Newman was born in the City of London on 21st February, 1801, the son of John Newman and Jemima Fourdrinier his wife, the eldest of six children, three boys and three girls. The Rev. Thomas Mozley, who married Harriet Newman, says: John Newman was of a family of small landed proprietors in Cambridgeshire, and had an hereditary taste for music of which he had a practical and scientific knowledge together with much general culture. He was chief clerk and afterwards partner in a banking firm in London which stopped payment early in 1819. He died 29th September, 1824. Dr. Wm. Barry in his work says the family was understood to be of Dutch origin, and

that its real descent was Hebrew, but he gives no evidence, except that in an earlier generation the family had spelt its signature Newmann, and he refers to his Jewish cast of features and intellectual qualities. The Fourdriniers were French by descent and Huguenots who after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes had settled in London as engravers and paper-makers, and had conformed to the Established Church. Mrs. Newman, says Dr. Barry, taught her children a "modified Calvinism," and they were expected at a proper age to go through the spiritual process known as "Conviction of sin," to be followed in due course by "Conversion," terms more familiar among English Dissenters of the Wesleyan type than among Churchmen. In a matter involving so much speculation, it would perhaps be safer to infer that as a matter of heredity and allowing for the father's musical tastes, John Henry Newman derived his brilliance as a writer and his love of and skill in music from the French side of his descent rather than from the very problematical Hebraic descent suggested by Dr. Barry. The two brothers, Francis William and Charles

Robert, were under great obligations to their elder brother, but their ultimate religious development led to painful personal and family estrangement. Francis, after obtaining a double first and going through various experiences, such as a missionary expedition to Persia, became a faddist, theist, and radical. He survived till 1877. Charles in early life became a convert to Robert Owen, the philanthropic Socialist, then called an Atheist, but he broke loose and tried to originate a "New Moral World" of his own. A clerkship in the Bank of England was obtained for him, but he failed to retain it. At his request he was sent to Bonn, but failed to take a degree, and owing to erratic tendencies bordering on the verge of insanity, all attempts to help him failed, and he was maintained till his death in 1884 by his two brothers and his brother-in-law, the Rev. Thos. Mozley. It is a curious speculation as to what led to this extreme and apparently erratic development in the three brothers—whether it arose from some want of mental ballast or the inexorable working out, to their conclusions, premises either unsound or incom-

plete, but the results in the three cases were certainly very curious. There was nothing remarkable about the three sisters. They remained members of the English Church in which they had been brought up; Harriet and Jemima were in sympathy with their eldest brother, and his frequent and regular correspondents. They looked up to him naturally with affectionate appreciation, but neither followed him to Rome. Harriet was married to the Rev. Thomas Mozley, and Jemima became the wife of John Mozley of Derby, while the youngest, Mary, died early. When John Henry Newman was about seven, he was sent by his father to the large private school at Ealing, Middlesex, kept by Dr. George Nicholas, of Wadham College, Oxford, and which reckoned about 300 pupils. He is said to have been a precocious, imaginative, sensitive boy who passed rapidly before the other pupils, but took no part in out-door games. Even then he was devoted to literature. In December, 1816, his father set out with him for Oxford, and when not quite sixteen he was matriculated at Trinity College, which Dr. Nicholas pronounced "most gentle-

manlike". In June, 1817, he went into residence and won a Trinity scholarship (£60 a year for nine years) in the following May. Early in 1819 his father's bank suspended payment, but after a month settled in full with its creditors, but thenceforth Newman's pecuniary prospects were much clouded. Newman was a hard worker, and with his great abilities his friends looked forward confidently to a brilliant degree, but when he went in for examination in November, 1820, he lost his head, broke down, and after vain attempts for several days, had to retire, only first making sure of his B.A. degree. His name did not appear at all on the mathematical side of the paper, and in classics it was found in the lower division of the second class of honours, which at that time went by the contemptuous title of "Under the line," there being as yet no third or fourth classes. The explanation was that he had over-read himself. In October, 1819, he wrote his mother that he was reading between eleven and twelve hours a day. He had dabbled in other things. With his friend Bowden he had published a poem, and carried on for some time a small

d/ periodical, and in the summer term of 1819 had attended Buckland's lectures on Geology. He had broken down before, and did so afterwards when examined, and being called up for his degree examination a day sooner than he expected, lost his head, with the result stated. There had been some idea of going to the Bar, and in 1819 he was entered at Lincoln's Inn,¹ and in 1819 and the beginning of 1820 he attended Modern History Lectures, but his failure in the schools making his prospects at the Bar doubtful, and his religious views becoming more pronounced, he decided in 1821 to take Orders.² His scholarship continuing for several years still, he remained at Oxford, and the year following the Degree Examination he devoted to more or less desultory reading—mineralogy, chemistry, music and the Scriptures—but from the time he thought of standing at Oriel, he gave considerable time

¹ He entered 19th November, 1819: "John Henry Newman of Oriel College, Oxford, Esq. (age eighteen). First son of John Newman of Southampton St., Esq." He left the society on his own petition 11th March, 1825, having paid absent Commons seven and a half years, but not having kept any terms for call to the Bar.

² *Letters*, p. 47.

to Latin composition, logic and natural philosophy. His friends heard with great surprise and doubt that he had determined to make an attempt for an Oriel Fellowship, but Newman never accepted his failure in the Degree Examination as the real measure of his powers. A reaction set in, and he determined to retrieve his position. His hopes were well founded, for to the surprise of his friends he was elected Fellow on 12th April, 1822, the messenger carrying the news finding him playing the violin. Newman¹ ever felt this 12th April, 1822, to be the turning point of his life, and of all days most memorable. It raised him from obscurity and need to competency and reputation. He never wished anything better or higher than in the words of the epitaph, "To live and die a Fellow of Oriel". Dr. Copleston in a letter to Dr. Hawkins, 2nd May, 1843, speaking of the defect of examinations as a test, says: "You remember Newman himself was an example; he was not even a good classical scholar, yet in mind and power of composition, and in taste and knowledge, he was decidedly su-

¹ *Letters*, p. 73.

perior to some competitors who were a class above him in the schools". Newman, speaking of the meeting with the Fellows, says: "I could bear the congratulations of Copleston, but when Keble advanced to take my hand I quite shrank, and could have shrunk into the floor, ashamed of so great an honour". His first difficulty as a Fellow was his extreme shyness. He did not at once find his place in the loud and constant argle-bargle of dialectic in the Common Room, so he was handed over to Whately as a cub to be licked into shape, and an anvil upon which Whately might beat out ideas. The process was educative, and Newman says that Whately not only taught him to think correctly but to rely upon himself. Whately in the preface to his *Logic*, and much to Newman's gratification, acknowledged assistance obtained in its composition from Newman, a great part of which was no doubt done in his capacity of anvil. Whately was on the point of leaving Oxford for his living (he left in fact in 1822), but Newman was considerably under his influence while he was in Oxford, and a mutual regard followed, and to this is no doubt largely due

the fact that Whately in 1825 made him his Vice-Principal of Alban Hall. Newman on election as Fellow at once set himself to make up, as far as he could, the deficiency in scholarship referred to by Dr. Copleston, and was of course as a new and noted Fellow busy with private pupils for some years, but between 1822 and 1825 he saw most of Hawkins and fell under his influence. On 13th June, 1824, he was ordained deacon (priest in due course), and became curate for two years of St. Clement's, Oxford, and a large amount of time and work was taken up in his parochial duties, and in collecting the funds for building a new Church. He also, until he became curate, studied theology under Dr. Lloyd, the Professor of Divinity, who was one of the high and dry school. In 1825 Whately returned to Oxford as head of Alban Hall, and Newman became his Vice-Principal, until his appointment as Tutor of Oriel in 1826. On that appointment Newman gave up his curacy and vice-principalship and thenceforth devoted himself to his College duties as tutor with zeal and assiduity, not merely discharging his ordinary duties, but endeavouring to render

it unnecessary for his pupils to go to private tutors, and in other respects taking a strong personal interest in them. It may be useful to summarise so far as conveniently may be the state of his opinions at this stage. The statement of Dr. Barry that Mrs. Newman had reared her children in a modified Calvinism can hardly be accepted. The Rev. T. Mozley, after his wife's death, asserted that Mrs. Newman had reared them in extreme Calvinism, but this was omitted in a second edition, and is strongly denied by Mr. F. W. Newman,¹ and the Cardinal himself says :² "When I was fifteen (in the autumn of 1816) a great change of thought took place in me. I fell under the influences of a definite creed, and received into my intellect impressions of dogmas which through God's mercy have never been effaced or obscured. Above and beyond the conversations and sermons of the excellent man long dead, the Rev. Walter Mayers of Pembroke College, Oxford, who was the human means of this beginning of

¹ *Early History of Cardinal Newman*, by F. W. Newman, p. 72.

² *Apologia*, p. 4.

divine faith in me, was the effect of the books which he put into my hands, all of the school of Calvin . . . of the Calvinistic tenets, the only one who took root in my mind was the fact of heaven and hell, divine favour and divine wrath, of the justified and the unjustified.”¹ Two other works in the autumn of 1816 produced a deep impression on his mind, Milner’s Church History and Newton on the Prophecies, and in consequence Newman became convinced that the Pope was the Antichrist, and says his imagination was “stained” by the effects of that doctrine till 1843. While an undergraduate, Newman heard Hawkins preach his celebrated sermon on Tradition, and accepted the proposition that the Sacred Text was never intended to teach doctrine, but only to prove it, and that if we would learn doctrine, we must have recourse to the formularies of the Church, for instance, the Catechism and the Creeds. Seeing much of Hawkins from 1822 to 1825, Hawkins, discussing much, taught Newman to weigh his words and to be cautious in his statements, and was the means of great additions to his

¹ *Apologia*, p. 6.

belief. He gave Newman the treatise on apostolical preaching by Sumner, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, from which he was led to give up his remaining Calvinism, and to receive the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. About 1823 the Rev. William James, Fellow of Oriel, to use Newman's common expression, "taught" him the doctrine of Apostolical Succession. Dr. Lloyd's lectures took his pupils through Sumner's *Records of Creation*, Graves on the Pentateuch, Carpzov on the Septuagint, Prideaux's *Connection*, and other standard works of that kind, and Newman also read considerably, and about 1825 was much impressed by Butler's *Analogy*, by its inculcation of a visible Church, the oracle of truth and a pattern of sanctity, of the duties of external religion and of the historical character of Revelation, and especially by its doctrine that Probability is the guide of life and the practical exclusion of emotion from the religious feelings. His knowledge was also extended by his studies for the Memoirs of Apollonius Tyanæus and the Argument on Miracles, as connected with it, which he had undertaken to write for the *Encyclopædia*

Metropolitana. When Whately returned to Oxford, he and his Vice-Principal naturally became very intimate, though their minds were very different, and ultimately diverged widely in opinion, but what he did for Newman¹ in point of religious opinion was first to teach him the existence of the Church as a substantive body or corporation, and next to fix in him those Anti-Erastian views of Church polity which were one of the most prominent features of the Tractarian Movement. By 1826, when Newman began to devote himself mainly, as already stated, to the duties of his College tutorship, his Calvinistic and Evangelical views were gradually dropping away from him, and he had accepted a considerable number of dogmas held by the high and dry Churchmen of the day, but having no real coherence and no real link binding them together and making them into one coherent system.

In 1826, however, Hurrell Froude was elected Fellow of Oriel, and he was also Tutor from 1827 to 1830; Robert Wilberforce became Fellow and Tutor (Dornford, a Fellow and

¹ *Apologia*, p. 12.

Tutor, was their senior). Newman's happiest time at Oxford began in 1826. His tutorship¹ gave him position, he had written one or two essays which had been well received, and he began to be known. He preached his first University sermon. In 1827 he was appointed by Dr. Howley, then Bishop of London, one of the preachers at Whitehall. In 1827 and 1828 he held the University office of Public Examiner in Classics for the B.A. Degree, and for the Honour List attached to the examination. In 1828, on Mr. Hawkins becoming Provost of Oriel, he was presented to the Vicarage of St. Mary's, the University Church. (He resigned the tutorship in 1832 and the vicarage in 1843.) In 1830 he served as proctor, and in 1831 and 1832 he was one of the University Select Preachers. Newman² says: "It was to me like the feeling of spring weather after winter; and if I may so speak, I came out of my shell, I remained out of it till 1841". The views of the tutors on Church matters, a subject of constant discussion, were naturally sobered and solidified, so to say, by Keble's *Christian Year*, which was published

¹ *Apologia*, p. 16. ² *Ibid.*

in 1827. The year 1828, as above mentioned, was noted by the election of Hawkins as provost, mainly through Newman and Pusey, in preference to Keble, Hawkins being considered the more practical man. It was in fact the preference of discipline over sentiment, and in 1828 Newman began the systematic reading and study of the Fathers. Whately's influence over Newman had been waning for some time, and in the same degree the influence of Keble and Froude over him had increased, and the formal break came in the beginning of 1829. The affair of Mr. Peel's re-election was the occasion of it. Peel's conduct in the question of Catholic Emancipation had, Newman considered, taken the University by surprise, and Newman opposed him on academical and not at all on ecclesiastical or political grounds; but Whately was much annoyed by the line Newman took; he saw a serious meaning in the act and that Newman was separating from Whately's own friends. In 1830, as a consequence of his developing opinions, Newman ceased to be secretary of the Church Missionary Society, and to be a member of the Bible Society. In the

Begin

same year Mr. Rose proposed to him to write, as part of a theological library, a history of the principal Councils, a work which he undertook, but which grew into one of rather a different kind, and at last appeared at the end of 1833 under the title of *The Arians of the Fourth Century*, of which Dean Church¹ says that "though an imperfect book, [it] was one which for originality and subtlety of thought was something very unlike the usual theological writing of the day".²

Difficulties also soon began to arise with the Provost Hawkins, the practical man and disciplinarian. By the resignation of two senior tutors and the appointment of Froude and Wilberforce in their places, the provost found himself faced by tutors whose views of the

¹ Church, p. 132.

² "In the Arian heresy it was contended that the Son sprang not from the nature of the Father but was created from nothing. He had an existence before the world, even before time, but not from eternity. He was therefore in essence different to the Father and belonged to the order of creatures, whom, however, He preceded in excellence. As there was a period in which He was not, so there was an infinite distance between Him and the nature of the Father" (Hook, *Church Dictionary*, 15th edition, p. 60).

pastoral nature of their office did not coincide with his. At first and on different grounds the provost and tutors worked heartily together and with success for the enforcement of discipline and the purification of the College, and the academical prospects of the College improved. There was, however, at bottom, a grave and latent difference of principle between the provost and the tutors, which was likely to lead, and did in time lead, to a collision between them. There was a standing difference of opinion among religious men of that day whether a College tutorship was or was not an engagement compatible with the ordination vow. Newman, not content merely with his College lectureship, and setting himself against the system of private tutors by himself preparing candidates among his pupils for honours, cultivated with them relations of intimacy and friendship and almost of equality, but his main object was the exercise of his pastoral office. He says :¹ " I think the tutors see too little of the men and there is not enough of direct religious instruction. It is my wish to consider

¹ *Letters*, p. 151.

myself as the minister of Christ. Unless I find that opportunities occur of doing spiritual good to those over whom I am placed, it will become a grave question whether I ought to continue in the tuition." At length the quarrel came. The immediate occasion was a claim of the tutors to use their own discretion in their mode of arranging their ordinary terminal lecture table—a claim which on the provost denying it they based on the special relation existing between each tutor and his own pupils, in contrast with his accidental relation to the rest of the undergraduates whom he from time to time saw in lecture. The provost practically made the relation the same in both cases, but Newman, Wilberforce and Froude refused to accept this view, and after correspondence through 1829 to June, 1830, the provost closed it by signifying to Newman, Wilberforce and Froude his intention to stop their supply of pupils, and he thus gradually deprived them of their office as their pupils took their degrees and left. By the Long Vacation of 1832, Newman's pupils had all but a few passed their B.A. examination, and the two or three who remained he gave over into the hands of the

provost, and Newman so relinquished the tutorship.

When Newman became Vicar of St. Mary's, the hold he had acquired over his pupils led to their following him there, and receiving directly religious instruction from his sermons, though from the first he had kept his pastoral relationship in view. After the appointment he had naturally a wider and perhaps more legitimate scope for the exercise of his pastoral duties and instincts, and his four o'clock sermons on Sundays became "an institution" largely attended and in growing numbers, not merely by his own pupils, but by members generally of the University. The charge made in the heat of controversy against him, and revived by the Rev. Charles Kingsley, that in this series of sermons¹ he had some insidious desire to lead men Romewards, and that, with that view, he would preach even a whole sermon for the purpose of launching some sentence, or even word, which might adhere and germinate, was of course preposterous and the figment of a fanatical imagination.

¹ Vol. i. of the *Parochial and Plain Sermons* was published in March, 1834.

Dean Church says the Movement had its spring in the consciences and characters of its leaders, that to them religion really meant the most awful and the most seriously personal thing on earth. It had not only a theological basis, it had still more deeply a moral one, and the indications of its ethical temper and habits are forcibly given in Newman's earliest preaching. When he became a parish priest his preaching took a singularly practical and plain-spoken character, and as he began he continued, but growing in purpose and directness as the years went on. A passionate and sustained earnestness after a high moral rule seriously realised in conduct is the dominant character of these sermons.¹ The *Parochial and Plain Sermons* are clear and emphatic, but without exaggeration in their recognitions of the actual facts of life, and their stern denunciation of the religion of the day with its laxity and easiness and general concurrence with the tendencies of modern civilisation, and it is probable that these sermons reacted on the preacher by creating in him a dissatisfaction

¹ Church, p. 20.

with the Protestant ideal of life, its insufficient renunciation of the world, and its want of those aids to religious life which fill so large a part of Roman Catholic life. In the first stage of the Movement moral earnestness and enthusiasm gave its impulse to theological interest and zeal, and little appeared to be owing to adventitious aids. J. A. Froude says: "His appearance was striking. He was above the middle height, slight and spare. His head was large, his face remarkably like that of Julius Cæsar. The forehead, the shape of the ears and nose were almost the same. The lines of the mouth were very peculiar, and I should say exactly the same."¹ According to Principal Shairp:² "The service was very simple, no pomp, no ritualism; for it was characteristic of the leading men of the Movement that they left these things to the weaker brethren. Their thoughts at all events were set on great questions which touched the heart of unseen things. About the service the most remarkable thing was the beauty, the silver intonation of Mr. Newman's voice as he

¹ *Short Studies*, fourth series, p. 192.

² Quoted Church, p. 141.

read the lessons. . . . When he began to preach a stranger was not likely to be much struck. There was no vehemence, no declamation, no show of elaborated argument, so that one who came prepared to hear a great intellectual effort, was almost sure to go away disappointed." Mr. Gladstone, in a speech delivered in the City Temple in 1887, says of Newman's manner in the pulpit that there was not much change in the inflection of the voice, action there was none, the sermons were read and his eyes were always bent on his book ; but the man must be taken as a whole, and there was a stamp and a seal upon him, there was a solemn sweetness and music in the tone, there was a completeness in the figure taken together with the tone and with the manner which made his delivery singularly attractive.¹

Newman had great personal influence. Archbishop Temple when an undergraduate (born 1821, degree 1842), in a letter to his mother,² dated 31st May, 1841, says: "Mr. Newman must be a very wonderful man to

¹ Account in Hutton's *Life*, pp. 90, 91.

² *Life of Archbishop Temple*, edited by Archdeacon Sandford, vol. ii., pp. 456-57.

have such immense power over all that come into contact with him. You may see this most strikingly in the way that all his acquaintance imitate his manner and peculiarities; it looks like affectation certainly, but I confess I believe them to be above that. I think the reason is that in their minds his manner is so connected with every good feeling that mere association leads them to imitate him, and many I think do it unconsciously. It is, however, very absurd to see them all hold their heads slightly on one side, all speak in very soft voices, all speak quick and make long pauses between their sentences, and all on reaching their seats fall on their knees exactly as if their legs were knocked from under them. He preached on Christian wisdom, etc.” The Rev. Thomas Mozley,¹ after saying that Newman’s appearance was not commanding to strangers, that he did not carry his head aloft, but had a slight bend forwards, and was thin, pale, and with large lustrous eyes, says: “His dress—it became almost the badge of his followers—was the long-tailed coat, not always very new . . . and it was so long kept

¹ *Reminiscences*, vol. i., p. 205.

up by the new Oxford school as to be likely to become as permanent as the distinctive garb of the Quakers ”.

Hurrell Froude's health giving way, it was decided that he should winter abroad accompanied by his father, and at their invitation Newman, being then practically free from College duties, and worn out by writing his book,¹ agreed to join them in a tour to Italy and the Mediterranean, and the party accordingly set sail in December, 1832. The accounts of this journey are extremely interesting, but the details are outside the scope of this work, though there are a few points which may be touched upon. They kept clear of Catholics during their tour, and as to Church services they attended the Tenebrae at the Sistine, for the sake of the Miserere, but that was all. They saw nothing but what was external. Froude and Newman made two calls on Monsignore Wiseman shortly before they left Rome, but Froude's statement that they asked Wiseman on what terms they could be received into the Roman Catholic Church cannot be accepted. No statement as to the subject of

¹ *Arians* ; finished middle of 1832, published end of 1833.

their conversations is contained in the Apology. Froude's statement must have been an exaggeration, one of those caricatures of allegation he frequently indulged in, as when he described the Hadleigh Conference as "a conspiracy," but as he was a man incapable of mere invention, the probability is that there was some conversation about the points of similarity and difference between the Churches ; and the possibility of reunion—a very natural subject—may and probably was mentioned, though not in the way of such request as Froude's words would imply. The Froudes left Rome for England early in 1833, but Newman remained, and at the end of April, without a companion, for a second time went to Sicily, and got back to England by Palermo in July, 1833. While in Sicily he had a violent fever, but when his servant thinking he was about to die asked for directions, he said :¹ " I shall not die," and repeated, " I shall not die, for I have not sinned against the light, I have not sinned against the light," though Newman says he has never been able quite to make out what he meant. Before starting from

¹ *Apologia*, p. 34.

his inn for England, he sat on his bed and began to sob violently, and when asked what ailed him could only answer, "I have a work to do in England". When becalmed in the Straits of Bonifacio, he wrote the lines "Lead, kindly Light," with respect to which when asked by a correspondent some time ago what meaning precisely he attached to the words—

And with the morn those Angel faces smile
Which I have loved long since and lost awhile,

he admitted his inability to say what it was. It is probable that he had no precise idea what he meant by saying he had a work to do in England, but in Rome he had begun to think he had a mission, and when they took leave of Monsignore Wiseman, who courteously expressed a wish that they might make a second visit to Rome, Newman said with great gravity, "We have a work to do in England". This feeling, which Newman calls a presentiment, grew stronger in Sicily, and in his hysterical state found utterance in the words quoted, "I have a work to do in England," though he had no precise or definite idea of the work to be

done. Subject to the delay from calm and a few days' rest at Lyons, Newman proceeded straight to England, where he arrived on 9th July, 1833.

There were many points on which the opinions of Newman and Froude did not coincide, but Newman considers that Froude taught him to look with admiration towards the Church of Rome, and in the same degree to dislike the Reformation, that he fixed deep in him the idea of devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and led him gradually to believe in the Real Presence. By this time Newman had completely lost all his distinctive Calvinistic and Evangelical beliefs. He was not even a high and dry Churchman, but an advanced Churchman, enthusiastic for his Church and its priesthood, their rights and privileges, and eager to work for their defence. His idea of the position of the Church with relation to the State and his want of grasp of the Catholic idea of the status of the Church were shown in 1829, by his letter of 13th March, 1829, in which he says: "There will not be that security for sound doctrine without change which is given by Act of Parliament". From

the long illness in Sicily and consequent weakness, the solitude of the sea and hurried journey home, Newman plunged at once into the Movement. He learned the position of general politics and their probable effect on the Church, and the steps being taken for its defence, especially at meetings, chiefly in Oriel Common Room, to unite and associate in its defence. On 14th July, 1833, came Keble's famous sermon on National Apostasy. Between 25th and 29th July was the conference at Mr. Rose's Rectory at Hadleigh. Although Newman was not at Hadleigh and there was some difference of opinion, especially as to the precise mode in which to move in the defence, Newman took his place among the leaders and moved with increasing power and prominence. He had serious doubt whether any useful purpose would be served by combinations. Nothing striking was ever done by a committee. The individual had always accomplished any great work, as for example Luther, and no committee or board brought about the Reformation, and therefore Newman favoured each individual doing his own work, though in general unity and co-operation with

(the others, having the same or similar aims. Hence in September, 1833, Newman published his tract, the first of the *Tracts for the Times*, which was undoubtedly the strongest overt act yet taken in the Movement. At the end of 1833 he published his history of the Arians, and in March, 1834, the first volume of his *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, but by this time the Movement was under full way and had passed beyond the limits of these preliminary notices.

