We now turn to the history of the *Tracts for the Times*, and for this purpose must retrace our steps to the autumn of 1833. It had been unanimously agreed amongst those who originated the movement, that the press ought to be made the means of bringing before the clergy and laity the great principles on which the Church is based, and which had been almost wholly forgotten. We felt it necessary to teach people that the duty of adhering to the Church of England rested on a basis somewhat higher than mere acts of parliament, or the patronage of the State, or individual fancy. We were anxious to impress on them, 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.

In the necessity of such teaching we all concurred most heartily; but no particular arrangements had been made as to the composition or revision of Tracts, their title, form, &c; 1 when the publication of the Tracts commenced, and was continued by several of our friends, 2 each writer printing whatever appeared to him advisable or useful, without the formality of previous consultation with others. Several Tracts were thus privately printed and dispersed amongst friends and correspondents in the country. I received these Tracts, which were published during my absence, and aided in their distribution at first, because their general tendency seemed good, though I confess that I was rather surprised at the rapidity with which they were composed and published, without any previous revision or consultation; nor did it seem to me that any caution was exercised in avoiding language calculated to give needless offence. Circumstances had induced me to pay some attention to the writings of Romish and Dissenting controversialists, and it seemed clear that the Tracts contained gratuitous admissions, of which these opponents would almost certainly avail themselves.
Unwilling, however, to interrupt the harmony of our proceedings, I did not at first express my sentiments, further than urging the necessity of greater caution and discretion. The respect and regard due to the authors of the Tracts rendered me anxious to place the most favourable construction on everything which they wrote, and to hope that my apprehensions might be ill-founded. In the course, however, of the extensive correspondence in the autumn and winter of 1833 which has been mentioned, so many objections were raised by the clergy against parts of the Tracts, and so many indiscretions were pointed out, that I became convinced of the necessity of making some attempt to arrest the evil. With this object I made application in a direction [Newman] where much influence in the management of the Tracts was exercised, and very earnestly urged the necessity of putting an end to their publication, or, at least, of suspending them for a time. On one occasion I thought I had been successful in the former object, and stated the fact to several correspondents; but the sequel proved that I was mistaken.3

I did not, however, entirely relinquish the hope of being of some use, and therefore early in 1834, after the conclusion of a protracted visit to London, on the affairs of the Association, I most earnestly urged in the quarter where most influence existed [Newman], the absolute necessity of appointing some Committee of revision, to which all the Tracts might in future be submitted previously to publication; and that authors should no longer print in the series whatever might seem advisable to themselves. I urged this, on many grounds, and with all the arguments which I could think of, observing that although it was true, that the Tracts were really only the productions of individuals, and although those individuals disclaimed everywhere the notion that the Tracts emanated from any body of men, yet still the mere circumstance of their being published anonymously, in the same place, and in a series,4 did, and would continue to impress the public with a belief, that they were not the writings of individuals—that they represented the doctrines held by our Association—and that we should be held responsible for all the statements contained in the Tracts. I observed, that in proposing a system of revision by some Committee, there was not the least wish to lower the tone of doctrine, or to conceal any part of Catholic truth; but that the only object was to obviate the use of mere incautious expressions, of language likely to give needless offence, and to be laid hold of by enemies. It seemed that no sufficient answer was returned.5

This was the substance of our discussion, which was renewed more than once on successive days; but in the conclusion I had the mortification of finding my endeavours wholly fruitless, and that there was a fixed and unalterable resolution to admit no revision of the Tracts for the Times.

It may be, perhaps, that a greater amount of benefit to the Church has resulted from the continuation of the Tracts than would have been attained, had these suggestions been adopted. Perhaps, too, others perceived more clearly than I did
that my views on doctrine and discipline were not in perfect harmony on all points with those of the writers of the Tracts, and that a Committee of Revision, of which I should have been a member, would really have imposed a far greater restrain on those writers than I should have been conscious of, or designed. Certainly I had, in private conversation with Mr. Froude, and one or two others, felt that there were material differences between our views on several important points. I allude more particularly to the question of the union of Church and State, and of the character of the English and the Foreign Reformers. Mr. Froude occasionally expressed sentiments on the latter subject which seemed extremely unjust to the Reformers, and injurious to the Church; but as his conversation generally was of a very startling and paradoxical character, and his sentiments were evidently only in the course of formation, I trusted that more knowledge and thought would bring him to juster views.

