

I

From the Beginning of the Movement to the Publication of Tract 90 (Exclusive).

With the view of helping to keep alive the memory of an important crisis in the ecclesiastical annals of this country the contemporary witnesses to which will soon have passed away, I propose, not to write a history, but to set down certain notes of memoranda of the great religious movement which took its rise in the University of Oxford about thirty years ago. My record shall be founded upon reminiscences of my own, aided by those of others, and by published writings of the period. Though my own connection with the movement was far less intimate than that of many who are still living, and though my own name will never pass with theirs to future generations as that of one of its leaders or of its luminaries; yet for these very reasons I am, in one point of view perhaps, and in one only, better qualified to bear testimony to it than those who took a more active and prominent part in it, inasmuch as my position in reference to it was more external; as I am not embarrassed by the restraints which personal reserve or the obligations of mutual confidence might impose upon them: and as the public may reasonably consider such a witness to make up in independence what he wants in higher claims upon its regard.

It is no small evidence in its favour of the great religious movement in question that we should find so much difficulty in assigning to it a name which is not either unjust towards its real character or inadequate to its extent and importance. We have no such difficulty about the nomenclature of a heresy or a party agitation: we call the one by the name of the heresiarch, the other by that of the demagogue or popular idol; and such terms, with due allowance for the imperfection of all general appellatives, are sufficient to cover the ground of the idea they represent without going beyond it. But who shall include within the limits of a brief definition, still less express by the force of a simple term, a religious manifestation which was the result of a simultaneous yet mutually independent stirring of hearts in various places about

the same time, rather than of any premeditated design and concerted action; whose elements of vitality seemed to float in the air rather than to be confined within the range of a single spot; which its enemies delighted to characterise as an “epidemic” —a phrase which its friends were not unwilling to accept, in so far as it implied that their work was not so much propagated by contact as due to unseen agencies which human analysis was unable to investigate, and subject to laws which human power was too weak to oppose? Shall we call it by a name which degrades it to the level of a sect, and identifies it in some exclusive or especial way with an amiable and esteemed divine who, after all, was neither its author nor the most prominent of its leaders? No; for that were to commit an historical error, as well as a controversial discourtesy. Or shall we call it by the name of the university which, if not its home, was at least its head-quarters? That were indeed far truer to facts and free from the vice of personality. Yet, should we call it the Oxford Revival, what would Cambridge say which had its share in the work, or London which helped it on, or Oscott¹ which smiled upon it? Nay, what would Oxford herself say—that famous university, which, so far from claiming its authors as her own, regarded them as a knot of pestilential agitators; scowled upon them, denounced them, degraded them, and at length drove them from her bosom! Or, lastly, shall we call it the Catholic movement of the Anglican Establishment? But that were to encumber our definition itself with a new controversy, or at least to involve it in a *petitio principii*. On the whole, I am disposed to rest in the modest term Tractarian; not as being free from material objections, but as being, at any rate, unpretending, uninvincible, and sufficient for the purpose. For the *Tracts for the Times* certainly contained, one with another, the principles of which the movement, in its ultimate state, was the legitimate development, although some of those who were their authors withdrew from it as it advanced, and even ranged themselves on the side of its enemies.

The theory of party combination by which the opponents of the Tractarian school always endeavoured to weaken its importance was, from the first, strenuously resisted by its friends, as will be evident to anyone who reads, ever cursorily, the publications to which it gave rise. That theory was, in fact, the world’s usual apology for its own ignorance—an attempt to explain facts which were strange to it upon principles with which it is conversant. But a sufficient answer to the charge of astute complicity is to be found not merely in the singlemindedness of the principal movers, but in the remarkable differences of character and personal antecedents which distinguished them one from another; differences which they sought neither to conceal by diplomacy, nor to reconcile by compromise. Mr. Newman was unlike both Dr. Pusey and Mr. Keble, who were, in their turn, unlike one another; and Mr. Froude, whom Dr. Newman somewhere calls the real author of the movement, had nothing originally in common either with him or with Dr. Pusey, except the great

abilities which he shared with the former, and the loyalty to the Anglican communion which was common to all.

Between Mr. Newman and Mr. Keble there had once existed a state of feeling which was far from being of religious sympathy; and Mr. Froude speaks of it as a bright feature in his life that he had been instrumental in bringing these two remarkable men together. The two of these leaders who most resembled one another in personal characteristics were Mr. Keble and Mr. Froude. Both of them sons of High Church clergymen, and, so far, differing at once from Mr. Newman and Dr. Pusey, they had imbibed from their earliest years an affectionate attachment to their Church's system, which became a powerful bond of union when they were brought together as members of the same college at Oxford, although their respective educations had been different, and Mr. Keble was considerably Mr. Froude's senior. The only one of these remarkable men who has passed into the region of history is he who, though the youngest of the whole number in years, deserves to be commemorated as the first who took a comprehensive view of the character and bearings of the movement. Mr. Froude was a college contemporary of my own, and I enjoyed at one time the privilege of constant intercourse and familiar acquaintance with him. Those who have formed their impression of him from his published *Remains* will scarcely, perhaps, be prepared to hear how little there appeared in his external deportment, while he was at Oxford, of that remarkable austerity of life which he is now known to have habitually practised even then. To a form of singular elegance, and a countenance of that peculiar and highest kind of beauty which flows from purity of heart and mind, he added manners the most refined and engaging. That air of sunny cheerfulness which is best expressed by the French word *riant* never forsook him at the time when I knew him best, and diffused itself, as is its wont, over every circle in which he moved. I have seen him in spheres so different as the commonrooms of Oxford and the after-dinner company of the high aristocratic society of the West of England; and I well remember how he mingled even with the last in a way so easy yet so dignified as at once to conciliate its sympathies and direct its tone. He was one of those who seemed to have extracted real good out of an English public-school education, while uninfected by its manifold vices. Popular among his companions from his skill in all athletic exercises, as well as for his humility, forbearance, and indomitable good temper, he had the rare gift of changing the course of dangerous conversation without uncouth abruptness or unbecoming dictation, and almost seemed, as is recorded of St. Bernardine of Sienna, to check by his mere presence the profane gibe or unseemly *équivoque*. To his great intellectual powers his published *Remains* bear abundant witness; nor do we, in fact, need any other proof of them than the deference yielded to his opinions by such men as those who have acknowledged him for their example and their guide. Let it not be