Some illustrations of Newman's style are set forth in the note to this chapter. It has been observed that his style both in prose and verse seems to have become much more brilliant and unfettered after he became a Roman Catholic than it was before.

5. Edward Bouverie Pusey, D.D., Canon of Christchurch and Professor of Hebrew, Oxford.—Dr. Pusey was by many people regarded as the head of the Movement. It was in fact frequently called the Puseyite Movement, and its adherents were commonly called Puseyites, and that long after the Movement itself was spent. As a fact he only joined it comparatively late and long after it was well

on its way, under the impetus given by Newman, Keble and Froude, but his adhesion was regarded as of great importance. His family and connections, his professorship and immense reputation for learning, all contributed to his weight. He gave us, says Newman, "a position and a name". Pusey was born on 22nd August, 1800, at Pusey House, Berkshire. His father was the Hon. Philip Bouverie, the youngest son of Jacob, first Viscount Folkestone, the name of Bouverie having been exchanged by him for that of Pusey as a condition of succession to the Pusey estate. His mother was the daughter of Robert, fourth Earl of Harborough. Edward was the second son, and after preparatory schools and Eton he entered Christ Church in 1819. As a young man his health was delicate, but he was industrious and able, and in the Easter term, 1822, obtained his First Class in the Classical Honour Schools. In 1823 he gained a Fellowship at Oriel College. He graduated B.A., 1822, and M.A., 1825, in due course, and the intervening years determined the drift of his future life. At Oriel he was brought in contact and intimacy with

Keble and Newman, and though Keble ceased to reside after his mother's death in 1823, Pusey went into lodgings with Newman. Dr. Lloyd, Professor of Divinity, exercised great influence over him, and strongly advised him to reside in Germany so as to acquire familiarity with the language and theological literature of that country. Pusey in pursuance of this advice spent about two years, June, 1825, to June, 1827, at German Universities, especially Berlin, Gottingen and Bonn, devoting himself to the Oriental languages, not content merely with Hebrew, but carefully studying Arabic and Syriac, as well as the general theological literature of the time. He became on friendly terms with Tholuck, Bunsen, Eichhorn, Schliermacher, Neander, Freitag and other German scholars, and read hard under their guidance. On his return to England he became involved in controversy with Mr. Hugh James Rose, who had delivered a course of lectures at Cambridge tracing German rationalism almost exclusively to the absence of that control which is provided in the Church of England by formularies of faith and devotion and by its episcopal form of govern-

ment—inferring that the English Church being so protected need not fear any lapse into German rationalism, which had resulted from the want of them. Pusey did not adopt that view, and tried to show that the English Church showed symptoms of dead orthodoxism which would result in the decadence of religious life here as among German Protestants. Many of Pusey's expressions were misunderstood; he was supposed to sympathise not merely with pietism but also with rationalism, if not to be himself a rationalist. He defended himself at great length against such a charge, and never reprinted his first book or its sequel, and in a will drawn up a few years before his death he forbade any one to do so. No doubt Pusey's well-known general liberal opinions helped to fasten this charge of liberalism in religious belief also upon him.

On the 1st June, 1828, Pusey was ordained deacon, and on 13th November, 1828, the Prime Minister, the Duke of Wellington, recommended him for appointment as Regius Professor of Hebrew, to which was annexed a Canonry of Christ Church, and on 23rd

November, 1828, he was ordained priest, and so entered on what was really his life's profession and work. Pusey's aim in life was undoubtedly the priesthood, though he does not seem to have been well fitted for or even very desirous of the ordinary pastoral work, but the office he now obtained gave him exactly what he was fit for and what he desired—an office in the Church ecclesiastical and academical, and also connected with the preparation for orders of such as desired either ordinary assistance or help to more advanced study in Biblical linguistics. He accordingly did not treat his duties as professor in any perfunctory manner, but by himself and his assistants converted his chair into a real machine for the teaching and study of the Biblical languages. He did not, however, confine himself merely to the duties of his chair as a teaching office. His first great work during the years following his appointment to the chair was the completion of the Catalogue of Arabic Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library. This involved enormous labour and took up the best part of his time during seven of the most active years of his life.

In his own words: "When engaged on the Arabic Catalogue at the Bodleian, I have as I rose from the drudgery envied the very bricklayers whom I saw at work in the streets".

The ordinary life of Oxford in 1828-1829 was greatly interrupted by the question of Catholic Emancipation. Sir Robert Peel had represented the University since 1817, and for many years had been an opponent of emancipation, but after O'Connell's return for Clare in 1828 the King's speech in opening the session announced relief, and when on 5th February, 1829, the Oxford Convocation voted a petition against the Roman Catholic claims, Peel offered to resign his seat. An election followed, resulting in 755 voting for Inglis and 609 for Peel. This election divided men sharply in Oxford. It separated Newman from Whately. Keble was strongly against Peel, but Pusey strongly supported Peel, not merely because as a young Liberal he had taken an interest in the question and was glad to see the conversion of the Government, but also because he had the example and influence of his friend Dr. Lloyd, then Bis-

hop of Oxford, formerly Peel's tutor and his supporter in the House of Lords. Whately, Blanco White, Shuttleworth and the Provost of Oriel were Pusey's allies against Keble, Newman, Hurrell Froude and Robert Wilberforce. Dr. Lloyd died on 31st May, 1829, and his strong influence being removed, Pusey was ultimately thrown more into contact with the minds which together with his own were to give being and shape to the Movement of 1833. Lord Henley published *A Plan of Church Reform, with a Letter to the King*, which was much discussed. It was taken for granted that the first effort of the Reformed Parliament would be to reform the Church. Arnold's pamphlet on *The Principles of Church Reform* which appeared early in 1833 reflected the general panic. At the close of 1832 Pusey completed his *Remarks on the Prospective and Past Benefits of Cathedral Institutions*. Other writers discussed all or portions of Henley's proposals, but Pusey concerned himself with the scheme only so far as it related to the redistribution of Cathedral endowments, defending the services they rendered to the Church and theology gener-

ally, and illustrating his arguments by his experience of German Universities. Pusey's pamphlet was favourably received, and many of its proposals have passed into shape, or at least into the general thought of the Church.

Pusey, as already stated, did not come into the Movement until comparatively late. He opposed Mr. Rose, not for defending orthodoxy, but because he was of opinion that he was mistaking some friends for foes, and in his work on Cathedral Institutions he tried to arrest assaults on the outer fabric of the Church by an improved use of part of her endowments. He worked privately with the same objects, but when the Movement began he did not join it. He was not invited to the meeting at Hadleigh, nor to the meetings subsequently held at Oriel, but he soon began to circulate the Tracts. In November he signed the Address to the Archbishop, and on 21st December, 1833, Tract No. 18 was issued with his initials. Pusey contributed only seven Tracts to the entire series of ninety. The first was on Fasting. Mr. Isaac Williams (*Autobiography*, pp. 70-72) gives an account of the occasion of this Tract. Pusey said to New-

man: " 'You are too hard on the Peculiars as you call them. You should conciliate them; I am thinking of writing a letter myself with that purpose.' 'Well,' said Newman, 'suppose you let us have it for one of the Tracts.' 'Oh! No,' said Pusey, 'I will not be one of you.' This was said in a playful manner, and before we parted Newman said: 'Suppose you let us have that letter of yours which you intend writing and attach your name or signature to it. You would not then be mixed up with us, nor in any way responsible for the Tracts.' 'Well,' said Pusey at last, 'if you will let me do that, I will.'" And so the Tract was published with his initials, which gave the Record and Low Church party his name, which they at once attached to all.

Newman says of Pusey's joining:¹ "I had known him well since 1827-28 and had felt for him an enthusiastic admiration. I used to call him *ὁ μέγας*. His great learning, his immense diligence, his scholarlike mind, his simple devotion to the cause of religion, overcame me; and great of course was my joy when in

¹ *Apologia*, pp. 61-63.

the last days of 1833 he showed a disposition to make common cause with us. His Tract on Fasting appeared as one of the series, with the date of December 21st. He was not, however, I think, fully associated in the Movement till 1835 and 1836, when he published his Tract on Baptism and started the Library of the Fathers. He at once gave us a position and a name. Without him we should have had little chance, especially at the early date of 1834, of making any serious resistance to the Liberal Aggression. But Dr. Pusey was a Professor and Canon of Christ Church; he had a vast influence in consequence of his deep religious seriousness, the munificence of his charities, his Professorship, his family connections, and his easy relations with the University authorities. He was to the Movement all that Mr. Rose might have been, with that indispensable addition which was wanting to Mr. Rose, the intimate friendship and the familiar daily society of the persons who had commenced it, and he had that special claim on their attachment which lies in the living presence of a faithful and loyal affectionateness. There was henceforth a man who could

be the head and centre of the zealous people in every part of the country who were adopting the new opinions, and not only so, but there was one who furnished the Movement with a front to the world and gained for it a recognition from other parties in the University. In 1829 Mr. Froude or Mr. Robert Wilberforce or Mr. Newman were but individuals; and when they ranged themselves in the contest of that year on the side of Sir Robert Inglis, men on either side only asked with surprise how they got there and attached no significance to the fact; but Dr. Pusey was, to use the common expression, a host in himself: he was able to give a name, a form, a personality, to what without him was a sort of mob. And when various parties had to meet together in order to resist the liberal acts of the Government, we of the Movement took our place by right among them.

“Such was the benefit which he conferred on the Movement externally; nor were the internal advantages at all inferior to it. He was a man of large designs; he had a hopeful sanguine mind; he had no fear of others; he was haunted by no intellectual perplexities. . . .

“Dr. Pusey’s influence was felt at once. He saw that there ought to be more sobriety, more gravity, more careful pains, more sense of responsibility in the Tracts and in the whole Movement. It was through him that the character of the Tracts was changed. When he gave to us his Tract on Fasting he put his initials to it. In 1835 he published his elaborate Treatise on Baptism which was followed by other Tracts from different authors, if not of equal learning, yet of equal power and oppositeness. The Catenas of Anglican Divines projected by me which occur in the series were executed with a like aim at greater accuracy and method. In 1836 he advertised his great project for a Translation of the Fathers :—but I must return to myself.”

6. Hugh James Rose, and others.—One of the men who prepared the way for the Movement was Mr. Hugh James Rose, a Cambridge man, Pusey’s old antagonist. He had the reputation of wide learning, practical ability, and great disinterestedness and zeal. He insisted on the importance of combined action in defence of the Church, and in 1832 undertook the editorship of the British Magazine,

a periodical which besides discharging in some degree the duties of a magazine, anticipated in not a few respects the *Tracts for the Times*. It also contained poems expressive of the faith and feelings of the Oxford party, some of which were afterwards collected into the volume known as the *Lyra Apostolica*. He was Rector of Hadleigh, and invited some friends, more or less like minded, to stay with him at the Rectory just after midsummer, 1833. This was the famous Hadleigh Conference, which, however, separated without arriving at any definite conclusions.

The Rev. William Palmer of Worcester College, Oxford (not William Palmer of Magdalen), had been educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and came to Oxford in 1828 to read in the libraries there. His work, enriched by notes of Bishop Lloyd, was published at the Oxford University Press in 1832, under the title of *Origines Liturgicæ*. It impressed strongly the almost forgotten fact that the Prayer-book was mainly a translation from earlier Office Books, and powerfully contributed to the devotion to the traditions of the Anglican Church which arose from close study

of the antiquities of its ritual, and was in fact for a long time the main storehouse from which many Anglican Churchmen drew their knowledge of the ritual of the Church and its historical descent. Newman says of him:¹ "Mr. Palmer had many conditions of authority and influence. He understood theology as a science; he was practised in the scholastic mode of controversial writing: and I believe was as well acquainted as he was dissatisfied with the Catholic Schools. . . . But he was deficient in depth." He had not grown into an Oxford man and wanted personal influence.

Isaac Williams was born in Wales in 1802, and from Harrow went to Trinity College, Oxford, and having been introduced to Keble spent the Long Vacation, 1823, reading with him and his other pupils, Hurrell Froude and Robert Wilberforce, at Southrop. Keble made him an old-fashioned High Churchman. He became Fellow and Tutor of his College, and accepted Newman's offer of curacy of St. Mary's. At first Williams threw himself heartily into the Movement both poetically and practically. His poetry was looked upon as the outpouring

¹ *Apologia*, p. 40.

of a very beautiful mind deeply impressed with realities. He was candidate for the Professorship of Poetry in succession to Keble as before mentioned. He represented moderation in teaching, though curiously his Tract on Reserve in Religious Teaching singled him out as a dangerous Tractarian. Newman, however, gave signs of going where Williams could not follow, and at last the strain broke. Williams left Oxford and took a country living.

Walter Farquhar Hook brought in knowledge of active parochial work, and the social centre of the group was the Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval, Vicar of East Horsley, who had corresponded intimately with Keble on religious and social subjects, and was now engaged on a catechism on Church doctrine.

Blanco White, a converted Spanish Roman Catholic priest, born in 1775, came to Oxford in 1826, the University having conferred on him the degree of M.A., and was welcomed widely as a witness to the truths of the English Reformation. He was made a member of the Oriel Common Room and found himself among a company of able men in the University all of whom in various ways were interested in him

—as a type of Latin Christians. He educated Oxford men in many things of which they were practically ignorant. He explained to Newman and Hurrell Froude the order and use of the Breviary, and is generally believed to have taught Hampden so much of the Scholastic Philosophy as enabled him to write his famous Bampton Lectures and gave him the bias with which to read scholastic literature. His intellect was destructive rather than constructive or receptive and he ultimately became a Socinian.

Charles Marriott, the solitary saintly eccentric scholar, who was drawn into the Movement almost in spite of himself, devoted himself largely to the Library of the Fathers—translating himself or correcting or helping the translation of others.

NOTE.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF NEWMAN'S STYLE.

(1) Hymn—"Lead, Kindly Light."—16th June, 1833.

(2) *Dream of Gerontius*—verse from Choir of Angelicals.—January, 1865.

Praise to the Holiest in the height,
And in the depth be praise :
In all His words most wonderful ;
Most sure in all His ways !

(3) Musical Sounds—extract from sermon on "Developments in Religious Doctrine". Illustrations of the distinction between supernatural and eternal laws and our attempt to represent them, that is, our economies.—Purification, 1843.

"Let us take another instance, of an outward and earthly form, or economy, under which great wonders unknown seem to be typified ; I mean musical sounds, as they are

exhibited more perfectly in instrumental harmony. There are seven notes in the scale; make them fourteen; yet what a slender outfit for so vast an enterprise! What science brings so much out of so little? Out of what poor elements does some great master in it create his new world! Shall we say that all this exuberant inventiveness is a mere ingenuity or trick of art, like some game or fashion of the day, without reality, without meaning? We may do so; and then perhaps we shall also account the science of theology to be a matter of words; yet as there is a divinity in the theology of the Church, which those who feel cannot communicate, so there is also in the wonderful creation of sublimity and beauty of which I am speaking. To many men the very names which the science employs are utterly incomprehensible. To speak of an idea or a subject seems to be fanciful or trifling, and of the views which it opens upon us to be childish extravagance; yet is it possible that that inexhaustible evolution and disposition of notes, so rich yet so simple, so intricate yet so regulated, so various yet so majestic, should be a mere sound, which is gone and perishes?

Can it be that those mysterious stirrings of heart, and keen emotions, and strange yearnings after we know not what, and awful impressions from we know not whence, should be wrought in us by what is unsubstantial, and comes and goes, and begins and ends in itself? It is not so; it cannot be—No; they have escaped from some higher sphere; they are the outpourings of eternal harmony in the medium of created sound; they are echoes from our Home; they are the voice of Angels, or the Magnificat of Saints, or the living laws of Divine Governance, or the Divine Attributes; something they are besides themselves, which we cannot compass, which we cannot utter,—though mortal man, and he perhaps not otherwise distinguished above his fellows, has the gift of eliciting them.

“So much on the subject of musical sound; what if the whole series of impressions, made on us through the senses, be, as I have already hinted, but a Divine Economy suited to our need, and the token of realities distinct from them, and such as might be revealed to us, nay, more perfectly, by other senses, as different from our existing ones as they from

each other?" (*University Sermons*, 1843, pp. 348-50).

(4) Extract. Close of sermon on parting of friends. Farewell sermon as Anglican, 25th September, 1843.

"And, O my brethren, O kind and affectionate hearts, O loving friends, should you know any one whose lot it has been, by writing or by word of mouth, in some degree to help you thus to act; if he has ever told you what you knew about yourselves, or what you did not know; has read to you your wants or feelings, and comforted you by the very reading; has made you feel that there was a higher life than this daily one and a brighter world than that you see; or encouraged you, or sobered you, or opened a way to the inquiring, or soothed the perplexed; if what he has said or done has ever made you take an interest in him, and feel well inclined towards him; remember such a one in time to come, though you hear him not, and pray for him that in all things he may know God's will and at all times he may be ready to fulfil it" (*Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, p. 409).

(5) Extract. Letter to *Times* by Catholicus.

On the Tamworth Library and Reading Room and ridiculing Lord Brougham's *Discourse on Knowledge*. February, 1841.

“Nothing comes amiss to this author; saints and sinners, the precious and the vile, are torn from their proper homes and recklessly thrown together under the category of knowledge. 'Tis a pity he did not extend his view as Christianity has done, to beings out of sight of man. Milton could have helped him to some angelic personages, as patrons and guardians of his intellectual temple, who of old time, before faith had birth,

Apart sat on a hill retired
In thoughts more elevate, and reasoned high
Of providence, fore-knowledge, will and fate,
Passion and apathy, and glory, and shame,—
Vain Wisdom all, and false philosophy.

And indeed he does make some guesses that way, speaking most catholically of being ‘admitted to a fellowship with those loftier minds’ who ‘by universal consent *held a station apart*’ and are ‘spoken of *reverently*’ as if their names were not those of ‘mortal men’; and he speaks of these ‘benefactors of mankind,

when they *rest* from their *pious* labours, looking down' upon the blessings with which their '*toils and sufferings* have clothed the scene of their former existence' " (*Discussions and Arguments*, p. 290).

(6) Who's to blame? Extract from letters to the *Catholic Standard* by Catholicus, on the Crimean War. March, 1855.

"If you want your work done well which you cannot do yourself, find the best man, put it into his hand, and trust him implicitly. An Englishman is too sensible not to understand this in private affairs; but in matters of State he is afraid of this being done over much. He prefers the system of checks and counter-checks, the division of power, the imperative concurrence of disconnected officials and his own supervision and revision—the method of hitches, cross-purposes, collisions, dead-locks, to the experiment of treating his public servants as gentlemen. I am not quarrelling with what is inevitable in his system of self-government; I only say that he cannot expect his work done in the best style if this is his mode of providing for it. Duplicate functionaries do but merge responsibility, and

a jealous master is paid with formal heartless service. . . .

“England surely is the paradise of little men and the purgatory of great ones. May I never be a Minister of State or Field Marshal! I'd be an individual self-respecting Briton, in my own private castle with the *Times* to see the world by, and pen and paper to scribble off withal to some public print, and set the world right. Public men are only my *employés*; I use them as I think fit and turn them off without warning—Aberdeen, Gladstone, Sidney Herbert, Newcastle, what are they muttering about services and ingratitude? Were they not paid? Hadn't they their regular quarter day? Raglan, Burgoyne, Dundas—I cannot recollect all the fellows' names—can they merit aught? Can they be profitable to me their lord and master? And so having no tenderness or respect for their persons, their antecedents, or their age—not caring that in fact they are serving me with all their strength, not asking whether if they manage ill it be not perchance because they are in the fetters of Constitutional red tape which have weighed on their hearts and

deadened their energies till the hazard of failure and the fear of censure have quenched the spirit of daring, I think it becoming and generous—during, not after their work, not when it is ended, but in the very agony of conflict—to institute a formal process of inquiry into their demerits, not secret, not indulgent to their sense of honour, but in the hearing of all Europe and amid the scorn of the world—hitting down, knocking over, my workhouse apprentices, in order that they may get up again and do my matters for me better. . . .

“In England sensitively suspicious of combination and system, three precautions have been taken in dealing with the soldier and the parson (I hope I may be familiar without offence)—precautions borrowed from the necessary treatment of wild animals. (1) To tie him up, (2) to pare his claws, and (3) to keep him low; then he will be both safe and useful; the result is a National Church and a Constitutional Army” (*Discussions and Arguments*, pp. 342-44, 357).

CHAPTER III.

THE MOVEMENT, 1833 TO 1839.

1. THE statement of Dean Church (whose authority Churchmen will accept) is that "What is called the Oxford or Tractarian Movement began, without doubt, in a vigorous effort for the immediate defence of the Church against serious dangers arising from the violent and threatening temper of the days of the Reform Bill".¹

This does not seem quite consistent with his statement quoted above (p. 83), that the Movement had its spring in the consciences and characters of its leaders, that to them religion really meant the most awful and seriously personal thing on earth, and that it had not only a theological basis but had still more deeply a moral one. But what the Dean no doubt meant was that the leaders were in-

¹ Church, p. 1. ✓

fluenced by no mean petty or private motive, but only took the part they did from the highest motives and in defence against dangers threatening what they believed to be an institution calculated to help the cause of religion. Whatever the motive, however, the Dean admits that the Movement began (1) in defence of the Church, and (2) against certain threatened dangers. The history of the Movement, therefore, involves an inquiry into (1) the threatened dangers, and (2) the steps taken in defence. It will be convenient to take them in that order. The antecedents of the Movement usually referred to, such as the temper which preceded and created the great French Revolution; the interest in the Middle Ages aroused by Sir Walter Scott; the questionings of S. T. Coleridge; the influence, slight as yet, of German philosophy; the Evangelical revival and the theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—all had their effect in creating an atmosphere in which the ideas of the Movement flourished, as Newman said of the rapid spread of the ideas of the Tractarians, there was something “in the air,” but they were all past and had been more or less as-

simulated or acquiesced in. Their effect was not confined merely or even primarily to the Church. They or most of them had a great effect in moulding men's opinions and helping to create that desire for progress and improvement which was expressed in the cries for reform in Church and State. The real danger threatened was that arising from the spirit of liberalism which had arisen. Liberalism was the enemy. The nation had outgrown its clothes, and was determined that its government and institutions should be remodelled in accordance with what were considered then to be modern ideas, and therefore that all necessary changes should be made with that object. The cry was for reform of Parliament; in a country pretending to be governed by representative institutions it was absurd that the system of rotten boroughs should be allowed to exist, and representation, as in Old Sarum, reduced to a farce, and when Parliament had been made into a real or more real instrument of government, it was obvious that it must be used to rectify the evils of which people under the unreformed Parliament had suffered so long. It meant the destruction of the old

régime of privilege and exclusiveness, and therefore among other things relief from religious disabilities, the improvement of the general law, and what touched English Churchmen to the quick, possibly separation of Church and State, and at any rate, the reform of the Church, interference with its rights and privileges, and in the first place the correction or modification of such scandals as the Irish Church Establishment and the English Cathedral Establishment, and the like. Even before the Reform Act was passed the force of public opinion had brought about some changes in the law. In 1828 the Test and Corporation Acts (9 Geo. IV. c. 17) were passed, by which some relief was given to Dissenters, and in 1829 the principle was further carried out by the concession of Roman Catholic Emancipation (10 Geo. IV. c. 7). On 7th June, 1832, the Reform Bill passed the House of Lords, and the new Parliament was to meet in 1833. Some idea of the frame of mind created among English Churchmen by these measures may be gathered from the language of Rev. W. Palmer, whom Keble,¹ writing to Mr. Perceval, describes as

¹ Pusey, vol. i., p. 264.

