STORY OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

G·H·F·Nye

THE STORY
OF THE
OXFORD MOVEMENT.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

OUR ISLAND HOME - - - 3s. 6d.

THE CHURCH AND HER STORY 2s. od.

POPULAR STORY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND - - 1s., and 6d.

LONDON:
BEMROSE & SONS, LIMITED, 23, OLD BAILEY;
AND DERBY.

Photo. by] [*Preston, Penzance.*

JOHN KEBLE,

THE FOUNDER OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

THE STORY

OF THE

OXFORD MOVEMENT.

A BOOK FOR THE TIMES.

BY

G. H. F. NYE,

AUTHOR OF "A POPULAR STORY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND," AND EDITOR OF "NYE'S ILLUSTRATED CHURCH ANNUAL," ETC.

With an Introduction by the Very Rev. THE DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S.

"Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget."
Rudyard Kipling.

London:
BEMROSE & SONS, LTD., 23, OLD BAILEY;
AND DERBY.

1899.

"One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism."

Eph. iv. 5.

"The Communion of the Church of England as it stands distinguished from all Papal and Puritan innovations, and as it adheres to the Doctrine of the Cross."

Bishop Ken, A.D. 1710.

"I believe in one Catholic and Apostolic Church."

Book of Common Prayer—Order of Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion.

"In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength."

Motto chosen by John Keble for "The Christian Year."

INTRODUCTION.

I HAVE been asked by Mr. Nye to write a few words of introduction to his excellent little work on the Authors of the Oxford Movement. This I can do with great satisfaction, as I have had nearly a life-long knowledge of some of them, and have read over the whole of what Mr. Nye has written in proof. I can truly say that a more fair and equitable treatment of the subject I could not wish for.

It was my happiness to receive my title for Holy Orders more than half a century since from the Rev. Thomas Keble, Vicar of Hursley, one of the writers of "Tracts for the Times," and I could use no words too strong to express

my deep admiration for his ability, piety, and earnestness in discharging the duties of Vicar of a large and straggling parish, and of my personal obligations to him. The Rev. Isaac Williams, another of the writers, was my brother curate, and was a learned and self-sacrificing clergyman. A large amount of ignorant and senseless clamour was raised against the authors of these Tracts. From the first their aims were misunderstood or misrepresented; their characters were vilified; whilst their hearty loyalty to the Church of England was called in question in a manner that can only reflect discredit on their traducers. For the most part this was done by people who had little or no personal knowledge of them, and who wrote recklessly about excellent men who did not utter their shibboleths. It is to be feared that this old spirit is not dead; and whilst it has become less personal, it freely applies epithets to the

intentions and actions of the holy men who started the Movement, and their successors, which will not bear examination.

If people who thus act and speak would only remember that the excitement over a few choir boys wearing surplices was as great as any that has been aroused by the most extreme display of Ritualism, and that for weeks, if not for months, *The Times* and other newspapers were filled with letters and articles against the frightful dangers that threatened the Church in consequence of clergymen preaching in a surplice instead of a black gown, and by their collecting the alms of the congregation in bags instead of on plates after the Sunday services, they would surely moderate many of the foolish and uncharitable utterances which are now frequently heard. A first step towards their obtaining the equanimity of mind required for seeing things

as they are, would be their learning something accurately concerning the men who originated the Movement against which they protest so loudly. They would then see how different were these men, their objects, and the means they took to secure them, from what they are represented by the noisy agitators, who thrive upon trying to rouse the people to frenzy by speeches and assertions, for many of which they have little or no authority beyond their own imaginations, and floating gossip for which no trustworthy evidence can be adduced.

Mr. Nye has very wisely made no attacks upon those who differ from him, neither has he said anything of the class of persons for whom his book would be especially profitable. He has contented himself with a plain and simple statement of facts. That there have been exaggerations and excesses in matters

of ritual, of which the Tract writers would disapprove, there can be no doubt. Their object was to draw people's minds to the doctrinal teaching of the Prayer-book, and the patience with which many of them bore for years with Hymn-books which they disliked, and with a slovenly ritual which they felt to be unworthy of the Church, would seem remarkable to many who applaud the work they accomplished; but such thoughtful consideration for the feelings of others is not really valued in these hurried and impetuous days. For these persons, as well as for others, it would be well to have a correct knowledge of facts as they really were, and it is desirable that the comparatively few survivors of the early days of the Movement, who were personally acquainted with some of the able men who are now comparatively little known, should bear their testimony before their tongues are silenced for ever on earth.

No good cause can really suffer by having the truth told of it. This should apply to both supporters and opponents of the Oxford Movement, as no doubt both consider the cause they advocate to be good. I should be thankful if this feeling was so far manifested, as to lead those who are only imperfectly acquainted with the facts to study what Mr. Nye has written, and so to become more competent to take an intelligent part in the controversy which had its origin in what was written more than half a century since, and which still exists.

ROBERT GREGORY.

Deancry, St. Paul's,
February, 1899.

AUTHOR'S NOTE.

THE following pages have been written with the simple object of bringing before plain and simple folk—who have little opportunity, or leisure, to study the question as it deserves—something of what the writer believes to be the truth concerning what is known as the "Oxford Movement," the causes that led to that Movement, and something also of the character of the men with whom it originated.

This little work neither is, nor is it desired that it should be so considered, an apology for, or a defence, or condemnation of, that great "Forward" movement, as some might call it, in the Church, which, however it may be regarded to-day, was, it is believed by the

writer, intended by its early promoters to elevate the character of the Apostolic Church of Christ—to deepen men's love and affection, and to revive fresh interest and enthusiasm for the old Church of England.

Moreover, it is not desired that this should be supposed to be put forth as a controversial work. It has nothing to do with Doctrine as such. It deals neither with Ecclesiastical ceremonies, customs, nor practices, nor their meanings. The revival of many customs, ceremonies, and practices of the Primitive Church —then long in abeyance, or neglected by those responsible for their due observance — may doubtless be traced to what is known as the "Oxford Movement," but all these things have been dealt with by other writers, and authorities upon such may be easily found by those who wish to enquire into such matters. The intention of the writer is simply to give an outline sketch of the Movement; to present rather the practical side of the question to

those who have never studied it at all, or who having done so, have formed their opinions—it may be, possibly, upon works put forth by writers who have a purpose of their own to serve—the desire being to show what Church and Nation owe to the Movement started by John Keble more than sixty years ago.

G. H. F. NYE.

Holly Lodge,
Brixton, S.W.,
February, 1899.

[The writer desires it to be understood that he, and he alone, is responsible for any incidental remarks that may appear in the following pages.]

BRIEF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

CHAPTER II.

CHAPTER III.

CHAPTER IV.

CHAPTER V.

CHAPTER VI.

CHAPTER VII.

CHAPTER VIII.

CHAPTER IX.

THE STORY

OF THE

OXFORD MOVEMENT.

CHAPTER I.

The Georgian Period.

IN order to understand in any degree the reasons which animated the founders of the Oxford Movement, we must consider not only the times in which they lived, but we must go further still, back to the days which preceded those times, and recall — here but briefly, of course—the condition of things then existing in the Church, and in the country, during the period known in history as the

Georgian Period, *i.e.*, from the accession of George I., 1714, to the death of George IV., 1830.

In those days there were, as now, what are commonly known as three "sections," or parties, in the Church of England. They are commonly described as "High," "Low," and "Broad." Many there are who consider that it is in the best interests both of Church and people that there should be more than one "party," or one "section," in the National Church, and some are thankful that the one platform of the great Church of England is so wide that it yet includes all three parties named, all engaged in the work of winning souls to Christ. A little reflection will probably suggest that nothing is likely to make Church teaching more acceptable to the enormous numbers of her adherents (shall we say seventy per cent. of the whole population of England and Wales?)* than the maintenance

* See Appendix as to the numbers of Church people in England and Wales.

of such parties as now exist within the Church itself. They may be called, in fact, the Church's "safety valves."

For instance, there are some most devoted and devout Church people who cannot for a moment tolerate what they call "Ritualistic" practices. To such, anything beyond the maintenance of God's house in what they regard as a proper and decent condition is more or less offensive. Aids to public worship such as we see in many churches to-day, church ornaments and decorations, are to such people considered to be unnecessary and even improper—the word "Catholic" even has for some Church-goers a "Romish" sound, though of course it is no more "Roman" than English. It is a Greek word, and simply means "universal." And yet amongst this vast body of worshippers there are many who would fight for the Church and defend it, if necessary, with their very lives. There are yet others—few, perhaps, comparatively speaking—who would go still further, who

not only disagree with, but who would do their utmost to sweep away by force, or otherwise, those external adjuncts used in many churches in the celebration of divine worship, symbols which to others again add dignity, glory, additional reverence, and beauty to the services, and many of which symbols those who wish to remove them, are frequently quite ignorant of the fact that they were commonly used in the Christian Church long before Reformation times. To others, again, ritual is not only more or less acceptable, but in their opinion absolutely necessary to the due performance of divine worship, and many would perhaps abstain from joining in public worship altogether, unless those aids to devotion, which they find in the Church they are accustomed to attend, were always present, and in daily use. Amongst such there are many thousands who would yield to none in their zeal, devotion, and attachment to Mother Church. We must remember that God did not form all men in one mould, nor of one mind,

nor is it ordained that all men should see the same thing with the same eyes, or even from the same standpoint, so the Church, claiming to be, and being, in fact, "National," must of necessity embrace men of various ideas, of different schools of thought, often of conflicting opinions even; but still, above all things, loyal Churchmen, prepared at all hazards to maintain unimpaired their magnificent heritage—the Church, in which their forefathers worshipped, in which they worship, and in which they hope and believe their own children and the generations yet unborn will still worship and praise the God of their being.

"I am told," once said the late Earl of Beaconsfield, "that the chief reason for believing "in the danger of the Church is the existence "of parties in it. But there have always been "parties in the Church. There were parties in "the Church of Jerusalem; and as long as the "various nature of man subsists, those parties "will subsist also. There are some minds that

"find no adequate spiritual exposition except "in ceremony. There are some spirits, on the "other hand, which require for their solace "exaltation and enthusiasm; and even within "the hallowed enclosure of the ecclesiastical "precinct free thought will become resistless "and press its inquiries. Yet all these moods "of mind are consistent with fealty to the "National Church. I believe that the three "great parties in the Church may have fair "play with a due respect to the principles and "practice of the Reformation. Where there is "eccentricity, which is as often the result of "personal vanity as of religious conviction, it "should be checked and discouraged; but to "check and discourage without persecution is "a wise course in spiritual as well as temporal "affairs. I look forward, as I have ever "looked forward, to the Anglican Church as "one of the chief agencies in the elevation of "the people of this country."*

* *Speech in Merchant Taylors' Hall*, June 24th, 1874.

Lord Beaconsfield is here, of course, only giving expression to his own opinions, in view of the hostile faction which was then clamouring for disestablishment and disendowment of the Church of England. Knowing and believing that the great Church is the pillar, and ground of THE TRUTH, thoughtful Churchmen will regard the statement as only presenting a one-sided view, and that by no means an exalted one, of the Church of their Fathers.

The Church of England differs from other so-called religious bodies in that it is a branch of the "Catholic" Church of Christ. We declare it to be "Catholic" every time we recite the creeds. For instance, in the Apostles' Creed, "I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church"; or, again, in the Creed recited in the order of administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion,* "I believe one 'Catholic'

---

* *Vide* "Book of Common Prayer."—"Order for Morning Prayer daily throughout the year," and "The Service for Holy Communion."

and Apostolic Church," such referring of course to the "Church of England," the Holy Catholic Church of Christ—"Catholic" in very truth—"universal," that is, not local; "Catholic," not "Roman" Catholic, and herein lies a great distinction.

One of the great differences between the Church of England and the Church of Rome has been well pointed out by a writer who has carefully studied the question in all its various aspects. He says, and history bears out the statement—"The Church of England has neither added to the faith of ancient Christendom, nor taken away from it, and accordingly while she is Catholic, which the sects are not, she is not Roman Catholic, with mere local and modern variations for the worse, from the old teaching of the Church Universal."*

There is no necessity for undue alarm when the Church of England is attacked, either because she is a great national institution, or

* The late Dr. Littledale C.D.I., Tract No. 88.

because of other reasons. Whenever such attempts to overthrow or discredit the Church occur, we remember that it is neither for the first time, nor certainly will it be for the last time. The Church of England has passed through many attacks, many so-called "crises," which, but for the fact, never to be forgotten or put out of sight for an instant, that she rests on no earthly foundation, but is "of God," would have rended and torn and annihilated her, as it most assuredly would have crushed out of existence any "sect," or "society," or "Church" so-called which was of man's creation, and founded, not on truth, but on error. The inner life of the Church would be unaffected even if it should happen one day to be "disestablished" and "disendowed," though its progress and usefulness might be impeded, to the great loss of the Nation, as well as the Church herself.

It has been truly said that "History is a splendid cordial for drooping courage." We

have only to turn to the pages of history to find that, however bad the condition of things in the Church of England may be supposed by some to be to-day—and it is the writer's belief, based on some experience, that it is nothing like so bad as many would lead us to imagine—in the days preceding the movement known as the Oxford Movement, the condition of things in the Church was infinitely worse.

Take, for instance, the condition of the very fabrics themselves, buildings which with very few exceptions presented none of the ornate features known to English Churchmen to-day. "Our forefathers," writes Mr. Abbey,* "in the eighteenth century were almost always content to maintain in tolerable, or scarcely tolerable, repair, at the lowest modicum of expense, the existing fabrics of their churches. It has been truly remarked that to this apathy we are

* "The English Church in the Eighteenth Century," p. 404. (New and revised edition.)

indeed much indebted, for, after all, they took care that the buildings should not fall to the ground. If they had done more, they would probably have done worse, for ecclesiastical architecture was then, as is well known, at its lowest ebb."

"Public taste," wrote Warburton, in 1749, "is the most wretched imaginable. . . . There were, however, special reasons for the decline in church architecture. It had become, for very want of exercise, an almost forgotten art. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the work of building churches had been prosecuted with lavish munificence, so much so that the Reformed Church succeeded to an inheritance more than doubly sufficient for its immediate wants.* A period, therefore, of great activity in this respect was followed by one of nearly total cessation. Internally, anything in the

---

* James Fergusson, "History of Modern Styles of Architecture," p. 246.

shape of adornment in God's house would have been misunderstood by the attendants. Private houses might, and did, contain any amount of valuable adornment and art treasures, but the house of God nothing. Externally things were little, if any, better. In England no church was erected of the smallest pretensions to architectural design between the Reformation and the Great Fire of London, in 1666, with the solitary exception of the small church in Covent Garden erected by Inigo Jones in 1631. During the eighty years which elapsed from the death of Henry VIII. to the accession of Charles I., the Transition style left its mark in every corner of England, in the mansions of the nobility and the gentry, and in the colleges and schools which were created out of the confiscated funds of the monasteries; but, unfortunately for the dignity of this style, not one church, not one really important public building, or regal palace, was erected during the period which might have tended to redeem

it from the utilitarianism into which it was sinking. The great characteristic of this epoch was that, during its continuance, architecture ceased to be a natural mode of expression, or the occupation of cultivated intellects, and passed into the state of being merely the stock-in-trade of certain political experts. . . . The reign of Puritanism was of course wholly unfavourable to art: the period of laxity that followed was no less so. Even Wren, of whose comprehensive genius Englishmen have every reason to speak with pride, formed in the first instance a most inadequate conception of what a Christian church should be." "The very theory of the ground plan for a church had died out when he constructed his first miserable design for a huge meeting-house."*

John Evelyn laments the appearance of the "heavy, dark, melancholy, and monkish piles erected without any sense of proportion, use, or beauty," and the people, while they wondered

* M. E C. Walcot, "Traditions, etc., of Cathedrals," p. 47.

at the marvellous proportions of Henry VII.'s magnificent chapel at Westminster—regarded even then as one of the wonders of the world—and spoke with pride of the grand cathedrals they possessed, did not in the least know what to do with them. For the most part they were considered as curiosities, beautiful indeed to look at, but useless for any purpose, except perhaps as ornamental buildings, and therefore worth preserving.

This utter neglect for the fabrics of our churches, which was almost, if not quite, universal, was followed, it would appear, by an ardent desire for the obliteration of every then existing item of beauty—and these were few enough—in the churches, under the pretence of making such clean! So to the age of neglect and utter indifference, succeeded an age of whitewash! It seems scarcely to be believed, and yet it is quite true, that the usual method of "cleaning and restoring" in vogue in the Georgian period was a "pail of whitewash"

and a brush, and the only building of any importance in London that escaped the destructive hand of the dauber of whitewash was Westminster Abbey, for the exception of which indeed we ought to be truly grateful. In fact, it is affirmed that this was the one and only church structure in the kingdom which was not "treated" in the same barbarous fashion of the times. "The stone fretwork of the lady chapel at Hereford, the valuable wall paintings at Salisbury, the carved work of Grinling Gibbons at St. James's, Westminster, shared, for example, the general fate, and were smothered in lime.* As Horace Walpole, in condemning the authorities for employing someone to compile their history of the City of London, whom he thought unfit for the purpose, sarcastically wrote, that he supposed that in future, instead of having books published with the imprimatur of a university, they would be

* Quoted in Abbey and Overton's "English Church in the Eighteenth Century," p. 408.

'printed—as churches are whitewashed'—John Smith and Thomas Johnson, Churchwardens."

But even "whitewash" has its uses, for while it often conceals treasures from the eye, which, once removed or destroyed, could never be replaced, in many cases, too, it happily preserved them. As Mr. Abbey observes, "it hides beauties to which one generation is blind, that it may disclose them the more fresh and uninjured to another which has learned to appreciate them."

CHAPTER II.

The Wesleyan Movement.

EVER since the Gospel has been preached in this country—that is to say from the days of the Apostles to our own times, good and faithful Priests have been found doing their work in their parishes; but it must be admitted that a time came—it was about the middle of the eighteenth century—which may be fittingly described by the well-known title of "Darkest England," when the religious life of the nation had reached, perhaps, its lowest level since the Reformation; when the blight of apathy, indifference, and infidelity abounded on every side. Religious rites, with few exceptions, were everywhere neglected. To very few, probably, were the doctrines of the Church known.

Some idea of the religious apathy, and spiritual deadness which then covered the country may be gathered from the fact that from the year 1711, when a grant of £350,000 was made for the purpose of assisting in the building of fifty churches in populous districts (of which, by the way, only a dozen appear to have been taken in hand), down to the year 1811—exactly a century—when Parliament voted the "Million" grant* for a similar purpose, little or no attempt was made by Churchmen to meet the growing needs of the increasing population.†

Do not let it be supposed that in the Church alone this terrible state of things was to be found. The communities outside the Church were infected in much the same degree. Mosheim, a learned Church historian, writing in 1740, says: "Those who are best acquainted with the English nation tell us that the Dissenting

* See at end of Appendix.

† Previous to 1819, a Special Act of Parliament was necessary to the erection of a church. During the first seven years of the present century only 24 churches were built or re-built.

interest declines from day to day." There was as much apathy in Dissenting circles as in the Church. Indifferentism, in fact, reigned supreme everywhere throughout the land, only in party politics was the presence of the Church really felt.

From this state of things both Church and Nation were to be awakened by a remarkable religious revival, which has left its mark upon our country unto this day.

In 1727 there were at Oxford two sons of the Rev. Samuel Wesley, then Rector of Epworth, Lincolnshire. John, the elder, who was born in 1703, at Epworth Rectory, became Fellow of Lincoln College. Charles was a student of Christ Church.