The disappointment which had been experienced in the efforts to obtain some system of revision for the Tracts, and the apprehensions which I could not but feel for the result, together with a growing perception of the differences which existed between my views and those of my colleagues, led to the conviction that any further direct co-operation with them was impossible. I accordingly ceased to take any active part in their proceedings, or to be possessed of that intimate confidence, with which I had previously been honoured; while, at the same time, the friendship which had been cemented by a community of principles on the more important and sacred subjects, and by a community of interest and exertion in the cause of the Church, prevented me from adopting any course of opposition which might have been calculated to cause pain or embarrassment. 6

But, though thus reduced to silence and inaction, I was a deeply interested spectator of the progress of events. I could distinctly see (and with regret), that the theology of the Non-jurors was exercising a very powerful influence over the writers of the Tracts. Collections of Non-juring works had been made, and Hickes, Brett, Johnson, Leslie, Dodwell, &c. were in the highest esteem. To this source it was easy to trace much of that jealousy of State interference, much of that assertion of unlimited independence of the Church, and above all, much of that unfavourable judgment of the English and foreign Reformation, which so largely characterized the Tracts and other connected works. The Non-jurors, from whom these views were, perhaps unconsciously, borrowed, had been pressed by their opponents with precedents of civil interference in Church matters at the period of the Reformation; and their remedy too frequently was to assail and vilify the Reformation itself. 7 Their separation from the Established Church also led gradually to their discovery of various supposed defects in our Liturgy and institutions. Certain ceremonies which had been prescribed in the first Book of Common Prayer of Edward VI, and which had been subsequently omitted, were represented by several Non-juring writers as
essentials; and their views on this subject had been partially adopted by various authors of merit, even in the Church of England, as by Wheatley (in his book on the Common Prayer). Having devoted great attention to the study of the ancient Liturgies, I was perfectly satisfied, that the Non-juring writers (such as Johnson, &c.) were by no means qualified, by the amount of their information, to form a sound judgment on such points. It was, therefore, a matter of great concern to observe, that their views were developing themselves in the writings of friends.

Deeply uneasy as some of us felt on witnessing such questionable doctrine gradually mingling itself with the salutary truths which we had associated to vindicate, and often as we were driven almost to the verge of despair, in observing what appeared to be a total indifference to consequences; yet, finding that more experienced members of the Church, in London and throughout the country, were not equally apprehensive; and seeing also the sort of miraculous success which Truth was obtaining, notwithstanding these mistakes; we hoped that all would still be well, and consoled ourselves with the reflection, that no great religious movement had ever taken place without a certain amount of accompanying evil. There seemed also to be little probability that extreme and questionable views would prevail; for they had already become the subject of hot controversy; and the disapprobation which was so generally expressed, would, it might be hoped, have rendered their reception impossible; so that, in fine, they would probably have but little influence, and the only result would be, to establish great Ecclesiastical principles, and a firmer attachment to the English Church, in the public mind.

Had we not been restrained by these considerations and hopes, there can be no doubt, that many of those who have been identified with the Tract theology, would have publicly avowed that dissent on some points, which they took no pains to conceal in conversation with friends. I am satisfied, indeed, that such considerations alone would not have sufficed to keep us silent, had we not been reluctant to join in the ungenerous and furious outcry, which had been raised by certain periodicals; and which confounded and mingled in common denunciation truth and error, the most sacred principles of the Church and the questionable theories of some of its adherents. We shrank from being made the instruments of party-hate; and from seeing our language perverted and distorted to ends the most remote from our intention; perhaps to the assault of truths which we held most dear and sacred, or to the destruction of brethren, whose principle fault seemed to be indiscretion, and whose faults were more than balanced by their merits and their services.