“the mildest and most unpretending of men”. Mr. Palmer says:¹ “At the beginning of the summer of 1833 the Church in England and Ireland seemed destined to immediate desolation and ruin. We had seen in 1828 the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts cutting away from the Church of England one of its ancient bulwarks and evincing a disposition to make concession to the clamour of its enemies. In the next year—the *fatal* year 1829—we had seen this principle fully carried out by the concession of what is called ‘Roman Catholic Emancipation,’ a measure which scattered to the winds public principle, public confidence, and dispersed a party which, had it possessed courage to adhere to its old and popular principles, and to act on them with manly energy, would have stemmed the torrent of revolution and averted the awful crisis which was at hand,” etc., etc.

The “awful crisis” arrived in February, 1833, when Lord Stanley’s Irish Church Temporalities Bill was introduced, and on 30th July, 1833, it passed the House of Lords, and by it ten dioceses, that is to say, one-half of the Irish

¹ Palmer’s *Narrative*, p. 96.

Episcopate, were suppressed. The former measures repealing the Test and Corporation Acts, Roman Catholic Emancipation and the Reform Act might have been recognised as Acts of political and social justice not really hostile to the Church of Christ, but this Act of Lord Stanley seemed to be a new departure in an irreligious direction and a presage of worse measures that might follow.

Measures of this kind, interfering with the rights and privileges of the Church, naturally received the support of Protestant and Catholic Dissenters, but English Churchmen also bitterly complained of the support given by some members of the Church itself. Thus in 1832 Lord Henley had published his pamphlet entitled *A Plan of Church Reform, with a Letter to the King*, in which he discussed such scandals as non-residence, sinecures and pluralities, and insisted on the claims of the dense populations of manufacturing towns, and proposed a Board to manage all Episcopal and Capitular estates, the equalisation of bishops' incomes, reduction of the staff of Cathedrals, new bishoprics, bishops no longer to sit in the House of Lords, and Convocation

to be revived. Pusey dealt with this scheme only so far as related to the distribution of Cathedral endowments. Early in 1833 appeared Arnold's pamphlet on *The Principles of Church Reform*,¹ in which after a defence of the National Establishment and a statement of the extreme danger to which it was exposed, he proposed what seemed to him the only means of averting this danger—(a) by a design for comprehending the Dissenters within the pale of the Establishment without compromise of principles on either side, and (b) by various details intended to increase its actual efficiency. This pamphlet caused an enormous sensation. By making the Establishment co-extensive with the nation, it virtually destroyed the exclusive rights and privileges of the existing Establishment, and therefore was merely a form of Disestablishment. The air was full of discussions on questions of this nature, all involving unsettlement of existing conditions of the Church and interference with its existing rights and privileges. It is not within the aim of this work to discuss these questions or to narrate either the course or the result of the

¹ Stanley, *Life of Arnold*, pp. 292, 293.

discussions, but they have been referred to for the purpose of showing what it was that Dean Church had in mind when he spoke of threatened dangers. It was in this state of things and in this frame of mind that the leaders of the Movement took steps for the defence, as they considered, of the Church against these dangers.

2. It will be remembered that the crisis referred to by Mr. Palmer arrived in February, 1833, when Lord Stanley's Bill for the Suppression of the Irish Bishoprics was introduced, and that it passed the House of Lords on 30th July, 1833, so that when Newman reached home on 9th July, 1833, from his foreign tour, he found himself in the midst of the agitation caused by that Bill and threatened Act, and the general fear of danger to the English Church exacerbated by the dealings with the Irish Church. English Churchmen, of course, had not failed to observe and discuss the course of events; no overt act of defence had yet been taken, but the feeling was that now the time had arrived to act.

While Newman and Froude were abroad, Palmer had been in communication with Rose

and Perceval upon the dangers of the times, and did what he could to resist "a dangerous proposal" that Unitarians should be treated as members of the Christian Community and invested with all the privileges of Churchmen.¹ Palmer mentions a fact illustrating Newman's feelings at that time in reference to the suppression of the bishoprics. He says² that the then Bishop of London offered to Newman the office of Whitehall Preacher at that crisis, but that Newman having learned that the bishop had not taken a part against the Bill for the Suppression of the Bishoprics, declined to accept the appointment.

It being considered necessary to bring together for conference a few representative men of like minds on the subject of the Church, and the best mode of averting the threatened dangers (men in full agreement on the main questions but with great differences in temperament and habits of thought), Mr. Rose summoned a small meeting which was held at his parsonage at Hadleigh in Suffolk be-

¹ Palmer, p. 39. (Pattison, p. 172, speaks of Palmer's book as "his dreary narrative".)

² Palmer, p. 46.

tween the 25th and 29th July. Besides Mr. Rose it was attended by Mr. William Palmer of Worcester, Mr. Perceval and Mr. Hurrell Froude. Keble and Newman were not present, but they were in active correspondence with the others, notwithstanding their want of confidence in meetings or committees. The small company of four, however, proceeded to discuss fully for three days the whole state of things and the dangers besetting the Church. In that they were all of one mind, but when it came to propose remedies they could not agree; each person had his own view of what would be advisable. In the end no definite mode of action was agreed on, though all felt the publication of tracts or essays to be an important feature, or rather an imperative necessity.¹

Upon returning to Oxford the Conferences recommenced, and it was proposed to form an Association of Friends of the Church, and after a considerable amount of discussion a declaration framed by Palmer was adopted as the basis of the undertaking, and concluded

¹ Palmer, p. 47 *et seq.* Adopted by Church, p. 95.

with a declaration of principles and purposes in the following terms :—

(1) To maintain pure and inviolate the doctrines, the services and the discipline of the Church—that is, to withstand all change which involves the denial or suppression of doctrine, a departure from primitive practice in religious offices or innovation upon the Apostolical prerogative orders and commission of bishops, priests and deacons.

(2) To afford Churchmen an opportunity of exchanging their sentiments and co-operating together on a large scale.

The formulary thus agreed on was printed and was privately and extensively circulated in all parts of England in the autumn of 1833. The intention of Mr. Palmer and his more particular friends was not to form a society merely at Oxford, but to extend it throughout all England, or rather to form similar societies in every part of England. Although the declaration at first met with some success, the plan of an association or of separate associations, however, came to nothing. The discussions which led to the preparation of the declaration had revealed considerable differ-

ences of opinion on several points. Jealousy was expressed in several high quarters of the formation of any associations, and the notion was also unacceptable to Froude and others. Froude objected to any association less wide than the Church itself, and Newman had a horror of committees and meetings and great people in London. He felt that the Church and the clergy wanted plain speaking, and that could not be got by papers put forth as joint manifestoes, or with the revision and sanction of "safe" and "judicious" advisers. He thought it was better for each man to write as he felt, though in concert and sympathy with others for the cause and interests of the Church. Newman expressed this in a letter¹ to Rose, dated the 15th December, 1833: "Each tract should be separate—we want sharp-shooters, not regular troops".

The result was that the association would not work. For a time Palmer's line and Newman's line ran on side by side, but Palmer's plan, though not entirely without result, had soon done all it could do and gradually faded out of sight; while Newman, without formal

¹ *Letters*, vol. ii., p. 2.

consultation with Palmer and the others, issued a number of Tracts, which became known as the Oxford Tracts, and which he caused to be circulated with the utmost diligence, and upon them attention was soon concentrated. Palmer had, however, undertaken a kind of mission to different parts of the country explaining the intention and designs of the association, and, meeting with a good deal of general approbation, and feeling that there was a sound and healthy feeling general in the Church, prepared a declaration of attachment to the Church to be subscribed by the clergy, and which after some revision assumed the form of an address to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and in February, 1834, this document, with the signatures of about 7,000 clergy, was presented to his Grace at Lambeth by a deputation representative of Convocation, the Universities and the Church at large. This was followed by an address from the laity of the Church, recording their firm attachment to the faith and worship of the Church and her Apostolic form of government. This address when presented to the Archbishop in May, 1834, contained about 230,000 signatures.

These declarations were mainly of importance in relieving much of the feeling of despair which the Reform Act had created in the minds of Churchmen, and, by creating confidence in their numbers and zeal, strengthening their determination to defend their rights and privileges. But it is time now to follow the main stream of the Movement, that is, the *Tracts for the Times*. Rose was obliged by his health to leave Hadleigh, and at the end of the Long Vacation went to Durham as Professor of Divinity, then became Principal of King's College, London, but died very early, and Palmer soon went to a small living in the country, and practically passed out of the Movement, leaving a clear field to Newman and his friends, and the Oxford Movement became in effect the Tractarian Movement.

3. Stated roughly, the earlier form of the Movement was a practical conservative attempt to defend the Established Church against certain threatened dangers, while the later form of the Movement, beginning with an attempt to establish some principle to which to appeal in the defence, developed mainly into an attempt to identify the Established Church

of England as a branch or part of the Church Catholic, but with no more precise terminus, and thus theories and investigations were launched and prosecuted which led some of the leaders to results they had never anticipated when they began.

“The ring of these early Tracts,” says Dean Church,¹ “was something very different from anything of the kind yet known in England. They were clear, brief, stern appeals to conscience and reason, sparing in words, utterly without rhetoric, intense of purpose. They were like the short sharp utterances of men in pain and danger and pressing emergency. The first one gave the key-note of the series.” It is here set out in full :—

“TRACTS FOR THE TIMES. No. I.

“*Dated 9th Sept., 1833.*

“TO MY BRETHREN IN THE SACRED MINISTRY, THE PRESBYTERS AND DEACONS OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST IN ENGLAND, ORDAINED THEREUNTO BY THE HOLY GHOST AND THE IMPOSITION OF HANDS.

“FELLOW-LABOURERS,—I am but one of yourselves—a Presbyter ; and therefore I conceal

¹ Church, p. 110,

my name, lest I should take too much on myself by speaking in my own person. Yet speak I must; for the times are very evil, yet no one speaks against them.

“Is not this so? Do not we ‘look one upon another,’ yet perform nothing? Do we not all confess the peril into which the Church is come, yet sit still each in his own retirement, as if mountains and seas cut off brother from brother? Therefore suffer me, while I try to draw you forth from those pleasant retreats, which it has been our blessedness hitherto to enjoy, to contemplate the condition and prospects of our Holy Mother in a practical way; so that one and all may unlearn that idle habit, which has grown upon us, of owning the state of things to be bad, yet doing nothing to remedy it.

“Consider a moment. Is it fair, is it dutiful, to suffer our bishops to stand the brunt of the battle without doing our part to support them? Upon them comes ‘the care of all the Churches’. This cannot be helped; indeed it is their glory. Not one of us would wish in the least to deprive them of the duties, the toils, the responsibilities of their high office.

And, black event as it would be for the country, yet (as far as they are concerned) we would not wish them a more blessed termination of their course than the spoiling of their goods and martyrdom.

“To them then we willingly and affectionately relinquish their high privileges and honours; we encroach not upon the rights of the SUCCESSORS OF THE APOSTLES; we touch not their sword and crozier. Yet surely we may be their shield-bearers in the battle without offence; and by our voice and deeds be to them what Luke and Timothy were to St. Paul.

“Now, then, let me come at once to the subject which leads me to address you. Should the Government and the Country so far forget their God as to cast off the Church, to deprive it of its temporal honours and substance, *on what* will you rest the claim of respect and attention which you make upon your flocks? Hitherto you have been upheld by your birth, your education, your wealth, your connections; should these secular advantages cease, on what must Christ’s Ministers depend? Is not this a serious practical question? We

know how miserable is the state of religious bodies not supported by the State. Look at the Dissenters on all sides of you, and you will see at once that their Ministers, depending simply upon the people, become the *creatures* of the people. Are you content that this should be your case? Alas! can a greater evil befall Christians than for their teachers to be guided by them, instead of guiding? How can we 'hold fast the form of sound words,' and 'keep that which is committed to our trust,' if our influence is to depend simply on our popularity? Is it not our very office to *oppose* the world? Can we then allow ourselves to *court* it? to preach smooth things and prophesy deceits? to make the way of life easy to the indolent and rich, and to bribe the humbler classes by excitements and strong intoxicating doctrine? Surely it must not be so;—and the question recurs, *On what* are we to rest our authority when the State deserts us?

“Christ has not left His Church without claim of its own upon the attention of men. Surely not. Hard Master He cannot be, to bid us oppose the world, yet give us no cre-

dentials for so doing. There are some who rest their Divine mission on their own unsupported assertion ; others, who rest it on their popularity ; others, on their success ; and others who rest it upon their temporal distinctions. This last case has, perhaps, been too much our own ; I fear we have neglected the real ground on which our authority is built—OUR APOSTOLIC DESCENT.

“ We have been born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. The Lord Jesus Christ gave His spirit to His Apostles ; they in turn laid their hands on those who should succeed them, and these again on others ; and so the sacred gift has been handed down to our present bishops, who have appointed us as their assistants, and in some sense representatives.

“ Now every one of us believes this. I know that some will at first deny they do ; still they do believe it. Only, it is not sufficiently, practically, impressed on their minds. They *do* believe it ; for it is the doctrine of the Ordination Service, which they have recognised as truth in the most solemn season of their lives. In order, then, not to prove, but to

remind and impress, I entreat your attention to the words used when you were made Ministers of Christ's Church.

“The office of Deacon was thus committed to you: ‘Take thou authority to execute the office of a Deacon in the Church of God committed unto thee; In the name,’ etc.

“And the Priesthood thus: ‘Receive the Holy Ghost, for the office and work of a Priest, in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of His Holy Sacraments; In the name,’ etc.

“These, I say, were words spoken to us, and received by us, when we were brought nearer to God than at any other time of our lives. I know the grace of ordination is contained in the laying on of hands, not in any form of words;—yet in our own case (as has been usual in the Church) words of blessing have accompanied the act. Thus we have confessed before God our belief that the Bishop who ordained us gave us the Holy Ghost, gave us

the power to bind and to loose, to administer the Sacraments, and to preach.¹ Now *how* is he able to give these great gifts? *Whence* is his right? Are these words idle (which would be taking God's name in vain), or do they express merely a wish (which surely is very far below their meaning), or do they not rather indicate that the speaker is conveying a gift? Surely they can mean nothing short of this. But whence, I ask, his right to do so? Has he any right, except as having received the power from those who consecrated him to be a bishop? He could not give what he had never received. It is plain then that he but *transmits*; and that the Christian Ministry is a *succession*. And if we trace back the power of ordination from hand to hand, of course we shall come to the Apostles at last. We know

¹ The text is that set out by Dean Trench, *Oxford Movement*, p. 112. The reprint, dated 1839, though the Preface is dated Feast of All Saints, 1834, is addressed, "Thoughts on the Ministerial Commission Respectfully Addressed to the Clergy.—I am but one of yourselves—a Presbyter," etc., and instead of "our belief that the Bishop who ordained us gave us the Holy Ghost," etc., it says, "our belief that through the Bishop who ordained us we received the Holy Ghost," etc.

we do, as a plain historical fact ; and therefore all we, who have been ordained clergy, in the very form of our ordination acknowledge the doctrine of the APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION.

“ And for the same reason, we must necessarily consider none to be *really* ordained who have not *thus* been ordained. For if ordination is a Divine ordinance, it must be necessary ; and if it is not a Divine ordinance, how dare we use it ? Therefore all who use it, all of *us*, must consider it necessary. As well might we pretend the Sacraments are not necessary to salvation, while we make use of the offices in the Liturgy ; for when God appoints means of grace, they are *the* means.

“ I do not see how any one can escape from this plain view of the subject, except (as I have already hinted) by declaring that the words do not mean all that they say. But only reflect what a most unseemly time for random words is that in which ministers are set apart for their office. Do we not adopt a Liturgy *in order to* hinder inconsiderate idle language, and shall we, in the most sacred of all services, write down, subscribe, and use again and again forms of speech which

have not been weighed, and cannot be taken strictly?

“Therefore, my dear brethren, act up to your professions. Let it not be said that you have neglected a gift; for if you have the Spirit of the Apostles on you, surely this *is* a great gift. ‘Stir up the gift of God which is in you.’ Make much of it. Show your value of it. Keep it before your minds as an honourable badge, far higher than that secular respectability, or cultivation, or polish, or learning, or rank, which gives you a hearing with the many. Tell *them* of your gift. The times will soon drive you to do this, if you mean to be still anything. But wait not for the times. Do not be compelled, by the world’s forsaking you, to recur as if unwillingly to the high source of your authority. Speak out now, before you are forced, both as glorying in your privilege and to insure your rightful honour from your people. A notion has gone abroad that they can take away your power. They think they have given and can take it away. They think it lies in the Church property, and they know that they have politically the power to confiscate that property. They have been

deluded into a notion that present palpable usefulness, produceable results, acceptableness to your flocks, that these and such like are the tests of your Divine commission. Enlighten them in this matter. Exalt our Holy Fathers the bishops, as the representatives of the Apostles, and the Angels of the Churches; and magnify your office, as being ordained by them to take part in their ministry.

“But, if you will not adopt my view of the subject, which I offer to you, not doubtingly, yet (I hope) respectfully, at all events CHOOSE YOUR SIDE. To remain neuter much longer will be itself to take a part. *Choose* your side; since side you shortly must, with one or other party, even though you do nothing. Fear to be of those whose line is decided for them by chance circumstances, and who may perchance find themselves with the enemies of Christ, while they think but to remove themselves from worldly politics. Such abstinence is impossible in troublous times. HE THAT IS NOT WITH ME IS AGAINST ME, AND HE THAT GATHERETH NOT WITH ME SCATTERETH ABROAD.”

4. List of the Tracts with their dates, authors and subjects :—

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

No.	Date. 1833.	Author.	Subject.
1.	9th Sept.	Newman	Thoughts on the Ministerial Commission.
2.	" "	"	The Catholic Church.
3.	" "	"	On alterations in the Liturgy.
4.	21st "	J. Keble	Adherence to the Apostolical Succession the safest course.
5.	18th Oct.	J. W. Bowden	The Nature and Constitution of the Church of Christ and of the Branch of it established in England.
6.	29th "	Newman	The present obligation of Primitive Practice.
7.	" "	"	The Episcopal Church Apostolical.
8.	31st "	R. H. Froude	The Gospel a Law of Liberty.
9.	" "	"	On shortening the Church Services.
10.	4th Nov.	Newman	Heads of a week-day lecture delivered to a country congregation.
11.	11th "	"	The Visible Church. Letters I. and II.
12.	4th Dec.	Thos. Keble	Richard Nelson. No. I. Bishops, Priests and Deacons.
13.	5th "	J. Keble	Sunday Lessons. Principle of Selection.
14.	12th "	A. Menzies	The Ember Days.
15.	13th "	(W. Palmer. Revised and completed by Newman)	On the Apostolical Succession in the English Church. See <i>Apologia</i> , pp. 115-16.
16.	17th "	B. Harrison	Advent.

No.	Date.	Author.	Subject.
	1833.		
17.	20th Dec.	B. Harrison	The Ministerial Commission. A trust from Christ for the benefit of His people.
18.	21st „	E. B. Pusey	On the benefits of the System of Fasting, enjoined by our Church.
19.	23rd „	Newman	On Arguing concerning the Apostolical Succession.
20.	24th „	„	The Visible Church. Letter III.
	1834.		
21.	1st Jan.	„	Mortification of the Flesh a Scripture duty.
22.	6th „	Thos. Keble	Richard Nelson. No. II. The Athanasian Creed.
23.	„ „	A. P. Perceval	The Faith and obedience of Churchmen the strength of the Church.
24.	25th „	B. Harrison	The Scripture view of the Apostolic Commission.
25.	„ „	Reprint (Bp. Beveridge)	The great Necessity and Advantage of Public Prayer.
26.	2nd Feb.	Reprint (Bp. Beveridge)	The Necessity and Advantage of Frequent Communion.
27.	24th „	Reprint (Bp. Cosin)	The History of Popish Transubstantiation.
28.	25th March	The same	Concluded.
29.	„ „	J. W. Bowden	Christian Liberty, or Why should we belong to the Church of England?
30.	„ „	The same	Continued.
31.	25th April	Newman	The Reformed Church.

142 SHORT HISTORY OF OXFORD MOVEMENT

No.	Date.	Author.	Subject.
	1834.		
32.	25th April	C. P. Eden	The standing Ordinances of Religion.
33.	1st May	Newman	Primitive Episcopacy.
34.	" "	"	Rites and Customs of the Church.
35.	8th "	A. P. Perceval	The People's Interest in their Ministers' Commission.
36.	11th June	"	Account of Religious Sects at present existing in England.
37.	24th "	Reprint	Bp. Wilson's Form of Excommunication.
38.	25th July	Newman	<i>Via Media</i> , No. I.
39.	" "	Reprint	Bp. Wilson's Form of receiving Penitents.
40.	" "	Thos. Keble	Richard Nelson. No. III. On Baptism.
41.	24th Aug.	Newman	<i>Via Media</i> , No. II.
42.	" "	Reprint	Bp. Wilson's Meditations on his Sacred Office. No. I. Sunday.
43.	21st Sept.	Thos. Keble	Richard Nelson. No. IV. Length of the Public Service.
44.	29th "	Reprint	Bp. Wilson's Meditations on his Sacred Office. No. II. Monday.
45.	18th Oct.	Newman	The grounds of our Faith.
46.	28th "	Reprint	Bp. Wilson's Meditations on his Sacred Office. No. III. Tuesday.
47.	1st Nov.	Newman	The Visible Church. Letter IV.
48.	30th "	Reprint	Bp. Wilson's Meditations on his Sacred Office. No. IV. Wednesday.

No.	Date.	Author.	Subject.
	1834.		
49.	25th Dec.	B. Harrison	The Kingdom of Heaven.
50.	26th ,,	Reprint	Bp. Wilson's Meditations on his Sacred Office. No. IV. Wednesday (continued).
	1835.		
51.	6th Jan.	R. F. Wilson	On dissent without reason in conscience.
52.	Undated	J. Keble	Sermons for Saints' Days and Holidays. No. I. St. Matthias.
53.	24th Feb.	Reprint	Bp. Wilson's Meditations on his Sacred Office. No. V. Thursday.
54.	2nd ,,	J. Keble	Sermons for Saints' Days and Holidays. No. II. The Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary.
55.	25th March	Reprint	Bp. Wilson's Meditations on his Sacred Office. No. V. Thursday (continued).
56.	,, ,,	J. W. Bowden	Holy Days observed in the English Church.
57.	,, ,,	J. Keble	Sermons for Saints' Days and Holidays. No. III. St. Mark's Day.
58.	19th April	J. W. Bowden	On the Church as viewed by Faith and by the World.
59.	25th ,,	R. H. Froude	Church and State.
60.	25th March	J. Keble	Sermons for Saints' Days and Holidays. No. IV. St. Philip and St. James.
61.	1st May	A. Butler	The Catholic Church a witness against illiberality.

144 SHORT HISTORY OF OXFORD MOVEMENT

No.	Date.	Author.	Subject.
	1835.		
62.	1st May	Reprint	Bp. Wilson's Meditations on his Sacred Office. No. V. Thursday.
63.	„ „	R. H. Froude	The Antiquity of the Existing Liturgies.
64.	11th June	Reprint	Bp. Bull on the Ancient Liturgies.
65.	29th „	„	Bp. Wilson's Meditations on his Sacred Office. No. VI. Friday.
66.	25th July	Pusey	On the Benefits of the system of Fasting prescribed by our Church. Supplement to Tract 18.
67.	24th Aug.	„	Scriptural views of Holy Baptism.
68.	29th Sept.	„	Scriptural views of Holy Baptism (continued).
69.	18th Oct.	„	Scriptural views of Holy Baptism (concluded).
70.	28th „	Reprint	Bp. Wilson's Meditations on his Sacred Office. No. VII. Saturday.
	1836.		
71.	1st Jan.	Newman	On the Controversy with the Romanists. (No. I. Against Romanism.)
72.	6th „	Reprint	Archbishop Usher on Prayers for the Dead. (No. II. Against Romanism.)
73.	2nd Feb.	Newman	On the Introduction of Rationalistic Principles into Religion.
74.	25th April (Printed as appendix to Tract No. 77)	„	<i>Catena Patrum.</i> No. I. Testimony of Writers in the later English Church to the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession.