supposed that this high panegyric is prompted by the partiality of friendship. Although I enjoyed constant opportunities of intercourse with Mr. Froude, and made his character a study, yet I have no claim whatever to be considered as his intimate friend. We were not, indeed, at that time in anything like complete religious accord; and I remember his once saying to me, in words which subsequent events make me regard as prophetic, "My dear O., I believe you will come right some day, but you are a long time about it." Poor Hurrell Froude! may it be allowed to one who was your competitor in more than one academical contest, and your inferior in everything save in his happy possession of those religious privileges which you were cut off too early to allow of your attaining, to pay you, after many years, this feeble tribute of gratitude and admiration! Never again will Anglicanism produce such a disciple; never, till she is Catholic, will Oxford boast of such a son:—

Ostendent terris hunc tantum fata, neque ultra
Esse sinent. Nimium vobis Romana propago
Visa potens. Superi, propria hæc si dona fuissent. . . .
Nee puer Iliaca quisquam de gente Latinos
In tantum spe tollet avos; nec Romula quondam
Ullo se tantum tellus jactabit alumno.

As I have begun this quotation, I may as well go on with it:—

Heu pietas! heu prisea fides! invietaque bello
Dextera! non illi quisquam se impune tulisset
Obvius armato. . . .
. . . . Manibus date lilia plenis;
Purpureos spargam flores, animamque [sodalis]
His saltem accumulem donis, et fungar inani
Munere.²

To adjust such a character with Catholic facts and Catholic principles is no part of my present object. The reader who takes an interest in this question will find it discussed in Dr. Newman's *Lectures on Anglican Difficulties*.³ For me it will be sufficient to take leave of this gifted person in the well-known words, "*Cuni talis sis, utinam noster esses!*"⁴

The characteristic differences which undoubtedly existed among the chief members of the Tractarian School, although they had no effect—at least for a long time—in marring that front of external unity which the movement itself presented to the public, were not unknown to those who were near the scene of action, and did

not wholly escape the notice of keen observers, even at a distance. It soon came to be felt that both Mr. Newman and Mr. Keble, but especially the former, were considerably in advance of Dr. Pusey in their opinions, as well as materially different from him in *ethos*; and that the principal ground of these differences related, more or less directly, to the proper mode of conducting the controversy with Rome. It was not that Mr. Newman had spoken less strongly than Dr. Pusey upon the alleged corruptions of the Church; for, in fact, he had spoken even more strongly against those supposed corruptions. Still, notwithstanding some painful passages in one of his works, there was throughout Mr. Newman's writings an undercurrent of sympathy with many parts of the Catholic system, which led to the apprehension that these apparent antipathies were *in* him rather than *of* him—views incidental to his position, which, as a humble disciple of Anglicanism, he felt himself bound to adopt in uninquiring faith, rather than those at which he might have arrived had he allowed himself to be tempted into trains of less guarded speculation. No careful student of the works of the two men could doubt that the bias of Dr. Pusey's mind and that of Mr. Newman's were in divergent if not even opposite directions. But a tangible point of difference between them soon appeared in scarcely disguised form before the observant public. This difference, though it might be represented as relating merely to a point of history, touched, as a matter of fact, very closely upon the essential character of the controversy. It concerned the peculiar opinions and objects of the Anglican Reformers, and therein, by consequence, the theological aspect of the Anglican Reformation. Dr. Pusey had publicly come forward in defence of the orthodoxy of Ridley and Jewell.

The estimate taken, on the contrary, of these men and of their work by Mr. Froude, Mr. Keble, and Mr. Newman, became sufficiently manifest on the publication of Mr. Froude's *Remains*, with the remarks prefixed to them by the friends just mentioned. Mr. Froude had described the English Reformers in general as a "set with whom he wished to have less and less to do." He declared his opinion that Bishop Jewell was no better than an "irreverent dissenter," and expressed himself as sceptical whether Latimer (of whom, as a "martyr," he did not speak disrespectfully) were not "something in the Bute line."⁵ Dr. Pusey was too humble and forbearing to enter any kind of public protest against statements and views so different from his own. But he was generally believed not to go along with the tenour of these expressions, nor to approve any otherwise than by passive acquiescence of the publication of those parts of the work in which they were contained.

Such personal differences as existed among the foremost of the Tractarian writers were anything rather than unfavourable to the progress of the movement. In the eyes of friendly critics they furnished an attestation of its sincerity, but they likewise tended to disarm opposition where they did not altogether succeed in

conciliating attachment. They formed links of connection between the several authors and various classes of men throughout the university and the country. Those who did not like one of these authors could fall back upon another. With able and thoughtful persons, of whatever party, Mr. Newman's name was a sufficient guarantee for the intellectual depth of the opinions; sober and quiet-going churchmen, who did not altogether relish Mr. Newman's and Dr. Pusey's religious antecedents, were diverted from their opposition by the well-known and consistent orthodoxy of Mr. Keble. Even the Evangelicals (at least the more religious portion of them), who detested this new manifestation of a theology so essentially opposed to their own, were almost won to forbearance, if not to some kind of sympathy, by the fervid piety of Dr. Pusey; while Mr. Froude's frankness and attractive personal qualities gained from the rising generation of Oxford a favourable hearing for the (to them) original views which he so ably and dashingy inculcated.