At this distance of time, and after all the discussion which has taken place in regard to the Tracts for the Times and other connected writings, it can hardly be necessary that those who have hitherto studiously refrained from engaging in the controversy, either for or against the Tracts, should deviate from the course which they have so long pursued. Whether their judgment has been right or wrong in
preserving silence as far as they could on these agitating topics, and in abstaining from open opposition where they felt that they could not always approve, still it were now, at least, too late for them to enter on the discussion. That discussion, indeed, ought to be considered at an end, as regards various points, in consequence of the judgments which have emanated from ecclesiastical authority. It may be that we are not prepared to concur in every opinion or statement which occurs in those episcopal judgments. We may also be of opinion, that an unnecessary degree of severity has been exercised in some instances. But on the whole, I am persuaded that the points which have exited the combined animadversion of the majority of those Prelates who have spoken, are points which the great body of those who are really attached to Church principles have never approved; and on which they have always looked with distrust and dissatisfaction.

Admitting, as we do, most cordially and fully, the great services which have been rendered to the cause of truth and of piety by the authors of the Tracts, services which have been acknowledged even by their opponents, and which the chief pastors of the Church have not scrupled to commend in terms of the highest approbation; and deeply sensible as we are that they have established great verities, called attention to some distinctive features of our Church which had been too much neglected, and frustrated the designs of Latitudinarianism: 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, been not unfrequently placed in very serious embarrassment by the incaution of individuals, by indiscreet publications, and actions. They have felt that opponents were, in various ways, furnished with additional objections and arguments, and that they were themselves committed by proceedings of which they could not approve; and I really cannot but be of opinion that they have exhibited very great patience and forbearance throughout the whole of these difficulties. If those whose actual sentiments have met with opposition have suffered much, surely the position of those who have been exposed to suspicion, jealousy, and enmity, on account of the sentiments of others which they really disapprove, is not less distressing. They have, however, endured in silence the imputations under which they labour, when they could easily have relieved themselves by avowing their sentiments, and thus lending their aid to the opposite party. This is a view of the subject which has not been taken: it may suffice at least to show, that those advocates of Church principles who are not prepared to approve of all the theories advanced in *Froude’s Remains*, or in some particular Tracts, have had their own causes of complaint, and yet have borne them with patience and kindliness of feeling.

Explanation seems to be required on one or two points which are commonly misunderstood and misrepresented. The case of Dr. Hampden is one of these.
It was in 1836, that the discussions consequent on the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the chair of Divinity at Oxford, took place. This movement has been generally, but rather erroneously, attributed to the leaders of the Tract Association; they only took some share in it. Dr. Hampden had preached the Bampton Lectures in 1832; and an admirable theologian, who heard the concluding discourses, agreed with me, that their tendency was decidedly Rationalistic; that they went to the extent of representing our articles of faith, and our creeds, as based on merely human and uncertain theories. The publication of these lectures was unusually protracted. In 1834, on occasion of the attempt made to force dissenters on the Universities, Dr. Hampden published his pamphlet on Dissent, in which the boldest latitudinarianism was openly avowed, and Socinians were placed on a level with all other Christians. If any doubt could have existed on the tendency of the Bampton Lectures, it would have been removed by the clue to Dr. H.’s views furnished by this pamphlet. So great was the excitement of the time, however, when the whole University, banded together as one man, met, confronted, and overthrew the Ministerial attempt to change the character of its institutions, that this pamphlet attracted comparatively little notice. In 1834, soon after the appearance of the pamphlet, the friend mentioned above, urged on me the necessity of some protest against Dr. Hampden’s doctrines being made, lest impunity might lead to a repetition of similar attempts against the Articles. It seemed to me, however, that any such measure might be productive of harm, in drawing public attention to statements which, appearing as they did in by no means a popular form, would probably attract but little notice.

Thus stood matters when, early in 1836, Dr. Burton, Regius Professor of Divinity, died. The University was not long in suspense as to his successor. In a few days we were electrified by the intelligence that Dr. Hampden was to be appointed to the vacant chair. This measure seemed a designed insult to the University for its resistance to the Ministry in the preceding years. It was like an attempt to force latitudinarian principles on the Church. It was to place in the chair of Divinity, with the power of instructing and guiding half the rising Clergy of England, one who would undermine the authority of our Creeds and Articles. The dangerous principles which, we had hoped, would have remained unobserved, in writings of no very popular character, would now be at once brought into public notice, invested with authority, and received by all the rising generation. Some influential friends therefore of Church principles, unconnected with the Tracts, visited all parts of the University, inviting its members to instant exertion, in the hope of averting the danger by which we were threatened.