Impressed with the awful spiritual deadness which everywhere stared them in the face, John, together with his brother, and George Whitefield, of Pembroke; Hervey, the author of the "Meditations," and about a dozen others, set themselves to work to see what they could do, as individuals, to arouse the Church and

the Nation from the state of slumber and decay into which both had undoubtedly fallen. With no small difficulty, and in spite of much opposition and no little misunderstanding, the brothers succeeded in forming a small society of students of the University, numbering some twenty-seven persons, with rules framed somewhat upon the lines of an older parochial association, founded by Mr. Wesley, senior, for the purpose of creating a new interest in religious affairs both in the University and in the town. Each night they met to review what they had done during the day, and to arrange their plans for the morrow. Whilst endeavouring to persuade their companions to lead better lives, the little band of workers proceeded to undertake the relief of impoverished families in the town and suburbs of Oxford, the education of the children in certain poor schools in the neighbourhood, while some ministered to the poor in the parish workhouse.

The members of the society attended a

weekly Celebration of the Holy Communion—a custom by no means practised except by a very few in those days—and their regular conduct of life, so unlike the majority of their fellow students, obtained for them the nickname of "Methodists," on account of their adhesion to "method" and their love of regularity and order, a name which has remained identified with Wesley's followers to this day. They were also called, by some, by the name of "Sacramentarians," because they elected to partake of Holy Communion both frequently and systematically.

Thus the "Holy Club," as it came to be called at Oxford—in the days when University students were for the most part far more given to the pleasures of the world than they are to-day—a club composed of a little knot of self-denying students, who visited the sick, instructed the poor, practised acts of self-sacrifice, and lived a life of devotion, surprised many who took any interest at all in such matters.

John Wesley himself thus speaks of it: "In

November, 1727, at which time I came to reside in Oxford, my brother and I, and two or three young gentlemen more, agreed to spend three or four evenings a week together. On Sunday evening we read something in Divinity, on other nights the Greek and Latin Classics. In the following summer we were desired to visit the prisoners in the castle—and we agreed to visit them twice a week. Soon after we were desired to call upon a poor woman in the town who was sick, and in this employment too we believed it would be worth while to spend an hour or two every week. Soon after we all agreed to communicate as often as we could (which was then once a week at Christ Church). In April, 1732, Mr. Clayton, of Brazenose College, began to meet with us. It was by his advice that we began to observe the Fasts of the Ancient Church every Wednesday and Friday. This was the beginning of the Methodist Society."

John Wesley, who was ordained in 1725, went

as a Missionary, in October of 1735, to the then newly-formed colony of Georgia, with the intention and hope of converting the Red Indians. There he remained for two and a half years, living a very ascetic life.* But the enterprise not turning out so well as he had hoped or expected, he returned home. Having in his travels come into communication with a company of Moravians, he imbibed some of their teachings. On Wesley's return to England he at once set about preaching with intense earnestness, and frequently in the open air. The times, as may be imagined, were most debased. The people sought amusement in bull-baiting, cock-fighting, drunkenness, and brutality, and it required no small amount of moral courage to stand up and publicly condemn the iniquities of the savage mobs which often assembled to hear the preacher. The

* Wesley tried to enforce Church discipline, but failed in his endeavour. He divided the Church Services, having Morning Prayer at 5 a.m., and celebrating Holy Communion with Sermon as a service by itself at 11 a.m.

question of places to preach in, soon forced itself upon the Wesleyans, and in 1739, in the Horse Fair at Bristol, the first Wesleyan Meeting House was erected.

It should never be forgotten that John Wesley was to the last a staunch upholder of the Church of England. He urged his followers never to depart from the teaching of the Church; and at the early meetings of the Methodists, held in the Foundry Chapel, resolutions were passed by which the Wesleyans promised to "uphold and defend the Church, both by their preaching and living."*

But John Wesley was not only a staunch upholder of the Church of England. He was, in fact, distinctly a High Churchman, and that

---

* Amongst Wesley's correspondence are several allusions to the Church—which Church he never ceased to praise during his life—and in one of his letters he expresses his belief that "the Church of England is nearer to the Scriptural plan than any Church in Europe." He died March 2nd, 1791, aged 88. In the year previous (1790), he thus wrote in the *Arminian Magazine*: "I hold all the doctrines of the Church of England."

in a very true sense, though he may have shared the doubts of some of his fellow labourers, as to whether or not a National Church was warranted by the authority of scripture; he asserted the rights of the civil power in things indifferent, and he is careful to remind a correspondent that "allegiance to a National Church in no way affects allegiance to Christ."*

Wesley indeed would seem to have desired above all things that his followers should tread in the old, safe paths laid down by the early Church, rather than seek out fresh and thorny ones for themselves. He would have adopted no doubt the old Cornish motto, "*Na reys gara anvor goth, ragan vor noweth*," which, being interpreted, means, "Do not leave the old paths for the new." "Wesley's idea," writes Mr. J. H. Overton, "of the Church was not like that of the high and dry Churchmen of his day; 'that Church which was always in danger' was not

* Letter in reply to Toogood's "Dissent Justified," 1752, Works X. 503-6.

what he meant, neither was it like that of the later Evangelical School, the Church of the Reformation period. He went back to far earlier times, and took for his model in doctrine and worship the primitive Church before its division into East and West. Thus we find him recording, with evident satisfaction, at Christmastide, 1774, 'During the twelve festival days we had the Lord's Supper daily'—*a little emblem of the Primitive Church.*" *† (The italics are Mr. Overton's.) His ideas of worship were many of them, at any rate, unlike the methods of worship in vogue in Methodist Chapels to-day, at least one would suppose so, if what Mr. Overton and others tell us is true. "His ideas of worship," we read, "are strictly in accordance with what would now be called 'High Church' ways. He would have no pews, but open benches alike for all; he would have the men

---

* "The English Church in the Eighteenth Century," p. 320.

† He writes much to the same effect in 1777.

and women separated,* '*as they were in the Primitive Church*'" (*vide* Mr. Overton's italics); he would have a hearty, congregational service. The fasts and festivals of the Church, Wesley desired should be observed most scrupulously. *Every Friday was to be kept as a day of abstinence;* even the children at Kingswood School were obliged, if healthy, to fast every Friday until three o'clock.

All Saints' Day was John Wesley's favourite Festival Day, and he clearly lays it down that he considers the celebration of Holy Communion as a necessary part of the service every Lord's Day—many of which things probably are quite unknown to the majority of John Wesley's followers to-day.

John Wesley's deliberate opinion of the Church of England is thus solemnly recorded in one of his numerous letters touching on this subject:

* So late as the year 1780 he wrote "If I come into any new house and see men and women together, I will immediately go out."

"Having had an opportunity of seeing several of the Churches abroad, and having deeply considered the several sorts of Dissenters at home, I am fully convinced that our own Church, with all her blemishes, is nearer the Scriptural plan than any other in Europe."

George Whitefield is represented as having lived a most austere and self-denying life, spending whole days in prayer, partaking of the meanest food, and wearing the shabbiest clothes. He kept all the Fasts of the Church—especially Lent—with the most rigid abstinence, being so thoroughly weak and exhausted with pain and hunger, that it is said he could hardly find sufficient strength wherewith to crawl upstairs. Dr. Benson was, at that time, Bishop of Gloucester, and one night, after evensong, he sent for Whitefield, and asked him his age. He answered twenty-one. The Bishop, who had carefully remarked the life of this young man, offered to ordain him at once—though the proper age is twenty-three—should he elect

to serve the Church. For days he fasted, and considered this call to work, and finally he was ordained, and preached his first sermon at S. Mary-le-Crypt, with such intense fervour, force, and zeal, it is recorded, that to the Bishop it was reported that seven members of the congregation "had been driven mad," to which the Bishop is said to have humorously replied that he hoped the madness would not be "forgotten before next Sunday."

In 1741 John Wesley separated from Whitefield on account of his extreme Calvinism, and the result was the formation of yet another sect, known as Lady Huntingdon's Connexion.

"It was just a century ago, March 2nd, 1791," says a writer in the *Guardian*, "that Whitefield's more celebrated contemporary, John Wesley, died at his house in the City Road—a new thoroughfare first opened in 1761—and was buried at the back of the chapel erected by him in 1778, which still ranks as the mother church of Wesleyanism. Wesley's first

chapel, on an independent basis, after his final split with the Moravians in Fetter Lane—where the meeting-house of that excellent and simple-hearted body still remains—was at the 'Foundry,' Moorfields, near the present building. This, as its name implies, was originally a foundry, in which, from the Protectorate onwards, cannons and other ordnance were cast by the Government. A terrible explosion, caused by damp castings, resulting in the death and injury of many people, led to the transference of the works to the then desolate Woolwich Common, in or about 1716. Wesley leased the unoccupied building, described as a 'ruinous place, with a pantile roof, and a few rough boards nailed together for a temporary pulpit,' and, as his brother Charles said,* 'gathering up our wreck,' of about five and twenty men, and double the number of women, made it the centre of his operations till the building of the City Road Chapel, preaching

* November 11th, 1791.

when in London at 5 a.m. and 7 p.m., 'for the convenience of his hearers,' who were mostly artisans."

No doubt there were serious difficulties in the way of incorporating the activities of Methodism* into the general system of the National Church, yet we cannot but regret that the authorities of the Church, some of whom, certainly, recognized, appreciated, and encouraged their early efforts, Bishop Poller and Bishop Benson, amongst others, allowed the great Wesleyan movement—which at first was curiously like to, and in some measure foreshadowed, the great Oxford Revival—to drift on until it became a series of communities of Dissenters, in spite of the fact that John Wesley himself did his utmost to prevent it, as his last pathetic charge to his followers clearly shows—"In God's name stop there. Be Church

* Wesley's "Connexion" was formed into a separate sect about 1750. In 1784 a Deed of Declaration was enrolled in Chancery for its perpetuation.

of England men still. Do not cast away the peculiar glory which God hath put upon you." But the voice of the charmer was now heard in vain, his arm no longer controlled his work; and his followers bent, as it would appear, on following their own convictions, split up into a series of divisions, in which state they remain to this day.*

The Wesleyans, as a body, were not, nor are they now, as far as the writer believes, at all

---

* "The original Methodists were all of the Church of England, and the more awakened they were the more zealously they adhered to it in every point, both of doctrine and principle. Hence we inserted in the very first Rules of our Society 'They that leave the Church, leave us.'"—Letter from John Wesley to Miss Bishop, 10th October, 1778.

Letter from John Wesley to Mr. Hall, jun.

Dublin, July 7th, 1789.

My dear Brother,—I am not as a reed shaken by the wind. My yea is yea, and my nay is nay.

I have been firm to the Church from my youth up; and so I shall be, till my spirit returns to God.

If Thomas Hornby is otherwise minded, I am sorry for it.

I am, your affectionate brother,

J. WESLEY.

To Mr. Hall, jun.,
at Baisford, near Nottingham.

anxious for the disestablishment of the Church of England, nor did they give any assistance to, nor, certainly at one period of their existence, did they countenance apparently in any way, the designs of the "Liberation" Society; indeed, there yet remains evidence that they regarded the possibilities of an endowed Church—as a National recognition of Christianity—as essential to the well-being of Christians, looking upon disestablishment as a calamity to be avoided, rather than as a blessing to be invoked, as the following noble testimony to the work and value of the Church of England, taken from the *Methodist Magazine*, clearly shows:—

"Rising above the influence of mere sectarian feelings, they [the Methodists] are anxious that the religious wants of the nation at large should be fully met; and comparing the utmost of what the Dissenters and themselves have done, or are able to do, with what yet remains to be done in the land, they are

persuaded that the cause of our common Christianity so needs the extensive provision of means made by the Established Church, that were she overthrown, a vast proportion of our teeming population must be left in utter destitution, even of the outward ordinances of religion. By the overthrow of the Church, we do not intend her ceasing to exist as a Church, but her being removed from the foundation of a State religion. Our argument is, that it is because the Church of England is established by law, that she is able to provide a much larger amount of religious instruction for the nation at large than she possibly could do were she subverted as an Establishment. Sinful men do not go of their own accord to seek the gospel. The ministers of Christ have, like their Divine Master, to seek, in order to save, them which are lost; and the gospel must be brought to bear on their minds for some time, before they will feel that interest in it which will induce them to provide for its

support among themselves, and meet, if they are able, the expense of erecting a place of worship for their own use. What then remains, but that they must continue destitute of the gospel, or that the expense of providing it for them must be met by others? But who are to make this provision? Among ourselves, as a body, we painfully know that we have gone to the utmost extent of our means in chapel building, and our Dissenting brethren, we presume, from statements which we have occasionally seen, have zealously and laudably done all they can. The same may be said both of the Wesleyans and the Dissenters, as to their funds for what are called home missionary efforts. A vast number of churches, too, have been built within the last few years; and yet, after all, our united efforts fall fearfully short of overtaking the religious wants of our rapidly increasing population. Let, then, the Establishment be subverted, and let her be stripped of her wealth, and let the religious

necessities of the nation be made henceforth to depend for supply exclusively on the 'voluntary principle,' and what must be the result? We confess that our Christian and patriotic feelings are so excited on this point that we cannot steadily contemplate what we think must be the inevitable consequence of a vast and every-day increasing proportion of our population being thus utterly abandoned to open, undisturbed Sabbath profanation, to irreligion and infidelity, and every evil agency now at work in society. . . . If, then, the Methodists, as a body, have not ranged themselves in the ranks of low Dissent, and participated in the design of subverting the Establishment; if they have, rather, invariably maintained a friendly position towards the Church, it has been from a persuasion of the utility, nay, under present circumstances, the *necessity*, of an established religion, for securing to the nation such an amount of religious instruction as could not be provided by merely

voluntary efforts, and from a conviction that the cause of religion is not best promoted by one religious body striving to uproot another; but that the religious wants of the nation require all to renounce the spirit of party, and in their different spheres to do all the good they can."*

---

* "Methodist Magazine," April, 1834.

CHAPTER III.

The Evangelical Revival.

TO the Methodist movement succeeded a fresh revival in the Church, in which what is known as the "Evangelical" School took its rise, about the year 1775. One of the characteristics of the Evangelistic School was the sermon, which was what most of us would now regard as of unnecessary length, and highly flavoured with the views and opinions of Luther, and of those who thought with him. "Even this bald, mutilated form of Theology," writes Jennings, in his "*Ecclesia Anglicana*," * "was a vast improvement on the lifeless system

* Page 469.

hitherto prevalent. Its professors were pious, hard-working parish priests, strict to the verge of prudery in their manner of life, yet enthusiastic and sympathetic on the one point of religion. Under the influence of the Methodist and Evangelical movements, the Church here and there recovered vitality. There was a re-action against profligacy and scepticism. Many philanthropic schemes were carried out. But it was ever the inspiration of detached units, not of the mass. For corporate action, the Evangelical system offered no scope. It was a purely subjective religion: one based on feelings, to the exclusion of creeds and means of grace. Its view of the Christian gathering was fundamentally at variance with the congregational system of our Prayer-book, and it attached no value to accessories of worship. Naturally the services continued as slovenly, and the fabrics as uncared for, as during the period of religious apathy."

The strength of the movement was with the

Clergy, not with the Bishops. Amongst the Fathers of the Evangelical School were Fletcher of Madeley, Venn of Huddersfield, Toplady of Broadhembury, Newton of Olney, and Rowland Hill, a famous preacher in his time, who it will be remembered eventually established a considerable following at the Surrey Chapel in the Blackfriars Road, London, which Chapel, by the way, is now used as a depôt for the sale of agricultural implements.

It is only necessary here to mention in particular, John Fletcher of Madeley, an ideal of Christian saintliness, who lived about the middle of the eighteenth century. Fletcher was a Swiss by birth, but came, early in life, to England, and was ordained in 1753, becoming tutor to the sons of Mr. Hill, of Terne Hall. Mr. Hill, who was the patron of a living, offered it to Mr. Fletcher, describing it as one where the population was small, and the income good ; a recommendation which had no attractions for Mr. Fletcher, who preferred rather to

accept, by way of exchange, the living of Madeley, which possessed but half the income, and had twice as many parishioners.

Madeley was a large Shropshire village, full of rough colliers, with but few well-to-do residents ; the latter were willing enough to pay their tithes, but seldom went to church. Fletcher accordingly wrote a letter to his richer parishioners, in which, after reminding them that they "are no less entitled to my private labours than the inferior class of my parishioners," he urges them, affectionately, to accept his ministrations, which he offers in the shape of his "written" morning meditations, in the hope that those "well-meant efforts of my pen will be more acceptable to you, than those of my tongue."

Rich and poor, old and young, were soon irresistibly attracted to "Fletcher of Madeley," whose saintly life is still recalled by many an old inhabitant. His life, indeed, was so Christ-ke, that Voltaire, asked to name a character

as nearly as possible perfect, at once named Fletcher of Madeley.

John Wesley's opinion of Mr. Fletcher is worth recalling for our own edification. "I was intimately acquainted with him for more than thirty years. I conversed with him morning, noon, and night, without the least reserve, during a journey of many hundred miles, and in all that time I never heard him speak one improper word, nor do an improper action." Fletcher died at Madeley in 1785.

Towards the middle of the eighteenth century Unitarian doctrines spread with great rapidity amongst many of the clergy, and this gave rise to a remarkable controversy respecting the doctrine of the Trinity.

Some one had suggested that the time had arrived for abolishing subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles; and one of the more active supporters of the movement was Archbishop Blackburne, and the then Bishop of Clogher.

To oppose these men and others who supported their views, an Evangelical clergyman, by the name of "Jones of Nayland," wrote a remarkable book in defence of the doctrine of the Trinity under the title of "The Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity." It was written upon the principle that scripture is its own best interpreter, and it was composed of a series of well-chosen texts from the Bible, placed in order, to each of which was added a brief explanation showing its application to the doctrine of the Trinity.

Upon one point "Jones of Nayland" is most emphatic, viz., that every Article of the Christian Faith depends upon the doctrine of the Trinity; and he illustrates this (in his Address to the Reader, prefixed to his book) by applying it to our creation, redemption, sanctification, resurrection, and glorification, by the power of Christ and of the Holy Spirit.

"Jones of Nayland" stands out as one of the few bright and shining lights in a dark

and dismal age; and had he done nothing else than write his little pamphlet, headed "A Letter to the Common People in answer to some Popular Arguments against the Trinity"—more useful perhaps, because more widely read, than his book upon the doctrine of the Trinity—he would not have lived in vain.

The outbursts of zeal and conversions due to the work of the Wesleys, and Whitefield, stirred up other clergy to emulate their example. At Clapham the Rev. John Venn, a preacher of great power, attracted to his work wealthy laymen such as John Thornton, the banker, and the great orator Wilberforce, and the tide of infidelity, which had for years been steadily rising, began to ebb. In 1799, Mr. Venn in the chair, at a meeting consisting of sixteen clergy and nine laymen, held at the Falcon Inn, in Bishopsgate Street, it was agreed to found a society for sending missionaries to heathen lands, and this was the first meeting

of the now great and flourishing Church Missionary Society. This was followed by the formation of the Religious Tract Society, the Bible Society, and the British and Foreign School Society.

One of the results of this "Evangelical Revival," was the establishment of Sunday Schools, the first of which was started at Gloucester, by Robert Raikes, a printer, and Mr. Stock, a clergyman.

But the "Evangelical Revival," excellent as it undoubtedly was, and thankful as we ought to be for all it accomplished, did not teach the people the doctrines of the Church of England, did not do much to elevate the character of the Church, did not set forth the high standard of religious duty which was everywhere then neglected, did not influence the people in any very marked degree.

Some of the fault no doubt lay with the episcopate. The revenues of some of the Bishops' Sees were then enormous in proportion to

what they are to-day.* The Bishops were chosen, to a great extent, from the sons of the nobility. In the year 1815 we read that "younger sons and connections of peers, or private tutors to the families of noblemen and statesmen, filled nineteen out of twenty-six bishoprics."† When not engaged in affairs of State they commonly spent their hours in lettered ease. Such episcopal duties as Confirmation and examining for Orders, were neglected, or performed in a slovenly and perfunctory fashion; consequently the Bishops became unpopular with the people. The clergy, too, were often non-resident, but with more excuse. The clerical status had altered, but nothing had been done to provide residences fit for persons who now ranked as gentlemen. In numberless parishes a ruinous cottage betokened the site of the ancient

* In those days the Archbishopric of Canterbury was endowed with £27,000 a year, and the Bishop of Durham received £17,000 a year. All this was altered sixty years ago.