I am here, throughout, considering the movement in its earlier stages. The minds which it drew towards itself at a later period had been formed on a type very different from that of those with which we have been hitherto engaged; and the argument for its depth and reality was thus proportionately strengthened. A more motley group of adherents than it exhibited some years later it is difficult for imagination even to conceive. But it is fair to add that these adhesions were followed by the defection of many among its earliest supporters, and, as time went on, had the effect of completely splitting it in two.

So much, then, for the evidence of depth and solidity which the Tractarian movement derives from its having commended itself to more than one character of mind. I will now say a few words upon a point which is constantly insisted on by its great writers throughout their published works—I mean the fact that it was not new, but had been, in a measure, anticipated by men who had preceded it, and foreshown by many significant prognostics. One quotation to this effect may suffice, and it shall be taken from Mr. Newman's *Letter to Dr. Jelf* in vindication of the 90th Tract:—

“I have always contended,” he says, “and will contend, that it (the religious revival) is not satisfactorily accounted for by any particular movements of individuals on a particular spot. The poets and philosophers of the age have borne witness to it many years. Those great names in our literature, Sir Walter Scott, Mr. Wordsworth, Mr. Coleridge, though in different ways, and with essential differences one from another, and perhaps from any Church system, still all bear witness to it. The system of Mr. Irving is another witness to it. The age is moving towards something, and, most unhappily, the one religious communion

which has of late years been practically in possession of this something is the Church of Rome.”⁶

I pass over the latter words of this quotation, which constitute one of those tokens, to which I have already adverted, of the illustrious author’s irrepressible sympathies with the Catholic Church. For I am here speaking of its general subject. I do not know that I altogether agree with the illustrious writer as to the individuals whom he has selected for the exemplification of his remarks; but this very probably arises from my own imperfect acquaintance with their writings. At any rate, with the large qualification by which he guards his statement, I should be disposed to add some other names to those which he has specified. In the wide sense of desiring to rise about the thoroughly worldly character of the poetry, philosophy, and divinity of the last century, I should be inclined to record the name of Cowper among poets, of Johnson among men of literature, and, in an eminent degree, to couple William Wilberforce with those religious laymen who, with whatever excusable deficiencies of doctrine, were almost the first, as a class, to treat sin and grace, and heaven and hell, as practical and urgent realities.

But to come now to more proximate causes of the Tractarian movement. I am disposed to give a very prominent place among these causes to the teaching of Dr. Charles Lloyd, Regius Professor of Divinity, and afterwards Bishop of Oxford, who died in 1829, about four years before the publication of the *Tracts for the Times*. Bishop Lloyd was, I believe, the first to introduce the admirable practice, since adopted by all his successors in the Divinity chair at Oxford, of giving private instruction to candidates for the Anglican ministry, as well as the public lectures which have always been customary. The class of pupils whom Dr. Lloyd assembled between the years 1826 and 1828 comprehended all the forementioned leading members of the great Tractarian movement, with the exception of Mr. Keble, who had then left the University.⁷ I was myself one of that class, though somewhat junior in standing to Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman; and this, therefore, is one of the subjects of these essays in which my testimony is drawn from personal experience. Among other matters which Dr. Lloyd read and discussed with his class was the history of the Council of Trent and that of the Anglican Prayer-book. There were, of course, two ways of treating both of these subjects; but Dr. Lloyd chose the more correct and Catholic one. And I have no doubt whatever that his teaching had a most important influence upon the movement, and—a point to which I wish to draw particular attention—upon that movement in its ultimate and, as I may call it, Roman stage. Upon the subjects of Church Authority, Episcopacy, the Apostolical Succession, and others, with which the earlier Tracts were almost exclusively occupied, I do not remember to have derived any very definite ideas from Dr. Lloyd’s teaching; but I do remember to have received from him an entirely new notion of Catholics and of

Catholic doctrine. The fact was that Dr. Lloyd, besides being a man of independent thought considerably in advance of the High Churchmen of his time, had enjoyed in his youth many opportunities of intercourse with the French emigrant clergy, to whom he was indebted, as he told us, for truer views of the Catholic religion than were generally current in this country. But his contributions to our future conclusion did not end here. In his lectures on the Anglican Prayer-book he made us first acquainted with the Missal and Breviary as the sources from which all that is best and noblest in that compilation is derived; and I have at this time, or lately had, an interleaved Book of Common Prayer with the references to the original sources side by side with the translated passages. It may be easily imagined what an outcry these lectures would have created a few years later; but in the peace and security which then reigned controversy was never thought of on any side, and a favourable opportunity was thus given for casting on the wide waters that bread which was to reappear after many days.

Dr. Lloyd's own course was soon run, and came to an abrupt and somewhat melancholy end. Upon the adoption of the great measure of Catholic Emancipation by the Government of the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel in 1829, Dr. Lloyd, who owed his bishopric to the friendly intervention of the latter statesman (who had been his pupil), was found in the ranks of its episcopal supporters. Those who, like ourselves, knew the bias of his mind, could understand how this fact was sufficiently explained by his general spirit of fairness and forbearance towards Catholics; but the world at large, who had known him only as a High Churchman of Tory principles, attributed his change of opinion to the most unworthy motives; and, being a man of strong feelings, he was unable to bear up against the imputation. Knowing that his vote with ministers would require an apology, he supported it by an eloquent speech, which, in the then prejudiced state of the public mind, only made matters worse. I had the privilege of hearing that speech; it was, in the main, a vindication of Catholic doctrines against Protestant misrepresentation. It led to a bitter altercation with Lord Chancellor Eldon. The Bishop charged the Chancellor with being a mere tyro in logic, and the Chancellor replied, not unnaturally, that such language was fitter for the class-room at Oxford than for their Lordship's House. Dr. Lloyd, who was always very kind to me, sent for me the next morning to his lodgings, and I found him literally flushed with his oratorical triumph. In fact, he plainly manifested the symptoms of an incipient fever, which in six weeks resulted in his death. The sad interval was full of events calculated to aggravate the malady. The week after his parliamentary display he appeared at the *levée*, where the King (George IV), who regarded the support of Catholic Emancipation as a personal insult, treated him with pointed rudeness. What he regarded as a far greater mortification than the rebuff he had experienced from a capricious monarch, was that at his

visitation, which followed soon after, the great body of his own clergy refused his invitation to dinner. Vexed and bitterly disappointed, he took to his bed, and a few days later expired—an impressive example of the worthlessness of human success, but a victim, as we may hope, of his zeal in the cause of charity and justice.