The result was, that a meeting was held in Corpus Christi common-room, where we elected, as our chairman, the Rev. Vaughan Thomas, B.D., on whom the independent party had previously fixed, as eminently qualified for the office by his
experience, habits of business, ability, eloquence, soundness and firmness of principle, and freedom from party connexions. Our petition to the Throne against this appointment was rejected, and Dr. Hampden became Professor. We met again, and petitioned the Heads of Houses to bring before Convocation a censure of the errors advanced in Dr. Hampden’s writings. It had been previously ascertained that the Professor refused to retract a single iota of his doctrines. Again and again was our petition rejected by the majority of the Board of the Heads of Houses, and again did we return to the contest with increased numbers and determination. All divisions and jealousies were forgotten in this noble effort. It was at length successful to a certain extent, and the Heads of Houses concurred in bringing forward a censure on Dr. Hampden (a different measure, however, from what we had desired), which was passed in Convocation by an overwhelming majority.

That this movement was not guided by the Tract writers, may be gathered from the fact, that the Principal of Brasenose College, afterwards Lord Bishop of Chichester, was the firm and persevering leader of our cause amongst the Heads of Houses, while the permanent committee appointed to prepare our addresses, comprised four members who were either opposed to, or in no degree connected with the Tracts, viz. the Rev. Vaughan Thomas, B.D.; the Rev. John Hill, M.A. of St. Edmund Hall; the Rev. Edward Greswell, B.D. of Corpus Christi; and the Rev. W. Sewell, M.A. of Exeter College. Mr. Newman and Dr. Pusey were the other members of the Committee, the latter of whom it was essential to appoint in consideration of his rank in the University.

The condemnation of Dr. Hampden, then, was not carried by the Tract writers; it was carried by the independent body of the University. The fact is, that had those writers taken any leading part, the measure would have been a total failure; for the number of their friends at that time, bore a very small proportion to the University at large, and there was a general feeling of distrust in the soundness of their views. I cannot but regret that the moderation and independence which were then so general, were afterwards superseded to a certain extent, by an extreme devotion to particular opinions on the one side, and a vehemence of hostility on the other, which have been equally injurious to truth and to Christian charity. The independent body was gradually diminished by the removal from the University of several wise, sober-minded, and influential men, who were lost to us, either by preferment or by death. In their place another generation arose, trained in different schools. Hence the development of extreme opinions; the temerity of assertion which day by day seemed to acquire fresh vigour from the reproofs which it encountered; the adoption of questionable rites and decorations in public worship, and the importance which was attached to them; and on the other hand, a jealousy of extreme views, gradually rising into vehement hostility and denunciation. We could even see a kind of personal enmity, which, with a steady and unremitting scent for destruction, tracked
and hunted down every fault, each mistake in doctrine, each folly in practice, every
unguarded word, or look, or deed; and found in them all damning proof of dis-
honesty and of all imaginable crimes against the Church of England.

One measure which must have materially, though unintentionally, increased the
influence of the writers of the Tracts, was the formation of a Theological Society, in
1835, the meetings of which were held at Dr. Pusey’s house in Christ Church. This
Society was to be managed by a committee, of which the Regius and Margaret
Professors of Divinity were to be ex officio members, while the other places were to
be occupied by Mr. E. Greswell, Dr. Pusey, Mr. Newman, Mr. Oakeley of Balliol
College. A wish was kindly expressed, that my name should also appear on this com-
mittee; but I declined, together with Dr. Faussett, Mr. Greswell, and Dr. Burton.16
Theological essays were read at the meetings of the Society, which were held once
a fortnight; and discussion was encouraged at first, but was afterwards discontinued.
I attended one of their meetings, and felt by no means satisfied of the wisdom and
expediency of the design. Several of the papers read on these occasions afterwards
appeared in the Tracts for the Times. They were listened to by attentive audiences,
consisting of bachelors and masters, to the number of fifty, and upwards.