† "*Ecclesia Anglicana*," p. 470.

parsonage, and there were no means of securing a better accommodation. Many livings were therefore amalgamated. Not unfrequently two or more churches were served on Sunday from someone living in the nearest town, and this was all the parishes probably ever saw of their pastor. Fifteen churches in the Norwich Diocese were said to be served by three brothers, as recently as 1837. Hannah More speaks of "thirteen contiguous parishes without even a resident curate." A clergyman living in the diocese of Norwich, wrote: "When I first came here in 1837, out of twenty-eight parishes, five churches only were open for divine service—twice on the Lord's Day." It was no uncommon custom for a clergyman to ride over from his house, to different neighbouring villages, to preach the sermon on Sundays, but he was not seen again amongst them during the week. The state of the church fabrics of that day defies description, and it was rare for new churches to be

built to meet the wants of the ever increasing numbers.*

Concerning the Church worship of those times, the late Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, writing in 1874, of his own personal knowledge thus sums up the position: "That even no longer than fifty, and forty, years ago, the actual state of things as to worship was bad beyond all parallel known to me in my experience or reading. Taking together the expulsion of the poor and labouring classes (especially from the town churches), the mutilation and blockages of the fabrics, the baldness of the service, the elaborate horrors of the so-called music, above all, the coldness and indifference of the lounging and sleepy congregation, our services were probably without a parallel for their debasement; as they would have shocked a Brahmin or a Buddhist, so they hardly could have been endured in this country had not the faculty of taste, and the perception

* Hore's "Eighteen Centuries of Church History," p. 545.

of the seemly or unseemly, been as dead as the spirit of devotion."*

That a hundred years ago and more the nation as a whole appears to have been utterly corrupt may be inferred from the testimony of William Wilberforce, who, writing in 1785 to Lord Muncaster, speaks of the "Universal corruption and profligacy of the times, which, taking its rise amongst the rich and luxurious, has now extended its baneful influences and spread its destructive poison through the whole body of the people." †

Was there not a cause? Aye, and a mighty one—and this disgraceful, demoralized state of affairs, both in Church and State, it was, which was so largely responsible for, and gave birth to, the so-called "OXFORD MOVEMENT."

---

* *Ritual and Ritualism.* Article in "The Contemporary Review," October, 1874.

† "Life," I., p. 84.

THE MOVEMENT

AND

THE MEN.

"IF THE TRUMPET GIVE AN UNCERTAIN SOUND, WHO SHALL PREPARE HIMSELF TO THE BATTLE?"—*Motto of the "Tracts for the Times,"* 1833.

AUTHOR'S NOTE.

SIXTY-FOUR years after the great Religious Revival, known as the "Oxford Movement," took definite shape (*i.e.*, in 1898), someone invents, as the title of a book, its so-called "SECRET HISTORY."

But why "SECRET"? As a matter of fact, there was nothing in the nature of a "secret" side to the Oxford Movement at all. It exists only in imagination; therefore, such a title is misleading, to say the least of it.

The pioneers of the Oxford Movement, whatever else may be alleged against them, were pious, God-fearing men, wholly incapable of deceit, and anything in the nature of "secrecy" or duplicity in connection with their great work in arousing the nation, and uplifting the Church to its true position and dignity, would have been simply abhorrent to one and all alike.

The common-sense, plain-spoken Englishman, who can see and read with unprejudiced eyes (and for such these pages have been written), will, as he proceeds, probably agree with the author, that whatever its faults or failings, there were absolutely "NO SECRETS" whatever to reveal in connection with the labours of those who initiated the OXFORD MOVEMENT.

G. H. F. NYE.

THE STORY

OF THE

OXFORD MOVEMENT.

CHAPTER IV.

What the Oxford Movement was.

PROBABLY there are few important movements which have taken place in the Church of England—certainly none within the memory of living man—which have had more influence upon, not the Church only, but the national life, nor any more commonly misunderstood by English people to-day, than what is known as the "Oxford Movement."

Some there are who appear to think that it was a movement the intention and design of which was to introduce Romish doctrine into the Church of England, to bring about unity with Rome, to place the old Church once again under the control of Papal power.

The writer has even heard men affirm that they always believed the founders of the Movement to be Roman Catholics, and in consequence preferred to attend a decided Evangelical place of worship, rather than any which favoured "Catholic" (understood, erroneously of course, to mean "Roman Catholic") practices.

Now it is certain that whatever else is, or may be, untrue concerning this great religious movement, it was the creation solely of Church of England men, of whom there were then none more staunch, men who certainly, as we shall see as we proceed, had not the slightest intention of "Romanizing" the Church of England, of introducing "Romish" doctrine,

or of seeking to bring the Church under the thraldom or leadership of Papal administration.

The aims and intentions of the pioneers of the Movement are thus summarised in the advertisement to the first volume of "The Tracts for the Times," dated Oxford, Feast of All Saints, 1834:—"The Church of Christ was intended to cope with human nature in all its forms, and surely the gifts vouchsafed it are adequate for that gracious purpose. There are zealous sons and servants of her English branch, who see with sorrow that she is defrauded of her full usefulness, by particular theories and principles of the present age, which interfere with the execution of one portion of her commission, and while they consider that the revival of this portion of truth is especially adapted to break up existing parties in the Church, and to form instead a bond of union among all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, *they believe that nothing but these neglected doctrines, faithfully*

preached, will repress that extension of Popery for which the ever multiplying divisions of the religious world are too clearly preparing the way (italics ours).

Surely these are not the words of "Romanizers," or of men who wished to restore the Papal power in England!

Canon Liddon* tells us how the Oxford Movement began:—

"The great movement of religious thought and life named after the Tracts, which were its earliest product, and very largely its directing influence, first began in Oxford during the summer of 1833. To no small degree it was a result of the re-action from the encyclopedist, or negative, temper, which had preceded and created the great French Revolution, and had been felt in every country in Europe. When the flood-gates of human passion had been opened on a gigantic scale in the horrors of war and anarchy, men felt that religion, and

* "Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey," Vol. 1, p. 253.

a clear, strong, positive religious creed, was necessary, if civilization was to be saved from ruin. . . . It acquired a new intensity in the eventful months which followed on the death of George IV. The three days of July, 1830, in Paris, and the wide-popular agitation in this country, culminating in the Bristol Riots, which preceded the passing of the first Reform Bill, appeared to contemporaries to threaten a renewal, perhaps on another scene, of the days of the Terror, and revived and deepened the convictions with which religious Englishmen like Burke, or Bishop Horne, had regarded the work of Marat and Robespierre.

Of this re-action one element was a new interest in the Middle Ages, which the literary men of the eighteenth century had agreed to denounce with a violence which was only greater than their ignorance. The Middle Ages were not perfect, they had evils all their own, but they were very unlike what they appeared to the gloomy imagination of a French theo-

philanthropist. Of the new interest in the Middle Ages, the pioneer, in his century, was Sir Walter Scott; his indirect relation to the Oxford Movement was often dwelt upon by Pusey in private conversation. That relation consisted not only in the high moral tone which characterised Scott's writings, and which marked them off so sharply from the contemporary popular writers of fiction, but also, and especially, in the interests which he aroused on behalf of ages and persons who had been buried out of sight, to an extent that in our generation would appear incredible.

Another influence very unlike Scott's, yet distinctly contributing to the Tractarian movement, was that of S. T. Coleridge, the philosopher of Highgate. . . . He was a great force in making men dissatisfied with the superficiality so common a hundred years ago in religion as in other matters; and in this, if in no other way, he prepared the English mind to listen to the Oxford teachers.

Viewed on another side, however, the Oxford Movement was a completion of the earlier revival of religion known as Evangelical. That revival was provoked by the prevalence of a latitudinarian theology in the last century, and by a dry and cold preaching of morality, often only of natural morality, which left out of view, or at least failed to assign, its rightful place to the Person, and Work, of our Divine Redeemer. This failure led to the movement which, outside the Church, became Wesleyanism and within it Evangelicalism. "In its earlier days, the Evangelical Movement was mainly, if not exclusively, interested in maintaining a certain body of positive truths. . . . The deepest and most fervid religion in England during the first three decades of this century was that of the Evangelicals, and to the last day of his life Pusey retained that 'love of the Evangelicals,' to which he often adverted, and which was aroused by their efforts to make religion a living power in a cold and gloomy age. . . ."

But the more immediate incitement to action was the introduction into Parliament in February, 1833, of Lord Stanley's Irish Church Temporalities Bill, suppressing one-half of the Irish Episcopate, which Bill was carried in the House of Lords by a majority of 135 to 81.

The "Oxford Movement," then, or as it was called by some the "Tractarian Movement," was so called because it had its origin at Oxford. It was started by men of the University of Oxford, and Oxford was not only the place of its birth, but the scene of its hopes, its fears, and its early successes.

The causes for the Movement were many, and no doubt were due to the spirit of the age when it was first promoted. Political forces were then, as now, arrayed against the Church, which presented but a feeble and listless condition, and had no means for resisting the onslaughts made upon her as a National Institution. There was a great and growing

desire upon the part of the people for "Reform" in the political world, which found its counterpart in the Church, at a time when this very subject was discovered to be not only in the 'air,' but on the floor of the House of Commons.

In such a bad way was the Church supposed to be some sixty years ago even—about the time Queen Victoria ascended the throne—that prominent men gave expression to their convictions that the days of the Old Church were numbered! The famous Dr. Arnold, of Rugby—one whose words were always received with the respect due to so eminent a man—deliberately stated in 1832 his belief that the Church, as it then stood, "no human power could save."* A year later this same learned headmaster wrote: "Nothing, as it seems to me, can save the Church, but a union with Dissenters; now they are leagued with the anti-Christian party, and no merely internal

* "Life," I., 326.

reforms will satisfy them"* (though it is right to say that in later days he thought this expression of opinion was rather exaggerated).

The Church of England was, as we have seen, in fact in a very bad way. It was—as a well-known writer has put it—"imperilled amid the crude revolutionary projects of the Reform epoch, and something bolder and more effective than the ordinary apologies for the Church was the call of the hour. The official leaders of the Church were almost stunned and bewildered by the fierce outbreak of popular hostility. The answers put forth on its behalf, to the clamour for extensive, and even destructive, change, were the work of men surprised in a moment of security. They scarcely recognised the difference of what was indefensible and what must be fought for to the death; they mistook subordinate, or unimportant, points, for the key to their position; in their compromises, or in

* "Life," I., 336.

their resistance, they wanted the guidance of clear and adequate principles, and they were vacillating and ineffective.

"But stronger and far-seeing minds perceived the need of a broad and intelligible basis on which to maintain the cause of the Church. For the air was full of new ideas; the temper of the times was bold and enterprising."*

The only redeeming feature of the English Church of those days was probably its family life of purity and simplicity; the great blot—its worldliness. The fortunes of the Church were unsafe in the hands of a clergy the greater part of whom took their obligations all too easily. It was a Church of slumber and of sleeping, which was soon to be thoroughly awakened in a way and in a manner never before remembered, by the great change which had its origin in the Oxford Movement of sixty years ago.

Mr. W. Palmer, one of the first of the

* "The Oxford Movement," Dean Church, pp. 1, 2.

leaders of the Movement, explains in an article,* that it was the Irish Bishoprics Act which actually brought things to a crisis. "Its result was the Oxford Movement, which, however some may have sought to explain it, really sprang from necessity; the need felt by various minds agreeing in their essential feeling towards the Church of England and its principles. It became evident to them that something was required to be done in order to meet changes which had become tangible, and which threatened to become intolerable."

Between the years 1825-1830 there were two recognised parties in the Church of England. One may be termed the Anglican School, men who followed in the steps of the great divines, such as Hooker, Bishop Wilson, Jeremy Taylor, and good brave Bishop Ken. The best of this school of thought—for there were good and bad amongst them—instituted or re-established daily services, which had never wholly ceased

* "Contemporary Review," p. 639.

in England, and regarded, and accustomed their congregations to regard, the Service of Holy Communion with reverence deep and abiding.

One of the best exponents of this party was the celebrated Dr. Hook, whose work at Leeds is cited to-day as one of the remarkable efforts of this great Apostle of the Church of modern times. Through good and evil report Dr. Hook worked on, the supporter of a Church which knew not the errors of the Papist, nor the innovations of the Puritan.

The other party, no less influential and far more numerous, was the Evangelical party, inheritors of the traditions of Wesley, and those zealous clergy and laity who sympathised with and worked for the Methodist revival. Their system was a magnificent one in itself, but dwarfed and cramped by reason of their own narrowness of view. They undoubtedly often "quickened conscience," as Dean Church tells us they did, but their system became a one-sided and an unnatural one, though its principles

led Howard and Elizabeth Fry to assail the brutalities which were then common in our jails, and urged Clarkson and Wilberforce to overthrow that blot upon England's fair fame—the traffic in slaves. It created, as we have seen, great Missionary Societies, and gave motive power and stimulus to many schemes of philanthropy, that would have probably never existed but for the so-called Evangelical party.

But neither the one party nor the other was able fully to satisfy the earnest cravings, wishes, and desires of many devoted sons of Mother Church.

CHAPTER V.

The Pioneers of the Movement.

NOW there were at Oxford at that time men whose hearts burned within them as they recalled the fact—remembered, it seemed, by so few—that the great Mother Church of England was very different from what it was usually regarded by the majority of thinkers or writers upon the subject in those days. Such men realised that the National Church was no mere institution of the State; that she, among all the religious societies in the kingdom, and she alone, claimed to be a true branch of the Holy Catholic Church of Christ, whose ministers were ordained to teach, and to preach, with the authority of her one Divine Head and Founder, Jesus Christ.

Thus, while outside and around raged confusion worse confounded, while hot partisans were issuing tracts, broadsides, and leaflets, demanding this and that reform in Church matters, a few men in the quiet recesses of the Common Room of Oriel College, Oxford, met together to consider the position of affairs, and they ultimately resolved to put into practice what they believed would be the best remedy for the then appalling state of things existing in the Church.

Foremost among such men was John Keble, parish priest, Fellow of Oriel, and poet, to whom really the Oxford Movement was due.

Let us first briefly recall to mind Mr. Keble's work as a poet, as the writer of some of the most beautiful verses the world has ever read.

It will be admitted that no little force was given to ideas which ultimately resulted in the Oxford Movement by the publication in 1827 of a singularly beautiful book of poems, issued under the title of "The Christian Year," a

work which has done perhaps as much as any book ever written to elevate and deepen the religious thoughts of mankind. Few books have been more largely read—none more highly treasured—than Keble's "Christian Year."

John Keble was the son of a clergyman, and was born on S. Mark's Day, 1792, at Fairford, in Gloucestershire. His life at Oxford will long be remembered as one of the most brilliant and distinguished careers which ever fell to the lot of the student. At his first College—Corpus—he carried off every prize that was obtainable, took a double first, the prize for English and Latin essays, and was rewarded with a Fellowship of Oriel.

A man of singularly sweet disposition, true piety, and excessive modesty, bordering almost upon shyness, he left Oxford to become his father's curate, and for some years worked amongst the poor as the most ordinary young curate does work to-day.

Born a poet, young Keble devoted his spare

hours to the composition of verses, which he himself contemptuously undervalued, and it seems wonderful to relate that he refused even to put his name to that rare volume which has been read with such deep interest, pleasure, and profit wherever the English language is spoken. "The Christian Year" was therefore put forth anonymously at first, but its intrinsic value and beauty soon won for it a place of honour and distinction which it will never lose.

In the year 1835 an old friend and pupil, Sir William Heathcote, presented Mr. Keble to the living of Hursley, a beautiful little village—it became a model village under the fostering care of its pastor—situate about four miles from Winchester. Hursley is a place of more than ordinary interest, for it was the home at one time of Richard Cromwell during the period of the Commonwealth. The parishes of Hursley, and Otterbourne, had been consolidated into one living for more than five hundred years. In Keble's time a

resident clergyman was in charge of the latter, and a new church and parsonage were built, mainly through the exertions of Mr. W. C. Yonge, an old Waterloo officer, and the father of the much respected authoress, Miss C. M. Yonge. Afterwards another church was built at Ampfield, in Hursley parish, at the cost of Sir William Heathcote. And then Hursley Church was rebuilt, almost entirely out of the moneys provided from the profits yielded by the publication of "The Christian Year."

Mr. Keble is described as an old-fashioned English Churchman, with much veneration for the Church and its bishops, and an equal dislike for the errors of the Church of Rome, and for the principles which guide the various forms of Dissent. He died, deeply and deservedly regretted, on Maundy Thursday, March 29th, 1866, and was buried at Hursley, the place he probably loved better than any spot on earth.

Keble was buried in his own churchyard.

A memorial brass was inserted in the chancel floor by the parishioners, and a tall granite churchyard cross was erected at Otterbourne.

That John Keble was indeed a bright and shining example of a thoroughly good and consistent Christian man, and a delightful companion, may be inferred from the following testimony of the companion and partner of all his joys and sorrows:—

On the day before his funeral his wife said to one who was standing by his bedside:—"There is one thing I do not think anyone could know but those who were constantly with him—the depth of his humility, and charity. Notwithstanding his very keen feeling about doctrine, he always made such great allowances for other people. He never spoke a sharp word about those who differed from him without correcting himself immediately."

The following passages from a private letter addressed to one of his dearest relatives from one who was a lifelong friend of Keble well

illustrates the beautiful life of this eminently good man:—

"I suppose that no man has died in England within our memory who has been so dearly loved, and whose memory will be held in such tender reverence by so many good men. It will be long before many will cease to say to themselves when in doubt, 'What would Keble say to this?' or to remind themselves of his ways and sayings, and of Hursley as it was in his time, and of all that made his judgment a law and his companionship delightful. . . . What I think remarkable was, not how many people loved him, or how much they loved him, but that everybody seemed to love him with the very best kind of love of which they were capable.

"It was like loving goodness itself. You felt that what was good in him was applying itself directly and bringing into life all that was best in you. His ready, lively, transparent affection seemed as if it was the very spirit

of love opening out upon you, and calling for a return such as you could give."

Surely this is the picture—drawn as it is by one of his intimate associates—of an eminently good, holy, and peculiarly lovable nature. All this Mr. Keble indeed was, and more.

Amongst the pioneers of the Oxford Movement, in addition to Keble, were Mr. (afterwards Cardinal) Newman, Dr. Pusey, Hugh James Rose, William Palmer, Richard Hurrell Froude, William John Copeland, and Isaac Williams.

The lives of some of these men have been written, and we know probably all we are ever likely to learn about their work in connection with this Movement, but as for the majority of us such "lives" are usually sealed books, often costly, not always easy to read, and frequently unattainable, it may be just as well to see what manner of men were they, whose names have come to us as foremost in the important work of opening the eyes of

the people of England to a higher and deeper sense of their responsibilities as members of the Holy Catholic Church.

William Palmer was a scholar of Worcester College, Oxford, well equipped as a controversialist, fully versed in all matters pertaining to Church ritual, and one well able to discriminate, as he did discriminate, between those things which for the most part the "people" then confounded—as they do for the most part, at any rate, still confound—the enormous difference, that is, between Romish error and primitive Church doctrines. He was the author of a volume of great value, written in English, but with the title of "Origines Liturgicæ," published in 1832, which dealt with the history and offices of the Church.

In this book, amongst other matters of great interest and value, Mr. Palmer thus sums up the question of the Apostolical Succession :—*

* "Origines Liturgicæ," Vol. II., p. 249.

"This continual descent is evident to every-one who chooses to investigate it. Let him read the catalogue of our bishops ascending up to the most remote period. Our ordinations descend in a direct, unbroken line from Peter and Paul, the apostles of the Circumcision and the Gentiles. These great apostles successively ordained Linus, Cletus, and Clement Bishops of Rome, and the Apostolic succession was regularly continued from then to Celestine, Gregory, and Vitalianus, who ordained Patrick bishop for the Irish, and Augustine and Theodore for the English, and from those times an uninterrupted series of valid ordinations has carried down the apostolical succession in our churches to the present day. There is not a bishop, priest, or deacon among us who cannot, if he pleases, trace his own spiritual descent from St. Peter or St. Paul."