No.	Date.	Author.	Subject.
	1836.		
75.	24th June	Newman	On the Roman Breviary as embodying the substance of the devotional Services of the Church Catholic.
76.	29th Sept.	„	<i>Catena Patrum.</i> No. II. Testimony of writers in the later English Church to the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration.
77.	1st Nov. (First issued with Tract No. 74)	Pusey	An earnest Remonstrance to the Author of <i>The Pope's Letter.</i>
	1837.		
78.	2nd Feb.	H. E. Manning and C. Marriott	<i>Catena Patrum.</i> No. III. Testimony of writers in the later English Church to the duty of maintaining <i>Quod Semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus traditum est.</i>
79.	25th March	Newman	On Purgatory. (No. III. Against Romanism.)
80.	Undated	I. Williams	On reserve in Communicating Religious knowledge. Parts I.-III.
81.	1st Nov.	Pusey	<i>Catena Patrum.</i> Testimony of writers in the later English Church to the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice with an historical account of the changes made in the Liturgy as to the expression of that doctrine.

146 SHORT HISTORY OF OXFORD MOVEMENT

No.	Date.	Author.	Subject.
	1837.		
82.	1st Nov.	Newman	Preface, title-page and contents to vol. iv., <i>i.e.</i> , Tracts 78-81, both inclusive. It was intended that each volume should contain the Tracts issued in an aca- demical year.
	1838.		
83.	29th June	„	Advent Sermons on Antichrist.
84.	24th Aug.	Thos. Keble	(Conclusion from page 35 by G. Prevost.) Whether a Clergy- man of the Church of England be now bound to have Morn- ing and Evening Prayer daily in his Parish Church.
85.	21st Sept.	Newman	Lectures on the Scrip- ture proof of the Doc- trines of the Church.
	1839.		
86.	25th March	I. Williams	Indications of a Super- intending Providence in the Preservation of the Prayer-book and in the changes which it has under- gone.
	1840.		
87.	2nd Feb.	„	Reserve in communicat- ing Religious Know- ledge (conclusion).
88.	25th March	Newman	The Greek Devotions of Bp. Andrews. Translated and ar- ranged.

No.	Date.	Author.	Subject.
	1840.		
89.	Undated	J. Keble	On the Mysticism attributed to the early Fathers of the Church.
	1841.		
90.	25th Jan.	Newman	Remarks on certain passages in the Thirty-nine Articles.

Appended to volumes i. and ii. as *Tracts for the Times* are papers styled "Records of the Church," such as "Translations of Justin Martyr on Primitive Christian Worship," "Irenæus on the Rule of Faith," "St. Cyprian on the Unity of the Church," etc.

This list is based on the *Tracts for the Times*; *Pusey's Life*, vol. iii., Appendix; Burgon's *Twelve Good Men*, vol. i., Appendix D, and the references in the *Lives* referred to in the list of authors prefixed hereto, but the greatest assistance has been obtained from the *Pusey Appendix* from which the writer has obtained most of the names and dates of the several Tracts and some incidental information. No. 8, attributed in *Pusey* to Newman, seems to have been written by R. H. Froude, see L. J. Guiney's *Life of Froude*, and Burgon's Appendix D to vol. i., p. 492, quoting Marriott's statement in a letter to Rev. A. Burn (Chichester, 29th Jan., 1840): "You ought to know that Froude was the author of the Tract 'The Gospel a Law of Liberty,'" the subject of Tract 8. No. 81, attributed to Pusey in the Appendix to his *Life*, is there said to be sometimes attributed to B. Harrison, but according to Burgon, who says he had the assistance of Harrison in preparing his Appendix, that Tract was by Harrison

and had prefixed a Tract by Dr. Pusey. As to No. 32, by C. P. Eden, Burgon refers to the *Life of Eden*. No. 51, attributed in the *Pusey Appendix* to R. F. Wilson, is said by Burgon to be of uncertain authorship. After the first edition No. 65 is a Tract of thirty-two pages containing the unabridged form of Bishop Wilson's Meditations for Friday and Saturday, and the Notes to the Scriptural views of Holy Baptism, Tracts 67, 68 and 69, are reckoned as No. 70.

Down to the middle of 1839 the progress of the Movement and especially of the Tractarian development was strenuous, prosperous and confident. The idea entertained during the early ages, expounded by Mr. Bryce in his *Holy Roman Empire*, that the Church and the State were one and coterminous, was not and could not be entertained by English Churchmen in view of the facts of the legalised existence of Roman and Protestant dissenters ; but a form of that idea, *i.e.*, the idea that an Established Church was a vital part of the State, was held by them, and so strongly that the tampering with such connection, whether by the suppression of Irish bishoprics or threatened interference with the English Church, justified the use by Mr. Keble and his friends of so strong a term as "National Apostasy". } Newman

himself had returned in July fully recovered from his recent serious illness, full of life and vigour, and so rejuvenated that some of his friends hardly recognised him, and able and willing to take up the work he had to do, which he had rather mistily talked of in Rome and Sicily. In 1833 Newman was firmly confident of his position, based on three propositions :¹ (1) The principle of dogma. His battle was with liberalism, by which he meant the anti-dogmatic principle and its developments. (2) The truth of a certain definite religious teaching based on that foundation of dogma—*viz.*, that there was a visible Church, with sacraments and rites which were the channels of invisible grace and which he thought was the doctrine of Scripture of the early Church and of the Anglican Church. In 1834 and following years he put this ecclesiastical doctrine on a broader basis after reading Laud, Bramhall, Stillingfleet and other Anglican divines on the one hand, and after studying the Fathers on the other, but when he began the *Tracts for the Times* he rested the main doctrine upon Scripture, on the Anglican

¹ *Apologia*, p. 48.

Prayer-book and on St. Ignatius's Epistles. (3) The third point was his view of the Church of Rome, which he considered to be Antichrist ; but as time went on he became less bitter on the subject and did not give up the notion altogether in any shape till 1843 ; but the two first propositions Newman says he always retained. The Tracts began by the issue of Newman's three dated the 9th of September, 1833, and the issue continued rapidly till about the end of 1835, when, the influence of Pusey having made itself felt, the Tracts from being merely short sharp addresses, designed, as stated in the advertisement prefixed to volume i. of the Tracts, to strengthen the Anglican Church against the inroads of Popery and of Methodism, and to rouse the members of the Church to comprehend her position and their own duties, with only so much of doctrine and argument as might be necessary to account for their publication or might answer more obvious objections to the views therein advocated, became argumentative treatises and promised to form a deeper and fuller body of Anglican theology based on the lines laid down by the theologians of the seven-

teenth century, and with these were ponderous catenæ of patristic or Anglican divinity by which the continuity and authority of various points of such doctrine were intended to be established. Pusey had contributed Tract 18, dated 21st December, 1833, but did not fully join the Movement till 1835 or 1836. He published his Tracts on Baptism,¹ August to October, 1835, being Nos. 67, 68 and 69, and started the Library of the Fathers in 1836. The distribution of the earlier Tracts was energetic though primitive. The Rev. T. Mozley describes the difficulties of circulating them. After referring to the prejudice against Tracts, which had become a favourite medium for the spread of the truth as currently believed, but from which the clergy and educated classes had been exempt, and the practical difficulties with publishers about publishing, circulating and the like, he says the Tracts had to be circulated by post, by hand, or anyhow, and many a young clergyman spent days in riding about with a pocketful, surprising his neighbours at breakfast, lunch, dinner and tea. The correspondence that ensued was enormous.

¹ *Apologia*, p. 42.

Nobody was too humble in intellect or in clerical position not to be invited and enrolled an ally.¹ Newman says he called upon clergy in various parts of the country (as upon a Northamptonshire clergyman who inquired whether Whately was at the bottom of them) whether he was acquainted with them or not, attended the houses of friends and wrote various letters, and later on² he describes how young curates fresh from Oxford had down from London parcels of the Tracts and other publications, placed them in the shops of local booksellers, got them into newspapers, introduced them into clerical meetings, and converted more or less their rectors and their brother curates. If it may be permitted to use the language of Company Promoters in connection with a religious Movement, it might be said that it was well "boomed". Towards the end of 1834 the first forty-six Tracts were collected into a volume with an advertisement prefixed explaining their object. The first sentence is: "The following Tracts were published with the object of contributing some-

¹ Mozley, *Reminiscences*, pp. 312-13.

² *Apologia*, pp. 58, 59.

thing towards the practical revival of doctrines, which although held by great divines of our Church at present have become obsolete with the majority of her members, and are withdrawn from public view even by the more learned and orthodox few who still adhere to them". Then it refers to the Apostolic Succession and the Holy Catholic Church as principles of action in the minds of their predecessors of the seventeenth century, the increase of sectarianism, that the Sacraments, not preaching, are the sources of Divine Grace, that the Apostolical Ministry had a virtue in it which went out over the whole Church when sought by the prayer of faith, that fellowship with it was a gift and a privilege as well as a duty, that Methodism and Popery are in different ways the refuge of those whom the Church stints of the gifts of grace, and calls attention to the neglect of the daily service, the desecration of festivals, the scanty administration of the Eucharist, insubordination and such deficiencies, and that an injunction to men to depend on their private judgment cruel in itself is doubly hurtful as throwing them on such teachers as speak

daringly and promise largely, and not only aid but supersede individual exertion, and that those neglected doctrines faithfully preached would repress that extension of Popery for which the multiplying divisions of the religious world were preparing the way.

For about a year after the Hadleigh Conference matters progressed quietly, Mr. Palmer was pathetically busy with his addresses and associations, and the University found congenial amusement and interest in discussing the false quantity made by the Duke of Wellington on his installation as Chancellor, but in the meantime the Tracts were increasing rapidly in number, and although the early energetic distribution was no longer persisted in, and perhaps unnecessary, they had attracted attention and caused inquiry all over the country and not merely in Oxford. And concurrently Newman was Sunday by Sunday delivering with increasing power and influence those Sermons which attracted the members of the University in great numbers and formed a powerful and luminous commentary on the great ethical and religious questions which underlie all the forms of religious faith. The

influence of Mr. Palmer and his friends with their mechanical processes naturally decayed, while the influence of Newman and his friends with their strenuous appeals to the learning, intelligence and consciences of men as naturally increased.

5. Towards the end of 1834 the fears of immediate violent interference with the English Church had largely died down, but a new and important question appeared which raised in effect the claim of Oxford to be an exclusive preserve for members of the Church and a training ground for its clergy, and not merely a place of education for the nation at large. This question was brought forward by the Liberals, and was whether subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles should still be required at matriculation from all persons who desired to enter the University. Oxford had always been one of the great schools of the Church, and had even more than Cambridge been regarded as the home of dogmatic orthodox Church teaching, and was for all practical purposes an ecclesiastical institution in the closest connection with the Church. Unlike Cambridge, it required every one who matriculated to sign

the Thirty-nine Articles. The proposal therefore to abolish the subscription at matriculation with the express object of admitting Dissenters, came as a shock to all who considered themselves to be sound Churchmen without any taint of Liberalism. This proposal produced two pamphlets of interest, one by a writer who signed himself Rusticus, and who was, in fact, well known afterwards as the Rev. F. D. Maurice, who defended subscription on the ground that the Articles were signed not as tests or confessions of faith, but as "Conditions of thought" under which learners were willing to learn and teachers to teach, but this reasoning obviously cut away the ground on which the orthodox rested their defence of subscription. The other pamphlet directly indicated and enforced the proposal. It was by Dr. Hampden, who had delivered the Bampton Lectures in 1832. His theory was that all creeds and formularies were merely the inventions of philosophy and invasions of Christian Liberty. The importance of the pamphlet was said to have arisen from its reasons and not from its conclusions, its ground being that already developed in his

Bampton Lectures, namely, the distinction between the "Divine facts" of revelation and all human interpretations of them and inferences from them, and this was used as an argument against the old system of the University, and his reasons created alarm among the sounder Churchmen. Put more precisely, in this pamphlet he had maintained that religion was distinct from theological opinion, that it is but a common prejudice to identify theological propositions, methodically deduced and stated, with the simple religion of Christ, that under theological opinion were to be placed the Trinitarian doctrine and the Unitarian, that a dogma was a theological opinion formally insisted on, that speculation always left an opening for improvement, and that the Church of England was not dogmatic in its spirit, though the wording of its formularies might so sound. In November, 1834, Hampden sent Newman a copy of the second edition of the pamphlet, and in his letter acknowledging its receipt, Newman says: "While I respect the tone of piety which the pamphlet displays, I dare not trust myself to put on paper my feelings about the principles contained in

it ; tending as they do in my opinion to make shipwreck of Christian faith ".¹ A war of pamphlets ensued between those who insisted on the religious character of University education and those who insisted on the injustice of exclusion and the hurtfulness of tests applied to young and ignorant men. In the end the heads of houses were induced to submit to the Oxford Convocation the proposal to abolish subscription at matriculation, and it was in May, 1835, rejected by a majority of five to one, and this large majority was a genuine expression of the sense of the University.² In August, September and October, 1835, Pusey had issued the Tracts by him on Holy Baptism. These being on the same subject could scarcely be called Tracts, but made a bulky volume of 400 pages which on reprinting was cut down to about 200 pages, and was considered a very learned and complete treatise on the subject. In November, 1835, the preface to volume ii. of the Tracts, after referring to the altered state of public information and opinion relating to the grounds of adherence to the Church

¹ *Apologia*, p. 57. ² Church, p. 158.

created by discussions in various quarters and among other writers by the writers of the Tracts, the author refers especially to the doctrine of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, and to the fact that the prospect of the loss of State protection had made it necessary to look out for other reasons for adherence to the Church besides that of obedience to the civil magistrate, that the work would not be the work of a day, and that relapses, abuses and perversions must not occasion surprise. From the end of 1835 or the beginning of 1836 men outside Oxford began to be alive to the new and not very intelligible ideas referred to in the Tracts and the preface to volume ii. The question of subscription was of course a question of very far-reaching importance, but an event was about to occur which although of far less intrinsic importance in general University polity yet attracted enormous interest in the University and the Church, and, coupled with the ideas just referred to, naturally occasioned great alarm.

6. On the 19th January, 1836, Dr. Burton, the Regius Professor of Divinity, unexpectedly died, and in a few days the news came that

the Prime Minister, Lord Melbourne, would appoint Hampden to the vacant chair. Great commotion arose at Oxford, a petition to the throne was presented, but rejected, and every influence was used by the High Church and Tory party to prevent such an appointment being made : but Dr. Hampden became Professor. He was a man of mature age, having been born in 1793, and of ability, who had obtained a double first class and a Fellowship at Oriel. On marriage he left Oxford and engaged in parochial and other work for some time, but ultimately returned to Oxford. He was of assistance to Dr. Hawkins in taking part in the tuition at Oriel when the provost fell into difficulties with the tutors. In 1833 he became Principal of St. Mary Hall, and in 1834 Professor of Moral Philosophy as against Newman the other candidate. But he was a Liberal both in religion and politics. The Rev. T. Mozley says : " Hampden was one of the most unprepossessing of men. He was not so much repulsive as utterly unattractive. There was a certain stolidity about him that contrasted strongly with the bright, vivacious and singularly lovable figures with whom the

eyes of Oriel men were then familiarised . . . his face was inexpressive, his head was set deep in his broad shoulders and his voice was harsh and unmodulated. Some one said of him that he stood before you like a milestone and brayed at you like a jackass. . . . He made one thing as dull as another.”¹

In 1827 he had published an essay on the Philosophical Evidence of Christianity, and in 1832 had delivered his famous Bampton Lectures on the Scholastic Philosophy Considered in its Relations to Christian Theology, but he was best known at Oxford by his pamphlet, already referred to, advocating the admission of Dissenters to the University. The opposition was so strong that Hampden offered to resign the appointment, but the Prime Minister declined to accept it or to yield to University clamour, and accordingly in October, 1836, Hampden entered on his office. It is easy to understand the feelings of the High Churchmen at an appointment

¹ *Reminiscences*, pp. 351-52. Lord Panmure said: “Macaulay’s *History* is not a history; it is merely pot-house gossip” (*Life of Earl Granville*, by Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, vol. i., p. 141).

which carried with it the power of instructing and guiding half the rising clergy of England. The Bampton Lectures which formed the foundation of the objection to Hampden, although delivered so long ago as 1832, were practically unknown to most men at the University. The subject was dry and difficult and the treatment unattractive. They were in fact neither listened to nor read till later events called attention to them, when it was found that their theory left nothing standing but the authority of the letter of the Scripture. All else was "speculation," "human inference," "dogma," and he did not pretend to take even the creeds out of that category. He distinguished between the "Divine facts" of Scripture and the authority of its bare letter and the glosses placed on them or deduced from them by the Church, whether in the shape of creeds or other formularies, and so implicitly denied the authority of the Church and treated its most authoritative assertions as mere dicta. It was this theory on which he based his plan of comprehension in his pamphlet on the admission of Dissenters. Men were familiar with that as raising a distinct

concrete issue who would never pay any attention to abstract investigations and discussions like those contained in the Lectures. It was the reasoning in the pamphlet which startled and aroused men quite as much as its conclusions, and by degrees it filtered into men's minds that this reasoning was in essence identical with that in the Lectures, and, notwithstanding Hampden's professions of absolute orthodoxy, both alike unsound and dangerous. It was felt that efforts should be made to neutralise the effect of the appointment so far as was then possible, and naturally the first step was to mark their disagreement with Hampden's unsound positions and to censure his errors, but a preliminary difficulty arose in the comparative ignorance of the majority of his specific teaching, and therefore a pamphlet was written by Newman called *Elucidations of Dr. Hampden's Theological Statements*, and said to have been drawn up in one night. One special point made was that according to Hampden there might be interpretations and inferences from Scripture, but no certain or authoritative one, none that warranted an organised Church. Hampden's

friends said that the Elucidations were merely garbled extracts and unfair, and that many took their estimate of Hampden from those extracts, while the other side contended that they fairly represented the subject discussed. A great mass of literature, however, was issued on the question, and in the result the heads of houses, without stating Hampden's unsound doctrines, but to mark their distrust, brought in a proposal to deprive Hampden of his vote as professor in the choice of select preachers till the University should otherwise determine. This was defeated in Convocation by the veto of the two proctors, but when new proctors came into office the proposal was introduced again, and carried in May, 1837, by 474 to 94. This seems a petty exhibition of impotent rage and had no real effect, and in the end after some futile attempts to rescind the vote the agitation on this question gradually died down. Passions, however, had risen high during the discussions, and were not confined merely to Hampden's alleged unsoundness but also extended to the tendencies of the Tractarian Movement, and members of the Evangelical party, who in 1837 joined in the pro-

test against Hampden's appointment, avowed their desire that the next time they were brought up to Oxford to give a vote it might be in order to put down the Popery of the Movement.¹ The suspicions of the Tract writers and their friends had been gathering head for some time, and were also given expression to in a violent article in the *Edinburgh Review* (April, 1836) by Dr. Arnold, on what he called the "Oxford Malignants". In 1836 Dr. Pusey projected a great work, a series of translations and also editions of the Fathers which was announced as a "Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church Anterior to the Division of the East and West," under the editorship of Pusey, Keble and Newman. Pusey always took a great interest in this work, and it became the main task of Charles Marriott's life. It had a fair circulation, and a considerable number of bishops were among its subscribers.

7. Rome had never forgotten or become reconciled to the loss of England at the Reformation, and had not lost hope that at some time she would return to the one fold, the

¹ *Apologia*, p. 63.

Church of Rome, and therefore remained an interested spectator of the events passing in the English Church, and judging that a psychological moment had arrived, Dr. Wiseman, who had returned to England by 1836, delivered in London lectures on the doctrines of Catholicism, the first effect of which was to create an impression through the country which was shared in by the Tract writers and their friends, that they had for their opponents in controversy, not only their brethren, but their hereditary foes.¹ Newman, not content merely with his writings and sermons, had for some years in Advent and after Easter delivered lectures on some theological subject in Adam de Brome's Chapel, an appendage to St. Mary's on the north side, and these lectures afterwards became the volume on *The Prophetical Office of the Church Viewed Relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism*, the volume on Justification, and the lectures on Antichrist and on Rationalism and the Canon of Scripture, which afterwards became Nos. 83 and 85 of the Tracts. The force, breadth of view and grasp of subject which marked these

¹ *Apologia*, p. 64.

lectures caused them to be listened to with great interest, and when collected into volumes their influence was powerful and wide. Dr. Wiseman's lectures and the views taken of them led to the publication of *The Prophetical Office of the Church*. It had employed Newman for three years, from the beginning of 1834 to the end of 1836, and was composed after a consideration and comparison of the principal divines of the seventeenth century. It was recast twice, and lastly, after considerable retrenchments and additions, was rewritten for publication and published in March, 1837. It attempted to trace out the rudimental lines on which Christian faith and teaching proceed and to use them as means of determining the relation of the Roman and Anglican systems to each other. It insisted on points of agreement as well as of difference, but its main scope was an attempt at commencing a system of theology on the Anglican idea and based on Anglican authorities. It aimed at a consolidation of their judgments. What Newman wished was to build up an Anglican theology out of the stores which already lay cut and hewn upon the ground, the past toil of great divines,

though this could not be the work of one man. And he also desired to find a basis in reason for his belief and to avow that basis. He says in the introduction: "What we need at present for our Church's well-being is not invention nor originality nor sagacity nor even learning in our divines, at least in the first place . . . but we need peculiarly a sound judgment, patient thought, discrimination, a comprehensive mind, and abstinence from all private fancies and caprices and personal tastes—in a word, Divine Wisdom". The subject of the volume was, in fact, the famous doctrine of the *Via Media*, a receding from extremes, but still with a definite shape and character. The obvious objection to it was that it was not objective and real; it was merely a paper religion, and not a real religion like Protestantism or Popery. It, however, implied no doubt of, but on the contrary assumed, the three fundamental points above mentioned, namely, dogma, the sacramental system and anti-Romanism. The object, therefore, of those who accepted the doctrine of the *Via Media* was to make it a living Church in a position proper to itself and founded on distinct

principles, and a number of works originated in this object. The essay on Justification, written in 1837 and published in March, 1838, was aimed at the Lutheran dictum that justification by faith only was the cardinal doctrine of Christianity. In the preface he speaks of suggestions towards the consolidation of a theological system built on those formularies to which all clergymen are bound, and implies that the dissertation was a tentative inquiry. In his University Sermons there is a series of discussions on the subject of Faith and Reason, being the commencement of an inquiry into the ultimate basis of religious faith prior to the distinction into creeds. In like manner Newman published in 1838 a pamphlet on the Real Presence, designed to place the doctrine on an intellectual basis by denying the existence of space except as a subjective idea of our minds, and there was a stream of articles in the *British Critic* written directly or indirectly with the same object. In 1838 the Rev. W. Palmer published his treatise on the Church of Christ which was begun under the circumstances which induced Newman to re-write his *Prophetical Office of the Church*, and was a

work highly spoken of by Newman and all persons acquainted with its subject, but which from its dry learned scientific treatment failed to catch the attention of persons accustomed to the spice and flavour of the writings of the Tract writers and their friends, and was some time before it obtained the recognition it deserved, and, in fact, was in the nature of a theological treatise or text-book.

Towards the end of 1838 a proposal was made, and was zealously pushed forward by Mr. Golightly and other opponents of Tractarianism, to raise a subscription and erect a monument in Oxford to the martyrs of the Reformation—Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer. This was apparently an innocent and reasonable proposal, and some members of the party gave in their adhesion to it, but it soon became obvious that it was also calculated and intended to be, at any rate indirectly, a test question which would place, and did place, the Tractarian party in a difficulty, for recent investigations had shown that in their view the Reformers had been parties to many reprehensible acts and were untrustworthy theologians. Although among other

things much was due to them for the respect shown to the essentials of Catholic truth and usage and much for what was beautiful and devotional in the Prayer-book, their own language was in the direction of Calvin and Zwinglius, and so there was a reaction among High Churchmen from the excessive veneration they had formerly enjoyed. Although, therefore, Dr. Pusey was at first disposed to subscribe, Newman and his friends for the most part, as was expected and perhaps intended, held aloof, and so marked themselves as not loyal to the Reformation as understood by the promoters of the memorial. The subscription, however, was raised and the memorial erected, but they had no real effect upon the Tractarian Movement beyond the creation of a certain amount of prejudice, and they altogether failed as an effective protest against such Movement. It may, however, be said of Newman and of every one who adopted the doctrine of the *Via Media*, that at this time the language used by Hurrell Froude fairly described them, namely, "we are Catholics without the Popery, and Church of England men without the Protestantism".¹ The doctrine of the *Via Media*,

¹ *Remains*, vol. i., p. 404.

however, involved very difficult questions. Had it any, and, if so, what solid basis? Why choose arbitrarily the divines of the seventeenth century as the foundation of the desired substantive living religion? If, as Newman said, the work of building up an Anglican theology (that is, the work of investigation, harmonising and consolidation of the stores already existing) could not be the work of one man, who was to choose the men for the work? Who was to decide in case they differed, or if others criticised their conclusions? Was it to be Pusey, or Keble, or Newman, or was there to be a Council of Oxford to define authoritatively the tenets and details of this doctrine? To the plain outsider, the holders of the doctrine were like men sitting on a fence, and regard being had to their expressed views, there did not seem much doubt on which side they would ultimately jump off.