Among the facts which heralded in the Tractarian movement, and helped, as I must think, towards its real success, was the publication of Mr. Keble's *Christian Year*, and its almost unexampled popularity. I am afraid to say how many large editions this work went through in a comparatively short time.⁸ It was in everyone's hands—admired by literary men for its poetical beauty, and loved by religious minds for its calm and deep spirit of devotion. Appearing at a time when controversy was not suspected, it was the occasion of circulating—and that, too, in the form of all others the most attractive and the most valuable—sentiments which, if every they had a place in the High Church schools of divinity, had, at all events, been long in abeyance. Not only was it free, to an extent at that time remarkable, from anti-Catholic phraseology, but it dared to plead, in terms than which even a Catholic could use no stronger, for the love of which our Blessed Lady should be the object.⁹ The natural and affectionate use of the Holy Name, with the pervading tone of tender love towards our Divine Lord, was another of its characteristics, which, strange to say, placed it in contrast to the High Church publications of the time, and won for it an access to many an Evangelical hearth from which the well-known religious opinions of its author might otherwise have banished it. The work was thus, in all probability, the means of insinuating principles and infusing a spirit which prepared the way for a more favourable reception of the Tractarian theology than that theology might have received if not pre-announced by so popular a forerunner.

I cannot help thinking, although I am not sure if the opinion be shared by others, that the great religious movement in question was favoured to a considerable extent by the peculiar character of the education, both philosophical and classical, by which the Oxford of those days was distinguished. The basis of the former was the great moral treatise of Aristotle, the *Ethics*, which contains, as I need not say, the skeleton of our own system of Moral Theology. The Aristotelian ethics, with the Christian philosophy of Bishop Butler¹⁰ as their commentary and supplement, entered into the academical education of all the more cultivated minds of Oxford, and contributed, in a pre-eminent degree, to form their character and regulate their tone. In the absence of anything like a powerful and consistent teaching on the part of the Established Church, this positive philosophy was a real boon. Those, of course, who had no higher object in their academical life than to gain the honours of the Schools, studied it, like everything else, with an eye merely to that secondary end. But more thoughtful minds found in it a deeper meaning and a more practical use. No one can read Mr. Froude's *Remains*, for instance, without seeing that with him, and with

those with whom he corresponded, the ethical system of Oxford had exercised no small influence in the formation of mental habits. Those who, like myself, were personally acquainted with Mr. Froude, will remember how constantly he used to appeal to this great moral teacher of antiquity ("Old 'Stotle," as he used playfully to call him), against the shallow principles of the day.¹¹ There is a sense, I am convinced, in which the literature of heathenism is often more religious than that of Protestantism. Thus, then, it was that the philosophical studies of Oxford tended to form certain great minds on a semi-Catholic type.

I wish I had more space to do more than indicate a similar impression with regard to the (then) classical education of Oxford, which made critical scholarship less an end in itself, than the means towards a certain habit of mind. It was an education which fed the chivalrous and romantic spirit of youth, and which formed those capacities for the perception of the beautiful, of which the Catholic religion is the sole adequate correlative. Hence those accomplished scholars of the olden time, who have not become Catholics, such as Mr. Keble and Mr. Isaac Williams, have been apt to invest their own religion with an ideal beauty, which has been to them, unhappily, a kind of substitute for the reality. Meanwhile, where is it but in the Catholic Church, her storied annals, her world-wide exploits, her awful sanctity, her varied devotions, her versatile institutions, her graceful and loving ceremonial, that romance finds its noblest field of investigation, and the love of the beautiful its most congenial sphere of exercise? The natural reverence of Æschylus, the all but inspired flights of Pindar, the philosophical vein of the reflective Sophocles, the fascinating elegance of Virgil, and even the pathetic moralism of the voluptuous Horace,—where do they find the light which illustrates their instinctive guesses, the substance which corresponds with their dim foreshadowings, the agent which precipitates their dross and brings out their gold? In the theory, the history, and the actual manifestations of Holy Church.¹²

It was about the year 1833 that the Tractarian movement actually took its rise, in the publication of the first of the *Tracts for the Times*. The more immediate occasion of this attempt to reanimate the Established Church with the spirit of ancient times is said by Mr. William Palmer, of Worcester College, in his *Narrative of Events connected with the Publication of the Tracts*,¹³ to have been the exhibition on the part of the Government of an increasing desire to subject the National Church to the influence of the State; and the destruction of the ancient landmarks which had separated the Establishment, on the one hand from the Roman Catholics, and on the other from the Dissenters, by the then recent repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, the emancipation of Catholics from civil disabilities, and other measures of a similar character. Those who desire to acquaint themselves with the circumstances under which the Tracts arose, and the differences of opinion which were the cause of division among their authors almost from the first, and ultimately of a complete

separation of the more backward from the more advanced disciples of the school, will do well to consult Mr. Palmer's *Narrative*, which will be found to bear out some of the remarks contained in the present essay.