In a "Narrative of Events," connected with, and explanatory of, the publication of the "Tracts for the Times," published in 1843,

Mr. Palmer thus describes the state of things then existing:—

"We felt ourselves assailed by enemies from without and foes within; our prelates insulted and threatened by Ministers of State; in Ireland the bishoprics suppressed. We were advised to feel thankful that a more sweeping measure had not been adopted. What was to come next? . . . Was the same principle of concession to popular clamour . . . to be exemplified in the dismemberment of the English Church? We were overwhelmed with pamphlets on Church Reform. Lord Henley, brother-in-law of Sir Robert Peel, Dr. Burton, and others of name and influence led the way. Dr. Arnold of Rugby ventured to propose that all sects should be united by Act of Parliament with the Church of England! Pamphlets . . . . recommended the abolition of the Creeds (at least in public worship), especially urging the expulsion of the Athanasian Creed; the removal of all mention of the Blessed

Trinity, of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, of the practice of absolution. We knew not to what quarter to look for support. A prelacy threatened, and apparently intimidated, a Government making its power subservient to agitators who avowedly sought the destruction of the Church; and, worst of all, *no principles in the public mind to which we could appeal*, an utter ignorance of all rational grounds of attachment to the Church; an oblivion of its spiritual character as an institution not of man, but of God; the grossest Erastianism most widely prevalent, especially amongst all classes of politicians."

Much of this is as true to-day as at the time (1843) it was written. The people of England, as a rule—those who call themselves Churchpeople that is—have no intelligent idea why they go to Church beyond the fact, possibly, that their fathers went before them.

This was curiously illustrated in a case which came to the personal knowledge of the writer

a few years ago. Elizabeth H—— was a Churchwoman and a communicant at St. Peter's, Cornhill, for several years, a place of worship in which her father and mother, for many years previously, had been regular attendants. This lady went to live in South London, and one day casually visited the "Tabernacle" at Newington, where the late Mr. Charles Haddon Spurgeon, then in the zenith of his popularity, was preaching. Miss H—— was much impressed with the wonderful eloquence of the man, as were most people who heard him for the first time, and finally she became a baptized member of the Spurgeon community. Why? Because, as she herself informed the writer, she had learned from some one at the Newington Tabernacle that John the Baptist was the "founder" of the Baptist community (!) and therefore she felt she was in "safe" hands as a recognised and incorporated member of that body. This is not an idle story, but a fact, and it shows how very small a matter will

sometimes turn unthinking persons from the old paths in which they have been brought up. And yet possibly there are still many who, simply for want of knowledge, are led into the same error, or similar errors, which caused Elizabeth H—— to abandon the Church of England to become a baptized member of Mr. Spurgeon's community.

The condition of things set forth by Mr. Palmer, was fully corroborated by another writer of the time, Mr. A. P. Perceval, who in 1842 thus graphically sums up the position of affairs relating to the Church some sixty years ago:—"An agrarian and civic insurrection against the bishops and clergy, and all who desired to adhere to the existing institutions of the country; the populace goaded on, openly by the speeches, covertly (as was fully believed at the time) by the paid emissaries of the Crown, the chief of those Ministers* in his place in Parliament bidding the bishops

* The then Lord Grey.

'set their house in order,' the mob taking him at his word and burning to the ground the palace of the Bishop of Bristol, with the public buildings of the city, while they shouted the Premier's name in triumph on the ruins."*

Cardinal Newman, in his "Apologia," fully endorses the description given in the foregoing lines, tells of bishops "insulted and threatened in the streets of London, and," he adds, "there was so much apathy on the subject in some quarters, such imbecile alarm in others, the true principles of Churchmanship seemed so radically decayed, and there was such distraction in the councils of the clergy . . . I felt affection for my own Church, but not tenderness; I felt dismay at her prospects, scorn and anger at her do-nothing perplexities. As to leaving her, the thought never crossed my imagination; still I ever kept before me that there was something greater

* "Collection of Papers connected with the Movement of 1833," p. 25.

than the Established Church, and that was the Church Catholic and Apostolic, set up from the beginning, of which she was but the local presence and organ."

So it appeared to thoughtful men, in the face of the then grave crisis, that some attempt must be made to improve, if possible, the condition of the Church; that it must be done quickly, or not at all, seemed to be the united opinion of all who thought about the matter, and so exceedingly perilous were the times thought to be that some sixty years ago Mr. Hugh James Rose expressed his belief that the Church could not stand as it was then for ten or fifteen years even!

Various suggestions were made. Mr. Palmer suggested an association being formed, probably very much like the "English Church Union," or the "Church Defence Institution," which were founded in later times, but for some reason or another no such association was then brought into being, and the reasons

for adopting the use of the pen in preference to committees were no doubt wise in the face of the fact that the "Liberationists" at that time were making use of the popular form of literature of the day, the pamphlet and leaflet, or tract, which could be quickly produced, and was readily circulated amongst the people.

But, before a leaflet or tract was written or circulated, it was resolved that an address should be drawn up to the heads of the Church. This was the work of Mr. Palmer, and notwithstanding the apathy and opposition of some, amongst whom must be reckoned certain of the bishops of that time, and the distrust, timidity, and crotchets of others, no less than 7,000 clergy signed the address, which was presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury in February, 1834.

This address made no small stir, and created something like a revived interest in affairs affecting the Church. Fortunately, it did not stop there. A lay address was resolved upon,

which was signed by no less than 230,000 heads of families, and which, as every word is applicable to the year 1899, we make no apology for reproducing in these pages.

"At a time when the clergy of England and Wales have felt it their duty to address their Primate with an expression of unshaken adherence to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of which they are ministers, we, the undersigned, as lay members of the same, are not less anxious to record our firm attachment to her pure faith and worship, and her apostolic form of government.

"We further find ourselves called upon by the events which are daily passing around us to declare our firm conviction that the consecration of the State by the public maintenance of the Christian religion is the first and paramount duty of a Christian people; and that the Church established in these realms, by carrying its sacred and beneficial influence through all orders and degrees, and

into every corner of the land, has for many ages been the great and distinguishing blessing of this country, and the means under Divine Providence, no less of national prosperity than of individual piety.

"In the preservation, therefore, of this our National Church in the integrity of her rights and privileges, and in her alliance with the State, we feel that we have an interest no less real, and no less direct, than her immediate ministers, and we accordingly avow our firm determination to do all that in us lies, in our several stations, to uphold unimpaired in its security and efficiency that establishment which we have received as the richest legacy of our forefathers, and desire to hand down as the best inheritance to our posterity."*

This address was perhaps the first real organised step in the direction of Church defence in modern days, and produced, as may

* Archdeacon Churton's "Memoir of Joshua Watson," Vol. II., p. 23.

be readily believed, a very marked impression upon the people of those times; in fact, from these two addresses it was said by Mr. Perceval (in 1842) that "we may date the commencement of the turn of the tide which had threatened to overwhelm our Church and our religion."

These lay and clerical addresses brought men of various shades of religious opinion together, and gave courage and unity to a movement, which, though it took no definite shape then, resulted, in later days, in the formation of an organised body of laymen who determined to uphold and defend the National Church against its adversaries.

The result of the deliberations of the framers of the addresses was the determination to issue a series of tracts, which became known as the Oxford Tracts, or "Tracts for the Times." These papers were written at different periods and by many persons. Each man wrote as he felt, plain speaking and plain

writing was what each one of the tract writers aimed at, and each writer, though all acted in close concert together, took the responsibility for what he had written, and no one else.

Canon Liddon tells us:—"At Oriel College some effort was made to agree upon a basis of mutual co-operation. Two documents were drawn up, in one of which it was declared that the object was to maintain pure and inviolate the doctrines, the services, and the discipline of the Church; to withstand all change involving denial or suppression of doctrine and departure from primitive practices in religious offices, or innovation upon the Apostolical prerogatives, order, and commission of bishops, priests, and deacons."

This meeting was followed by others in London, Winchester, Coventry, and other places, at which one of the little band of friends, generally Mr. (afterwards Sir William) Palmer, attended, to explain the objects of the "Association of Friends."

To Mr. Newman belongs the idea of the "Tracts" as a means of arousing Church people into action. The suggestion was to issue short papers, "full of nerve," intentionally alarming in tone, "as a man might give notice of a fire, or inundation," transparently clear in statement, and setting forth the truth upon which the Church rested with uncompromising simplicity. This method was rejected; the Association would not acknowledge Newman's earlier efforts, and Newman and his friends would not give them up.*

Richard Hurrell Froude, though one of the leaders of the Movement, soon passed away, dying at the early age of thirty-three, at Dartington, where he was born in 1803. He had at Oxford as colleagues Mr. Newman, and Robert Wilberforce, and was elected Fellow of Oriel in 1826. He is thus described by one who knew him intimately:—†

* Liddon's "Life of Pusey," Vol. I., p. 269.

† Sir John T. Coleridge, "A Memoir of John Keble," p. 110.

"I knew him from a child, and I trace in the somewhat singular composition of his character what he inherited both from his father and his highly gifted mother. His father, whom Keble, after his first visit to Dartington Parsonage playfully described as 'very amiable, but provokingly intelligent, one quite uncomfortable to think of, making one ashamed of going gawking, as one is wont to do, about the world, without understanding anything one sees'; his mother, 'very beautiful in person, and delicate in constitution, with a highly expressive countenance and gifted in intellect, with the genius and imagination which his father failed in.' Like the one, he was clever, knowing, quick, and handy; like the other, he was sensitive, intellectual, imaginative. He came to Keble, full of respect for his character; he was naturally soon won by his affectionateness and his simplicity, and in turn he was just the young man in whom Keble would at once take an interest and

delight as a pupil; and so, in fact, it was. I find him again and again in Keble's letters spoken of in the most loving language, yet often not without some degree of anxiety as to his future course. It would be idle to speculate on what might have been when the hour of trial came, which none of those specially engaged probably then foresaw; before it arrived Hurrell Froude had sunk under the constitutional malady against which he had struggled for four years. What he would have been, and what he would have done, had his life been prolonged none can say, and it would be unfair to judge him by what he left behind except as rich grounds of promise."

Of him Dean Church* writes:—"It would be more true to say that, with one exception, no one was more responsible for the impulse which led to the Movement; no one had more to do with shaping its distinct aims,

* "The Oxford Movement," p. 36.

and its moral spirit, and character in its first stage; no one was more daring and more clear, as far as he saw, in what he was prepared for. There was no one to whom his friends so much looked up with admiration and enthusiasm. There was no wasted shade in Hurrell Froude's disabled, prematurely shortened life."*

Cardinal Newman, his colleague, described him as "an Englishman to the backbone"; another, who knew him intimately, described him as "that bright and beautiful Froude"; a third, Thomas Mozley,† says: "The strength of his [Froude's] religious impressions, the boldness and clearness of his views, his long habits of self-denial, and his unconquerable energy of mind, triumphed over weakness and decay, till men with all their health and strength about them might gaze upon his attenuated form, struck with a certain

---

* "In this mortal journeying, wasted shade
Is worse than wasted sunshine."—
Henry Taylor, *Sicilian Summer*, Vol. III.

† "British Critic," April, 1840, p. 396.

awe of wonderment at the brightness of his wit, the intenseness of his mental vision, and the iron strength of his argument."

In 1845, after Newman's secession, Isaac Williams, who knew him very intimately, said: "If Hurrell Froude had been living he would not have left the Church of England."

Surely here was a beautiful life, all, as it seemed to his dearest friends, too short. He was a typical Englishman, loved the sea, sailed his own boat, and was a bold cross-country rider. A thorough Churchman in the best and truest sense of the word, and a man who desired, above all things, that the primitive doctrine, so long in abeyance, should be once again revived in the old Church of England, which he loved so well. None spoke of him, none thought of him, as ever likely to proclaim or extol the doctrines of the Church of Rome. Clearly, whatever else he was, he was an English Churchman, and that, too, of the best and highest type.

Of Charles Marriott, a Fellow of Oriel, who joined the Movement at a later stage, Sir John Coleridge writes:—*

"I recall the name of a man justly dear to many, and too early taken from us, a man of great learning and ability, but more remarkable for his rare simplicity, zeal, and purity, of a charity in one sense bounded only by his means, in another and higher sense unbounded. He died in the prime of life, still a Fellow."

"He was," says Dean Church,† "profoundly and devotedly religious, without show, without extravagance . . . a man under an uncouth exterior, of the noblest and most affectionate nature; most patient, indulgent, and hopeful to all in whom he took an interest, even when they sorely tried his kindness and his faith in them. . . Marriott moved to Oriel, and

---

* "Memoir of John Keble," p. 264.

† "The Oxford Movement," p. 80.

became the friend of Mr. Newman. Master and disciple were as unlike as any two men could be; they were united by their sympathy in the great crisis around them, by their absorbing devotion to the cause of true religion. Marriott brought to the Movement, and especially to its chief, a great University character, and an unswerving and touching fidelity. He placed himself, his life, and all that he could do at the service of the great effort to elevate and animate the Church."

Mr. Marriott was at one time Principal of the Theological College at Chichester, and afterwards Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford. It was this earnest worker for the Church who took over the buildings at Littlemore, commenced by Mr. Newman, and made use of them for the purpose of printing religious books. He was a great worker, a most generous-hearted man, whose purse was ever at the service of the first person in need or distress. "There was no claimant on his

purse or his interest," writes Dean Church,* "who was too strange for his sympathy — raw freshmen, bores of every kind, broken-down tradesmen, old women, distressed foreigners, converted Jews, all the odd and helpless wanderers from beaten ways were to be heard of in Marriott's rooms."

Mr. Marriott was one of the editors, with Mr. Keble and Dr. Pusey, of a projected edition of the works of the early Fathers who had flourished before the division of Christendom into East and West. These two made themselves responsible for a certain selection of the works which, with the help of a number of University men whose names were publicly made known, were translated and printed. It is pleasant to remember that these men refused all pecuniary profit arising from the issue of this "Library of the Fathers," which, however, was never fully completed. "All through his life," writes Dean Church, "he (Mr. Marriott)

* "The Oxford Movement," p. 87.

was a beacon and an incitement to those who wish to make a good use of their lives. In him all men could see, whatever their opinions, and however little they liked him, the simplicity and the truth of a self-denying life of suffering (for he was never well) of zealous, hard work unstinted, unrecompensed."

In a serious outbreak of small-pox at Oxford in 1854, in visiting a sick person, he was struck down by this disease, and though he was supposed to have recovered from its effects, there is no doubt that a constitution never strong was thereby greatly weakened, for a year later he was seized with paralysis, from which he never wholly recovered, dying September 25th, 1858.

Isaac Williams was a Welshman, and a close friend of Newman's, with whom he almost daily walked and dined. He was born in 1802, so was ten years younger than John Keble. He was an excellent Latin scholar and a good cricketer, won a scholarship at

Trinity, and was one of the merriest, and, in some ways, at one time of his life, one of the most unthinking youths at the University.

All this was changed by what some would call the "accidental" bringing together of Mr. Keble and the young student. In Mr. Williams' own words, "It was this trivial accident, this short walk of a few yards, and a few words spoken, which was the turning-point of my life. If a merciful God has miraculously interposed to arrest my course, I could not have had a stronger assurance of His presence than I always had in looking back to that day."

Mr. Williams contributed his share of the "Tracts for the Times," and aided the Movement by his poetical works, many of which are of a high order, and by writing a series of *Plain Sermons*, which were largely read by the clergy, and thus his opinions, and those who wrote with him, became more widely known.

Of William John Copeland little need be

said, except that he was a friend of Mr. Williams, and was constantly consulted by his colleagues when he lived at Oxford.

Mr. W. G. Ward, who joined the Movement at a later stage, was a great controversialist, with strong leanings to Rome, into which Church he was ultimately admitted. He was a man of many attractive parts, a brilliant conversationalist, and described by a friend as "possessed of a fund of wit and good humour, a great musical critic, a great admirer of the opera, and an admirable buffo singer."* He had had no such training as Keble or Pusey, and was in consequence not so devotedly attached to the Church of England as the pioneers of the Oxford Movement certainly were, and, above all, he was extravagantly a one-sided individual, as his writings clearly

* "Ward and Oakeley (Rev. F., Minister at Margaret Chapel) were united in a disposition to urge the Movement forward, and in a measure calculated to imperil its original scope and purpose." —Canon Liddon, "Life of Pusey," Vol. II., p. 217.

show, a man with a mind but ill-proportioned.*

There remain two names, and certainly not the least important amongst the pioneers of the Movement, to mention—Dr. Pusey, who became its head, and Mr. (afterwards Cardinal) Newman — names which the writer has purposely left to the last to touch upon.

These two eminent and remarkable men, for this they certainly were, are only bracketed together here for purposes of convenience, the names of "Pusey and Newman" being frequently upon men's tongues. Here is a description of Newman,—a man of surpassing personal influence, taken from the words of Dean Church, one who knew him well, and who regularly attended his sermons at St. Mary's. †

"None but those who remember them can adequately estimate the effect of Mr.

---

* Mr. Mozley's "Reminiscences."

† "The Oxford Movement," p. 129.

Newman's four o'clock sermons. The world knows them, has heard a great deal about them, and has passed its various judgments upon them, but it hardly realises that without those sermons the Movement might never have gone on, certainly would never have been what it was. Even people who heard them continually, and felt them to be different from any other sermons, hardly estimated their real power, or knew at the time the influence which the sermons were having upon them. Plain, direct, unornamented, clothed in English that was only pure and lucid, free from any faults of taste, strong in their flexibility and perfect command both of language and thought, they were the expression of a piercing and large insight into character and conscience and motives, of a sympathy at once most tender and most stern with the tempted and the wavering, of an absolute and burning faith in God and His counsels, in His love, in His judgments, in the awful glory of His

generosity and His magnificence. . . Unsought for, as the *Apologia* makes so clear—unsought for, as the contemporary letters of observing friends attest—unsought for, as the whole tenour of his life has proved—the position of leader in a great crisis came to him because it must come. He was not unconscious that, as he had felt in his sickness in Sicily, he 'had a work to do,' but there was shyness and self-distrust in his nature as well as energy, and it was the force of genius, and a lofty character, and the statesman's eye, taking in and judging accurately the whole of a complicated scene which conferred the gifts, and imposed inevitably and without dispute the obligations and responsibilities of leadership. Dr. Pusey was, of course, a friend of great account, but he was as yet in the background, a venerated and rather awful person, from his position not mixing in the easy intercourse of common room life, but to be consulted on emergencies. Round Mr. Newman gathered, with a curious

mixture of freedom, devotion, and awe, for with unlimited power of sympathy, he was exacting and even austere in his friendships, the best men of his college . . . bound to him not merely by enthusiastic admiration and confidence, but by a tenderness of affection, a mixture of the gratitude and reliance of discipleship with the warm love of friendship of which one has to go back far for examples, and which has had nothing like it in our days at Oxford."

Mr. James Mozley,* a great authority and a man whose judgment was ever regarded as independent and entirely free from bias, testified to the marvellous power of Newman's sermons, wrote that "a sermon of Mr. Newman's enters into all one's feelings, ideas, modes of viewing things. He wonderfully realises a state of mind, enters into a difficulty, a temptation, a disappointment, a grief; he goes into the different turns and incidental

* "Christian Remembrancer," Jan., 1846, p. 169.

unconscious symptoms of a case with notions which come into the head and go out again, and are forgotten till some chance recalls them. . . . Here is the point. Persons look into Mr. Newman's sermons and see their own thoughts in them. This is, after all, what, as much as anything, gives a hold upon the mind."

Mr. Newman not only preached wonderful sermons, but he preached them in a wonderfully persuasive manner; the silver intonation of his voice will be recalled by many who heard him read the daily lessons, or preach the simple Gospel message of salvation. And marvellous as it may appear to some to believe, there was about his services neither pomp nor display; indeed there was a marked absence of "ritualism," as is commonly understood by the word to-day.