THE MOVEMENT, 1839 TO 1845.

1. Newman himself considered that in the spring of 1839 his position in the Anglican Church was at its height, but notwithstanding the smoothness with which matters had pro-

ceeded there were some premonitory signs of the storm which was shortly to burst. There was the Martyrs' Memorial just referred to. Men like Jas. B. Mozley, Mark Pattison and others, suspected of leanings even towards Puseyism, found the suspicions to be in their way when applying for Fellowships. The Bishop of Oxford in his charge in 1838 made some animadversions on the *Tracts for the Times*, in consequence of which Newman offered to withdraw those over which he had control if he were informed which were those to which the bishop had objections, but the bishop did not think it necessary to proceed to such a measure. There was also to be reckoned with the growing sullen displeasure of men whose settled beliefs were being attacked when the attack was passing from the academic to the practical stage. The publication of Hurrell Froude's *Remains*, the first part of which had appeared early in 1838 and the later part in 1839, added largely to the uneasiness and alarm which were being generally felt by moderate men. Their general character is stated above in the sketch of Hurrell Froude, but by degrees men began to realise the mean-

ing and effect of the fact that they avowedly condemned the Reformation, and its condemnation was acquiesced in and adopted by the two editors, Newman and Keble, in their preface to the second part of the *Remains*, the theory of the *Via Media* not dealing directly with the Reformation. The general feeling created by them was alarm at the attack on the Reformation, and disgust at the morbidity and unwholesomeness of the self-revelations they contained. The equilibrium of the *Via Media* party was disturbed by the adhesion of a number of able young men who had not gone through the investigations, discussions and struggles of the previous six years, who were comparatively free from the lingering conservatism of the older members, and in fact began at the stage those older members had so painfully arrived at, and whose more daring logic and speculation are said to have forced the pace. The foremost of these was Mr. William George Ward, sometime Fellow and Mathematical Lecturer at Balliol. He was a man of immense ability, acuteness and energy, but his tastes were mathematical rather than classical. He had no historical sense or attain-

ments, but he had a gift for taking premises and working them out to their ultimate logical conclusions. He had a certain taste for theology, was given to society, and without being coarse or profane he was jovial and fond of music, inclining occasionally rather to the buffo style, but extremely popular with all classes. He was ordained deacon as an Arnoldian, and priest as a Newmanite, and signed the Articles in a different sense on each occasion. The other prominent men of his school were Oakeley, Faber, Dalgairns, and others of the same kind. " While Newman passed from the study of antiquity to the conception of a United Universal Church, and from that conception to a reluctant doubt of the lawfulness of separation from Rome, Ward by an exactly opposite process passed from admiration for the Roman Church to the conception of the necessity of Union with the Church Universal, and hence to a doubt, suggested by the fact that the Anglican Church had once enjoyed such communion, as to whether it might not still have it potentially. The link in the past which drove Newman towards Rome in spite of his love of England kept Mr. Ward in the

English Church in spite of the attractions of Rome.”¹ From 1839 Ward and his friends practically repeated to Newman and his friends their treatment of W. Palmer and his more moderate party. It would be hopeless and unnecessary to attempt to give anything like a detailed account of the war of essays and articles which raged round this new development, but some writings must be referred to.

2. About February, 1839, Pusey put forward in the shape of “A Letter to the Bishop of Oxford” a defence of Tractarianism from the charge of holding corrupt and dangerous principles approximating to Romanism. It adhered anew to the Apostolicity of the Christian Episcopate and Ministry in England, and fully recognised the bishop’s authority as a successor of the Apostles. He also vindicated the authority of the Scripture and of the Church, maintaining the orthodox view of the weight of universal tradition. He also dealt with the doctrine of justification, the Sacraments, prayers for the dead, invocation of saints and other teaching of the Tractarians, and on the whole

¹ Ward, pp. 137, 141.

the Letter was considered to have strengthened the Tractarian cause.

In April, 1839, Newman had an article in the *British Critic* entitled "The State of Religious Parties," which Newman says¹ best describes his state of mind at the early part of 1839. It reviews the actual state of things and looks towards the future. After citing evidence from opponents as to the success of the Movement, including a bishop's charge that "under the specious pretence of deference to antiquity and respect for primitive models the foundations of the Protestant Church are undermined by men who dwell within her walls, and those who sit in the Reformers' seat are traducing the Reformation," the article proceeds to account for it as a reaction from the dry and superficial character of the religious teaching and the literature of the last generation or century, as a result of the need for a deeper philosophy and as the evidence and partial fulfilment of that need. It was absurd to refer it to the act of two or three individuals. It was "a spirit afloat".

¹ *Apologia*, p. 94.

“It was an adversary in the air, a something one and entire, a whole wherever it is, unapproachable and incapable of being grasped, as being the result of causes far deeper than political or other visible agencies, the spiritual awakening of spiritual wants.” And after referring to the variety of the antecedents of its chief preachers, he admitted that some of the disciples of the Movement needed to be kept in order. He then passed on to the subject of antiquity, the basis of the doctrine of the *Via Media*, and, lastly, the author proceeded to the question of the future of the Anglican Church which was to be a new birth of the Ancient Religion. Liberalism, he said, merely occupied the ground between contending powers, Catholic Truth and Rationalism. Then indeed would be the stern encounter when two real and living principles, simple and entire and consistent, one in the Church the other out of it, at length rush upon each other, contending not for names and words or half views, but for elementary notions and distinctive moral characters. This state of things could not last, men would take one view or another, but it would be a consistent

view, Liberalism or Erastianism, or Popery, or Catholicity, but it would be real, and concluded by saying that all who did not wish to be democratic or pantheistic or popish must look out for some *Via Media*.¹ Many years after Newman describes this article as the last words which he ever spoke as an Anglican to Anglicans. Taken literally, this is not quite accurate, but qualified as the last words spoken by him as an undoubting Anglican, it is probably quite accurate, and interesting accordingly. The article had brought matters to a clear issue. The parties were the Anglican *Via Media* on the one side, and the Popular Religion of Rome on the other. The issue was, the Anglican stood on antiquity or Apostolicity, the Roman on Catholicity. "The Anglican said to the Roman there is but one faith, the ancient, and you have not kept it; the Roman retorted there is but one Church, the Catholic, and you are out of it. The cause lay thus, Apostolicity *v.* Catholicity."²

3. About the middle of June, 1839, Newman began to study and master the history

¹ *Apologia*, p. 103. ² *Ibid.*, p. 106.

of the Monophysites and was absorbed in the doctrinal question.¹ It was in the course of this reading that a doubt came upon him of the tenableness of Angelicanism, and by the end of August he was seriously alarmed. Newman says: "Here in the middle of the fifth century I found as it seemed to me Christendom of the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries reflected. I saw my face in that mirror, and I was a Monophysite. The Church of the *Via Media* was in the position of the Oriental Communion, Rome was where she now is, and the Protestants were the Eutychians."² In the *Dublin Review* for August, 1839, there was an article by Dr. Wiseman on the "Anglican Claim". It was on the Donatists with an application to Anglicanism, but a friend in September called Newman's attention to the words of St. Augustine which had escaped him at first,

¹ "The Monophysite heresy, originated by Eutychus, an Oriental theologian, asserted that Christ had only one nature, and that His Divine and human natures were so united as to form only one nature, yet without any change, confusion or mixture of the two natures" (Hook's *Church Dictionary*, fifteenth edition, p. 509).

² *Apologia*, p. 114.

“Securus judicat orbis terrarum,” and repeated them again and again, and after he had gone they kept ringing in his ears, “Securus judicat orbis terrarum”—the deliberate judgment in which the whole Church at length rests and acquiesces is an infallible prescription and a final sentence against such portions of it as protest and secede. Newman had seen a ghost. He mentioned his state of mind to two friends—one of them Mr. Henry Wilberforce, who felt the shock severely, but the doubt was not generally known, and Newman by degrees began to grow calm and the vivid impression on his imagination faded away, but he could no longer speak with the same clearness and confidence as before respecting the validity of the Anglican position, and never settled down again exactly into his old position. He no longer maintained the *Via Media* or attacked Rome as schismatical. His new position was, Rome is the Church, and we are the Church; and we need not inquire which of the two has deflected most from the Apostolic Standard.¹ This was the view

¹ Ward, p. 145.

he put forward in the article on "The Catholicity of the English Church," which appeared in January, 1840, and was the first result of his restored tranquillity of mind. But he had never really got over the effect of Dr. Wiseman's article on the Donatists, and began to prepare for a move from Oxford, from St. Mary's and his Fellowship. He bought about ten acres of land at Littlemore and began to plant, and asked his brother-in-law, Rev. T. Mozley, for plans, intending to build and establish a kind of monastic establishment connected with the University, Littlemore was a part of St. Mary's Parish, about two or three miles from Oxford. Newman had built a church there some years before, and went there in Lent, 1840, and gave himself up to teaching in the parish school and practising the choir.

4. Newman was in a very difficult position now. The younger men carried out their conclusions to their utmost limits and defended them by ascribing them to Newman, but when challenged with a request for a reference in his writings they could only reply that he had said so and so, and that what they alleged

was implicitly contained in what he had already said. On the other hand, even at a later date, when asked by Pusey whether he agreed with some proposition of Ward, he could only reply, "I do not know the limits of my own belief" (Letter, Newman to Pusey in October, 1842). On the other hand, Newman had led a multitude of younger men to a considerable distance in the direction of Rome, and he was expected to keep them from going the whole distance and joining that Church. The actual cause of his dealing with the Articles in the beginning of 1841, was the restlessness of those who neither liked the *Via Media* nor his strong judgment against Rome. Their tangible difficulty was subscription to the Articles. Newman says: "It was thrown in our teeth: How can you manage to sign the Articles? They are directly against Rome. Against Rome? I made answer, what do you mean by Rome? and then I proceeded to make distinctions."¹ He says that by Roman doctrine might be meant one of three things: (1) The Catholic teaching of the early centuries; or (2) the

¹ *Apologia*, p. 78.

formal dogmas of Rome as contained in the later Councils, especially the Council of Trent, and as condensed in the Creed of Pope Pius IV.; or (3) the actual popular beliefs and usages sanctioned by Rome in countries in communion with it over and above the dogmas, and these he called "dominant errors". Newman alleged that Protestants commonly thought that in all three senses "Roman Doctrine" was condemned in the Articles, but Newman thought that though Catholic teaching was not condemned the dominant errors were, and as to the formal dogmas, that some were and some were not, and that the line had to be drawn between them. Each creed was obscured and misrepresented by a circumambient "Popery" and "Protestantism". The main thesis of his essay was therefore this: The Articles do not oppose Catholic teaching, they but partially oppose Roman dogma, they for the most part oppose the dominant errors of Rome, and the problem was to draw the line as to what they allowed and what they condemned. The Articles he considered were elastic, and he wanted to ascertain what was the limit of that elasticity

in the direction of Roman dogma—and what a man subscribing might hold rather than what he must.

5. The result of this investigation was the celebrated Tract 90 of the *Tracts for the Times*, entitled, “Remarks on Certain Passages in the Thirty-nine Articles,” and published in February, 1841. It was intended to establish the thesis above stated, and therefore to show that the Thirty-nine Articles were not hopelessly irreconcilable with the Catholic teaching the Tract writers had defended on the authority of the great Anglican divines, although this was alleged by some advanced Tractarians as well as by their opponents. This could only be done by a strict examination of the language of the Articles themselves; when it was objected that the ideas of the framers of the Articles were well known, and that the object was to place an insuperable barrier between the English Church and everything Romish, the answer was that the Articles were legal documents and were to be interpreted according to the strict meaning of words, and not by the opinions of the framers or promulgators, either as theologians or ec-

clesiastical politicians, that they were in fact intended to be comprehensive and not such as to drive away extreme men of either view in the Church. The principle was compromise, and was visible not only in the Articles but also in the Sacramental offices of the Prayer-book, which left so much out to satisfy the Protestants and left so much in to satisfy the Catholics. The Tract went therefore through the Articles which were looked on as either Anti-Catholic or Anti-Roman. It went through them with a dry logical way of interpretation such as a professed theologian might use, and as they would be examined and construed by a purely legal court. He argued that they could not have been intended to contradict the Canons of the Council of Trent, as was popularly supposed, because they had been composed several years before those Canons were published or the Council itself completed, that they were directed not against Catholic doctrines but against the popular abuses of those doctrines. They condemned "Masses," but they did not condemn "the Mass". They condemned the Romish doctrine of Purgatory, but the Romish was not the

Greek, and there might be many others. Some of the interpretations seemed far fetched and artificial.¹ The whole Tract seemed to the ordinary plain mind too subtle and too clever, and from that it was only a step to describe such a treatise, explaining away what had been believed to be a sure test, as dishonest and immoral.

6. Tract 90 at once became the sensation of the day. Mr. James Mozley in a letter to his sister dated the 8th March, 1841, says : " A new Tract has come out this week and is beginning to make a sensation. It is on the Articles and shows that they bear a highly Catholic meaning, and that many doctrines of which the Romanist are corruptions may be held consistently with them. This is no more than what we know as a matter of history, for the Articles were expressly worded to bring in Roman Catholics. But people are astonished and confused at the idea now, as if it were quite new. And they have been so accustomed for a long time to look at the Articles as on a par with the Creed, that they think, I suppose,

¹ Church, pp. 284-87. Froude, *Short Studies*, fourth series, pp. 214, 215.

that if they subscribe to them they are bound to hold whatever doctrines (not positively stated in them) are not merely condemned. So if they will have a Tractarian sense they are thereby all Tractarians. It is of course highly complimentary to the whole set of us to be so very much surprised that we should think what we held to be consistent with the Articles which we have subscribed."

On the same day, the 8th March, 1841, four senior tutors, Mr. Tait, Mr. Churton, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Griffiths, protested against the teaching of the Tract. They indicated five heads of doctrine: (1) Purgatory, (2) Pardons, (3) Worshipping and adoration of images and relics, (4) Invocation of Saints, and (5) the Mass, and in view of the tendency of the teaching as mitigating the differences between England and Rome, and as breaking down the guarantee which subscription was supposed to afford, that Roman doctrine should not be preached by Anglican Ministers, and requested that the writer's name should be made known, so that some person besides the printer and the publisher should acknowledge himself responsible. On the 15th March, 1841,

a week later, at a meeting of the Vice-Chancellor, heads of houses and proctors which refused to wait for Newman's defence, although known to be coming, and in fact dated 13th March, 1841, a resolution was carried with respect to Tract 90: "That modes of interpretation such as are suggested in the said Tract, evading rather than explaining the sense of the Thirty-nine Articles and reconciling subscription to them with the adoption of errors which they were designed to counteract, defeat the object and are inconsistent with the due observance of the above-mentioned Statutes," *i.e.*, the statutes of the University, that every student should be instructed and examined in the Thirty-nine Articles and should subscribe to them. Newman wrote the following day to the Vice-Chancellor acknowledging the authorship, and immediately afterwards published a letter to Dr. Jelf in explanation of the Tract, especially with reference to the criticisms in the Four Tutors' Protest. The conclusion was: "The Tract is grounded on the belief that the Articles need not be so closed as the received method of teaching closes them, and ought not to be for the sake of many persons.

If we will close them we run the risk of subjecting persons whom we should least like to lose to the temptation of joining the Church of Rome." It is now generally considered that the conduct of the authorities was violent and ignorant, but with the exception of Dr. Routh none of them were men of learning or distinction, and they were strongly prejudiced against and full of fear of Rome. The Bishop of Oxford, however, informed Newman that in his view the Tract was objectionable and might tend to disturb the peace and tranquillity of the Church, and advised that the *Tracts for the Times* should be discontinued. Newman at once wrote to the bishop (29th March, 1841) expressing his willingness to comply, and giving up his place in the Movement, but vindicating the Tracts generally, and Tract 90 particularly, from the charges made against them. The great point was that the Tracts were not suppressed. Number 90 was neither suppressed nor withdrawn; on the contrary, on the 29th March, 1841, the date of the letter to the bishop, a second edition appeared with additions and qualifications to meet objections made to it in its original form. Newman

in a letter dated 9th May, 1841, says: "The bishops are very desirous of hushing the matter up, and I certainly have done my utmost to co-operate with them on the understanding that the Tract is not to be withdrawn or condemned".¹ Newman had forgotten the warning he had received some thirteen years before against "understandings"² ("I greatly dislike the word 'understanding,' which is always *misunderstood*").³ There followed of course a violent war of pamphlets between the supporters and opponents of the Tract, in which Mr. Ward took a very prominent part, but which it is not necessary here further to refer to. Feelings ran so high that in June, 1841, Mr. Ward felt it proper to resign his mathematical and logical lectureships in the College.

7. In the summer of 1841 Newman was at Littlemore without any harass or anxiety on his mind—he had determined to put aside all controversy and set himself down to a translation of St. Athanasius—but between July and November he received three blows which he says "broke him".⁴ (1) In the Arian

¹ *Apologia*, p. 138.

² *Ibid.*, p. 90.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 388.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 139.

History he found the very same phenomenon as in the Monophysite, though he had not observed it in 1832. He saw that in the history of Arianism the pure Arians were the Protestants, the semi-Arians were the Anglicans, and that Rome now was what it was then. The truth lay not with the *Via Media* but with what was called "the extreme party". (2) The bishops one after another began to charge against him. It was a formal determinate movement. (3) There came the matter of the Anglo-Prussian bishopric at Jerusalem. The plan was to have a Protestant Bishop of Jerusalem, nominated alternately by England and Prussia, consecrated by English bishops and exercising jurisdiction over English and German Protestants in Palestine. This was in effect a contradiction of the Tractarian argument for the Catholicity of the English Church, since it involved close communion with Lutherans and Calvinists, and Newman protested strongly against the proposal. The protest, dated the 11th November, 1841, purported to be by Newman as a priest of the English Church and Vicar of St. Mary the Virgin's, Oxford, and its foundations were:

(1) that the Church of England had a claim on the allegiance of Catholic believers only on the ground of her own claim to be considered a branch of the Catholic Church ; (2) that the measure implied some sort of recognition of the doctrines of Lutheranism and Calvinism which were heresies ; and (3) that the dioceses in England were connected together by so close an intercommunion that what was done by authority in one immediately affects the rest. The protest was of course disregarded and the project carried into effect. The Jerusalem bishopric was the ultimate condemnation of the old theory of the *Via Media* ; its establishment demolished the sacredness of diocesan rights. If England could be in Palestine, Rome could be in England. But from the end of 1841 Newman says : " I was on my death-bed as regards my membership with the Anglican Church, though at the time I became aware of it only by degrees ".¹ Newman had for some time been pressed with the difficulty of his position as a beneficed clergyman of the Anglican Church, and as early as

¹ *Apologia*, p. 147.

October, 1840, had consulted Keble about his resignation of St. Mary's, contemplating a retirement in the first instance to Littlemore. Keble, however, was in favour of his retaining the living, at any rate, for the present. The inference from retirement would be that Newman could no longer go on except in mere lay communion with the Anglican Church. There was also the practical difficulty that retirement from St. Mary's involved retirement from Littlemore, and so the matter was allowed to go on temporarily, but from this time Newman had a curate at St. Mary's who gradually took more and more of the work. In the same year Newman made arrangements for giving up the *British Critic* in the following July, which were then carried into effect. Towards the end of 1841 Newman began to write "shakily," and in December preached his four sermons at St. Mary's on Wisdom and Innocence and began to contemplate eventualities more definitely; but a question was arising which though not directly theological, yet had great influence in marshalling parties and consolidating animosities.

8. In October, 1841, Keble gave his last

lecture as Professor of Poetry, and a contest arose as to the appointment of his successor. The two candidates were Mr. Isaac Williams and Mr. (afterwards Archdeacon) Garbett. Apart from theological bias, there seems to be little doubt that Mr. Isaac Williams, who was a poet rather of the Keble school and a man of scholarly and refined tastes, would have been a most proper and worthy successor, although his competitor, Mr. Garbett, was also an accomplished man of high culture and considerable reputation for acquaintance with general literature, though he had given no public evidence of his claims to such an office. Some of Mr. Williams' friends injudiciously asked for support for him on the ground that his religious views would ensure his making the office minister to religious truth. The other side at once took advantage of this slip, and so the question became almost entirely theological. The innocent and ignorant electors who had been puzzled by such publications as Keble's tract on the *Mysticism of the Fathers in the Use and Interpretation of Scripture*, and Williams' own tract *On Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge*,

however sound their doctrine may have been, could not rid their minds of the idea that they had a Jesuitical character calculated to Romanise the Anglican Church, and therefore to be put down. The result of the whole discussion was that when the University met in January, 1842, the contest was settled. A comparison of votes gave a majority of 921 to 623, or about 3 to 2, to Mr. Garbett, and Mr. Williams withdrew, but it was a distinct defeat to the Tractarians as a party and encouraged their opponents accordingly. It was of course only a more formal and public manifestation of the feeling above referred to, which prejudiced men suspected of Tractarianism or Tractarian leanings in their applications for Fellowships and other appointments. Newman himself as preacher at St. Mary's had suffered from the same dislike. It was said that some heads of houses had altered their dinner hour in Hall so as to make it difficult for men to attend the services and listen to his sermons. In his letter to Keble of October, 1840, about giving up St. Mary's, Newman says the authorities of the University "have shown a dis-

like of my preaching—one dissuades men from coming; the late Vice-Chancellor threatens to take his own children away from the church, and the present having an opportunity last spring of preaching in my parish pulpit gets up and preaches against doctrine with which I am in good measure identified,” and so on. But now, after Tract 90, Newman was a person not merely disliked, but one who required to be “watched” and to be kept under “observation”. He was pursued to Littlemore. What was he doing there? He was a sly insidious person and could be after no good. Newman complains that one day when he entered his house he found a flight of undergraduates inside, that heads of houses as mounted patrols walked their horses round his poor cottages, and that doctors of divinity dived into the hidden recesses of that private tenement uninvited and drew domestic conclusions from what they saw there. The matter came before the bishop, and on the 12th April, 1842, he wrote to Newman a very considerate letter, in which among other things he says: “In”—a newspaper—“however, of April 9th there appears a paragraph in which it is as-

served as a matter of notoriety that a so-called Anglo-Catholic Monastery is in process of erection at Littlemore, and that the cells of dormitories, the chapel, the refectory, the cloisters all may be seen advancing to perfection under the eye of a parish priest of the diocese of Oxford," and giving an opportunity for explanation as to the alleged revival of monastic orders without previous communication with him, so that he might be able to contradict, what if uncontradicted would appear to imply a glaring invasion of ecclesiastical discipline on Newman's part, or neglect and indifference to his duties on the bishop's part. Newman replied on the 14th April, 1842, and after reminding the bishop that a year ago he submitted entirely to the bishop's authority, stopped the series of Tracts and withdrew from all public discussion of Church matters of the day, he says that he had turned to the preparation for the press of his translation of St. Athanasius and intended to employ himself in the like theological studies, and in the concerns of his own parish and in practical works, that with a view to personal improvement he had for many years, at least thirteen, wished to give

himself to a life of greater religious regularity than he had hitherto led, and that he had been thinking of himself alone and not aiming at any ecclesiastical or external effects, but that it would be a great comfort to him to know that God had put it into the hearts of others to pursue their personal edification in the same way, and unnatural not to wish to have the benefit of their presence and encouragement . . . that he proposed to live there himself a good deal as he had a resident curate at Oxford, that the population at Littlemore was at least equal to that of St. Mary's in Oxford, and the whole of Littlemore was double of it, that it had been very much neglected, and in providing a parsonage house at Littlemore as that would be, and would be called, he conceived that he was doing a very great benefit to his people, and that a partial or temporary retirement from St. Mary's Church might be then expedient, and he then proceeds: "As to the quotation from the"—newspaper—"which I have not seen, your Lordship will perceive from what I have said that no 'monastery is in process of erection,' there is no 'chapel,' no 'refectory,' hardly a dining-room or parlour.