Although there was certainly much occasionally in the pages of the British
Critic, which seemed overstrained and fanciful; much also which savoured of
sympathy with Rome, or of a spirit of discontent with the English Church; and
although the tide of opposition was continually increasing; yet there was much on
the whole for some time to encourage the sincere friends of Church principles. The
argument was all on their side: intemperate clamour, invective, unfairness, were
wholly on the other. It sometimes occurred to those friends of Church principles,
who were not exposed to the brunt of public obloquy, that their warmest sympathies
were due to men who, notwithstanding some errors in judgment, were, in fact,
standing in the fore-front of the battle, breaking down the reign of ignorance and
prejudice, and making way for the gradual prevalence of enlightened principle—for
its triumph over even their own mistakes.

It was thus that we were circumstanced, when in 1841 the celebrated Tract 90
was published. I have already spoken of the spirit of almost personal hostility, which
is some quarters was so painfully exhibited towards the author of this Tract. I had
with unspeakable concern observed the growth of feelings which I will not trust
myself to characterize, and had privately endeavoured in vain to infuse some kinder
and more generous temper, to soothe asperities, and to suggest favourable construc-
tions. The untiring persecution which the author of Tract 90 and his friends had
sustained, had often excited the displeasure of those who witnessed it. On the
publication of Tract 90, we learnt that a furious agitation had been set on foot in the
quarter alluded to, and that by dint of condemnatory letters from Prelates and others,
which were carried from house to house, and by other similar means, the Heads of
Houses were to be urged and almost intimidated into some measure, designed to crush the author of the Tract. I, in common with others (though by no means prepared to concur in some of the interpretations suggested by that Tract, or in some of its other positions), yet made every possible effort to prevent the success of this attempt, because it seemed to emanate from merely personal hostility; to threaten consequences disastrous to the peace of the University and the Church; and, above all, because I could not but apprehend that an opportunity would be taken by party, to represent the censure as a censure of Church principles in general—as a blow aimed, not merely against the author of Tract 90, or the Tract Theology, but against the doctrine of Apostolical succession—against all high views and principles—against all that Churchmen are bound to value and defend. Alarmed at this prospect, many influential clergy in various parts of the country concurred in opinion with some members of the University of Oxford, who were unconnected with party, that in consequence of the censure passed by the Heads of Houses, it was necessary to make some public declaration of our attachment to Church principles, and to express our sense of the benefits which had been derived from the writings of those whom it was not attempted to crush. But this undertaking was laid aside in deference to the wishes of an authority to which our obedience was most justly due; and I am as fully sensible of the wisdom which dictated such injunctions, as of the condescending kindness with which they were conveyed. In the then disturbed state of the public mind, our declaration would have been misunderstood, and might have been only a signal for fresh divisions.

Notes

1. The difficulties which were felt in regard to the publication of Tracts by an Association, led to the designed omission of any mention of Tracts in the “Suggestions” which formed the original basis of our Association. I have now before me a paper containing proposed additions to the “Suggestions,” in the following terms: “In this early stage of its proceedings, the Association does not feel itself competent to publish Tracts on its own authority; but it invites its friends to write Tracts upon the subjects which are the basis of its union, and undertakes to circulate them, pledging itself to no more than an approbation of the general sentiments they contain.

“Or should it be thought an awkwardness for the Association to circulate Tracts which it is not expressly to sanction, thus:

“‘In this early stage, &c. But it invites its friends to distribute Tracts, after first submitting them to the Committee, as well as otherwise exert themselves with a view of recommending the general objects which it is pledged to further.’”
This addition, however, was not thought advisable. The revision of the Tracts, which here seems to be contemplated, was not afterwards approved of. It was even decidedly opposed.

2. [The leader in the movement was Newman, but others supported him.]

3. This effort is alluded to in Froude’s Remains. I cannot but think that Froude’s influence, which was very great, was on many occasions exerted in a direction contrary to mine. He has expressed his disapprobation of the only Tract, in the composition of which I was in any degree concerned (Tract 15, “On the Apostolical Succession in the English Church”). At the request of a friend I furnished a few notes for this Tract, which were filled up and expanded by another, so that I am not in any way responsible for the Tract.

In a letter of 17 November 1833, Froude writes, “As to giving up the Tracts, the notion is odious” (Remains of the Late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude, M.A., Part 1, 2 vols. [London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1838], 1: 331). Ed.