The objects with which the Tracts were originally started will sufficiently account for the tenour of those which came earliest in the series. The earlier numbers will be found to turn principally upon the points in which the Established Church is supposed to mediate between the two extremes of "Romanism" and Latitudinarianism, as well as upon the claims of that body to a share in those hereditary privileges of an Apostolic society which Catholics consider to have been fatally impaired by the great schism of the sixteenth century. This portion of the subject has so little interest for Catholics, whom I am here principally addressing, that I gladly follow the dictate of my own inclination by passing it over. In truth it is a phase of the movement which never presented any features of attraction either to my own mind or to that of others whom the movement eventually absorbed into itself. I can confidently assert that the hardest trial to which my faith was ever exposed was that of being asked to see in the Anglican bishops the successors of the Apostles. I have a sincere respect for several of the present members of the Episcopal Bench, and for more than one of them a great personal regard and affection;¹⁴ but to look upon them, in their collective character, as the lineal descendants of St. Peter and St. Paul was another matter altogether. It was not the seat in the Lords, for that might be an accident; nor the *congé d'élire*,¹⁵ for that might be an usurpation. Neither was it altogether the handsome equipage and the numerous retinue, the palace with its imposing exterior, or the castle with its princely domain, for these might, without much difficulty, be located in the Catholic system: they had their counterparts in Catholic countries, and some of them were even the heritage of Catholic times. But it was those characteristics of the institution which appeal rather to the imagination than to the reason which made havoc of the theory, and seemed to indicate some fatal flaw in the Apostolic pedigree, and some bar of illegitimacy athwart the royal escutcheon. Nor did it appear any injustice to the dignitaries in question to hesitate in attributing to them prerogatives which, for a long time at least, they appeared to be themselves as anxious to disclaim as others to force upon them.

Had the influence of the Tractarian movement been continued within the range of mere literature, it might have been very many years in spreading itself; and, in all probability, would never have succeeded in gaining that hold on the public mind which, as a fact, it asserted with almost miraculous rapidity. Literature proper has but a slender influence on human action unless it be powerfully aided by collateral supports or by the predisposition of the public. Neither of these auxiliaries was actually wanting in the case of the Tracts. They evidently responded to some craving which was not felt to exist till its satisfaction was supplied. But the teaching of the Tracts also required for its due effect some vast machinery of oral instruction to

explain, to amplify, and to qualify it. For it consisted, as truly understood, not in certain doctrines only, but in a great ethical system, by which the whole character was to be leavened, and not merely the reason convinced. The place in which the movement arose was, of all others, the most favourable for this purpose. The University of Oxford is both a centre which draws to itself all that is powerful in this country, and a source from which those elements return to their several spheres of influence with an immense accession of strength, whether for good or for evil. Moreover, Oxford possesses, so far as a Protestant University can possess it, a most valuable apparatus of oral teaching. Its lecture-rooms in the several colleges furnish, to those who preside in them, abundant means of moulding the ductile mind of youth in one or another form; while its pulpits, parochial as well as academical, where filled by able and earnest preachers, may easily be made, as they have been made, materially instrumental to the same end. The former of these means of influence—the lecture-room—was all but completely barred, by the exercise of authority, against the approaches of Tractarianism. Tutors of colleges who were known to share the new opinions, were speedily disposed of by some one among those hundred methods of regulating his society according to his own views which the head of a college possesses; while younger men who might be aspirants after the same position were still more easily prevented from ever arriving at it.¹⁶ Many methods would occur to the anti-Tractarian president or principal for the attainment of his object. He might crush the spirit of the unhappy juvenile by snubbing him at “collections,” by quarreling with his exercises, by cold looks and cutting words at other times; and, as a last resource, by sending him upon some plea of health or college necessity into the country. These methods of petty persecution, which were extensively resorted to in the hope of checking the progress of Tractarianism among the junior members of the University, have been so admirably described by Dr. Newman in his inimitable tale of *Loss and Gain*, that no more need be said of them in this place. Even the higher tribunals of the University were sometimes perverted to the same party uses. Thus the School of Divinity was turned into a court of inquiry; and on a celebrated occasion the Regius Professor of that faculty endeavoured to convert a zealous admirer of Tractarian principles by refusing him his degree, unless he would consent to accept a thesis so worded by the Professor as to admit but on one mode of treatment, and to treat it according to the views of doctrine which he (the Professor) espoused.¹⁷

But the other instrument of moral power to which allusion has been made—the pulpit—was not quite so manageable a weapon. The University pulpit, indeed, had a two-sided effect upon the movement; for the conditions of that institution entail a constant variety of preachers; and, as the Tractarians were of course in the minority, their sermons bore a very small proportion to those of their opponents. And almost every hot-headed orator who came from the country to preach before the University

in his turn, came with a determination to crush the iniquitous system by some palmary argument. But all this while a course of pulpit-teaching was going on in the same church, which, unlike that we have just spoken of, was continuous and uniform. No sooner had St. Mary's been cleared of its dignified audience, than a new congregation was gathered together within its walls, ostensibly consisting of parishioners, but really comprehending a large number of the members, especially the junior members, of the University. This service, like its companion in the forenoon, was conducted entirely by Mr. Newman, who had succeeded, in his turn, as Fellow of Oriel, to the incumbency of the parish. Mr. Newman was, in fact, everything in this office—alike without rival and without coadjutor; he was reader, preacher, and celebrant; nay, music and ceremonial also; for, if these various departments were ever actually filled by others, they have faded from the memory, which has settled down on him alone. It was from that pulpit that Sunday after Sunday were delivered those marvelous discourses which have been since collected into several volumes, and of which, it may be said that there is hardly a sentence which does not form a study for the philosopher. Nor was it in the pulpit alone that Mr. Newman had the gift of throwing a character essentially his own over the work in which he was engaged. He succeeded in imparting to the Anglican service, and especially to that portion of it which from the lips of most clergymen was either an unimpressive recital or a pompous effort—the reading of the lessons—an indescribable charm of touching beauty, and a wonderful power of instructive efficacy. His delivery of Scripture was a sermon in which you forgot the human preacher; a drama in which the vividness of the representation was marred by no effort and degraded by no art. He stood before the sacred volume as if penetrating its contents to their very centre, so that his manner alone, his pathetic changes of voice, or his thrilling pauses, seemed to convey the commentary in the simple enunciation of the text. He brought out meanings where none had been even suspected, and invested passages which in the hands of the profane are often the subject of unbecoming levity, with a solemnity which forced irreverence to retire abashed into its hiding-places. In fact, for a non-Catholic ministration, nothing could be more perfect. It is the Church alone which completely merges the individual in the office, and which can afford, therefore, to dispense with every form of rhetorical embellishment, however legitimate, in the utterance of prayer or the recital of the Written Word. But I have often regarded Mr. Newman's mode of reading the lessons, with the inimitable power of representation which he threw into them, as a kind of foreshadowing, or, as I may say, apologetic counterpart, of that sublime idea which the Church has embodied in the quasi-dramatic recital of the Passion in Holy Week.