"With an unrivalled command of logic and pathos," writes Canon Liddon,* "he combined a singularly subtle beauty of style; and this

* Liddon, "Life of Pusey," Vol. I., p. 272.

combination caused his eulogies to bring home to his contemporaries the realities of spiritual things never before appreciated . . . and the majority of these tracts, the earliest and the most important, were the work of Newman. It was his power of speech and writing, combined with his enthusiasm, practical energy, and attractive personality which could alone supply the necessary impetus at the start."

Dr. Newman, we all know, unhappily seceded from the Church of England, greatly to the regret of Church of England folk. It was, of course, a deplorable act, and especially so in such a man, one whose saintliness of character and literary attainments were matters of common knowledge to all the world, and nothing can excuse or alter that; yet when he died full of years (in August, 1889) it was admitted by friend and foe alike that the world was the poorer, that it had lost a man of uncommon genius, of wonderful gentleness, and of exalted character. Once he was hailed as one of the

brightest ornaments of the Church of England, and when he passed away, secular and religious papers alike had for the writer of the familiar and beautiful lines, "Lead, Kindly Light," little else but praise. "Forty-five years ago," said a writer in a daily paper of the time, "he was the most virulently abused man in this country. 'Renegade' and 'traitor' were among the epithets freely applied to him at public meetings and in the columns of the press. His character was eloquently vilified by some of the most eminent Englishmen of that day, who for the most part lived to repent the intemperance of their language and the injustice of their accusations. John Henry Newman lived through that tempest of wrath and scorn . . . and Englishmen of all parties and creeds are now united in a common sorrow over his grave."

"The real originators of this Oxford Movement," writes Canon Liddon,* "were undoubtedly

* "Life of Pusey," Vol. I., p. 270.

Keble and Newman. It is, however, difficult to say in what exact sense or proportion the leadership should be assigned to each of these two men. Undoubtedly, to the world at large Newman, at any rate at first, was the principal figure in the revival, but it may be questioned whether he did not himself derive from Keble his first impulses as well as many underlying principles. Newman himself speaks of Keble as the 'true and primary author of the Movement.' 'I compared myself with Keble,' he says, 'and I felt that I was merely developing his, not my, convictions.'" *

The Oxford Movement, it will be seen, was initiated almost exclusively by junior men, nearly all of whom belonged to one college—Oriel College, Oxford—and it was not until after it had been started a year or more that Dr. Pusey, Canon and Professor of Christ Church, joined the pioneers.

---

* "Apologia," p. 75.

Pusey had been a friend and fellow worker of Newman, and his adhesion greatly elevated the character of the Movement; in Newman's words, "gave us at once a position and a name." Dr. Pusey was a man possessed of an intensely religious mind, of unbounded liberality, and was on terms of equality with the collegiate authorities. He was essentially designed by nature to be a leader of men, and destined to become the particular head, the chief director of the Oxford Movement. Resolute self-possession and a fixity of purpose, with full and perfect confidence in the cause he headed and worked for, Dr. Pusey never for an instant wavered in his sincere attachment for the Church of England.

"Dr. Pusey," says Dean Church, "was, indeed, a man of 'large designs.' The vision rose before him of a revived and instructed Church. . . . He was prepared for opposition; but he had boundless reliance on his friends and in his cause. His forecast of the future, of

great days in store for the Church of England, was, not unreasonably, one of great promise." Surely the promise, to anyone who thinks about it at all, has been abundantly redeemed, for it is true beyond the shadow of a doubt that during the last sixty years the Church of England has enormously deepened its influence and demonstrated its power over the world in a way—and probably to an extent—that even the most sanguine of these pioneers of the Oxford Movement, in its inception, never for one moment deemed possible.

Although there were many who did not then, as there are many who do not at the present day, see eye to eye in all things with Dr. Pusey's teaching, there were, and are, few, if any, who knew him intimately who could not but be struck with the greatness and the goodness of this eminently great and good man, for he was in reality both the one and the other.

An intimate friend of the author, and one who knew Pusey well, writes as follows:—

"Much as I dislike a good deal of his teaching, and regret a good deal of his influence, he was undoubtedly one of the greatest and best men of the nineteenth century. The Dons of the University of Oxford snubbed and persecuted him in the early forties; but within twelve years, when they were themselves attacked by the University Commission, they were glad to shelter themselves under his shield; and his defence of the University occupies nearly one-half of the volume which they published, and which I possess." A section of the Press had unlimited venom for him, and *The Record* invented the nick-name, "Puseyite." But I remember how in the later fifties it published a letter from his pen, and a leading article upon it, in favour of joining the High Church and Evangelical forces, when the "Essays and Reviews" were attacking the foundation "of the Faith."

Concerning his writings the same correspondent asks: "Has the nineteenth century

produced any Commentary deeper or more spiritual than Pusey's on 'The Minor Prophets'? How many defences of Holy Writ have been worth more than his book on Daniel?"

But, perhaps, it was as a man of intense courage, and almost infinite compassion, that caused Pusey to be regarded by many as a prince among men. One incident in his life illustrating this point must suffice. When the writer of this little volume was a boy at school, the cholera was raging in London, and "cholera" powders were always placed ready for instant use each night before we went to our beds. One hot August afternoon Pusey went down to the East End of London, and pulled the door-bell of a rector's house, and offered to give up his vacation to pastoral work there, and, though at that time a man of sixty years of age, actually hired lodgings, and devoted his holidays to visiting the worst parts and the poorest people in that squalid and cholera-stricken parish. Who but a man of infinite

courage and compassion would have done such a thing?

If we cannot all agree with Pusey's lofty ideas concerning doctrine, we can at least admire—nay, we must admire, his work, and his devotion as a parish priest.

Such, then, in few words, was the character of the men who began the Oxford Movement, a movement which led to such an uprising in the Church as the world has never seen. We shall see as we read on that, though extravagance of thought, disproportion, and often dangerous exaggeration, marked the character of some of the writings of certain of the followers of the pioneers of the Movement, yet it is certain that the leaders were men who thought nothing of themselves, but who, having fixed a high standard of religious principle, gave up all else in their endeavour to attain and to lead others to attain to it.

Above all, whatever they were, certainly they cannot be regarded as "Romanizers," but as staunch Church of England men, if we may except Newman and Ward, who began well, but ended badly.

CHAPTER VI.

The "Tracts for the Times."

OF the "Tracts for the Times," all of which created so unusual an amount of interest, and some of them even alarm—that is, in certain quarters—Dean Church has left it on record that "there was no Romanism in them, nor anything that showed a tendency to it." But custom, and the prevalence of other systems and other ways, made their readers forget, as so many forget to-day, the simple facts about the Church, her history, and her position. Men did not know then—as for the most part they do not know now—the difference between "Catholic" truth and "Roman Catholic error." The vast tract that separates "Popery" from

primitive Church doctrine, is for most an absolutely unknown region. So many thought—erroneously, of course—then, as many no doubt think now, that the Tracts were meant to spread the errors of the Papacy in the Church of England; whereas, instead, they were directed to quite another—and a wholly different—object. There was, as Dean Church assures us, "absolutely nothing in them but had the indisputable sanction of the Prayer-book."

On July 14th, 1833, Mr. Keble preached a remarkable sermon on *National Apostacy*, which created no small stir in the country, and in which, amongst other things, he said that there were "hundreds, nay thousands, of Christians, and that there soon will be tens of thousands, unaffectedly anxious to be rightly guided." And what he said was true, as time and the events proved.

The first step in the direction of producing the "Tracts for the Times" was taken at a little meeting of friends at Mr. Hugh James

Rose's parsonage at Hadleigh, in Suffolk, in July, 1833. At this meeting were assembled Mr. Rose, Mr. Wm. Palmer, Mr. A. Perceval, and Mr. Froude. Two others, at least, were concerned in the work of producing the first Tracts, Mr. Keble and Mr. Newman, both of Oriel College; but neither was present at the first meeting.

It seems clear that Mr. Keble, though absent, was the mainspring of the Movement, and it was from this meeting that the first issue of the Tracts was decided upon. Mr. Rose, who died six years later, was a man of great energy of character, a Churchman of the best type, utterly opposed to anything that tended towards Romanism.

Keble's "powerfully constructive mind," writes Canon Liddon,* "grasped from the beginning the strength of the Anglican position as opposed to Protestantism, and Rationalism, as well as to the (yet unappreciated) power of Romanism."

* "Life of Pusey," Vol. I., p. 271.

He saw, as he stated in one of the earliest Tracts, that the Apostolical Succession was the essential bond, recognised by the sixteenth and seventeenth century divines, associating the English Church, through Reformation and Papal dominion, with that primitive Catholicism in which Anglicans laid their foundations, and to which they always appealed. He was never conscious of being an innovator. And with this firmness of conviction and principle, he was able, in spite of his position, not only to strike heavy blows in controversy, but on occasion to head protests and even agitations.

The first Tract was issued on September 9th, 1833. The beginnings were—like the beginnings of many other great movements—very humble. "A tract," wrote Newman, "would be long enough if it filled four octavo pages. We hope to publish tracts for hawkers' baskets in time." The first Tracts were chiefly concerned in setting forth the constitution, ordinances, and services of the Church.

One of the commonest mistakes, as we have said, is to suppose that the Tractarian Movement was intended to favour or spread the doctrine or practices of the Church of Rome.

Nothing appears to have been further from the thoughts and intentions of the writers. "We all concurred most heartily," writes Mr. Palmer,* "in the necessity of impressing on people that the Church was more than a merely human institution; that it had privileges, sacraments, a ministry ordained by Christ; that it was a matter of the highest obligation to remain united to the Church."

This is the criticism of a distinguished Roman Catholic writer :—

"The scope of the Tracts," writes Cardinal Wiseman, "seems to be twofold. First, they endeavour to revive in the Anglican Church a love of ancient principles, and practices, by showing us how many points it has departed from them, and how wholesome it would be

* "Narrative of Events," p. 20.

to return to them. Secondly, they endeavour to place their Church upon the foundation of Apostolical succession." *

When the first forty-six Tracts had been issued, they were gathered up into a volume, in the year 1834, to which an "Advertisement" was prefixed explaining the nature and scope of the writings, from which we quote the following :—

"The following Tracts were published with the object of contributing something towards the practical revival of doctrines which, although held by the great divines of our Church at present, have become obsolete with the majority of her members. . . .

"Methodism and Popery are in different ways the refuge of those whom the Church stints of the gifts of grace ; they are the foster-mothers of abandoned children. The neglect of the daily service, the desecration of the festivals, the Eucharist scantily administered, insubor-

* "Catholic Institute Tract," 17, No. 3.

dination permitted in all ranks of the Church orders, and offices imperfectly developed, the want of societies for particular religious objects, and the like deficiencies, lead the feverish mind, desirous of a vent to its feelings and a stricter rule of life, to the smaller religious communities, to prayer and Bible meetings, and ill-advised institutions and societies, on the one hand; and on the other, to the solemn and captivating services by which Popery gains proselytes. . . . There are zealous sons and servants (of the Church of Christ) . . . who 'believe that nothing but these neglected doctrines, faithfully preached, will repress that extension of Popery, for which the ever-multiplying divisions of the religious world are too clearly preparing the way.'"

So it appears that in the minds of the writers of these Tracts they were doing what they could, and in what they thought was the best way, to "repress the extension of Popery which they all alike deplored.

The "Tracts for the Times" made their first appearance, as we have said, in 1833, and were continued until 1841, when Newman's celebrated Tract "No. 90" brought the series to an abrupt close. Their influence was enormous. The two great objects set forth were: the maintenance and assertion of Catholic doctrine (the doctrine of the Apostolical succession), and the preservation and use of the Prayer-book in its integrity.

In about two years from the issue of the first Tract, the little band of workers, and those who sympathised with them, had grown to be called a party, although there appear to be no grounds for supposing that any attempt was made, anywhere, or by any of these men, to secure adhesion to their cause, beyond issuing tracts, and writing, and preaching sermons. "I would not have it called a party," says Dr. Newman in his *Apologia*, but of course it became to be known as one, and one which was assailed by many foes from without and friends from within.

There were many able and thoughtful men who were utterly displeased, and even mystified, at the growth of the Movement, and the way in which it found favour in unlooked-for quarters; whilst in places, and with persons where sympathy and practical help might have been possibly forthcoming, the whole thing was utterly distasteful, and by many unreservedly condemned.

But whatever the feelings, clearly the work had not been in vain.

Soon a marked change came over the Church of England. An unlooked-for vitality was visible in many a long-neglected parish. The clergymen began to study and to teach the people not a new doctrine, but the *old* primitive doctrine of the Church of England. In many churches the Holy Communion had been almost wholly neglected, or administered in a very irreverent fashion. Now a change was observable in many quarters, the holy sacraments of the Church were once more "rightly and duly

administered," the services for saints' days—for many a long year forgotten altogether in some parishes—were once again adopted, and daily services in church became frequent. Of course all this did not happen at once; it came about gradually, but it came; and soon the influence of this revival of religious worship extended to the uttermost parts of the Church.

But the influence of the Movement did not end with a better observance of the sacraments of the Church, or with the revival of old primitive doctrines so long utterly neglected and forgotten.

The laity were much interested, much impressed, with what was going on, and, as in all ages the laity have responded to the call of the Church when they see and know that the clergy are thoroughly awake and alive to their duties, they heartily responded to a call for new churches, and for the proper restoration, enlargement, and improvement of old ones.

In every growing town and village new

churches began to spring up, to meet the wants of an ever-growing population. Parsonage-houses—in the parish, so that the clergy might have no longer any excuse for living away from their parishioners—were erected; the old fabrics were restored, enlarged, and beautified; music, and every other accessory for the promotion of divine service, was introduced; and the Church again invited the poor and the outcast to come in and worship their God and Father.

As is usual with almost every new movement—whether it be in the Church or in the world, if it is of sufficient importance to command attention at all—the Oxford Movement was at first, but not for long, neglected, next condemned, and its leaders ridiculed and held up to scorn and derision.

Dr. Pusey, who became the actual leader of the little knot of reformers—for such they may be called—in 1835 had thrown himself heart and soul into the Movement. His high position

and equally high standard of life, ought to have secured for him — however much men disagreed with his views—that respect which is due to all well-meaning and high-principled men. What the average British-born subject does not understand, he ofttimes ridicules; and so the followers of this great divine were called, in derision, "Puseyites," just as followers of John Wesley had been nicknamed "Methodists," only because they were more methodical, more devoted to their religious duties than the great majority of their college contemporaries.

It will have been observed that there was reality and vitality about the Movement. It was not the embodiment of abstract ideas of college dons and antiquated fogies. It was the simple result of real, practical, intense, and earnest thought, and deliberation, on the part of men who realised the enormous value of Catholic teaching in an age when the very word "Catholic" was itself, even, wholly misunderstood and misrepresented.

"The Movement," writes Dean Church,* "was not one of mere opinion. It took two distinct —though connected—lines. It was on the one hand theological, on the other resolutely practical. Theologically it dealt with great questions of religious principle. What is the Church? Is it a reality, or a mode of speech? On what grounds does it rest? How may it be known? Is it among us? How is it to be discriminated from its rivals and counterfeits? What is its essential constitution? What does it teach? What are its shortcomings? Does it need reform? But, on the other hand, the Movement was marked by its deep earnestness on the practical side of genuine Christian life. . . . The Movement, above all, was a moral one; it was nothing—allowed to be nothing — if it was not this. Seriousness, reverence, the fear of insincere words and unsound professions, were essential in the

---

* "Oxford Movement," p. 190.

character which alone it would tolerate in those who made common cause with it."

Of course the party soon had the faults of a party—real and imputed. "Is it conceivable," says Dean Church, "that there should ever have been a religious movement which has not provoked smiles from those outside of it, and which has not lent itself to caricature? . . . There were weaker members of it, and headstrong ones, and imitative ones; some were deeper, some shallower; some liked it for its excitement, and some liked it for its cause; there were those who were for pushing on, and those who were for holding back. There were men of combat and men of peace; there were those whom it made conceited and self-important, and those whom it drove into seriousness, anxiety, and retirement. But whatever faults it had, a pure and high spirit ruled in it; there were no disloyal members, and there were none who sought their own in it, or thought of high things for themselves in joining

it. It was this whole-heartedness, this supreme reverence for moral goodness, more even than the great ability of the leaders, and in spite of mistakes and failures, which gave its cohesion and its momentum to the Movement in its earlier stages."*

The Tracts, of course, differed greatly, not only in size and quantity, but in tone and structure. Some were written for the clergy only, others were written for the people; some consisted of only a few pages, others reached the size of volumes of four hundred pages, or even more. Amongst the Tracts were village dialogues. Others were reprints of the writings of the early English divines, such as Wilson and Cosin. Many were directed against Romish worship. Tract 75 dealt with the Breviary, a tract which was printed for the purpose of "wresting a weapon out of our adversaries' hands, who have in this, as in many other instances, appropriated to themselves a treasure

* "Oxford Movement," p. 193.

which was ours as much as theirs, and on our attempting to recover it, accuse us of borrowing what we have lost." In the words of the then Bishop of Exeter (who at a subsequent stage strongly dissented from the later teaching of some of the writers, and severely criticised their work): "The writers of the Tracts have largely contributed, not to revive, for it was never dead, but to spread and strengthen a practical sense of this our corporate character, as we are Christians; to exhibit the Church as the designation of that body of which Jesus Christ Himself is, in some mysterious yet most true and perfect manner, the Head. For earnestly impressing this truth, and others connected with it, and the consequences resulting from them, the writers of whom I speak appear to me to merit the grateful acknowledgment of true Churchmen, in proportion to the contumely which has been in some quarters most unsparingly heaped upon them."*

* "Charge of the Bishop of Exeter," 1842, p. 15.

For some eight years or so nothing could exceed the labours and the energy, which was inspired by leaders and followers alike of the Oxford Movement. Of course they were continuously attacked and assailed upon every side. Dr. Arnold, in a letter to Dean Stanley, writes that it is clear to him "that Newman and his party are idolaters. I have been looking," he adds, "through the Tracts, which are a memorable proof of their idolatry." But even he is constrained to admit, "some of the idols are better than others."*

As the Movement made itself more and more widely felt, it was eagerly discussed, and—by many—condemned. Some of the heads of the Church began to be seriously alarmed. The then Bishop of Chester spoke of the matter as one "daily assuming a more serious and alarming aspect." Mr. Newman endeavoured to allay the alarm and irritation

* Dr. Arnold to Dean Stanley, "Life," II., 42.

that existed in certain quarters by explaining * that the Movement was not in any sense to be regarded as a party movement, that it was "in a manner quite independent of things visible. . . . It is not here nor there, it has no progress, no causes, no fortunes; it is not a movement, it is a spirit, it is a spirit afloat, neither in 'the secret chamber,' nor 'in the desert,' but everywhere. It is within us, rising up in the heart where it was least expected, and working its way, though not in secret, yet so subtly and impalpably, as hardly to admit of precaution or encounter on any ordinary human rules of opposition. It is 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."

Nothing can show more strikingly the

* Article in *British Critic*, April, 1839.

truth of this representation than to refer to what may be called the theological history of the individuals who, whatever be their differences from each other on important or unimportant points, yet are associated together in the advocacy of the doctrines in question. Of Dr. Hook and Mr. Churton, it was said, that they "represented the High Church dignitaries of the last generation; Mr. Perceval, the Tory aristocracy; Mr. Keble was of the country clergy, and came from valleys and woods far removed both from notoriety and noise; Mr. Palmer and Mr. Todd were of Ireland; Dr. Pusey became what he was from among the Universities of Germany, and after a severe and tedious analysis of Arabic MSS.; Mr. Dodsworth is said to have begun in the study of prophecy; Mr. Newman to have been much indebted to the friendship of Archbishop Whately; Mr. Froude, if anyone, gained his views from his own mind; others have passed over from Calvinism, and kindred religions."