The cloisters are my shed connecting the cottages. I do not understand what 'cells of dormitories' means. Of course I can repeat your Lordship's words that 'I am not attempting a revival of the Monastic orders in anything approaching the Roman sense of the term,' or 'taking on myself to originate any measure of importance without authority from the heads of the Church'. I am attempting nothing ecclesiastical, but something personal and private." It is perhaps not an unfair criticism of this letter to say that it does not err on the side of excessive candour, but it is fair to remember that it was written under an obvious feeling of irritation at being hunted down and misrepresented, and therefore he answered argumentatively and so to say "by the card". He gave a fuller explanation in the Apology, page 177: "As I made Littlemore a place of retirement for myself, so did I offer it to others. There were young men in Oxford whose testimonials for orders had been refused by their Colleges; there were young clergymen who had found themselves unable from conscience to go on with their duties and had thrown up their parochial engagements.

Such men were already going straight to Rome, and I interposed . . . from fidelity to my clerical engagements and from duty to my bishop and from the interest I was bound to take in them and from belief that they were premature or excited. Their friends besought me to quiet them if I could. Some of them came to live with me at Littlemore. They were laymen or in the place of laymen. I kept some of them back for several years from being received into the Catholic Church. Even when I had given up my living I was still bound by my duty to their parents or friends, and I did not forget still to do what I could for them. The immediate occasion for my resigning St. Mary's was the unexpected conversion of one of them. After that I felt it was impossible to keep my post there, for I had been unable to keep my word with my bishop." And he sets out letters referring more or less to these men.

The case of Mr. Sibthorp, a Fellow of Magdalen, who had a chapel at Ryde, but not connected with Littlemore, was an illustration of precipitateness against which Newman was guarding. He was received into the Church

of Rome in the middle of October, 1841, in spite of Newman's friendly warning, and apparently after only a few days' consideration, but reverted in about two years, that is in October, 1843. Newman himself was naturally in a state of great difficulty, and it was in this period that his letter to Pusey above referred to was written. It is dated 16th October, 1842, and was in answer to Pusey's inquiry whether he went entirely with Ward. He says: "As to my being entirely with Ward, I do not know the limits of my own opinions. If Ward says that this or that is a development from what I have said, I cannot say yes or no. It is plausible, it *may* be true. Of course the fact that the Roman Church *has* so developed and maintained adds great weight to the antecedent plausibility. I cannot assert that it is not true, but I cannot with that keen perception that some people have appropriate it. It is a nuisance to me to be *forced* beyond what I can fairly accept."

9. Newman having considered it expedient to leave St. Mary's for the present, may well have considered it expedient that he should also leave Oxford, at any rate for a time, and

accordingly about the end of 1842 he went to Littlemore to live there exclusively. There was little left for him really to do except to settle his accounts with the Movement and the Church. He collected round him some younger friends and followers who lived in community a life of regular religious observances. He had retired permanently from active leadership. He had resigned his place in the Movement, given up the contest to others, and his part in it had passed into the hands of others. For the rest of the time until just before he was received into the Catholic Church in October, 1845, he remained too uncertain either to maintain the Anglican position or to adopt the Roman. He was waiting for certitude; though he had gradually come to the opinion that the Anglican Church was formally in the wrong and the Roman Church formally in the right, no valid reason could be assigned either for remaining in the Anglican or joining the Roman Church. In February, 1843, however, he made a formal retraction of strong language he had used against Rome. In the course of his writing as an Anglican he had said many hard things

of the Church of Rome, and he now withdrew all these things. He had followed the consensus of the divines of the Anglican Church, who had ever used the strongest language against Rome, and he had thrown himself into their system and adopted their views and statements, whereas he now saw that he should have exercised less faith in them and more criticism. He could not have published the Tracts or other works professing to defend the Anglican Church without accompanying them with a strong protest or argument against Rome, but he now saw that the one obvious objection against the whole Anglican line was that it was Roman; so he withdrew the expressions accordingly.

The next event of notice was that on the 24th May, 1843, Pusey preached his sermon on the Holy Eucharist as a comfort to the penitent. It was full of the fervid language of the Fathers, like the sermons of the high Anglican divines, but was strictly within Anglican limits. Dr. Faussett, the Margaret Professor of Divinity, however, delated it to the Vice-Chancellor, who commenced proceedings. The Statutes provided that in such a case the Vice-Chancellor should demand

a copy of the sermon, and summoning to him as assessors six doctors of divinity should examine the language complained of, and if necessary condemn and punish the preacher. A copy having been asked for, was sent by Pusey with a request that he might be heard. The Vice-Chancellor, however, appointed six doctors, one being the delator, who sat in place of the Regius Professor who was himself under the ban of a special statute. No answer was given to the request for a hearing, and after a private deliberation, the sentence came out that on the 2nd of June, 1843, Dr. Pusey had been accused and condemned for having taught doctrine contrary to that of the Church of England, and that by the authority of the Vice-Chancellor he was suspended from preaching within the University for two years. This was an arbitrary act done in defiance of the most elementary rules of justice, and disgusted all reasonable and moderate men.

In September, 1843, Newman preached his last sermon as an Anglican, and in the same month he resigned his living of St. Mary's, the immediate occasion being that an inmate of Littlemore had just conformed to the Church

of Rome. The only remaining step for him to take was submission to the Church of Rome, but that did not take place for two full years. He says he could not do so earlier without doubt and apprehension, that is, with any true conviction of mind or certitude. He therefore remained in lay communion with the Church of England, taking no clerical duty, but attending its services as usual and abstaining altogether from intercourse with Catholics, from their places of worship and from those religious rites and usages, such as the Invocation of Saints, which are characteristics of their creed. He could not go to Rome while he thought what he did of the devotions she sanctioned to the Blessed Virgin and the Saints. He did not give up his Fellowship, for he could not be sure that his doubts would not be reduced or overcome, however unlikely he might consider such an event. He says¹ it was made a subject of reproach to him at the time and was at that day that he did not leave the Anglican Church sooner, and he seems astonished at the reproach. But it does seem to plain men a very curious thing that he should have re-

¹ *Apologia*, p. 185.

mained quiet for two years at Littlemore, having regard to the stage of opinion he had reached, to the acts he had done, and to the importance to his salvation according to his own view of joining the one true Church. The explanation probably is that although a brilliant controversialist, he was not equally great in arriving at a judgment, just as a great advocate often proves a feeble judge, because the power of drawing a definite and sound conclusion implies faculties of quite a different kind from the power of stating powerfully one side of a question or of criticising equally powerfully the other side. This seems to be the view taken by many capable men of Newman's powers, but allowance must be made for their theological bias. Thus Archbishop Tait, in a discussion at Addington in 1877, said Newman had a strange duality of mind, and that in all matters of belief he first acted on his emotions and then brought the subtlety of his reason to bear till he had ingeniously persuaded himself that he was logically right, and that the result was a condition in which he was practically unable to distinguish between truth and falsehood.¹

¹ Tait, *Life*, vol. i., p. 89.

Dr. James B. Mozley,¹ in a letter dated the 14th May, 1845, to the Rev. W. Scott, says : “ It is actually to take place some time or other ” (that is, Newman’s going over). “ We must be prepared for it. What Newman says of himself is that he is borne along by an irresistible course of mind in the direction he is going—that he has withstood it and yet it will take him . . . he cannot help the working of his own mind.”

The Rev. W. Palmer says :² “ He was always unable to determine intellectually where the truth lay, and he yielded at last to an imaginary and enthusiastic impulse which he supposed to be celestial. But at this time no one knew what his real sentiments were or what he was meditating.” Dr. E. A. Abbott³ sums up his view of the case by saying that Newman’s going over was merely “ an act of volition ”.

10. From the time Newman abstained from taking any active share in the Movement, the extreme party came more prominently forward and asserted more uncompromisingly its

¹ *Letters*, p. 168. ² *Palmer*, p. 235. ³ *Life*, p. 385.

Roman tendencies. Mr. Ward had succeeded Newman as the acknowledged leader of the Movement, and Dean Stanley says¹ that "by his unrivalled powers of argument, by his transparent candour, by his uncompromising pursuit of the opinions he had adopted and by his loyal devotion to Dr. Newman himself, he was the most important element of the Oxford school at this crisis". Ward had the support of Mr. Oakeley, and their writings, especially a series of articles in the *British Critic*, eventually brought matters to a crisis. The question whether the Anglican Church was in any sense a branch of the Church Universal was answered more and more doubtfully, and it was openly denied to have any of the external notes of a Church. Next, the protest against Roman corruptions grew gradually more feeble, Roman doctrine was more and more fully accepted, until in Mr. Ward's book, *The Ideal of a Christian Church*, Rome was practically acknowledged as the divinely appointed guardian and teacher of religious truth. Finally, the old idea of working towards reunion and calling

¹ *Edinburgh Review*, April, 1881. Ward, p. 213.

for concessions on both sides disappeared, and the ultimate aim proposed for the English Church was not reunion with but submission to Rome.¹ Rome attracted them because it had kept up the recognition of the supernatural element in religion by the offices of the Church and its administration of the Sacraments; they loathed the doctrine of justification, and taught that careful and individual moral discipline was the only possible basis on which Christian faith and practice could be reared; and they were affected by what they believed to be the paramount place given to Sanctity in the Roman theology and professed system. Mr. Ward postulated from the first what he afterwards developed in the *Ideal*, the existence at some time or other of a perfect Church in creed, communion, discipline and life. He was much struck by the idea that while the Primitive Church might have been corrupted into the Roman, it could not have been into the Protestant Church. With respect to the Articles, he rejected the distinction between what was Catholic and

¹ Ward, pp. 211, 212.

what was Roman. As the controversy proceeded he substituted Roman for Catholic, and absolutely identified Roman with Catholic. This of course was far beyond Tract 90 and the teaching of the early Tractarians, and the discontent of readers of the *British Critic* became so great that the paper was discontinued in October, 1843. Mr. W. Palmer having denounced the Romanising tendency of the articles in the *British Critic*, Mr. Ward began a reply, intending merely a long pamphlet, but it grew into a large volume of 600 pages, *The Ideal of a Christian Church Considered in Comparison with Existing Practice, Containing a Defence of Certain Articles in the British Critic in Reply to Remarks on Them in Mr. Palmer's Narrative*. This was published in June, 1844. It incorporates the teaching above referred to, and, stated shortly, after starting with an "ideal" of what the Christian Church may be expected to be in its various relations to men, it assumes that the Roman Church, and only the Roman Church, satisfies the conditions of what a Church ought to be, and it argues in detail that the English Church, in spite of its professions, utterly and absolutely fails to

fulfil them.¹ But the sting of the book was in the claim, "we find the whole cycle of Roman doctrine gradually possessing numbers of English Churchmen. . . . Three years have passed since I saw plainly that in subscribing the Articles I renounce no Roman doctrine, yet I retain my Fellowship which I hold on the tenure of subscription and have received no ecclesiastical censure in any shape."² This was a plain challenge, and so when the University met in October the Board of Heads of Houses took up the matter. A Committee examined the book, and in December, 1844, the Board announced that they proposed to submit to Convocation three measures: (1) To condemn Mr. Ward's book; (2) to degrade him by depriving him of all his University Degrees; and (3) whereas the existing statutes gave the Vice-Chancellor power of calling on any member of the University at any time to prove his orthodoxy by subscribing to the Articles, to add to this a declaration to be henceforth made by the subscriber that he took them in the sense in which "they were both first published and were now imposed by

¹ Church, p. 371.

² Ward's *Ideal*, pp. 565, 567.

the University," with the penalty of expulsion against any one, lay or clerical, who thrice refused subscription with this declaration. A great cry arose that this third proposal was a new test, and it had to be abandoned or all would have been lost. The proposals were to come on on the 13th February, and the Vice-Chancellor on the 23rd January, in giving notice of it, announced that the third proposal was withdrawn. A circular, however, which obtained 400 or 500 signatures, asked the Board to propose on the 13th February a formal censure of the principles of Tract 90. When Convocation met, the book (*The Ideal*) was condemned by 777 to 386 votes, the deprivation by 569 to 511, but when the Vice-Chancellor put the third it was vetoed by the two proctors, and so Newman escaped formal censure, and it was not attempted to be revived after the expiration of the proctors' year of office. There was an element almost of farce, and somewhat in keeping with Mr. Ward's character, connected with what to Churchmen was a really trying time. In the winter of 1844 Mr. Ward became engaged to be married, but it was considered advisable that the en-

gement should not be made publicly known till after the 13th February, and it came to the knowledge of his friends, to their great astonishment and amusement, soon after the proceedings. It was considered that the public would not be disposed to take a fair view of the subject, and the broad fact that the English clergyman who advocated clerical celibacy was himself about to marry, would have been an effective weapon in the hands of his opponents. The marriage took place on 31st March, 1845, and in September, 1845, Mr. and Mrs. Ward were received into the Roman Catholic Church.

11. Newman in a letter dated 16th November, 1844, had said: "My one paramount reason for contemplating a change is my deep unvarying conviction that our Church is in schism and that my salvation depends on my joining the Church of Rome. . . . What keeps me yet is what has kept me long—a fear that I am under a delusion; but the conviction remains firm under all circumstances, in all frames of mind." The fear referred to in the last letter arose from the question, what inward test had he that he should not change again after he had become a Catholic? He had

still some apprehensions of this, though he thought a time would come when it would depart. However, some limit must be put to those misgivings, so, at the end of 1844, he resolved to write an essay on Development, and then if at the end of it his convictions were not weaker, to take the necessary steps for admission to the Church of Rome. He began the essay in the beginning of 1845, and worked at it till October. He says: "As I advanced my difficulties so cleared away that I ceased to speak of 'the Roman Catholics' and boldly called them Catholics. Before I got to the end I resolved to be received, and the book remains in the state in which it then was, unfinished." It was a curious mode of proceeding. A plain man having formed certain opinions writes a book to explain them to others. Newman writes a book to enable himself to form opinions and so come to some conclusion.

In the meantime Dr. Wiseman had been watching these movements with great interest. His lectures of 1835, repeated 1836, which produced considerable effect had been delivered during a casual visit to London, but in 1840

he had returned to this country permanently as bishop *in partibus* and President of Oscott. By means of articles written or inspired by himself, some private correspondence himself with friends, and correspondence and interviews of friends with Newman, Wiseman—although it was inexpedient for him to become in any way publicly identified with the Movement or to be apparently mixed up with it—yet largely influenced its development. It produces rather a disagreeable effect to read Newman's pathetic account of his spiritual struggles, and Mr. Ward's rather opinionated and ignorant demonstrations of Rome's supremacy, and then to read of the astute Roman ecclesiastic at Oscott watching and quietly giving a help now and then, when and where he considered it desirable, to guide Anglicans to the haven where he would have them go. After Ward's deprivation Wiseman expected to hear almost immediately of Newman's reception into the Roman Church, but months passed away and the impatience at Oscott grew almost past endurance. The younger men at Littlemore, however, would not wait longer. Dalgairns and Ambrose St. John went away for a holi-

day and were received into the Roman Church. Stanton went away and wrote to Newman early in October that he should be received at Stonyhurst, and then Newman, who had resigned his Fellowship on 3rd October, 1845, broke his somewhat inscrutable silence by proposing that they should be received together. He wrote: "Father Dominic the Passionist comes here on the 8th to receive me. Come back on that day."¹ Newman says that at the beginning of October Father Dominic was passing through London to Belgium, and as he was in some perplexity what steps to take for being received himself, he assented to the proposition that the priest should take Littlemore on his way with a view to receiving him. Newman says further: "He does not know of my intention, but I mean to ask of him admission into the one fold of Christ".² On the pouring wet evening of 8th October, Stanton and Father Dominic arrived almost together. The next day Newman, Bowles and Stanton having made their

¹ Wiseman, *Life*, vol. i., pp. 429, 430.

² *Apologia*, pp. 234, 235.

confessions, received at his hands conditional baptism and were received into the Roman Church. When the essay on Development was published, the following words were subjoined to the advertisement: "Postscript.— Since the above was written the Author has joined the Catholic Church. It was his intention and wish to have carried his volume through the press before deciding finally on this step. But when he got some way in the printing he recognised in himself a conviction of the truth of the conclusion to which the discussion leads so clear as to preclude further deliberation. Shortly afterwards circumstances gave him the opportunity of acting on it, and he felt that he had no warrant for refusing to act on it."

On the Saturday and Sunday, the 21st and 22nd February, he was in his house at Littlemore alone. He slept on Sunday night at his friend Mr. Johnson's, at the observatory. Various friends came to see the last of him, Dr. Pusey, Mr. Copeland, Mr. Church, Mr. Buckle, Mr. Pattison and Mr. Lewis, and he called on Dr. Ogle, his old tutor at Trinity. On the 23rd he left Oxford, and never re-

visited it till 26th February, 1878, when he stayed with the President of Trinity College, of which he had recently been made an Honorary Fellow, and in the evening dined in Hall in his academical dress.

CHAPTER IV.

RESULTS.

1. It has been said that the secession of Newman gave the Church of England a blow under which it reeled and from which it has not yet entirely recovered. This, however, seems to be much too strong a statement to be adopted without a great deal of qualification. There is no doubt that Newman's secession, preceded and followed as it was by that of a number of his pronounced and devoted followers, gave an enormous shock to many serious members and friends of the Anglican Church. It was feared that the Church if not disrupted and ruined, would at any rate be dangerously weakened by the secession of so many able and devoted men. Still more it was feared that the forces typified if not embodied in the Church of Rome, would be disproportionately increased by the transference of power from the Anglican to the Roman

Church, that Protestantism would decrease and Romanism increase, and consequently the perpetual fear of Papal Aggression and domination was appreciably increased.

History, however, has shown that these fears, if not unfounded, were greatly exaggerated, and that the evil effects anticipated have not been realised. This has been due to several causes. In the first instance, the steady loyalty of Pusey and Keble to the Established Church acted as ballast to the ship tossed about as it was in the tempest, and prevented its being capsized. Pusey and Keble were two solid old-fashioned English Churchmen, firmly attached to the Anglican Church. Their names had given weight and respectability to the Movement, and had obtained for its advocates a hearing from the great body of the Church, which the subtlety of Newman, the learning of Palmer, and the intellectual gymnastics of Ward would never have obtained, and therefore now in the hour of stress and trouble, men turned to Pusey and Keble asking for guidance and they were told to sit still. In the next place, sufficient allowance has not been made for the *vis inertie* which operated in the

Anglican Church as in all other societies. It must not be forgotten that though the Movement was an Oxford Movement, it did not include all Oxford men, much less all Churchmen. There was a compact band of men in or closely connected with Oxford who were keenly interested and working with intensity to push their views among the general body of the Church. But the number of able scholars, preachers and writers who devoted themselves to this work, and their converts and followers, were only a small portion of the Church. They did not make, and could not be expected to make, any profound impression on the average cleric. His intellect and attainments were too narrow, and his interests too parochial and too practical, to allow him to take more than the slightest interest in a Movement which discussed Church matters from a point of view much too academical for him to appreciate, and which certainly did not and could not so influence his springs of action as to compel him even to consider whether he could any longer conscientiously hold his living or fellowship, or continue in communion with the Anglican Church.

The result was, as might be expected, that beyond a comparatively small band of men intimately connected with the Movement, the main body of the Anglican Church remained in their old Church and there was no stampede, nor indeed any serious secession to Rome from the general body of the Church.

Such a blow must, however, have had a stunning effect, it must in the ordinary course of things have taken some considerable time for the Church to recover its equanimity, and the endeavours of those sound Churchmen who, although High, were not Romanist in their teaching were directed rather to retaining within the Church those whose minds had been unsettled by the more advanced and aggressive teachers, than to emphasising and expounding the views of those teachers.

Naturally both Oxford and the Church began to feel that the Movement was rather a thing of the past, and the more violent emotions provoked by it subsided.

2. Oxford, however, soon became absorbed in a matter immediately affecting College and University interests, and the turmoil of the discussion caused the Movement, for some

considerable time, to be almost entirely forgotten. The liberal spirit that had so alarmed Oxford and the Church at large, and which had really been the immediate cause of the defensive steps which developed into the Oxford Movement, had been hard at work since the Reform Act in destroying abuses, rectifying evils which were remediable, and generally in reconstructing society in accordance with liberal ideas. It was inevitable that in due course attention should be directed to the two ancient Universities. They were supposed to be enormously rich, but with an output ludicrously small in proportion to their income. Regarded as homes of reaction and centres of opposition to Liberal ideas, and as the theological seminaries of a single sect in which theology was neglected and in which no secular studies (except the barren learning of classical texts) were admitted except in the most grudging and parsimonious spirit, what wonder if Liberal Statesmen determined that national property administered by the Universities should be utilised for the national good. Accordingly in 1850 a Royal Commission was appointed by Lord John Russell for

the purpose of holding an inquiry into the "state, discipline, studies and revenues of the University and Colleges of Oxford," and two years later a similar commission was appointed for Cambridge. The Oxford Commission included some very able men—Dr. Tait, afterwards Primate ; Dr. Jeune, afterwards Bishop of Peterborough ; Dr. Liddell, afterwards Dean of Christ Church ; and Professor Baden Powell. The secretary was the Rev. A. P. Stanley, afterwards Dean of Westminster, assisted by Mr. Goldwin Smith. Their report was a very strong one : it recommended that all clerical restrictions should be abolished, that a new governing body should be created, that undergraduates should be admitted without becoming members of any College or Hall, that subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles at Matriculation should be abolished, that Mathematics and the new studies such as Modern History and Natural Science should have their fair share of rewards, that the Professorships should be revived and extended and unprofitable Fellowships reduced, that the condition of celibacy should be abolished in case of Professors or University Lecturers, and above all

that the principle of open competition should be applied to Fellowships and Scholarships. The measure introduced by the Government did not carry into full effect all the recommendations of the report. It did not abolish subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles on matriculation, and removed clerical restrictions only where three-fourths of the Fellows of a College were already in Orders, but in most other respects it embodied the proposed reforms in a fairly adequate form. By an Amendment in the Commons, the theological test at matriculation was abolished, and by a later vote it was abolished in the case of all lay degrees. The House of Lords disallowed this as to the M.A. Degree, but left the B.A. open to Nonconformists. This Bill became law in the summer of 1854, and the executive Commission constituted by the Act began its work and gradually transformed the Oxford of Keble, Newman and Pusey into a comparatively modern and useful institution. In 1871 the Universities Tests Acts were passed by which no person was required on taking any degree (other than of divinity) in the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge or Durham, or

for holding any University or College office there, to subscribe any Article or formulary of faith or to conform to any religious observance, and in 1877 Parliament again interfered with the internal affairs of Oxford, the general object being to improve the machinery of government and the teaching bodies of the University and Colleges, and clerical Fellowships were almost entirely abolished. It was not in human nature that so violent a rupture with the past as was implied in the abolition of tests should come early or easily, but the effect of the throwing open of Fellowships and other measures above referred to, was to flood Oxford with a large number of able young men filled with Liberal ideas, consumed with the love of knowledge, and burning with the desire to improve everything. It would be absurd to represent the Oxford Movement as responsible for this revolution in Oxford. The Oxford Reform is only referred to for the purpose of accounting for what appeared to many to be the extremely superficial impression made on the University by the events of 1833-1845, but there can be no doubt that the strong dislike entertained by the average

man for what he roughly considered the Romanising tendency of Oxford engendered by the leaders of the Movement, supplied a strong support which enabled the Liberal Statesmen of the day to force through measures of University Reform which were bitterly opposed by the vast majority of the aristocratic and professional classes. Mr. G. C. Brodrick, who left Oxford in 1856 and returned as Warden of Merton in 1881 (in his *Memories and Impressions*, 1900), says among other things which struck him as changed in the interval of his absence was the prodigious increase in the number of resident ladies, the specialisation of studies at the expense of general culture, the loss of its old world aspect, and especially its fast ceasing to be a peculiar seminary of Anglican clergy and training school for the English country gentry, the increase of inter-collegiate lecturing and transfer of instruction in natural science to the Museums, and side by side with the older academic studies a widening of interests in the directions of Art, Music, Archæology, Belles-lettres and the like culture.