The charm of the ministration to which I have just referred had scarcely less effect in securing the presence, and riveting the attention, of a devout and highly

educated congregation than the masterly discourses which followed it. There were particular chapters of the Old Testament (for, as it was evening service of which I am speaking, the narrative portion of the New did not enter into the lessons), to the recurrence of which people used almost to look forward as master specimens of the peculiar power in question. The sacrifice of Isaac by his father, the history of Joseph and his brethren, the passage of the Red Sea, and the history of Balaam, are portions of the Old Testament which gave especial opportunity for its exercise. Ah! it might almost make one weep to think of the change which has come over that University; of the blight of scepticism and infidelity which has penetrated, to all appearance, to its core, and poisoned the very well-springs of faith and love. Unhappy Oxford!—

Not poppy nor mandragora,
Nor all the drowsy syrups of the world,
Shall ever med'cine thee to that sweet sleep
Which thou owedst yesterday.¹⁸

The spirit of confidence has fled; the demon of mistrust has entered in; and there is no charmer now to lure it away by the music of his song: no exorcist to bid it avaunt by the power of his word.¹⁹ One panacea alone remains—the authority of an infallible Church, and the gift of a childlike faith.

The second act of the drama which I am engaged in evolving opens with the publication of the celebrated 90th Tract, upon which the curtain shall rise in a future paper.

Before concluding, however, I must briefly advert to an event which belongs to the period we have just traversed, and not to that upon which we have still to enter. Mr. Froude had now passed away from the scene of his earthly labours. Towards the close of his mortal career, his opinions appear to have undergone some change, which was perceptible to many of his friends even in his outward demeanour. He associated less than formerly with the old High Church party of the Establishment, as he became convinced that the ills of the Church must be cured by sterner and more unworldly methods of discipline than that party was prepared to accept. An air of gravity and a tone of severity, even in general society (so far as he mixed with it), had replaced that bright and sunny cheerfulness which was characteristic of his earlier days; and this change of exterior was greater than could be explained by his declining health, against which he bore up with exemplary fortitude. Together with a more anxious view of the state and prospects of the Establishment, he had apparently taken up a less favourable opinion of the Catholic Church, at least, in its actual manifestation. A visit to the Continent had operated, from whatever cause, unfavourably upon his judgment of Catholics, whom he now first stigmatised as “Tridentines,”—a strange commentary, certainly, on the view put forth later by Mr.

Newman, to the effect that the prevalent Catholic system was erroneous, in that it had deviated from the Tridentine rule²⁰—not in that it represented that rule. This and similar dicta (some of a still more painful import) have led such of Mr. Froude's friends as have clung to the Established Church to believe that, had he lived, he would have remained on their side. Such a question will naturally be determined, to a great extent, according to the personal views and wishes of those who speculate upon it. Certain, at any rate, it is that, had he come to us, the Church would have secured the humble obedience and faithful service of a rarely gifted intellect; while, had he stayed behind, he would have added one more to the number of those whose absence is the theme of lamentation, and whose conversion the object of our prayers.

It is part, however, of the historian's office to investigate such questions according to the evidence at his disposal; and, in the instance before us, that evidence is far more accessible and far more satisfactory than is usually the case in post-humous inquiries. Mr. Froude's "Letters to Friends," published in his *Remains*, give an insight into his character and feelings, with all their various developments and vicissitudes, such as is commonly the privilege of intimate personal acquaintance, and of that alone. His bosom friends could hardly have known him better than the careful student of these letters may know him, if he desire it; indeed, it is to such friends that he discloses himself in those letters with almost the plain-spokenness of the confessional.

Now, it must be admitted that these letters leave the question as to the probability of his conversion very much in that evenly-balanced state in which, as I have just said, the wishes of friends or partisans come in to determine it on either side. His letters contain, on the one hand, many passages from which, if they stood alone, it might be concluded that he was, at certain times, almost ripe for conversion. They also contain others apparently of an opposite tenour. In the former class must be reckoned those indications of antipathy, continually deriving fresh fuel from new researches, to the English Reformation and Reformers.²¹ Mr. Froude's theological sentiments had long passed the mark of the Laudian era, and settled at the point of the Non-jurors.²² He thinks "one might take" for an example "Francis de Sales," whom, by the way, he classes with "Jansenist saints."²³ Again, he was most deeply sensitive to the shortcomings and anomalies of his communion: he calls it an "incubus" on the country, and ascribes to it the blighting properties of the "upas tree."²⁴ It is evident that he was in advance both of Mr. Keble and of Mr. Newman: he twits the former, in friendly expostulation, with the Protestantism of his phraseology in parts of the *Christian Year*, and laments the backwardness of the latter on some questions of the day.²⁵ On the other hand, and in the same direction of thought, he expresses admiration of Cardinal Pole;²⁶ he scruples about speaking against the Catholic system—even its "*seemingly indifferent practices*";²⁷ he can understand, on the principle of reverence, the communion under one species²⁸—perhaps the

greatest of all practical difficulties to many Anglican minds. Moreover, when at Rome, he evidently opened the subject of reconciliation to a distinguished prelate whom he met there.²⁹

Per contra, we have painful sayings against supposed practical abuses in the Church. He “really thought,” as he tells us, “that certain practices” which he witnessed abroad are “idolatrous”: he charges priests with irreverence, ecclesiastical authorities with laxity, &c.³⁰ Yet even these opinions he partially qualifies, and is disposed to attribute to defective information.³¹ He shrinks from speaking against Rome “*as a Church*” (p. 395).