It was not only interested lookers-on who attacked the workers and assailed the work. Friends of the household, like Mr. Palmer, of whom we have written, became alarmed at the progress things were making. In his published account of the Movement he writes as touching the "Tracts for the Times":—

"Admitting, as we do most cordially and fully, the great services which have been rendered to the cause of truth and piety by the authors of the Tracts, it is still undeniable that the friends of Church principles have not been able to concur in every position which has been advanced by individual writers connected with the Tracts. They have indeed, not infrequently, been placed in very serious embarrassment by the incaution of individuals, by indiscreet publications and actions."* But the steady issue of the Tracts went on until a catastrophe happened, which put an end to the issue.

* "Narrative of Events," p. 26.

"The Tracts for the Times," writes Dean Burgon, "pursued their brilliant course until the publication of Tract No. 90 (Jan. 25, 1841) brought the series to a calamitous close. They had begun admirably in the autumn of 1833, and continued to do good service until the middle of 1835, when there was a sudden halt. They were resumed in the first days of 1836, under seriously altered conditions, whereupon they encountered rebuke, suspicion, disfavour at the hands of their best friends."

Into the excited controversy which subsequently raged over the famous "Tract 90,"* from the pen of Mr. Newman, respecting the Thirty-nine Articles, endeavouring to justify their acceptance in a way other than that which they were commonly intended to convey, we have no desire or intention to enter, as it forms no part of our design. Sufficient is it to say that party spirit ran high at the time of its appearance. The "Tract" was received

* "Remarks on certain passages in the Thirty-nine Articles."

with a torrent of indignation. The authorities at Oxford met, and hurriedly passed resolutions disclaiming all responsibility, not only for its appearance, but for "a series of anonymous publications purporting to be written by members of the University; but which are in no way sanctioned by the University itself," and thus they condemned, not only this one particular offending Tract, but the whole series.

Mr. Newman, it should be said, at once wrote to the Vice-Chancellor of the University, acknowledging himself to be the author of the Tract in question, and expressing himself as sorry; but not convinced by the action of the authorities.

As touching this action, Dean Church has left it on record that in his judgment the policy of the authorities of Oxford was wrong, stupid, unjust, pernicious. "It was a deplorable mistake, and all will wish now that the discredit did not rest on Oxford. And yet

it was the mistake of upright and conscientious men."

As time wore on, party passion gradually subsided, a calm succeeded the storm. Four years later, when someone suggested that the condemnation of the University authorities should be made a University decree, the proposal was negatived by the proctors, who were thanked by a letter, signed by 554 members of the University Convocation.*

It is only fair to say that the Tract found many staunch supporters, Keble and Pusey being amongst them, and it does not appear that Newman left the Church of England because of the official declaration against his writings. That unhappy event seems to have been connected with something quite different —the result of the establishment of the Jerusalem Bishopric — for, writing in his *Apologia*,† he says: "As to the project of a

* "A History of the English Church," Canon Perry, p. 231.

† Page 253.

Jerusalem Bishopric, I never heard of any good or harm it has ever done, except what it has done for me, which many think a great misfortune, and I one of the greatest of mercies. It brought me on to the beginning of the end." Newman evidently was not prepared to join the Church of Rome at the time he could write, "I could not go to Rome while she suffered honours to be paid to the Blessed Virgin and the Saints," but finally, not, however, until 1845, he was, as we know, received into the Church of Rome.

Mr. Newman's disappearance made a great rift, and an immense difference, in the Movement—gave it, as some thought, its death-blow. A few amongst the prominent leaders followed in his footsteps; but men like Keble, Dr. Pusey, and Mr. Palmer held firm, and though many then possibly thought the days of the Church of England were numbered, they were wrong. The Church gained strength rather than lost it by the departure of men, who, in

course of time, became untrue to her principles, and she emerged from the event stronger, and more firmly enshrined in the hearts of the people than ever.

It was thought that many would follow the example of Mr. Newman, Robert Wilberforce, and the others who then or thereafter joined the Church of Rome, but, as a matter of fact, the secessions to Rome since 1841 have been comparatively few.

It is also a fact, far less recognised, that many who do join the Roman Catholic Communion return to the fold of Mother Church. For obvious reasons, little is said of the secessions *from* Rome, yet cases such as are described in the following paragraph, taken from a daily newspaper, are by no means uncommon:—

"Under a commission from the Archbishop of Canterbury the Rev. W. F. Chambers, who recently, under circumstances of physical depression, joined the Roman Communion, has

been received back again into the English Church."

Dean Church has pointed out with much force the behaviour of the authorities of the University towards the Movement. The heads, from a posture of indifference, drifted into that of ignorant antagonism, following the outside current of uninstructed and ignoble prejudice, not taking the trouble to understand the character of the Movement, or to "put themselves frankly into communication with its leading persons." The result was, as might have been expected, "men who in point of intellect, and character, might have been the flower of the English Communion, were hounded out of her, by ignorance and clamour, when wiser heads, and more courageous hearts, might have averted these disasters. But the irreparable loss did not occur till October 8th, 1845, when Father Dominic received Newman into the Church of Rome. There was no wavering at this crisis in Keble, and Pusey,

the recognised chiefs, and the Movement went on, though somewhat weakened and impoverished for a time. It was found impossible to crush it, for it was a matter now, not of men, but of principles. What had first been academic became parochial, and finally leavened the National Church." *

Mr. Newman once lamented that "A certain new section was sweeping the original party of the 'Movement' aside, and taking its place," † and if this were so, as indeed would appear to nave been the case, much of the evil which is attributed to that "Romanizing" influence exercised by some of the later Tractarians must be set down—not to the original founders of the Oxford Movement, whose characters we have roughly sketched in these pages, but to those who succeeded Mr. Keble and his co-workers in their great efforts to place the Church of England upon its true basis, that "new section" here

* "The Oxford Movement."

† See Canon Liddon's "Life of Pusey."

alluded to by Mr. Newman, who were accused of "sweeping aside" the labours of the little band of workers, the men, in fact, who desired above all things to maintain, and to explain to others, true Church of England principles and none other.

"The more impatient spirits," writes Canon Garnier,* "finding themselves distrusted, lost heart and began to fall away to the Church of Rome. The greatest blow of all was the secession of J. H. Newman . . but Edward Bouverie Pusey, though also censured in 1842 by the University authorities, and debarred from preaching before the University for a time, never despaired of his Church. The thought of joining the Roman Communion never appears to have presented itself to him."

To many no doubt the work which had promised so well at the outset was finished, with the loss of Mr. Newman, but, as it has been well said, they did not preach themselves —they appealed to primitive Christianity, they

* "Title Deeds of the Church of England," p. 235.

simply asked the sons and daughters of Mother Church to return to the old paths. The work did not flow within any narrow channel of its own devising; but sought rather to lose itself in the very life of the Church itself.

The secessions to Rome filled the country with alarm, and many condemned the Oxford Movement as the cause of all the trouble. Those who had sympathised with the Movement, but who remained faithful to the Church of their forefathers, were regarded with much suspicion by others, and doubtless it was due in part to the later development of the Movement that Rome for the moment gained converts.

As, however, it was wrong to condemn all the "Tracts for the Times," because of one offending writing, so also is it wrong to condemn the "Oxford Movement" for the defects of some of its promoters, and of others who joined the Movement at a subsequent period. We should remember that before the Movement began there had been a steady leakage

from the Church of England to Dissent—a leakage which we are assured had assumed "formidable proportions"—and which was only "stopped in a large degree with the Tractarian Movement." *

Another thing to be remembered is this, that had it not been for this great Revival in the Church of England—Rome might, and probably indeed would, long before this, have possessed a far greater hold upon the English Nation than she admittedly now has. As it was, the very fact of Newman's secession opened the eyes of English people to the folly of joining a Church, many of whose doctrines are but the vain inventions of man, based upon fraudulent writings. †

It has been mentioned that, as a matter of fact, the secessions to Rome were nothing like so numerous as some people imagine. If we

---

* Hore's "History of the Church of England," p. 487.

† See Appendix, "The Forged Decretals."

accept a statement made in a London paper,* the number of clergymen who joined the Church of Rome between 1833 and 1878, in forty-five years, numbered only 385, many of whom had been far from being what are known as "advanced" men. It is indeed possible that the number is even less than that here given, a number which the writer has made no attempt to verify.

---

* *The Whitehall Review.*

CHAPTER VII.

Some Results of the Oxford Movement.

RESULTS, of course, are not ours to think of or to care about. Results are in the hands of God Almighty. We are, the best of us, but poor feeble workers in His vineyard. It is not for us, but for the Master, to judge of our work or its usefulness; and yet we cannot close our eyes to facts.

When the excitement had in a measure died down, when the agitation against the men and their work had gradually but distinctly subsided, some fruits of their labours began to be manifest. It could not be hid from the notice of the world that parish churches,

hitherto long neglected, began to be cleaned, and restored, to something like their former beauty; that new churches everywhere sprang up as and when needed; that clergy and laity began to take fresh interest in Church affairs; that services hitherto slovenly and carelessly rendered, became brightened and multiplied; that greater reverence for all things pertaining to public worship became almost universal; and that the Holy Sacraments were re-instated in their proper place. In addition, men began to work for souls—for the improvement of the Church in all directions. Lay Readers, Missions, Sisterhoods, the revival of Convocation, Church Congresses, Diocesan Conferences, Houses of Laymen, the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences (the one institution where clergy and laity deliberate together and in common); all these, and much else beside, may be traced to the spirit which animated the workers who were first amongst the pioneers of the great Oxford Movement.

We have said that one of the outcomes of the Oxford Movement was the marked increase in the number of places of worship erected to keep pace with the growing populations. As an example of the valuable practical work which the Oxford Movement certainly helped to promote, take the case of Leeds. Sixty years ago, in 1837, when the well-known Dr. Hook became the Vicar of this important town, there were, besides the parish church, only fourteen district churches. In one, every pew was said to be private property, and conferred a 40s. freehold vote on the owners, or those who claimed to be such; * and of schools for the poor there were but three. When Dr. Hook left the town, in 1859, he left there thirty-six churches, thirty flourishing schools, and instead of six clergy houses, there were then twenty-nine. Between 1861-1886 twenty-three new churches were built, four old churches

* A reference to old newspaper files will show that pews were not infrequently put up for sale by public auction, and sold as freeholds.

were enlarged, and nineteen permanent mission rooms were erected. In 1861, with a population of 218,806, church room was provided for 27,406 people, or about 12 per cent. of the community; whilst in 1886, with a population of 348,012, the number of sittings was 48,743, representing 14 per cent., and of these 42,051 were and now remain absolutely free. The total amount of money voluntarily raised for new churches, enlargements, mission rooms, parsonages, and endowment of districts during one quarter of a century in Leeds was £296,496. *

At Birmingham, in 1803, there were only two churches, and three small so-called Chapels of Ease; in 1886 there were fifty-four churches, besides a very considerable number of permanent mission rooms. In 1861 the population was 298,124, and the number of sittings provided in the churches 39,564. Between 1861 and

* See for this and other signs of Church progress, "The Church and Her Story," p. 180. (Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 2/-.)

1886, thirteen churches were rebuilt, enlarged, or restored, and twenty-two new churches and thirty mission rooms were built. In the latter year the population was 443,000, and the number of sittings 54,866. During this period £279,029 were raised by voluntary contributions, for the work of building, restoration, and endowment of new districts.

In the diocese of Manchester, between 1861-1886, forty-six new churches were built, providing 31,337 new sittings, at a cost of £331,511, and £205,124 were expended on the rebuilding, enlargement, and restoration of existing churches, and the erection of permanent mission rooms, whereby a further addition of 10,382 seats were obtained. The total amount of voluntary contributions for Church extension alone in Manchester during the same period amounted to £647,931. The entire sum spent in church building, exclusive of endowments and sites, in the Diocese of Manchester, from its creation in 1847, until the death of Bishop

Fraser, in 1885, was £1,494,998. During the episcopates of Bishop Prince Lee, and his successor, 215 new churches were there consecrated, forty-one new churches were erected to replace former buildings, and 280 new districts were formed. Within this period, 137,373 additional church sittings were provided, of which 89,470, or nearly two-thirds, are free. In the same period, Bolton devoted voluntary contributions amounting to £202,000; Sheffield, £251,597; Bristol, £446,564; Leicester, £214,470; and Halifax, £225,152 to the same purpose.* The less important towns show equally remarkable results.

Such, then, in brief, is the simple story, here incomplete, of course, and but roughly sketched, yet sufficient to indicate the character of the aims, and the methods of work, of the Oxford Movement, a Movement which was

* For instances of the growth of the Church year by year, see "Nye's Popular Illustrated Church Annual," published in December of each year. (Bemrose & Sons, Ltd., price 1/-.)

rather an "influence" than a "party," which, having first permeated, then shed light and life into every corner of the land, and finally has spread itself abroad, until it has now penetrated into every country, and largely influenced the Church wherever the Gospel of Christ is taught.*

The late Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone, whose words in reference to the state of the Church of the pre-Victorian era we have already quoted (see p. 48), has well summed up the enormous progress of the Church of England—very much of which we must admit was due to the pioneers of the Oxford Movement, in the following words:—

"Between 1831 and 1840, the transformation, which had previously begun, made a progress altogether marvellous. Much was due, without doubt, to the earnest labour of individuals. Such men as Bishop Blomfield on the bench, and Dr. Hook in the parish (and I name them only as illustrious examples), who had

* See "Oxford Movement," p. 337.

long been toiling with a patient but dauntless energy, began, as it were, to get the upper hand. But causes of deep and general operation were also widely at work. As the French Revolution had done much to renovate Christian belief on the Continent, so the Church of England was less violently, but pretty sharply, roused, by the political events which arrived in a rattling succession; in 1828 the Repeal of the Test Act; in 1829, the emancipation of the Roman Catholics; in 1831-2, the agony and triumph of Reform; in 1833, the Church Temporalities Act for Ireland. There was now a general uprising of religious energy in the Church throughout the land. It saved the Church. Her condition before 1830 could not possibly have borne the scrutinising eye, which for thirty years past has been turned upon our institutions. Her rank corruptions must have called down the avenging arm. But it was arrested just in time. It would be difficult to give a just and full idea of the beneficial

changes which were either accomplished or begun during this notable decade of years. They embraced alike formal, official movements, of a nature to strike the general eye, and those local improvements in detail, which singly are known only in each neighbourhood; but which unitedly transform the face of a country. Laws were passed to repress gross abuses, and the altering spirit of the clergy seconded and even outstripped the laws. The outward face of divine worship began to be renovated, and the shameful condition of the sacred fabrics was rapidly amended, with such a tide of public approval as overflowed all the barriers of party and of sect, and speedily found its manifestations even in the seceding communions. There is no reason to doubt that at that time at least, and before such changes had become too decidedly the fashion, the outward embellishment of churches, and the greater decency and order of services, answered to and sprang from a call within,

and proved a less unworthy conception of the sublime idea of Christian worship. The missionary arm of the Church began to exhibit a vigour wholly unknown to former years. Noble efforts were made, under the auspices of the chief bishop of the Church, to provide for the unsatisfied spiritual wants of the metropolis. The great scheme of the Colonial Episcopate was founded; and in its outset, led to such a development of apostolic zeal and self-denial as could not but assist, by a powerful reaction, the domestic progress. The tone of public schools (on one of which Arnold was now spending his noble energies) and of universities, was steadily yet rapidly raised The greatest change of all was within the body of the clergy. A devoted piety and an unworldly life, which had been the rare exceptions, became visibly, from year to year, more and more the rule. The spectacle, as a whole, was like what we are told of a Russian spring; when, after long months of rigid cold,

almost in a day the snow dissolves, the ice breaks up and is borne away, and the whole earth is covered with a rush of verdure."*

A writer in *The Edinburgh Review*† thus testifies to the new life and vigour infused into the Church:—"The truth is that no class of men in English society has undergone a change and reform so radical and so meritorious as the clergy of the English Church have accomplished in their own order, since we commenced, now just seventy years ago, the labours of this journal. We shall not be accused of flattering them, for we have never ceased to combat their bigotry, and to oppose their sacerdotal pretensions. But this shall not prevent us from doing signal justice to their merits. They have rooted out a multitude of abuses, and they have raised in many places in the land a lofty standard of what the Christian clergy of a free and enlightened

* Gladstone, "Chapter of Autobiography," p. 24.
† *Edinburgh Review*, April, 1872, p. 381.

people ought to be. They have placed themselves at the head of the great work of national education, insomuch that the charge now made against them is that they are too eager in the cause. They have everywhere given new life and vigour to the spiritual work, which is the leaven of society. No doubt all this zeal tends sometimes to excess, but upon the whole it does good; and when we compare the deplorable abasement of the Church of England in the deep and sluggish corruption of the last century, with the spirit and energy of her present life, we know not which astonishes us most—that she should have at all survived that *nadir* of degradation, or that she should be threatened with Disestablishment at the very zenith of her utility."

Some marks of Church progress in our own day are very clearly put forth by a well-known writer, the Rev. W. W. Webb, of Exeter, in a work published a few years ago (1868), since which time enormous strides have been made

in the development of church life both at home and abroad.

"By the Episcopal Act of 1836," he reminds us, "the Bishoprics of Manchester and Ripon were created; the aggregate episcopal income was redistributed, and ecclesiastical dignities, or benefices, were forbidden to be held by any bishop *in commendam*, and the residence of the bishop in his diocese secured. Episcopal supervision was made a reality, which for two centuries past it had scarcely been.

"The fifty years that have now elapsed since the passing of the Pluralities Act (1838), have given nearly full effect to that most excellent measure, and almost every parish has now its resident clergyman. Besides securing residence, it has involved the erection of parsonage houses, and the provision of a more adequate maintenance.

"Under the provisions of the Cathedral Act (1840), some three hundred and sixty prebendal estates attached to the cathedrals of the old

foundation, and the corporate incomes of all canons beyond four in the other cathedrals (about sixty), and the revenues of the separate estates of deans and of residentiary canons, as distinguished from their corporate revenues and the proceeds of sinecure rectories, were appropriated to provide, when they should all be vacated, £134,251 a year, for the augmentation of poor livings, and placed for that purpose in the hands of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

"In 1843, Sir Robert Peel obtained an Act of Parliament charging the accruing funds of the Ecclesiastical Commission with an annual income of £48,000 for the creation of two hundred new ecclesiastical districts in the mining, shipping, and manufacturing towns.

"The Tithe Commutation Act also has been exceedingly beneficial to the Church in the rural districts, by creating a better state of feeling between the clergy and the farmers.

"In 1852, the Convocations of the two

Provinces were revived, after a suspension of more than a century and a half; but this revival has excited less of enthusiasm than of hope —hope that it may lead by-and-bye to the establishment of a standing synod, which shall have real powers and shall truly represent the whole body of the Church.

"In this summary of events marking the increased vitality of the Church, we must not omit to mention Church congresses. The first of these was held, under the presidency of Archdeacon France, in the hall of King's College, Cambridge. This Congress was the result of the energetic action of Mr. Emery, of Corpus Christi College, now Archdeacon of Ely, and the late Mr. Beaumont, of Trinity College. To them, indeed, the Church is indebted for all the valuable results of the Congresses. Since the first meeting, others have been held at Manchester (1863), Bristol, Norwich, York, Leeds, Bath, Brighton, Stoke-upon-Trent, Plymouth, and Croydon, and many since that

day, the Diocesan in each instance having been in the chair.

"The institution of Church Congresses has been accompanied by the revival of the more regular Diocesan Synods or Conferences, and by the infusion of new life into the Archidiaconate and the Ruri-Decanal Chapters, in all of which there is much room for, as there is certainly progress towards, more extended usefulness.

"In 1867, the first Pan-Anglican Synod was held at Lambeth, by which the various branches of the Anglican communion throughout the world were drawn together in closer bonds of brotherly love and sympathy; and at this present moment of 1878, a second similar synod is actually in session. (A third Lambeth Conference was held in 1897.)