3. The most obvious and interesting inquiry

respecting the results of the Movement is of course what permanent effect, if any, it has had on the Anglican Church, but it is as difficult as it is interesting. The caution against being misled by the fallacy *post hoc, propter hoc*, applies with special force, and even where it is apparent that the Movement must have had some influence in shaping subsequent developments in the Church, that influence was only one among many causing or occasioning those developments. (The Movement itself was not an ultimate source of change or development, but it was merely an incident in history, and it may be that in future time it may come to be regarded as a comparatively small backwash caused by the progress of Liberalism in religion and politics.) The Movement, however, left behind it a more vivid and definite idea of the Anglican Church as a branch of the Church of Christ, whose members were not merely individuals in direct relation with their Creator, but were members of the body with which remained the deposit of Faith, the institution of Episcopacy, and the right and due administration of the Sacraments. The more complete organisation of the Church

the
Church

which this led to, and the great amount of truth believed to underlie such a system, led to great and permanent results in society, such as greater interest in religious practices and exercises, influence over the higher and more educated classes, unlike the poorer and more ignorant persons to whom Wesleyanism mainly appealed, and especially a fruitfulness in good works such as the building and restoring Churches in great numbers throughout the land. The raising the tone of the Church operated among both laity and clergy. The disgraceful negligence which previously characterised the conduct of the services of the Church and the care of the fabrics and furniture of its buildings has almost entirely passed away, and leaving out of consideration the conduct of extreme men, the services are not only more numerous and more regular, but are conducted almost universally with fitting decency and decorum. The prominence given to the sacramental and sacerdotal side of the Church has not only conduced to those improvements, but by directing attention to the functions of the priest as such, has incidentally required him to live up to the character.

Looseness of living, even undue participation in secular sports and amusements, have come to be looked upon as incompatible with such an office, and the influence of the laity in despising a man who falls short of the "form" required by his position has had no small effect in preventing the clergy from failure to maintain at any rate a decent and becoming style of language and life. Another undoubted result has been to make the Church much more scholarly than it was. Both before and since the Movement, there has always been a great mass of clergy whose qualifications for their office have been very moderate. They may make, and many of them do make, fair parish clergymen, but to pretence of scholarship they have very little. There is probably no profession which makes less external demand for constant study and self-improvement after admission than the Church does on a man once admitted to the priesthood. It would be absurd to suppose that even before the Movement the ranks of the clergy contained only men of the classes above indicated, because it is well established that here and there, scattered about the country and fairly

represented in the Universities, were many men well versed in the classical writings of great English Churchmen, and fairly well informed in ecclesiastical history, so far as it was then known and understood. Such men were the father of Mr. Keble, and Dr. Routh, the President of Queens. That class of men, however, has been enormously increased since the Movement began. It is not pretended that men of the class of Hooker, Palmer and Lightfoot are plentiful, and the poor in ability and learning will always be with us, but if it may be so expressed, a great middle class of clergy has been almost created since 1845. The immense shaking up of the Church occasioned by the great controversy, naturally directed attention to the whole range of theological study; even men of moderate abilities and attainments turned some attention to the questions which lay at the foundation of their faith, or at any rate of their professional status and rights. Men who did not accept the more advanced views of the sacerdotal position of the clergy, insensibly absorbed some of the feelings that animated the advanced members that they were a caste set apart to administer

and expound sacred mysteries, and they would have been less than human if they had not been led to some extent to satisfy the interest so created, and to remove the stings of self-reproach which must afflict every right-minded man who becomes aware that he is not sufficiently equipped for a task he has taken in hand. Beyond this moderate advance the abler men in the Church both at the Universities and in the country set themselves seriously to work in theological study, and not content with becoming merely learned men themselves, made strenuous efforts to raise the standard of theological learning among the clergy at large, and especially among the younger men. This led to the vivifying of the theological chairs, the greater assistance given to such studies in the Universities themselves, the systematisation of theological teaching culminating in theological honour schools, and in the multiplication of theological colleges intended mainly for the promotion and encouragement of post graduate theological study. The effect of this long-continued effort has been that not only has the Church been enriched by the works of such men as Lightfoot, Westcott,

Hort, and many others too numerous to mention, but the general scholarly tone of that large and increasing middle class of the clergy has been enormously raised. The honest earnest student could not keep his studies within the limits of strict ecclesiastical history and literature, and so close his eyes to secular history and literature. The two overlap and are inextricably intermingled. It was found necessary, therefore, to make explorations beyond the stricter professional limits if the subjects included in those limits were to be adequately investigated or their bearings thoroughly grasped. Scientific study required resort to original authorities, the comparison and weighing of authorities, the critical examination of texts, and generally the taking of nothing for granted ; but it required the strict scrutiny and consideration of evidence, to be followed by the rejection of all that did not satisfy the reasonable tests already applied by competent men who desire only to discover the truth or the nearest approximation thereto. When the new regulations respecting the studies of the University of Oxford came to be put in force, and the study of history was

given a fairly due share of encouragement, there was already at Oxford a fair number of men trained in the habit of historical investigation. The concurrence of these circumstances undoubtedly gave a great impetus to historical studies at Oxford, and led to the development of a historical school which has shed lustre on the University. It is only necessary to refer to the writings of Mr. Freeman, Mr. J. A. Froude, Mr. Bryce, Dr. Stubbs, and Mr. J. R. Green to show the character and high standard of the work done by Oxford men in this department of learning, but while giving full weight to the encouragement given to all modern learning, to recent legislation, and to the improvement time itself might be expected to bring about, it must be admitted by fair-minded men that the Oxford historical school owes a great deal of gratitude to the Oxford Movement.

The accentuation of the difference between the two streams of tendency followed naturally from the prominence given in the controversy to the importance of the Sacraments and the necessity of valid orders. The Low Churchmen, resting on appeals to the emotions

and on the direct communion of the soul with its Judge and Redeemer, regarded reliance on external means of grace, if not as actual hindrances to salvation, yet as dangers if and so far as they did not directly contribute to that attitude of mind which regarded salvation as a thing to be directly asked for and directly given, and the assumptions of men who claimed mysterious powers resting on their orders to act as intermediaries in administering authorised means of grace, and who taught that such means were generally necessary to salvation, were consequently regarded as sacerdotal and unfounded assumptions, indistinguishable in their essentials from the assumptions of Rome. Hence the Evangelical party felt bound to make clear that they were free from any taint of the unclean thing, and they felt and denounced bitterly what they considered unsound doctrine and treasonable conduct on the part of the High Church clergy. The two views are in fact irreconcilable and the two tendencies are incapable of coalescing, but some amount of the original bitterness among the Evangelicals has died out, and the two streams are for the present

running side by side. The strong arm of the State has prevented either side from expelling the other from the Church or seriously ostracising it. In latter times, too, the strength of Evangelicalism seems rather to be on the decrease, probably because there is no essential difference, if there is any difference except in form, between the Low Churchmen and the saner members of the Nonconformist Churches. There seems to have been no real development in the Evangelical party which for all practical purposes, except numbers, remains as it was before 1845. The main efforts of Pusey and Keble after Newman's secession, as already stated, were necessarily directed to retaining in the Church those whose minds had become unsettled and were filled with doubt whether outside Rome they could be considered as members of the true Church, and their attention therefore remained directed largely to that phase of the controversy. There was a large and increasing body of men who accepted the Anglican Church as an undoubted branch of the Church of Christ with valid orders and the power to duly administer the Sacraments, and they, with attention

awakened by the great controversy, with interest in the theological dogmas they had accepted, and with the professional bias of their class, and the honest desire to confirm themselves and others in the faith, devoted themselves and encouraged others to theological and historical studies as before mentioned. Without pursuing the subject into further detail, it might be expected, and the expectation has been realised, that the impetus has on the whole led the High Church clergy to become a more learned body than their Low Church brethren, and learning which began to be acquired with perhaps somewhat narrow professional aims declines to be so cabined and confined, and gradually travels outside the mere professional limits, with the result that when the student returns within those limits he brings with him the wider outlook and the more moderate views of the man who knows more than the mere technical learning of his particular profession. There seems to be no antecedent probability that either the Low Church or the High Church clergy would excel the other in devotion to ordinary parish work, or in endeavours for the spiritual good

of their parishioners. Both are equally interested in the elementary and religious education of the young, in promoting temperance and the general sobriety and decency of life, and both take as their main business in life to help and so far as possible to secure the salvation of the souls committed to their charge. In some respects the Evangelical has the advantage of endeavouring to induce his people to appeal directly to their Maker, and this one would suppose could be done more effectually by private appeals than by public services, but the temptation arises that public appeals, owing to the effect of the sympathy of numbers on both hearers and speaker, are apt to lead the Evangelical to rely more and more on his weekly oratorical efforts than on private appeals which are listened to with shyness if not repulsion, and which are frequently extremely difficult to ensure attention to. The Evangelical theory can really only be carried into effective practice by men specially gifted for that purpose, and such men must always be in a very small minority. The High Church theory by its reliance more on the Church as an institu-

tion and on the efficacy of the Sacraments as means of grace, is not so dependent on the special ability of the minister, and their theory naturally leads them to multiply services, and to multiply the opportunities of so administering to the spiritual necessities of their flock, and their private and public appeals naturally are persuasions to become members of the institution in fact as well as in name, and partakers of the privileges to be so obtained. Hence the multiplication of services by High Churchmen and the desire to make such services as attractive as possible, and also instructive, not merely by direct teaching from the pulpit, but by such display of symbols and the creation of such an atmosphere as will develop feelings of reverence for the unseen, awe for the mysteries so symbolised, and a "comfortable" feeling that they are partakers in the benefits then being distributed, and so laying up for themselves treasure in heaven. It is not suggested that High Churchmen teach that mere membership of the Church and participation in the services and sacraments are sufficient when a proper spirit is absent, but it seems fair to say that in addition to that spirit

reliance on that participation is strongly felt as of essential importance, and there is a tendency to overrate the importance of the external acts at the expense of the subjective feeling, and perhaps to encourage the performance of such acts in the hope that in due course the proper feeling will come. In minds so attuned, and informed by study of Church History of the practice of asceticism by good men from the earliest times, it is easy to see that a spirit of self-denial would spring up among devoted High Churchmen, and would be practised openly for the good thereby to be obtained personally, for an example of simplicity of life to others, and for the extension of Church work by the economy so exercised in the consumption of Church funds. The general impression seems to be that the High Churchmen have made the most devoted and effective parish priests. It is not easy to test this statement, for it would be absurd to deny that in the ranks of Low Churchmen have been many men whose sanctity of life, devotion to work, and personal self-denial are not surpassed by any men in the High Church ranks, and it must also be borne in mind

while the Low Churchman has worked without any special attention being directed to him, the High Churchman, distinguished by the high qualities above referred to, has frequently had them brought into prominence by being brought before the Courts, and so in popular language advertised. When all is said, however, and considered, there can be no doubt that the standard of tone and work expected and obtained from a clergyman has been enormously raised since 1845. It is unnecessary to consider which party has now the best claims to superiority in this respect, but it may perhaps be safely asserted that it is mainly due to the revival in the Church caused by the Movement, and in the first instance was begun by the High Churchmen.

4. The most obvious and remarkable development of the Movement is that now known as Ritualism. Neither Newman, Pusey nor Keble could be described as a Ritualist. Their concern was with teaching and establishing sound doctrine. They insisted on sober, decent, orderly and devout services, but laid no stress on ceremonies, dress and ornaments as if they were matters of real moment. Newman left

the services at St. Mary's practically as he found them. Pusey was never a parish clergyman, and Keble never advanced beyond a sober and devout mode of worship. As the echoes of the controversy died away, and those High Churchmen who had fought the battle and remained in the Church still continued their teaching of what they considered Catholic truth and denied the claim of Rome as the sole successor of the Church of the early days, many men who had made little or no investigation into the foundations of Anglo-Catholic pretensions to be a living member of Christ's Church, if not the only pure and undefiled branch of it, accepted its doctrines and claims as settled things, and made them the starting point for what became really a new departure. Why should Rome have a monopoly of the use of ancient vestments, of Church ornaments, of the adventitious aid of splendid music and ceremony, of incense, and of the priestly power of absolution following on systematic confession? And if the sacrifice of Christ was repeated at the consecration of the elements, why should not the celebration be led up to and treated as the culminating

point of worship and performed with every circumstance which could impress the worshippers with the awful nature of the rite being performed, and at the High Celebration of which it was enough that the worshipper should be partaker merely by his presence and devotional feeling? It is easy to see that many men starting from the point above indicated would answer those questions in favour of the Anglican Church, and hence the development of what has come to be known as Ritualism. The use of incense, processions, dress practically indistinguishable from that of Roman priests, and generally of services approximating as nearly to those of Rome as the limitations of the Prayer-book and the fear of the law would allow, have followed almost as of course. It would not be right to say that the mainspring of this development generally is either vanity or a childish aping of the Church of Rome, though they probably had a powerful influence on the weaker-minded men who have adopted the practices, and who are often minded to go a step farther than any one else, almost for the mere sake of doing so, but with the great majority of Ritualistic clergy it is fair

to believe that they have adopted the practices referred to in the honest belief that they were authorised by law, or if not, that they were venial excesses going no more beyond the law than the Low Churchmen had fallen short of it, and in either event in the belief that they are merely clothing sound doctrine in its proper and becoming dress. The foundation of Sisterhoods cannot be said to have originated with the Ritualists, as they were encouraged by some of the Tractarians themselves, but there can be no doubt the very great and perhaps undue multiplication of Sisterhoods, and of societies such as the Confraternity of the Sacred Heart, is due to Ritualistic zeal and energy, and if the idea was not borrowed from Rome, it is difficult to resist the impression that it has been largely influenced and supported by the desire to utilise a force of which so much use has been made by the Church of Rome. So long as Ritualism remains a mere eccentricity on the part of a small section of the Church, no serious mischief will be done, but if it should absorb the large body of High Churchmen who have hitherto abstained from the adoption of the more pronounced practices,

it would seem that the fear and loathing with which High Church teaching and practices are regarded by Low Churchmen and Protestant Nonconformists must hasten the coming of Disestablishment, and as a necessary consequence the disruption of the Church, as men with such differing tendencies as Low Churchmen and High Churchmen have, cannot voluntarily remain long members of the same body. When those events occur the Broad Churchman will be able to find a home in neither camp, and as there will be no State Church emoluments and exclusive privileges to enjoy, he will be under no temptation to endeavour to prove his right to remain a member of a society whose dogmas in either view he is unable to accept, and of which he can only remain a member by explaining away or tacitly ignoring the dogmas of both parties which the Church formularies were alone framed to admit.

The Tractarian controversy, as we have seen, was followed at Rome and especially by Dr. Wiseman with great interest. This interest arose from a hope and belief that the necessary result would be a large secession of the Anglican clergy, and that this would be a

large step in the conversion of the country at large. But when it was seen that there were only a comparatively few secessions, though those were of prominent and able men, and that the great mass of the clergy stood firm, and that the mass of the country remained practically untouched, the interest naturally tended to die out. This was helped by the natural dislike entertained by born and bred Catholics for the new men who had come over. They were tainted with their education and early training, and were looked on with suspicion and dislike. There was also the rather squalid question of what to do with the men who came over. Newman himself, in a letter to his sister, discusses his future and speculates on the living he might make by writing for *The Times* and by the sale of his Anglican sermons. He was ultimately absorbed and provided for, but it was quite another question whether an indefinite number of Anglican clergy who seceded could expect to continue their clerical career in the Church of Rome. There was in fact no secession in such numbers as to materially modify the character of the Church of Rome in this

island. Rome itself was too far off to be disturbed by a petty ebullition in a foreign Protestant University like Oxford, which had apparently calmed down with no appreciable resultant benefit to Roman interests. Rome was too immovable, too solidly fixed for its centre of gravity to be altered in the most infinitesimal degree. The few distinguished converts were suspected of Liberalism, and so far from liberalising Rome, were themselves barely tolerated. Moreover, Rome does not compromise. She does not seek converts by yielding points of principle. If they come they must submit to the new authority with unquestioning and absolute obedience. Manning only succeeded by becoming more Roman almost than the Romans. The effect of the Movement on the Church of Rome was therefore practically nothing.

5. A common complaint among the clergy is of the great and growing spirit of indifference and aloofness shown to all religious dogma by laymen and especially by educated laymen, and there can be little doubt that this complaint is well founded. Many causes have contributed to produce this state of mind.

Foremost has been the great attention paid to the study of the natural sciences and the immense progress made in all their branches, followed as it has been by the absolute antagonism shown to all forms of revealed Christianity by distinguished scientific men, who assert that the teachings of science are irreconcilable with the teaching of the Bible and the Church, and that the last-mentioned teaching must therefore be rejected as unfounded, or at any rate as founded only on probabilities, apparently inconsistent in many ways with established facts. Then, again, modern philosophers following and developing the doctrine of Mansel, teach that the knowledge attainable by human intellect must lie within certain limits, and that everything beyond those limits which includes all supernatural religion, must be unknowable and therefore rest merely on speculation and not on any rational basis of ascertained fact. The more extensive study of the origins of history and the destructive criticism based thereon has destroyed many old beliefs, and reduced many classical stories which used to be repeated as undoubted truth to the class of

popular myths, while the wider study of other religions, and particularly those of Asia, has tended to place the Bible as one merely of the Sacred Books of the East, with which it has much in common. It seem paradoxical to assert that the efforts of the great leaders of the Oxford Movement to place the Christian Faith and the Anglican form of it on the firm basis of authority should be responsible, even in part, for the undermining of the faith of laymen which really is the cause of the indifference and aloofness above referred to; but there can be little doubt that the result of the attack on the doctrine of the Bible and the Bible alone as the religion of Protestants, and the effort to rest religion mainly on the authority of the Church, coupled with the study given to early ecclesiastical history and literature, developed as it has been, have helped with other causes to bring about such indifference and aloofness, even when it has not resulted in absolute disbelief of the Christian theory, and this indirect help to the destruction of the basis of belief which has led to agnosticism, must be reckoned among the indirect results of the Movement.

6. There are no scales in which to weigh the amount of good and evil respectively caused by the Movement, and there is no analytical process by which to apportion to that Movement its precise share in causing or shaping the events and policies which succeeded to it. It may be that those events and policies would have occurred if there had been no such Movement, but then the occasion would have taken another form. The Oxford Movement was merely the expression of the reaction which followed the somewhat rapid if not violent realisation and development of Liberalism in the early part of last century, and might never have occurred if such realisation and development had begun earlier and moved with less friction. It was merely an incident, if not an accident, and now that it has receded somewhat into the past, it can be seen that any good or evil which resulted from the Movement would in all probability have come even if the Movement had never occurred, yet, on the other hand, the Movement itself was not the alarming and dangerous thing it was represented and feared to be, but was merely an interesting episode.



INDEX

- ABBOTT, Dr. E. A., on Newman's secession, 208.
- Act of Appeals, 12.
- Act, Archbishopal Licences, 13.
- Act, Election of Bishops, 13.
- Act to reform certain disorders touching ministers of the Church, 16.
- Act of Submission, 12.
- Act of Supremacy, 14 ; repealed, 16.
- Act of Uniformity of 1662, 16.
- Anglican Church, Tracts published to strengthen the, 150 ; result of the Oxford Movement, 229.
- Apostolic Succession, doctrine of the, 75, 137, 153.
- Apostolicity *v.* Catholicity, 179.
- Appeals, Act of, 12.
- Archiepiscopal Licences Act, 13.
- Arian heresy, 79 *note*.
- Arianism, view of, 192.
- Arians, The, of the Fourth Century*, 79, 92.
- Arminians, belief of the, 3.
- Arnold, Dr., his opinion of Froude's *Remains*, 61 ; his pamphlet on *The Principles of Church Reform*, 98, 122 ; his article on the "Oxford Malignants," 165.
- Articles, Thirty-nine, declaration prefixed to the, 16.
- BACON, his philosophy, 24.
- Balliol College, 43.
- Bampton Lectures, character of the, 162.

- Baptism, Tract on, 101, 103, 151, 158.
- Barbados, Archdeaconry of, 50.
- Barry, Dr. William, on the origin of the Newman family, 64 ;
on the Calvinistic views of Mrs. Newman, 65, 73.
- Beveridge, Bishop, *Tracts for the Times*, 141.
- Bishoprics, Suppression of the Irish, Bill, 123.
- Bishops, Election of, Act, 13.
- Bodleian Library, completion of the Catalogue of Arabic
Manuscripts, 96.
- Boleyn, Anne, 10.
- Bonifacio, Straits of, 89.
- Bouverie, Hon. Philip, 93.
- Bowden, J. W., *Tracts for the Times*, 140, 141, 143.
- Bowles, received into the Church of Rome, 217.
- British Critic*, articles in, 169, 177, 209 ; discontinued, 211.
- British Magazine*, 103.
- Broad Church, origin of the, 20.
- Brodrick, G. C., on the changes in Oxford from 1856-1881,
228.
- Brougham, Lord, criticism on, 112.
- Bryce, Mr., his *Holy Roman Empire*, 148 ; his writings, 235.
- Buckle, Mr., 218.
- Bunsen, 94.
- Burton, Dean, *Twelve Good Men*, 147.
- Burton, Dr., Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, his death,
159.
- Butler, A., *Tracts for the Times*, 143.
- ✓ Butler, his argument on continuity, 55 ; his *Analogy*, 75.
- CALVIN, 14.
- Calvinists, belief of the, 2.
- ✓ Cambridge Platonists, 20.
- Cambridge University, condition of, 26 ; Royal Commission of
enquiry appointed, 225.
- Canterbury, Archbishop of, addresses of attachment to the
Church, presented to, 128.
- Cathedral Institutions, Remarks on the Prospective and Past
Benefits of*, 98, 122.

- Catholic Emancipation question, 97 ; concession, 119.
- Catholicity *v.* Apostolicity, 179.
- Catholicus, letters by, 111, 113.
- Charles I., his declaration prefixed to the Thirty-nine Articles, 16.
- Cherwell, 45.
- Chillingworth, *The Bible and the Bible alone the Religion of Protestants*, 1.
- ✓ *Christian Year, The*, 52-54, 77.
- Church, Dean, on the character of Hurrell Froude, 63 ; his opinion of *The Arians of the Fourth Century*, 79 ; on the origin of the Oxford Movement, 83, 116 ; on the character of the *Tracts for the Times*, 130.
- Church, Mr., 218.
- Church of England, 7 ; separation from the Church of Rome, 14 ; condition in the Stuart period, 19 ; in the Georges period, 20 ; proposed formation of an Association of Friends of the, 125 ; declaration of principles, 126 ; effect of Newman's secession, 220.
- Church of Rome, 7. *See* Rome.
- Church, Ideal of a Christian*, 209, 211 ; condemned, 213.
- Church Temporalities, Irish, Bill, 120, 123.
- Church, The Prophetical Office of the*, 166 ; scope of the work, 167.
- Church Reform, A Plan of, with a Letter to the King*, 98, 121.
- Church Reform, The Principles of*, 98, 122.
- Churton, Mr., his protest against Tract 90, 188.
- Clement's, St., Oxford, 72.
- Clergy, improvement in their character and scholarly tone, 230-234.
- Codrington College, 60.
- Coleridge, Bishop, 50.
- Coleridge, Rev. George, 58.
- ✓✓ Coleridge, S. T., his speculations, 25, 117.
- Copeland, Mr., 218.
- Copleston, Dr., appointed Bishop of Llandaff, 50 ; on the test of examinations, 70.

Cosin, Bishop, *Tracts for the Times*, 141.
 Cranmer, 34.
 Crimean War, 113-115.
 Cromwell, Oliver, 10.

DALGAIRNS, 175 ; received into the Church of Rome, 216.
 Development, Essay on, 215, 218.
 "Developments in Religious Doctrine," sermon on, 108-111.
 Disabilities, religious, removal of, 18.
Discussions and Arguments, extracts from, 113-115.
 Dominic, Father, at Littlemore, 217 ; receives Newman into the
 Church of Rome, 218.
 Dornford, Fellow and Tutor of Oriel, 76.
Dublin Review, article in the, 180.