Unwilling as I am to hazard conjectures on the subject, especially against the judgment of any among his more intimate friends, I do not think it unreasonable to conclude, from a comparison of these passages, that Mr. Froude’s objections were chiefly directed against imaginary abuses, or possible relaxations of discipline, which time and reflection would have shown him to be entirely independent of the real merits of the controversy. I find it also difficult to believe that, as the principles of the English Reformation received those illustrations in the Established Church which we have lived long enough to see,—as her constituted tribunals were found to give up in succession the grace of the Sacraments, the authority of the Church, and even the inspiration of Holy Scripture itself, as necessary truths,—his clear and honest mind would not have accepted some or all of these tokens of apostasy as a summons to enter the True Fold. Assuredly, too, we have known no instance of a mind equally candid, intelligent, and instructed, whose advances in the direction of the Truth (especially where assisted by extraordinary acuteness of conscience and purity of life) have stopped short, as time has gone on, of the logical conclusion, except in cases where the progress of such a mind has been arrested by conflicting tendencies of deeply ingrained Protestant or national prepossession—such as in his instance were singularly absent.

There is, however, one phase of Mr. Froude’s mind with which it is far more difficult to reconcile the belief of his probable conversion than any other. This phase, indeed, seems to have been a characteristic of himself, as compared with nearly all of those who took a leading part in the movement, including even Mr. Keble, who, on the whole, was the nearest to Mr. Froude in general character. The peculiarity to which I refer is that of an extraordinary leaning to the side of religious dread, and a corresponding suppression of the sentiments of love and joy. Mr. Froude’s religion, as far as it can be gathered from his published journal, seems to have been (if the expression be not too strong) more like that of a humble and pious Jew under the Old Dispensation, than of a Christian living in the full sunshine of Gospel privileges. The apology for this feature in his religious character, and for any portion of it which appears in those of other excellent men of the same period, is to be found in the ungraceful and often irreverent form in which the warmer side of the Christian

temper was exhibited in the party called Evangelical, whose language, based as it often was upon grievous errors of doctrine, had a tendency to react in religious minds on the side of severity and reserve. Such a form of religious spirit, however, where exhibited in the somewhat unusual proportions which it assumes in Mr. Froude, must undergo almost a complete revolution before it can be naturally susceptible of the impressions which Catholic devotion has a tendency to produce, or even tolerant of the language which pervades our approved manuals. It is certainly difficult to find in the Mr. Froude of the *Remains*, a compartment for devotion to our Blessed Lady, for instance, or even to the Sacred Humanity of our Lord, in all its attractive and endearing fulness. Yet, taking the phenomena of his case as a whole, and duly estimating the respective powers of the two conflicting forces, I cannot help thinking that the Church would more easily have conquered his prejudices than the Establishment have retained his allegiance.

Notes

1. St. Mary's College, in Oscott, about four miles north of Birmingham, established in 1793 for the education of the sons of Catholic nobility and gentry. *Ed.*

2. Virg. *Æn.* lib. vi. ad fin.

The modern reader may find the following English verse translation, by John Dryden (1697), helpful:

“This youth (the blissful vision of a day)
Shall just be shown on earth, and snatch'd away,
The gods too high had rais'd the Roman state,
Were but their gifts as permanent as great! . . .
No youth shall equal hopes of glory give,
No youth afford so great a cause to grieve;
The Trojan honor, and the Roman boast,
Admir'd when living, and ador'd when lost!
Mirror of ancient faith in early youth!
Undaunted worth, inviolable truth! . . .
Full canisters of fragrant lilies bring,
Mix'd with the purple roses of the spring;
Let me with fun'ral flowers his body strow
This gift which parents to their children owe,
This unavailing gift, at least, I may bestow!”

Oakeley, by substituted *sodalis* for *nepotis*, alters the second to the last line of this passage to read, “This gift which friends to their companions owe.” *Ed.*

3. Lecture XI.

4. The phrase “*Talis quum sis, utinam noster esses*” is from Plutarch’s “Agesilaus,” where Agesilaus says to Pharnabazus, the governor under the king of Persia, “How much rather had I have so brave a man my friend than my enemy” (trans. John Dryden). The traditional meaning of the phrase, however, is “So good is he, I wish that he was on our side,” as in the following quotation from J. H. Newman’s essay, “Palmer’s View of Faith and Unity”: “No wonder that Fr. Perrone . . . uses of [William Palmer of Worcester], in spite of his many errors, the often-quoted words, ‘Cum talis sis, utinam noster esses’” (*Essays Critical and Historical*, vol. 1 [London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1907], 217). *Ed.*

5. See Froude’s *Remains*, vol. i. pp. 251, 379. Mr. Bulteel was a clergyman of the Low Church School, who eventually, I believe, joined the Dissenters.