J. H. Newman, in his own account of the movement at Oxford, makes the following observation:

“Mr. Palmer has a certain connexion, as it may be called, in the Establishment, consisting of high Church dignitaries, Archdeacons, London Rectors, and the like, who belonged to what was commonly called the high-and-dry school. They were far more opposed than even he was to the irresponsible actions of individuals. Of course their beau idéal in ecclesiastical action was a board of safe, sound, sensible men. Mr. Palmer was their organ and representative; and he wished for a Committee, and Association, with rules and meetings, to protect the interests of the Church in its existing peril. He was in some measure supported by Mr. Perceval.

“I, on the other hand, had out of my own head begun the Tracts; and these, as representing the antagonist principle of personality, were looked upon by Mr. Palmer’s friends with considerable alarm. The great point at the time with these good men in London . . . was to put down the Tracts. I, as their editor, and mainly their author, was of course willing to give way. Keble and Froude advocated their continuance strongly, and were angry with me for consenting to stop them. Mr. Palmer shared the anxiety of his own friends; and, kind as were his thoughts of us, he still not unnaturally felt, for reasons of his own, some fidget and nervousness at the course which his Oriel friends were taking” (Apologia Pro Vita Sua; being, A History of His Religious Opinions, ch. 2). Ed.

4. The title of Tracts for the Times had not yet been adopted.

5. I am not at liberty to publish the remainder of the conversation, including the objections to my proposal.

6. Actuated by such sentiments, I could not resolve to allow my name to be mentioned in Mr. Perceval’s narrative, because it would have imposed on me an
obligation of stating the reasons why I had ceased to co-operate with the authors of the Tracts. The circumstances, however, of the present time, oblige me to lay aside such personal considerations.

7. Heylin had adopted too much of the same tone in his History of the Reformation, and from causes somewhat similar.

8. It should be added, indeed, that several leading friends of church principles, such as Dr. Hook and Mr. Perceval, felt themselves obliged at last publicly to announce their dissent on various points.

9. In 1832 Renn Dickson Hampden delivered a course of eight lectures titled The Scholastic Philosophy Considered in Its Relation to Christian Theology. In the final lecture, Hampden argues that religious truth is to be found in Scripture alone, that statements of doctrine and formularies, as productions of the human intellect, have only a negative value in that they oppose error. Ed.

10. In 1834 Hampden published his Observations on Religious Dissent, in which he urges the removal of all tests of orthodoxy, and argues that, although the pious opinions of one religious community may oppose those of another, religion has to do with emotion and conduct resulting from a heartfelt assent to the truth of Scripture. Hampden, therefore, concludes, “I do not see that we are entitled to exclude any communion, merely as a distinct communion, from the name of the one Church of Christ.” Ed.

11. On this occasion the Rev. W. Sewell of Exeter College first became generally known to the public by his admirable pamphlets in vindication of the University.

12. [Hugh James Rose, Dean of Bocking, and Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury.]

13. We had previously communicated to Professor Pusey our wish that he should not take any prominent part in the affair, and our intention of nominating the Rev. V. Thomas as our chairman—a communication which was received in the kindest and most friendly spirit.

14. Our desire was that the specific errors advanced might be censured, in order that the students of theology might be put on their guard: we did not ask for the censure of any person. The statute proposed by the Heads of Houses, as a sort of compromise, condemned Dr. H. personally, without specifying his errors. We, however, accepted this measure as the best that could be expected under the circumstances, being satisfied that it was neither unjust nor unprecedented.

15. Ashurst Turner Gilbert (1786-1870) was elected principal of Brasenose College in February 1822 and was vice-chancellor of the university from 1836 to 1840. He was consecrated Bishop of Chichester on 27 February 1842, and acting in this capacity he interdicted the Rev. John Purchas, on 14 October 1868, from using ultra-ritualistic services at St. James’s Chapel, Brighton (DNB). Ed.
16. I ought to state, that in the communications which passed on this subject, the most earnest wish was expressed by Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman to prevent this Society from assuming anything of a party character, or developing any peculiar theological system. With this view they endeavoured to associate with themselves men who were wholly independent. Had we been able to meet their wish, some evils might have been obviated: but occupations and difficulties of various kinds interfered.