EALING, 67.

Eden, C. P., *Tracts for the Times*, 142.
Edinburgh Review, article in the, 165.
 Edward VI., Acts of Uniformity, passed, 15 ; Prayer-books,
 15, 33.
 Eichhorn, 94.
 Elizabeth, Queen, her Acts, 15, 16.
 Emancipation, Catholic, question, 97 ; concession of, 119.
 England, Church of, 7. *See* Church.
 Episcopalians, belief of the, 4.
 Established Church, 4, 6 ; condition of, 19, 26.
 Eutychus, originates the Monophysite heresy, 180 *note*.
 Evangelical revival, influence of, 117.
 Evangelicals, their views, 236-241.

FABER, 175.

Fasting, Tract on, 99, 103.
 Faussett, Dr., 204.
 Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond, *Life of Earl Granville*, 161 *note*.
 Folkestone, Viscount, 93.
 Fourdrinier, Jemima, 64.
 Freeman, Mr., his writings, 235.

- ✓ Freitag, 94.
 French Revolution, result of the, 23, 117.
 Friends, parting of, sermon on, 111.
 Froude, James Anthony, 57 ; on Piety and Dogmatic Theology, 6 *note*, 29 ; on Newman's appearance, 84 ; his writings, 235.
 Froude, Robert Hurrell, 57.
 Froude, Richard Hurrell, pupil of Keble, 49, 58, 105 ; his character, 57, 63 ; education, 58 ; elected Fellow of Oriel, 58, 76 ; friendship with Newman, 59, 62 ; tour abroad, 59, 87 ; at the Hadleigh Conference, 59, 125 ; his four *Tracts for the Times*, 60, 140, 143, 144 ; the *Remains*, 60, 171 *note*, 173 ; religious views, 62 ; leader of the Oxford Movement, 63.
 ✓ Fyffe, C. A., his article on the state of Oxford University, 40-43.
- GARBETT, Archdeacon, candidate for the Professorship of Poetry, 195 ; his election, 196.
 Georges period, state of the Church in the, 20.
 German philosophy, influence of, 25, 117 ; rationalism, view of, 28, 94.
Gerontius, Dream of, 108.
 Gibbon, E., his view of history, 25.
 Gladstone, W. E., on Newman's delivery, 85.
 Golightly, Mr., his proposal to erect a monument to the martyrs of the Reformation, 170.
 Green, J. R., his writings, 235.
 Griffiths, Mr., his protest against Tract 90, 188.
 Guiney, Louise J., *Life of Hurrell Froude*, 58 *note*, 147.
- HADLEIGH Conference, 59, 91, 104, 125.
 Halesworth living, 45.
 Hampden, Dr., his pamphlet on abolishing subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, 156 ; appointed Regius Professor at Oxford, 160 ; Principal of St. Mary Hall, 160 ; political views, 160 ; characteristics, 160 ; his essay on the Philosophical Evidence of Christianity, 161 ; character of his Bampton Lectures, 161-163 ; unsound doctrines, 163.

- Harborough, Robert, Earl of, 93.
 Harrison, B., *Tracts for the Times*, 140, 141, 143.
 Hastings, Warren, his verses, 53.
 Hawkins, Mr., appointed Provost of Oriel, 50, 77 ; his influence over Newman, 72, 74 ; sermon on Tradition, 74 ; relations with the Tutors, 79-82.
 Henley, Lord, *A Plan of Church Reform with a Letter to the King*, 98, 121.
 Henry VIII., King, his influence on the Reformation, 10 ; Acts, 11-14.
 High Church, founders of the, 20 ; Clergy, their views, 236-241 ; learning, 238 ; character, 239, 241 ; multiplication of services, 240.
 Hook, Dean, *Lives of Archbishops of Canterbury*, 33, 35, 106.
 Hook, *Church Dictionary*, extracts from, 79 note, 180 note.
 Howley, Dr., Bishop of London, 77.
 Hursley living, 49.
 Hutton, R. H., *Life of J. H. Newman*, 85 note.

Ideal of a Christian Church, 209, 211 ; condemned, 213.

- JAMES, Rev. William, 75.
 Jelf, Dr., 189.
 Jerusalem, Anglo-Prussian bishopric, protest against, 192.
 Jeune, Dr., member of the Oxford Commission, 225.
 John, St., Ambrose, received into the Church of Rome, 216.
 Johnson, Mr., 218.
 Jowett, Professor, on the leaders of the Oxford Movement, 27.
 Justification, Essay on, 169.

KEBLE, John, his career, 48 ; elected Fellow of Oriel, 49 ; at Hursley, 49 ; his pupils, 49, 58, 105 ; character, 49-51 ; elected Professor of Poetry, 51 ; his theory of poetry, 51 ; *The Christian Year*, 52-54 ; attitude towards the Church, 53 ; religious views, 55 ; his sermon on "National Apostacy Considered," 56, 91 ; *Tracts for the Times*, 140,

143, 147, 195; last lecture as Professor of Poetry, 194; tract on the *Mysticism of the Fathers in the Use and Interpretation of Scripture*, 195; his loyalty to the Established Church, 221.

Keble, Thos., *Tracts for the Times*, 140, 141, 142, 146.

Kingsley, Rev. Charles, his charge against Newman, 82.

LANFRANC, Archbishop, 8.

Laud, Archbishop, draws up the declaration to the Thirty-nine Articles, 16.

Laymen, their indifference to all religious dogma, 248-250.

"Lead Kindly Light," 89, 108.

✓ Lewis, Mr., 218.

Liberalism, danger of the spirit of, 118.

Liddell, Dr., member of the Oxford Commission, 225.

Littlemore, plans for a monastic establishment at, 182, 198.

Lloyd, Dr., Professor of Divinity at Oxford, 72; his lectures, 75; influence over Dr. Pusey, 94; Bishop of Oxford, 97; his death, 98.

Locke, his teaching, 24.

Low Church, 20; clergy, their views, 236-241; learning, 238; character, 239, 241.

Luther, Martin, 14.

Lyons, 90.

✓ *Lyra Apostolica*, 104.

MANNING, H. E., *Tracts for the Times*, 145.

Marriott, Charles, his work of translating the Library of the Fathers, 115, 165; *Tracts for the Times*, 145.

Martyrs of the Reformation, memorial to, 170, 173.

Mary, Queen, her repeal of the Reformation Acts, 14, 15.

Mary's, St., Oxford, 77.

"Mass," use of the word discontinued, 15.

✓ Maurice, Rev. F. D., on subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, 156.

Mayers, Rev. Walter, 73.

Melbourne, Lord, appoints Dr. Hampden Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, 160.

- Menzies, A., *Tracts for the Times*, 140.
- Methodist Societies, position of, 27.
- Mill, Stuart, on Archbishop Whately's philosophical investigations, 46.
- Ministers of the Church, Act to reform certain disorders touching, 16.
- Monophysite heresy, 180 *note*.
- Mozley, Dr. James B., on Newman's secession, 208 ; on Tract, 90, 187.
- Mozley, John, 67.
- Mozley, Rev. Thomas, his *Reminiscences*, 47 *note et seq.* ; on the character of Keble, 50 ; on the family of John Newman, 64 ; his marriage, 64, 67 ; on the appearance and dress of Newman, 86 ; on the difficulties of circulating the Tracts, 151 ; on the characteristics of Dr. Hampden, 160.
- Musical Sounds, sermon on, 108-111.
- "NATIONAL Apostacy Considered," sermon on, 56, 91.
- Neander, 94.
- Newman, Charles Robert, 65 ; his career, 66.
- Newman, Francis William, 65 ; his career, 66 ; *Early History of Cardinal Newman*, 73 *note*.
- Newman, Harriet, her marriage, 64, 67.
- Newman, Jemima, her marriage, 67.
- Newman, John, 64.
- Newman, John Henry, his friendship with Hurrell Froude, 58, 62 ; birth, 64 ; parents, 64 ; brothers, 66 ; sisters, 67 ; at school, 67 ; breaks down in his examination, 68 ; entered at Lincoln's Inn, 69 ; takes holy orders, 69 ; elected Fellow of Oriel, 70 ; his shyness, 71 ; under Whately's influence, 71, 76 ; curate of St. Clement's, Oxford, 72 ; Vice-Principal of Alban Hall, 72 ; appointed Tutor of Oriel, 72 ; religious views, 73, 90, 175 ; under the influence of Hawkins, 74 ; religious studies, 75 ; his first University sermon, 77 ; various appointments, 77 ; Vicar of St. Mary's, 77, 82 ; studies of the Fathers, 78 ; opposition to Peel's re-election, 78 ; his work on *The Arians of the Fourth Century*,

79 ; relations with his pupils, 80 ; character of his sermons, 82, 154 ; his appearance, 84, 86 ; delivery, 85 ; personal influence, 85 ; dress, 86 ; tour in Italy, 87 ; attack of fever, 88 ; hymn, 89, 93 ; *Tracts for the Times*, 92, 140, 141, 142, 144, 145, 146, 147, 150 ; illustrations of his style, 92, 108-115 ; on Pusey's joining the Movement, 100 ; his opinion of Mr. Palmer, 105 ; sermon on Musical Sounds, 108-111 ; farewell sermon as Anglican, 111, 205 ; criticism on Lord Brougham, 112 ; on the Crimean War, 113-115 ; on the Bill for the Suppression of Bishopsrics, 124 ; on the Association of Friends of the Church, 127 ; recovery from his illness, 149 ; his position based on three propositions, 149 ; his view of the Church of Rome, 150, 175, 202 ; on the distribution of the Tracts, 152 ; his opinion of Dr. Hampden's pamphlet on abolishing subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, 157 ; pamphlet on *Elucidations of Dr. Hampden's Theological Statements*, 163 ; lectures on *The Prophetical Office of the Church*, 166 ; scope of the work, 167 ; adopts the doctrine of the *Via Media*, 168 ; essay on Justification, 169 ; pamphlet on the Real Presence, 169 ; article on "The State of Religious Parties," 177-179 ; study of the Monophysite heresy, 180 ; his doubt of the tenableness of Anglicanism, 180 ; article on "The Catholicity of the Church," 182 ; plans for a monastic establishment at Littlemore, 182, 198 ; on the meaning of the Roman doctrine, 183-185 ; his Tract 90, 185-191 ; defence of it, 189 ; at Littlemore, 191, 203 ; view of Arianism, 192 ; movement of the bishops against him, 192 ; his protest against the proposed Anglo-Prussian bishopric at Jerusalem, 192 ; unsettled views, 194, 203, 206, 214 ; sermons on Wisdom and Innocence, 194 ; under "observation," 197 ; explanation of his retirement to Littlemore, 198-201 ; retracts his words against Rome, 203 ; resigns the living of St. Mary's, 205 ; Essay on Development, 215 ; resigns his Fellowship, 217 ; received into the Church of Rome, 218 ; leaves Oxford, 218.

Newman, Mary, 67.

Newman, Mrs., her Calvinistic views, 65, 73.

Nicene doctrine, acceptance of, 39.

Nicholas, Dr. George, 67.

Noetics, their views, 47.

Nonconformists, belief of the, 4.

OAKELEY, Mr., 175, 209.

O'Connell, elected for Clare, 97.

Ogle, Dr., 218.

Oriel College, 43.

Origines Liturgicæ, 104.

Owen, Robert, the philanthropic Socialist, 66.

Oxford, Bishop of, his opinion of Tract 90, 190 ; his animadversions on the *Tracts for the Times*, 173.

Oxford or Tractarian Movement, leader of the, 64 ; origin, 116 ; antecedents, 117 ; threatened dangers, 118-123 ; steps for the defence of the Church, 123 ; Hadleigh Conference, 124 ; proposed formation of an Association of Friends of the Church, 125 ; address to the Archbishop, 128 ; later form of the Movement, 129 ; *Tracts for the Times*, No. 1, 130-139 ; list of, 139-148 ; results on the Anglican Church, 229.

Oxford University, condition of, 26, 40-43 ; result of election, 97 ; proposal to abolish subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, 155 ; Royal Commission of enquiry appointed, 224 ; members, 225 ; report, 225 ; measures for the reform, 226-228 ; changes, 228 ; development of a historical school, 235.

PALMER, Rev. William, 104 ; his work *Origines Liturgicæ*, 104 ; on the Catholic Emancipation measure, 120 ; on proposed privileges to Unitarians, 124 ; at Hadleigh Conference, 125 ; his proposed Association of Friends of the Church, 125 ; address to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 128 ; *Tracts for the Times*, 140 ; treatise on the Church of Christ, 169 ; on Newman's secession, 208 ; denounces the Romanising tendency of the articles in the *British Critic*, 211.

- Parker, Archbishop, his influence on the Prayer-books of Edward VI., 34 ; draws up the Thirty-nine Articles, 35-39.
- Parliament, reform of, 118.
- Parochial and Plain Sermons*, 82, 92 ; their character, 83.
- Pattison, Mr. Mark, on the Noetics, 47 ; at Littlemore, 218.
- Paul, Mr. Herbert, on the religious views of Keble, 53 ; on the character of Hurrell Froude, 58.
- Peel, Sir Robert, and the Catholic Emancipation question, 78, 97 ; re-election, 78.
- Perceval, Hon. and Rev. A. P., Vicar of East Horsley, 106 ; at the Hadleigh Conference, 125 ; *Tracts for the Times*, 141, 142.
- Platonists, the Cambridge, 20.
- Powell, Professor Baden, member of the Oxford Commission, 225.
- Prayer, Books of Common, 15, 17, 33.
- Priests, marriage of, 15.
- Printing, result of the discovery, 24.
- Prophetical Office of the Church*, 166 ; scope of the work, 167.
- Protestants, number of forms of belief, 1.
- Pusey, Dr. Edward Bouverie, 92 ; his refutation of German Rationalism, 28, 94 ; his birth and parents, 93 ; in Germany, 94 ; ordained deacon, 95 ; Regius Professor of Hebrew, 95 ; ordained priest, 96 ; completion of the Catalogue of Arabic Manuscripts, 96 ; support of Peel's election, 97 ; his pamphlet *Remarks on the Prospective and Past Benefits of Cathedral Institutions*, 98, 122 ; tract on Fasting, 99, 103 ; on Baptism, 101, 103, 151, 158 ; joins the Movement, 101, 151 ; influence, 101, 103 ; his project for a translation of the Fathers, 103, 151, 165 ; *Tracts for the Times*, 141, 144, 145, 151 ; his defence of Tractarianism, 176 ; sermon on the Holy Eucharist, 204 ; proceedings against, 204 ; suspended from preaching, 205 ; visit to Newman, 218 ; loyalty to the Established Church, 221.
- "QUEEN Anne's Bounty," 12.

- RATIONALISM, views on, 28, 94.
- Real Presence, pamphlet on, 169.
- Reform Bill of 1832, 22, 119.
- Reformation, 8, 10; result of the, 9; motives, 10; Acts of Henry VIII., 11-14; character, 31; martyrs of the, proposal to erect a monument to, 170.
- Religious disabilities, removal of, 18.
- "Religious Parties, State of," article on, 177-179.
- Remains*, publication of, 60, 173.
- Reserve in Religious Teaching*, tract on, 106, 195.
- Revolution, the French, result of, 23, 117.
- Ritualism, development of, 242-246.
- Roman doctrine, meaning of the term, 183.
- Rome, Church of, 6; influence, 7; separation from the Church of England, 14; effect of Newman's secession, 220; interest in the Tractarian controversy, 246; effect of the Movement, 248.
- Rose, Hugh James, 79; Hadleigh Conference at his Rectory, 91, 124; his lectures on German rationalism, 94; controversy with Dr. Pusey, 94; characteristics, 103; editor of the *British Magazine*, 103; Rector of Hadleigh, 104; Principal of King's College, London, 129; death, 129.
- Routh, Dr., 190.
- Russell, Lord John, appoints a Royal Commission of enquiry into Oxford University, 224.
- SACRAMENT, administration of the, 15.
- Sandford, Archdeacon, *Life of Archbishop Temple*, edited by, 85 note.
- ✓ Schliermacher, 94.
- Scott, Sir Walter, influence of his writings, 25, 117.
- Scott, Rev. W., 208.
- Settlement, Act of, 22.
- Shairp, Principal, on Newman's voice, 84.
- Shuttleworth, 98.
- Sibthorpe, Mr., received into the Church of Rome, 201.
- Sicily, 88.

- Sisterhoods, foundation of, 245.
- Smith, Mr. Goldwin, Secretary to the Oxford Commission, 225.
- Southrop, Curacy of, 58.
- Stanley, Dean, *Life of Arnold*, 122 note; on the characteristics of Mr. Ward, 209; Secretary to the Oxford Commission, 225.
- Stanley, Lord, his Irish Church Temporalities Bill, 120, 123.
- Stanton, received into the Church of Rome, 217.
- Stuart period, state of the Church in, 19.
- Stubbs, Dr., his writings, 235.
- Subjects of the Day, Sermons on*, 111.
- Submission, Act of, 12.
- Sumner, Archbishop of Canterbury, his treatise on apostolical preaching, 75.
- Suppression of the Irish Bishoprics Bill, 123.
- Supremacy, Act of, 14; repealed, 14, 16.
- TAIT, Archbishop, his protest against Tract 90, 188; on Newman's duality of mind, 207; member of the Oxford Commission, 225.
- Temple, Archbishop, on the personal influence of Newman, 85.
- Test and Corporation Acts, repeal, 119.
- Thirty-nine Articles, declaration prefixed to the, 16; origin, 35; character, 36-39; proposal to abolish subscription to the, at Oxford University, 155.
- "Thirty-nine Articles, Remarks on Certain Passages in the," 185-191; protests against, 188.
- Tholuck, 94.
- Times, Tracts for the*, 60, 99, 106; No. 1, 92, 130-139; list of the, 139-148; their character, 150; distribution, 151; publication, 152; No. 90, 185-191; protests against, 188.
- Tractarianism, defence of, 176.
- Trench, Dean, *Oxford Movement*, 136 note.
- Tudor period, changes in the, 19.
- Tulloch, Dr., his view of the character of the English Reformation, 14 note, 31.
- Tyndale, 14.

UNIFORMITY, Act of, 1662, 16.

Unitarians, belief of the, 2 ; proposed privileges, 124.

University Test Acts of 1871 passed, 226.

Via Media, doctrine of the, 168, 171.

Victoria, Queen, condition of Oxford at her accession, 43.

Victorian Era, achievements of, 27.

WARD, William George, Fellow and Mathematical Lecturer at Balliol, 174 ; his characteristics, 175 ; religious views, 175 ; resigns his lectureships, 191 ; leader of the Movement, 209 ; his book *The Ideal of a Christian Church*, 209, 211 ; condemned, 213 ; engaged to be married, 213 ; marriage, 214 ; received into the Church of Rome, 214.

Ward, Mrs., received into the Church of Rome, 214.

Wellington, Duke of, 95.

Wesley, influence of his teaching, 21.

Whately, Archbishop, 44 ; his career, 45 ; appointed Archbishop of Dublin, 45 ; characteristics, 45-48 ; his philosophical investigation, 46 ; religious view, 47 ; contribution to the Oxford Movement, 48 ; influence over Newman, 71 ; Principal of Alban Hall, 72.

White, Blanco, 98 ; at Oxford, 106 ; character of his intellect, 107 ; a Socinian, 107.

Wilberforce, Henry, 181.

Wilberforce, Robert, pupil of Keble, 49, 58, 105 ; Fellow and Tutor of Oriel, 76.

William the Conqueror, 8.

William of Orange, his wars, 22.

Williams, Isaac, pupil of Keble, 49, 58, 105 ; extract from his *Autobiography*, 99 ; his birth, 105 ; curate of St. Mary's, Oxford, 105 ; character of his poetry, 105 ; Tract on *Reserve in Religious Teaching*, 106, 195 ; *Tracts for the Times*, 145, 146 ; candidate for the Professorship of Poetry, 195.

Wilson, R. F., *Tracts for the Times*, 143 ; protest against Tract 90, 188.

Wiseman, Dr., 59, 87 ; his lectures on the doctrines of Catholicism, 166, 215 ; article on the "Anglican Claim," 180 ; President of Ascott, 216 ; interest in the Tractarian controversy, 246.

Wolsey, Cardinal, 10.



NEW THEOLOGICAL WORKS.

The Royal Commission and the Ornaments Rubric.

By the Rev. MALCOLM MACCOLL, D.D., Canon Residentiary of Ripon.
8vo.

The Example of Our Lord, especially for His

Ministers. By the Right Rev. A. C. A. HALL, D.D., Bishop of Vermont.
Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. net.

For Faith and Science. By F. H. WOODS, B.D., some-

time Fellow and Theological Lecturer of St. John's College, Oxford,
Rector of Bainton. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. net.

The Critical Problems of the Pentateuch: a Series

of Lectures. By the Rev. RANDOLPH H. MCKIM, D.D., President of
the Lower House of the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church
in America. With a Preface by the Very Rev. H. WACE, D.D., Dean
of Canterbury. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. net.

The Mission of the Holy Ghost: Lectures delivered

to the Members of the St. Paul's Lecture Society, 1905. By the Rev.
G. H. S. WALPOLE, D.D., Rector of Lambeth. Crown 8vo, 2s. net.

Stoic and Christian in the Second Century: a

**Comparison of the Ethical Teaching of Marcus Aurelius with that of
Contemporary and Antecedent Christianity.** By LEONARD ALSTON,
M.A., sometime Scholar of Trinity College, Melbourne; Burney Prize-
man, Cambridge, 1904 and 1905. Crown 8vo, 3s. net.

The Practice and Science of Religion: being the

Paddock Lecture for 1905-6. By JAMES W. WOODS, Instructor in
Philosophy, Harvard University. Crown 8vo.

A Great Archbishop of Dublin, William King, D.D.,

**1650-1729: his Autobiography, Family, and a Selection from his Corre-
spondence.** Edited by Sir CHARLES SIMEON KING, Bart. With 7
Plates and 4 Illustrations in Text. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Is Religion Undermined? By the Rev. C. L. DRAWBRIDGE,

M.A., Author of "Old Beliefs and New Knowledge". Crown 8vo,
3s. 6d. net.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.,

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON,

NEW YORK AND BOMBAY.

I
131297
2 of 4
LATE
30

THE OXFORD MOVEMENT, ETC.

Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman during his Life in the English Church. With a brief Autobiography. Edited, at Cardinal Newman's request, by ANNE MOZLEY. 2 vols. Crown 8vo, 7s.

The Story of Dr. Pusey's Life. By the Author of "Charles Lowder". With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d. net.

Life and Letters of Thomas Thellusson Carter, Warden of the House of Mercy, Clewer, and Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. Edited by the Ven. W. H. HUTCHINGS, M.A., Archdeacon of Cleveland. With Portrait and 8 other Illustrations. 8vo, 10s. 6d. net.

Life and Letters of Henry Parry Liddon, D.D., Canon of St. Paul's, and sometime Ireland Professor of Exegesis in the University of Oxford. By JOHN OCTAVIUS JOHNSTON, M.A., Principal of Cuddesdon Theological College; with a Concluding Chapter by the LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD. With 5 Illustrations (4 Portraits). 8vo, 15s. net.

Cuddesdon College, 1854-1904 : a Record and Memorial. With 3 Portraits and 3 other Illustrations. 8vo, stiff paper covers, 2s. 6d. net; cloth boards, 3s. net.

A Short History of the Oxford Movement. By Sir SAMUEL HALL, M.A., K.C., formerly Vice-Chancellor of the County Palatine of Lancaster. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d. net.

The Life of George Rundle Prynne, M.A. : a Chapter in the Early History of the Catholic Revival. By A. CLIFTON KELWAY. With Photogravure Portrait and 4 other Illustrations. 8vo, 6s. 6d. net.

Life and Letters of Mandell Creighton, D.D. Oxon. and Camb., sometime Bishop of London. By his WIFE. With 8 Portraits (4 Photogravures), and 3 other Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo, 28s. net.

Gregory the Great: his Place in History and Thought. By F. HOLMES DUDDEN, B.D., Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford. 2 vols. 8vo, 30s. net.

The Reformation Settlement : Examined in the Light of History and Law. By the Rev. MALCOLM MACCOLL, D.D., Canon Residentiary of Ripon. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. net.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.,

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON,

NEW YORK AND BOMBAY.





LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 019 566 660 A