6. Newman’s *Letter to Dr. Jelf*, pp. 25, 26.

7. Charles Lloyd’s biographer notes, “Within seven years, from 1822 to 1829, he transformed the teaching of theology and impressed himself—in his techniques of instruction as well as the content of his theological perspective—upon the memory of an entire generation of Oxford ecclesiastics. . . . Within a year after he came to the Regius chair, he began meeting with small, informal classes of select students. . . . To private sessions in his rooms at Christ Church, Lloyd invited the most promising young men of that generation—Newman, Pusey, Froude, Robert Wilberforce, R. W. Jelf, W. R. Churton, Edward Churton, Frederick Oakeley, Edward Denison, Thomas Mozley, F. E. Paget, and George Moberly, to name a few” (William J. Baker, *Beyond Port and Prejudice: Charles Lloyd of Oxford, 1784-1829* [Orono: University of Maine at Orono Press, 1981], 93-4, 103). *Ed.*

8. *The Christian Year: Thoughts in Verse for the Sundays and Holydays throughout the Year* was first published in two volumes in 1827. In 1865, the year of publication of these *Historical Notes*, John Henry and James Parker of London and Oxford released their 86th edition of *The Christian Year*. Numerous editions had also been published in the United States. *Ed.*

9. John Keble, “Feast of the Annunciation,” *Christian Year*: “Ave Maria, thou whose name / All but adoring love may claim.”

10. Oakeley is here referring to *The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature*, by Joseph Butler, Bishop of Durham (1736). *Ed.*

11. Mr. Froude’s “Letters to Friends” furnish abundant evidence of a mind formed upon the best Oxford model. (See *Remains*, vol. i. pp. 170, 249, 329, 363, 367-8, 375-6, &c.)

12. For an illustration, I might point to the “Promessi Sposi,” or to “Fabiola.”

13. William Palmer of Worcester’s *Narrative of Events connected with the Publication of the Tracts for the Times, with Reflections on the Existing*

Tendencies to Romanism and on the Present Duties and Prospects of Members of the Church was published in 1843. *Ed.*

14. No difference of opinion or change of position can ever weaken my personal attachment to my former esteemed and much-loved tutor, the present Bishop of Winchester, under whose roof I passed the three happiest years of my Protestant life; and I can truly say that the separation from him, which I feel to be more consistent with a true affection towards him than the only sort of intercourse which would be possible under the circumstances, is among the foremost of those painful sacrifices which an act of imperative duty imposed upon me. I will also take this opportunity of publicly expressing to another distinguished prelate of the Establishment with whom I was once connected in an opposite relation, the present Bishop of London, the grateful sense which I entertain of his affectionate kindness towards me, unbroken as it has been by the event which has indicated such grave differences of religious opinion between us, and which has, of course, thrown me entirely out of the immediate sphere of his Lordship's interests and associations. I have also a pleasant and grateful remembrance of Archbishop Longley and Bishop Short, who were both tutors at Christ Church when I was there as an Undergraduate and Bachelor of Arts. I will also take this opportunity of paying a long-standing debt of gratitude to Bishop Lonsdale, for his kindness to me when I felt myself bound in duty to resign my prebendal stall at Lichfield after the sentence of the Court of Arches in 1845.

15. The *congé d'élire*, or "leave to elect," has its origin in disputes over whether monarchical or papal authority was requisite for the election of bishops in England. The dispute was settled in 1214 by King John, who endowed deans and chapters of cathedral churches with the freedom to select their own bishops, provided that the royal assent was granted. The *congé d'élire* was afterwards modified to its present form, in the statute Payment of Annates, by which statute deans and chapters of cathedral churches are given the freedom to elect the bishop chosen by the monarch. *Ed.*

16. Oriel tutors J. H. Newman, R. H. Froude, and Robert Wilberforce had, in the Lent term of 1829, initiated a series of reform, which "consisted of alterations in the timetable whereby the tutors were to supervise their own pupils more fully, both academically and morally, and thus augment their pastoral role." In June 1830 Edward Hawkins, Provost of Oriel College, after weeks of unsuccessful protest and admonition, cut off their supply of pupils (Piers Brendon, *Hurrell Froude and the Oxford Movement* [London: Paul Elek, 1974], 96-7). *Ed.*

17. *Copies of the Correspondence in the case of the Regius Professor of Divinity and Mr. Macmullen*. Oxford: 1844.

When Mr. Macmullen, a candidate for the degree of B.D., applied to Dr. Hampden for his exercises in theological argumentation, the Regius Professor of

Divinity presented him with the following two theses: (1) "The Church of England does not teach, nor can it be proved from Scripture, that any change takes place in the Elements at Consecration in the Lord's Supper"; (2) "It is a mode of expression calculated to give erroneous views of Divine Revelation, to speak of 'Scripture and Catholic Tradition' as joint authorities in the matter of Christian doctrine." In response, Macmullen requested the liberty to select his own subjects for argumentation. Hampden refused, and Macmullen did not advance to his degree. *Ed.*

18. Shakespeare, *Othello* 3.3.334b-337. *Ed.*

19. Since these words were written a prospect of brighter days has been granted to us.

20. This is a reference to both the Tridentine Creed, issued by Pope Pius IV in 1564, and the Tridentine Mass issued by Pope Pius V in 1570, both of which embrace and reflect the decisions made in the Council of Trent (1545-1563). *Ed.*

21. Froude's *Remains*, vol. i. pp. 389, 393, 394, &c.

22. Froude's *Remains*, vol. i. p. 363.

23. Froude's *Remains*, vol. i. p. 395.

24. Froude's *Remains*, vol. i. pp. 403, 405, &c.

25. Froude's *Remains*, vol. i. pp. 326, 394, 395, 403, 417, &c.

26. Froude's *Remains*, vol. i. p. 254.

27. Froude's *Remains*, vol. i. pp. 336, 395.

28. Froude's *Remains*, vol. i. p. 410. See the passage, "*If I were a Roman Catholic Priest*," &c.

29. Froude's *Remains*, vol. i. p. 306.

30. These passages are collected in the Editor's Preface to the *Remains*, p. 11, et. seq.

31. See Preface, p. 14, et. alibi.