"In 1869 was passed the Bishops' Resignation Act, which was followed in 1871 by the Incumbents' Resignation Act, both of which measures will help to relieve the Church of

senile or valetudinarian incapacity, without making age and infirmity penal.

"In 1872 was passed the Act for the Amendment of the Act of Uniformity—a measure generally acceptable as permitting shortened services under certain conditions, and special forms of service to be approved by the Ordinary."

CHAPTER VIII.

The Increase of the Episcopate at Home and Abroad.

THE "Catholic Revival," as Pusey always called the Oxford Movement, is responsible for the vast and unexampled development in the Episcopal organization of the Church of England, not only at home, but also abroad. It has given shape and stability to the increasing efforts of many zealous Evangelicals, and it may be said to date from the year 1841, when the Colonial Bishoprics' Fund was first started. It is true that some may say that the Tractarian Movement was not wholly responsible for this further development of the

Church organization, but at any rate it owes very much to that energetic spirit of "work" which the Oxford Movement—and that alone—certainly may claim to have originated.

When the story of the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria is written, it will be found that it has been not only the longest reign recorded in history, but in some ways the most remarkable reign of ancient or modern times. Those who are old enough to remember the accession of Queen Victoria may recall, amongst many other circumstances, the introduction of railways (very few of which were in existence in pre-Victorian times), also of steamboats, telegraphy, photography, of the screw propeller, breech-loaders, ironclads, bicycles, motor-cars, and a thousand and one other inventions, most of which our grandfathers never so much as dreamed of, as the saying goes; and several of which, had they thought about at all, they would possibly have regarded as "miracles." Perhaps, indeed, it is not too much to say that the "Record Reign"

of our Empress-Queen, taking it altogether, is one of the most wonderful and marvellous reigns ever chronicled in story.

But there is also something beyond and above all these inventions, wonderful as they most certainly are.

As one who witnessed the Jubilee procession in 1897 wrote as touching what had happened during the reign of Queen Victoria: "It is not possible to emphasize by long procession through our streets all the moral and spiritual developments which our eyes have seen: our milder laws; the growth of the sense of justice; the abolition of many abuses, and the righteous jealousy of such as remain; the pread of education; the practice of temperance; the development of peaceful self-government; and in other departments of life the strides of science; the advance in the treatment of disease; the opened markets of the world which have reduced the cost of the necessaries of life and added largely to its

comforts; a just horror of war, and a desire to substitute a peaceful arbitration for the barbarous arbitrament of the sword: still less the growing spiritual activities of the Church and her marvellous expansion in all parts of the world"—an expansion, we may add, which has no parallel in any reign, or any series of reigns, since the foundation of the Church herself.

When Queen Victoria ascended the throne there were but 5,776 beneficed clergymen, though there were 10,637 benefices to serve, so that many of the clergy must have been responsible for the duties of more than one living. To-day there are nearly 14,000 rectors and vicars, an army of assistant curates, and lay workers—men and women, too—all engaged in the work of spreading the Gospel amongst the English people.

Remarkable as the sixty years are, when we turn to the home Episcopate we find that never before during a similar period of time has there been such wonderful growth in the number

of our Bishoprics. No less than nine new Episcopal Sees have been created in great manufacturing and other centres of population in England alone by and at the expense of Church people since 1836. They are Manchester, Ripon, Newcastle, Liverpool, Southwell, St. Albans, Truro, Wakefield, and Bristol; while at least three more are likely to be created within the next few years.

"In 1876 the new Sees of St. Albans and Truro were constituted, and in the following year the Bishop of Rochester (Claughton) was invested as the first Bishop of St. Albans, and Dr. Benson the first Bishop of Truro. The way in which the income (£3,000 in each case) of these Sees has been raised, affords a striking example of the generous spirit which in all ages has given birth to Church endowments. To endow the Cornish bishopric, the Bishop of Exeter, of his own motion, surrendered £800 a year of his episcopal income; Lady Rolle contributed the munificent

gift of £40,000, and the remainder was voluntarily subscribed by Churchmen. In the case of St. Albans, the then Bishop of Winchester surrendered Winchester House, from the sale of which resulted an income of £1,600. In addition to this, the same Bishop, and also the then Bishop of Rochester, surrendered each of them £500 a year, and the residue was made up from private sources. Upon the occasion of the investiture of the Bishop of St. Albans, *The Times* made the following remarks on the new bishoprics:—

"Notwithstanding all the disputes and divisions in the Church, the steady increase of its activity, and the extension of its work afford daily evidence of its increasing vitality. These new bishoprics, it should be remembered, are not created by mere force of an Act of Parliament; they are not 'established' in the mistaken sense often affixed to that word. They are as much the products of voluntary agency as the restoration of the Abbey

Church of St. Albans itself; and the Legislature interferes, not to provide the funds, but simply to invest the new See with the customary rights and privileges. The creation of these new bishops will tend to modify considerably the general position of the episcopal order. Their incomes will be considerably less than those of their brethren on the bench; they will be destitute of 'palaces,' and will neither have the opportunity nor the means to live in the style hitherto associated with episcopal rank. They will be forced to rely, in a far greater degree than has hitherto been the case, on the purely spiritual and moral efficacy of their work. They will have to lean less on authority, and more on influence. They will have to throw themselves in greater measure upon the direct personal support of their clergy and their laity, and, in a word, they will be less official. This must re-act on the older bishoprics. Bishops will be expected to spend less, see

more of their clergy, take a more conspicuous lead in the spiritual and moral agencies of their dioceses, and be persons instead of personages."

And what shall we say of the increase of Bishops' Sees abroad?

The first Colonial Bishopric founded by the Church of England was that of Nova Scotia, which was founded in 1787. Little, if any further, effort was made for some years afterwards towards providing new Episcopal centres abroad. It seems almost incredible to believe that in the year that Queen Victoria ascended the throne only seven Bishoprics of the Anglican Church in her dominions were to be found in foreign parts.

In a carefully compiled statement issued by the authorities of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, we read that until 1841, the Church of England sent no Bishops beyond the limits of the Empire! Now there are important Missionary centres in Borneo,

in China, Japan, Madagascar, Corea, and the Isles of the Sea—all helping to forward the work commanded of old, "Go ye and teach all nations."

There is indeed nothing to boast of in all this, but there is much indeed to be thankful for to Almighty God, the giver of all good gifts.

"In 1837," says the compiler of the statement put forth by the S.P.G., "there were only seven bishoprics in foreign parts owning allegiance to the See of Canterbury, and in the United States there were sixteen, all in the Eastern States. The respective numbers now are ninety-two and seventy-eight—170 in all. The way in which our sister Church has multiplied her bishoprics, and has followed the Indians and the settlers in the Western States of America, has commanded the admiration of the whole Church.

"In our own development similar extension can be shown. In older Canada, where in 1837 there were the two bishoprics of Nova

Scotia and Quebec, there are now ten dioceses; and westward, where sixty years ago the buffalo and moose roamed at large, disturbed only by wandering tribes of Indians, over the prairies of the North-West, there are now seven bishops, of whom some, far removed from contact with the outer world, devote their lives to the conversion of the Indians in their sub-Arctic homes, and others care for the spiritual welfare of the vast immigrant population which have fled from the shores of the Old World and established themselves on the virgin soil of the New. On the Pacific coast yet three other bishops hold the land in trust for the Gospel.

"In India, in 1837, two bishops bore the spiritual burden of our great dependency, and now ten bishops serve to bring before the Church the vastness of the field and the need of a large extension of their order. At that time not more than four natives of Hindostan appeared on the roll of the clergy

and now nearly 300 minister in sacred things to their own people in the Indian dioceses, and forty-seven in other lands of the farther East. Where the South African Province now covers the land with its ten dioceses, two or three chaplains were the sole representatives of the ministry of our Church in 1837. On the West Coast the missionaries of the Church Missionary Society were laying the foundation of the Church at the cost of a death-roll unprecedented in any part of the world; to-day the Native Church possesses its own territory and has four bishops, two of whom are of African race. On the East Coast not a single English Missionary was to be found in 1837, and where now the Church Missionary Society and Universities' Mission hold up the banner of the Cross, the whole land was the unchallenged stronghold of darkness and cruel habitations. In 1837 no native of Africa had been ordained; now nearly 150 are to be found in the

ranks of the native clergy. In Australia the famous Bishop Broughton, charged with the care of that broad continent where now fourteen bishops meet in provincial synod, was ministering to small bodies of settlers gathered in little hamlets which have now grown into mighty cities. In New Zealand, Samuel Marsden and his few companions were converting the Maoris to the faith; but four years elapsed before Bishop Selwyn arrived to plant the six dioceses, and to originate the glories of the Melanesian Mission.

"In the West Indies, the two Bishops of Jamaica and Barbados were grappling with the problem of the spiritual elevation of a slave population who had recently obtained from the Christian conscience of England their freedom, and now eight bishops have succeeded to and have extended their labours."

Surely the old writer who framed this passage knew what he was writing about:—

"There never was anything by the wit of man so well devised, or so sure established, which in continuance of time hath not been corrupted."*

No one, we imagine, pretends to suggest that the Oxford Movement was absolutely perfect, or without fault. No human institution can, or ever will be, perfect, so the Oxford Movement had in it bad, and good, elements. But possibly the faults were magnified by reason of the excitement of the times, when, because of the faults, the whole Movement itself was condemned.

Both the men who were the pioneers of the Movement, and their work, have been shamefully reviled, abused, and misunderstood. They have been called "Papists," "Romanizers," "Traitors"; and every insult has been heaped upon their heads, and upon the heads of their followers; but surely there is much truth in what Dean Church tells us when writing in

* Preface to "The Book of Common Prayer."

his calm, unimpassioned way, he thus sums up the work and the workers:—"Anglicanism, in itself, was not Roman. It was not Roman in Dr. Pusey, though he was not afraid to acknowledge what was good in Rome. It was not Roman in Mr. Keble and his friends, in Dr. Moberly of Winchester. It was not Roman in Mr. Isaac Williams, Mr. Copeland, and Mr. Woodgate, each of them a centre of influence in Oxford and the country. It was not Roman in the devoted Charles Marriott. . . . These men were, in any fair judgment, as free from Romanism as any of their accusers."

And yet, notwithstanding all that has been written and spoken to the contrary, there are still some who believe, and others who wish it to be believed, that the Oxford Movement was simply a Romanising Movement and nothing else.

Such men forget, or do not choose to remember, the great gulf, as we have said, that separates "Romanism," and "Ritualism"

(things frequently as confounded as the words "Catholic," and "Roman Catholic")—between "Papalism," and primitive Church doctrine.

Many Roman Catholic doctrines taught to-day are wholly different from those taught in the infant Church of Rome. That *early* teaching was the same, broadly speaking at any rate, as may be found in the doctrines held by the Church of England to-day, and herein lies the whole difficulty to those who have never studied the subject at all. The Church of England teaches substantially the same doctrine as that taught by Pope Gregory the Great, and the Church in Rome of thirteen centuries ago. As it has been well expressed, "The Church of England has neither added to the Faith of Ancient Christendom, nor has she taken away from it, and therefore the National Church may be said to represent more truly the Church of St. Augustine even, than does the Roman Catholic Church to-day." *

---

* See Note A, Appendix.

CHAPTER IX.

As touching so-called "Secret" Societies.

WE hear much in these days about the "secrecy" with which the Oxford leaders are said to have gone about their work; but as a matter of fact the only "secrecy" about anything connected with that Movement itself was that which is natural to all shy, sensitive, and retiring natures. Those who have taken the trouble to read the foregoing pages will remember that the pioneers of the Movement expressly desired to have no form of "Society" or "Institution" whatever, nor did any of the leaders for a moment seek to gain

the applause of the multitude, or to do anything which by any twist of the imagination could be called "secret" in connection with their great work. Certainly advertisements, and "puffs," such as we are all familiar with to-day, had no existence then; there was no "booming" of new systems in the days when the Oxford Movement began. Had there been any such questionable aids, and methods, whereby their labours might possibly have been more widely known, depend upon it, John Keble and his little band would have been the last men in the world to permit of, or sanction their use. Because the founders of the Movement were not the kind of men to make a fuss over their work, because they possessed a far higher sense of their duty than most of us who do make a fuss about our work to-day, they are even yet stigmatised as conspirators, and branded as traitors, by those who do not know or remember of whom they speak.

As a matter of fact and of history the Tractarian leaders were entirely opposed to anything like "secrecy" at all. They were perfectly open and fearless in what they did and in what they wrote or said, and it is only misguided, ignorant, and intentionally wilful persons who think—or wish others to think—differently. It is impossible to read the lives of the Oxford reformers, and to have knowledge of some persons yet alive who were personally and intimately connected with them, to believe for an instant such men were capable of deceit or of entering into anything like underhanded proceedings with the intention of misleading others. It was indeed to the open fearlessness of these men, their utter disregard for public opinion, the knowledge that they were teachers of what they knew to be right, which gave such strength to the Movement itself, and provoked at the same time the hostility of their adversaries.

Another matter which can hardly be passed over in this connection at the present moment is the existence of, or alleged existence of, certain so-called "Secret" Societies said to be connected with the Church of England and with the Oxford Movement. As these form no part of our present enquiry, which is confined to ascertaining something of the true origin and growth of the Oxford Movement itself, we have nothing to say for or against the existence of such alleged societies, except this: that the two or three societies named appear to have come into existence long after the Oxford Movement was firmly planted, and never at any time of their existence—as far as the writer can ascertain—did these so-called "Secret" Societies exert much influence upon Church people. Whether such associations be "secret" or "open," they cannot, and ought not, to be put down as creations of John Keble and his co-workers, nor were these men responsible for any society, secret

or otherwise, professedly antagonistic to the principles and doctrines of the Church of England. In corroboration of this, the writer has taken pains to ascertain from one who was a close connection of John Keble, whether or not there is the slightest foundation for connecting the founders of the Oxford Movement with such societies, and he replies, "I do not think that the 'Secret' Societies, of which so much is written and talked about to-day, had come into existence at the time of my relative's death. I do not remember that I have ever met with any letter of his which alluded to anything of the kind." And this writer must have met with such letters had there been any in existence, for most of Mr. Keble's correspondence, if not indeed all, has passed through his hands.

One word in conclusion.

What, perhaps, is most needed in these busy,

bustling days in which we live, is more patience and more knowledge.

The first is a difficult virtue to practise at the best of times, as most of us will admit; it becomes next to impossible in times of unusual, but generally temporary, popular excitement. To those who have read this little work, the writer would humbly suggest the exercise of much patience and forbearance, before committing themselves to any particular policy or scheme, which may ultimately hinder the due progress of the Church, always remembering what important issues are at stake.

What are these important issues?

"What is at stake," said the Bishop of Derry, * "is nothing less than the destinies of the Church of England, of the greatest and most august witness in Christendom at once for the truth and the grandeur of the faith of Jesus, with her ancient and stately structure,

---

* The Bishop of Derry, Church Congress Sermon, 1898.

her frankness of recognition for all new truth that is truly ascertained, her works and labour and patience, her fidelity, her plasticity, her learned and time-tested championship of the faith. She holds, from her sons of other ages, a magnificent patrimony, around which, while we dispute, the wolves are howling; but there is a patrimony far more precious, which none can rend from her, the illustrious inheritance of great names, great examples, apologists, missionaries, martyrs, saints. And in her hand (may I not still say, also in her heart?) she holds what is of all manuals of devotion the most reasonable yet most fervid, the most Scriptural, the most pathetic and sublime—her Book of Common Prayer. Woe to us, if any failure of this generation, whether of exertion, or faith, or faithfulness, or prayer, should cause this stately and golden candlestick to be removed out of its place."

After all, what is it that loyal sons of the Church would wish to have? Do not the

words of the great orator, Edmund Burke, find an echo in many hearts:—

"I wish to see the Established Church of England great and powerful; I wish to see her foundations laid low and deep, that she may crush the giant powers of rebellious darkness; I would have her head raised up to that heaven to which she conducts us; I would have her open wide her hospitable gate by a noble and liberal comprehension, but I would have no breaches in her wall; I would have her cherish all those who are within, and pity all those who are without; I would have her a common blessing to the world, an example if not an instructor to those who have not the happiness to belong to her; I would have her give a lesson of peace to mankind, that a vexed and wandering generation might be taught to seek for repose and toleration in the maternal bosom of Christian charity, and not in the harlot lap of infidelity and indifference. Nothing has driven

people more into that house of seduction than the mutual hatred of Christian congregations." *

Next, every Churchman should remember that Clergy and Laity alike are trustees for this great National heritage, the Church, which is not ours to do with as the passing fancy of the hour may happen to suggest. The Church of England is a great, a sacred, and a solemn trust, and upon the shoulders of her members there lies a heavy responsibility. It is the duty of the strong to help the weak to have faith in the Church herself, and to see that no harm shall come to the Church, nor anything suffered to be done which may interfere with her great and growing influence for good.

Everyone should try to obtain an accurate knowledge of the birth and work and position of the Church of England, and the differences between "Romanism" and "Ritualism." † This

---

* Burke, "Works," Vol. VI., p. 112. (Rivingtons.)

† See Appendix, Notes C and D, "The Forged Decretals" and the "Continuity of the Church of England."

can be easily done now, for there are books in abundance which treat on the subject.

Finally, we must have courage—courage to defend the Church with our lives if necessary, courage to maintain, at all hazards, the Truth as it is in Christ Jesus. Then, in the noble words of the Archbishop of Armagh, we may exclaim, "I do not believe that the great English Church will go to pieces over ignominious squabbles, over curiously tesselated opinions, and patchwork and piebald rites. When I look round Christendom, England is about the only country where faith is not afraid to reason, and reason ashamed to adore."*

Thus possessed of more knowledge about the Church, exercising more forbearance and patience towards those who differ from us, and working shoulder to shoulder endowed with courage to do what is right, not counting the cost, we shall, as true sons and daughters of the great Catholic and Apostolic Church of

* Address to his Synod, Oct., 1898.

our Fathers, in defending her best interests, which are far dearer than life, learn to realise with John Keble the true value of his motto which never changes :—"In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength."

This brief and imperfect sketch, which the writer believes to be a true, unvarnished story of a great Religious Revival, may well close with Mr. Rudyard Kipling's magnificent "Recessional," which first appeared in the columns of *The Times*, during the sixtieth commemoration of the Queen's Accession, and has the true poetic ring about it which animated the writings of John Keble, the founder of the GREAT OXFORD MOVEMENT.

"God of our fathers, known of old—
Lord of our far-flung battle-line—
Beneath whose awful hand we hold
Dominion over palm and pine—
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

"The tumult and the shouting dies—
The captains and the kings depart—
Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice,
An humble and a contrite heart.
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget.

"Far-called our navies melt away—
On dune and headland sinks the fire—
Lo, all our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre!
Judge of the Nations, spare us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

"If, drunk with sight of power, we loose
Wild tongues that have not Thee in awe—
Such boasting as the Gentiles use,
Or lesser breeds without the Law—
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

" For heathen heart that puts her trust
In reeking tube and iron shard—
All valiant dust that builds on dust,
And guarding calls not Thee to guard—
For frantic boast and foolish word,
Thy mercy on Thy People, Lord ! "

APPENDIX.

As to the Numbers of Church People in England and Wales.

Note A.

IT is true that concerning the actual number of Church members we have no reliable statistics. Official returns, so far as they exist, tend to show that, at the present time, some 72 per cent. of the population are professed members of the Church of England.* That no reliable figures are forth-

	Churchmen.		Dissenters.	
*Various Returns	75	against	25	Out of every 100.
Burial ,, ...	70	,,	30	
School ,, ...	72	,,	28	
Army ,, ...	63	,,	37	
Navy ,, ...	75	,,	25	
Workhouse,, ...	79	,,	21	

Taken from the various Government Returns.

coming on the subject, however, must not be put down to the fault of Churchmen, for, as in former years, so again in 1891, Churchmen petitioned the Government of that day for a "Religious Column" in the Official Census papers, the only possible way of arriving at a satisfactory conclusion of the matter, only to find that once again, as on former occasions, the suggestion was hotly opposed by representative Nonconformists, who, no doubt, had good reasons for their action, and in deference to whose wishes the Government refused to grant the request.

Ancient and Modern Romanism.

Note B.

"The Church of Rome," writes the late Lord Selborne, "underwent important changes during the many centuries which elapsed between the mission of Augustine and the reign of King Henry VIII. The whole mediæval system grew up during that interval.

. . . If the authorised doctrine and practice of the Church of England at the present day should be compared with that of the Christian Church generally, including the Church of Rome in the days of Augustine, it would require a strong application of the theological microscope to discover any really substantial differences between them. Almost, if not absolutely, everything which the Church of England has since rejected as usurpation or corruption was then unknown."*

The Church of England, then, has neither added to the faith of Christendom, nor taken away from it; and, accordingly, while she is Catholic, she is not Roman Catholic, with mere local and modern variations for the worse from the old teaching of the Church Universal.

Further, the Church of Rome, by claiming, as for some centuries past, to be the whole Church; excommunicating and anathematising those who do not submit to that claim; denying

* "Defence of the Church," pp. 7, 8.

the orders and sacraments of other Churches, and re-baptizing their members; refusing them even the name of Church—as when styling the Eastern Church by the title of "the Photian Schism"—has not only departed from the Catholic spirit, but has minutely copied the precedent and followed the example of the Donatist sectaries of ancient times.

Contrariwise, the Church of England makes no such claim of monopoly, has no excommunications or anathemas for other Churches, acknowledges the validity of their orders and sacraments, and interposes no barrier to communion with them, thus keeping to the original Catholic method.*

As a fact, the old religion of Rome during its early life had no formal Invocation of Saints or Angels, no Purgatory, nor prayers to be delivered from thence. It possessed no image worship, no transubstantiation, no half-communion, it neither issued indulgences nor

* Dr. Littledale's "Words for Truth."

practised auricular confession. The doctrine of Purgatory was unknown previous to the seventh century. The worship of Images was unheard of before the eighth century. Transubstantiation was first decreed as a matter of Faith at the Lateran Council in 1215, and the denial of the cup to the Laity dates from 1415. The infallibility of the Pope was denied by Roman Catholics in England up to the year 1870.

The present Church of Rome, therefore, represents neither the old religion of the Scriptures, nor that of the primitive Church, nor that of the early Church of Rome itself.

Some things are omitted, others added, and more so much altered that the present Roman system is only old in name; it keeps the old name, whilst it rejects the old faith.

"They that have not Peter's faith," saith St. Ambrose, "cannot succeed to Peter's inheritance."*

* St. Ambrose, "De Poenitent," lib. i., cap. 6.

Note C.

THE "FORGED DECRETALS."

IT is a fact open to no contradiction that modern Roman Catholic assumptions and assertions of absolute ecclesiastical supremacy are largely built upon forged documents.

These modern Roman Catholic claims are mainly the outcome of a series of documents, utterly false and untrue, and which are known as the FORGED DECRETALS. A "Decretal"* is the name given to a letter from the Pope, in reply to questions put to him by his bishops. In the ninth century nearly a hundred such forged Papal letters appeared, the forger of which documents was known as "Isidore Mercator," but which were alleged to be the genuine productions of some thirty Popes who followed each other in the first three centuries. They were fathered upon Isidore, Bishop of Seville, a writer who lived

* The first genuine "Decretal" is believed to bear date February 11, A.D. 385, and is attributed to Pope Siricius.

in the seventh century. Their purpose was to exalt the power of Rome. They introduced novel maxims in regard to the authority and the power of the Popes. They asserted—for the first time in history—that the Pope had supreme authority over all bishops, and they claimed for the Pope the right to hear appeals from all parts of the world.

The great Father and writer, Augustin, Bishop of Hippo, and 216 bishops of Africa, as well as the Churches of Asia, did not acknowledge the authority or supremacy of the bishops of Rome. The first of the four General Councils, called by the Emperor Constantine at Nicæa, in 325, was presided over by Hosius, Bishop of Cordova. For six hundred years the bishops of Rome themselves were so far from knowing anything of such supremacy, in themselves or in any others, that Pope Gregory the First denounced John of Constantinople for his assumption, and wrote: "Quis-quis se universalem sacerdotem vocat, Anti-Christum

praecurrit"—"Whosoever calls himself universal priest is the forerunner of Antichrist."

The forged decretals, writes the Rev. Canon Charles Gore,* "represent a step of immense importance in the aggrandisement of the Papal claim. It is not that they contain a wholly new claim, but they converted what was a claim, a pretension, an aspiration, into an accepted principle, firmly rooted in the precedents of the whole Christian past reaching back to the Apostles. For what were these decretals? They were a forgery of the middle of the ninth century, and the first part consisted of a number of forged letters supposed to be by the early Popes from A.D. 90 to 314. These forged letters represented these bishops of Rome as claiming and exercising the rights of the mediæval Papacy. The fraud consisted in assigning the language of a later period to the writers of an earlier one." Thus, their recognition gave to the

* "Roman Catholic Claims," 3rd Edit., 1890, p. 121.

growing claims of Papacy an altogether fallacious appearance of antiquity. No sober historian can deny that this successfully inaugurated a wholly new epoch of canon law. It is impossible to exaggerate the extent to which they elaborated and strengthened the system of appeals to Rome, and developed the existing tendency to centralise the governmental authority of the Churches in the hands of the Pope.

"The reforms," says the Jesuit, Père Regnon, "brought about by the pseudo Isidore, consisted in reserving to the Roman Pontiff the trial and judgment of all bishops." Upon these "spurious decretals," writes Hallam, "was built the great fabric of Papal supremacy over the different national Churches, a fabric which has stood after its foundation crumbled beneath it, for no one has pretended to deny during the last two centuries that the imposture is too palpable for any but the most ignorant ages to credit" ("Middle

Ages," Vol. II., p. 236). "The letters from subsequent Bishops of Rome in this collection," writes the late learned Bishop Lightfoot,* "abound in anachronisms and blunders of such a kind that a less credulous age would have detected the imposture at once."

Now, although these decretal letters were known to be false, we have the remarkable fact that successive Popes most ardently defended them as if they were true. "Every one of these Papal epistles," writes Milman, † "was a canon of the Church. Every future 'bull,' therefore, rested on the same irrefragable authority, commanded the same implicit obedience."

The enormous influence of these forged documents may be gathered from the fact that in the twelfth century (A.D. 1151) Gratian made them the foundation for his *Decretum*—the standard law book of Rome in the Middle Ages. Upon these forged decretals, Lord

* See notes in "Leaders of the Northern Church."

† "Lat. Christ," Vol. II., 309.

Selborne declares, "the entire edifice of mediæval and modern Papal supremacy was built up," and he adds that they were the true source of all the subsequent encroachments of the spiritual on the civil power, and on the independent rights of national Churches.*

DATES OF ORIGIN OF SOME ROMAN CATHOLIC ERRORS.

	A.D.
Office in honour of the Virgin ...	about 9th or 10th century.
Transubstantiation and Auricular Confession	1215
Withholding the Cup from the Laity...	1415
Doctrine of Purgatory	1438
Creed of Pope Pius IV. (twelve new articles of faith introduced) ...	1564
Immaculate Conception	1856
Doctrine of Infallibility	1870

* See also "The Right of the Church of England to her Property," asserted by Roman Catholic Bishops (Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 6d.)

Note D.

AS TO THE CONTINUITY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

WE are constantly reminded of things having happened "*in Roman Catholic times.*" Occasionally one hears it said of a Cathedral, "It was built by the Roman Catholics." Of course what is meant is that it was built by English Churchmen in the days when the Pope had great influence in this island. As a matter of fact, there never were any Roman Catholics in England, except the modern ones. Certainly there never was before the Reformation any "Roman Catholic Church" in England. Though the bishops of Rome had great influence in England, and though things were done to a large extent in the same way as they are done now in Roman Catholic countries, yet ours was always the English Catholic, not "Roman" Catholic, Church; and the name by which it was

always known was "The Church of England," or "Anglican Church." The first words, *e.g.*, of King John's Magna Charta are these:— "Let the Church of England be free." An Act of Edward III. (1350) tells us that "The Holy Church of England" (*Seinte Eglise d'Engleterre*) was founded within the realm of England, by the King's ancestors and the earls, barons, and other nobles of the realm, to inform the people of the law of God." The Papal encroachments, which that statute was passed to restrain, were described as tending to the "annullation of the estate of the Holy Church of England." This was followed by what is known as the Statutes of Præmunire, which were aimed at the unauthorised and unconstitutional assumptions of the Church of Rome, the jurisdiction of which was always repudiated by the law of the land. There is nothing in all these early statutes to show that the Church of Rome, or, indeed, any other Church whatsoever, at any time

before the Reformation, was in possession of this country. As the late Lord Selborne says: "It was the Church, not of Rome, but of England (*Ecclesia Anglicana*), of which the 'rights and liberties' were declared inviolable by King John's Great Charter, confirmed by Henry III." [9 Hen. III., c. I.] Therefore we affirm with truth that the Church of pre-Reformation times was the same Church as she is in our own day, and that no new Church was set up in Reformation times.

In the year 1570, Pope Pius V. published a "Bull" of Excommunication, and Deposition, against Queen Elizabeth, whereby he exhorted his followers to withdraw from the Church of England. Then commenced the Roman schism in England. English Churchmen are not separatists and dissenters from the Church of Rome; but Romanists in England are separatists and dissenters from the Church of England.

The Church of England, we should never forget, is the oldest English institution.

The Church of England never at any time separated from the Church of Rome. Such an act has always been a pure impossibility, for the Church of England has never been either a part of the organization of the Church of Rome, or in formal subjection to Rome. The Bishop of Southwell has well said: "It is a delusion that the Church of England was ever Roman, or ever acknowledged as a Church any subjection to the Pope, or any other relation but that of an independent English Church. It is a delusion that the Church of England seceded or separated from Rome, as indeed she could not, if she was always independent of her." The Church of England did not separate from the Church of Rome at the Reformation, for the simple reason that the Church of England was separate from her from the beginning.*

* See "The Church and Her Story," published by Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 2s.

Mr. Gladstone's testimony on this point is worth remembering:—"I can find no trace of that opinion," writes the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, "which is now common in the mouths of unthinking persons, that the Roman Catholic Church was abolished in England at the period of the Reformation, and that a Protestant Church was put in its place: nor does there appear to have been so much as a doubt in the mind of any one of them (the Reformers) whether this Church, legally established in England after the Reformation, was the same institution with the Church legally established in England before the Reformation." *

Note E.

As touching Apostolical Succession in the Church of England.

According to a learned writer: — "The bishops who rule the churches of these realms were validly ordained by others, who by means of an unbroken spiritual descent

* "The State in its Relations to the Church," 1841.

of ordinations derived their mission from the Apostles, and from our Lord. This continual descent is evident to anyone who chooses to investigate it. Let him read the catalogues of our bishops, ascending up to the most remote period. Our ordinations descend in a direct unbroken line from Peter and Paul, the apostles of the Circumcision and the Gentiles. These great Apostles successively, ordained Linus, Cletus, and Clement, bishops of Rome; and the apostolical line of succession was regularly continued from them to Celestine. Gregory, and Vitalianus, who ordained Augustine and Theodore for the English Church. And from those times an uninterrupted series of valid ordinations have carried down the apostolical succession in our churches even to the present day. There is not a bishop, priest, or deacon amongst us, who cannot, if he pleases, trace his own spiritual descent from St. Peter and St. Paul." *

* Dr. A. J. Stephens on "The Book of Common Prayer," Notes on the Ordinal, p. 2067.

Note F.

PARLIAMENTARY GRANTS TO THE CHURCH.

PARLIAMENTARY grants have been made both for Church and Dissenting purposes. Those given by the Government to Dissenters will be found already detailed, as far as they are known, in "How Dissent is Established and Endowed,"* and have no place in this book; but so little is really known by the people concerning the grants voted by Parliament in aid of the Church of England, why such were made, and the gross amounts of such grants, that the following authentic particulars, taken from *Hansard*, may prove interesting and useful for reference.

On March 16th, 1818, the Chancellor of the Exchequer rose in his place in the House of Commons, and called attention to the fact that the population of London and its

---

*Simpkin, Marshall & Co. Price 1/-.

vicinity was then 1,129,451 souls, of whom the Churches and Episcopal Chapels could only contain 151,536, leaving an excess of 977,915 persons unprovided for. In the Diocese of York, it was stated that the population was 720,091, and there were 96 Churches accommodating 139,163 worshippers, leaving, therefore, a deficiency of 580,928.

In Chester Diocese, the population of which was at that time 1,286,702, there were 167 Churches, with accommodation for 228,696, leaving a deficiency of 1,040,006. In Winchester Diocese there were 37 Churches having accommodation for 59,503; the population was 325,209, leaving a deficiency of 265,706.

It was suggested that while Parliament should be asked to make a special grant towards the erection and in order to provide more Churches in the poor and populous districts in various parts of the country, no assistance should be given to parishes having a population of less than 10,000 souls. The

Chancellor concluded his speech by moving:—"That His Majesty be enabled to direct Exchequer Bills to an amount not exceeding one million, to be issued to Commissioners, to be by them advanced, under certain regulations and restrictions, towards building, and promoting the building of, additional Churches and Chapels in England."

The Resolution was agreed to.*

"On May 15th, 1818, in the House of Lords, the Earl of Liverpool moved the second reading of the New Churches Bill, which was carried. It was mentioned that new Churches would be provided for St. Marylebone, St. Pancras, for St. Leonard's, Shoreditch, for St. Matthew's, Bethnal Green, and Lambeth, also for Manchester, and other towns.

Liverpool was mentioned as then possessing a population of 100,000, having then fourteen Churches, and the speaker who moved the second reading stated his belief that, with the

* *Hansard.* "Parliamentary Debates," p. 1127.

aid of voluntary subscriptions, which the passing of the Bill into law would probably secure, some 150 or 200 new Churches might be reasonably expected to be built by reason of the passing of this Bill.

In the next year (1819) a Committee was appointed by the Government to enquire into the state of the country. This Committee reported, amongst other things, as follows:—

"Your Committee have not noticed any charge which may arise in respect of the Exchequer Bills for £1,100,000 (£100,000 it may be explained went to Scotland) appropriated or intended to be appropriated to the building of Churches, because no charge has yet been incurred on account of this grant, and it is at present uncertain when and to what amount any disbursement upon this account may occur."*

We have been unable to trace any further allusion to this grant in *Hansard*,

* *Hansard*, Vol. XL., Appendix, p. 26.

and it is generally accepted that in fact this grant of a million was actually met by the receipt by this country of that sum, or more, from Russia, on account of a War loan, or other indemnity.

After the Treaty of Campo Formio was concluded, it would appear that the Parliament of Great Britain guaranteed (in 1795 and 1797) a sum amounting to six millions to the Emperor of Austria, to assist in "driving the French out of the Netherlands." "But, I believe," said Lord Holland in the House of Lords,* "that between what was paid and what was lost, the bargain cost this country seventeen and a half millions."

In respect to the loan made by the British Government to Austria, neither interest nor principal appear to have been received at any time; but on February 28th, 1824, the House of Commons agreed to accept £2,500,000

* Speech in the House of Lords, May 11th, 1824.

from Austria in settlement of the debt.* Of this two and a half millions so unexpectedly recovered, it was suggested that a fifth portion should be expended in helping to build Churches in poor and populous districts.

On April 9th, 1824, the Chancellor of the Exchequer moved that £500,000† Exchequer Bills should be devoted to the building of new Churches, remarking that the million already granted had done incalculable good; it had sufficed to build 98 Churches and to provide accommodation for 153,000 persons; and from this example set by Parliament, already more than £200,000 had been subscribed (by Churchmen) for building places of worship, and more might be expected.‡

This was agreed to by the House, but it does not appear that the whole of this sum

---

* *Hansard*, Vol. X., p. 438.

† *Hansard*, Vol. XI., p. 329.

‡ See "The Church and Her Story," p. 174. Simpkin, Marshall & Co., price 2/-.

was received by the Church for the purpose intended.*

On March 11th, 1825, it was proposed in the House of Commons "That out of this £2,500,000 to be received from Austria £500,000 should be devoted to building new Churches; that a portion should be expended in the creation of a Picture Gallery, and that another portion should be expended upon the restoration of Windsor Castle.†

The resolution was carried.

So it would appear that but for this unexpected windfall the Church might, and

---

* *Hansard*, Vol. X., p. 884.

† This grant of half a million, together with one million voted by Parliament in 1818, with interest and allowances, made a total of £1,875,917. These sums, with the £100,000 a year for eleven years, made by Government to Queen Anne's Bounty, represent all the money given by Parliament to the Church of England. The total of all the Government grants to the Church of England, including interest for moneys not paid when voted, and allowances, &c., amounts to, it is believed, £3,026,000, against which we must put the Church property confiscated by Henry VIII. at the time of the Reformation, representing perhaps about a million and a half or more, per annum, of money at its present value.

probably would, not have received the £500,000 then agreed to be handed over for the purpose of aiding the erection of Church buildings. Nor does it appear that these grants of one million and a half came out of the pockets of taxpayers at all (unless, indeed, it be urged that the amount *might* have gone in mitigation of taxation), being, as we have seen, provided for in a special way.

Between 1809 and 1820 further grants of £100,000 per annum were made, for the augmentation of poor livings, through the agency of Queen Anne's Bounty. No grants have been made by the State in aid of Church building since 1825.*

* Dr. Rigg, a leading Wesleyan Minister, writes in "The International Review," in 1877—"The Church of England is, indeed, established and endowed, but it does not derive a farthing of revenue from public taxation. The tithe in no strict sense can be regarded as a tax. It is property, ecclesiastical property, but not a public tax or rate. If the tithe charges were to be remitted, rent would be increased by the amount of the remission. The right and title of the Church is, in almost every case, far more ancient than that of the lay proprietor, whatever be the antiquity of his inheritance."

Of course, it must be quite understood that the Church of England receives no grants from the State, now; that the Church is not endowed by the State, nor was it so endowed at any time of its existence; nor do any of the parochial Clergy receive their stipends out of any but purely Church funds. Nor, of course, do the Archbishops or the Bishops receive a farthing out of the National Exchequer, but derive their incomes from Church property, and Church property alone. The writer desires to emphasise this point, because it is, or used to be, one of the commonest forms of mistake which he has met with amongst the audiences at various places, when giving lectures on English Church History, and it is a mistake, which is, or was, confined to no class of society, high or low, rich or poor. A well-remembered incident will help to make this plain. A learned professor of Oxford, whose writings on Church History are well known, was

married to a lady who moved in fashionable society. At a dinner party in the West End, one night, this lady happened to sit next to a parish clergyman, who told her, amongst other things, that in his parish there lived a man who would not believe that he, the parson, was paid other than by the Government, and, of course, out of the taxes. "Dear me," remarked the lady—the wife of the Church historian be it remembered—"how very silly he must be; now had he said the *Bishops*, he might not have been far out!"

A Nonconformist (Wesleyan) Review* puts the case of Church Endowments very clearly:—"The original endowments of the Church of England, indeed, whether in lands or in tithes, were as really voluntary gifts and offerings as those donations of land, and those yearly offerings, in kind, which are made by recently converted tribes at the present day in

* "London Quarterly Review," January, 1877.

Polynesia, in Africa, or elsewhere, to their missionary preachers or pastors, or to the Churches which have ordained and sent forth those preachers and pastors." In a recent report of the London School Board on Educational Endowments there occurs a passage which we are tempted to quote in this connection :—" Your Committee," says the report, " recognise that there is a limited analogy between the operations of endowment and the operations of voluntary agency. Endowment is a voluntary agency of the past or of the present, extending to the future." *The endowments of the Church of England unquestionably represent, with few exceptions, the voluntary contributions of the past.* In this respect they differ essentially from Church revenues derived from public taxation.

Bemrose & Sons, Limited, Printers, London and Derby.